

Supply—External Affairs

as having a bearing upon the government's decision in regard to the application of Israel for those Sabre jets.

Mr. Pearson: I have just tried to answer that by saying that there may be a relationship between those two things which has not yet been established, to my satisfaction, but it was felt advisable to delay any decision for a few days until we could, after exchanging views with other governments, decide in our own minds what relationship, if any, did exist between these two things.

My hon. friend from Eglinton had something to say also about the Colombo plan. He felt that we might do more to show our support for that plan than we have been doing. In that connection I might repeat that, as hon. members know, we are increasing our contribution to the Colombo plan very substantially this year. It will be a larger increase than that of any other member of the Colombo plan, and I am sure that increase will be welcomed by all members of the house.

The hon. member said there was no limit to what could be used by the recipient countries under the Colombo plan and, to indicate that, he quoted from Mr. Cavell, who appeared before the external affairs committee and who, I agree, is a man who has won the respect not only of that committee but of others who know him. As shown on page 145 of the hearings of the committee Mr. Cavell did say, in reply to a question:

I think I can say now that I could spend any amount parliament agrees to give me, within reason. It is not too easy to spend this money, and I do not want to give that impression—

It is not so much the spending of money; it is the spending of money effectively. On that point Mr. Cavell went on to say:

If we can press on our leaders the necessity of making these people available;—

That is technical people, who are indispensable in connection with the contributions we are making under the Colombo plan in seeing that the money is well and efficiently spent.

—and having done that I would hope the situation would change to such an extent—

Mr. Goode: It is just a hope. It is not just a matter of the government providing money.

Mr. Cavell: That is so. It is a matter of national effort.

Mr. Michener: Would the expenditure of more money today be dependent on more technical people being available to you?

Mr. Cavell: Of course . . .

Mr. Michener: I take it we could not have more projects at the present time without there being more people in your administration?

That is, technical people from Canada to administer the expenditures.

Mr. Cavell: Quite right.

[**Mr. Fleming.**]

Then further on:

Mr. Michener: Your experience is that it would not be easy to get more at the present time?

Mr. Cavell: I think that expresses it very well.

So, while it is true that we could spend unlimited sums of money, because the needs are unlimited in that part and in other parts of the world, nevertheless I think it is even more important to make sure that the money we do spend is used effectively. The additional amount that is, I hope, being appropriated this year by parliament can be used effectively. It will be used for the establishment of the atomic reactor in India and for the building of the Warsak hydroelectric project in Pakistan, which has been a very difficult project indeed, involving as it does the engineering and technical co-operation of Pakistani and Canadian technical people. This extra money can also be spent in other constructive projects.

I join with the hon. gentleman in feeling that what has been done under the Colombo plan is one of the most valuable and imaginative things in post-war history. I hope we shall continue to support it constructively, and I hope that other countries will take the same stand in the future as they have in the past.

There is just one other matter, and that is a question which has been referred to by so many speakers, the liberation of subject peoples who are now under the Soviet yoke. In this connection my hon. friend from Dauphin read me a lecture a few minutes ago, and I must confess I deserved the lecture, because if I ever had any reputation as a historian I have certainly now lost it as far as being a historian of the Slav peoples is concerned. I talked about the Slav tradition of autocratic rule. That, I must confess, is a careless and unhistorical expression insofar as some Slav peoples are concerned, notably the Ukrainian people, the Czech people and the Polish people. They have a long tradition of democratic rule, when they had freedom in which they could express that tradition.

I think of Czechoslovak Bohemia in the seventeenth century and the Ukrainians during their great period. In fact in Poland they carried this passion for representative government in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to the extent that every member of the Polish diet in those days had a veto. But of course what I had in mind, and what I should have said—and I think this is historically accurate—was the Russian tradition, under the czars and under the communists, of autocratic rule. I think that does apply, and I think it might even apply to the developments going on inside the Kremlin walls now.