

"During those first three years of the WFP's existence, we had a change of government in Canada and, when the executive director of FAO came to Ottawa in December 1964, seeking a supplementary contribution, Mitchell Sharp was Minister of Trade and Commerce and Harry Hays was at Agriculture. As soon as Addeke Boerma, the executive director, asked for an extra \$2 million, Mitchell Sharp said, 'I have no problems with that,' and Harry Hays told me to draft a memo ready for the Cabinet in three days. I was delighted, because here the political figures were moving really fast.

"Then towards the end of 1965, Mitchell Sharp, who was also in charge of the Wheat Board, made [it] clear [that] he hoped the program would continue; so I put up a proposal for a three-year contribution from Canada of \$15 million, which was quite a jump. But I got a call from Trade and Commerce, saying that Mr. Sharp would like to see a figure of \$27 million. I said, 'Glory be!' From then on, Canada became a bigger and bigger contributor.

"What made the WFP an exciting enterprise was that the use of food aid on a continuous basis for economic and social development was ... new.... There were no established ground rules to guide the operations. Member governments, their delegates and the WFP secretariat had to make *ad hoc* decisions. As a result, we were involved all the time in experimentation, and in both rational and irrational debate at the sessions of the governing body of the WFP.

"Not all countries were equally enthusiastic over a multilateral food aid program. Some countries [that] did not have surpluses felt that they should not be expected to help dispose of the surpluses of other countries. However, there were five or six countries, including Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands and the United States, [that] took the lead in making sure that the WFP functioned well. We worked out rules and regulations. One rule was that at least one-third of a country's contribution should be in cash, because there would be many expenses to cover and because it would help prevent countries just dumping surplus stocks. Countries didn't always adhere to this rule. Another was that contributions in kind had to be valued at world market prices, not at the higher domestic support levels. And food aid was to be used in conjunction with other forms of aid, both capital and technical.

"Other rules called for the food basket to consist of quality products with a nutritional balance. They had to fit various peoples' food habits and religious requirements. Food aid had to be provided on a grant, not loan, basis—and yet we had to avoid a conflict between food aid shipments and commercial sales. At the same time, the aim was to get the most food aid for the donor's buck. All these rules had to be acceptable to both donor and recipient countries. As you can imagine, the exercise called for a fine balancing act.

"The delegates and WFP staff had also to agree on the types of food aid project[s] to support, and this took a good deal of discussion. Some delegations supported only the idea of emergency food aid. Others favoured projects of economic and social development, and there was some disagreement about the priority to be given to either. I took [a] leave of absence from Agriculture Canada to prepare for the WFP an evaluation study on food aid and special