

I mention this merely to try to show that this is not as simple a problem as is sometimes portrayed. Also, while not unduly satisfied or smug, or certainly not boasting about what we have done, I am not going to be apologetic about it.

I would prefer in this regard to quote the verdict of an outside source, the Economist, a magazine which is often quoted in this House and which, writing about the Colombo Plan progress report on December 25, 1954, had this to say:

"On the contributing side of the Plan, the part played by Australia and Canada is particularly striking.

The Economist went on to say:

"In spite of the undoubted achievements of the Plan in the past three years, it will be necessary not only to maintain the momentum of economic development in the area but to increase it.

I agree with that, I continue.

"But it is not simply a question of finance. Expert technical advice and training is of equal importance, and in this direction the technical co-operation scheme, together with other parallel projects of technical assistance, has undoubtedly played a major part. It is equally important to get more effective planning as well as better management and administration. None of these tasks can be solved quickly. The Colombo Plan's future tasks are measured not in years but in decades."

And so, while none of us needs to be satisfied with what we have done, I think we can look forward to a continuation of this Plan with resources from this and other countries and with an even greater field for usefulness than it has had in the past.

A planning conference has been set for Singapore next September, when the whole future of the Plan is to be examined, particularly in its relationship to United States support, which has been, if I may say so, somewhat more forthcoming in recent months than previously.

The discussion of the Colombo Plan brings me to the main subject which has occupied most of our attention in this debate and which I dealt with when I introduced the resolution some time ago, namely international developments in the Far East. Discussion of that subject has, to a very large extent in this debate, revolved around our Canadian relationship with the United States, to a point where it has been difficult at times to disentangle the two things. I think it is a normal and healthy sign that we should be so preoccupied in this house in a debate on external affairs with the most important aspect of our foreign relations at the present time namely our relationship with the United States of America. I think of that relationship, important as it is bilaterally to us, in terms of collective action, in terms of collective defence, not merely as something between Canada and the