

authorized to offer direct support to organizations engaged in population research. Several of the Subcommittee's witnesses were very emphatic about the urgency of the population aspects of the development problem. They also stressed, however, that because of various kinds of sensitivity in some developing countries, this type of assistance should only be extended through multilateral agencies or, bilaterally, in response to direct requests. While the Subcommittee considers these limitations to be prudent, in view of the gravity of the overall problem, Canada should meet such requests as quickly as possible and should be prepared to expand the programme in response to requests.

78. Another type of assistance mentioned in the policy paper and in many of the Subcommittee's hearings is the broad category of food aid. In discussing this issue, it is essential to distinguish between famine and disaster relief on the one hand, and development assistance on the other. Clearly, when the former need arises, there can be little question that all available international help should be mobilized to meet it. The relationship of food aid to basic economic development, however, is much more complex. As the policy paper points out,

"The ultimate objective must be to help the less-developed countries to develop and improve their own food-production capabilities. Food aid must be provided with some discretion since large amounts of food, when not directly required to meet shortages, can depress agricultural prices in the developing countries and discourage investment and expansion in the agricultural sectors of their economies". (p. 16).

79. Fortunately for the developing countries, technology has intervened, in the form of the so-called "Green Revolution" despite the relative neglect of agricultural policy for too long a period. There is now a real prospect that an increasing number of developing countries will become self-sufficient in food grain production—at least in the short-term—and some will even develop exportable surpluses. In many cases, however, there remain major problems in such crucial areas as grain storage and transportation, fertilizer and pesticide production and the development of new techniques of food preservation in tropical climates. (These are all areas where Canadian expertise has and should be made available to work on overcoming these problems). These countries must also cope with the manifold social and economic side-effects of the "Green Revolution".

80. Nevertheless, it now seems quite clear, that, while there will continue to be some scope for Canadian food aid to meet emergency needs or fluctuations in crop conditions, the need of most developing countries for regular food imports has declined. This trend is likely to continue in the near future, it is also likely that in future these needs will be less concentrated in a few commodity areas. In the interests of basic development, it will be necessary to ensure that Canadian agricultural commodities on concessional terms do not preempt market opportunities for

efficient food export-producers among other developing countries.

81. It is also vitally important that the diminution of the need for Canadian food surpluses not be allowed to lead to any reduction in the overall volume of Canadian development assistance.

II THE NATIONAL EFFORT

A. Official Policies and Development

i. An Integral Strategy for Development Cooperation

82. Probably the point which has emerged most frequently and forcefully in the course of the Subcommittee's whole inquiry is that the challenge of development (and of development cooperation) is not an isolated exercise or programme, but part of a total picture in which many diverse areas of policy are vitally important and closely interrelated. It is quite clear that there is a general need for much greater consistency and much improved coordination. As Mr. Edward Hamilton, the Executive Secretary of the Pearson Commission told the Subcommittee,

"One of the principal problems in this field is the divorce or at least the estrangement between the various kinds of resource instruments in the development field. That is to say, the trade people do not talk to the aid people, the aid people do not talk to the capital movements people, and the capital movements people do not talk to the private investment regulations people. That is overstating it, but the point is very much there, and there are innumerable cases in which a country that is presumably trying to support development in a less developed country takes away with one hand what it gives with the other. It provides through aid something which it promptly nullifies through some change or some rigidity in its trade policy.... The right hand simply has to know what the left hand is doing, and it would be very pleasant if they were doing the same things." (35-24)

83. This comment was a general one, referring to all donor countries, but the Subcommittee has concluded that it definitely seems applicable to Canada. Indeed Prof. Hel-leiner stated that "Canada is relatively backward in its acknowledgement of the importance of the trade relationship..." (35-322) and supported his assertion by comparisons with six other donor nations. In other fields (e.g. population, immigration, public education and the encouragement of non-governmental agencies and private investors) the Canadian record is mixed. Specific comments will be found in the appropriate sections of this report.

84. Part of this general problem seems to be attributable to the relatively new and unprecedented character of the development task. It must be remembered that not too many years ago it was very widely assumed that a massive infusion of capital was all that would be required to develop the poor countries practically overnight. While there is much still to be learned about the development process, few now underestimate its immensity or complexity.