

CANADA: THE COMMONWEALTH SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP PLAN

Charles Levi

Dedicated to the memory of Lakshman Rao Chervu (1937-1988)
Commonwealth Scholar from India to Canada, 1960
Murdered in New York City, December 31, 1988

Von Hügel Institute, St Edmund's College, Cambridge
2009

Table of Contents

Preface	v
Introduction	1
Section A: The Canadian context	3
Highlights of the early history of Canadian universities.	3
Canadian students overseas	3
Foreign students to Canada	4
Graduate studies in Canada	5
Canada, international relations and the Commonwealth	6
Section B: Development and implementation of the CSFP.	8
A plan is born	8
From Montreal to Oxford	11
Setting up the Plan in Canada	20
Introduction of fellowships	26
The first ten years of scholars (1960-1969) – Statistics and observations	27
General numbers for the 1960s	27
Canadians abroad	27
Impact – Canadians	30
Foreign scholars in Canada	32
Nations and programmes	35
Foreign scholars and their careers	36
The impact of the Plan on foreign scholars - 1960s	37
Did scholars go home	38
Section C: CIDA, the AUCC, and External Affairs 1969-1992	39
Evaluating the Plan	41
Changing the guard	42
New challenges for foreign students	45
The second ten years of scholars 1970-1979	46
Canadians Abroad	46
Careers and impact – Canadians in the 1970s	47
Foreign scholars in Canada in the 1970s	48
Nations and programmes	50
Impact – Foreign scholars, 1970s	51
Did the scholars go home?	53
British fees, Commonwealth mobility, and the road to Nicosia, 1980-1984	54
Nicosia – a promise without substance?	56
Human Rights, Aboriginal Rights, Women’s Rights	57
University expansion in Canada since the 1960s	59
Scholars in the third decade (1980-1989)	61

Canadians abroad in the 1980s	61
Impact – Canadians – 1980s	62
Foreign scholars to Canada in the 1980s	63
Nations and programmes	65
Impact – Foreign scholars – 1980s	66
Did scholars go home?	67
Section D: AUCC, CIDA, WUSC, CBIE, ICCS and CBIE – The Plan 1985-present	68
Committee composition in question	69
Budgets, policies, and tenders	70
The Canadian Caribbean Distance Education Scholarship Programme	73
New criteria and new challenges, 1999-present	73
Commonwealth scholars since 1990	75
Canadians Abroad	75
Impact – Canadians since 1990	76
Foreign scholars in Canada since 1990	77
Nations and programmes	77
Impact – Foreign scholars in the 1990s	78
Did scholars go home?	79
A comment on “Brain Drain”	80
Conclusion	82
Bibliography	83

_Toc225166512

List of Tables

1	Scholars tracked, as percentage of scholars by nominating country	2
2	Canadian Awards abroad by country, sorted by time period	28
3	University of undergraduate study for Canadian Commonwealth scholars, by time period	29
4	University where scholarship was tenable, Canadians, by time period.	29
5	Course of study by scholars, Canadian, by time period.	30
6	Occupational choice of Canadian scholars, 1960s.	31
7	Foreign Awards in Canada by country, sorted by time period	33
8	Course of study by scholars, foreign, by time period.	34
9	University where scholarship was tenable, foreign scholars, by time period.	34
10	Occupational choice of foreign scholars, 1960s	37
11	Percentage of scholars returning home, 1960s	39
12	Occupational choice of Canadian scholars, 1970s	48
13	Occupational choice of foreign scholars, 1970s	51
14	Percentage of scholars returning home, 1970s	53
15	Scholarship funding and percentages of ODA, 1981-1992	57
16	Percentage of women holding Commonwealth scholarships in Canada 1961-1993	60
17	Institutions with graduate and doctoral programs, 1971, 1984, and 2001	60
18	Occupational choice of Canadian scholars, 1980s	62
19	Occupational choice of foreign scholars, 1980s	67
20	Percentage of scholars returning home, 1980s	68
21	Occupational choice of Canadian scholars since 1990	76
22	Occupational choice of foreign scholars since 1990	78
23	Percentage of scholars returning home since 1990	80
24	Nominating country of inward scholars to Canada with careers in developed world	81

Preface

This paper is one of a number of regional reports commissioned as background for a history of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. The history has now been published as:

Learning abroad: A history of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan by Hilary Perraton
(Cambridge Scholars Publishing) 2009

Material has been drawn from the country reports, and is quoted and referred to in *Learning abroad* but it was thought that it would be useful for the reports themselves to be made available in web format. This report was drafted in 2008.

I am personally indebted to the scholars who wrote the country reports and we are together indebted to the four agencies that funded the research: the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Nuffield Foundation, the British Academy with the Association of Commonwealth Universities, and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade of the government of Canada. Funds from the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade were used to pay for this report.

Dr Charles Levi is a freelance researcher in Canada with extensive experience of working on the history of Canadian higher education.

Hilary Perraton

Cambridge 2009

Introduction

The Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan will turn 50 in 2009. Canada has been involved in the plan since its inception in 1959, and over 6,000 graduate students and visiting fellows have either studied in Canada or left from Canada to study abroad under the terms of the scheme. Students from over sixty countries and territories have come to Canada and Canadians have gone abroad to slightly over a dozen Commonwealth locations.

This study is designed to examine the origins of the plan (and the Canadian claim that they invented it), the policies under which it operated, and the lives and experiences of Commonwealth scholars, especially the impact that the scholarships might have had on both Canada and other countries.

The policy side is well documented in archival material now residing at Library and Archives Canada, as well as some material from university archives. However, this material becomes sparse and less reliable after 1987. For the most recent twenty years, policy discussions have to be teased from available published material and the recollections of individuals involved in the plan. Sadly, the plan has changed administrations four times since 1992, and in the ensuing shuffles much potentially useful material has either been destroyed or misfiled. The resulting balance of this paper suffers from this problem – eventually archival material will surface which will help fill some of the gaps in the post-1987 discussions.

Similarly, there is no authoritative list of Commonwealth scholars in Canada or Canadian scholars who have studied abroad. The information on the 6,139 individuals covered in this study has been cobbled together from at least five places, and contradictory data has been legion. This is especially problematic after 1992 – the last year in which a complete list of all awards given was published. It is impossible to estimate how many scholars have been overlooked in the process of consolidating lists, but the number is certainly close to 50 and may in fact be over 100. Efforts to create an authoritative list continue and perhaps by the 100th anniversary of the plan this will no longer be a problem.

Efforts were made to track every scholar in order to make the statistical sections of the report as accurate as possible, but this proved more difficult than originally expected. In the end, good (but sadly not complete) data has been found on over 1,400 of the former scholars, or approximately a quarter of the total. There is no doubt that in time every scholar could be tracked, but this would involve combing more assiduously resources scattered across Canada and the entire world – the present study only had time for internet searches backed by significant but not exhaustive print resources, as well as some scattered efforts to contact scholars directly. Certain university web sites are more informative than others, in too many cases it was impossible to link certain academics with potential Commonwealth awards. This researcher tends to be conservative when dealing with information, and there are hundreds of entries in the database which are marked with a “?” and hence not part of the final study. To cite one frustrating example, one “R. Meade” of Montserrat received a Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship in 1978 to McGill University. Reuben Meade served in the Parliament of Montserrat from 1991-2007 and also was Chief Minister. However, no material has been found which shows that this Reuben Meade was the same R. Meade who studied at McGill. He is not listed in the 1996 *McGill Alumni Directory* and none of his on-line biographies mention McGill or the Commonwealth Scholarship. A less conservative scholar might make the leap and code the data, this scholar has not.

In his PhD thesis, which also involved tracking University students, this researcher stated amongst other things, that “information on the successful was easier to find than that on the unsuccessful.”¹ For this study, I can add that information in Canada and the United States was easier to find than information elsewhere, and that information in the developing world was especially problematic to find. This can be shown in Table 1, where the total scholars tracked as a percentage of overall scholars connected with Canada is shown. The resulting analyses of scholars and their impact therefore is skewed towards the developed world – this will be highlighted in the sections that follow.

In terms of evaluating impact, the reader should be aware of two biases which this researcher brings to the topic. He is of the opinion that the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan (CSFP) was designed a) as a ex-

¹ Charles Morden Levi, “Where the Famous People Were: The Origins, Activities, and Future Careers of Student Leaders at University College, Toronto, 1854-1973.” (PhD Thesis, York University, 1998), 19.

Table 1: Scholars tracked as percentage of scholars by nominating country

	Cases Valid No.	Missing percent	Total No.	Per Cent	No.
Canada	561	30.4	1284	69.6	1845
U.K.	135	24.0	427	76.0	562
Australia	69	30.5	157	69.5	226
India	92	17.6	432	82.4	524
Anguila	2	50.0	2	50.0	4
Jamaica	21	16.7	105	83.3	126
Antigua	3	12.0	22	88.0	25
Bahamas	7	21.9	25	78.1	32
Barbados	14	19.2	59	80.8	73
Bermuda	3	18.8	13	81.3	16
Caymans	2	33.3	4	66.7	6
Dominica	3	13.6	19	86.4	22
Grenada	7	17.9	32	82.1	39
Montserrat	4	22.2	14	77.8	18
St Lucia	10	27.8	26	72.2	36
St Vincent	1	4.2	23	95.8	24
St Kitts	4	22.2	14	77.8	18
Trinidad	24	21.2	89	78.8	113
Turks/Caicos	1	20.0	4	80.0	5
BVI	4	14.3	24	85.7	28
Belize	6	19.4	25	80.6	31
Guyana	9	14.1	55	85.9	64
Gibraltar	1	12.5	7	87.5	8
P.N.G.	3	12.5	21	87.5	24
N.Z.	46	29.3	111	70.7	157
Fiji	4	20.0	16	80.0	20
Solomons	3	75.0	1	25.0	4
Tonga	3	25.0	9	75.0	12
Vanautu	1	33.3	2	66.7	3
Bangladesh	33	23.4	108	76.6	141
Pakistan	27	18.1	122	81.9	149
Sri Lanka	35	21.0	132	79.0	167
Maldives	3	18.8	13	81.3	16
Mauritius	9	15.0	51	85.0	60
Seychelles	3	15.0	17	85.0	20
Malta	19	30.6	43	69.4	62
Cyprus	10	21.3	37	78.7	47
Nigeria	33	16.9	162	83.1	195
Ghana	21	13.2	138	86.8	159
Sierra Leone	11	16.9	54	83.1	65
Kenya	35	26.1	99	73.9	134
Botswana	1	4.0	24	96.0	25
Cameroon	1	7.7	12	92.3	13
Gambia	5	13.9	31	86.1	36
Lesotho	4	14.8	23	85.2	27
Malawi	9	19.6	37	80.4	46
South Africa	6	17.6	28	82.4	34
Swaziland	1	7.7	12	92.3	13
Tanzania	27	19.6	111	80.4	138
Uganda	21	18.9	90	81.1	111
Zambia	10	12.5	70	87.5	80
Zimbabwe	13	15.7	70	84.3	83
Hong Kong	25	30.5	57	69.5	82
Malaysia	15	17.9	69	82.1	84
Singapore	14	23.3	46	76.7	60

change program among humanists as opposed to technicians and b) intended for scholars to return to their home countries instead of staying where they received their scholarships or taking their knowledge to a third country. It is not clear that the Plan, as events transpired in Canada, fulfilled either objective.

Section A: The Canadian context

In order for there to be an international exchange of graduate students between Canadian universities and those of other countries, certain preconditions had to exist. Canada had to have universities, a tradition of foreign students, proper graduate programmes, and some type of foreign relations, in the case of the CSFP, with the Commonwealth. All of these preconditions existed before the plan was first proposed in 1958.

Highlights of the early history of Canadian universities.

The first Canadian universities were founded in the 18th Century, mostly as religious colleges sponsored by religious denominations. Ironically, given what transpired later, these colleges were originally founded to dissuade students of university age from leaving the country. John Graves Simcoe, an early colonial administrator in what would become Ontario, insisted that a strong educational system would allow Canadians to rebuff the republican traditions of the United States and maintain loyalties to British values. However, he was unable to receive the funding required to found a university during his tenure, being told by Secretary of State Henry Dundas that “the Country must make the University, and not the University the Country.”²

Colleges in Canada were thus largely dependent on private and not public support. This was known as the voluntary system. Attempts had been made to set up land endowments for certain institutions, but the low price of land over the long term made the income from these sources weak. Support was also sought from overseas branches of churches in Canada, but the multitude of denominations of Christianity in Canada divided up this pie into very small amounts. St. John’s College in Winnipeg, to cite one of these examples, was able to raise enough money from overseas to build their institution, but never enough to operate it.³ With few exceptions, the voluntary principle ensured a multiplicity of small institutions, each of which struggled for survival. Even the University of Toronto, nominally the Provincial University of Ontario after 1849, could not engage in any long-term planning as its annual expenses consistently outstripped revenues.⁴

If the colleges of Canada had been content to remain institutions solely involved in the teaching of liberal arts and theology, their financial situation would not have been a concern. However, beginning as early as the 1860s, scientific inquiry began to become important, and colleges realized that “chemistry required apparatus even at the level of simple demonstration.”⁵ The pressure for centralized institutions receiving provincial funds thus grew, and led to consolidation and federation measures across Canada. Some of these were more successful than others. The University of Toronto merged with Victoria College of Cobourg in the 1880s and then Trinity College of Toronto in 1903 and other colleges soon after. Four smaller religious colleges also consolidated under the umbrella of the University of Manitoba in the 1870s. These new universities were better suited to research and to the development of multiversities, and by the beginning of the 20th century some research innovation was coming out of Canadian universities, such as Ernest Rutherford’s earliest experiments in atomic theory⁶ and Banting and MacLeod’s discovery of insulin at the University of Toronto.⁷

Canadian students overseas

Canadian students had a tradition of going overseas for research that also went back to the 19th century. Germany had long been a site where prospective scientists and theologians had traveled to complete a level of study which was not possible in their home country, such as the four Toronto chemistry students who studied originally under Professor W.H. Pike and then proceeded to Leipzig.⁸ Canadians were also present at Oxford and Cambridge in the 19th century, but there was less support available for these trips since they rarely ended in advanced degrees.⁹ However, an Oxbridge BA was a valued commodity among certain disciplines in Canada, such as history.¹⁰ The

² A.B. McKillop, *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario 1791-1951* (University of Toronto Press, 1994), 6.

³ J.M. Bumstead, *St John’s College: Faith and Education in Western Canada*, (University of Manitoba Press, 2006), 18, 35.

⁴ McKillop, 28-29.

⁵ McKillop, 43.

⁶ Stanley Brice Frost, *McGill University for the Advancement of Learning Volume II* (McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1984), 37-39.

⁷ Martin Friedland, *The University of Toronto: A History* (University of Toronto Press, 2002), 285-291.

⁸ Friedland, 176-177.

⁹ Friedland, 177.

¹⁰ Robert Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation: A Century of History at the University of Toronto* (University of Toronto Press,

Rhodes Trust provided eight places for Canadians in 1904, and from that point on, all possible Rhodes places were taken up by willing Canadian applicants, at least in English-speaking Canada.¹¹

Beginning in the late 1870s the United States began to rise in prominence, on the strength of the introduction of the PhD to American universities. Johns Hopkins was especially attractive to Canadians, nearly 40 of whom received doctorates there between 1878 and 1900. The University of Chicago and Clark University were also favored destinations for Canadian students.¹² Except for periods of trouble such as during the two world wars, the traffic of Canadians abroad was substantial, although exact numbers of students abroad have not been calculated.

Foreign students to Canada

It is probably safe to say that before the Second World War, Canada was a net exporter of foreign students and a net importer of foreign-trained academics, mostly from Britain and the United States. Canada's universities were not well-developed, and their status in the world of the 19th and early 20th century would not be too dissimilar from the new universities in the third world of the later 20th century. There were limited exceptions. Refugee scholars from the Confederate States of America did study in Canada in the 1850s, as did the occasional son or daughter of an American businessman transferred to a Canadian "branch plant" operation. Students from outside North America would be excessively rare. In the 1920s, there was a trickle of students from overseas, but at places like McGill Americans were still the only "foreigners" in 1932.¹³ As of 1936, there were only 2,443 foreign students in a total population of 35,108, and 2,018 of those students, or 80%, were from the United States.¹⁴ The International Student Service (ISS), which would later become the World University Service of Canada (WUSC), was dedicated to providing assistance to students overseas and occasionally assisted a student to escape oppressed areas to come to Canada. During World War Two, a group of "friendly alien" students interned by the British because of their citizenship in Nazi countries were shipped to Canada and eventually some of them were released to continue their studies.¹⁵ In general, however, Canada did not open its doors to immigrants, including students from abroad.

After World War II, a variety of displaced students and other foreigners entered into Canadian universities in more visible numbers, even if they were still low. In 1949 and 1950, the ISS awarded 35 scholarships to displaced persons to study in Canada and to stay in Canada as citizens.¹⁶ In 1950-51, the University of Toronto branch of the Friendly Relations with Overseas Students (FROS) estimated that there were 60 Asian, 20 African, and 20 West Indian Students present at their institution.¹⁷ In Canada as a whole in 1952 there were 3,012 foreign students out of a university population of 63,499. Although this was a drop in percentage from 1936, the shape of the population had changed, with only 50% being from the United States. The next largest group was West Indian students, at 8.6%.¹⁸ Despite institutions like FROS, however, these students did not always find a warm welcome in Canada. In 1946, a West Indian student was barred from participating in a bridge tournament at the University of Toronto, the University of Toronto Ski Club was known to have a ban on non-WASP members and at McGill University the election of a West Indian student as "snow queen" in the late 1940s caused a backlash from fraternity elements on campus.¹⁹

No such problems occurred with a group of Hungarian refugees from the 1956 revolution, who were welcomed on Canadian campuses with open arms. In one extreme case, a large group of students and staff from Sopron University was integrated into the University of Toronto when they arrived in January, 1957. This complemented

1991), 47-48.

¹¹ Douglas McCalla, "The Rhodes Scholarships in Canada and Newfoundland", in Anthony Kenny, ed., *The History of the Rhodes Trust 1902-1999* (Oxford University Press, 2001), 203-208, 210-211. There were occasional difficulties in getting nominations from French Canadian institutions.

¹² Friedland, 177-178.

¹³ Frost, 129.

¹⁴ D.B. Clarke, "A Review of the Present Situation", *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1954*, 33.

¹⁵ Friedland, 346-347.

¹⁶ *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1951*, 53.

¹⁷ Friedland, 394.

¹⁸ D.B. Clarke, "Review of the Present Situation", 33.

¹⁹ Charles Levi, "Decided Action has been Taken: Student Government, Student Activism and University Administration at the University of Toronto and McGill University 1930-1950" (MA Major Research Paper, York University, revised version September 8, 1994), 64, 96.

earlier support which had been given to Yugoslavian students who had escaped a few years earlier.²⁰

All of these experiences with foreign students, however, occurred ad-hoc and without any integrated Canadian strategy. For every student admitted, many were most likely turned away. An observer in 1954 noted, “many of us have been ashamed over the years of the fact that our country can not even insure reciprocity for the fellowships offered by other countries to our own students.”²¹ In both the sciences and the humanities, Canadian scholarship support for foreign students was dwarfed by the resources available to Canadians abroad, and the Canadian Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences (the Massey Commission) had declared in 1951 that Canada had been “singularly negligent in the matter of exchange scholarships.” The commission, and others, called for some permanent scheme of scholars for foreign students, either at the provincial or national level.²²

Graduate studies in Canada

The development of graduate studies in Canada in many ways parallels the events related above on foreign students. Each university made its own isolated progress towards awarding advanced degrees. The University of Toronto was the first institution in Canada to offer the PhD, with regulations being passed in 1897, the first degree awarded in 1900 and a total of 35 awarded by 1915.²³ Queen’s University had provided for doctoral studies as early as 1889 but awarded no degrees before the turn of the century, and only four PhD’s between 1935 and 1950.²⁴ McGill University did not establish a graduate school and a PhD degree until 1906, and did not award the degree until 1909.²⁵ However, U of T and McGill did have significant graduate programmes before World War II. McGill awarded 320 PhD’s between 1923 and 1939.²⁶

Other Canadian universities were very slow to institute graduate programs. Dalhousie issued 300 masters degrees between 1930 and 1950 but did not have an established Faculty of Graduate Studies until 1949 and did not have a PhD programme until their Chemistry department created one in 1955.²⁷ This experience was very typical. In 1945, the Social Science Research Council of Canada commissioned John Bartlett Brebner to report on the state of graduate studies. Brebner reported that “with some modest exceptions... advanced students in Canada have only three English-speaking universities (Toronto, McGill, and Queen’s) which seriously attempt to provide the staff and facilities for conclusive graduate work” and that “Canada does not possess a single fully-rounded graduate school.” The centralization of facilities in central Canada was a serious problem, and Brebner declared that “Dalhousie, Manitoba and British Columbia... have much too far to go” to become decent places for graduate students. Brebner noted that graduate studies in Canada was too often treated as an “extra... something loosely appended to undergraduate instruction and handled by professors in their spare time”, and that it was “high time” that Canadian universities stop “deluding themselves and cheating both faculty and students” out of a proper education.²⁸

The Brebner report was a spur to action on the part of Canadian universities. The National Conference of Canadian Universities struck a Committee on Graduate Studies in 1947 to “promote the development of graduate work at the Master’s level at the smaller universities in Canada” and to do whatever was possible to enhance the “more complete utilization of the academic resources of Canada” to promote PhD work.²⁹ This committee encouraged western Canadian universities to start PhD work as soon as possible, and in places such as Toronto and McGill suggested that something be done to reduce “undergraduate teaching loads” which were precluding full development of graduate programmes.³⁰ Significantly for what would come later, the committee also called for “arrang-

²⁰ Friedland, 396.

²¹ Jean-C Falardeau, “Scholarships for Foreign Students”, *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1954*, 44.

²² *Ibid.* 44-45.

²³ McKillop, 163; Friedland, 175; 180.

²⁴ Frederick W. Gibson, *Queen’s University: To Serve and Yet be Free* (McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1983), 318-319.

²⁵ Frost, 82.

²⁶ Frost, 181.

²⁷ P.B. Waite, *The Lives of Dalhousie University Volume Two 1925-1980 The Old College Transformed* (McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998), 170; 265.

²⁸ John Bartlett Brebner, *Scholarship for Canada: The Function of Graduate Studies* (Ottawa: Canadian Social Science Research Council, 1945), 42-43, 52.

²⁹ *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1948*, 20-21.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 22-23.

ing the exchange of professors for greater or shorter periods – and for the exchange of graduate students where practicable.”³¹

Slow expansion of graduate studies took place in the 1950s, but the fact remained that there was a clear hierarchy of graduate schools in Canada, with the most active programmes at McGill and Toronto, followed closely by Queen’s, UBC, and Dalhousie. Other institutions could barely be located in any world map of university research institutions. But graduate instruction was taking place and degrees were available to be awarded – another critical precondition for the CSFP.

Canada, international relations and the Commonwealth

The last main precondition for Canadian participation in CSFP was the development of an independent foreign policy and a sense of a Canadian role to play in the world. This did not develop until well into the 20th century. For the longest time, Canadian foreign policy decisions were made by imperial authorities in London. Canada did have a “High Commissioner” in Britain as early as 1879, but no other representation abroad. When Britain declared war on Germany in 1914, Canada was considered to be automatically at war as well, and acted accordingly.³² However, Canada’s large and timely commitment to that war in defense of the British Empire allowed it to put forward proposals (along with South Africa) for a “Commonwealth of Nations” based on a united foreign policy within the Empire in which all members would have an input. This did not evolve as expected, but by the 1920s, the “First Commonwealth” had developed comprising “communities which had a long historical association with Britain, which were settled mainly by white people of British stock, which had a long experience managing their communal affairs through British political and legal institutions and living together with each other in a freely accepted co-operative association.”³³ The Balfour Declaration in 1926 made all self-governing dominions such as Canada “autonomous communities within the British Empire” and Canada appointed its first minister to Washington in 1927, and representatives in Paris and Tokyo soon followed. The Statute of Westminster in 1931 made Canada’s parliament independent from decisions made in London.³⁴ Canada symbolically invoked its rights when it waited until September 10, 1939 to declare war on Germany, one week after the British did.³⁵ This did not impede full Canadian participation on the allied side in the Second World War, and Canada was the main site of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan, the first major “Commonwealth Exchange” programme ever developed.

After World War II, Canada’s foreign policy was pulled in several directions. Canada joined the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and NORAD, thus being part of a world governance system as well as local and hemispheric defense initiatives. However, the Commonwealth remained a key part of Canadian foreign initiatives and was viewed as “a vehicle or forum for special contacts and relations with a large part of the Third World and the advanced industrial democracies of the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand”³⁶ as well as a means of strengthened “political, commercial and cultural links” with these countries.³⁷ This support of Canada’s role in the Commonwealth remained intact for many years over several changes of government. The two major parties to hold power in Canada (The Conservatives and Liberals) have both kept good relations with the Commonwealth as part of their policies.³⁸ It is true that different administrations stressed at different levels the political, commercial and cultural value of the Commonwealth, but both the Conservatives in the 1960s and the Liberals in the 1970s supported the multi-racial harmony of the institution against challenges from South Africa and Rhodesia.³⁹ Diefenbaker may have stressed trade and Trudeau bridge-building between north and south, but the end result in terms of Commonwealth policy tended to be the same. Although this policy may have been shaken somewhat by the 1990s, even then support of the Commonwealth as part of Canadian multilateralism was

³¹ Ibid., 25

³² Frank Underhill, *The British Commonwealth: An Experiment in Co-operation among Nations* (Durham, N.C: Duke University Press, 1956), 23, 37-38.

³³ Ibid., xx-xxi, 49-50, 55-56.

³⁴ Ibid., 56-58, 69-70.

³⁵ Ibid., 67.

³⁶ Costas Melakopides, *Pragmatic Idealism: Canadian Foreign Policy 1945-1995* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998), 45.

³⁷ Ibid., 46

³⁸ Melakopides, 63-65, 79-81; Solomon Gabriel, *Foreign Policy of Canada: A Study in Diefenbaker’s years* (New Delhi: Uppal Publishing House, 1987), 121-128; J.L. Granatstein and Robert Bothwell, *Pirouette: Pierre Trudeau and Canadian Foreign Policy* (University of Toronto Press, 1990), 279-280.

³⁹ Gabriel, 80-85; Granatstein and Bothwell, 279-280.

evident.⁴⁰

The Canadian position on international organizations had implications on what resources were available to support educational initiatives. Through UNESCO, Canada participated from 1948-1950 in a fellowship scheme which brought 64 individuals to various places in order to aid future reconstruction of their home countries. Although the fellowships were granted to “relatively mature persons who have established positions in their own countries” for short-term training, the fellowship scheme was watched very carefully by Canadian universities,⁴¹ and well into the 1950s was still considered a “remarkable” Canadian achievement which assisted in the development of a Canadian capacity for research assistance on a world scale.⁴²

In 1950, the United Nations established the “Colombo Plan Technical Co-operation scheme”, sponsored primarily by Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Canada, with the purpose of providing training and assistance to countries and territories in Southeast Asia including India, Pakistan and Ceylon. As well, Canada was a participant in the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Programme, which had a more world-wide scope. Under the auspices of these plans, Canada had by 1954 provided 250 overseas experts and training facilities for 423 foreigners. Most of these places were in industry or government, but approximately 93 were in university situations.⁴³ The Colombo Plan was especially important because it brought graduate students from abroad into Canadian universities, although such students were under the instructions of their home governments and their activities were strictly limited to those which would benefit the immediate economic and technical needs of their home countries, and this “inevitable rigidity” was considered to be a liability.⁴⁴ However, through the Colombo Plan the strands of foreign students, graduate studies, and international relations were drawn together.

This was explicitly connected to the Commonwealth at the National Conference of Canadian Universities annual meetings in 1953, which contained a session on Commonwealth inter-university relationships. G.P. Gilmour of McMaster University noted that Canadians had been slow to appreciate the value of such inter-university contacts, and no rational allocation of resources had been made to foster them. However, Gilmour insisted that there was a need for “wider mutual acquaintance among Commonwealth scholars, both for the sake of establishing friendships and for the sake of creating points of contact,” and he especially noted that “graduate students, who would come to Canada if they could find the means, are an increasing problem and opportunity, which we are not yet prepared to deal with adequately.” Gilmour rhetorically suggested that Canada was not doing enough to impart to students from India, Pakistan or Africa that “Canada is a nation generous, courteous and unprejudiced.”⁴⁵

More significant for events which would follow, Sidney Smith of the University of Toronto gave a speech at the same session which outlined the specific extent of Commonwealth student activity at his university. And he noted in terms of incoming students that “many are coming, many more are anxious to come,” and that for Canadians “there is great need of encouragement and funds to enable students to take advanced work in other parts of the Commonwealth.” He called on the National Council of Canadian Universities (the umbrella organization which at that point was the main place where university representatives gathered to discuss mutual problems) to “take definitive steps to the end that more funds will be available to enable scholars – students and staff – to come to, and go forth from, Canada, not only to the British Isles but to the other members of the British Commonwealth.”⁴⁶

Frank Underhill, the iconoclastic professor of history at the University of Toronto, speaking at Duke University in 1955, worried out loud to his audience that:

the present elite group of leaders in India and Pakistan were trained in an English way of life, a good

⁴⁰ Melakopides, 167.

⁴¹ *National Conference of Canadian Universities Proceedings, 1949*, 41.

⁴² Falardeau, “Scholarships for Foreign Students”, 43; J.A. Gibson, Honorary Treasurer, NCCU to T.H. Matthews, October 31, 1958, Library and Archives Canada (henceforth LAC), RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1.2, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges October 13 1958 – February 24, 1959.”

⁴³ D.W. Bartlett, “Foreign Students Under Official Auspices”, *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1954*, 38-39.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 39, 41.

⁴⁵ G.P. Gilmour, “Higher Education in the Commonwealth”, *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1953*, 55-56.

⁴⁶ Sidney Smith, “Higher Education in the Commonwealth”, *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1953*, 61-62.

many of them at English schools and universities. They learned English methods of political debate and party organization, English standards of administration in a great civil service headed by English officials, English military organization in the armed services where they served alongside of English officers. What will happen when this generation of leaders dies and a native leadership emerges from that mass democracy of peasants and townsmen who will no longer even be learning the English language? It is hard to believe that the present British orientation of Indian thought and policy will continue to be so powerful.⁴⁷

Such a development worried Underhill and others, but there were doubts as to what Canada could do about it. Underhill noted that Canada's primary commitments "are now outside the Commonwealth" and focused on the North Atlantic and the British-United States axis.⁴⁸ However, the Commonwealth was clearly on the radar screens of Canadian educators, if faintly. At least one small pressure group, the Canadian British Education Committee, was active in the late 1950s in proposing a "Rhodes Scholarship in Reverse" which would bring students from the Commonwealth to Canada.⁴⁹ What actually developed would be much different, but it would tie together several developments in Canada which had been converging from the turn of the century.

Section B: Development and implementation of the CSFP.

A plan is born

The creation of the CSFP is generally credited to the vision of Sidney Smith, who after his tenure as President of the University of Toronto took up the position of Secretary of State for External Affairs with the Canadian government in September of 1957.⁵⁰ The credit does seem to make some sense – Smith had already shown his interest in Commonwealth educational issues, and certainly it was during his watch that the first plans for the scholarships were announced. But there is no evidence in his personal or state papers for the time that he put forward the plan or even conceived of its creation. The only reference under his signature to anything close to the scholarship plan is a letter dated February 12, 1958 to Professor D.R. Dudley of the University of Birmingham, in which he declares he has a "deep personal interest" in educational exchanges with the United Kingdom.⁵¹

Smith was, however, casting around in the spring of 1958 for ideas on how to foster co-operation within the Commonwealth, and especially amongst their universities. He held informal discussions with one of his younger academic colleagues, Tom Symons, and apparently challenged Symons to come up with a "great Britannic initiative" which would "unite the universities of the Commonwealth in a new shared endeavour." Symons rose to the challenge and suggested a "Commonwealth scholarships plan" involving open competition among students of intellectual excellence.⁵²

If Smith did in fact commission Symons to develop ideas, this evolved out of Canadian worries about a public relations failure at a Commonwealth conference scheduled for September of 1958. As early as April of that year, there were worries that the conference would be "unproductive" and certain countries had suggested it be cancelled because "there were not sufficient matters of substance to place before" it. In May, the Cabinet discussed the possibility of using the meeting to enhance training plans for Commonwealth members, but also the creation of a "Commonwealth Bank" similar to the World Bank to assist with economic development. There was resistance, however, to any capital commitments to such a bank. As one long-time civil servant wrote ten years later, "long before the Montreal conference actually assembled it had become clear that no massive new Commonwealth trade diversion, in whatever form, was going to take place. Therefore other important matters had to be

⁴⁷ Underhill, 88.

⁴⁸ Underhill, 96.

⁴⁹ Correspondence between J.W. Pickersgill and the Canadian British Education Committee, 1959, LAC, RG26, Vol, 133, Deputy Minister's Registry Files, Immigration – Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan, File 3-35-3, "Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan."

⁵⁰ E. A. Corbett, *Sidney Earle Smith* (University of Toronto Press, 1961), 58.

⁵¹ Smith to D.R. Dudley, February 12, 1958, University of Toronto Archives (henceforth UTA)/Sidney Smith Personal Papers, Box 32, File 81.

⁵² THBS draft notes for Dr. Sidney Smith for a Commonwealth Scholarship Plan, May 1958", typescript copy of original document at one point in the possession of Tom Symons. No copy of these notes have been located in the Smith papers to date.

found to take pride of place on the agenda.”⁵³ Finally, on July 9 the cabinet noted that there was a plan that was coming forward from the United Kingdom on scholarships, which was supposed to have been discussed in June but which was not “because its practicalities had not been studied by U.K. authorities.”⁵⁴ As a result of the mention of scholarships, a memo was prepared by D.W. Bartlett and R. Grey of External Affairs on the subject of Commonwealth Scholarships on July 30, 1958. There is no indication on whose authority the memo was commissioned, nor is there any indication that Bartlett and Grey were aware of the Symons note submitted to Smith in March.⁵⁵

On the heels of the memo, what the Canadians described as an “informal” meeting took place on July 31, 1958 between Canadian and U.K. officials on the subject of “Training of Commonwealth Students.” Sir Roger Makins of the United Kingdom noted that of the 35,000 overseas students at U.K. universities, 24,000 were from the Commonwealth, and that there was little room for these numbers to expand. Douglas LePan, Assistant Undersecretary of State for External Affairs replied that “Canadian Ministers had been considering the expansion of existing technical assistance schemes to Commonwealth countries and their extension to those parts of the Commonwealth where there were no arrangements at present.” As well, scholarship possibilities were in the offing, and “since the essence of the Commonwealth association lay in common educational backgrounds, there was scope for offering facilities for education in the humanities.” Makins and LePan discussed the further possibilities of the plan, and Makins assured LePan that the matter would be raised in Montreal, with the idea of having “at some later date... a further meeting of interested Commonwealth governments to discuss the whole nexus of problems in the field of training of overseas students.”⁵⁶ The Canadian Cabinet noted with interest on August 6 the U.K. report on scholarship programmes, which “would be available to all Commonwealth countries at both graduate and undergraduate levels” with the aim of maintaining Commonwealth enrollment at U.K. universities at between 7 and 8 per cent of total enrollment. Cabinet also noted “Canadian officials had said they had not been thinking solely in these terms but that for presentational purposes, it might be possible to relate the schemes that we both had in mind.”⁵⁷

The essence of the Canadian scheme began to take shape in August, after the meeting with the British. Klaus Goldschlag of Economic Division II of External Affairs noted to LePan the problems of Commonwealth leadership in the next twenty-five years. Echoing Underhill’s remarks at Duke three years earlier, Goldschlag said:

the stage has already been reached in countries like India where the number of people exposed to English in schools and universities is rapidly shrinking and where the quality of the English that is taught and spoken is deteriorating... It seems to me, therefore, that what Commonwealth countries could do at Montreal would be to put in hand a plan under which they would help one another in providing opportunities for the training of those who in twenty-five year’s time will be carrying the responsibility for decision-making in Government, in business and industry, in labour movements, and in the armed forces.

Goldschlag added that this is not likely to “differ too much from the scholarship scheme of which the British are known to be thinking.”⁵⁸

External Affairs was pushing the idea of scholarships in the humanities. However, their counterparts in the Department of Finance were not so optimistic. On receipt of the plans, one analyst declared that the humanities was not the proper place for scholarships. “Without wishing to denigrate these fields of study”, the analyst wrote, “I question seriously the need for a scholarship programme limited to or including these fields... The Commonwealth Conference is a trade and economic conference and the main problem facing the Commonwealth is the economic development of its poorer members.” These problems, and not “tangential elements” such as the humanities, were more critical, and the plan should restrict itself to the training of graduate students, “and to certain fields of study related to economic development in general, e.g. the social sciences, rather than specific aspects of economic development, e.g. transportation.” Such a plan would be worthy of Finance’s approval, and “the justification for such a programme rests in its prestige value, in the publicity which it attracts, and in the interest in Commonwealth development which it will foster.”⁵⁹ This memorandum highlighted the tensions which would ex-

⁵³ A.F.W. Plumtre, “Perspective on Our Aid to Others”, *International Affairs* 22, 3, (Summer 1967), 490. See also Gabriel, 125.

⁵⁴ LAC/Douglas LePan Papers/MG31-E6, Box 11, Folder 118, “Cabinet Committee on the Commonwealth Conference.”

⁵⁵ LAC/Douglas LePan Papers/MG31-E6, Box 10, Folder 113, “Scholarships and Education.”

⁵⁶ LAC/Douglas LePan papers, MG31-E6 Folder 64, “Meetings in London Between Canadian and United Kingdom Delegates July 1958”.

⁵⁷ LAC/Douglas LePan Papers/MG31-E6, Box 11, Folder 118, “Cabinet Committee on the Commonwealth Conference.”

⁵⁸ LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges June 13-October 17, 1958.”

⁵⁹ LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges June 13-October 17, 1958.”

ist in the CSFP in Canada in its earlier years, between graduate and undergraduate and between humanities and technical training.

Meanwhile, R.Y. Grey, the hard-working drafter in External Affairs, put the finishing touches on the original proposal, suggesting that “we should make some effort to ensure that the governing elite in the emergent Commonwealth countries in twenty-five years from now will have some form of practical association with Western administrative and managerial processes as they operate in other Commonwealth countries.” Grey noted that if Canada could manage to provide 100 scholarships, the whole plan might end up being “five or ten times larger.” One scholarship for every two million people in the undeveloped Commonwealth would be 70 scholarships, and if they each had an average duration of three years, the total cost would be just over a million Canadian dollars over three years. Another 29 scholarships could be added for developed countries and move the cost to closer to a million a year. Grey also appended a chart which gave the possible breakdown of scholarships by country, and which ones would be graduate or undergraduate.⁶⁰ Grey’s plan was distilled into another memorandum, “Commonwealth Scholarship and Technical Assistance Proposals for Montreal Conference”, which highlighted that “with general participation by all Commonwealth governments an exchange of one thousand or more individuals might be possible”, and that such a plan required “distinction and prestige” and wide recognition. Thus, “it is proposed at Montreal, the Canadian delegation should take the initiative in seeking an agreement in principle for the establishment of a broad and reciprocal programme of scholarships and teaching fellowships as an instrument to strengthen the intellectual resources of the Commonwealth.”⁶¹

The Cabinet Committee on the Commonwealth Conference considered this idea on August 20, and this was the first official mention of Sidney Smith in connection with the plan, backhandedly, when LePan apologized that Smith was not present to introduce the proposal. LePan continued to present the idea as “an effort to accept and adopt Canadian thinking to the ideas current in Whitehall,” and noted if the “U.K. scheme was found to lack substance, we could then put forward our proposals for a somewhat broader programme as a comment on the U.K. ideas.” The general lines which would be followed in the future were laid out – reciprocal programmes, broad lines of study, individual applications instead of government sponsorship, and high standards of intellectual ability.⁶² In the wake of the Cabinet meeting, telexes began to spread the idea to Canadian representatives abroad, stressing that Canada would be seeking “a broad and reciprocal programme of Commonwealth scholarships and senior teaching fellowships, all Commonwealth countries would both offer awards and receive awards, which might total a thousand a year or more... Ministers attach great importance to reaching agreements at the conference that such a programme will be put in hand.”⁶³ Missions were no doubt expected to ferret out opinions of Commonwealth countries, and quickly it was learned that Ceylon and Ghana approved of the idea.⁶⁴ Representatives in London, however, noted that “UK Govt wishes to raise this question at conference. The Tel will not include any actual proposals, but should be adequate to give us an opportunity to send our message by way of comment on it.”⁶⁵

Only then did Sidney Smith enter the picture. Before the Commonwealth Conference was to meet, there was a gathering of members of the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth in Montreal on September 1, 1958. Smith addressed that meeting and noted “Until a few years ago... intellectual traffic was almost entirely in one direction... I believe that a programme of exchange of Commonwealth university staff and students, particularly at the graduate level, should be promoted. Such a programme should reflect the pattern already established; rather than the one-way traffic of an earlier time, our exchanges must be multilateral in character. Selections under such a scheme should be made by universities and not by governments.” Smith noted the importance of the humanities and hoped there would not be too much priority put on sciences.⁶⁶ The *Canadian Globe and Mail*, without missing a beat, proclaimed the next day, “University exchanges proposed by Smith.”⁶⁷ Thus a legend was born.

That Smith was not the author of the plan can be further discerned by the fact that his fellow university presidents were caught off guard by the declaration. Why would they not have been tipped off to this idea by Smith, since they would have to take part in any such scheme if it was to be successful? They seem to have had no such warn-

⁶⁰ LAC, Douglas LePan papers, MG31-E6, Box 10, Folder 113, “Scholarships and Education”

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² LAC, Douglas LePan papers, MG31-EG, Box 11, Folder 118, “Cabinet Committee on the Commonwealth Conference.

⁶³ LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges June 13-October 17, 1958.”

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ LAC, Douglas LePan papers, MG31-E6, Box 10, Folder 113, “Scholarships and Education.”

⁶⁶ LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges June 13-October 17, 1958.”

⁶⁷ Ibid.

ing, although the announcement was timed to take place two days before a Board meeting of the NCCU. The NCCU, without missing a beat, passed a September 3, 1958 motion that “The Conference would welcome such an interchange scheme, particularly for staff and graduate studies.” but noted that the government should pay the costs of any such scheme.⁶⁸

Now that the plan was out, the next phase involved selling it to the various members of the Commonwealth. Canadian representatives in Canberra reported that Australia envisaged difficulties in finding space at their universities and from Wellington it was reported that New Zealand thought the “concept has real merit” but authorities there “are anxious to avoid a firm commitment regarding the proposal at Montreal.”⁶⁹ A meeting of Commonwealth officials was held on September 11 before the conference and LePan did his best to push the idea that “there was, in a sense, a surplus of educational opportunities in some Commonwealth countries and a good deal could be done to promote economic development by some sharing out of this surplus,” but Sir Frank Lee of the U.K. remarked that “United Kingdom ministers would be sorry if a scholarship plan was all that emerged from the Conference in this field” and the Indian representatives questioned how practical a reciprocal scheme was.⁷⁰ Further objections also were coming from the U.K., as LePan related to his counterpart in the finance ministry. The British were worried about the overall quality of foreign students, and also noted that their institutions would be sensitive “to anything that might smack of dictation from government.” According to the recollection of Sir Henry Lintott, the government had proposed the idea to the University Grants Committee and were told “All that was necessary was for the Commonwealth Governments to inform the Association of Commonwealth Vice-Chancellors how much money would be available and to hand the total responsibility for elaborating and operating the scheme over to the Association.” This the U.K. was not prepared to do, nor were they able to commit to a definite number, “but an informal use of ‘some fairly large figure (say 1000 scholarships)’ could be used in press briefings.”⁷¹

From Montreal to Oxford

With those preliminaries aside, Sidney Smith was brought back on stage to speak to the Montreal Conference on September 19, 1958, where he set forth at the plenary sessions the terms of the Canadian proposals, noting that he understood that “the United Kingdom would also be the most important partner in the scheme he was proposing but Canada was anxious to play its full part.” Smith stressed reciprocity and the need to co-operate with university officials.⁷² The Conference created a “Working Group on Commonwealth Educational Exchanges” which stated in its final communique that “It was decided in principle to establish a new scheme of Commonwealth scholarships and fellowships... the exact scope and detailed arrangements... can only be worked out after consultation with university and other educational authorities in Commonwealth countries.” A figure of “some thousand” was put forward, with the U.K. to take a half and Canada a quarter.⁷³ The *Globe and Mail* chirped in, “Canadian Plan for Student Aid to be Adopted.”⁷⁴ Sidney Smith alerted T.H. Matthews, Executive Secretary of the NCCU that there would shortly be some “systematic discussions of these initiatives”⁷⁵ while frantic civil servants in the information division of External Affairs tried to set up some system to field inquiries from individuals on the details on what was still a nebulous plan.⁷⁶

Meanwhile the NCCU began to decide how to approach the proposal which had been passed at Montreal largely without their input. J.A. Gibson, Honorary Treasurer of the NCCU, pointed out to Matthews that “to deal with 250 people in one academic year will require (at a guess) no less than eight full-time persons of special aptitudes and experience, and with unusual qualities of perseverance and thoroughness.” Matthews suggested in turn to LePan that a meeting be held between government officials and the universities as soon as possible. LePan responded to Matthews that indeed the time was ripe to involve them in the decision-making process, and set out in

⁶⁸ UTA/A71-0011/Office of the President (Bissell)/Box 28, File 1.

⁶⁹ Canberra to Ottawa, September 9, 1958; Wellington to Ottawa, September 11, 1958, both in LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges June 13-October 17, 1958.”

⁷⁰ LAC, Douglas LePan papers, MG31-E6, Box 10, Folder 117, “Minutes of Meetings of Officials.”

⁷¹ LePan to Plumpton, September 12, 1958, LAC, Douglas LePan papers, MG31-E6, Box 10, Folder 113, “Scholarships and Education.”

⁷² LAC, Douglas LePan papers, MG31-E6, Box 10, Folder 113, “Scholarships and Education”; also in LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges June 13-October 17, 1958.”

⁷³ LAC, Douglas LePan papers, MG31-E6, Box 10, Folder 115, “Conference Documents.”

⁷⁴ LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges June 13-October 17, 1958.”

⁷⁵ Smith to Matthews, October 2, 1958, *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Information division memorandum, October 17, 1958, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, *Ibid.*

a letter to Matthews on November 12, 1958 the “considerations which led the Canadian Government to introduce its scholarship scheme in the context of a Trade and Economic Conference,” and noted the need for reciprocity and cross-fertilization amongst the entire Commonwealth.⁷⁷ LePan had several meetings with Canadian intellectuals involved with the Canada Council⁷⁸ and the National Research Council, with the result that he believed that “the way should be pretty well open to plan in terms of asking the NCCU to assume the major administrative responsibility for Canada’s participation in the scheme.”⁷⁹

The British slowed matters down. They suggested that the next conference on the matter be held in England, in July of 1959. This caused some consternation to Canadian officials who were in a hurry. One complained that “if the meeting is held in July, it would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, to have this scheme take effect for the university year 1959-1960” and that this might affect the government estimates for the plan. LePan conceded this and indeed by December of 1958 External Affairs had decided “there was little hope of bringing the project to the point of practical implementation before the autumn of 1960.”⁸⁰ External Affairs set up an interdepartmental committee with the Ministries of Finance and Trade in order to discuss further moves on the plan. But before that could meet, External Affairs had to settle its own ideas on the plan, which was done in a meeting on February 2, 1959. It was decided that each country in the plan would be responsible for creating a selection committee to vet individual applications, but the hopes would be that this committee would be at “the senior level.” Scholars would have to be of “high intellectual ability” and “one of the basic purposes of the Commonwealth Scholarship scheme is to benefit those who are likely to occupy leading positions in other Commonwealth countries and in this way to strengthen the Commonwealth link.” Reciprocity, but not “mathematical equivalence”, would be the goal, and Canadians should be careful not to take places “at the expense of the less developed Commonwealth countries or territories where needs are greater.” Because all agreements among nations would be bilateral, there would be no need for a central organizing authority. External Affairs also saw the need to meet with the universities in March.⁸¹

Plumptre of Finance also chirped in, with his insistence that Canada award both inward and outward scholarships (as opposed to the British who were believed to only be interested in inward scholarships). Plumptre noted to LePan, “if Canada is going to play an increasing role (in an Expanding Commonwealth in an Expanding World) we should take steps to see that more Canadians know about more parts of the Commonwealth and this they can only do by going there.” Plumptre added, sarcastically, that this is less interesting to the British because there was “a surfeit of Englishmen who have spent many years in Poona and similar places.” LePan quickly agreed on all points, and the stage was set for interdepartmental meetings.⁸²

The first of such meetings was derailed by the opinions of the George Glazebrook, head of the Commonwealth Division of External Affairs, who, oddly, had not yet been privy to the discussions. Glazebrook noted that there seemed to be three parts to the plan, one part technical assistance to under-developed countries, one part “Rhodes Scholarship programme” and one part “multilateral exchange of scholars on the basis of genuine intellectual attainment,” and that the three parts did not fit together very well. Glazebrook declared:

If the scheme were to be regarded as essentially a technical assistance one, then the other two could easily be disposed of. If, on the other hand, the scheme were to emphasize the Commonwealth context and the cross fertilization of ideas, then he felt that certain other questions were not answered. The contribution to be made by Asian countries would be mainly in the facilities for the study of their different civilizations. This was true to a lesser degree also of the Western countries, but the main contribution of the latter would be the facilities for study in the scientific fields. We would have to be very careful, as a receiving country, not to imply that Canada had more to offer and thereby offend the Asian members of the Commonwealth.

Glazebrook also worried about the lack of mention of Canada-Australia or Canada-New Zealand exchanges, as

⁷⁷ J.A. Gibson to Matthews, October 31, 1958; Matthews to LePan, November 5, 1958; LePan to Matthews, November 12, 1958, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1.2, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges October 13 1958 – February 24, 1959.”

⁷⁸ The Canada Council for the Arts [commonly called the Canada Council] had been formed in 1957 to foster and promote the study and enjoyment of the arts. It was founded on the recommendations of the 1951 Massey Commission and because that Commission suggested federal grants to universities, the Council also administered those grants.

⁷⁹ LePan memo, December 4, 1958, LAC. Douglas LePan Papers, MG31-E6, Volume 62.

⁸⁰ O.E. Ault, International Economic and Technical Co-Operation Division to LePan, December 16, 1958; LePan to Ault, December 24, 1958, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7893, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 1.2, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges October 13 1958 – February 24, 1959.”

⁸¹ Minutes of External Affairs sub-committee on “Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme”, February 2, 1959, Ibid.

⁸² Plumptre to LePan, February 9, 1959; LePan to Plumptre February 13, 1959, Ibid.

these were important. Plumptre at this point chimed in that the proposals “lacked any indication of what the objectives of Canada are with respect to the scheme” and he worried that the Asian members would highlight technical subjects and not cross-fertilization of ideas. LePan tried his best to brush aside the question of mixed motives, saying that all scholarship schemes suffered from that flaw, and that he was confident a focus on “genuine scholastic achievement” would carry the day. On this basis the government was prepared to present the plan to the universities.⁸³

And it was about time. The NCCU had heard nothing formally about the plan for months, causing T.H. Matthews to write to Sidney Smith, “Some of the Canadian university heads are growing a bit anxious about our preparations for the Inter-Commonwealth Exchange Scholarships and Fellowships meeting to be held in Oxford in July.” Matthews was worried the Canadians would not be prepared. LePan was duly confused and drafted a letter for Sidney Smith to send in return. This declared “Within the Government, we have been moving as quickly as possible to prepared for consultations with those outside the Government, and particularly in the university world... But you will appreciate that in a matter of this kind involving a number of Government departments some time is needed to prepare the way for outside consultations.”⁸⁴ Indeed, the official announcement of the conference had not yet been made by the British because of foot-dragging by South Africa as to whether or not they would participate in a conference that might involve the sending of non-white students abroad.⁸⁵ A decision from South Africa was not expected before March 18, 1959. On March 17, Sidney Smith, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, died in his Ottawa home of a “massive cerebral haemorrhage.”⁸⁶ The plan for which he was to get so much credit was still a long way from approval.

The death of the minister did nothing to dissuade External Affairs from proceeding with the plans. Three days after his death, a draft report on the scholarship plan was distributed from External Affairs to Finance and Trade. LePan also drafted a statement for Prime Minister John Diefenbaker about the upcoming Oxford conference. The statement was to be read at the same time a similar statement was to be delivered in the United Kingdom and released in London to “be timed for morning papers in U.K. Wed Mar 25.”⁸⁷ The day before the announcement was to be published in London, LePan invited Matthews of the NCCU to a meeting on April 10, 1959, asking that he send a maximum of three representatives, to complement three others from the NRC, the Canada Council, and the World University Service of Canada (WUSC) who he had invited a day previously. LePan noted to Matthews “You might like to know that I had an opportunity of discussing these arrangements with Mr. Smith a few days before he died. He was, of course, at all times closely interested in the progress of the scholarship scheme and I know he was looking forward to the results of our joint efforts in the formulation of proposals that would make a genuine contribution to the Commonwealth association.”⁸⁸ If there was any time for LePan to credit Smith with the idea for the scheme, that would have been it, but LePan did not do so.

Drafts of the proposed scheme flew up and back between External and the other departments. D.W. Bartlett of Trade and Commerce responded twice over two days, noting to his superior that the latest draft “shows its committee origins in some redundancies and gaps and it also still tends to reflect some of the original rather unrealistic thinking about the administrative requirements of the program. However this plan comes much closer than its predecessors in outlining a program which can be administered reasonably effectively.” He then told External affairs that said superior had “some doubt about the extent to which we will succeed in avoiding government involvement with the scholars particularly in countries where the private sector is very small.”⁸⁹ Glazebrook focused instead on the allocation of scholarships, which he said was “not consistent on basis of population.”⁹⁰ Meanwhile, the very harassed information division of External Affairs asked, yet again, to be kept apprised of details of the plan as questions flooded in after the press release. The division complained that all it knew was

⁸³ Minutes of the Third Meeting of the “Interdepartmental Committee on External Aid Policy”, February 20, 1959, LAC, RG 25, Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.1 [March 4-25, 1959].

⁸⁴ Matthews to Smith, March 5, 1959; Smith to Matthews March 10, 1959, Ibid.

⁸⁵ Cape Town to External Affairs, March 11, 1959; Ottawa to London March 12, 1959; London to Ottawa, March 13, 1959, Ibid.

⁸⁶ Corbett, *Sidney Earle Smith*, 70. Notice of funeral of Sidney Smith, LAC, Douglas LePan Papers, MG31-E6, Box 6, Folder 63.

⁸⁷ Goldschlag to Hudon and Bartlett, March 20, 1959; LePan to Prime Minister, March 23, 1959; London to Ottawa March 23, 1959, LAC, RG 25, Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.1 [March 4-25, 1959].

⁸⁸ LePan to Matthews, March 24, 1959, Ibid. Letters to Lewis Perinbaum of WUSC, A.W. Trueman of the Canada Council and E.W.R. Steacie of the NRC, all dated March 23, 1959, are in the same file.

⁸⁹ Bartlett to Ault, March 23, 1959, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1 Vol. 1, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy” August 18, 1958-June 19, 1959; Bartlett to Goldschlag March 24, 1959, Ibid.

⁹⁰ Glazebrook comments, March 31, 1959, LAC, RG 25 Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.2 [March 26-May 1, 1959].

gleaned from newspapers, and “it would be helpful if we could be kept informed of plans.”⁹¹

The final government memorandum was prepared on April 8, 1959 for the April 10 meeting and carried the title, “Inter-Commonwealth Fellowship and Scholarship Plan proposed by interested Government departments.” The memo cited a “need for training people of more general skills and aptitudes.. A scholarship scheme would help to cement the Commonwealth association... the subjects covered would include the humanities and social sciences as well as the natural sciences and other accepted academic disciplines.” The document continued the number of 1,000 scholarships, of which Canada would provide 250 at any one time. It also noted that “the major role of selection should be carried out by people associated with the university community”, with the government remaining “generally in the background.” Reciprocity was considered to be very important. The document ominously noted “The United Kingdom... had been thinking in terms that were both broader and less specific than the Canadian proposals” but on the whole the document was optimistic that Canadian ideas would prevail. This was the first hard evidence of the plan to escape the civil servants and land in the hands of a wider audience.⁹² It was circulated to Canadian university officials and sent to the Canadian High Commission in London with instructions that it be informally passed to Sir Henry Lintott at the Commonwealth Relations Office, and copies were also sent to Canadian missions in Canberra, Accra, and other places.⁹³

With that, fifteen men sat down in an Ottawa conference room to discuss the further progress of the plan as a “Special Meeting of the Interdepartmental Committee on External Aid Policy”. Eight of them were from government, seven from non-government agencies. The government was represented by LePan (chair), Glazebrook, Goldschlag, and A.P. Sherwood (secretary) from External Affairs; Ault and Bartlett from Trade and Commerce; Plumptre and Hudon from Finance. The National Research Council sent J.B. Marshall and J.D. Babbitt, the Canada Council sent A.W. Trueman for the morning and E. Bussiere for the afternoon, WUSC was represented by J.A. Gibson, and the NCCU sent G.F. Curtis, Dean of Law from UBC; J.R. Mallory from McGill (who was representing D.L. Thomson, the Dean of Graduate Studies); and T.H. Matthews, NCCU Executive Secretary. Curtis was not originally supposed to be present, but President N.A.M. MacKenzie of UBC was unable to attend and sent Curtis in his stead. From the morning until 5:10 P.M. (with a stately two hour and fifteen minute lunch break) they thrashed out the details of the plan. The University officials showed that they had not grasped the nature of the plan, despite attempts by the government to keep Matthews apprised of developments through LePan’s November 12, 1958 letter. Dean G.F. Curtis of the University of British Columbia, who would later be so influential in the plan, insisted that it had to “involve an exchange between all members of the Commonwealth including Canada and the U.K. and that it should not merely be a form of aid to the underdeveloped countries” and that the plan had to be primarily aimed at graduate students. J.R. Mallory, another NCCU representative, said that all mention of technical training had to be “damped down” and there was a need for decentralization of the plan and a clear emphasis on “intellectual excellence.” Mallory noted that Canada could, at Oxford, “be in a position to provide an example to other countries who might not naturally think in terms of a minimum of government control” and thereby “help other Commonwealth Universities.” To all of this LePan, who was chairing the meeting, agreed [perhaps in an exasperated fashion, since all of these points were set out in his letter of November 12, 1958 which was sent again to Matthews on March 10, 1959, a month before the meeting], except that he noted that ultimately the government would be responsible for the plan because it would be providing the funds.

The NCCU representatives, along with WUSC and the NRC, insisted that the cost of the plan had been underestimated. J.A. Gibson from WUSC added that this could be managed by having a one-year limit on all scholarships to start, which would “guard against academic opportunism” and weed out “the ‘perpetual scholar’ who never finishes his studies.” Plumptre, ever vigilant over the role of his finance department in the plan, declared that there was a million dollars available and the programme would have to fit within that parameter. All through the day, the representatives of the universities pressed for more money. Curtis determined that there would be a need of a “allowance or grant for these students” which would be paid to the universities directly [this would be later known as the “capitation grant”] and later in the day the universities and the NRC both put forward that “additional students will... impose a considerable additional strain on the universities in that they will have to try to help the new students adjust to their environment.” They also claimed they would need more administrative staff than the plan envisaged. Plumptre declared that the universities were already receiving federal grants and should not expect more, and Bartlett at trade emphasized that there was enough existing administrative machinery

⁹¹ Information Division to LePan, March 25, 1959, LAC, RG 25, Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.1 [March 4-25, 1959]. They continued to complain into April, see Information Division letter April 8, 1959, LAC, RG 25 Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.2 [March 26-May 1, 1959].

⁹² UTA/Office of the President/A71-0011/Box 38, File 5.

⁹³ Goldschlag memo to High Commission in London, April 10, 1959, with copies to other offices, LAC, RG 25 Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.2 [March 26-May 1, 1959].

in place to provide for the scholarship plan. The day ended with money still being an outstanding question.

There was little dispute about the operating mechanism for the plan. Sending countries were to screen applications and to send the best files forward to receiving countries, who would then make selections and assign university places. 50% more names than places would be requested. The opinion of the sending countries was critical because there was “often no real basis for comparability between universities” and this was especially hard for observers from abroad to distinguish. English or French fluency was considered essential. The only operational question was the distribution of scholarships, with Curtis suggesting there should be more spaces for the old Commonwealth and less for the new. Goldschlag insisted that the emphasis on the new Commonwealth was driven by the need to foster “personal associations” with new Commonwealth leaders as well as a reflection of the poor graduate facilities in under-developed parts of the Commonwealth. The meeting, however, decided that “premature rigidity” should be avoided and “we should not permit our desire to assist the under-developed countries of the Commonwealth to have the result of crowding out other programmes or to accept candidates from these areas who do not have the necessary qualifications for study at a Canadian university.” Here the NCCU was jealously guarding its turf against an unknown foreign group. The meeting ended amicably and all concerned were asked to submit their written comments within the next two weeks.⁹⁴

Trueman of the Canada Council responded promptly on April 14, 1959 with his comments on the discussions. He cautioned against over-lapping functions among too many bodies, said FROS and WUSC could receive students and in general complained that there was not enough budgeted for all aspects of administration. Trueman, still not clear on all points, insisted that he was “very dubious about bringing anything like technical assistance into the scheme”, saying it should remain “purely academic” because technical assistance required “more nursing of the persons assisted.”⁹⁵ WUSC and the NRC remained silent. And, for the full two weeks after the plan, nothing had yet been heard from the NCCU. This held up planning for the Oxford conference by External Affairs. The department noted to the High Commission in London that it could not be certain of Canada’s plans because “discussions with University and other educational authorities here are still in progress and may also lead to revision of our proposals.”⁹⁶

Finally, on April 28, Matthews responded with the results of the NCCU deliberations. His letter set out much of the terms under which the plan’s administration in Canada would eventually be set up. He insisted that “the real responsibility for selecting winners of Canadian awards should lie with the Canadian Selection Committee in Canada”, and suggested a screening committee could do the routine work of checking candidates and short-listing them, and a selection committee of four or five members from the universities could assign scholarship winners to universities. Sub-committees would deal with individual fields of study. These administrative issues were largely uncontroversial. Neither was Matthews’ suggestion that students be limited to a maximum of three years of study and supply a “written promise to return” to their home countries (although Matthews noted a three-year limit would cause problems to individuals seeking Canadian undergraduate degrees). Matthews did, however, put down two stipulations that would be an issue between NCCU and the government. He stressed the need for direct grants to universities on a per-candidate basis. Without these grants, students would be steered “into work that involves less expense rather than the work that would best suit their needs.” Matthews set the optimum figure at \$600 a student and cited a McGill University study which had determined that figure. Also, he noted the need for travelling allowances for the wives of scholars.⁹⁷

There was no immediate response to this from the government. LePan was to resign his position at the end of May and return to teaching at Queen’s University and then the University of Toronto (Glazebrook and Plumtre would also resume teaching at Toronto after their time in office)⁹⁸, and External Affairs was also busy preparing

⁹⁴ Minutes of Special Meeting of the Interdepartmental Committee on External Aid Policy, dated April 17, 1959 [meeting took place April 10, 1959], LAC, RG 25 Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.2 [March 26-May 1, 1959].

⁹⁵ Trueman to LePan, April 14, 1959, *Ibid*.

⁹⁶ Draft telegram of U.K. High Commission, April 17, 1959, *Ibid*.

⁹⁷ Matthews to LePan, April 28, 1959, NCCUC *Proceedings*, 1959, 108-114. A copy of this is also in the appropriate LAC file.

⁹⁸ LePan (who is now better known in Canada as a poet than a civil servant) had left Harvard University in 1941 to join the Canadian war effort and stayed on after the war at External Affairs. He had taught at the University of Toronto in 1937 and 1938. He taught English at Queen’s and then became Principal of University College, Toronto from 1964-1970. Glazebrook had been on U of T History Staff from 1925-1941, joined External Affairs for war service in 1942-1946, returned to U of T from 1946-1948, and then returned to External Affairs until 1963, when he retired to a teaching position in History at Toronto from 1963-1967. Plumtre had taught Political Economy at the University of Toronto from 1930-1941, was with the government service from 1942-1947 and an editor of *Saturday Night* until 1949, when he joined External Affairs until 1965,

for the Oxford conference. They enlisted the aid of the NCCU in surveying Canadian experiences and possibilities in the area of co-operation in general education for Oxford conference, and arranged for Kurt Goldschlag to speak to the NCCU conference that was to be held in June in Saskatoon.⁹⁹ And they crunched the numbers to see whether there was any room for a capitation grant, discovering that there was not. The original budget proposal only had room for \$800 per student for fees of all kinds, and with university tuition calculated at \$400 a year over two years, there was no room for capitation.¹⁰⁰ Canada's \$1 million commitment was also under pressure from the United Kingdom, which wanted to announce at Oxford that a nice round 10 million pounds was available for the plan. The U.K. only was prepared to contribute 6 million, and pressed Canada to go higher on their budget. This proposal was rejected by External Affairs, although LePan noted for the record that there was an understanding that Canada's contribution would "gradually increase" over the years.¹⁰¹

It was not only the U.K. which was causing headaches for Canada's planning for Oxford. External Affairs was also trying to make sure that other Commonwealth countries were on their side before the conference in Oxford met. Goldschlag sent a memorandum to Canadian high commissions early in May to emphasize that "Canadian thinking has not been that Commonwealth Scholarships scheme should be mere supplement to Colombo Plan [it is] designed to accommodate people of more general skills and aptitudes." Goldschlag stressed the need for more contact between Canada and New Zealand and Australia.¹⁰² Initial reports from Australia were mixed. The Australians liked the "general idea" of the scheme and were prepared to put forward something between 150,000 and 250,000 Australian pounds, but Australia was "not attracted by Rhodes type of selection [as] Australians now going overseas [were] adequately covered."¹⁰³ From New Zealand, Canadians heard the same thing, nothing like the Rhodes plan would fly with Wellington because "several countries including NZ are now receiving enough fellowships to skim off the cream of first-class students." New Zealand saw the plan as "an umbrella for extending quote Colombo Plan unquote aid to Africa and the West Indies."¹⁰⁴

when he returned to teach at the University of Toronto. See *The Canadian Who's Who*, Vol XII, 1970-1972.

⁹⁹ LePan to Matthews, April 30, 1959, LAC, RG 25 Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.2 [March 26-May 1, 1959].

¹⁰⁰ Goldschlag to Bartlett and Hudon, May 11, 1959, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1, Vol. 1, Box 289, File "Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy", August 18, 1958 – June 19, 1959.

¹⁰¹ Memorandum from Goldschlag May 15, 1959; Memorandum from LePan, May 19, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 3, "Commonwealth Educational Exchanges (Scholarship Programme) – Accepted at Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference, Montreal, 1958; May 1, 1959 – June 12, 1959."

¹⁰² Goldschlag to High Commissions, May 1, 1959, Ibid.

¹⁰³ Memorandum from MacDermot, Australia, May 13, 1959, Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Wellington to Ottawa, April 30, 1959, LAC, RG 25 Volume 7893, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 2.2 [March 26-May 1, 1959].

All of this came through clearly at a meeting of the Commonwealth Relations Office in the U.K. held on May 25, 1959, where the nascent plan was kicked around by representatives from the old Commonwealth nations as well as India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Ghana, Malaya and Rhodesia. The Canadians put forward their view that the scheme had to stress reciprocity and make sure it was not just “an arrangement whereby the more developed countries of the Commonwealth could assist the less developed countries.” Canadians were clear that they believed “that each member of the Commonwealth had something to contribute to the scheme,” and also clear that individuals, and not governments, should be applying for the scholarships. Several countries also put forward their comments, with Pakistan drawing attention to “the difficulty of placing Pakistan students at universities in the United Kingdom, particularly at Oxford, Cambridge, and London.” To this the U.K. replied that their own students had trouble getting into these universities, and “there was not much prospect of finding more places for Commonwealth students in the larger firms, but the possibility was being investigated of accommodating a greater number in the smaller firms.”¹⁰⁵ In the wake of that meeting, India approached Canada for more details and Canadian officials in New Delhi were urged to hue to the lines of reciprocity, and the need to avoid “undue rigidity” in allocating scholarships to specific countries.¹⁰⁶ And External Affairs heard from Malaya that the Malaysians were worried about the calibre of their graduate students and “would probably need to seek more undergraduate training abroad than graduate studies” and “more scholarships under the scheme in science and engineering fields rather than in the Arts.” Malaya was also worried about being seen as a “sponge” as “the Federation had little to offer in return” at their universities in graduate training.¹⁰⁷ The word from Ghana was more optimistic. They were keen to be an awarding country even if they could not “be able to offer more than two or three places a year.” They expected that reciprocity would not mean numerical parity, and hoped to benefit from the scheme, but again as a means of undergraduate and not graduate training. As the High Commission in Ghana noted “It is... probably inevitable that the underdeveloped Commonwealth countries will in practice try to use the scheme as another form of technical assistance to build up a nucleus of persons training in fields other than the humanities and the physical sciences. This is understandable.”¹⁰⁸

While the high commissions wrestled with issues of foreign policy, External Affairs continued to tailor the scholarship plan for domestic consumption. In the middle of May, they began to consider how to sell the plan to the Canadian government and Cabinet. They boiled down their approach into six points, “a) the composition of the Canadian delegation [to Oxford]; b) the principle of capitation grants; c) the payment of a grant to the Canadian Universities Foundation [CUF]¹⁰⁹ to cover its share of administrative costs; d) the organization and function of the Canadian Scholarship Committee; e) the principle of having the Canadian Government supplement awards offered by other Commonwealth countries; and f) the responsibility of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the day to day administration of the scheme with the expenses of the Department of Trade and Commerce to be paid from its regular departmental appropriation.”¹¹⁰ They also continued to make their plans known to Canadian universities, sending Kurt Goldschlag to speak to the NCCUC meeting at Saskatoon on June 8, 1959.

Goldschlag’s remarks noted the need, expressed several times before, to promote common values through the Commonwealth and the need to make sure that “in each Commonwealth country” there would be “men and women who have experience of the national life and institutions of other Commonwealth countries.” He noted that there would be 1000 scholarships under the plan, 250 in Canada, with an annual intake of 100-125 scholars of “high intellectual competence” a year. Scholars would apply “on their own initiative.” Screening committees would be necessary, which might consist of university and government appointees. Reciprocity would be the goal, as far as the capacities of various countries could manage. Goldschlag ended on a note that this reciprocity would “not only strengthen but... deepen the ties that hold the Commonwealth together by increasing mutual un-

¹⁰⁵ Minute of Commonwealth Relations Office, May 25, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 3, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges (Scholarship Programme) – Accepted at Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference, Montreal, 1958; May 1, 1959 – June 12, 1959.”

¹⁰⁶ Ottawa to New Delhi, May 27, 1959, Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ High Commission in Malaya to Ottawa, May 4, 1959, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1, Vol. 1, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy”, August 18, 1958 – June 19, 1959.

¹⁰⁸ High Commission in Ghana to Ottawa, June 13, 1959, Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ The Canadian Universities Foundation was incorporated in February, 1959 as the executive agency of the NCCU and managed all financial transactions for its parent body. In 1965 it merged with the NCCU again to form the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC).

¹¹⁰ Memorandum by Hudon, May 20, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 3, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges (Scholarship Programme) – Accepted at Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference, Montreal, 1958; May 1, 1959 – June 12, 1959.”

derstanding and mutual respect.” The high tone of External Affairs was immediately brought down to earth by the representatives of the universities, who had been for years familiar with the rhetoric of Commonwealth cooperation. Before Goldschlag left, N.A.M. MacKenzie, President of UBC stressed the need under the plan for “the scholars to be distributed through the Canadian universities and not concentrated in a few.”¹¹¹ (This was not a new position for Mackenzie – he would complain in 1960 that UBC was overrun by students from Trinidad who showed no signs of being prepared to go back home after graduation.¹¹²) G.C. Andrew, also from UBC, would suggest after Goldschlag had departed that the plan be run by a foundation “administratively independent of government,” and be supported in this argument by Robin Ross, the Registrar of the University of Toronto. J.F. Morgan, chairman of the WUSC scholarship committee and also from Toronto¹¹³, would add that he hoped candidates would not be nominated by governments. All of these comments seem to show that Goldschlag had spoken without being listened to. MacKenzie would compound the problem by declaring during the conference that consultation between the government and the universities had been inadequate. MacKenzie insisted that the plan had to be one of exchange and not “a one-way street from the underdeveloped countries,” and that Canadians would have to go places other than the U.K. for the scheme to be successful.¹¹⁴ All of this, of course was already the policy of External Affairs. They had, as they informed the head of their delegation to Oxford, decided “that this is clearly a scheme which will rely for its success upon the goodwill and support of the universities and many of the decisions that will have to be made are equally decisions which the universities alone are competent to make. On the other hand, it seems to us that the Government has a responsibility for the operation of the scheme in relation to Parliament.”¹¹⁵

The Universities, however, did not quite get the message. T.H. Matthews of the NCCU sent a draft letter to Goldschlag which he was planning to send to the Prime Minister of Canada on the NCCU’s vision of the scholarship plan. The letter contained the phrase “The scheme, when it is in full operation, must place heavy responsibilities on the universities if it is to be a success, and the universities must therefore be directly involved from the outset.” Goldschlag found the wording unusually aggressive, and told Matthews that this was (as he had stated in Saskatoon without anyone apparently listening) already the policy of the government. Goldschlag suggested that instead of creating difficulties, Matthews should recognize that “there was clearly a large identity of views between the universities and the Government” and the NCCU would be in a better position if “the universities volunteered to help from the start instead of demanding to be in the picture.” Matthews agreed to this, and reworded these sections of the memorandum, also stressing the need for “traffic in all directions and no strict balancing of books between any set of Commonwealth countries.” The exchange of drafts led both sides to claim a victory. Goldschlag took credit for bringing the universities on side, and the universities, as represented by Matthews, chortled that since the plan would now be sure to be “on a high academic level” and the Canadian selection committee would now “be composed entirely of university men”, they had “to a great extent converted the Government to our point of view.”¹¹⁶ That no such conversion ever happened was quite beside the point. The universities claimed a victory and wrote the Prime Minister that they welcomed “this Commonwealth scheme as an imaginative means of strengthening Commonwealth ties and promoting Commonwealth ideals.”¹¹⁷

The positive word from the universities made the moment right for the Canadian cabinet to approve the plan, and a memorandum was accordingly prepared for Howard Green, Minister of External Affairs, to sign. This, in general, followed the lines discussed by the civil servants in May. The Canadian Committee would be largely composed of university representatives, 250 scholars would be accommodated within a \$1 million budget, the Canadian Universities Foundation would administer the selection process, finance and transport would be handled through the Department of Trade and Commerce as had Columbo Plan arrangements, and a \$500 capitation grant figure was put forward, as “not unreasonable in meeting the position of the universities.” The Canadian delega-

¹¹¹ NCCUC *Proceedings*, 1959, 48-53.

¹¹² N.A.M. MacKenzie to Norman Robertson, March 1, 1960, LAC, RG25, Vol. 433b, File 14020-C-14-5-40, pt. 1, “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Committee – Meetings 1960-1961.”

¹¹³ There is some confusion in the minutes over this identity. Joseph F. Morgan, the noted biochemist, was in 1959 at the Laboratory of Hygiene in Ottawa. The text of the minutes gives his as “J.F. Morgan” but in the list of conference participants he is shown as “J.S. Morgan.” This would be John S. Morgan, Professor of Social Work at the University of Toronto at the time.

¹¹⁴ NCCU *Proceedings* 1959, 91-96.

¹¹⁵ N.A. Robertson to George Drew, June 16, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 4, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges (Scholarship Programme) – Accepted at Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference, Montreal, 1958; June 15, 1959 – June 30, 1959.”

¹¹⁶ Goldschlag to Plumtre and Ault, June 17, 1959; LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 4, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges (Scholarship Programme) – Accepted at Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference, Montreal, 1958; June 15, 1959 – June 30, 1959.”; Matthews to NCCUC Executive and Board of Directors, CUF, June 17, 1959, UTA/A71-0011/Box 28, File 1.

¹¹⁷ Matthews to Diefenbaker, June 19, 1959; UTA/A71-0011/Box 28, File 1.

tion at Oxford would “direct its efforts towards the formulation of a genuinely reciprocal programme providing for an exchange of scholars of high intellectual competence who would be able to make a distinct contribution in their own countries and in this way to enhance the Commonwealth association as such.” This memorandum was sent forward with a comment from the Under-Secretary of State: “it is difficult to think of any medium that is more likely than education to ensure that there will continue to be such a community of experience in an expanding multi-racial Commonwealth.”¹¹⁸ The under-secretary added a week later that it was clear that the universities would be on side, as long as it was clear that there “should be traffic in all directions and that there should be no a priori assumptions that ‘some countries have everything to give and others everything to receive from the scheme.’”¹¹⁹ With that, the Cabinet approved the Canadian delegation for the Oxford conference and other matters, including acceptance in principle of the capitation grants.¹²⁰ The scheme was announced in Parliament of July 9, 1959.¹²¹ All was in place for Canada to go Oxford.

There is no need to go into great detail about the Oxford conference, as this will no doubt be covered in great detail in the general history being prepared for the 50th anniversary of the plan. A few points can be stressed. The Canadian position on the scholarship plan was essentially adopted at the conference, with the only unresolved question being whether or not scholars were to be paid marriage allowances.¹²² The Canadians, however, seriously erred in the composition of their delegation. Almost all of the delegates were university representatives, including Mary Quayle Innis, a late add to the delegation as representative of the Canadian Federation of University Women.¹²³ So, when the conference quickly strayed from the Commonwealth plan to the matter of teacher training, the delegation was caught off guard. Teacher training was a matter which was under the jurisdiction of provincial ministers of education, not the universities. And there was no provincial representative at Oxford. The Canadian Educational Association, the representative of the provinces in this regard, began sending protests to Ottawa even while the conference was still in progress, which led to a degree of necessary damage control. External Affairs was forced to concede that there had been “some rather unfavourable publicity” on the matter and this might damage federal-provincial relations.¹²⁴ Innis was more blunt, noting “The Canadian members of the Committee felt that they were sitting more or less as onlookers witnessing the threshing out of a family problem... It was apparent that Canada could make no contribution toward solving the urgent immediate problem of teacher supply.”¹²⁵ George Drew, head of the Canadian delegation, in his official reports months later denied things were so bad, stating:

Because Canada had originated the Scholarship and Fellowship Scheme, and because we had agreed in advance of the Conference to take 250 scholars with the financial commitment that this entailed, there was some danger that the Delegation might tend to concentrate unduly on this aspect of the work of the Conference. That this did not occur was due firstly to the excellent chairmanship [of the Committee on the Scholarship and Fellowship Scheme at the Conference] of Dean Curtis, and secondly to the amount of pre-conference planning which had been done in Ottawa between members of the university community and federal officials.¹²⁶

This was clearly the best face that could have been put forward on a planning disaster which somewhat clouded the early days of the Commonwealth Scholarship Plan.

¹¹⁸ Cabinet Memorandum, June 23, 1959; N.A. Robertson to H.A. Green, June 25, 1959; LAC, RG25, Vol 7894, 14020-C-14-2-40, Part 4.2 [June 15-July 3, 1959].

¹¹⁹ Robertson to Green, July 2, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 5, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges (Scholarship Programme) – Accepted at Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference, Montreal, 1958; July 2, 1959 – August 31, 1959.”

¹²⁰ Note on Cabinet Approval, July 3, 1959, *Ibid.*

¹²¹ Ottawa to London, July 10, 1959, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1 Vol. 2, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy” July 3, 1959-January 29, 1960 [with one extra document from June 26, 1969].

¹²² Oxford to Ottawa, July 28, 1959, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 1, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” April 17, 1959-April 28, 1960.

¹²³ Memorandum, July 15, 1959 on P.M. insistence that CFUW representative be added, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 5, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges (Scholarship Programme) – Accepted at Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference, Montreal, 1958; July 2, 1959 – August 31, 1959.”

¹²⁴ Memo from Economic Division of External Affairs, September 18, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-1-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth and Scholarship Plan, Policy and General”; September 2, 1959 – December 30, 1959.”

¹²⁵ Undated comments by Innis, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 5, “Commonwealth Educational Exchanges (Scholarship Programme) – Accepted at Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference, Montreal, 1958; July 2, 1959 – August 31, 1959.”

¹²⁶ Assessment by George Drew of Canadian Delegation at Oxford Conference, October 6, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-40, pt. 6, “Commonwealth Educational Conferences”; September 2, 1959 – June 10, 1960.”

Setting up the Plan in Canada

Despite the problems at Oxford, by the fall of 1959 the pieces were falling into place for the plan to go forward. The interdepartmental committee met and decided to alert all missions to invite applications for scholarships by January 30, 1960. Mary MacPherson was appointed as the designated member of External Affairs to administer the plan. Discussions were made as to the size composition of the Canadian Committee, and considerations were given as to who would be the chair. G.F. Curtis, who had performed well as the chair of the session discussing the plan, was an early favourite for chair of the Canadian Committee, but there were questions as to whether he was too junior to hold such a position.¹²⁷ As well, efforts were made to get the promised funds in place to cover 125 scholarships in the first year, with a first installment of \$500,000 needing approval from the Treasury Board.¹²⁸ The NCCUC was alerted that they would shortly be receiving an invitation to administer the plan, and finally on November 19, 1959 they received a letter from Minister of External Affairs H.C. Green. Green regretted that he had not written since the Oxford Conference and noted that the time was “growing very short” for the plan to become active in 1960. “For reasons of efficiency”, Green declared, “the administration of the plan might best be undertaken by the National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges and I should like now, formally, to ask the NCCUC to accept this responsibility.” Matthews accepted on behalf of the NCCUC on December 1, 1959.¹²⁹ In the interim, Green informed Cabinet that “it is now appropriate and timely to consider the appointment of a Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship Committee” and he suggested the committee “comprise persons of stature and known reputation in the academic world who will at once bring knowledge, expertise and competence to the work of the Committee and be broadly representative of the Canadian university community.” He set forth the names of the Committee, with Curtis as chair, and noted that the list left “several important universities without representation on the Committee.” This omission, Green suggested, could be solved by the establishment of specialized subcommittees for various areas, which could have their own diverse membership.¹³⁰ The Cabinet approved Curtis as chair but dithered on the appointments of other members. When the committee first met on December 4-5 all members had not been approved in the Cabinet, as “there was not general agreement on the list of universities or those to represent them.”¹³¹ The final list of members of the “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Committee.” [henceforth “The Canadian Committee”] was not released until December 10, 1959. The Committee as it emerged was certainly dominated by senior academics. Along with Curtis who was Dean of Law at UBC, it included F.W. Jeanneret, Chancellor of the University of Toronto, four deans from New Brunswick, Alberta, McGill and Manitoba, and the Director of the Ecole Polytechnique in Montreal. The most junior member was most likely the sole woman on the committee, Marion E. Grant of Acadia University. The press release which announced the committee noted that the Plan was founded on the “initiative” of Sidney Smith, and the Plan would support “men and women of high intellectual promise who might be expected to make a significant contribution to life in their own countries on their return from study overseas.”¹³² The selection of the Committee was based on previous discussions with the NCCU, who had been promised a minimum of government control [the press release announcing the membership did note that a representative from External Affairs and Trade and Commerce would be on the Committee, as would a representative from both the Canada Council and the National Research Council]; a need to balance regional, language and discipline representation (only Quebec among the provinces had more than one committee member, the two were from English and French institutions respectively); and a need for senior academic representation (hence the presence of five deans and a director amongst the original ten NCCU representatives). Five of the ten NCCU representatives had been on the Canadian delegation to Oxford, and a sixth had been on the original list for Oxford but had to cancel at the last minute.

By this point the Committee had already met, December 4-5, 1959 at the Chateau Laurier in Ottawa. The Committee wasted no time, setting down the allocation quotas for 1960-61, deciding that for the near term the focus

¹²⁷ Minutes of discussions, October 27, 1959; memorandum to Ritchie, External Affairs, November 6, 1959; LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-1-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth and Scholarship Plan, Policy and General”; September 2, 1959 – December 30, 1959.”

¹²⁸ Hobart to S.B. Kayes of Finance, November 16, 1959, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 1, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” April 17, 1959-April 28, 1960.

¹²⁹ Green to Matthews, November 19, 1959; Matthews to Green December 1, 1959, *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ Green to Cabinet, November 23, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 7894, File 14020-C-14-2-1-40, pt. 1, “Commonwealth and Scholarship Plan, Policy and General”; September 2, 1959 – December 30, 1959.”

¹³¹ Cabinet minutes, December 1, 1959.

¹³² Press release, December 10, 1959, LAC, RG25, Vol. 433b, File 14020-C-14-5-40, pt. 1, “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Committee – Meetings 1960-1961.”

would be on scholarships and not fellowships, and asking that all countries send in twice as many nominations as there were places. The deadline for the Canadian awards was set for February 15, 1960, and shortlists were to be produced by March 15, 1960. Responsibility for the shortlists was delegated to four “specialized advisory committees” in humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, and biological sciences. Chairs for these subcommittees were appointed and they were urged to seek out colleagues in close proximity to them because “there will be an urgent need for speed and this will save a lot of time.”¹³³ This is slightly ahead of the story, but an example of a local committee can be seen in the experience of the Humanities subcommittee, which was chaired by David M.L. Farr of Carleton University in Ottawa. Farr’s letter of instruction in 1961 called for him to select a committee of no more than five members, all of whom were to be from Carleton or the University of Ottawa. Farr dutifully chose two members from Carleton and two from Ottawa to join him on the committee. The committee effectively disposed of nominations within a week of them being sent to Farr.¹³⁴

One subject which was not settled at the first meeting was the question of whether scholarship winners could bring their wives. External Affairs did their utmost to make sure the question was sidestepped, deciding prior to the meeting that “it has been found generally difficult for the wife to adapt to Canadian social and economic life... food is so vastly different. Language may be a further barrier.” There were also worries about births in Canada.¹³⁵ After the December meeting, External Affairs noted with some relief that “the possibility of providing [marriage] allowances have been all but ruled out in the early consideration of the Scholarship Plan.” As one staffer informed another “to my view the recipients of scholarships or fellowships should be prepared to forego family life while in Canada in return for the educational privileges and advantages that they are enjoying under the awards.”¹³⁶

Delays in printing forms and informing the world about the scholarships led to further delays in receiving nominations, and the timetable for meetings of the Canadian Committee was adjusted accordingly. The Committee did meet in February of 1960 and sent names to the United Kingdom for consideration for U.K. Commonwealth Scholarships. As well, there was some discussion of welcoming scholars to Canada and some appreciation that WUSC might be an appropriate body to take on this role.¹³⁷ The availability of awards in Canada was slowly made known to the rest of the world, with High Commissioners in Australia and India noting that local newspapers were printing notices that the awards were available. From India there was a report that the need for security clearances might mean a short list of candidates might not be available from April, as “India has had serious difficulties this year in several universities with student disorder originating from political sources.”¹³⁸ From Hong Kong only six nominees were received, all of whom were ineligible for awards under the plan, and the high commissioner contrasted this with 146 nominees Hong Kong submitted for U.K awards. He further commented, “Everyone in Hong Kong knows that if a scholarship is awarded to study in the United Kingdom the student can pick up immediately and depart with a minimum of formality whereas, in marked contrast, the difficulties facing students wishing to proceed to Canada for further studies are well known. In this sense the Canadian Immigration office here has a bad reputation in Hong Kong.”¹³⁹

The report from Ceylon was similarly dismal. Only 100 applicants had come forward for the Canadian scholarships, much less than had applied for U.K. scholarships. The High Commissioner there noted “Wealthy Ceylonese for a century or more have formed the habit of sending their children to the United Kingdom, preferably to Oxford or Cambridge, for their higher education... Harvard, Yale, and Cornell Universities, are comparatively well known for their high standards.” Beyond that, selection procedures by the Ceylonese were “careless and haphazard”, and:

¹³³ Meeting agenda for CSFP Committee December 4-5, 1959; Minutes of meeting of Canadian Committee, December 4-5, 1959; Ibid.

¹³⁴ H.W. Jamieson, Canadian Committee to David M.L. Farr, August 28, 1961; Farr to Jamieson September 7, 1961; Farr to Jamieson October 19, 1961; Jamieson to Farr, November 25, 1961, Carleton University Archives.

¹³⁵ External Affairs notes on meeting of Scholarship Committee, December 3, 1959, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1 Vol. 2, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy” July 3, 1959-January 29, 1960 [with one extra document from June 26, 1969].

¹³⁶ D.R. Taylor to Hudon, December 21, 1959; Hall to Ault, January 5, 1960, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 1, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” April 17, 1959-April 28, 1960.

¹³⁷ Minutes of meeting, February 1-2, 1960, LAC, RG25, Vol. 433b, File 14020-C-14-5-40, pt. 1, “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Committee – Meetings 1960-1961.”

¹³⁸ Canberra to Ottawa, February 10, 1960; New Delhi to Ottawa, February 10, 1960, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 1, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” April 17, 1959-April 28, 1960.

¹³⁹ C.J. Small, Canadian Government Trade Commissioner, Hong Kong, to External Affairs February 25, 1960, Ibid.

extremely unfair with racial, religious and caste factors influencing the judgement of those who make the selection... It is difficult to dissuade the Ceylonese authorities from recommending for Commonwealth scholarship Government employed engineers or physicians. We are trying to impress upon the Ministry of Education here that such people can be, and are, provided for under our Colombo Plan scholarships... It seems fairly obvious that we shall have to recognize a number of limiting factors in awarding scholarships to Ceylonese students... Unpalatable as it may seem we can also expect that for some time to come, we shall attract in the social sciences, arts and humanities, candidates of a lower calibre than those who apply to the United Kingdom or the United States.

The High Commissioner suggested, not very helpfully, that these problems arose “from the old folk ways and customs of the East” which might be eroded over time.¹⁴⁰

The situation in India was also difficult. 725 Indians came forward for Canadian scholarships, but only 277 fulfilled “stringent academic prerequisites” of which 90 nominees were selected. The Indian committee, however, was unbalanced in terms of discipline, as it “received and entertained applications from over 100 engineers, over half of these would be, from their records, the best products of Indian universities.” The High Commission in Delhi asked for instructions as to how to reconcile this with a scholarship plan designed for the humanities and social sciences, which had taken pride of place in the government memorandum on the plan which was sent to all departments in April, 1959. External Affairs replied that “the type of nomination submitted to the Canadian committee is of course a matter for the Indian Committee to decide taking into account the objectives of the scholarship plan as agreed to at Oxford... we would not be unduly concerned if there were a disproportionate number of applications in Engineering” but they also hoped that some nominations in Arts and Humanities would be made so “that the reputation of Canadian Universities in academic disciplines other than engineering would become more widely known in India.”¹⁴¹

The Canadian Committee met in May of 1960 to discuss all of these issues. They were cheered by the fact that the Canadian government had offered the universities \$500 per student in capitation grants (although this was not formally approved by Treasury Board until July)¹⁴², but dismayed that “a large proportion of candidates [for scholarships] wished to go to one of McGill, Toronto or UBC. The Committee decided it would try to spread the students more widely. The Indian problem was discussed in detail, as well as the fact that Ghana, Dominica, the Virgin Islands and others were insisting on undergraduate awards. Undergraduate degrees would take more than two years to complete and would “decrease the number of scholarships available” in the third and fourth years of the plan. Even with all of these issues, the Committee approved 86 scholars and 32 alternate choices from 28 Commonwealth countries and territories. Awards would be added for fourteen Indians and two Taganykians at a further committee meeting in June, which brought the total offers for 1960-61 to 102, somewhat under the 125 planned for that year.¹⁴³

May of 1960 was spent informing nominees of their requirements to have adequate travel documents and medical clearances, and correspondence flew up and back between Miss McPherson at External Affairs and Mrs. Berini, the hardworking secretary at NCCUC assigned to the Canadian Committee’s work. Telexes were sent out to Canadian High Commissions alerting them of scholars who had been selected and the universities to which they were assigned, with instructions that they make no announcements until all candidates were selected and placed.¹⁴⁴ During this process, the issue of allowance for wives yet again came up, with Matthews noting that several scholars were asking about bringing their spouses. The response from Trade and Commerce was mixed, the opinion being “if the wife is young and adaptable and comes from an environment in which she is accustomed to being alone for many hours of the day, walking unescorted in city streets and shopping on her own, it may well be that her companionship will inspire her husband to greater and better efforts in his studies... wives from many countries are unaccustomed [to these conditions].” In general, wives and families were not to be encouraged.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁰ Columbo to Ottawa, February 25, 1960, Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Delhi to Ottawa, March 26, 1960, Ottawa to Delhi, April 1, 1960, Ibid.

¹⁴² Treasury Board minute, July 28, 1960, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 3, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” July 1, 1960 -October 2, 1960.

¹⁴³ Minutes of meeting May 2-3, 1960 and June 6-7, 1960, LAC, RG25, Vol. 433b, File 14020-C-14-5-40, pt. 1, “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Committee – Meetings 1960-1961.”

¹⁴⁴ See various letters in LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 2, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” May 2 1960-December 3, 1965 and LAC, RG25, Volume 4336 – File 14020-C-14-2-2, “Commonwealth Scholarship Plan – Individual Cases” November 9, 1959 – August 30, 1960.

¹⁴⁵ Hobart to Matthews, May 30, 1960, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 2, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” May 2 1960-December 3, 1965.

Matthews was not satisfied and continued to press the issue, noting “the situation is that if we do not pay a marriage allowance we shall lose some of our best scholarship winners and if we do not get a decision quickly, we shall give Canada and this secretariat a reputation for rudeness and delay in answering reasonable requests.” Trade and Commerce was not pleased by Matthews continual pleading, commenting internally “this is an absolute pressure play by Matthews. I do think we should inform External that we repeatedly pointed out to Matthews the desirability of warning scholarship winners of the difficulties of bringing wives.”¹⁴⁶ Eventually, the cause of marriage allowances was taken up by Curtis directly with Green at External Affairs, and Green was forced to put the issue before the cabinet. His draft memorandum noted that 24 of the 105 scholars wanted to bring their wives, and many of them would not take awards without them. Financially, marriage allowances would allow for 227 awards within the \$1 million threshold. This draft met with significant resistance among the civil servants, who pointed out “Any concession to Commonwealth Scholars will inevitably be pressed for Colombo Plan students and others aided by our programme.” Not only would this be expensive, but “travel for wives will mean requests for travel for children. It will mean births in Canada.” If wives are encouraged “more will come. This adds administrative work... we may have to augment our staff beyond our present numbers.”¹⁴⁷ Despite the objections by the civil servants, the Cabinet approved marriage allowances “subject to the proviso that the cost of the entire programme must not exceed the ceiling of million dollars a year.”¹⁴⁸

All of the activity of the Canadian Committee, as well as proposals which they brought forward to reimburse WUSC and FROS for welcoming students at universities, also led Trade and Commerce to consider “some system in order that the commitments and intake by Dr. Matthews’ office will not exceed the funds made available to the department for administrative costs.”¹⁴⁹ External Affairs also fretted about the possible length of certain scholarships, and made a request to Matthews for information about the type and length of degree of each candidate “in order to set up encumbrances from the \$500,000 vote to finance each candidate’s programme.” Matthews found this request “puzzling” and “impossible” and noted “I am confident that the Canadian Government will, by some means or other, provide adequate funds to keep the promises made both at Oxford and to each individual student.” J.T. Hobart of the Training Division of the Economic and Technical Assistance Branch of Trade and Commerce refused to engage in similar optimism, curtly informing Matthews that without detailed instructions “the only reasonable system that we can employ will be to encumber for a period of two years, for each scholar, in order to ensure that we will have the necessary funds to enable him to complete his minimum programme.” After 1962 if any students were studying longer than two years, the problem would be Matthews’ and not the governments. Matthews shot back, “I am sure you are right and that the present annual appropriation will not keep the Commonwealth Scholarship Plan going at full strength in the future... I feel confident, however, that when the time comes the Government of Canada will consider the success of the Plan more important than a strict adherence to provisional estimates, and will produce more money if it is necessary rather than cut down the number of scholarships.” In any case, Matthews cheerfully concluded, he would be retired before 1962 and it would not be his problem either.¹⁵⁰ The exchange showed that the opinions of the Canadian Committee and of the federal government on the issue of long-term finance were at loggerheads. This would be more serious an issue in the 1970s.

Matthews’ comments on the first year of the Plan were reported to the NCCU at their annual meetings in June 1960. He noted that the administration of the plan had proved expensive and time-consuming, but he had two assistants working full-time, and the government was covering the costs of everything but Matthews’ time. “Although we started a bit late and made a few mistakes”, he concluded “I think Canada has done a reasonably good job.”¹⁵¹

There were further wrinkles with the first group of scholars. Reports came from Singapore that their government had insisted that all scholars sign an agreement that they must work for the government for five years after com-

¹⁴⁶ Matthews to Mary Q. Dench, Information Division, External Affairs, June 17, 1960; undated comment by Hobart, 1960, *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁷ Curtis to Green, June 10, 1960; Draft Memorandum, June 1960, Ault to Berlis, June 24, 1960, *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁸ Matthews to Canadian Committee, July 12, 1960; External Affairs to Matthews, July 14, 1960, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 3, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” July 1, 1960 -October 2, 1960.

¹⁴⁹ Hall to Hobart, June 15, 1960, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 2, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” May 2 1960-December 3, 1965.

¹⁵⁰ Hobart to Matthews June 8, 1960; Matthews to Hobart, June 20, 1960; Hobart to Matthews, June 24, 1960; Matthews to Hobart, June 28, 1960, *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ NCCUC *Proceedings*, 1960, 73-77.

pleting their courses, and that two scholars had refused to do so, reducing “the number of scholars from Singapore from three to one.”¹⁵² Discussions between NCCUC, WUSC, and government ministries on payment for WUSC reception services dragged on for months and WUSC’s request for \$5,000 was haggled down to \$2,000.¹⁵³ BOAC was accused of “complete bungling” of travel arrangements for Commonwealth scholars, and scholars from India reported that “in some cases airlines do not rpt not appear to know from what city candidate is to leave India, how or where he is to go to Cda or what his final destination will be.”¹⁵⁴ Still, by October 1960, 99 scholars had successfully arrived in Canada, and 24 Canadians had made it to destinations in the U.K, Australia, and New Zealand. In Canada, over half of the awards were taken up at Toronto and McGill, but 15 universities were participating, a respectable start. Considering, as Matthews reported, that each ongoing award required 38 documents in multiple copies, the NCCUC coped well with the plan.¹⁵⁵

For the next few years, the primary issues related to the plan were keeping it going financially and dealing with the issue of whether NCCUC was the proper group to administer the plan. As may be recalled, \$500,000 was budgeted for the first year’s scholarship winners, with the idea that this would cover 125 scholars and thus 250 within the initial \$1 million financial allotment. However, early on Trade and Commerce realized that \$650,000 was a fairer figure for two years study for these scholars and if some of them studied one or more years beyond 1962, it might add on another \$200,000 “to complete the full commitment to the initial one hundred scholars.” And this did not include the administrative fees charged by NCCUC.¹⁵⁶ As the plan reached its third year in 1962/63, forty scholars from 1960 were still in Canada, as well as one hundred who accepted in the second year. With the available funds, Canada was only able to offer another seventy scholarships, bringing the total to 210.¹⁵⁷ When this was reported to the Minister of External Affairs, he recorded his dismay. His undersecretary, however, engaged in some revisionism, noting “when this programme came into being, it was stated that eventually 1000 students would probably be exchanged between Commonwealth countries and Canada expressed its hope to look after one-quarter of these. A preliminary appropriation of \$1 million was sought for this purpose and later I believe some reference was made to 250 scholars. I have never used that figure.” He further explained that the main problem was marriage allowances, which were not calculated into the original budget for the plan. Carefully tweaking numbers, the civil servants suggested they could get Canada to 230 scholars in 1962/63, but no more.¹⁵⁸

The calculation of these numbers meant that Canadian officials had to throw cold water on any proposals for increasing the scholarships they could offer, even when pressure was applied by other countries in the run up to the Commonwealth Educational Conference in Delhi in 1962. Finance officials were steadfast – \$1 million was the ceiling and thus “The Canadian delegation will be in no position at New Delhi to enter into an enlarged commitment.”¹⁵⁹ The realization that PhDs were taking more years than expected to finish their degrees also led Canadians to try to stave off demands for more undergraduate awards, which could take even longer. This as well was in the cards at Delhi.¹⁶⁰ As the secretary of the Canadian committee declared in a memo for the instruction of the Delhi delegation, “To ensure that the largest numbers benefit from the scheme, it will be necessary to resist the desire of some scholars – incoming and outgoing – to pursue research and degrees, without time limit, at public expense.”¹⁶¹ By September of 1962, as decisions were being made for the fourth year of the plan, Canada was set to offer 120 awards and calculated that this would result in 90 acceptances, which “will bring the grand total of Commonwealth scholars to 250.” By this point, the average cost per student per fiscal year had been accurately calculated at \$4,000 – \$1 million for 250 scholars, if administrative costs were kept low.¹⁶²

¹⁵² M.P. Carson, Canadian Trade Minister, Singapore, to Trade and Commerce, July 14, 1960 and August 30, 1960, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 3, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” July 1, 1960 -October 2, 1960.

¹⁵³ Ault to Berlis, August 5, 1960, Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Douglas H. Munro, ETAB to Claude Labelle, BOAC, August 30, 1960; Delhi to Ottawa, September 15, 1960, Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Matthews report on “The Commonwealth Scholarship Plan”, October 1960, UTA/A71-0011/Box 47, file 9.

¹⁵⁶ Hobart to McPherson and Hudon, January 4, 1961, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-2 Vol. 4, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Training and Secretariat” October 3, 1960 – March 8, 1961.

¹⁵⁷ Moran memorandum, August 17, 1961, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1 Vol. 4, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy” June 19, 1961-January 25, 1963.

¹⁵⁸ Moran to the Minister, September 11, 1961, Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ C.L. Read, Department of Finance to N.F.H. Berlis, External Affairs, December 6, 1961, LAC, RG-25, Vol. 5636, File 14020-014-2-40, Vol. 11, “Commonwealth Education Conferences” December 1, 1961 – March 31, 1962.

¹⁶⁰ George Drew to Ottawa, January 19, 1962, Ibid.

¹⁶¹ H.W. Jamieson memo, August 3, 1961, LAC, RG25 – Volume 5636, File 14020-C14-2, “Commonwealth Scholarship Plan – Commonwealth Education Conferences” Volume 10, August 1, 1961 – November 30, 1961.

¹⁶² Moran to Minister, September 17, 1962, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1 Vol. 4, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy” June 19, 1961-January 25, 1963.

This problem of keeping costs under control brought the administrative arrangements between the government and the NCCUC (and its subsidiary, the Canadian Universities Foundation [CUF]) under scrutiny. The Treasury Board recommended to External Affairs as early as August of 1961 that it might be proper to “raise the question of whether or not the External Aid Office should perform the secretarial function in future years.”¹⁶³ When this information was reported to CUF, one of their representatives declared it would view any changes “with grave concern.”¹⁶⁴ This statement, another civil servant noted “puts the matter on an entirely different plane. The implication is that the present undoubted success of the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship Programme is largely due to the devoted and skilled co-operation of the Canadian Universities, of which the Canadian Universities Foundation is the Executive agency... the final sentence of Dr. Legare’s letter seems to me a masterpiece of under-statement.” The universities had specialized knowledge and “devotion” which “a government agency could not expect to have to the same degree.” All of this, External Affairs decided, should be made known to Treasury.¹⁶⁵ Already, when the matter of appointment of committee and subcommittee members had come up, the department had noted “no official in External Affairs is sufficiently acquainted with any of these professors to exercise a judgement on their suitability”¹⁶⁶ and that it was necessary to rely of the opinion of their peers. If the professoriate alone was a problem, how much so would be the entire field of Commonwealth education. All of this was conveyed to Treasury Board in due course, with an emphasis that the Commonwealth plan was not some run of the mill aid programme, and if it was turned over to External Affairs their offices would “need proportionally a larger establishment” to deal with it.¹⁶⁷ Nothing irks a Treasury Board than spending more money to save money.

Some individuals continued to press for full government control. In 1962, it was suggested that the government now had enough expertise to run the plan, and furthermore:

the present relationship with CUF is unsatisfactory and results in duplication of effort and confusion of purpose. There has been some difficulty in sorting out academic matters from non-academic matters, and compounding the difficulty is the reluctance or unwillingness of the present CUF staff to make a serious effort to confine their recommendations to academic matters. As a result, we continue to receive recommendations and gratuitous advice from CUF on financial matters.

As well, the CUF was taking their role in the plan completely for granted, and not keeping expenditures under control,

The latter point raises the question of our general relationship with CUF. On the one hand, we would obviously want to maintain as cordial relationships as possible with this organization since it is a valuable source of expert information and advice on academic matters and is influential in the university world. The Information Division of External Affairs would doubtless attach some importance to this. On the other hand, our annual grant should not be considered a form of Danegeld; it is, rather, payment for services rendered and there is good reason to believe we could now perform these better ourselves. In fact, I think there is some urgency in consolidating our position on a basis of strength in view of the thinly disguised desire of CUF to move into our area of responsibility. Messrs. Sheffield and Andrews would only be too happy to take control over all our academic programmes leaving us to rubber stamp their decisions and pay their bills.¹⁶⁸

These statements showed that Matthews’ indifference over the long-term costs of the plan as stated in 1960 still rankled the civil service. Allowing academics to control a government plan was somewhat akin to a “money pit,” it was implied. In any case, this civil servant was not finished, claiming two weeks later that “a number of academics, including at least one university president, not only would not object to this proposal but would welcome it. I understand that some academics share our reservations and concern about the empire building predilections of CUF personnel and are also unhappy about the rather high-handed railroading techniques used by them.”¹⁶⁹

Treasury Board was then involved in the discussions and CUF was invited to sit down with them and go through

¹⁶³ Assistant Secretary, Treasury Board to H.O. Moran, August 29, 1961, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1 Vol. 4, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy” June 19, 1961-January 25, 1963.

¹⁶⁴ H. Legare, CUF, to A. Day, Director of Education, EAO, October 26, 1961, Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Day to Moran, October 18, 1961, Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Moran to Minister, July 14, 1961, Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Moran to J.A. MacDonald, Treasury Board, November 7, 1961, Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ H.J. Hodder to Moran, October 17, 1962, Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Hodder to Moran, November 8, 1962, Ibid.

a line-by-line discussion of the administrative budget.¹⁷⁰ This productive exercise cleared the air. Although elements in External Affairs were still keen to dispense with CUF involvement, the recommendation which went to the Minister declared that “The experience we have now had would indicate that economies could be achieved and considerable duplication of work could be avoided if the External Aid Office were to take on the job of providing the Committee with secretarial services. However, the CUF have made it clear that they are anxious to continue to provide these services, and I would not propose that any change be made, at least for the time being...”¹⁷¹ As will be seen, “for the time being” lasted until 1992.

Introduction of fellowships

It should be remembered that the scheme approved in 1959 was the Commonwealth Scholarship AND Fellowship Plan. In the first few years, other countries in the Commonwealth had approved awards to senior scholars for short-term research and teaching visits, and Canada had indeed benefitted from those fellowship offers. However, it did not begin the process of offering its own fellowships until 1964, when the Canadian Cabinet, on the recommendation of the Canadian Committee, approved fellowships on provision that funding could be approved to bring Canada’s contribution over the \$1 million annual appropriation approved by Treasury Board.¹⁷² Once this approval was granted, terms for the fellowships were submitted by the Canadian Committee to the Ministry of External Affairs for approval in December of 1964, and the first fellowships were awarded in 1965.¹⁷³ The awards were different from the scholarships in that individuals themselves could not apply for them – fellows had to be nominated by “a Canadian educational institution” and all of those nominees were vetted by the Canadian Committee. The original provision was for three research fellowships and five visiting fellowships, and these all were earmarked for “persons prominent in various fields of education.”¹⁷⁴ Another interesting facet was that fellows did not have to be nominated by institutions of higher education, among the first fellows were G.W. Bassett of Australia and H. MacKintosh of the United Kingdom, both of whom served their visiting fellowships at branches of the Ontario Board of Education.¹⁷⁵

Little material survives on the nomination and approval of scholars, but McMaster University preserved a file covering some of its early nominees. McMaster received one of the first fellowships, to Thomas Crawford. Crawford’s nomination was approved before it was clear what his purpose at McMaster might be, and the Canadian Committee insisted on approving his “proposed program” at that university. McMaster outlined how Crawford would be coming to McMaster to work on a project involving Scottish songs and song-books, and also helping the university “build up our library resources, mainly in eighteenth-century Scottish material, but also in other areas.” As well, he was to give seminars and advise research students.¹⁷⁶ McMaster was so pleased by the experience of Crawford, that in 1968 the university was deluged by internal suggestions for fellows, to the point where H.G. Thode, President of the University, had to inform his Dean of Humanities that “two names have already gone forward from McMaster and it is my view that a third nomination would make it doubtful that any of our nominees would be approved.”¹⁷⁷ McMaster was successful in getting a fellowship for Thomas O’Donnell from Australia, who was already on the McMaster campus when the fellowship was approved. O’Donnell’s role that year was to assist McMaster in its programme in “Teaching Improvements in Elementary Science” and his award was only approved from a reserve list after one of the original appointments from the Canadian Committee de-

¹⁷⁰ B.A. Gunn, Treasury Board to G.C. Andrew, CUF, December 11, 1962; Moran to Andrew, December 21, 1962; Andrew to Moran, December 27, 1962, Gunn memorandum to file, December 28, 1962, Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Moran to Minister, January 21, 1963, Ibid.

¹⁷² Canadian Committee minutes February 5-7, 1964 and G.C. Andrew, AUCC to Paul Martin June 10, 1964, both in LAC RG-25, Volume 15986, File 55-12-CWLTH, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, December 1, 1963 - August 31, 1965.”

¹⁷³ Curtis to Martin, December 9, 1964, LAC RG-25, Volume 15986, File 55-12-CWLTH, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, December 1, 1963 - August 31, 1965.” *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan: Fifth Annual Report for the Period Ended 31 March 1965* (London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1965), 14.

¹⁷⁴ *Fifth Annual Report*, 14.

¹⁷⁵ *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan: Sixth Annual Report for the Period Ended 31 March 1966* (London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1966), 15.

¹⁷⁶ Curtis to H.G. Thode, President of McMaster University, March 12, 1965; Curtis to Thomas Crawford, New Zealand, March 22, 1965; Mrs J.O. Watson, Canadian Committee to Thode June 1, 1965; Thode to Miss Watson, June 10, 1965, W.J. Cameron, Professor of English, McMaster to Thode June 7, 1965, McMaster University Archives, Office of the President fonds.

¹⁷⁷ Thode to A.G. McKay, Dean of Humanities, McMaster University, November 20, 1968, McMaster University Archives, Presidents Fonds.

clined to accept the invitation of a fellowship. The Committee was quite strict in informing McMaster that they would only support O'Donnell for four months of educational assistance, they were worried that since O'Donnell was already in Canada they might be on the hook for his entire visit. This, however, did not happen.¹⁷⁸

McMaster was lucky to get two scholarships in the 1960s. Of the 23 awarded from 1965-1969, only McMaster, Ottawa, and UBC gained more than one. Since 1965, Canada has granted at least 186 fellowships, 23 in the 1960s, 49 in the 1970s, 71 in the 1980s, and at least 43 since 1990 (figures after 1990 are not complete). Until 1986, fellowships were granted to institutions other than universities, no such award seems to have been granted after that point (although this may be the result of lack of nominations). In the 1960s, nine of the 23 awards were granted to non-universities, this dropped to 4 of 49 in the 1970s and 5 of 71 in the 1980s. Of the 186 known fellowships, the University of Toronto has received the most at 15, followed by Alberta at 12, Queen's at 11, Carleton and McGill at nine, and Simon Fraser University at eight. Thirty-one universities and three community colleges have hosted Commonwealth fellowships since their inception.

The first ten years of scholars (1960-1969) – Statistics and observations

A few cautionary notes are in order before moving to a discussion of statistics on any group of Commonwealth scholars. There is, to date, no authoritative list of such scholars. In 2003 the Association of Commonwealth Universities published a *Directory of Commonwealth Fellows and Scholars 1960-2002*. This resource, while valuable, contained duplicate and erroneous material and cannot be considered comprehensive. For the first thirty or so years of the plan, the Association published on behalf of the Commonwealth Education Liaison Committee the annual report of the Plan, which listed scholars taking up awards by country. The Canadian Bureau of International Education has in its files material transferred through several agencies which list scholars who held Canadian scholarships and also Canadians who studied abroad. As well, from time to time lists of scholars showed up in various archival materials at Library and Archives Canada and other places. All of these lists have contradictory material. It is not clear that even at this point every Commonwealth scholar with a connection to Canada has been located, nor may this ever be possible. All data which is produced for this report will, of necessity, be a "best impression."

As well, the sheer bulk of the data connected to Canada's role in the plan has made it impossible to track every scholar and their history. The database comprises over 6,000 names, and in many cases only initials and not first names were available. Positive identification in some cases of individuals has proven problematic. This is less of a problem for Canadians and students from the United Kingdom, but for every other country the problem persists. With these caveats, we can move to a discussion of who studied what under the plan, where, and perhaps even why.

General numbers for the 1960s

In the period from 1960-1969, Canada welcomed 955 Commonwealth scholars and fellows, and 377 Canadians traveled abroad.

Canadians abroad

Of the 377 Canadians, 262 (or nearly 70%) took up awards in the United Kingdom, 61 in Australia, 18 in India and 17 in New Zealand, with the remainder spread among nine other countries (Jamaica, Pakistan, Ceylon, Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Uganda, Zimbabwe and Hong Kong.) 90% of Canadian scholars went to countries in the "Old Commonwealth" and very few fulfilled the promise of spreading Canadian knowledge to developing countries (See Table 2). As the Canadian Committee reported in 1965, "Canadian students... are still not sufficiently aware of the educational facilities in some of the new members of the Commonwealth."¹⁷⁹ In 1967, they added that applications for awards in developing countries continued "to be virtually non-existent"¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ Curtis to Thode, January 10, 1969; Watson to Thode, February 24, 1969; Watson to Thode, March 11, 1969; Thode to Watson, March 12, 1969; Watson to T.A. O'Donnell, University of Melbourne, April 25, 1969; Watson to O'Donnell, McMaster University, April 26, 1969, McMaster University Archives, Presidents Fonds.

¹⁷⁹ Quinquennial report of the Canadian Committee, as located in UTA/A75-0021/Box 23, file "NCCUC".

¹⁸⁰ Jacques Garneau to AUCC heads, February 8, 1967 with attached report on Plan as of October, 1966, UTA/A75-

Table 2: Canadian awards abroad by country, sorted by time period

Country	Decade of study			
	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s
United Kingdom	262 (70%)	298 (75%)	387(81%)	563 (95%)
Australia	61 (16%)	43 (11%)	41 (9%)	6 (1%)
India	18 (5%)	12 (3%)	9 (2%)	1
New Zealand	17 (4%)	22 (5%)	24(5%)	20 (3%)
Nigeria	5 (1%)	10 (2%)	2	0
Hong Kong	4(1%)	5 (1%)	9 (2%)	1
Ghana	2	6 (1%)	0	2
Jamaica	2	0	1	1
Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)	2	0	0	0
Sri Lanka	1	2	2	0
Pakistan	1	0	0	0
Kenya	1	0	0	0
Uganda	1	0	0	0
Sierra Leone	0	0	1	0
Total	377	398	476	594

In 268 of the 377 cases, the university in which they earned their initial degree is known (see Table 3). Not surprisingly, the University of Toronto (53/20%) and the University of British Columbia (38/14%) lead this list. Of the 8 universities which had over 5,000 students in 1960, seven show up in the top eight. The exception is Queen's University, which in 1960 only had 2.8% of the students in Canada, but ranked third on the scholars list with 30 (11%). McGill is in fourth, with 22 (8%). The top four universities on the list accounted for over 50% of the scholars. Queen's unusual success in gaining scholarships for their students has been remarked upon, with at least one academic giving credit to the aggressive lobbying policies of Jean Royce, the Registrar of Queen's for the entire 1960s.¹⁸¹

Institutionally, the overarching preference for Canadians abroad was the University of London and its subsidiary institutions, which attracted 101 of the Canadian scholars. Oxford was next with 49 and Cambridge with 28. Manchester ranked fourth with 21, and Edinburgh fifth with 12. No other U.K. university had more than ten Canadian scholars during this period. For Australia, Sydney had 16 Canadians and A.N.U. 10, Delhi (6) and Canterbury (5) were the leaders in Indian and New Zealand respectively (see table 4).

The course choices of Canadians abroad were diverse, with 70 (21%) opting for courses in the Social Sciences,¹⁸² 41 (12%) in English Language and Literature, 33 (9%) in History, 33 in Physical Sciences, 31 (9%) in Biological Sciences, 29 in Legal Professions and Studies, 18 in Philosophy, 17 in Engineering, 15 in Foreign Languages and Literatures, 10 in Mathematics, and 9 in area studies.¹⁸³ The rest were spread amongst other subjects. Comparatively few (5) were in Agricultural subjects, and only one was in Education (see Table 5). As will be shown, this was quite distinct from the subjects studied by scholars who came to Canada from abroad. In terms of course of study by individual institution, the only number that stands out is that 16 of the 29 Legal scholars were located at London, 16% of the London population while only 7% of the general population. Beyond that, no university can be said to have dominated in any single course of study chosen by Canadians.

0021/Box 86, file "AUCC".

¹⁸¹ Roberta Hamilton, *Setting the Agenda: Jean Royce and the shaping of Queen's University* (University of Toronto Press, 2002), 124-125.

¹⁸² The coding system used for course of study was the North American "Classification of Instructional Programs" [CIP], 2000 version. It is also the system used by Statistics Canada. UNESCO is currently working on an international standard but it has not been perfected.

¹⁸³ These percentages were calculated including the 19 research and visiting fellows (who were not sorted by subject) and 13 whose course of study was either unknown or had no CIP code.

Table 3: University of undergraduate study for Canadian Commonwealth scholars, by time period

University	Decade of study			
	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990-present
U. of Toronto	53 (20%)	49 (16%)	55 (15%)	35 (8%)
U. of British Columbia	38 (14%)	32 (11%)	18 (5%)	38 (9%)
Queen's	30 (11%)	29 (10%)	45 (12%)	32 (7%)
McGill	22 (8%)	21 (7%)	29 (8%)	29 (7%)
U. of Alberta	22 (8%)	10 (3%)	12 (3%)	12 (3%)
U. of Montreal	19 (7%)	21 (7%)	9 (2%)	13 (3%)
U. of Manitoba	16 (6%)	9(3%)	8 (2%)	10 (2%)
U. of Saskatchewan	11 (4%)	3 (1%)	11 (3%)	8 (2%)
U. of Western Ontario	10 (4%)	15 (5%)	14 (4%)	12 (3%)
Dalhousie	8 (3%)	7 (2%)	14 (4%)	16 (4%)
Laval	6 (2%)	7 (2%)	3(1%)	5 (1%)
Victoria	4 (1%)	6 (2%)	16 (4%)	14 (3%)
Carleton	4 (1%)	6(2%)	11 (3%)	14 (3%)
McMaster	4 (1%)	6 (2%)	10 (3%)	11 (2%)
Waterloo	3 (1%)	12 (4%)	7 (2%)	5 (1%)
Simon Fraser Univ.	3 (1%)	7 (2%)	9 (2%)	8(2%)
York	2 (1%)	8 (3%)	12 (3%)	27 (6%)
U. of New Brunswick	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	2	7(2%)
Calgary	1	10 (3%)	8 (2%)	9 (2%)
Trent	0	12 (4%)	14 (4%)	4 (1%)
Ottawa	0	3 (1%)	10 (3%)	16 (4%)
Concordia	0	1	11(3%)	13 (3%)
Guelph	0	1	6 (2%)	12 (3%)
All others	11 (4%)	20 (7%)	42(11%)	87(20%)
Total	268	298	376	437

Table 4: University where scholarship was tenable, Canadians, by time period

University	Decade of study			
	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990-present
London	101 (29%)	77 (20%)	103 (22%)	134 (24%)
Oxford	49 (14%)	64(17%)	99 (22%)	126 (22%)
Cambridge	28 (8%)	43 (11%)	73 (16%)	110 (19%)
Manchester	21 (6%)	12 (3%)	8 (2%)	4 (1%)
Edinburgh	12 (3%)	15 (4%)	17 (4%)	18 (3%)
Birmingham	8 (2%)	6 (2%)	2	3
Bristol	7 (2%)	0	4 (1%)	4 (1%)
Sussex	5 (1%)	15 (4%)	17 (4%)	28 (5%)
Glasgow	3 (1%)	4 (1%)	3 (1%)	5 (1%)
Leeds	2	6 (2%)	1	13 (2%)
York	2	2	3	10 (2%)
Reading	2	2	0	6 (1%)
Essex	1	4 (1%)	7 (1%)	10 (2%)
Warwick	0	6 (2%)	8 (2%)	8 (1%)
East Anglia	0	6 (2%)	5 (1%)	6 (1%)
Sheffield	0	4 (1%)	2	7 (1%)
Lancaster	0	1	1	7 (1%)
Kent	0	0	4 (1%)	6 (1%)

Sydney	16 (4%)	9 (2%)	10 (2%)	0
Australian Nat. Univ.	10 (3%)	11 (3%)	10 (2%)	0
Adelaide	7 (2%)	4 (1%)	2	0
Queensland	4 (1%)	4 (1%)	2	0
Canterbury	5 (1%)	10 (3%)	8 (2%)	2
Delhi	6 (2%)	0	0	0
Ibadan	4 (1%)	6 (2%)	2	0
Ghana	2	5 (1%)	0	2
Hong Kong	4 (1%)	4 (1%)	5 (1%)	0
All Others	56 (16%)	63 (16%)	63 (14%)	59 (10%)
Total	355	383	459	568

Table 5: Course of study by scholars, Canadian, by time period

	Decade of study			
	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990-present
Social Sciences	70 (21%)	80 (22%)	125 (29%)	156 (31%)
English Lang and Lit	41 (12%)	40 (11%)	30 (7%)	43 (9%)
History	33 (10%)	36 (10%)	36 (8%)	34 (7%)
Physical Sciences	33 (10%)	17 (5%)	20 (5%)	15 (3%)
Biological Sciences	31 (9%)	42 (11%)	24 (6%)	26 (5%)
Law	29 (9%)	31 (8%)	35 (8%)	41 (8%)
Philosophy/Religion	18 (5%)	12 (3%)	24 (6%)	22 (4%)
Engineering	17 (5%)	16 (4%)	15 (3%)	12 (2%)
Foreign Lang and Lit	15 (4%)	20 (5%)	14 (3%)	10 (2%)
Math/Statistics	10 (3%)	12 (3%)	10 (2%)	10 (2%)
Area Studies	9 (3%)	13 (3%)	10(2%)	18 (4%)
Visual/Performing Arts	5 (2%)	10 (3%)	39 (9%)	39 (8%)
Interdisciplinary Studies	0	3 (1%)	7 (2%)	13 (3%)
All Others	30 (9%)	38 (10%)	49 (11%)	59(12%)
Total	341	370	438	498

Impact – Canadians

What did these Canadians do after their scholarships? The statistical analysis for this project attempted to locate the occupations of scholars 5, 10, 20, and 30 years after the year in which they were granted the award. Table 6 shows the result of this for the 136 Canadians for whom information has been found. Some scholars only have information reflected in one, two or three of the four periods. As can be seen, two-thirds of the Canadians became professors, about ten per cent became civil servants or lawyers/judges, and a handful went into business, consulting and research positions. Those in the “other” category include one artistic director and one physician.¹⁸⁴ The large number of professors should not be surprising, as this was one of the main places where individuals which postgraduate degrees can be employed. Commonwealth scholars from the 1960s have been located at twenty-eight Canadian institutions, with five ending up in the United Kingdom, eight in the United States, three elsewhere in Europe and one in Zimbabwe. Of the Canadians, the highest concentration has been at the University of Toronto (13), Queen’s (12), UBC (9), York (7), Western Ontario (5) and Manitoba (5). Toronto, UBC and Queen’s also led the list of undergraduate institutions which produced Commonwealth scholars – it is surprising that McGill did not rank higher in the career list.

¹⁸⁴ Some of these are overlap categories and some individuals took on more than one of these roles in their life.

Table 6: Occupational choice of Canadian Scholars, 1960s

	Years after graduation			
	5	10	20	30
Professor	57 (62%)	70 (66%)	72 (66%)	82 (65%)
Civil Servant	9 (10%)	11 (10%)	15 (14%)	14 (11%)
Lawyer/Judge	9 (10%)	12 (11%)	10 (9%)	9 (7%)
Student	7 (8%)	1 (1%)	0	0
Researcher/Scientist	6 (6%)	5 (5%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)
Consultant	1 (1%)	0	0	5(4%)
Business	0	1 (1%)	4 (4%)	6 (5%)
Arts/Musician	0	1 (1%)	0	1(1%)
Writer	0	0	1(1%)	2(2%)
Other	3 (3%)	5 (5%)	4 (4%)	4 (3%)
Total	92	106	109	126

Three interesting clusters have been discovered. Of the nine professors at UBC, five were in law; five of the thirteen at U of T were in English and three were in law; and three of the seven at York in history. The law cluster at UBC does have an anecdotal support. George F. Curtis, in a recorded interview before his death, stated that one of the animating factors for his support of the Plan was the opportunity it would give his law students to get the higher training they needed to be law professors. No explanation has yet been found for the other clusters.

Unfortunately, existing records of graduate supervision for the total group of professors is poor. Only eleven have been known to have supervised students, a total of 103 students. This is most certainly an underestimate.

Apart from the professorial group, other former scholars took prominent positions in later life. Only one former scholar has been located in political office, Denis De Belleval who was a member of the Quebec Legislative Assembly from 1976-1982 and briefly Provincial Minister of Transport. Louis Bernard ran for leadership of the Parti Quebecois in 2005. Three scholars were involved in the apparatus of the New Democratic Party, with Gordon Vichert and Gerald Caplan both serving terms as secretary of the party, and Robert Weese as a research assistant before becoming Deputy Minister in the Saskatchewan government.

As mentioned earlier, two Commonwealth scholars served as judges, Robert DeCary at the Federal Court and Paul Gendreau at the Appeals Court in Quebec. Other prominent civil servants included Charles Freedman who served as Deputy Governor of the Bank of Canada, and John Paynter who was Canadian Ambassador to Laos, Thailand and Vietnam, and also High Commissioner to Nepal and India. In the business world, John Gardner rose to the Presidency of Sun Life Insurance and Ian McKay became a Vice-President of the Royal Bank. Charles Jago became President of the University of Northern British Columbia.

Those scholars who responded to inquiries about the effect the scholarship had on their life were generally positive, although the number of responses is not large. Professor Kanya-Forstner of York University noted that he had applied to Oxford and Manchester for the scholarship but was placed at Cambridge, which turned out to be a better fit. The fellowship paid him very well, much better than a fellowship which he later took up at Cambridge. His placement at Cambridge also put him in the right place to advance his successful career as a historian.¹⁸⁵ Ed Ongley who was a longtime scientist with Environment Canada and an internationally recognized expert on water quality, spoke to an "environment in which self-discovery was possible" amongst his colleagues in Australia during his scholarship.¹⁸⁶ Jack Bend, who also went to Australia, noted that the experience "had a profound impact on my scientific career,"¹⁸⁷ and Don Taylor said that at Oxford he gained access to "an excellent research environment" and had "the opportunity to interact... with a large number of leading researchers and bright students."¹⁸⁸ Jeffrey Fine, a consultant in agricultural economics, stressed that the leading research in that field was taking place in the United Kingdom, and if he had not got the scholarship he would have studied a less-interesting field in North America and had a quite different career. Fine also stressed the contacts he made in the

¹⁸⁵ Interview with Kanya-Forstner, June 3, 2008.

¹⁸⁶ E-mail from Ed Ongley, July 5, 2008.

¹⁸⁷ E-mail from Jack Bend, August 11, 2008

¹⁸⁸ E-mail from Don Taylor, August 18, 2008.

United Kingdom which served him well in his later career,¹⁸⁹ and he was not alone in highlighting this element of the experience. Roger Ruppner said that connections he made while at Queensland were vital in his successful interview for a position in Rome which he gained twenty-five years later.¹⁹⁰ Don Taylor noted “For many years my research has been very significantly facilitated through continuing contacts with a network of colleagues in the UK that grew out of my Oxford studies.”¹⁹¹

The effect of the scholarship in changing the geographic direction of an academic career made by Fine is also shared by other scholars of this period. Don Taylor and T.J.A. LeGoff both say that without the scholarship they would have pursued graduate studies in the United States. LeGoff, especially, says that if he had taken up an offer at Harvard he would have had to “undergo the idiotic comps [comprehensive exams] that people have to put up with in American universities” instead of immediately embarking on research in French History, his specialty.¹⁹² Fred Affleck stressed that his interest in transportation was sparked during his PhD in England, and without that he would never have taken up his position as Vice-President of Australia’s National Rail Corporation. Affleck noted, however, that another reason he went to Australia was that he met and married an Australian during the tenure of his scholarship. None of these events would have taken place without the support of the CSFP.¹⁹³ Affleck’s personal experience in cross-Commonwealth contacts is echoed in a different fashion by Fred Dahms, who went from his scholarship in Auckland to the University of Guelph and fostered “lasting student and faculty associations between Guelph and several New Zealand geography departments.” As chair of the geography department, he also “hired many faculty from ‘down under’” and he notes that as a result “we retain connections with Auckland, Massey, and several Australian Universities to this day, a continuing legacy of my excellent experience in NZ [New Zealand].”¹⁹⁴

These anecdotes do not give the full picture of the impact of the CSFP, but they are instructive. Of course, not all Canadians took on Commonwealth scholarships in good faith. David Helwig, future Canadian playwright, frankly admits in his memoirs that he took up his award in Liverpool because “Nancy and I wanted to travel and took the only means that came to hand.” He took no courses, read a fair bit and watched a lot of movies, and “found myself free enough in the evenings... that I wrote some stories and a full-length play.”¹⁹⁵ Although this was something short of the Canadian goal of sending leaders abroad, it did meet the humanist objectives that Sidney Smith had highlighted in his earlier speeches

Foreign scholars in Canada

As has been noted above, 955 scholars from abroad came to Canada. Of these, the largest number, 151 (16%) came from India, with 116 (12%) from the United Kingdom, 91 from Pakistan, 58 from Australia, 52 from New Zealand, 41 from Nigeria, 39 from Ceylon, 35 from Ghana, 31 from Kenya, 26 from Trinidad, 25 from Malaysia, 24 from Jamaica, and the remainder from forty other countries and territories (See table 7). In total, 234, or nearly 25% came from the “old Commonwealth”¹⁹⁶ and three-quarters from the “new”, or developing Commonwealth. The target of one-quarter to the old Commonwealth, set in the initial policy documents in 1959¹⁹⁷ was faithfully carried through over the first ten years of the plan.

Such could not be said about the Plan’s goal of turning out humanist leaders. The primary course of study among these scholars was Engineering at 176 (20%), followed by Social Sciences at 119 (13%), Biological Sciences at 101 (11%), and Physical Sciences at 98 (11%) A further 67 studied Agricultural Sciences, 45 Mathematics, and 39 Education. English, one of the primary studies of Canadians abroad, ranked a poor ninth at 38, Modern Languages at 34 and History at 31 (see table 8).¹⁹⁸

Before looking at individual countries and their scholars, a general point can be made about the universities in which these students were placed. 172 (18%) studied at the University of Toronto, 160 (17%) at McGill, 106

¹⁸⁹ Telephone conversation with Jeffrey Fine, May 1, 2008.

¹⁹⁰ E-mail from Roger Ruppner, August 19, 2008

¹⁹¹ E-mail from Don Taylor, August 18, 2008

¹⁹² E-mail from T.J.A. Le Goff, August 12, 2008.

¹⁹³ E-mail from Fred Affleck, June 12, 2008.

¹⁹⁴ E-mail from Fred Dahms, August 18, 2008.

¹⁹⁵ David Helwig, *The Names of Things* (Erin, Ontario: The Porcupine’s Quill, 2006), 72-85.

¹⁹⁶ This figure includes 10 South Africans.

¹⁹⁷ Copy of Inter-Commonwealth Fellowship and Scholarship Plan proposed by interested Government departments, April 8, 1959 UTA/A71-0011/Box 38, file 5.

¹⁹⁸ The percentages include 23 fellowships which were not classified by subject, and 33 cases where subject of study was unknown or located in CIP

(11%) at UBC, and 73 (8%) at Alberta. Only two other universities, Manitoba (46) and Queen's (44) had more than forty scholars in this period. The Maritime universities as a whole had only slightly more than Alberta's total, and the Quebec universities (with the exclusion of McGill) had just as many as Queen's on its own. Although 30 institutions hosted scholars during this period, the totals were skewed towards those with the biggest and most established graduate programs which registered internationally. (see table 9) Some of the smaller universities (York, Simon Fraser, Concordia) had small numbers because they had been founded in the 1960s or only began to offer restricted graduate programmes in the period.

Table 7: Foreign awards in Canada by country, sorted by time period

	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990-present
India	151 (16%)	124 (14%)	135 (11%)	114 (9%)
U.K.	116 (12%)	124 (14%)	137 (11%)	165 (15%)
Pakistan	91 (10%)	14 (2%)	0	44 (3%)
Australia	58 (6%)	61 (7%)	72 (6%)	35 (3%)
New Zealand	52 (5%)	38 (4%)	40 (3%)	27 (2%)
Nigeria	41 (4%)	51 (6%)	53 (4%)	50 (4%)
Sri Lanka	39 (4%)	36 (4%)	54 (4%)	38 (3%)
Bangladesh	0	29 (3%)	56 (5%)	56 (5%)
Ghana	35 (3%)	26 (3%)	51 (4%)	47 (4%)
Kenya	31 (3%)	22 (3%)	45 (4%)	36 (3%)
Trinidad	26 (3%)	23 (3%)	35 (3%)	29 (2%)
Malaysia	25 (2%)	31 (4%)	19 (1%)	9 (1%)
Jamaica	24 (2%)	21 (2%)	39 (3%)	42 (3%)
Mauritius	19 (2%)	10 (1%)	13 (1%)	18 (1%)
Sierra Leone	17 (2%)	14 (1%)	17 (1%)	17 (1%)
Barbados	17 (2%)	10 (1%)	24 (2%)	22 (2%)
Uganda	16 (2%)	18 (2%)	37 (3%)	40 (3%)
Singapore	16 (2%)	23 (3%)	11 (1%)	10 (1%)
Hong Kong	15 (2%)	28 (3%)	29 (2%)	10 (1%)
Tanzania	14 (2%)	16 (2%)	61 (5%)	47 (4%)
Guyana	14 (2%)	11 (1%)	18 (1%)	21 (1%)
Malta	11 (1%)	12 (1%)	19 (1%)	20 (1%)
Cyprus	10 (1%)	7 (1%)	15 (1%)	15 (1%)
South Africa	10 (1%)	0	0	24 (2%)
Zimbabwe	9	0	40 (3%)	34 (3%)
Grenada	8 (1%)	4	15 (1%)	12 (1%)
Saint Lucia	6	5	7	14 (1%)
Zambia	5	22 (3%)	35 (3%)	18 (1%)
Gambia	5	5	13 (1%)	13 (1%)
Malawi	5	5	22 (2%)	14 (1%)
Bahamas	3	9 (1%)	9 (1%)	11 (1%)
Saint Vincent	2	3	5	14 (1%)
Botswana	2	3	6	14 (1%)
Cameroon	2	0	0	11 (1%)
Papua New Guinea	1	10 (1%)	8	5
Maldives	0	0	2	14 (1%)
Others	69 (7%)	65 (7%)	88 (7%)	139 (11%)
Total	955	860	1230	1249

Table 8: Course of study by scholars, foreign, by time period

	Period when award held			
	1960-1969	1970-1979	1980-1989	1990-present
Engineering	176 (20%)	176 (23%)	212 (19%)	179 (16%)
Social Sciences	119 (13%)	91 (12%)	144 (13%)	141 (12%)
Biol. Sciences	101 (11%)	60 (8%)	77 (7%)	81 (7%)
Phys. Sciences	98 (11%)	54 (7%)	53 (5%)	61 (5%)
Agriculture	67 (7%)	63 (8%)	97 (8%)	76 (7%)
Math/Stats	45 (5%)	31 (4%)	45 (4%)	40 (4%)
Education	39 (4%)	46 (6%)	83 (7%)	93 (8%)
English Lang and Lit	38 (4%)	32 (4%)	33 (3%)	30 (3%)
Foreign Lang and Lit	34 (4%)	20 (3%)	32 (3%)	11 (1%)
History	31 (3%)	11 (1%)	11 (1%)	9 (1%)
Business/Management	29 (3%)	43 (5%)	62 (5%)	80 (7%)
Psychology	25 (3%)	22 (3%)	33 (3%)	26 (2%)
Health Professions	18 (2%)	8 (1%)	27 (2%)	32 (3%)
Public Admin.	14 (2%)	11 (1%)	19 (2%)	14 (1%)
Architecture	13 (1%)	20 (3%)	11 (1%)	12 (1%)
Philosophy/Religion	12 (1%)	10 (1%)	17 (2%)	4
Law	8 (1%)	17 (2%)	34 (3%)	36 (3%)
Natural Resources	8 (1%)	8 (1%)	27 (2%)	62 (5%)
Visual/Performing Arts	7 (1%)	12 (1%)	14 (1%)	21 (2%)
Interdisciplinary Studies	3	6 (1%)	19 (2%)	21 (2%)
Library Science	2	7 (1%)	13 (1%)	2
Computer Science	1	15 (2%)	50 (4%)	68 (6%)
Journalism	1	5	16 (1%)	9 (1%)
Engineering Technology	0	3	2	17 (2%)
All Others	11 (1%)	9 (1%)	17 (1%)	23 (2%)
Total	900	780	1148	1148

Table 9: University where scholarship was tenable, foreign scholars, by time period

	Period when award held			
	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990-present
Toronto	172 (18%)	117 (14%)	100 (8%)	143 (12%)
McGill	160 (17%)	83 (10%)	98 (8%)	115 (9%)
U. of British Columbia	106 (11%)	89 (11%)	102 (8%)	140 (11%)
Alberta	73 (8%)	69 (8%)	90 (7%)	94 (8%)
Manitoba	46 (5%)	28 (3%)	52 (4%)	29 (2%)
Queen's	45 (5%)	48 (6%)	47 (4%)	33 (3%)
U. of Western Ontario	38 (4%)	37 (4%)	52 (4%)	29 (2%)
Sask	38 (4%)	20 (2%)	42 (3%)	35 (3%)
Ottawa	30 (3%)	15 (2%)	40 (3%)	28 (2%)
Guelph	27 (3%)	56 (7%)	94 (8%)	83 (7%)
McMaster	27 (3%)	32 (4%)	34 (3%)	24 (2%)
Dalhousie	25 (3%)	21 (2%)	49 (4%)	67 (5%)
Carleton	21 (2%)	35 (4%)	66 (5%)	58 (5%)
U. of New Brunswick	21 (2%)	22 (3%)	46 (4%)	32 (3%)
Laval	19 (2%)	4	6	2
Waterloo	17 (2%)	49 (6%)	44 (4%)	78 (6%)

U of Montreal	13 (1%)	6	7	8
Windsor	10 (1%)	16 (2%)	11 (1%)	4
Acadia	8 (1%)	4	14 (1%)	11 (1%)
Tech U. Nova Scotia	7	4	14 (1%)	12 (1%)
Concordia	6	7	29 (2%)	26 (2%)
York	3	16 (2%)	38 (3%)	41 (3%)
Simon Fraser U.	2	14 (2%)	22 (2%)	14 (1%)
Calgary	1	17 (2%)	23 (2%)	32 (3%)
Memorial	1	8 (1%)	6	16 (1%)
Victoria	0	10 (1%)	12 (1%)	17 (1%)
OISE	0	4	38 (3%)	25 (2%)
Other	17 (2%)	14 (2%)	44 (4%)	28 (2%)
Total	933	843	1220	1234

No evidence has surfaced of a university actively lobbying for more or fewer students during the period – the Canadian Committee minutes show no such approaches. As C.W. Argue, a Committee member from the University of New Brunswick informed his President, “As you would expect, most of the applicants put as their first choice Toronto, McGill, U.B.C., and Queen’s... The Committee decided that in many cases it would be advantageous to the applicant as well as to the whole Scholarship Scheme to name certain winners and alternates to universities other than those of their first or even second choice. So it was that U.N.B. was assigned four scholars.”¹⁹⁹ H.W. Jamieson, Secretary of the Canadian Committee made the same comment to the subcommittees in the various fields, informing them “many, in fact too many, of the applicants want go to either Toronto or McGill. The Central Committee realized that many of the students would do well, or perhaps better, if they went to other universities but selecting the right place is sometimes difficult.”²⁰⁰ The policy of steering Commonwealth scholars to second-tier universities was already established in the United Kingdom by 1962, as they tried to divert Pakistani students from their traditional preference for Oxford and Cambridge through astute publicity for the “red-brick” universities.²⁰¹ Canada did not manage to have the same success. Annually, reports from selection committees in Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere showed Toronto and McGill at the top of the preference lists for all candidates.²⁰²

Still, the Committee seems to have done a good job of distributing candidates amongst universities. There were some asymmetrical patterns, 22 Australians ended up at Toronto and only four at McGill, whereas of the Nigerians 16 went to McGill and only 5 to Toronto. Beyond that, the only data which stands out is that of Mauritius, where 12 of the 19 students went to universities in Quebec (including McGill), and none ended up at Toronto. All of the three students who were assigned to the Ecole Polytechnique in Quebec were from Mauritius. As a predominantly French-speaking territory, the choice of Quebec for study may not have been accidental for Mauritians.

Nations and programmes

Two words could summarize the Canadian experience with the Commonwealth Plan – Indian Engineers. Of the 151 Indians who took up Commonwealth scholarships, 53 were in Engineering (30% of the total number of engineers) and 22 were in the Physical Sciences. The Indian predilection to nominate engineers was established right at the start, when they informed Canadian officials that they would like 70% of their scholars to be “Science, Technology or the Fine Arts” and only 30% in Humanities. This recommendation was passed on to the Canadian Committee with some trepidation, although as one civil servant declared, “It is however better to have a highly

¹⁹⁹ C.W. Argue, Dean of Science, UNB, to Colin B. McKay, President of UNB, May 6, 1960, University of New Brunswick Archives/UNB President’s Papers 1967-68, File 74.

²⁰⁰ Jamieson to Chairmen, January 17, 1962, Carleton University Archives.

²⁰¹ High Commissioner, Karachi, to External Aid Office, February 28, 1962, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1 Vol. 4, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy” June 19, 1961 - January 25, 1963.

²⁰² Canberra to Ottawa, December 9, 1963, LAC RG-25, Volume 15986, File 55-12-CWLTH, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, December 1, 1963 - August 31, 1965.”; Wellington to Ottawa, January 14, 1969, LAC, RG25, Vol 15214, File 55-12-CMWLTH-Vol 3 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, January 11, 1968 - October 24, 1969.”

qualified engineer than a poorly qualified humanities student studying in Canada.”²⁰³ The Committee did put forward the Indian idea as one of the items to be discussed at the 1962 Delhi conference, noting that it interfered with the “complete freedom” of the awarding country as envisaged at Oxford, but their protests had little effect on the Indian pattern of nominating candidates.²⁰⁴ The 22 Indian nominees in 1964, for example, consisted of thirteen scientists, eight engineers, and a forester [21 of them were also men].²⁰⁵ India was not alone in this practice – 59 of the 91 scholars from Pakistan were in Science and Engineering, as were 20 of the 39 from Ceylon and 14 of the 25 from Malaysia. 7 of the 14 Tanzanian scholars took either Agriculture or Engineering. Of the 24 Jamaicans, 6 (25%) studied education, and of the 39 students as a whole who were in that field, 19, or nearly half, were from Caribbean and South American territories. On the humanist side, 19 of the 38 students in English Literature were from the old Commonwealth countries, although New Zealand also had 23 of their 51 students in Sciences and Engineering. On the whole, many countries seemed to be using the scholarship nomination procedure as a means of extending technical aid in specific fields rather than engaging in broad-based humanist study. Sidney Smith’s wish for support for the humanities, as expressed in his speeches in September of 1958, had been dashed right from the start.

Reports surfaced from time to time of countries biasing their selection procedures. In 1963, “Hong Kong seemed unwilling to nominate Arts students for Commonwealth Scholarships abroad”²⁰⁶ (and, indeed, of the fifteen students from Hong Kong there were only one historian and two social scientists). The Ceylon committee was accused by Canadian observers of being biased racially against certain groups and of preferring to nominate government employees rather than “professional students” for scholarships.²⁰⁷ On the other end of the scale was the predilection of Mauritius to nominate students who were “unable [to] obtain suitable or any employment in homeland at end of awards... failure of Mauritians to return serves to defeat purpose of plan.”²⁰⁸ Attempts to bias the selection procedure would also occasionally happen the other way. The High Commissioner in Wellington, for example, in submitting nominations for 1969 awards, noted the presence of two candidates in nuclear engineering and nuclear physics. He noted, “Canada is most interested in playing a major role in New Zealand’s forthcoming nuclear power development... there would unquestionably be value in having additional New Zealand students in the same field in Canada.”²⁰⁹ Neither candidate was selected for a scholarship. Similar cold shoulders were given to candidates nominated informally by Canadian Members of Parliament.²¹⁰

Foreign scholars and their careers

Among the foreign scholars in Canada who could be tracked from the 1960s, nearly 70% became professors (the total number is close to 100). About a dozen became businessmen, ten or so became engineers, ten researchers, seven civil servants (including two diplomats), three resource explorers, three U.N. officers, 3 lawyers, two consultants and one each a social worker, forest conservator, editor, librarian, software developer and naval officer [see Table 10]. Given the number of engineers who took up scholarships in Canada, the total percentage in engineering is certainly an understatement.

²⁰³ MacPherson to Berlis, December 5, 1960, LAC, RG25, Vol. 433b, File 14020-C-14-5-40, pt. 1, “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Committee – Meetings 1960-1961.”

²⁰⁴ “Items proposed by the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Committee to be placed on the Agenda of the New Delhi Conference”, July 20, 1961, LAC, RG25 – Volume 5636, File 14020-C14-2, “Commonwealth Scholarship Plan – Commonwealth Education Conferences” Volume 9.2, May 30, 1961 – January 25, 1962.

²⁰⁵ Delhi to Ottawa, January 11, 1964 and February 10, 1964, LAC RG-25, Volume 15986, File 55-12-CWLTH, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, December 1, 1963 - August 31, 1965.”

²⁰⁶ Minutes of the Canadian Committee, December 4-6, 1963, LAC RG-25, Ibid.

²⁰⁷ High Commissioner in Colombo to Ottawa, March 14, 1961, LAC, RG74, 36-9A-1 Vol. 3, Box 289, File “Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Canadian Scholarship and Fellowship Committee Policy” February 2, 1960-July 31, 1961, [with some additional correspondence from 1964].

²⁰⁸ Ottawa to Capetown, March 3, 1967, LAC RG-25, Volume 15213, File 55-12-CWLTH, Vol 2 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, September 1965 - December 31, 1967.”

²⁰⁹ P.R. Jennings to Patterson, January 18, 1968, LAC, RG25, Vol 15214, File 55-12-CMWLTH-Vol 3 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, January 11, 1968 - October 24, 1969”. A similar request was made in 1969, see Wellington to Ottawa, January 14, 1969, LAC, RG25, Vol 15214, File 55-12-CMWLTH-Vol 3 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, January 11, 1968 - October 24, 1969.”

²¹⁰ Wally Nesbitt, M.P. to A.E. Ritchie, November 26, 1964; Ritchie to Moran, November 27, 1964; Moran to Ritchie, December 2, 1964, LAC RG-25, Volume 15986, File 55-12-CWLTH, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, December 1, 1963 - August 31, 1965.”

Table 10: Occupational Choice of Foreign Scholars, 1960s

Occupation	Years after Graduation			
	5	10	20	30
Professor/Teacher	44 (62%)	59 (74%)	67 (61%)	85 (64%)
Student	13 (18%)	0	0	0
Researcher/Scientist	5 (7%)	5 (6%)	4 (4%)	10 (8%)
Civil Servant	3 (4%)	5 (6%)	6 (6%)	7 (5%)
Engineer	3 (4%)	3 (4%)	5 (5%)	8 (6%)
Lawyer/Judge	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Librarian/Archivist	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0
Business	0	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	12 (9%)
Consultant	0	0	0	2 (2%)
Dead	0	0	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Other	1 (1%)	5 (6%)	6 (6%)	6 (5%)
Total	71	80	94	133

Of the professors, 30 were located in Canada, ten in the United States, nine in New Zealand, eight in Australia, seven each in India and Nigeria, five each in Bangladesh, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom. Again, the figures for the United Kingdom and India are certainly extremely low. Among the Canadians, seven were located at the University of Toronto, making its combined totals for the 1960s the largest in terms of professors identified as Commonwealth scholars. Michael Finlayson from Australia became a Vice-President at the University of Toronto and Peter Silcox from the U.K. a Principal of Woodsworth College and Vice-Principal of Erindale College. Other prominent Commonwealth scholars in academia were Bernard Philogene, Vice-Rector of the University of Ottawa; Graeme Fogelberg, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Otago; and Alberto Lutalo-Boso, Deputy-Vice-Chancellor of Makerere University and Vice-Chancellor of Kyambogo University. Collectively, twenty-one professors in this group are known to have supervised 532 graduate students, led by Mizra Saeed of Pakistan with 125 and Reginald Gorczynski of Toronto with at least 100.

As with the Canadians, few scholars rose to positions of political leadership. The most significant was probably M. Elton Georges, who was Deputy-Governor for the British Virgin Islands for over twenty years and briefly served as acting governor. Additionally two senior diplomats can be noted. Omar Jah was Gambian Ambassador to several middle eastern nations and Paul Firmano-Lukasa was Zambian representative to the United Nations and Ambassador to the United States. Alistair Glass, long-time researcher at Bell Labs, was recently appointed Deputy Minister of the Ontario Ministry of Research and Innovation. Two other names of note were Francis Otieno Pala, the founder of the Kenya Library Service; and Nadasiri Jasentuliyana, who became the President of the International Institute of Space Law. Certainly there were prominent Commonwealth leaders among the foreign scholars from the 1960s.

Another interesting impact of the CSFP outside of Canada was the result of a fellowship granted by Australia to Arthur Reeves, a former superintendent and inspector of schools who was Chairman of the Department of Education in Alberta. Reeves attended a conference of school inspectors in Australia and became determined to increase the educational levels of the inspectorate there. An initial invitation of one Australian to study for his MEd at Alberta quickly developed into a permanent scholarship eventually known as the "A.W. Reeves Memorial Scholarship", which existed for 22 years and educated 22 Australians at Alberta. The effect of this led, in the fullness of time, to 96 Australians gaining 110 graduate degrees from the University of Alberta, and the introduction of "new perspectives into the South Australian schools." One commentator concluded "the Australian involvement in the U of A Department of Educational Administration constitutes one of the outstanding international successes in Canadian graduate education", and it was a direct result of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellow Plan.²¹¹

The impact of the Plan on foreign scholars - 1960s

A handful of scholars from the 1960s were contacted for this project. They shared, however, similar perspectives

²¹¹ Ted Holdaway, "Leaders in Australian Education," *The Orange*, Spring/Summer 2007.

on the value of the scholarship plan. Subbanarasu Divakaran praised the skills of his supervisors at McMaster who helped him become “quite innovative not only in teaching but in research.”²¹² Cuddalore Krishnamurti praised the “work ethics of [the] scientists and their dedication to the job” at Alberta which made it clear to him “that these traits were mostly responsible for the progress made in science in the western hemisphere” and the necessity for “people in the developing countries” to “imbibe these valuable traits.”²¹³ Nimal Sanderatne encountered at Saskatchewan “some of the finest academics and gentlemen” who “improved the quality of my thesis... [and] improved my own writing and analytical skills.”²¹⁴ Mel Hosain spoke of an “all work and no play” attitude during his scholarship at the University of Manitoba.²¹⁵

Apart from the valuable experience in a serious work environment, the scholars also spoke of the generous terms of the Plan. Jim Cutt noted that the plan supported him at both the Masters and Doctorate level, which was unusual at the time as “many scholarship alternatives... left one to sink or swim after one year.”²¹⁶ Cutt did claim that the early stipend paid to scholars was not sufficient for living expenses, but Mel Hosain disagreed, claiming that he not only had enough to live on but he was also able to “remit \$25 a month to my mother in India. She used the money for charitable purpose in the village.”²¹⁷ John Denton added that the return provisions of the scholarship allowed him to “[return] to the U.K. by traveling round the world on the cheap.”²¹⁸ Most of the scholars added that their experience in Canada was pleasant, although adjusting to the Canadian climate was always an initial challenge. Sanderatne, especially, remarked that one morning in Saskatoon was enough to reverse “the accumulated knowledge of my 25 years in the tropics that there was no necessary correlation between the intensity of sunlight and the temperature in these parts of the world.”²¹⁹

Did scholars go home?

After enduring both academic and climatic rigour, Commonwealth scholars were expected to return to their home countries at the conclusion of their studies. The Quinquennial report on the Plan submitted by the Canadian Committee in 1965 noted that “Less than 2% are known to have decided not to return to their home countries.”²²⁰ The Committee in 1966 noted that 75 scholars whose tenure under the plan had terminated were still in Canada, and especially highlighted the problem of students from Cyprus and Mauritius.²²¹ On the whole, however, the assumption was that most scholars had returned home after their scholarships. How this was enforced is not clear. Professor Kanya-Forstner, on his part, does not remember anyone asking him about it after he finished his programme and accepted a fellowship at Cambridge.²²² Nimal Sanderatne notes that the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture offered him an “attractive job at high salar[y]” despite the restrictions supposedly in place on the subject.²²³ Subbanarasu Divakaran claims that “Quite a few of my colleagues who came on a Commonwealth Scholarship with a bond to return back to India broke the bond and stayed on in Canada seeking immigration.”²²⁴

Even if he or she went home, nothing prevented a scholar from later applying for permission to enter, live and work in another country other than his country of origin. Statistics calculated for this project show disturbing figures on how many actually returned to their country of origin for any significant period. The location of scholars five, ten, twenty and thirty years after their award is known for a percentage of scholars, and Table 11 shows how many scholars are known to have returned home. Only 85% of the Canadians returned home, and about half of the foreign scholars.

²¹² E-mail from Subbanarasu Divakaran, August 10, 2008

²¹³ E-mail from Cuddalore Krishnamurti, August 14, 2008

²¹⁴ Nimal Sanderatne, “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship”, August 2008.

²¹⁵ E-mail from Mel Hosain, August 30, 2008

²¹⁶ E-mail from Jim Cutt, August 30, 2008

²¹⁷ E-mail from Mel Hosain, August 30, 2008

²¹⁸ E-mail from John Denton, August 19, 2008

²¹⁹ Sanderatne, “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship.”

²²⁰ Quinquennial report on CSFP submitted to Minister of External Affairs by Canadian Committee, September, 1965, UTA/A75-0021/Box 50, file “AUCC”.

²²¹ I.C. Clark note to file on Committee meeting December 1966 dated December 13, 1966, LAC RG-25, Volume 15213, File 55-12-CWLTH, Vol 2 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, September 1965 - December 31, 1967.”

²²² Interview with Professor Kanya-Forstner, June 3, 2008.

²²³ Nimal Sanderatne, “Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship.”

²²⁴ E-mail from Subbanarasu Divakaran, August 10, 2008.

Table 11: Percentage of scholars returning home, 1960s

Years After Award	%return home	%Canadians	%Others	Scholars in Sample (1332 total)
Five	70%	84%	53%	162
Ten	73%	87%	54%	187
Twenty	70%	86%	52%	200
Thirty	64%	85%	44%	255

These figures represent less than 20% of the total scholars who took up awards in the 1960s, and is overweighted by Canadian scholars whose careers were easier to track. As well, the method of tabulating data ignores individuals who might have returned to their home countries for short periods. Even so the numbers are surprisingly low. However, on the bright side, 89% of all scholars remained within the Commonwealth, only 29 of the 255 thirty years after graduation had left, sixteen to the United States, eight to Europe, two to the Middle East, two to Asia and one to Africa. As a means of sharing knowledge amongst the Commonwealth, the Plan did serve a useful function, even if it was not the one expected by those who founded it.

There were a variety of reasons why scholars did not stay in their home countries. Jack Bend, a Canadian who studied in Sydney, returned to Canada briefly with the understanding that he was not going to be there for long. He noted that “In the last year of my PhD training in Australia I looked for post-doctoral positions in my area of specialization world-wide. I ended up having 3 very relevant and interesting funded offers from the USA, plus one offer in the UK if I could find a source for my own stipend, and none in Canada.”²²⁵ His post-doc ended up extending to a sojourn of a dozen years in the United States before he returned in Canada. Cuddalore Krishnamurti, who immediately after his graduation from Albera received job offers “on the spot”, returned to India and then realized “the utter lack of opportunity I got to impart my knowledge to those who needed it most. The bureaucracy and lack of appreciation by the authorities as to why I was sent to Canada in the first place depressed me very much.” Krishnamurti returned to Canada and embarked on a long career at the University of British Columbia.²²⁶ Mel Hosain returned to Pakistan and “landed a senior engineering job in Dacca with a lucrative salary” but eight months later the offer of a Canadian research opportunity with “the assurance of continuous financial assistance lured me back to Canada” where he stayed for the remainder of his career, mostly teaching at the University of Alberta.²²⁷ Krishnamurti and Subbarnarasu Divakaran both emphasized the need for the Canadian Commonwealth scholarship authorities to use care in selecting candidates and accountability with the nominating countries to ensure such a situation does not occur in the future.

Section C: CIDA, the AUCC, and External Affairs 1969-1992

The Canadian Universities Foundation officially disappeared in 1966, when the NCCUC reconstituted itself as the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). Under the new arrangement, the CSFP was to be run from the “Awards Division” of the AUCC. This division not only managed the CSFP, but also 112 other awards which were donated by the private sector.²²⁸ This change in administration did not lead to a dilution of interest in the Plan by the AUCC. On the contrary it led to a push to expand it. The Canadian Committee raised questions in 1967 as to whether or not Canada’s quota of scholars could not be raised from 250 to 300, “as latterly they have had to turn down large numbers of applications from adequately qualified people and that the present level of 250 was placing no strain on Canadian facilities.”²²⁹ Canada had, apparently, reached their quota in the Fall of 1966 with 257 students. This was projected to reach 267 in 1967 and then dropped to 247 in 1968. Civil servants who looked at the increase generally reacted favourably, noting that an increase of 50 in the Plan represented “an increase of less than 2% only in Canada’s combined Training Division and Plan programmes.”²³⁰ The Canadian increase was put forward for consideration at the 1968 Commonwealth Education Conference in

²²⁵ E-mail from Jack Bend, August 17, 2008

²²⁶ E-mail from Cuddalore Krisnamurti, August 14, 2008.

²²⁷ E-mail from Mel Hosain, August 30, 2008

²²⁸ Report of G.C. Andrew, Executive Director, AUCC, *AUCC Proceedings*, 1966, 51.

²²⁹ H.J. Hodder memorandum, June 8, 1967, LAC RG-25, Volume 15213, File 55-12-CWLTH, Vol 2 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, September 1965 - December 31, 1967.”

²³⁰ C. Demers to G.P. Kidd, January 15, 1968, LAC, RG25, Vol 15214, File 55-12-CMWLTH-Vol 3 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, January 11, 1968 - October 24, 1969.”

Lagos, and after the Canadian delegation to that conference informed the Minister of External Affairs “that the time had come to recommend to you in strong terms an increase in the number of Commonwealth scholarships provided by Canada.”²³¹ The increase was approved sometime between the end of the Lagos conference and 1970, and the plan had taken another step forward.

As the Canadian Committee was making this step forward, the Government of Canada was also changing how it administered matters of international aid, converting the former External Aid Office into the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in 1968.²³² CIDA’s responsibility for aid also included international scholarship programs such as the CSFP. The first spring after they were founded, CIDA officials dug into government back files and consulted letters going back to 1959 on how this Canadian Committee was constituted and what its responsibilities were.²³³ They had reported in their first annual report that the plan “has come to be regarded as one of the most important scholarship plans in the Commonwealth” and that it was “of particular benefit to the developing countries who gain additional access to the educational facilities of the older members of the Commonwealth,” but also ran a table showing that the Plan constituted only 11% of all “Students and Trainees” who received external aid assistance.²³⁴ By June of 1969 CIDA was holding meetings to discuss the implications of turning complete administration of the plan over to the AUCC.²³⁵ Dorothy Patterson, director of the AUCC Awards office and previous secretary with the Canadian Universities Foundation, explained to the President of the University of Toronto, that before this point housekeeping had been run through CIDA, “formerly the External Aid Office”, but the CSFP was not an “aid” programme but an exchange programme. The Plan was often, she said, “confused with other programmes which were designed solely to assist developing countries” and to avoid this “it has been recently agreed that the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada would be the administrator of the programme in all aspects, including those formerly carried out” by CIDA.²³⁶ The transfer agreement was signed on August 1, 1969, although certain problems persisted beyond that, primarily in trying to determine who was ultimately responsible for “the hundred or so former Commonwealth Scholars who have not gone home”²³⁷ and in finding some mechanism to allow for confidential medical files collected by the Medical Services division to be transmitted to a “non-governmental agency.”²³⁸ CIDA agreed to transfer \$1.7 million annually to the AUCC to pay for the costs of scholars and administration, and the AUCC was to be allowed direct liaison with Manpower authorities in government, as well as the airports and railways. The AUCC lauded the “officials of CIDA for their complete co-operation in effecting a smooth transfer of responsibilities.”²³⁹

Another immediate effect of the transfer was a change in policy on capitation grants. Apparently, CIDA had been in the practice of forwarding the funds “without appropriate explanation to the person at the University who had billed them for registration fees, so that in many cases the existence of this grant was not known either to the executive head of the institution nor to those in the department who had received the student.” In this first year of AUCC administration, the funds were instead sent to the head of the university, so that they could be aware of the payment. Oddly, the capitation grants continued to have no strings attached, they “may be used by the University for any purpose.”²⁴⁰ They simultaneously were and were not linked to the existence of Commonwealth scholars at any given university. Also, the Canadian Committee immediately took advantage of the new relationship to send

²³¹ J.F. Leddy, President of the University of Windsor, to Paul Martin, March 29, 1968, Ibid.

²³² David R. Morrison, *Aid and Ebb Tide: A History of CIDA and Canadian Development Assistance* (Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1988). 62-63. Oddly, CIDA issued its first Annual Report for the year 1966-1967 under the auspices of the External Aid Office.

²³³ Acting Director, Training Division, CIDA to Jennings, External Affairs, May 26, 1969, LAC, RG25, Vol 15214, File 55-12-CMWLTH-Vol 3 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, January 11, 1968 - October 24, 1969.”

²³⁴ Canadian International Development Agency, *Annual Report 1966-1967* (Issued by External Aid Office, Ottawa), 13.

²³⁵ Minutes of meeting on implications of transfer, June 24, 1969; memorandum from G.D. King, July 2, 1969 on meeting between External Affairs and CIDA, LAC, RG76, Volume 1164, File 5366-7 “Education and Training – International Projects – Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan”, 1959-1977.

²³⁶ Mrs. D.R. Patterson to Bissell, July 25, 1969, UTA/A77-0019, Box 21, file “AUCC”.

²³⁷ W.A. Monaghan, CIDA, to G.E. White, July 30, 1969, LAC, RG76, Volume 1164, File 5366-7 “Education and Training – International Projects – Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan”, 1959-1977.

²³⁸ R.W. Robertson, regional director, Overseas Region, Medical Services, Department of Health to G.E. White, September 4, 1969, LAC, RG76, Volume 1164, File 5366-7 “Education and Training – International Projects – Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan”, 1959-1977. This problem was not resolved until March of 1970, when it was decided that local missions would forward documents to Health officials, who would decide matters and inform CIDA, who would then tell AUCC who had been cleared. See Minutes of meeting between IMS, CIDA and AUCC, February 9, 1970 and Procedure for Medical Clearance of CSFP scholars, March 2, 1970, LAC, RG76, Volume 1164, File 5366-7 “Education and Training – International Projects – Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan”, 1959-1977.

²³⁹ AUCC *Proceedings*, 1969, 61-64.

²⁴⁰ Dorothy Patterson to Bissell, October 20, 1969, UTA/A77-0019, box 21, file “AUCC”.

to Treasury Board detailed recommendations for an increase in annual allowances for Commonwealth scholars so that these individuals could “carry out their studies without undue worry and concern over their maintenance.”²⁴¹ Treasury Board was initially hostile to the increases but they were approved in time to be reported in the annual report of the CSFP for 1971.²⁴² On CIDA’s end, they took the transfer as a means to remove themselves from immediate responsibility for publicizing the scholarships and they did not mention them directly in any of their annual reports after 1967, except for budgetary reports from the 1980s which will be dealt with later.

Evaluating the Plan

As the plan reached its ten-year anniversary, two reports were commissioned to look into the question of Canada’s role in educating foreign students. One was prepared for CIDA by Professor Norma Walmsley, a Political Scientist at Brandon University, on behalf of the AUCC,²⁴³ another was prepared by David G Fish (a former Commonwealth Scholar on the research staff of AUCC) for the AUCC alone and intended to “be ready for presentation at the Canberra Conference” slated for February of 1971.²⁴⁴ Both reports became available in 1970 for scrutiny.

The Walmsley Report, *Canadian Universities and International Development*, discussed the early history of foreign students in Canada as well as the development of the CSFP, noting the programme “did not come into being as the result of the collective initiative of Canadian academics nor as an index of any special interest in the community as a whole.”²⁴⁵ As of 1970, Walmsley saw that this was still the case in terms of the interests of universities in international development, and that there was still a need for them to “interpret their function and nature in an international dimension.” Also, Walmsley fretted that the entire way in which international students were treated was counter-productive in the long run, since developing countries had to define their own needs, not outsiders. She noted, “when students return home they find themselves over-trained for the facilities that exist in the developing countries, or that what they have learned often does not apply in view of the completely different sets of conditions pertaining in the country concerned... the student may indeed become so accustomed to the North American system and way of doing things – as well as the types of equipment and facilities – that when he returns to his own country he finds that he cannot function at his highest level of competence, because his home ‘system’ cannot provide satisfactory logistic support.”²⁴⁶ This comment echoes the anecdote of Krishnamurti cited in Section B of this report. Could all of those Indian engineers actually help India?

The Fish report has not surfaced, despite many attempts to find it. Unlike the Walmsley report, it is not available in Canadian libraries, nor did the AUCC retain a copy in their library (although it could theoretically be ordered from them as late as 1978). All that remains are comments on the report, nearly all of them unfavourable. A commentator in External Affairs noted that it only discussed foreign students in Canada and thus “attempts to tell half of the story.” Fish asked many valuable questions and then did “not attempt to answer any of them.” It suffered from “hasty organization and execution” and was “rather a disappointment” but did “reveal that further evaluations will have to be more clearly conceived, less hastily executed and perhaps better financed.” External Affairs said it could not be shown to anyone in the Commonwealth without extensive rewrites, and declared it “should receive no further distribution but [be] kept as an internal document for the Scholarship Committee, the AUCC, CIDA and ourselves.”²⁴⁷ The Canadian Committee, for its part, delayed comment on the Fish report well into 1971, damning it with faint praise by saying that it was “gratified that such a valuable report could be prepared in a very short period of time”, but that the reports conclusions “are not shared by the members of your

²⁴¹ Curtis to Sharp, November 5, 1969; Jennings to Monaghan, CIDA, November 21, 1969, LAC, RG25, Volume 15214, File 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 4, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth November 1969 - September 30, 1970.”

²⁴² *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan, Eleventh Annual Report for the Period Ending 31 March 1971* (London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1971), 18.

²⁴³ AUCC *Proceedings* 1968, 61, 63-64, 68.

²⁴⁴ Blackburn, Under-Secretary of State to High Commissioner, London, April 27, 1970; Minutes of Canadian Committee meeting, June 15, 1970, LAC, RG25, Volume 15214, File 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 4, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth November 1969 - September 30, 1970”

²⁴⁵ Norma Walmsley, *Canadian Universities and International Development* (Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1970).

²⁴⁶ Walmsley, 113.

²⁴⁷ Blackburn to Couvrette, November 19, 1970, LAC, RG25, Volume 15214, File 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 5, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships - CWLTH October 1, 1970 – August 30, 1971.”

Committee.”²⁴⁸ These comments relegated the Fish report to obscurity.²⁴⁹ However, one revealing comment by a civil servant created an ominous result of the report. He stated:

One of the basic tenets of the study is that the Commonwealth Scholarships are ‘prestige’ grants designed for the ‘elite in both academic and social sense’ While this may have been originally intended by some of the framers of the Plan and may still influence, for instance, the selection of grantees, it is of questionable relevance to Canada... Surely the Canadian policy of granting more than three times as many scholarships as are received by Canadians and making these grants to students from developing rather than developed countries on a 4:1 ratio implies that for Canada at least the Plan is considered principally an aid programme. A ‘prestige’ Plan would not make 300 grants each year.²⁵⁰

The presence of the Indian engineers was certainly not going unnoticed, this note suggests.

Changing the guard

The early 1970s also saw a changing of the leadership of the Canadian Committee and the administrators of the plan. Mrs. Patterson, the “first director of the awards division” left the AUCC to move to a position at the University of Calgary.²⁵¹ And in May of 1971 the chair of the Committee since its inception, G.F. Curtis, asked to “relinquish his appointment” as he was on the verge of retirement.²⁵² On the brink of his resignation, he suggested that in future all members of the committee serve on a rotating three-year basis, unlike previously when members had stayed on “long after... they had ceased attending Committee meetings.”²⁵³ A move was made to inject fresh blood into the committee, which at that point lacked any women members or “any person under the age of forty.”²⁵⁴ Arthur McCalla, Dean of Agriculture at the University of Alberta and the only remaining member of the original Committee, was offered the chair, and new members were appointed for three year terms.²⁵⁵ McCalla nearly resigned immediately when he learned that Curtis and Walter Gage, President of the University of British Columbia, were actively lobbying for Curtis to stay on after his retirement. McCalla sharply informed External Affairs that “I cannot really visualize any of the present members wishing to accept the chairmanship if the chairman for twelve years returned as an ordinary member.”²⁵⁶ As it transpired, McCalla only stayed on for a year, in which he worked out a new system for committee appointments in order to make the committee more representative of the volume of applications (which were heaviest in the social sciences) and in the actual distribution of graduate programmes in Canada (which were concentrated in Ontario and Quebec.) McCalla’s plan was considered “perfectly workable and acceptable”²⁵⁷ and McCalla dutifully turned over control of the committee to Arthur Brebner, an engineering professor from Queen’s. There was some brief discussion of handing the chairmanship to a French-speaking member (honouring the Canadian tradition of rotating French and English members in all organizations, most notably the Prime Ministership), but it was determined that since most communication in the Commonwealth was in English, there was little political advantage to nominating a chairman from a Quebec university. Brebner was offered the position, and accepted in on November 9, 1972.²⁵⁸ He alone would defy McCalla’s rotation policy and serve as chair until 1984.

Quickly after Brebner’s appointment, questions arose over how the Plan was being financed. The trouble may have occurred during yet another attempt by the Canadian Committee to raise stipends for scholars, which be-

²⁴⁸ Curtis to Sharp, June 21, 1971, Ibid.

²⁴⁹ But not Fish. He went on to become the Founding Department Head of Social and Preventative Medicine at the University of Manitoba. He died in British Columbia in 2000. Reports on which he collaborated on the attrition rates in medical schools and on predicting enrollment in those schools in the 1970s are still widely available.

²⁵⁰ Blackburn to Couvrette, November 19, 1970.

²⁵¹ AUCC *Proceedings*, 1970, 80-81, 97, 101-102. Patterson retired from her position at Calgary in 1980 and died in August of 2003.

²⁵² Curtis to Sharp, May 20, 1971, LAC, RG25, Volume 15214, File 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 5, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships - CWLTH October 1, 1970 – August 30, 1971.”

²⁵³ Memorandum to Minister, July 2, 1971, Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Sharp to Dutton, July 6, 1971, Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Sharp to McCalla, October 22, 1971; correspondence with other nominees, October 22, 1971; LAC RG25, Volume 10569, File 55-12-CWLTH, Vol 6 “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – CWLTH September 1, 1971 – July 31, 1972.”

²⁵⁶ McCalla to Blackburn, December 17, 1971, Ibid.

²⁵⁷ McCalla to Blackburn, January 4, 1972; Blackburn to McCalla January 25, 1972, Ibid.

²⁵⁸ McKay to Sharp, September 7, 1972; Memo from Bedard, Cultural Affairs, October 16, 1972 and October 24, 1972; A.E.R. memo to Minister, November 1, 1972; Brebner letter of acceptance November 9, 1972, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 7, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth August 1 1972 – January 31, 1973”

came effective on September 1, 1973, months after the increase was requested.²⁵⁹ Brebner complained to External Affairs, "We have been advised from time to time by the Canadian International Development Agency that our recommendations to you should be seen in the light of our overall budget; as we have never been informed by the Agency of the amount or details of the budget set aside for us, this has made our task somewhat difficult." Brebner also complained that "it is just as important that this Programme be seen in its proper light, that of an academic exchange of scholars between Canada and other Commonwealth countries. It was never intended to be a developmental assistance programme for developing countries, and its connection with CIDA may have had the effect of misleading Commonwealth countries as to its true purpose."²⁶⁰ CIDA was coming to the same conclusion – it was working on a proposal to the Treasury Board to transfer its authority for the Plan to External Affairs.²⁶¹ CIDA declared that if the plan was a cultural exchange programme, it did not belong under their jurisdiction.²⁶²

Nothing was done about this in 1974, but the issue flared up again four years later, when Brebner reported to External Affairs that he was fielding "a number of inquiries from CIDA as to the effect on the Plan of eliminating the offer of awards for 1979-80." The inquiries were sparked by CIDA's struggles to deal with cuts to their budget mandated by a deficit-conscious Liberal government. CIDA "had to make painful choices when planning for 1979-80 and 1980-81", David Morrison has noted, and "Some projects were stretched out and, where there were as yet no legal obligations, others were cancelled... bilateral aid absorbed a disproportionate share because multi-lateral commitments were longer-term and more difficult to break."²⁶³ CIDA no doubt was suggesting that the CSFP was a discretionary expense. Brebner was aware that the Canadian government was exercising restraint, but he noted the "political repercussions" if Canada was to pull out unilaterally, even for a year.²⁶⁴ Yet another flurry of correspondence ensued, in which CIDA informed External Affairs that the annual budget for the CSFP had to rise above \$2.2 million merely to maintain current allowances for scholars, and CIDA was forbidden to approve the increase.²⁶⁵ Jamieson at External Affairs then made a serious goof, when he informed Brebner that the government was committed to fund the Plan "in 1979-80," to which Brebner shot back asking whether there were plans to fund it in any subsequent year. He pointedly noted "to maintain your commitment to 300 Scholars in Canada at the current 1978 rate of allowances, with medical coverage and income tax included, necessitates an allotment of approximately \$3.5 million". Actual expenditures in 1978/79 to support 246 students would be \$2.6 million. All of these figures were higher than the \$2.2 million current budget. With a budget freeze "the Canadian Commonwealth Committee cannot afford a single new scholarship or fellowship for the year 1979/80 and might be hard pressed to maintain the continuing students after March 1979." And they had already asked for nominations for 100 new awards, "awards for which we now have no funds to honor the Canadian commitment."²⁶⁶

CIDA, caught in the middle of this dilemma, asked External Affairs "if there are monies that you could release to make up this deficit", because CIDA could not allocate new money without curtailing "other projects more directly related to assistance for developing countries." CIDA declared that since CSFP did not seem to be connected to development assistance (the same point which was made in 1974), it was logical for External Affairs "to take over the totality of the administrative and financial control for the program beginning in 1980/81."²⁶⁷ Much confusing correspondence then passed up and back between CIDA and External Affairs, with External Affairs declaring that CIDA was involved because 70% of the awards went to developing countries. External also suggested that a new line be developed which emphasized that "not cutting back" did not necessarily mean that 300 scholarships would be available every year, and they continued to press for shared responsibility with CIDA.²⁶⁸ CIDA parried, "Although there are a significant number of the Scholars and Fellows coming from the developing Commonwealth countries, I am still of the opinion that the interests of the Plan would best be served by having it

²⁵⁹ AUCC *Proceedings*, 1972, 45-46, 84-90; Watson to Caux, October 11, 1973, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 8, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth August 1 1973 – December 31, 1973"

²⁶⁰ Brebner to Sharp, October 24, 1973, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 8, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth August 1 1973 – December 31, 1973."

²⁶¹ Esme Girouard to Caux, October 5, 1973, *Ibid.*

²⁶² Jean-Jacques Noreau, CIDA, to Caux, April 19, 1974, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 9, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth January 1, 1974 – October 31, 1974."

²⁶³ Morrison, *Aid and Ebb Tide*, 153.

²⁶⁴ Brebner to Jamieson, October 18, 1978, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 12, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth July 1978 – September 31, 1979."

²⁶⁵ E.N. Hare, CIDA, to Richard Seaborn, Academic Relations Division, November 28, 1978, *Ibid.*

²⁶⁶ Jamieson to Brebner, Nov. 24, 1978; Brebner to Jamieson, December 19, 1978, *Ibid.*

²⁶⁷ Michel Dupuy, CIDA, to A.E. Gotlieb, Under-secretary of State, Feb. 2, 1979, *Ibid.*

²⁶⁸ K. Goldschlag, Acting-Undersecretary to Dupuy, April 3, 1979, *Ibid.*

operated independently of CIDA's overseas development assistance program."²⁶⁹

Isabel Massip, a staffer at External Affairs, made the most trenchant observations during the dispute, noting "there is some confusion as to the objectives of the programme, the Department's interests in it, and the division of responsibilities between the parties involved." These resulted from the fact that, 20 years after inception, there was still no "formal definition" of the programme. "the main objective of the programme has usually been presented... in terms of offering intellectually gifted students from Commonwealth countries the opportunity to perfect their academic training in a country other than their own. This politico-humanitarian definition appears to be the basis of CIDA's contention that the 'objective of the programme is not directly linked to ODA'" She noted that External wanted to make the plan CIDA's sole responsibility, with the Canadian government making its commitment "solely in dollar terms as opposed to number of scholarships." The financial aspect was welcome, but giving the plan to CIDA exclusively she called a mistake which would lead to the elimination of the CSFP, "since CIDA is already reluctant to recognize the aim of the programme."

External Affairs resolved to maintain a shared relationship with CIDA, but at the same time monetized the plan, informing Brebner that the budget for 1979/80 would be \$2.6 million, and while that "may not be sufficient to ensure that the objective of 300 awards is met, I am sure you will appreciate that in the present context of budgetary cutbacks and fiscal restraint, this represents a sizeable commitment on the part of the Government."²⁷⁰ In the midst of all this, a Federal election led to a change in government, but attempts to lobby the Conservatives met with the same reaction, although the new minister of External Affairs, Flora McDonald, told Brebner her government was determined to return Canada to the 300 scholar level at some point in the future.²⁷¹ She did not get the chance as the Conservative ministry fell nine months later. The Canadian Committee had the sad task of reporting to the Commonwealth that they only offered 35 new awards in 1979/80, despite receiving 196 nominations,²⁷² and further noted that the total number of scholars in 1980/81 had dropped to 203.²⁷³ Canada would not surpass the 300 scholar mark until 1985.

Internal pressure on Canada relating to the plan was matched by external pressure, although that was of a different dimension. Canada sent a representative to a 1973 meeting in Edinburgh to discuss the ten year review of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. Lucien Michaud of the AUCC complained that at the meeting there was "a lot of pressure from the Africans and Asians to change the program's purposes, scope, level... rather than improving it." Further pressure was expected at the 1974 Commonwealth Education Conference in Jamaica, and Michaud said Canada would need a delegation "made up of persons who will strongly defend our views."²⁷⁴ These views were stated in a position paper distributed at the AUCC meetings in October of 1973, in which the Canadians noted that at the Canberra conference there was pressure to make the CSFP "relevant to contemporary needs." Canadians, however, still see "the plan as it was originally conceived by the then Minister of External Affairs, the Honourable Sydney Smith... namely as an exchange of young people of high intellectual promise among members of the Commonwealth, serving to promote human development at a cultural and scientific level." Canada resisted any attempt to "see the plan as one of technical exchange for economic development" and "wished to point to a danger in the intrusion of questions of 'relevance' into scholarly areas... judgements of relevance require a precise knowledge of both the problem and the proposed solution to it." Although in the present this was possible, there was no way to predict any future needs, but there would always be a need for cultural exchange. The Canadian position concluded, "the aims of technical training and middle-management, however relevant to developmental assistance, should not be met at the expense of the intellectual and human side of the present Commonwealth and Scholarship Plan."²⁷⁵ Brebner submitted this position to External Affairs on behalf of the Canadian Committee.²⁷⁶ The Canadian plan held. At Jamaica, it was noted, a wish to "diversify and open up" the plan to include more training opportunities to middle-level manpower; to make the award tenable at the home

²⁶⁹ Dupuy to Gottleib, April 27, 1979, Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Goldschlag to Brebner, June 1, 1979, Ibid.

²⁷¹ Flora McDonald to Brebner, August 27, 1979, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 14, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, February 1 1981 – December 31 1982."

²⁷² *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Twentieth Annual Report for the Period Ending 31 March 1980* (Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1980), 11.

²⁷³ *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Twenty-First Annual Report for the Period Ending 31 March 1981* (Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1981), 15

²⁷⁴ Michaud to D'Auray, August 20, 1973, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 8, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth August 1 1973 – December 31, 1973." Emphasis in original.

²⁷⁵ "Preliminary Draft Agenda for Sixth Commonwealth Educational Conference in Jamaica", UTA/A79-0051/Box 38

²⁷⁶ Memorandum by Brebner, December, 1973, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 8, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth August 1 1973 – December 31, 1973."

country and not overseas; and to make the awards tied more to the acquisition of “experience and research techniques” rather than academic degrees, was aggressively made by several delegations, and just as actively resisted by Canada, Britain, Australia and New Zealand. The Canadians, especially, blocked efforts to make the CSFP “All things to all men.”²⁷⁷

New challenges for foreign students

Domestic considerations in Canada also began to be of interest in the 1970s, although not all of them would affect the plan as much as expected. The first rumble came from McMaster University in 1973, where students protested against “work permits for foreign students” and said that foreign students should only be allowed to take jobs if “no qualified citizen or landed immigrant is available.”²⁷⁸ In 1975, the CBIE noted “there is still a strange reluctance on the part of Canadians and Canadian institutions to establish the necessary offices and procedures to ensure that more of us are involved in a world community.”²⁷⁹ In 1976, the AUCC heard from W.F Allen of the University of Alberta that there was pressure on universities to limit their intake of foreign students. Allen declared, “we may have to set upper limits on the numbers we are prepared to accept, but that upper limit should not be zero” and might even reach 15-20% in graduate programmes. However, in Western Canada there was a “public problem” caused by a large number of students from Hong Kong in attendance. Allen suggested the AUCC “face this and deal with it directly.”²⁸⁰ At the same meeting, Michael Oliver, AUCC President, noted with some worry the raising of fees in Ontario for foreign students.²⁸¹ The CBIE in 1976 also noted that both Ontario and Alberta’s imposition of “differential fees” on foreign students was a “devastating blow.”²⁸² The AUCC went further, passing resolutions of concern about “government policies aimed at limiting the admission of foreign students to Canadian Universities.”²⁸³ Quebec would join the list of jurisdictions with differential fees in 1978, and the Maritimes in 1979. And a new immigration act in 1978 raised concerns about “foreign student movement into and within Canada.”²⁸⁴ The CBIE, would, rather confusingly for this project, complain in 1979 that “the Canadian Federal Government has not supported financially any significant international exchange programmes.”²⁸⁵

The ugliest chapter of this was yet to come. In September of 1979, a Canadian News Program “W5” broadcast a story they titled “Campus Giveaway”, in which they alleged that “thousands of Canadians were being kept out of Canadian universities because of foreign students”, especially foreign students from Asia.²⁸⁶ The effect of this television programme can be seen in a worried note which was sent some time after by the High Commission in Hong Kong, confirming the Canada would still be awarding Commonwealth scholarship to students.²⁸⁷ The increasing backlash against foreign students, combined with the government policy of restraint in funding the CSFP, must have spooked those watching from abroad.

It also could be combined with an increasing scrutiny of the usefulness of universities in meeting manpower needs, especially in the realm of graduate training. In Ontario, these concerns and the failure of the universities to engage in system-wide planning led the provincial government to declare an embargo on the funding of new graduate programmes.²⁸⁸ This was especially crippling to those universities founded in the 1960s which had only barely begun to develop graduate-level programmes, although these universities were allowed to continue initiatives at the master’s level. Attempts were made to institute a minimum enrollment level for doctoral-level pro-

²⁷⁷ Lucien Michaud, “Sub-report of the Canadian Delegation to the Sixth Commonwealth Education Conference – Kingston, Jamaica”, June 25, 1974, UTA/A79-0051, box 103, file “AUCC General.”

²⁷⁸ LAC, RG76, Volume 1164, File 5366-7 “Education and Training – International Projects – Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan”, 1959-1977.

²⁷⁹ Canadian Bureau for International Education, *Annual Report*, 1975, 1.

²⁸⁰ AUCC *Proceedings*, 1976, v.1, 18-21.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, v.2, 33

²⁸² CBIE *Annual Report*, 1976, 1.

²⁸³ AUCC *Proceedings*, 1977, v.1, 132.

²⁸⁴ CBIE *Annual Report*, 1978, 3

²⁸⁵ CBIE *Annual Report*, 1979, 3.

²⁸⁶ CBIE *Annual Report*, 1980, 1,4.

²⁸⁷ Hong Kong to Ottawa, November 21, 1979, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 13, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, October 1, 1979 – January 31, 1981.”

²⁸⁸ Edward J. Monahan, *Collective Autonomy: A History of the Council of Ontario Universities 1962-2000* (Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2004), 73-74.

grammes, and concentrate training in certain subjects at those institutions where graduate level work was already thriving.²⁸⁹ All of this was done with a view to the fact that Ontario university enrollment as a whole was contracting in the 1970s (as the baby boom population graduated and there was no significant pool of young adults to replace them) and hence there would be less need for PhD's.²⁹⁰ Into the late 1970s, any new graduate programs established in Ontario had to be directly connected to provincial manpower needs, and it had to be proven that the institution proposed was the best one to house such a programme.²⁹¹ These policy concerns were also present in the Commonwealth. J.M. Harrington, Director of the External Relations Division at External Affairs, reporting on the Commonwealth Education Conference in Lagos in 1980, noted, "underlying the discussion of higher education at the conference was an increasing note of scepticism by authorities in developing countries as to the relevance of university training as a means of meeting their developmental manpower requirements. Much of this parallels similar questioning in Canada and elsewhere..." In such an atmosphere, the CSFP was regarded as "overly academic in orientation and insufficiently attuned to development needs."²⁹² Despite pressure both at home and abroad for the limitation of traffic in overseas students, and the limitation of training of advanced students, certain groups remained optimistic. The CBIE published a report in 1981 called *The Right Mix*, which insisted that Canada had "obligations in the international community" which included the opening up of educational facilities to foreign students, even if some sort of "geographically determined quotas" might have to be instituted in certain circumstances.²⁹³ Responding to foreign criticism, *The Right Mix* also called for revision of curricula "to take account of the needs, interests and experience of foreign students in the perspective of how such changes could be to such revision to encompass the advantage of Canadian students as well."²⁹⁴ And the CSFP Committee lobbied successfully so that its scholars would not be subject to foreign student fee differentials in Ontario and the Maritimes.²⁹⁵

The second ten years of scholars 1970-1979

In the 1970s, 398 Canadians went abroad to study and Canada welcomed 860 scholars from abroad. Despite the increase on paper of 50 scholars a year in the 1970s, the actual number of scholars in Canada dropped by nearly 100 in this period. There seems to have been no comment globally, by either the Canadian Committee, CIDA, or External Affairs, on this drop, if it was even noticed. However, in 1973 and 1978 the Committee commented that there were fewer nominations for awards in Canada than there were places, and in 1973 especially it complained that "some countries submitted nominations of insufficiently high standard."²⁹⁶ Discussions of individual countries will follow later in this report.

Canadians Abroad

Of the 398 Canadians who went abroad, by far the largest number, 298 (75%) went to the United Kingdom, with 43 going to Australia, 22 to New Zealand, 12 to India, 10 to Nigeria, 6 to Ghana, 5 to Hong Kong, and 2 to Sri Lanka. Yet again, 90% of Canadians went to the old Commonwealth (see Table 2). The lack of Canadians who took up awards in African and Asian countries was occasionally noted by those countries. The High Commission in Lagos passed on a message in 1972 that the Nigerian authorities wished to know how they could increase the acceptance rate of Canadians who were offered Nigerian scholarships.²⁹⁷ This never, however, seemed to be translated into any policy position by the Canadian Committee.

²⁸⁹ Mohanan, 76.

²⁹⁰ Monahan, 79.

²⁹¹ Monahan, 82-83.

²⁹² Report by J.M. Harrington, August 22, 1980, LAC RG25, Volume 16988, File 55-11-CEC-8th, Volume 4, "Cultural Affairs – Education – Commonwealth Educational Conferences – 8th."

²⁹³ *The Right Mix: The Report of the Commission on Foreign Student Policy in Canada* (Ottawa: CBIE, 1981), Preface and page 6.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

²⁹⁵ D. Roesser to Maureen Dougan, June 21, 1982, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 14, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, February 1 1981 – December 31 1982."

²⁹⁶ *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Thirteenth Annual Report for the Period Ending 31 March 1973* (London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1973), 13; *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Seventeenth Report for the Period Ending 1977-1979* (London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1979), 64.

²⁹⁷ Lagos to Ottawa, October 16, 1972, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 7, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth August 1 1972 – January 31, 1973."

One of the reasons for the low acceptance rates of Canadians for Commonwealth Scholarships in developed countries may have been the introduction of CIDA Scholarships in 1971. These scholarships allowed “qualified Canadian university graduates” to “work in the field of development aid.”²⁹⁸ Although these scholarships were less lucrative than the Commonwealth scholarships, they allowed Canadians to study in Canada and pursue fieldwork experiences in the developing world. Between 1971 and 1983, 160 research programmes were carried out in more than sixty-three countries; twenty-three of these countries were in the Commonwealth.²⁹⁹ If this programme had not existed, some of the recipients might have become Commonwealth scholars.

The institutions in which Canadian scholars received their first degree is known in 298 of the 398 cases (see Table 3). In the 1970s, the scholars were more evenly spread amongst Canadian institutions. Although U of T still led the list, its 49 scholars only represented 16% of the total. UBC was next at 32 (11%), and Queen’s at 29 (10%). McGill and the University of Montreal each had 21 scholars, but new in the top eight were Trent and Waterloo with 12 scholars each. The larger western Canadian universities did not show as well in the 1970s as they did in the 1960s, although Calgary and Alberta combined have roughly the same numbers as Alberta alone had in the previous decade. Trent, especially, was proud of the results, with the President of the University informing a scholarship winner, “It is not easy for a small university such as Trent to establish the fact of its academic excellence, perhaps particularly in the sciences, and there is nothing like the success of our students to make the point. The fact that three of our science students... have been offered these scholarships is as important to the university as it is to you as individuals.”³⁰⁰

The institutional spread abroad for the Commonwealth scholars was also more diverse (see Table 4). The University of London still headed the list at 77 (20%), followed by Oxford at 64 (16%) and Cambridge at 43 (11%). 15 attended Edinburgh, 15 Sussex, and 12 Manchester. However, 28 other U.K. Universities accepted Commonwealth scholars. Outside of the U.K., only A.N.U. (11) and Canterbury (10) attracted more than ten Canadians (although Sydney took 9).

For course of study, Social Sciences still was the most popular, with 80 students (22%), followed by the Biological Sciences (42/11%), English (40/11%), History (36/10%), Legal Studies (31/8%), and Foreign Languages (20/5%). Other subjects which drew more than 10 students were Physical Sciences (17), Engineering (16), Area Studies (13), Mathematics (12), Philosophy (12), and Visual Arts (10). Only two students were in Agriculture and one in Education (see Table 5). The only significant change to the pattern from the 1960s was the drop in Physical Sciences and the rise in Visual Arts. Again, the strong showing of legal students in London can be noted, 21 of the 31 legal students being present there. The only other significant number is that 5 out of the 6 students studying at the University of East Anglia were in Biological Sciences, this was also the largest concentration of biological science students at any one institution.

Careers and impact – Canadians in the 1970s

The career paths of the Canadian scholars were not that much different as from the 1960s. Nearly 60 per cent became professors. Additionally, there were 19 lawyers (three judges), about a dozen civil servants, five businessmen, four research scientists, three consultants, three editors/journalists, 2 musicians, 2 social advocates, a librarian, an archivist, a writer, a politician, and a “relaxation teacher” (see Table 12).

Among the professors, 28 taught outside of Canada for a significant period.³⁰¹ For those who stayed in Canada, seven were located at UBC, six at Queen’s, five each at Alberta, Toronto, and McMaster, and the others scattered across twenty other Canadian institutions. The only significant cluster to be found was at UBC, where four of the seven professors were in law. As mentioned for the 1960s, Curtis as chair of the committee had a clear determination to populate his law school at UBC with Commonwealth scholars, and this trend continued into the 1970s. Only 11 professors have been identified as supervising graduate students, to a total of 102.

²⁹⁸ *CIDA’s Scholarship Program for Canadians: Its Background and its Development* (Human Resources Directorate, CIDA Scholarship Committee, June 1984), 1

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 6, 14.

³⁰⁰ T.E.W. Hind, President, Trent University to Simon Farthing, February 28, 1974, Trent University Archives, RG 4: Dean of Arts and Science, Box 14, File “Commonwealth Scholarships: Students.”

³⁰¹ Professors have emerged from this study as being rather mobile. Some individuals are counted in more than one location or University.

Table 12: Occupational choice of Canadian Scholars, 1970s.

	Years after graduation			
	5	10	20	30
Professor	28 (43%)	39 (50%)	56 (55%)	73 (59%)
Lawyer/Judge	17 (27%)	18 (23%)	17 (16%)	16 (13%)
Researcher/Scientist	7 (11%)	3 (4%)	4(4%)	1 (1%)
Civil Servant	5 (8%)	6 (8%)	9 (9%)	11 (9%)
Student	3 (5%)	2 (3%)	0	1 (1%)
Business	1 (1.5%)	3 (4%)	4 (4%)	5 (4%)
Arts/Musician	1 (1.5%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Editor/Journalist	0	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
Librarian/Archivist	0	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Consultant	0	0	2 (2%)	3 (2%)
Writer	0	0	0	1 (1%)
Dead	0	0	0	5 (4%)
Other	2 (3%)	4 (5%)	6 (6%)	2 (2%)
Total	64	78	102	123

Among the Commonwealth scholars from Canada who rose to prominence in academia were Edwin Bourget, who became Vice-President of Research of the University of Sherbrooke and Adam Shoemaker, Vice-Chancellor of Monash University in Australia. However, other prominent scholars can be identified in other fields. By far the most influential was probably Charles Krauthamer, long-time syndicated columnist and television commentator in the United States. In Canada, Margaret Visser can be also noted as a best-selling writer and long-standing radio personality on the CBC show *Morningside*. In the civil service, Kevin Lynch is currently Secretary to the Federal Cabinet, Johanne Gauthier and James Curry McPherson are serving as senior judges, and Peter Boehm has risen in External Affairs to be Assistant Deputy Minister for North America after successful terms as Canadian Ambassador to the Organization of American States and Minister of Political and Public Affairs at the Canadian Embassy in Washington. In the business world, Cecil Shewchuck was Vice-President of Honeywell Canada and Monique Mercier Executive Vice-President of Emergis Inc. Finally, in the field of social advocacy, Ken Battle must be noted as an influential social policy thinker, former Director of the Canadian National Council of Welfare and founded of the Caledon Institute of Social Policy. Only one former scholar seems to have gone into politics, Steven Langdon served as NDP Member of Parliament from 1984-1993.

Three scholars from the 1970s have been contacted for comment to date. Rod Germaine, currently an arbitrator in British Columbia, previously taught law in Singapore and Hong Kong, jobs he would not have received without the LLM he achieved as a Commonwealth scholar. Germaine notes, "My roots are in rural British Columbia, the experience of London, England and Europe had a profoundly enlightening and enriching impact... It changed my life, for which I am most grateful."³⁰² Craig Heron, History professor at York University, notes, "more than thirty years later, I still credit my year in England... as formative in my intellectual development." It gave him "a breadth of insights that I could never have found... in North America in the same way."³⁰³ Ted Bryant, now Associate Dean of Science at the University of Wollongong, Australia, enthused that "the scholarship did almost everything I expected because it was that prestigious... I owe everything to the start the Commonwealth Scholarship gave me. It launched me from a parochial world into a global one."³⁰⁴

Foreign scholars in Canada in the 1970s

860 scholars came to Canada from other countries in the 1970s. India and the United Kingdom each sent 124 scholars. After that came Australia at 61, Nigeria at 51, New Zealand at 38, Sri Lanka at 36, Malaysia at 31, Bangladesh at 29, Hong Kong at 28, Ghana at 26, Trinidad at 23, Singapore at 23, Zambia at 22, Kenya at 22, and Jamaica at 21 (see Table 7). The remainder were spread around thirty other countries and territories. 26%

³⁰² E-mail from Rod Germaine, June 12, 2008.

³⁰³ E-mail from Craig Heron, July 11, 2008

³⁰⁴ E-mail from Ted Bryant, August 11, 2008

came from the old Commonwealth and 74% from the new Commonwealth. The countries with the largest number of scholars was largely unchanged from the 1960s, with the exception of Pakistan (14 awards), which was excluded from awards when it left the Commonwealth in 1972.³⁰⁵ Pakistan, however, was still eligible for aid under other CIDA programs, and an External Affairs report from later in 1972 concluded that the only thing Pakistan lost by leaving the Commonwealth was the marriage allowances paid to Commonwealth Scholars.³⁰⁶

Canadian policy after they raised their award target to 300 scholarships a year in the 1970s was to reduce the percentage of old Commonwealth scholarships in preference to developed countries. A 1968 policy document suggested that a large increase be made in places for African countries "because of their need, and despite their inability to take immediate advantage of increased allocations." Before that point, Africa was reserved 71 places in the scheme, although they had never had more than 53 scholars in Canada at a time.³⁰⁷ The Canadian Committee, based on this advice and that of other divisions of External Affairs and foreign missions, raised the African quota by 14 and the Asian quota by 30, while keeping the others numbers steady. Under this plan, the percentage of scholars allotted to the old Commonwealth was to drop to 18%.³⁰⁸ As the numbers show, this was not achieved.

In the old Commonwealth, officials in Canberra reported that Australians tended to apply for both British and Canadian scholarships at the same time, and accept British awards. In 1969, for example, it was reported that only six Australians were available for the 14 places Canada was offering. When the Canadian representative suggested to the Australians that "Canada would like to have its Commonwealth Scholarship Programme function on as complete a basis as possible", one Australian "indicated his doubt that the Canadians were actually willing to proceed with as many as 14 scholarships for Australians in a given year."³⁰⁹ New Zealand reported the same anomaly, leading the Canadian Committee to request that both countries nominate three times as many candidates as there were places available in the hopes that some of these might make up the quota.³¹⁰ The Antipodean practice of applying for both British and Canadian awards persisted, but by the late 1970s New Zealand had at least compensated by nominating more candidates, while the Australians rarely followed suit, submitting only twelve names for eight awards in 1977.³¹¹

Later in the decade, Malaysian officials informed Canada that they could not find sixteen good nominees for the eight awards Canada was to offer.³¹² On the African side, the same report which suggested Pakistan had little to lose by leaving the Commonwealth noted that in countries like Nigeria, Zambia and Tanzania, "it has become apparent that the usefulness of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan in African countries generally is diminishing as reliance on local training has increased."³¹³ Nearly pathetically, External Affairs wired their man in Dar Es Salaam to ask him to inform Zanzibar that Canadian still offered Commonwealth Scholarships.³¹⁴ Conversely, a report sent from Hong Kong suggested that the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand would be cutting off scholarships for students there and suggested Canada follow suit, since there were few valid reasons for Hong Kong students to seek training in Canada, their main rationale being "friends are studying there, or family is there."³¹⁵

³⁰⁵ Freeman Tovell, Cultural Affairs, memorandum January 31, 1972, LAC RG25, Volume 10569, File 55-12-CWLTH, Vol 6 "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – CWLTH September 1, 1971 – July 31, 1972."

³⁰⁶ Confidential report, March 24, 1972, on Pakistan's Withdrawal from the Commonwealth, *Ibid*.

³⁰⁷ C. Demers to G.P. Kidd, January 15, 1968, LAC, RG25, Vol 15214, File 55-12-CMWLTH-Vol 3 "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, January 11, 1968 - October 24, 1969"

³⁰⁸ Jennings to GCO and GAF, January 28, 1970; Jennings to Watson, Canadian Committee, February 5, 1970, LAC, RG25, Volume 15214, File 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 4, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth November 1969 - September 30, 1970."

³⁰⁹ Mr. Jess to Mr. Roger, Acting High Commissioner, Canberra, December 5, 1969, *Ibid*.

³¹⁰ Canadian Committee minutes, June 15, 1970, *Ibid*.

³¹¹ D.R. Saunders, First Secretary, Wellington to External Affairs, December 22, 1976; Canberra to Ottawa, December 16, 1977, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 11, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth June 16, 1976 – June 30, 1978."

³¹² Kuala Lumpur to Ottawa, December 13, 1979, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 13, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, October 1, 1979 – January 31, 1981."

³¹³ Confidential report, March 24, 1972, on Pakistan's Withdrawal from the Commonwealth, LAC RG25, Volume 10569, File 55-12-CWLTH, Vol 6 "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – CWLTH September 1, 1971 – July 31, 1972."

³¹⁴ Robert Elliott, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs to High Commission, Dar Es Salaam, August 13, 1970, LAC, RG25, Volume 15214, File 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 4, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth November 1969 - September 30, 1970."

³¹⁵ Hong Kong to Ottawa, December 8, 1975, LAC, RG25, Volume 13159, File 55-12-CWLTH, "Cultural Affairs: Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth" November 11, 1974 – June 15, 1976."

Despite these issues of finding candidates, and clear deficiencies in numbers, a request to rethink allocations in 1978 met with no significant changes. One suggestion was made by the European desk at External Affairs that 5-10 extra scholarship be given to the U.K given their "position as a priority target of our public affairs programme." The Far East desk declined to alter the quota of 10 from Hong Kong. The only serious action was taken against Uganda, where the African Affairs division noted "In view of the reputation of the present Ugandan regime, the disfavour with which the majority of Canadians view its actions, and the fact that CIDA bilateral assistance was discontinued years ago, it is our view that it would be more consistent with government policy to reduce the number of scholarships available to Uganda." These requests were passed on to the Canadian Committee.³¹⁶

For various reasons, then, fewer scholarships were taken up by foreign students. Programme of study, however, stayed very similar (see Table 8). Topping the list again was Engineering, with 176 scholars (23%), followed by Social Sciences at 91 (12%), Agricultural Studies at 63 (8%) Biological Sciences at 60 (8%), and Physical Sciences at 54 (7%). A further 46 were in Education and 43 in Business Studies. English had risen to eighth on the list with 32 scholars, but it was followed by 31 in Mathematics. Among the rest, only Psychology (22), Architecture and related services (20), and Modern Languages (20) attracted 20 or more scholars. History, which had scored so respectfully in the 1960s, had sunk to 11 scholarships. The emergence of business studies is the only other notable change on this list. Humanism continued to rank poorly in the plan.

The list of institutions attended was on the whole broader than the list of subjects studied (see Table 9). The University of Toronto continued to rank first with 117 scholars, but this only represented 14% of the total. UBC was next with 89 (10%) and McGill with 83 (10%). Alberta had 69, Guelph 56, Waterloo 49, Queen's 48, Western Ontario 37, McMaster 32, and Manitoba 28. On the whole, 33 institutions hosted scholars. The surprising showing is Guelph, which is almost certainly tied to the rise in Agricultural studies on the list. Quebec universities (apart from McGill) had dropped to 18 scholars in this period from nearly 40 in the 1960s, and yet again the Maritimes (62 total scholars) approached the total of Alberta on its own. As with the previous period, there was little effort by individual universities to steer students their way. The only recommendation which surfaced was from the High Commission in London, who strongly suggested that a candidate in education be placed in a large urban centre with a cosmopolitan environment. That candidate, however, did not get a scholarship so the recommendation was moot.³¹⁷

Nations and programmes

Indian engineers continued to dominate the program, 51 of the 123 Indian scholars were in Engineering and a further 12 in Physical Sciences. Yet again, half of the Indian candidates were in science and technology. There were limitations on this – a CIDA directive in the early 1970s made Indian students ineligible to take nuclear studies in Canada, this was a direct reaction to India's announcement that they had successfully tested a nuclear device (using materials which Canada had indirectly supplied) in 1974.³¹⁸ Beyond that limitation, there was no further discussion of the Indian predilection for certain fields. Nigeria had also joined in the engineering field, with 20 of their 51 scholars. Other countries with a significant bias in the science and technology sectors were Bangladesh (16/29), Pakistan (12/14), Sri Lanka (16/36), and Uganda (11/18). Singapore had a small concentration in Business Studies, with 6 of their 23 scholars opting for that course of study.

Patterns also emerged in certain Island nations with smaller numbers of scholars. 3 of the 4 from Grenada were in Engineering. 3 of the 4 from Tonga were in Public Administration. Both Bermudan students opted for Business Studies. And then there was Trinidad. The High Commission in Port of Spain reported in 1973 that "certain things about the selection process" for 1974 "disturbed us." The Trinidad selection committee did not have any academic representatives, and "applicants for all these scholarships were selected first on the basis of the field in which they wanted to study. Only then were their academic attainments considered." The fields of study were

³¹⁶ Jack Whittleton, Northeast Asia Division to FAR, May 14, 1978; John W. Graham to various divisions May 24, 1978; E. Hebert, Europe II division to FAR May 30, 1978, H.H. Carter, African Affairs memo June 2, 1978; Larissa Blavatska, Academic Relations Division to Marliyn Watson, Canadian Committee, June 14, 1978, LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 11, "Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth June 16, 1976 – June 30, 1978." For Uganda, see also Granatstein and Bothwell, *Pirouette*, 283-284.

³¹⁷ London to Ottawa, December 18, 1975, LAC, RG25, Volume 13159, File 55-12-CWLTH, "Cultural Affairs: Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth" November 11, 1974 – June 15, 1976."

³¹⁸ Delhi to Ottawa, November 18, 1974; Ottawa to Delhi, November 20, 1974, LAC, RG25, Volume 13159, File 55-12-CWLTH, "Cultural Affairs: Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth" November 11, 1974 – June 15, 1976."; Morrison, *Aid and Ebb Tide*, 122-123; Granatstein and Bothwell, *Pirouette*, 294.

“based on order of priorities established by the Ministry of Planning and Development, the fields listed highest being those in which the Ministry felt there was a demonstrable lack of experts.” As a result, 4 “unimpressive” candidates were cleared for scholarships. The External Affairs department scribbled on the report “Some basis for this I think”, and replied to Port of Spain:

The AUCC is not generally interested in selection techniques. However, Mrs. Watson expressed great interest in the method used in Trinidad and Tobago... we might add that, as you are aware, Trinidad and Tobago is not the only country in which scholarships are directed to those studying in fields considered to be of priority by the government. This is not an objectionable procedure, we think, for countries with limited resources and high unemployment, providing that the candidates are of high academic standing.³¹⁹

Thus, when Trinidad selected 13 of their 23 scholars in the 1970s in Agriculture and Engineering, this was considered acceptable by External Affairs, even while the Canadian Committee was protesting at the Jamaica Commonwealth Conference that they believed in cultural exchanges and not “technical training.”

The old Commonwealth remained reasonably true to the humanist impulse. Eight of the 38 New Zealand scholars in Canada studied English. The three highest fields of study for the United Kingdom scholars were English (13), Social Sciences (13) and Biological Sciences (12).

In terms of subject studied by University, Guelph as predicted had a significant number of Agriculture students (27 of the 63) and Waterloo was the same in Mathematics (11 of the 31). No other significant clusters emerged. No nation dominated at any given university, the only three groups with nearly one third of their scholars at any given University were New Zealand at Toronto (12/37), Kenya at Alberta (7/22) and Hong Kong at UBC (10/28).

Impact – Foreign scholars, 1970s

As with the Canadians from this period, nearly 60 % of the foreign scholars whose career has been tracked became professors. 14 went into business (with a surprising number in the computer/telecommunications business), a dozen became researchers or scientists, seven civil servants (including one diplomat), 3 librarians, 3 foresters or conservationists, 3 engineers, 3 consultants, 2 architects, 2 U.N. officers, and one each lawyers, artists, curators, editors, and clergymen (see Table 13). As with the 1960s group, the engineers are certainly under-represented in this 10% non-random sample of occupations.

Table 13: Occupational Choice of Foreign Scholars, 1970s

Occupation	Years after Graduation			
	5	10	20	30
Professor/Teacher	30 (47%)	48 (65%)	63 (59%)	95 (62%)
Researcher/Scientist	10 (16%)	9 (12%)	12 (11%)	12 (8%)
Student	9 (14%)	2 (3%)	0	1 (1%)
Civil Servant	3 (5%)	3 (4%)	6 (6%)	7 (4%)
Engineer	3 (5%)	3 (4%)	3 (3%)	3 (2%)
Business	2 (3%)	5 (7%)	11 (10%)	14 (9%)
Artist/Musician	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Lawyer/Judge	1 (2%)	1 (1%)	0	0
Librarian/Archivist	1 (2%)	1 (1%)	0	2 (1%)
Editor/Journalist	1 (2%)	0	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Consultant	0	0	1 (1%)	3 (2%)
Dead	0	0	0	1 (1%)
Other	1 (2%)	1 (1%)	8 (8%)	14 (9%)
Total	63	74	106	154

³¹⁹ Port of Spain to Ottawa, December 4, 1973; GWC Draft reply to Port of Spain, January 11 [1974?], LAC, RG25, Volume 14472, File 55-12-CWLTH, volume 8, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth August 1 1973 – December 31, 1973.”

Of the professors, only 20 have been identified as supervising graduate students, although in total they have supervised 301 students (101 of these by the remarkable Baleshwar Thakur of India.) Eighteen have been identified as teaching in Canada, fifteen in Australia, twelve in the United Kingdom, eleven in India, ten in the United States, six in New Zealand, five in Bangladesh, four each in Malaysia and Trinidad, three each in Nigeria, Singapore, and Uganda, and the remainder spread among thirteen other countries. Certainly these numbers are lower than the actual figures. Among academic leaders can be noted Peter Thirkell, former Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Victoria University in New Zealand, Babatunde Adekele, the Vice-Chancellor of LAUTECH in Nigeria, and Dennis Kargbo, long-time principal of Milton Morgai College of Education in Sierra Leone. Among political leaders from this group can be noted Rabbi Langanai Namaliu, Member of Parliament in New Guinea from 1982 to 2007 and Chief Minister 1988-1992; Darcy William Boyce, Senator and Minister of Finance in Barbados; Trevor Moniz, long-time Member of Parliament in Barbados; and Dame Calliope Pearl Louisy, Governor-General of St. Lucia. For the Civil Service, Harcourt Turnquest, the High Commissioner from the Bahamas to Canada, and Akbar Ali Khan, the Finance Secretary of Bangladesh and Executive Director of the World Bank can be noted. Finally, in the cultural realm, Milena T. Kalinovska is Director of Public Programs for the Hirshhorn Museum of the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, D.C.

Nearly twenty scholars were contacted for personal remarks on their experience as scholars, and several themes emerge. Several spoke to the academic skills which were inculcated in the Canadian environment. Natesa Janakiraman said her experience at Carleton helped in the adaptation of “western values that are wholesome... work ethics... fair and objective evaluation of scientific and social issues... paying attention to detail and so many other things that are intangibles but extremely valuable in one’s life.”³²⁰ Nicola Bradbury noted that at McGill she “first encountered ‘theory’ and that stood me in good stead at later stages in my career.”³²¹ D.K. Uko from Nigeria at McMaster received “specialized training and development involving high-strength low-alloy steels which, I believe I was able to deploy effectively in various leadership roles to contribute to the development of the Nigerian steel industry.”³²² John Keane noted that he was able to secure at Toronto the supervision of C.B. Macpherson, “then a world leader in his field of political theory” and “set for myself his high standards, as well as pursued his themes, naturally in different directions.”³²³ John McCombie as well benefitted from being at McMaster as “three of the leading quantitative geographers happened to be there at the time.”³²⁴ Martin Green, a pioneer in solar cell development, said it was at McMaster where he was steered “into photovoltaics where I am now well known internationally and where I have spawned a new generation of researchers who have had a major impact on the industry.”³²⁵

Building international links was also important. Janakiraman says the scholarship made her “a citizen of the world.” Uko says “one easily developed international friendships with scholars from other Commonwealth countries based on the Scholarship and the common bond.” Peter Toohey, an Australian who returned to teach in his home country and then twenty years later accepted a position at the University of Calgary, says that “in my little way I bridge the two countries (I am a citizen of both countries and have a lot to do with both)... That sort of link must be part of the ideal behind the scholarship?”³²⁶

The financial terms were also attractive. John Busby says “I found the scheme comprehensive, in that it provided everything I needed: travel assistance [and] a generous (for the time) living allowance... It was also very well administered”³²⁷ Jon Driver adds “the scholarship provided me with all of the support I needed to complete my PhD. Not only did I get a monthly stipend, but I could also access travel funding for research and conferences. Unlike my colleagues in graduate school, I never had to worry about financial support, and this enabled my supervisor to divert some of his research funding away from supporting me to hiring research assistants for me in the field.”³²⁸ Noel Govinden of Mauritius adds “In those days, most scholarships were for first degrees and very few indeed for post-graduate studies... I was therefore lucky, doubly so, it getting admission at U of S[askatchewan], a centre of excellence in crop science.”³²⁹

³²⁰ E-mail from Natesa Janakiraman, August 18, 2008.

³²¹ E-mail from Nicola Bradbury, August 19, 2008

³²² E-mail from D.K. Uko, August 21, 2008.

³²³ E-mail from John Keane, August 11, 2008.

³²⁴ E-mail from John McCombie, August 11, 2008.

³²⁵ E-mail from Martin Green, August 11, 2008.

³²⁶ E-mail from Peter Toohey, August 10, 2008.

³²⁷ E-mail from John Busby, September 5, 2008

³²⁸ E-mail from Jon Driver, August 11, 2008

³²⁹ E-mail from Noel Govinden, August 11, 2008

There were also some more directly personal effects. Peter Toohey and John Driver both married Canadians during the tenure of the award. And Mashudi Kader said that the Canadian experience opened up new opportunities for his spouse (who received an MA in Canada) and two of his children, whose experience in Canadian schools boosted their confidence and led to future success in the Malaysian education system on their return.³³⁰

Did the scholars go home?

In 1970, the Canadian Committee discussed the problem of scholars who did not return home after their awards, and determined that stricter policies would have to be put in place about this. Scholars would be instructed to sign special declarations to the effect that they would return home.³³¹ In 1974, the Committee was consternated to learn that some scholars who had finished their awards were given landed immigrant status as part of a general amnesty by the Canadian government, declaring “this is very serious in our minds since a Commonwealth Scholar is expected to return to his own country upon termination of his award. Furthermore, a Commonwealth Scholar is not eligible to continue on his scholarship if he has obtained Landed Immigrant Status.”³³² Mention has already been made above of the domestic worries in Canada that foreign students were displacing Canadians from places in universities and perhaps in jobs after graduation. With those comments, one can consider the table of percentages of scholars from the 1970s who returned to their home countries after their scholarships, with the same basic caveats as was given for the 1960s (see Table 14).

Table 14: Percentage of scholars returning home, 1970s

Years After Award	%return home	%Canadians	%Others	Scholars in Sample (1256 total)
Five	72%	87%	58%	127
Ten	71%	79%	62%	152
Twenty	68%	75%	60%	207
Thirty	64%	73%	56%	269

In general these numbers are similar to the 1960s, except for the higher percentage of foreign scholars who returned to their home countries, and a lower percentage for Canadians after twenty years. The influence of the United States is critical here, 32 of the 269 scholars were located in that country thirty years after their awards, with another 3 in non-Commonwealth countries. By contrast, only 28 of the non-Canadian scholars were in Canada at that point. 12 of the 32 scholars in the United States were Canadians, over 10% of the total Canadians in that sample. Another eleven Canadians were in the United Kingdom. Again, the positive fact can be noted that still, 87% of Commonwealth scholars remained in the Commonwealth after their studies, even if they did not necessarily return to their home countries.

As with the 1960s, scholars had good reasons for not going home. Ted Bryant, a Canadian in Australia did return to Canada for a postdoc after his scholarship, “but in the back of my mind I knew that there was a wealth of work to do in Australia under a fairly benign climate. I migrated back to Australia after 18 months and... pursued many of the unresearched topics that Australia had to offer.”³³³ Jon Driver returned from the University of Calgary to the U.K. and did get jobs in British archaeology, but he said “a university position would had been very difficult to get in the late 1970s” and when Calgary had a job for him he immigrated to Canada, eventually landing an academic job at Simon Fraser University which he held for a further 25 years.³³⁴ Cultural factors also played a factor. Sayeedo Bano received her MA and PhD in Canada and then decided she “didn’t want to go back to India, at least for some time, because I would face pressure to marry and my career was too important. I wished to explore the world a little more.” She accepted a job in New Zealand, and is still there.³³⁵

³³⁰ E-mail from Mashudi Kader, September 3, 2008.

³³¹ Canadian Committee minutes, June 15, 1970, LAC, RG25, Volume 15214, File 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 4, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth November 1969 - September 30, 1970.”

³³² Marilyn Watson, Canadian Committee to J.G. Leonard, Home Services Branch, March 19, 1974, LAC, RG76, Volume 1164, File 5366-7 “Education and Training – International Projects – Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan”, 1959-1977

³³³ E-mail from Ted Bryan, August 11, 2008.

³³⁴ E-mail from Jon Driver, August 11, 2008.

³³⁵ “Sayeeda’s Story”, New Zealand Federation of Graduate Women *Newsletter*, November 2007, 37.

British fees, Commonwealth mobility, and the road to Nicosia, 1980-1984

The crisis in the position of foreign students and graduate students was not assisted by public policy decisions in the United Kingdom, which decided to increase tuition fees dramatically in 1979. Rapidly, Canadian authorities were notified that this would especially affect their own students in Britain, “and that the recipients of Cwlth and other scholarships will also be affected.”³³⁶ This British decision was “the dominant topic” at the Commonwealth Education Conference in Lagos.³³⁷ The result of this was the creation of a Commonwealth Committee on Student Mobility, discussion of which is somewhat tangential to the CSFP. However, documents which were forwarded from the committee did lead External Affairs to brief the Prime Minister that “in line with previous Canadian commitment, there should not be any decrease in the number of Canadian awards made under the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. To date not all quotas have been utilized.” The P.M. was also told that Canada would give “serious consideration” to increasing awards for students in countries “where facilities are not available for undergraduate or graduate programs and training is directly related to development needs.”³³⁸ As well, the Canadian Committee was made aware of the discussions around the subject.³³⁹ Internally, External Affairs was more pessimistic, noting that “it is unlikely that the program can be increased in size as to maintain it becomes most costly every year.”³⁴⁰ Thus the Canadian line well into 1983 was that there was nothing more they could do on the matter. As Gail Larose of the Committee informed Maureen Dougan of External Affairs in March of that year, “The committee does not recommend that the Canadian Government take any further action at this time to increase the number of awards Canada offers under the CSFP nor to further top up awards made to Canadians by developing Commonwealth countries.” More women were needed in the plan, better living allowances, and better publicity of existing awards. But no increases.³⁴¹

Two months later, however, remarkable news seeped out of the United Kingdom. Concerned about the damage that had been inflicted because of higher tuition fees, the U.K. had announced that:

Additional awards will be provided for students from the Commonwealth under the ‘prestigious and much valued’ Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. The U.K hopes to increase provision for the CSFP by 1 million pounds in 1983-1984 and thereafter by some 2.5 million pounds a year. It is hoped that other Commonwealth Countries will also increase their support for the plan (Canada will receive 20-25 new CSFP awards, bringing the total to 85.)³⁴²

Suddenly the position of some Canadians shifted from no increases to significant increases, and suggestions that this recommendation would be forthcoming from the Canadian Committee were made. Officials at external affairs, when consulted, stated they “could see no harm if the Committee was to recommend an increase... it would be for CIDA to take the lead in replying.”³⁴³ Gail Larose alerted the committee early in 1984 that the AUCC Board of Directors was going to endorse a statement in “support of Commonwealth Student Mobility” and to ask External Affairs to “encourage an increase in the number of Commonwealth Scholarships offered by Canada.” The increase by the U.K. had raised expectations that other old Commonwealth nations would increase their scholarships, and Canada might raise their allotment from 300 to 400.³⁴⁴ The AUCC was reacting to a report on Canadian Studies entitled *Some Questions of Balance*, which was published in 1984. The report had a section on foreign students, which among other things called for an increase in graduate student aid, and specifically an increase in support for the CSFP to match British intentions in this area. An increase in the number of foreign students was considered to be a benefit to the long-term trade and international relations of Canada.³⁴⁵

³³⁶ London to Ottawa, December 18, 1979, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 13, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, October 1, 1979 – January 31, 1981.”

³³⁷ Report by J.M. Harrington, August 22, 1980, LAC RG25, Volume 16988, File 55-11-CEC-8th, Volume 4, “Cultural Affairs – Education – Commonwealth Educational Conferences – 8th.”

³³⁸ A.R. MacKinnon to R.J. LaChapelle, September 3, 1981, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 14, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, February 1 1981 – December 31 1982.”

³³⁹ Gail Larose to Michael Pichette, External Affairs, September 18, 1981, Ibid.

³⁴⁰ R.G. Seaborn memorandum, July 14, 1981, Ibid.

³⁴¹ Gail Larose to Maureen Dougan, March 31, 1983, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 16, “Supporting Material for CCFSP meeting, December 12, 1983.”

³⁴² Rosemary Cavan memo to AUCC, May 25, 1983, UTA/A84-0016, Box 39.

³⁴³ R.G. Seaborn to H. Groh, January 13, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

³⁴⁴ Larose to Committee, February 3, 1984, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 17: “Agenda and supporting documents for CCSFC meeting, February 9, 1984.”

³⁴⁵ Thomas H.B. Symons and James E. Page, Chapter X of *Some Questions of Balance: Human Resources, Higher Education and Canadian Studies*, February 1987 reprint for Canadian Higher Education Research Network, 13, 16-17, 44.

The Committee refused to go along with the AUCC, with their minutes noting “it was agreed that the question of increasing the number of awards... had already been discussed and rejected at previous meetings. The primary objection to such an increase was, and remains, the question of academic standards.”³⁴⁶ Despite the objections of the Canadian Committee, the AUCC accepted a motion presented by Jim Downey, President of the University of New Brunswick, at the March 6, 1984 meeting which called on External Affairs to “increase significantly the number of scholarships” by perhaps 33%.³⁴⁷

External Affairs had also received a letter from Shridath Ramphal of the Commonwealth Secretariat, who was seeking a commitment from countries involved in Plan to more scholarships, and declared “the opportunity will be provided for every Commonwealth country to contribute to the expansion of the CSFP by making a pledge to provide new or additional awards to take effect either immediately or in the years to come” at the upcoming conference in Nicosia.³⁴⁸ Still, external hesitated to approve an increase to the scholarships, noting “the British increase in scholarships last year under CSFP served a domestic purpose, and it would not necessarily be appropriate to accept the British action as ‘pace-setting’.”³⁴⁹ However, by late March, the pressure from the Commonwealth, the AUCC, and George Curtis (who had written suggesting something be done to mark the 25th anniversary of the scholarships) began to add up. Rene De Chantal of the Academic Relations Division of External Affairs suggested that significant expansion of the Plan be considered. He stated “Any announcement of such an increase in the number of awards would be enthusiastically welcomed at the 9th Commonwealth Education Ministers’ Conference where pressure is expected to be exerted for just such a move.” Curiously, De Chantal also said “this matter was raised at the last business meeting of the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Committee meeting on February 9, 1984, where members were of the opinion that consideration should be given to increasing the number of Canadian awards.”³⁵⁰ How the objections of the Committee had been transformed into an endorsement is a mystery that has yet to be solved.

With External Affairs now in favour of expansion, word had to be supplied from CIDA. Eventually, in April, they hesitatingly suggested that Canada’s commitment could be raised by 75, but were in time pressed further. Internally, they suggested the scholarship total could be doubled, since the plan was being administered in an economical and effective fashion by AUCC, but only if the bulk of the new awards went to developing countries. One CIDA staffer noted that the currently policy was to give 30% of the awards to the developed world and “il nous serrait difficile de continuer à justifier cela sous L’Aide Publique au Développement.”³⁵¹ Slowly the recommendation worked its way up the CIDA hierarchy, with the final recommendation to the President of CIDA being “In view of CIDA’s expressed interest in expanding scholarship opportunities for students from developing countries, the evidence of need to increase opportunities for student mobility and the readiness of AUCC members to provide space for an increased number of scholarship students it is proposed that the Canadian contribution to the CSFP be expanded from 300 awards to 500 tenable in Canada beginning in 1985-86,” with an increase in the budget for the plan from \$4.4 to \$7.4 million.³⁵² Margaret Catley-Carson, President of CIDA, passed this on for ministerial approval with the added comment, “Commonwealth scholars are reported as playing important roles in their own countries and were valuable assets to the universities during their study periods. The failure rate of persons studying under an award is less than 1%.”³⁵³ The recommendation was made a mere 9 days before the Nicosia conference.

Most of the surviving correspondence on that conference focuses on the composition of the Canadian Delegation. By the 1980s federal-provincial relations had reached the point where the provinces wished to control all debate on education, both locally and internationally. Hence the Nicosia delegation was heavily weighted to-

³⁴⁶ Canadian Committee minutes, February 9, 1984, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

³⁴⁷ March 6 minutes of AUCC Board, UTA/A90-0021, box 27.

³⁴⁸ Shridath Rampal to “Minister”, February 23, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

³⁴⁹ Rene De Chantal, Director, Academic Relations Division to Dorothy Armstrong, Director, Commonwealth Division, External Affairs, March 9, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

³⁵⁰ Rene De Chantal memorandum, March 23, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

³⁵¹ A.R. Mackinnon, CIDA to D.J. Armstrong, Director Commonwealth Division, April 25, 1984; A.S. Metevier, political co-ordinator, CIDA to Terry Mooney, head of Department, May 2, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

³⁵² S. Plourde, Director General, Social Development to M. Catley-Carson, President, CIDA, May 9, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

³⁵³ Memorandum from Margaret Catley-Carson to Minister, July 7, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 22134, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 16.

wards provincial ministers of education under the umbrella of the Council of Ministers of Education in Canada (CMEC). CMEC issued an information notice just before the delegation left for Cyprus that “this year marks the 25th anniversary of the CSFP. In this regard, and further to a request from the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth to Member Countries to increase their contribution to the Plan, the Government of Canada, through the Canadian International Development Agency will increase the number of scholarships to be made available to developing Commonwealth nations from 300 to 500.”³⁵⁴ The announcement was dutifully made by the Canadian delegation at Nicosia, and according to the Canadian delegation report helped save what otherwise might have been a disastrous conference. “The raising of fees for foreign students by Britain and several Canadian provinces was protested by many delegations and the long-term negative effect that this development would have (indeed was already having) on the Commonwealth itself were described and deplored at length.” The delegation from Zimbabwe noted “As mobility diminishes, so the Commonwealth dies.” The Canadian announcement “was received with enthusiasm and served to lighten the atmosphere after the gloom had descended on the meeting... Britain, Australia and New Zealand, more modestly, undertook to maintain their contributions at the current levels.”³⁵⁵ T.B. Donohoe, the Nova Scotia Minister of Education who headed the delegation, took “great satisfaction” in making the announcement at the conference and receiving an undue share of the credit for it.³⁵⁶ However, the glow of Nicosia did not bring all provinces on side in reducing foreign fee differentials for Commonwealth scholars. At least two provinces (most likely Quebec and Alberta) refused to bring their fees down. Joe Clark, Minister of External Affairs, was quick to praise those provinces who were on side, but noted to CMEC “Our international position... must remain that, while Canada supports educational interchange, there are difficulties aligning ourselves with collective decisions or directives.”³⁵⁷

Nicosia – a promise without substance?

There was also some difficulty in the long term in keeping Canada’s commitment to 500 scholars (despite approval given to CIDA in October 1985 to increase the scholarships to 700 by 1988).³⁵⁸ Less than three years after Nicosia, the Canadian Committee fretted that their plan was not sustainable under the allowance rules of CIDA. Word had come from External Affairs “verbally and not in writing” that “the most important fact was not to exceed the budget rather than maintaining the total number of scholarships given at 500.” Since the official position of everyone was that 500 scholars was the target, the question came up as to how to deal with the problem of insufficient funds. The Committee and the AUCC were charged to “approach the appropriate authority for supplementary funds.”³⁵⁹ This was similar to the problem Canada had in maintaining the 300 award threshold in the late 1970s. In 1989, AUCC reported that there were 492 students studying in 36 institutions in Canada,³⁶⁰ but it is not clear that the 500 scholarships were ever reached. Certainly the 700 figure was discarded as unattainable, a CIDA memorandum from late 1986 had noted that “CIDA does not have sufficient funds to cover this increase.”³⁶¹

Funding for the Commonwealth Scholarships as percentage of ODA, as well as total funding, peaked in 1988 and then declined (see table 15). This table also shows how insignificant the CSFP was within the entire budget of CIDA. As of 1988-89, as well, the CSFP budget was no longer part of CIDA’s budget at all, and other scholarship plans began to receive more revenue. After 1989, other scholarships (which are assumed to be CIDA and Francophonie scholarships, the annual reports do not specify what they are) received more than 50% of all Canadian outlay in that area. The Commonwealth Plan was no longer the main plank in Canadian scholarship ODA.

It also was no longer a CIDA program. A Ministerial Task Force in 1986 on education recommended that all CIDA scholarship programmes be terminated. Although this recommendation was not followed up on, the Commonwealth Scholarships were transferred from CIDA to the Academic Relations Branch of External Affairs.³⁶²

³⁵⁴ CMEC “Information Note”, July 16, 1984, LAC RG25, Volume 16988, File 55-11-CEC-9th, Volume 6, “Cultural Affairs – Education – Commonwealth Education Conference – 9th, July 1-31, 1984.”

³⁵⁵ Report of the Canadian Delegation to Nicosia, July 23-26, 1984, Ibid.

³⁵⁶ Donohoe to Joe Clark, Minister of External Affairs, October 19, 1984, LAC RG25, Volume 16988, File 55-11-CEC-9th, Volume 6, “Cultural Affairs – Education – Commonwealth Education Conference – 9th, August 1, 1984 – May 31, 1985.”

³⁵⁷ David King, Chair, CMEC to Joe Clark, February 12, 1985; Clark to King, May 22, 1985, Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Margaret Catley-Carson memorandum to Minister, May 14, 1986, LAC RG-25. Volume 26405, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 19.

³⁵⁹ Canadian Committee minutes, February 22-23, 1987, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

³⁶⁰ AUCC *Annual Report Update* 1988-1989, 2-3, 7, 13-14.

³⁶¹ Undated memorandum to file, LAC RG-25. Volume 26405, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 19.

³⁶² Roopa Desai Trilokekar, “Federalism, Foreign Policy and the Internationalization of Higher Education: A Case Study of

Table 15: Scholarship funding and percentages of ODA 1981-1992

Year	Total Canadian ODA (\$millions)	Total Scholarships (\$millions)	CSFP (\$millions)	CSFP% of ODA
1981-82	1488.99	3.84	3.43	0.0023
1982-83	1669.64	4.2	3.6	0.0021
1983-84	1813.54	4.09	3.69	0.002
1984-85	2096.97	4.4	3.95	0.0018
1985-86	2174.01	5.96	5.46	0.0025
1986-87	2522.29	8.55	8.05	0.0032
1987-88	2624.04	11.57	11.57	0.0044
1988-89	2946.59	16.28	9.01	0.003
1989-90	2849.86	19.82	9.95	0.0035
1990-91	3035.34	20.9	9.46	0.0031
1991-92	3183.57	22.47	10.68	0.0033

Another result of that transfer was an increase in the budget for international cultural relations, but little of these funds were given to support the Commonwealth Scholarships, it being eclipsed in priority by support for Canadian studies at home and abroad.³⁶³ This development would only worsen in the 1990s as “political support at the ministerial level was sagging in respect of scholarship programs generally and in respect of the Commonwealth Program specifically – too elitist was an allegation frequently heard, along with the idea that with thousands of foreign students coming to Canada annually on their own funds, why do we need to spend money to bring what can only be called a drop in the bucket of additional students.”³⁶⁴ Although there were plans on paper for the Commonwealth Scholarship budget to grow to \$13.5 million by the early 1990s, Government cutbacks to ODA rebounded into CIDA cuts in the money transferred to External Affairs, and only significant battling kept the Commonwealth funding close to its 1989 levels.³⁶⁵

Human Rights, Aboriginal Rights, Women’s Rights

Several issues of equity came up in the CSFP Committee during the 1980s. In late 1982, the Plan was warned that it was the subject of a human rights complaint. The recently passed Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms contained a clause which prohibited discrimination on the basis of age. And the Australian government, in its published guidelines for applications, had a clear age limit. Youth programs were exempt from the Charter but, as External Affairs noted “at first glance, we are inclined to think that this plan cannot be considered a youth program.”³⁶⁶ Legal opinions were sought, and the Canadian Committee received advice from the Canadian Human Rights Commission on how to revise their material “in the spirit of the Canadian Human Rights Act.”³⁶⁷ The formal opinion of the Canadian Committee, expressed by the CIDA representative, was “when we nominate Canadians to other countries we may have to conform to their criteria but when placing foreign students we cannot contravene Canadian human rights regulations.”³⁶⁸ Forms were redesigned and the issue calmed down.

the International Academic Relations Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada” (Ed.D Thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, 2007), 157-158.

³⁶³ Trilokekar, 159, 165-166.

³⁶⁴ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008.

³⁶⁵ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008.

³⁶⁶ Seaborn memorandum, December 30, 1982, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 14, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, February 1 1981 – December 31 1982.”

³⁶⁷ Gail Larose to R.G.L. Fairweather, Chief Commissioner, Canadian Human Rights Commission, March 12, 1983, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 12, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

³⁶⁸ Canadian Committee minutes, December 12, 1983, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

The next group to receive consideration on issues of equity were aboriginal students, whose education in Canada had always been contentious. By the 1980s, they began to be more prominent in graduate schools, leading to a formal request from Professor J.S. Milloy of Trent University that some Commonwealth scholarships be specifically set aside for these students. Milloy believed that this would allow for interchange within the Commonwealth on aboriginal issues, which were not restricted to Canada.³⁶⁹ The proposal was discussed in the Canadian Committee, but the only resolution that emerged was that “other Commonwealth agencies may need to be informed about Native Studies programs available in Canada and, conversely... we may wish to alert Canadian universities with a large native student population to the availability of Commonwealth scholarships.”³⁷⁰ No actions were taken or quotas set.

A more strenuous effort was taken on the issue of getting more women nominated for Commonwealth scholarships. Statistics which Canadians had compiled on the plan showed that in 1981, for example Canada received 298 nominations from various countries and received 253, of whom 197 were men and 56 women. India’s 34 nominees were all male, as were Nigeria’s 12, Uganda’s 10 and Zambia’s 8.³⁷¹ The issue of more equal treatment for women was first broached in the Canadian Committee in 1983, and it was raised by the Canadian delegation at Nicosia, where, as Michele Landsberg reported later, “the ministers sat in baffled silence as Dorothy Armstrong, director of Canada’s Commonwealth Division, insisted that 200 new Commonwealth scholarships must be offered equally to men and women. They shrugged, finally, and agreed.”³⁷² This proposal had been agreed to as well by CIDA and the AUCC as a condition of the Nicosia pledge.³⁷³ In the mid to late 1980s, the Committee became more aggressive on the subject, pointedly reminding Indian nominators that “the Canadian authorities placed special emphasis on the increased participation of women in the Canadian CSFP... We have recently reviewed our statistics and have noted that in the past five years the number of women nominated by your country for the Canadian scholarship has been lower than the majority of other nomination countries.”³⁷⁴ Indeed, only 4 of the 59 nominees from India that year were women. Bangladesh and Zambia were also sent similar letters, with the Lusaka mission especially being advised to “exercise firmness (though not pressure) in an attempt to ensure the increased nomination of women [from Zambia] as a more balanced proportion of the total. At appropriate times the Mission should outline the reasons for our decision and the importance the Government attaches to it.” One of the reasons was “the importance of women in many vital economic fields in third world countries.”³⁷⁵

Discussion of male/female ratios in the Plan took up more of the Committee’s time, but here there was no policy conflict with CIDA, which also saw parity as important and had approved a policy framework for “Women in Development” in 1984.³⁷⁶ “Although we cannot expect to see changes overnight”, the CIDA representative said in a 1986 meeting, “the response to our effort has been generally positive” especially in the face of cultural differences. In Singapore, he declared “for public policy reasons, scholarships for study abroad are not, at this time, available to women at all.”³⁷⁷ The Canadians pressed the issue of more women at every opportunity. When, for the first time in thirty years, all of the plan administrators met at Carleton University to discuss common problems, the meeting report noted “participants agreed that all nominating agencies should take deliberate measures to increase the number of women nominated for CSFP awards” including preferential treatment when academic merit was similar, and adjustment of age limits to take into account women who returned to graduate school after they had formed their families.³⁷⁸ Gail Larose told those press who listened that “Women have an important role to play in national development.”³⁷⁹ The Canadian policy on equality for women was another reason why they never quite reached the 500 threshold, since “at one point we decided against awarding a full contingent of schol-

³⁶⁹ J.S. Milloy, Associate Professor, Trent, to Symons, September 27, 1985, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 12, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

³⁷⁰ Canadian Committee minutes, February 13, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

³⁷¹ “Part II – Statistical”, LAC RG-25. Volume 15986, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 14.

³⁷² Michele Landsberg, “Canada works stubbornly for international women’s rights”, *Globe and Mail*, April 26, 1986, A8.

³⁷³ Draft letter from CIDA to Andrew MacKay, AUCC, May 7, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

³⁷⁴ Gail Larose to Deputy Educational Advisor, India, October 28, 1985, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 13, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents. 1986.”

³⁷⁵ Dorothy J. Armstrong, Director, Commonwealth Division to Academic Relations Division, September 11, 1985, LAC RG-25. Volume 26404, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 18.

³⁷⁶ Morrison, *Aid and Ebb Tide*, 241.

³⁷⁷ Canadian Committee minutes, January 10, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

³⁷⁸ *Administering the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan: A Pan-Commonwealth Meeting: Report of the Meeting* (London: Commonwealth Secretariat, 1988), 10.

³⁷⁹ “More Commonwealth Scholars Needed”, *Share*, September 14, 1988, 6.

arships to some countries that failed to nominate enough women... if a country only nominated very few women, they also diminished the chances for the men of that country.”³⁸⁰

The Canadians also took a pro-active step which was “unusual” in scholarship plans at the time (and may still be). They amended the plan’s provision for marriage allowances to include an “Equivalent to Married Allowance” that could be used for child in “lieu of a spouse.” Although the change was gender-neutral, it was clearly expected to benefit single mothers who “would not otherwise be able to accept the awards.” This did have positive effects – in 1993/94, to cite the only year where statistics have been reported, six single women and two single men made use of the provision, although on the whole only 24 women as opposed to 90 men were receiving allowances, out of a total scholarship population in Canada of 246 men and 102 women. The effects were, however, short-lived as Canadian policy in 1995 eliminated dependent allowances of all kinds for new scholars.³⁸¹ And even with Canada’s strenuous efforts, women were still outnumbered by men by a factor of 2-1. Rona Kruger, who analyzed this matter over several scholarship programs, reported anecdotal evidence that this was the result of “unprofessional selection practices” that included leading and pointed questions directly only at female applicants by all-male selection committees. “In many countries”, Kruger declared, “women seeking to join the rarified world of international scholarship face more and greater obstacles than their male counterparts... competing fairly is, in the long run, a more effective way to increase the participation of women in the Commonwealth Plan than belated or half-hearted attempts at affirmative action.”³⁸² This focus on women in graduate studies, and on the obstacles which they faced in entering and completing post-graduate programmes, was part of a much broader debate on the subject in Canada in the 1980s. Feminist advocates across the country pressed for action to be taken to ensure equal accessibility to finances, support systems, and effective supervision; as well as policies on child-care in universities, sexual harassment, and safety.³⁸³ By 1987, 50% of all undergraduate enrollment in Ontario universities was female, but women only accounted for 43% of masters students and 38% of doctoral students in Ontario, and there were worries (not backed up by hard statistics) that women were completing fewer degrees than men.³⁸⁴ Financial support, especially in the humanities, was cited as one factor for this.³⁸⁵ Applying the results of this research to the Commonwealth Scholarships was only logical.

Statistically, however, the results of the drive were slowly evident (see Table 16). Four times as many women held Commonwealth scholarships in the 1990s as did in the 1960s, and overall percentages nearly doubled in that period. Between 1983 and 1993, the percentage of women had increased from 24% to 28%. In 1992/3, women made up 42% of the full-time graduate enrollment in Canadian universities.³⁸⁶ The plan still had some catching up to do.

University expansion in Canada since the 1960s

The change in enrollment patterns for women was not the only major change in the university scene since the beginning of the plan. Enrollment at Canadian Universities had risen substantially during that period. In 1960, there were 62 institutions of higher education in Canada with a total of 114,000 full-time students,³⁸⁷ this had risen to nearly 285,000 by 1972-1973 and 430,000 by 1987-1988.³⁸⁸ In 1992-1993, enrollment had reached 570,000 full-time students and by 2001 there were 635,000 such students. The number of parent institutions had also doubled, to 124, by 2001.³⁸⁹

The picture for graduate student enrollment was more striking. In 1966/67 there were close to 23,000 graduate students in Canada, this figure rose to nearly 60,000 by 1975/76³⁹⁰ 75,000 by 1988³⁹¹, 95,000 by 1998,³⁹² and

³⁸⁰ E-mail from Brian Long, August 11, 2008

³⁸¹ Rona Kruger, *Increasing Women’s Participation in International Scholarship Programs: An Analysis of Nine Case Studies* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1996) [Eric Document ED 401 776], 41.

³⁸² Kruger, 47-48.

³⁸³ For examples, see Carolyn Filteau, ed, *Proceedings of a Conference on Women in Graduate Studies in Ontario* (Toronto: Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, September, 1989).

³⁸⁴ Brad MacMillan, “The Flow-Through Hypothesis: A Review of the Data”, in Filteau, ed., 1-4.

³⁸⁵ Ella Haley, “Support Systems for Women in Graduate School”, in Filteau, ed., 33, 37.

³⁸⁶ “University Enrolment” *The Daily* (Statistics Canada), July 30, 2004.

³⁸⁷ Dominion Bureau of Statistics, *Fall Enrolment in Universities and Colleges 1960* (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 1961).

³⁸⁸ Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, *Trends: The Canadian University in Profile* (Ottawa: Research, Policy and Planning Division, AUCC, 1990), 20.

³⁸⁹ “University Enrolment” *The Daily* (Statistics Canada), July 30, 2004.

³⁹⁰ Canadian Association of Graduate Schools *1976 Statistical Report*, 15.

³⁹¹ Canadian Association of Graduate Schools *1988 Statistical Report*, 2.

127,000 by 2001.³⁹³ The number of institutions with graduate programs had also expanded (see table 17). In 1966-67, the “Big Five” graduate programs at Toronto, McGill, Montreal, UBC, and Alberta accounted for 53% of all graduate enrollment. Although this had dropped to 46% by 1971, the five still had a 55% of doctoral enrollment in that year.³⁹⁴ The top six institutions (which added the University of Ottawa) still had 45% of all graduate enrollment by 1980³⁹⁵, and 53% of all doctoral enrollment in 1984.³⁹⁶ By 1999, the top six institutions claimed 50% of all graduate students, but they were not the same six. Laval and the University du Quebec had joined the six and Alberta had slipped to seventh and Ottawa to 11th. In the doctoral realm, seven institutions still had 53% of enrollment, Laval and University du Quebec had replaced Ottawa (which had dropped to 13th). 27 institutions had more than 1,000 graduate students in 1999 and 29 institutions had more than 100 doctoral students.³⁹⁷ The graduate enterprise in Canada was far more diverse and well-established than in had been in the late 1950s.

Table 16: Percentage of women holding Commonwealth scholarships in Canada, 1961-1993

Year	Total Awards (Canadian) ³	Total Women	%Women
1961	101	13	0.13
1964	241	30	0.12
1967	253	30	0.12
1971	232	27	0.12
1977	253	33	0.13
1979	264	49	0.18
1982	254	60	0.24
1983	293	71	0.24
1986	399	98	0.24
1987	474	113	0.24
1989	491	126	0.25
1990	462	125	0.27
1991	458	126	0.27
1992	446	126	0.28
1993	395	112	0.28

Table 17: Institutions with graduate and doctoral programs, 1971, 1984, and 2001

Year	Institutions with Graduate Programmes ⁴	Institutions With Doctoral Programmes
1971	32	26
1984	37	28
2001	61	43

² Figures from CIDA Annual Reports 1983-1992. Earlier breakdowns are not publically available.

³ Statistics until 1989 drawn from various Annual Reports of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan.

⁴ Various Statistical Reports of the Canadian Association of Graduate Schools. Note that 2001 figures include all branches of the University du Quebec as separate institutions. If the system is considered as one institution, the number drops to 53 institutions with graduate programmes.

³⁹² Canadian Association of Graduate Schools *1999 Statistical Report*, 1.

³⁹³ “University Enrolment” *The Daily* (Statistics Canada), July 30, 2004.

³⁹⁴ Canadian Association of Graduate Schools *1971 Statistical Report*, 23, 26.

³⁹⁵ Canadian Association of Graduate Schools *1980 Statistical Report*, 21.

³⁹⁶ Canadian Association of Graduate Schools *1984 Statistical Report*, 26.

³⁹⁷ Canadian Association of Graduate Schools *1999 Statistical Report*, 8, 13.

Scholars in the third decade (1980-1989)

In the 1980s, 476 Canadian scholars went abroad and 1230 foreign scholars visited Canada. The cumulative effect of the raise to 300 scholars and the Nicosia pledge in 1984 made the 1980s the most fruitful decade for the Commonwealth Scholarship Plan in Canada, despite worries about overall student mobility within the Commonwealth. Although the Canadian Committee did in 1986 discuss the “low number of awards actually offered to Canadian scholars by other countries” and were worried about reciprocity³⁹⁸, more Canadians took up scholarships in the 1980s than in any previous decade.

Canadians abroad in the 1980s

Of course, the worry about low awards by certain countries was well founded. Of the 476 Canadians, 387 (81%) went to the United Kingdom, 41 (9%) to Australia and 24 (5%) to New Zealand, these three countries made up 95% of the total. Nine went to both Hong Kong and India, and the six final scholars were spread around Jamaica, Sri Lanka, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone (see Table 2).³⁹⁹ There were some significant problems reported with Nigeria and the Commonwealth Plan in the 1980s, beginning with a report in 1983 that the country had not followed through on an offer to a Canadian candidate.⁴⁰⁰ An investigatory visit by Tom Symons a few years later discovered that unprocessed applications were located in “a shack at the back of the Ministry Building” in Lagos.⁴⁰¹ One applicant who had not heard about the successful processing of her nomination actually flew to Nigeria to investigate but returned “frustrated, angry, and disillusioned”, declaring to the committee “It is somewhat reprehensible that a country as unstable as Nigeria seems to be should be allowed to participate in a programme with so high a reputation.” She was one of two applicants which the Nigerians accepted, but did not admit, during the tumultuous mid-1980s.⁴⁰² No Canadians have been located as going to Ghana, although Ghana offered such opportunities. The High Commission in Accra, however, noted that the Ghanaian stipend offer “could purchase four beers or provide four bananas per day per month. Even if current terms are increased by 300 per cent sum will still be totally inadequate to provide living standard accustomed to Canadian students.” As for other allowances, Accra declared “these rates are ludicrous. For example, entire clothing allowance would not repeat not buy one pair of used trousers and annual travel allowance would pay for taxi fare from airport to university once.” Prospective scholars were best informed “thoroughly on conditions in Ghana so they are well prepared for their arrival (word quote ordeal unquote perhaps better.)”⁴⁰³ Several Canadian students studying in Hong Kong signed a joint statement to the Director of Education there that “The Commonwealth Scholarship is completely inadequate to support scholars in Hong Kong” and as such scholars had “constant worries about our financial situation.” Monthly allowances did not “cover the cost of meals, basic toiletries, and necessary internal daily travel” and the cost of imported English-language textbooks was prohibitive.⁴⁰⁴ Two years later a Canadian student in Hong Kong reported difficulties in making arrangements with authorities so that he could follow his lectures in English, but Hong Kong swiftly agreed to improve liaison with Canadian scholars there, so that “future scholars will continue to receive our care and attention within reasonable limits.”⁴⁰⁵ CIDA did have a policy of supplementing stipends for Canadian scholars “for those Commonwealth countries where the local allowances provided by the Host Country to Canadian candidates are not sufficient to carry out a study program in the country” but they also noted, in 1983, that “it is seldom used, as there are few Canadians studying in countries other than the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand.”⁴⁰⁶ Canadians clearly preferred to study in the old Commonwealth.

³⁹⁸ Canadian Committee minutes February 13, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

³⁹⁹ These figures are open to question. It is unclear whether there is a complete accounting for Canadian taking up awards in certain African countries in the 1980s.

⁴⁰⁰ Canadian Committee Minutes, February 14, 1983, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 16, “Supporting Material for CCFSP meeting, December 12, 1983.”

⁴⁰¹ Canadian Committee Minutes, January 10, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

⁴⁰² Larose to Symons, March 13, 1986; Marilyn Watson to Janet Stewart, March 8, 1986; Stewart letter to Committee February 16, 1986; Correspondence with Canadian High Commission in Nigeria, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 13, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents. 1986.”

⁴⁰³ Accra to AUCC, June 19 and June 20, 1985, LAC RG-25. Volume 25794, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 17.

⁴⁰⁴ Commonwealth Scholars in Hong Kong to C.H. Haye, Director of Education, Hong Kong, July 4, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 22134, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 16.

⁴⁰⁵ Michael Leung, Director of Education, Hong Kong to Symons, January 28, 1986; Symons to Leung February 18, 1986, *Ibid.*

⁴⁰⁶ CIDA memorandum, undated but likely from 1983, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

In 376 of the 476 cases the institution where the first degree was achieved is known (see Table 3). They were more widely spread in the 1980s than in the 1970s, although U of T still led with 55 (15%). Queen's had moved up to second place with 45 (12%), McGill had 29 (8%), and UBC 18 (5.0%). The top ten included The University of Victoria (16) Western (14), Dalhousie (14), Trent (14), and Carleton (11). Dalhousie, Carleton and Victoria had not appeared on previous lists. Disappearing was the University of Montreal, which only produced 9 scholars in the period. Also high on the list were 19 scholars from universities in the United States – in previous decades these had been less than prominent. These additions brought the total number of universities supplying Commonwealth scholars up to forty-two.

In terms of course of study, the preference was, as in previous decades, for Social Sciences (125/29%), but this was followed by Fine Arts (39/9%), History (36/8%), Legal Studies (35/8%), English (30/7%), Biological Sciences (24/5%), Philosophy/Religious Studies (24/5%), and Physical Sciences (20/4%). Rounding up the group were 15 in Engineering, 14 in Modern Languages, and ten each in Mathematics and Area Studies. The high number in Fine Arts was the significant change in this period (see Table 5).

In terms of institution of study (Table 4), London topped the list again at 103 (23%), followed by Oxford at 99 (21%) and Cambridge at 73 (16%). Edinburgh and Sussex had 17 students each, no other U.K. University had more than 10, as Manchester, an earlier favorite, only took eight scholars, the same number as Warwick. The Canadian preference for Oxford, Cambridge and London was reported to the Canadian Committee as a headache for U.K. officials, as Canadians “faced difficulties when offered a place elsewhere.” The Canadian Committee debated this in a meeting in 1986, with one member noting that “in some fields in Humanities, students had already made arrangements to study at a particular university with a particular supervisor and thus cannot go elsewhere.” Another member suggested that the British should make their other institutions well known, but this was met by a rejoinder that Canadian students were already aware of the merits of other U.K. institutions – and that was why they wanted to go to Oxford, Cambridge and London!⁴⁰⁷ Even so, thirty-four U.K. universities took Canadian scholars, but outside of the big three these could be counted on one hand. Outside of the U.K., Sydney and A.N.U. took 10 scholars each, Canterbury took eight and Auckland seven.

Twenty-one of the 39 Fine Arts scholars attended London. Oxford was now the main choice for Legal Studies, but not as significantly as London had dominated in this field in the 1960s and 1970s. Ten of the 20 students in Natural Sciences were in Cambridge. No other patterns stood out.

Impact – Canadians – 1980s

The known career choices of Canadian scholars of the 1980s follows a similar pattern to that of the 1970s, at least as far as the preponderance of professors, where nearly two-thirds of the Canadian scholars became professors (Table 18). There were almost twenty lawyers, over a dozen researchers/scientists, eight businessmen, three editors/journalists, two doctors, and two musicians in the group. Among single instances are social advocate, psychoanalyst, UN staffer, IMF staffer, military officer, conservator, politician, curator, writer, and engineer.

Table 18: Occupational choice of Canadian Scholars, 1980s.

	Years after graduation		
	5	10	20
Professor	39 (52%)	65 (55%)	95 (63%)
Lawyer/Judge	13 (17%)	19 (16%)	16 (11%)
Researcher/Scientist	10 (13%)	14 (12%)	9 (6%)
Student	7 (9%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
Civil Servant	2 (3%)	2 (2%)	4 (3%)
Business	1 (1.5%)	3 (2.5%)	8 (5%)
Editor/Journalist	1 (1.5%)	2 (2%)	2 (1.5%)
Consultant	0	3 (2.5%)	3 (2%)
Arts/Musician	0	1 (1%)	2 (1.5%)
Other	2 (3%)	6 (5%)	9 (6%)
Total	75	118	149

⁴⁰⁷ Canadian Committee Minutes, January 10, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

Fifteen of the professors are known to have supervised 181 graduate students – they alone have nearly doubled the training of the whole group. No doubt many more students were supervised, if not at a 10:1 ratio.

Seventeen of the professors are known to have taught in the United States, and twelve in the United Kingdom. However, the vast majority stayed in Canada, with 11 at the University of Toronto, nine at UBC, seven at McGill, six each at Queen's and York, five each at Western Ontario and the University of Montreal, and four each at Carleton and the University of Ottawa. Twenty-four other Canadian universities had Commonwealth scholars from this decade on their staff. The only noticeable clusters of professors was three in Economics at McGill, three in Law at Toronto and three in Political Science at York.

By far the standout in terms of academic leadership was Steven Toope, who is now President of the University of British Columbia. In the field of the arts, Leslie Carlyle is Head of Conservation at the Tate gallery in the U.K. and David Franklin is Deputy Director and Chief Curator of the National Gallery of Canada (although he is currently on leave). In the print arena, Edwin Greenspon is Editor of the *Globe and Mail*, and David Stover is President of Oxford University Press Canada. The only politician in the group, Andrew Parkin, was Member of the British Columbia Legislative Assembly for ten years and also Attorney-General. Mark Hemingway is Senior Vice-President of CIBC Mellon. Perhaps the most fascinating career among the scholars has been that of Mark Stasiuk, who became interested in computer animation to model the activity of volcanoes during his research, and became so good at it that he now runs a special effects company in Hollywood. Finally, considering that this report is about a scholarship scheme, Andrew Parkin is currently Associate Director of the Millennium Scholarship Fund, a Canadian government undergraduate scholarship programme.

In terms of personal impact, several scholars have spoken favorably. Anne Bayefsky declared that it “laid the groundwork for my entire professional career” and was “a key ingredient in determining my subsequent professional life.”⁴⁰⁸ Jonathan Ostry noted that “I believe it opened doors for me at Oxford and LSE when I was there... [and] my educational background was very much essential for the work that I have done over the past 20 years at the IMF.”⁴⁰⁹ Moira McConnell, an expert on international maritime law, not only praised the opportunity the scholarship gave her to “see one of the most distant parts of the world [Australia]” but also noted that without the scholarship she was “not sure that I would have pursued this particular area of research or have had the same opportunities.”⁴¹⁰ Walter Park, who works on international intellectual property law, notes “The Commonwealth Scholarship helped me pursue graduate studies at top schools, network and meet world renowned scholars... the ‘Commonwealth’ award is very well-recognized and helps bring attention to the awardee.”⁴¹¹ Several scholars also spoke of the financial aspects of the plan. Ruth Hayhoe of the University of Toronto and Leslie Carlyle of the Tate gallery note that they could not have pursued graduate studies without the financial assistance of the scholarship. Hayhoe says the scholarship “was a turning point in my life and laid the foundation for a career as a scholar... [and] also as a diplomat.”⁴¹² Carlyle notes that “conservation is an international field and I have been able through my PhD research and what it started, to make a significant contribution to the field... I was able to introduce a new sub-discipline into the field, which I hope will outlast me.”⁴¹³ Stephen Brooke, now a historian at York University, notes “in purely financial terms, the Commonwealth was, at that point, a very generous programme, not only providing tuition and an allowance per term, but also a small but valuable book budget and travel funds and marriage allowances. In comparison to students on other scholarships – SSHRC in particular – I felt particularly lucky.”⁴¹⁴ Nancy Christie, although noting the “financially the support was somewhat meagre” added “I should say it totally paid my way” and allowed her “three wonderfully enriching years in Australia.”⁴¹⁵ These anecdotes speak to the effect of the plan on Canadians as it entered its third decade.

Foreign scholars to Canada in the 1980s

Of the 1230 scholars who came to Canada as Commonwealth Scholars in the 1980s, 137 (11%) were from the U.K. and 135 from India (11%), followed by Australia at 72, Tanzania at 61, Bangladesh at 56, Sri Lanka at 54,

⁴⁰⁸ E-mail from Anne Bayefsky, April 15, 2008.

⁴⁰⁹ E-mail from Jonathan D. Ostry, May 28, 2008.

⁴¹⁰ Moira McConnell, “Brief Recollection the impact of the Commonwealth scholarship on my career”, July, 2008.

⁴¹¹ E-mail from Walter Park, April 22, 2008.

⁴¹² E-mail from Ruth Hayhoe, April 15, 2008.

⁴¹³ E-mail from Leslie Carlyle, June 9, 2008.

⁴¹⁴ E-mail from Stephen Toope, August 8, 2008.

⁴¹⁵ E-mail from Nancy Christie, August 12, 2008.

Nigeria at 53, Ghana at 51, Kenya at 45, Zimbabwe and New Zealand each at 40, Jamaica at 39, Uganda at 37, Zambia and Trinidad each at 35. No other country had more than 30 scholars (although Hong Kong was close, at 29). Fifty-two countries and territories had scholars in Canada at some point in the decade (see Table 7). 249, or 20% of the scholars were from the old Commonwealth, 80% from the developing world. The significant pattern in the numbers is the rise of certain African nations who had not registered in large numbers in previous years.

The last discussions of scholarship quotas that have surfaced are from 1981 and 1984 just as this shift was taking place. Marilyn Watson of the Canadian Committee asked External Affairs about possible reallocation in 1981, noting “we still have an allocation of two awards for Zanzibar, when that country no longer exists” and also noting that the policy on Uganda might need rethinking.⁴¹⁶ External Affairs, with no money to do anything else, made the reallocation question their summer project for 1981. Each regional division of External Affairs chimed in, the Asian division saying 10 for Hong Kong remained fine, and the South American division noting that no increase should be made in the allocation for the Falkland Islands, which stood at zero. The African division, however, was full of ideas for changes based on “Canada’s bilateral relations with each country; absorptive capacity; and special regional relationships which exist between certain of the countries.” The Nigerian quota was to be increased as “we attach considerable importance to our relations with Nigeria.” Kenya’s absorptive capacity was lauded (and considered larger than that of Tanzania, which proved not to be the case), and Uganda was considered deserving of a quota increase because of improved political stability. Zimbabwe as well was highlighted, “Canada is making a special effort to assist in Zimbabwe’s reconstruction. Its proximity to South Africa makes it politically important for Zimbabwe to succeed as a stable, multi-racial state with an economically prosperous economy.”⁴¹⁷ The African division had been advised of the need to reassess in July, and did not respond until November. They took the request seriously, and their new interest in African education was reflected in the number of scholarships taken up, after the new suggested quotas were given to the Canadian Committee.⁴¹⁸

The 1984 quota exercise was a double-headed one, with External Affairs simultaneously discussing how to reallocate among the existing 300 scholarships and also planning how the situation would look if the expansion to 500 scholarships took place. Most of the expansion was expected to take place in developed countries, but with the British offering more than 80 annual scholarships to Canadians there also were discussions about increasing positions for British scholars in Canada.⁴¹⁹ Other developed countries seemed to be needing more scholarships, Canberra noting to Ottawa that nominations from Australia in the previous three years exceeded requested nominations by a factor of two or three, and stating “clearly interest in Canada awards exceeds their availability. Anything that can be done to increase number of scholarships for Australians would be welcomed.”⁴²⁰ Wellington, as well, noted that despite the recent low acceptance rate of New Zealanders for Canadian scholarships, increasingly strong Canadian studies programmes in that country would reverse that trend.⁴²¹ Representatives in the Caribbean and South America called for a doubling of awards, Georgetown noting that “Guyana suffers increasingly from a lack of skilled trained people [and] needs more opportunities to train in agriculture and veterinary science and would welcome more scholarships.”⁴²² Port of Spain suggested a doubling or tripling of awards to Trinidad and Tobago would “demonstrate that Canada can train and educate those of modest origins – proposition that always sells well... As TANDT students are more likely to return home than, say, those of Uganda, Ghana, or perhaps Jamaica... it strikes us as a sound developmental investment.”⁴²³ These responses, and others, led to a final decision in July of 1984 on the quota increases for 500 scholars. Many countries, such as Bangladesh, Ghana, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe, had their quotas doubled and India’s quota increased from 45 to 70 and Nigeria from 19 to 30. The old Commonwealth received fewer increases, the biggest being the U.K. which rose from 25 to 35.⁴²⁴ The rise in quotas is essentially linked to the changing patterns of some Commonwealth countries in accepting Canadian scholarships.

⁴¹⁶ Marilyn Watson to Pierre Charpentier, Director, FAR, External Affairs, May 15, 1981, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, 55-12-CWLTH, Volume 14, “Cultural Affairs – Scholarships and Fellowships – Commonwealth, February 1 1981 – December 31 1982.”

⁴¹⁷ R.G. Seaborn memo to various departments July 14, 1981; J.A. Whittleton, Director of North Asia and Pacific Division, July 24, 1981; Whittleton, September 3, 1981; Latin American Division memo July 28, 1981; E.J. Bergbush, Director of African Affairs, November 16, 1981, *Ibid.*

⁴¹⁸ Pierre Charpentier to Mariyln Watson, Nov. 27, 1981, LAC RG25, Vol 15986, *Ibid.*

⁴¹⁹ Rene de Chantal, Director, Academic Relations Division to several agencies, May 15, 1984, J. Zawisza, Director, Western European Programs Division memo May 22, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 22134, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 16.

⁴²⁰ Canberra to Ottawa, May 28, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 22134, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 16.

⁴²¹ Wellington to Ottawa, June 22 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 22134, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 16.

⁴²² Georgetown to Ottawa, June 4, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 22134, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 16.

⁴²³ Port of Spain to Ottawa, June 18, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 22134, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 16.

⁴²⁴ Helen Groh memorandum, July 12, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 22134, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 16.

The scholars continued to study at a diverse number of universities (see Table 9). In this period, UBC narrowly took the top spot with 102 (8%), followed by U of T with 100 (8%), McGill with 98 (8%), Guelph with 94 (8%), Alberta with 90 (7%), Carleton with 66 (5%), Western and Manitoba with 52 (4%), Dalhousie at 49, Queens at 47, University of New Brunswick at 46, Waterloo at 44, and Saskatchewan with 42. In total, 44 universities accepted scholars. And in the 1980s, for the first time, clear evidence surfaces of universities fighting over scholars. In 1986, a particularly visible incident involving UBC and the University of Toronto led the secretary of the Canadian Committee to say she found “this kind of squabbling over foreign students to be in extremely bad taste” and also to procedures which would prohibit more than one institution approaching any one scholar at a time.⁴²⁵ On a related note, the chair of the Committee was approached by an official at the University of Alberta who wanted detailed statistics on university preferences among Commonwealth scholars to assess the “effectiveness” of Alberta’s recruiting strategies.⁴²⁶ Perhaps the sheer numbers of Plan scholars was enough to make their priorities of interest to Canadian universities. This interest among universities, however, cut both ways, as York University refused to accept a scholar from Bangladesh, a decision which was criticized by academic advisers from that country.⁴²⁷

In terms of course of study, Engineering continued to dominate at 212 (19%), followed by Social Sciences at 144 (12%), Agriculture (97/8%), Education (83/7%), Biological Sciences (77/6%), Business Studies (62/5%), Physical Sciences (53/4%), and Computer Sciences (50/4%). Mathematics was next with 45, then followed Legal Studies at 34, English at 33, and Modern Languages at 32 (see Table 8). The Humanities continued to lag behind scientific and technological studies, the rise of Computer Science being a notable feature of the 1980s. The Committee continued to fret about this, declaring in one meeting that “some of the... members feel that the nominations received from other Commonwealth countries did not reflect the totality of the candidates who presented themselves. Fear of non-academic screening criteria was expressed.”⁴²⁸ A year later, one member of the Committee was blunter, stating that “standards and procedures are... under stress through nominations made not only on the basis of academic merit, but of need for technical assistance.”⁴²⁹ CIDA, on this part, had already conceded that this would of necessity happen when the number of scholarships was raised from 300 to 500, as “quotas have been set increasingly to favour developing countries needs. In turn, nominations from developing countries have biased their awards towards development concerns... the CSFP will become more developmentally ordered by this assignment.”⁴³⁰

Nations and programmes

Although the largest group of scholars in the 1980s were still Indian engineers, their numbers were down to 37. However, India had 99 of their 151 scholars in agricultural, scientific and technological fields (14 Indians took Computer Sciences, 27 Agriculture, 14 Biological Sciences and 7 Physical Sciences.) Similar technical training patterns could be seen in Trinidad (24 of 35 in Agriculture/Comp Sci/Engineering), Sri Lanka (22 of 54 in Engineering and Biological Sciences), Mauritius (11 of 13 in Computer Science and Engineering), Nigeria (31 of 53 in Agr/Sci/Tech), Ghana (29 of 50 ditto), Zimbabwe (22 of 40 ditto), and Tanzania (38 of 61 in Education and Engineering). Western Samoa had three scholars, all of them in Agriculture. The only other significant grouping was in Business Studies. 27 of the 63 students in Business Studies were from the Caribbean/North Atlantic (7 of the 24 from Barbados). Nations as always were producing the Commonwealth scholars that they required. There were only a few notable institutional concentrations – all three Western Samoans went to Guelph, seven of the eight scholars from Papua New Guinea attended institutions in Western Canada, and 20 of the 40 New Zealanders attended UBC and U of T (10 each).

Another interesting pattern in the 1980s was the degree of specialization in certain universities in certain subjects. 11 of the 14 foreign scholars who attended the Technical University of Nova Scotia (TUNS) were in Engineer-

⁴²⁵ Gail Larose to Symons, May 8, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 13, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents. 1986.”

⁴²⁶ J.R. Thompson, Associate Dean, University of Alberta to Symons, June 2, 1986, *Ibid.*

⁴²⁷ Kristin Laujberg, Danish Adviser to UNICEF, Dhaka, to Mrs. J.O. Watson, Assistant Secretary Canadian Committee, September 8, 1985, LAC RG-25. Volume 26404, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 18.

⁴²⁸ Canadian Committee Minutes, February 9, 1984, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

⁴²⁹ Canadian Committee Minutes, February 8, 1985, *Ibid.*

⁴³⁰ S. Plourde, Director General Social Development to M. Catley-Carson, President, CIDA, May 9, 1984, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

ing, as were 24 of the 46 who attended the University of New Brunswick. 43 of the 92 who attended Guelph were in Agriculture and Biological Sciences; 32 of the 38 students at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) were in Education, 6 of the 8 students at the University of Montreal studied Modern Languages, 28 of the 44 at Waterloo were in Computer Science or Engineering, 17 of the 38 at York University were in Law and Business, and 26 of the 42 students at Saskatchewan were in Agriculture or Engineering. Also, of the 13 scholars who took Library Science, 8 were at U of T. None of these figures would have been surprising to Canadians, who would have expected certain universities to be prominent in certain fields. The open question is whether foreign scholars were noticing this and adjusting their preferences in applications, or whether the Canadian Committee was making these decisions on behalf of the scholars.

Impact – Foreign scholars – 1980s

In terms of career choices for these foreign scholars (see Table 19), over half became professors. As well there were 38 in business, 28 in research of various kinds, 26 civil servants, 13 engineers, 12 consultants, 12 lawyers, four politicians, three librarians, two editors and two physicians. Single career instances include writer, divorce mediator, counsellor, agronomist, coastal manager, veterinarian, UN staffer, choral director, artist, IMF staffer and conservationist.

Twenty-three of the professors are known to have supervised graduate students, 403 students in total, although this figure is inflated by the 104 engineering students supervised by Arun Somani, an Indian scholar residing in the United States; and Lindela Ndlovu's 67 disciplines in Animal Science in Zimbabwe.

As can be expected, the professors were well-spread around the world, however, the most were located in the United States (35), followed by Australia at 28, Canada 27, the United Kingdom at 19, Hong Kong 12, India 11, Kenya 10, Bangladesh 8, New Zealand and Nigera both at 6, Ghana, Malta and Zimbabwe each at five. Twenty-four other countries and territories had Commonwealth Scholars from the 1980s amongst their professoriate. A large number of the professors in Australia were scholars who did not originate there.

There was a surprising number of academic leaders amongst these scholars, as can be shown from the following list:

Leopold Perriott – V-P, University of Belize
 William Haizel – Founder, Bronston College, Ghana
 Dankit Nassiuma – Vice-Chancellor, Nakurasi, Kenya
 Jacob Kwaga – Vice-Chancellor, Adamawa, Nigeria
 Kulatilike Ramasinghe – Vice-Chancellor, Moratuwa, Sri Lanka
 Cisco Magagula – Vice-Chancellor, University of Swaziland
 David J. Duncan, University Secretary, Dundee, U.K.

As well, Gabriel Talokwai was the Director of Higher Education for the Solomon Islands.

Also noticeable in this period are a number of political leaders:

Clyde Mascoll – Senator and Minister of Finance, Barbados
 Ratu Madraiwiwi - V-P and Attorney General, Fiji
 Ken Ligenga – MP and Minister of Economic Planning, Malawi
 Mahamood Shougee – Minister of Education and Tourism, Maldives
 Walter Francois – MP and Minister of Planning, St. Lucia

And, in the technical field, Karim Owolabi of Nigeria has for many years served as Surveyor-General of Namibia. Scholars who studied in Canada from the 1980s spoke to the effect that it had on their future career. Jacob Tumbulto of Ghana said he received “international experience through interaction with the Profs. It has shaped my life... I believe that things could have been different without the scholarship.”⁴³¹ Carlyle Glean of Grenada declared “it is very difficult to imagine my achievement to date without the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship.”⁴³² Mohd Mansor noted the opportunity of the scholarship “made quite an impact to me personally and also to my career here in Malaysia.”⁴³³ Especially important to some of these scholars was the social mobility which was provided by the scholarship. Deborah Brown declared “I can honestly say that but for that scholarship I

⁴³¹ E-mail from Jacob Tumbulto, August 25, 2008

⁴³² E-mail from Carlyle Glean, August 28, 2008

⁴³³ E-mail from Mohd Noor Azudin Mansor, August 26, 2008

Table 19: Occupational Choice of Foreign Scholars, 1980s

Occupation	Years after Graduation		
	5	10	20
Professor/Teacher	42 (43%)	99 (58%)	187 (54%)
Student	19 (19%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)
Researcher/Scientist	9 (9%)	19 (11%)	28 (8%)
Civil Servant	8 (8%)	13 (8%)	26 (8%)
Lawyer/Judge	4 (4%)	6 (4%)	12 (4%)
Business	2 (2%)	6 (4%)	37 (11%)
Consultant	2 (2%)	6 (4%)	12 (4%)
Engineer	2 (2%)	6 (4%)	10 (3%)
Editor/Journalist	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	1
Librarian/Archivist	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	4 (1%)

would not be where I am today, coming as I did from a low-income background.”⁴³⁴ Lucia Andall also noted that “being from humble and poor parents, university education would have been possible without the scholarship.”⁴³⁵ One student from the 1980s, Permanand Mohan of Trinidad, took the time to make his experience known to the University of Saskatchewan. He praised the facilities at that University, including “a wide range of computers, the likes of which I had never seen before in Trinidad”, the excellent teachers (in Trinidad “teaching staff tended to be scarce”), and says in general “the training I got at the U of S also helped me tremendously after joining the academic staff here at the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science [at the University of the West Indies] in 1995... It is nice to know that I am making a contribution to the intellectual and industrial development of not only Trinidad and Tobago, but also the wider Caribbean. I feel very happy to have in sense ‘paid back’ the scholarship to the people who needed it most – the students from the struggling Caribbean countries.”⁴³⁶

Did scholars go home?

However, the experience of Permanand Mohan was not one which accrued to all of the scholars. In the 1980s, as in earlier decades, the question of scholars returning to their home countries after their awards had expired was discussed. At least once in the 1980s, External Affairs tried to make it clear that scholars could not apply for landed immigrant status while in Canada and had to return to their home countries.⁴³⁷ In 1989, the AUCC said that a recently published tracer study of scholars showed that it demonstrated the programme’s success, since “most graduates return to practise university-acquired skills in their home countries.”⁴³⁸ Not everyone was so sure. The director of South and Southeastern Asia Programs Division of External Affairs noted, “although Bangladeshi authorities have not formally complained concerning this issue, the ease with which Commonwealth scholarship students return to Canada with approved work authorizations undermines the effectiveness of Canadian developmental efforts in Bangladesh. Would it be possible to instruct Canadian Immigration Centres to refuse work authorizations to Commonwealth scholarship students until all of the conditions of their award have been satisfied?”⁴³⁹

Statistics calculated for this study show that the worries from the field were more grounded than the claims of the AUCC. The return rates for the 1980s were the lowest of all the periods so far. Because of limited information on occupations five years after graduation, and no data on thirty years since (which has not happened yet), the figures will only be given for 10 and 20 years after graduation (see table 20):

⁴³⁴ E-mail from Deborah Brown, August 12, 2008

⁴³⁵ E-mail from Lucia Andall, August 28, 2008

⁴³⁶ “U of S made a world of difference to Trinidad student”, *University of Saskatchewan On Campus News*, vol 7, no. 17, May 19, 2000.

⁴³⁷ External Affairs to High Commission, India, February 3, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 13, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents. 1986.”

⁴³⁸ AUCC *Annual Report Update* 1988-1989, 2-3, 7, 13-14.

⁴³⁹ R.A. Nauman, Director, South and Southeast Asia Programs Division to Brian McQuillan, Director, Case Review, Operations Branch, Employment and Immigration Canada, May 30, 1986, LAC RG-25. Volume 26405, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 19.

Yet again we are dealing with a non-random sample, but it represents 17% of the scholars ten years and 28% of them twenty years after graduation. Nearly one-third of Canadians and four out of every ten foreign scholars were not in their home country after their scholarship. The influence of the United States is critical to this phenomenon, as 15-16% of all scholars were in the United States in the period after their scholarship. (Another 1-3% were in other non-Commonwealth locations.) Nearly 80% of the scholars remained in the Commonwealth. Australia and the United Kingdom, as well as Canada, were major draws for Commonwealth scholars, nearly 10% of the sample of foreign scholars twenty years after graduation (44 of 473) either were still in, or had returned, to Canada. The triumphalism of the tracer study cannot be sustained by the information collected for this report.

As always there were many reasons for not returning home. Andrea Davis, a scholar from Jamaica who has had a significant career in teaching Caribbean literature at York University in Toronto, stated “I understood on accepting the award that I was expected to return to Jamaica and had every intention of doing so. I, however, got married and had a child and decided in the interest of my family that it was best for me to embark on my career here.”⁴⁴⁰

Table 20: Percentage of scholars returning home, 1980s

Years After Award	% return home	%Canadians	%Others	Scholars in Sample (1706 total)
Ten	62%	68%	59%	290
Twenty	63%	69%	60%	489

Section D: AUCC, CIDA, WUSC, CBIE, ICCS and CBIE – The Plan 1985-present

On the surface, the Canadian triumph at Nicosia should have been the harbinger of bigger and better things for the CSFP and its administrative body, the AUCC. But beginning in the mid-1980s, how the plan was being administered began to be questioned by civil servants always keen to improve the bottom line. Treasury Board had made inquiries in 1983 which suggested that the plan could be run cheaper. As one external affairs staffer declared to CIDA, “of particular note was the Board’s comment that the method for selecting the contractor should be reviewed. I should like to point out that from the Department’s perspective, we are generally pleased with the way in which the AUCC Committee has handled the administration for the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan.” AUCC, it was emphasized, had specialized knowledge and the prestige of being “the sole, Canadian non-governmental organization which is recognized by Canadian authorities as being their representative on international and domestic education matters.” AUCC’s charges for running the plan were “at the low end of the range charged” by similar agencies, and on the whole external concluded that “unless the function of the AUCC was to change in terms of its recognized role as the Canadian NGO representing the universities, we would not wish to see a transfer in the responsibility for administering the CCSFP.”⁴⁴¹ CIDA passed this along to Treasury Board with their own analysis that AUCC was on average charging \$840 per student compared to the \$1200 annually it cost for other CIDA trainees. The Board had made continuance with the AUCC “conditional on an in-depth review of the contractual arrangements prior to seeking authority for fiscal year 1983/84,” and CIDA believed they had made such a review.⁴⁴² On the strength of this review, AUCC’s administration of the plan from 1983/84 and 1985/85 was approved, at \$3.7 million and \$3.95 million accordingly.⁴⁴³ However, AUCC’s administration of the plan still was far from secure. In December of 1985, the AUCC received a curious letter from the Minister of External Relations, Monique Vezina, stating “I am pleased to inform you that I have authorized CIDA to request a costed proposal from the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada to be the executing agency for the Canadian Commonwealth and Scholarship Plan for the next three years.” Tom Symons, who

⁴⁴⁰ E-mail from Andrea Davis, August 27, 2008.

⁴⁴¹ R.G. Seaborn, Acting Director, Academic Relations Division to R.F. Black, Director, Human Resources Directorate, CIDA, January 4, 1983, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

⁴⁴² Pierre P. Sicard, Vice-President, Resources, CIDA to P. Meyboom, Deputy Secretary, Administrative Policy Board, Treasury Board, January 6, 1983, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

⁴⁴³ William MacWhinney to Minister, March 29, 1983, LAC RG-25. Volume 21173, File 55-12-CWLTH, Part 15.

had taken over as Chair from Brebner in 1984, on receiving a copy, underlined that passage and added a “?” in the margins.⁴⁴⁴ And “?” was certainly a valid question. The wording was reminiscent of the 1978 promise to fund the plan “in 1979-80.” It left open what would happen after the three years were up. Similarly, the Canadian Committee became aware that CIDA was nosing around behind their back on the question of how much was being spent on health care benefits for scholars.⁴⁴⁵ Word came from the Treasury Board that the monthly stipend for research fellows might be decreased on the assumption “that each researcher was paid by the sending institution as well.”⁴⁴⁶ The negotiations with CIDA dragged on, with the Plan’s administrative secretary declaring that Treasury Board was using “irrelevant” forms and CIDA representatives “do not understand the need for us to be advanced large sums to distribute to students each month.”⁴⁴⁷ Questions were also posed on the usefulness of capitation grants to universities. The niggling over funds reached the point that a promising idea to issue a newsletter on the plan was nixed by External Affairs after the first issue was prepared for release, despite its modest cost of \$2,000.⁴⁴⁸ Nothing was beyond scrutiny, and the whole process, according to Gail Larose was “dreadful, absolutely dreadful.”⁴⁴⁹ The switch to full control of the plan by External Affairs also occurred during this period, as did the drops in funding relative to overall ODA (and overall scholarship funding) in Canada.

Committee composition in question

An example of the new interventionist policy of External Affairs can be seen in the nomination of new members to the Committee. In 1986 a routine letter was sent from the Assistant Deputy Minister, Communications and Culture to the Secretary of State for External Affairs asking him to sign “five letters of welcome to new members of the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Committee.” The letter noted, “Following a tradition going back to the beginning of the CCSFP Committee, we have accepted the recommendations of the AUCC for new members of the Committee, which are drawn from the Canadian academic community.” This letter was almost a carbon copy of a similar letter which was sent in 1984. The change, in 1986, was that the letter “requests the AUCC in future to seek your concurrence... before approaches are made to prospective new members, rather than after the fact... in addition, this letter requests the AUCC to make every effort to achieve a better linguistic balance... and a better ratio between male and female members of the Committee.” Only three Francophone and two women were present on the fourteen-person committee.⁴⁵⁰ Joe Clark, then Secretary of State for External Affairs, then took matters further, requesting from the AUCC that they put forward a slate of candidates from which he could pick new members for the Canadian Committee. The AUCC pointed out to External Affairs the “practical difficulties” which such a procedure would create, stating “The idea of a slate of candidates makes me very uneasy... It is impossible, for example, to nominate a British Columbia sociologist and a francophone New Brunswick engineer and be happy with a choice of either one when we really need a historian who could represent a smaller Ontario institution. The reason that we nominate only one candidate for each place to be filled is precisely because we have done the homework necessary to make the Minister’s appointment a useful and workable one in the context of the committee’s task.”⁴⁵¹ AUCC did declare that they would continue to take “great care... to ensure the representation of our female and francophone colleagues while at the same time ensuring the disciplinary, geographical and institutional representation so necessary to the efficient work of the Committee.”⁴⁵² This seems not to have satisfied External Affairs, because in 1987 the nominations list for the committee proposed “several names for each slot.”⁴⁵³ External Affairs was pleased to receive “a record of the in-depth

⁴⁴⁴ Monique Vezina to David Johnson, President AUCC, December 21, 1985, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 13, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents. 1986.”

⁴⁴⁵ Gail Larose to Jacques Boisvert, Director, Veterans Affairs Canada, Feb. 3, 1986, *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁶ Canadian Committee minutes, February 13, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

⁴⁴⁷ Larose to Symons, May 22, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 13, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents. 1986.”

⁴⁴⁸ Canadian Committee minutes, December 12, 1986, Trent University Archives, Fonds 97-019: T.H.B. Symons Papers, Box 23, File 15, “CSFP: Some correspondence, notes, and documents.”

⁴⁴⁹ Gail Larose interview with Hilary Perraton, August 17, 2007.

⁴⁵⁰ Marie-Andree Beauchemin and D.H. Burney to Secretary of State for External Affairs, January 16, 1986; Jacques Dupuis and de Montigny Marchard to Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, June 7, 1984, both documents forwarded from Natalija Marjanovic, Deputy Director, International Education and Youth Division, DFAIT, June 27, 2008.

⁴⁵¹ Gail Larose to Allan Gillmore, AUCC, September 26, 1986; Gillmore to Joe Clark, September 26, 1986; documents forwarded by Marjanovic.

⁴⁵² Gillmore to Clark, March 19, 1986; document forwarded by Marjanovic.

⁴⁵³ Sheila D. Armstrong, Director, Awards Division AUCC to Brian Long, Deputy Director, Academic Relations Division, External Affairs, September 24, 1987; document forward by Marjanovic.

consideration which you have obviously given to reaching a balance in all facets which must be taken into account,⁴⁵⁴ but creation of these slates added to the workload of the AUCC and the Canadian Committee, without much effect on the overall representativeness of the Committee. Although female membership was up to 5 of 15 members by 1988, Francophone membership had stayed at three.⁴⁵⁵

Budgets, policies, and tenders

Things would only get worse in the 1990s. Cultural and academic budgets became increasingly peripheral to Canadian foreign policy objectives in the 1990s.⁴⁵⁶ CIDA was under pressure to achieve “better development assistance at a better price.” and to reduce the number of contracts and the cost of these contracts with outside agencies. These contracts would be open to bids from “medium and small firms” although the move to cut costs would, CIDA believed, lead to criticism from “some smaller NGO’s who had in the past easy access to some CIDA funds.”⁴⁵⁷ Canadian priorities were shifting, too, as Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada emphasized the need to “play a more prominent role in assisting states of the former Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe.” Any money that was available for developing countries had to be channeled into those with “high growth” potential.⁴⁵⁸ And Canada’s list of high-priority countries for international relations included “most of Western Europe, Japan, and the United States, as well as a couple of developing countries like China and India.”⁴⁵⁹ None of these were in the Commonwealth.

The main policy report that changed matters was written by Barry Carin, the assistant under-secretary for economic policy and trade competitiveness, who was “new to External Affairs and had no prior experience in the field of economic development.” The “Carin report” advocated a significant reduction in development aid to emerging countries and replaced it with greater emphasis on peacekeeping initiatives, humanitarian assistance, and environmental initiatives. What aid was to be given would be focused on a few “focus countries.”⁴⁶⁰ There was little room for broad-based Commonwealth wide bilateral agreements for graduate study under this model. When it was leaked, the Carin report “unleashed a furor among NGO’s and others who saw in it the most serious threat ever to Canadian development assistance.”⁴⁶¹ As The AUCC noted:

Toward the end of January, 1993, details about the departments so-called Carin Report began to emerge. The report proposed that some \$284 million in development assistance which had previously supported projects in nearly 140 countries be redirected to support activities in fewer than a dozen countries... Major changes were being proposed for the Canadian International Development Agency’s Educational Institutions Program.⁴⁶²

During this period of conflict over foreign policy objectives, the contract for the CSFP, which the AUCC had been administering continuously since 1960, was put out for tender. Treasury Board and the Assistant Deputy Minister of External Affairs both demanded significant cuts in the budget for educational initiatives, and the AUCC’s administrative costs were perceived to be growing too rapidly. Although the expectation was that the tender would lead the plan back to the AUCC, “their bid came in significantly higher than any other bid” and a complicated point system made the Canadian Bureau of International Education’s bid superior to that of the AUCC.⁴⁶³ CBIE only held on to the awards for one two-year contract, at which point it was again put out to tender, not only because that was now the custom for all contracts, but also because External Affairs were reported to have some disappointments about CBIE’s handling of the contract and were at that time bringing the administration of the Commonwealth Program together with the administration of several other awards.⁴⁶⁴ The winning bidder in 1995 was the International Council for Canadian Studies. They beat out an aggressive bid by WUSC, which believed that “the programme fit within WUSC’s institutional mandate to work with the Canadian post-

⁴⁵⁴ Long to Armstrong, October 16, 1987; document forwarded by Marjanovic.

⁴⁵⁵ Sheila Armstrong to Janet Bax, Director, Academic Relations Division, External Affairs, October 19, 1988; document forward by Marjanovic.

⁴⁵⁶ Trilokekar, 185.

⁴⁵⁷ David R. Morrison, *Aid and Ebb Tide: A History of CIDA and Canadian Development Assistance* (Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1998, 338-339).

⁴⁵⁸ Morrison, 340.

⁴⁵⁹ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008

⁴⁶⁰ Morrison, 341-343.

⁴⁶¹ Morrison, 344.

⁴⁶² AUCC *International Division Progress Report 1992-1993*, 2-3.

⁴⁶³ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008. CBIE *Annual Report 1993*, 5.

⁴⁶⁴ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008.

secondary community to foster sustainable human development internationally through education and co-operation.”⁴⁶⁵ The WUSC bid highlighted their “considerable experience in delivering professional services” and the fact they had 350 students in Canada and 200 placements overseas under their current programs, and an “unmatched record of cooperation between north and south.”⁴⁶⁶ Still, the contract went to ICCS, which on its part had been running some smaller scholarship programs on behalf of the federal government since 1987.⁴⁶⁷ CBIE protested the decision to tender to ICCS without effect.⁴⁶⁸ ICCS was still somewhat surprised by the result, with their President noting “the ICCS was by far the smallest and least well known” of the bidders. Still, by getting the plan they felt they had heightened their position in “the international academic relations field, which will undoubtedly enable it to lobby the DFAIT in the interest of Canadian Studies even more effectively.”⁴⁶⁹ When ICCS took over, there were 344 “foreign recipients in Canada”, showing that the ambitious goal of 500 set ten years earlier was a distant dream.⁴⁷⁰ The original contract with ICCS was for five years, but in 2000 it received yet another five-year renewal.⁴⁷¹

The Commonwealth Scholarships were not just being kicked around from agency to agency in the period 1992-1995. As well, they were the victim of conflicting messages from all levels of government. In 1994, the Prime Minister’s Office “insisted that the Commonwealth Scholarship program be continued at generous levels in spite of the budget cuts”⁴⁷² but did not indicate how this might happen. Mulroney had been in office when the plan was increased to 500 scholarships but the new Chrétien government did not see how to back away from that promise. The Academic Relations division, however, did not have the money, and reduced the plan to 2/3 of its original size by 1993-1994. The division warned that the reduction made the program “imbalanced” and the division worried that the PM’s credibility in the Commonwealth was at risk. Francophone awards (and their annual stipends) were growing, but the CSFP was stagnant.⁴⁷³ Academic Relations had also decided that their programs in support of Canadian Studies abroad were more important than the CSFP, and cuts to the Scholarship Plan were always preferred.⁴⁷⁴ Canadian Studies “dealt with professors already employed in their universities and had a leveraging effect that was tremendous in terms of the number of students reached who would study about Canada and also on the impact of foreign students seeking to study in Canada.” Canadian Studies professors abroad had “an interest in forging links with Canadian institutions”. Under this circumstance, Canadian Studies had the clear advantage over Commonwealth Scholarships, although one external affairs staffer insists that “we could not use the ODA part of the academic relations budget for developed countries, so in fact there wasn’t a situation where monies for scholarships... were being hived off for Canadian Studies.”⁴⁷⁵

The defeat of the Conservative Mulroney government in 1993 and the return to power of the Liberals briefly brought the plight of the CSFP back into the open. The Liberals embarked on a strenuous review of their foreign policy, and held open hearings on the subject, to which many Canadian educational agencies spoke. The Canadian Bureau of International Education stressed that education should be seen as a matter of international trade as well as of education, and the Commonwealth Scholarship program as an important trade initiative.⁴⁷⁶ Thus, cuts to the training and education aspects of ODA, which CBIE said had reached “25% in one year”, were unacceptable.⁴⁷⁷ Cornelius Remie of the International Council of Canadian Studies added that “we need to know the long-term prospects for the sustained funding [of international programmes] so we can plan for the future.”⁴⁷⁸ The suggestion was made in debate that some sort of “permanent home... complete home... separate home for international education” would solve the problem.⁴⁷⁹ CIDA was criticized directly for not doing enough to encourage

⁴⁶⁵ E-mail from Peter Szyszlo, Senior Program Officer, WUSC, to author, January 30, 2008.

⁴⁶⁶ WUSC Proposal for “Administration of the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan”, undated, page 2, forwarded from Peter Szyszlo, 2008.

⁴⁶⁷ E-mail from Christina Frias, Manager, Canadian Studies Programs, ICCS, January 22, 2008.

⁴⁶⁸ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008

⁴⁶⁹ *ICCS Contact*, 14, 2 (May 1995), 1-2.

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 4

⁴⁷¹ Serge Jaumain, *The Canadianists: The ICCS/25 Years in the Service of Canadian Studies* (Ottawa: International Council for Canadian Studies, 2005), 44.

⁴⁷² Trilokekar, 186.

⁴⁷³ Trilokekar, 187-188.

⁴⁷⁴ Trilokekar, 191.

⁴⁷⁵ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008.

⁴⁷⁶ *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons of Reviewing Foreign Policy*, Issue 29, June 7, 1994, 29.

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 31.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁴⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 43.

Canadians to study in countries other than “the United States, the United Kingdom, or France.”⁴⁸⁰ Eva Egron-Polak of the AUCC complained as well that Foreign Affairs was “responsible for the promotion of co-operation in international higher education” but also “up until now has not been able to commit important resources to this.” Polak also derided the cuts made to Commonwealth scholarships.⁴⁸¹ The Royal Commonwealth Society also addressed the committee and stressed the important role which Canada had played in the Commonwealth in the past, and insisted that “Canada should support an NGO base within the Commonwealth” and “use the Commonwealth as a means to address the pressing political, economic, and development issues in Africa and the Caribbean.”⁴⁸²

The Committee also commissioned position papers on Canadian foreign policy. John Ralston Saul, prominent Canadian philosopher, wrote one “Culture and Foreign Policy”, and he as well stated “It is unfortunate that we seem to be cutting back on Commonwealth Scholarships and reciprocal awards – that is, student exchanges – with other countries. At the same time we are developing unnecessary programs with the United States... we need to develop more balance in our relationships.”⁴⁸³ He also stated “that approximately the same amount... is spent on Canadian Studies as on all cultural efforts makes no sense at all... it should not be an area to benefit if more money is put into our cultural effort.”⁴⁸⁴

The final report of the foreign policy review committee seemed to have listened to the general word from the educational committee. It established as the “third pillar” of Canada’s foreign policy, “Projecting Canadian Culture and Learning Abroad.” The report noted “Strengthening Canadian identity and enhancing out innovative and creative capacity make us better arms to deal with a more intensely competitive global system.”⁴⁸⁵ It further stated:

Canada has many very good universities and colleges which are already home to thousands of foreign students. Canadian professors, researchers and students are instrumental in creating an atmosphere in which foreign students learn about Canada, its people and its culture. These students are potential ambassadors of Canada when they return home... We should be encouraging more foreign students to come and study in Canadian universities and colleges... Canada’s capacity to compete in the global economy will depend in part on the next generation of the best and brightest developing the knowledge and skills necessary to deal with other cultures and to participate in foreign environments. To do so Canada should support international student mobility programs designed to give foreign experience to young scholars... A coherent strategy on these... fronts (student mobility... and international research linkages) would help in the achievement of key national objectives.⁴⁸⁶

To this end, the Review recommended that “the Government of Canada give careful consideration to the creation of scholarship and exchange programs that would involve the private sector in an essential way, to allow Canadian students to spend short, though meaningful, periods in centres of higher learning beyond the United States and traditional European destinations, and to allow students from those countries to do the same in Canada.”⁴⁸⁷ Sadly, the report did not mention existing government programs which were pursuing the same ends. The repeated mention of the CSFP in the Review deliberations did not translate to the final report.

On paper, the government remained in support of student exchanges. But in reality, the situation continued to be dire. On the ground, the “pillar never became more than a ‘toothpick’, as one colleague put it, because the Department itself resisted doing anything more significant and because the Government was never prepared to put its money where its mouth was.”⁴⁸⁸ In the fall of 1996, word came down to Academic Relations that the budget for such programs would be cut by a further 33% in 1998-99 and onward. As a result, it appears that the decision was made to “cancel all programs, including the marketing of Canadian universities and colleges, distance education, Commonwealth awards, and the Fulbright scholarships, in order to leave the flagship program, Canadian

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid., 45.

⁴⁸¹ *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons of Reviewing Foreign Policy*, Issue 41, June 15, 1994, 41.

⁴⁸² *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons of Reviewing Foreign Policy*, Issue 42, June 15, 1994, 34.

⁴⁸³ John Ralston Saul, “Culture and Foreign Policy”, in *Canada’s Foreign Policy: Principles and Priorities for the Future: The Position Papers* (Ottawa: Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons Reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy, November 1994), 104.

⁴⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁵ *Canada’s Foreign Policy: Principles and Priorities for the Future: Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons Reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy* (Ottawa, November 1994), 63.

⁴⁸⁶ Ibid., 64-65.

⁴⁸⁷ Ibid., 66.

⁴⁸⁸ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008

studies, with enough for survival.”⁴⁸⁹ The funding was restored in April 1998 after a cabinet shuffle brought in a new foreign minister who was more supportive of the “third pillar.”⁴⁹⁰ It is not clear how much of the restored funding, however, accrued to the CSFP – one staffer claims that no cuts were ever threatened because it was “mostly ODA money” which if not spent on the awards would simply have been “spent by CIDA elsewhere.”⁴⁹¹ Whether the cuts were threatened or not, the fact remains that short-term decisions had the potential to do long-term damage to the Scholarship Plan.

The Canadian Caribbean Distance Education Scholarship Programme

In late 1997, the Canadian Government announced \$1.75 million in funding for an “education pilot programme to benefit students in the Caribbean.”⁴⁹² The programme, which was to be administered by the Commonwealth of Learning in Vancouver, would allow winners of Commonwealth Scholarships from Caribbean countries to take degrees in teacher education, information technology, and hospitality management through distance learning. Lloyd Axworthy, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, said the plan would provide “an innovative vehicle to promote technology based distance education, which Canada excels in.”⁴⁹³ The universities which participated in the plan were Memorial University, Mount St. Vincent University, and Athabasca University, all of which had a nascent capability to offer such schemes. Over the five year course of the plan, sixty-seven students graduated.⁴⁹⁴ The plan was not renewed after its five year pilot, and its overall evaluation has been mixed. The plan was supposed to be a co-operative venture between Canadian universities and the University of the West Indies. An external examiner of the plan declared that such co-operation had been “virtually non-existent.” The three disciplines were all normal subjects at UWI, but the Canadians wished to restructure them to be joint UWI-Canadian degrees. UWI was not prepared to supply the input for such revisions, so “the degrees quickly became purely Canadian affairs.”⁴⁹⁵ However, an analysis of the report from Mount Saint Vincent University (MSVU) declared that there were “strong, local supportive partnerships” between their university and the UWI under the scheme.⁴⁹⁶ MSVU noted that their participation in the plan improved their reputation in Caribbean countries and led to the expansion of distance initiatives through seven other projects, and concluded that “Expansion, particularly internationally, would not have been feasible without access to these innovative teaching tools... Cross-cultural sharing and learning is growing amongst students at Mount Saint Vincent University.”⁴⁹⁷ Memorial as well improved their software capabilities for distance education by participating in the project.⁴⁹⁸

New criteria and new challenges, 1999-present

Near the end of ICCS first contract, in 1999, DFAIT “identified the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarships Plan” as a program “that could benefit from an evaluation.” The evaluation was designed to determine whether the program was “still relevant in the overall context of Canadian foreign policy objectives” and to what extent it was “cost-effective.” The report concluded in 2002 that the CSFP was “successful in terms of awarding scholarships to international students of academic merit” and appeared to do so “in a cost-effective manner.”⁴⁹⁹ However, the analysts “were unable to determine whether the programs are achieving their objectives in terms of development assistance to home countries of the selected scholars, disseminating Canadian cultural values, promoting Canadian systems of higher education, assisting Canadian diplomatic efforts by creating a network of ‘friends to Cana-

⁴⁸⁹ John Graham, “Third Pillar or Fifth Wheel? International Education and Cultural Foreign Policy”, in Fen Osler Hampson et. al. eds., *Canadian Among Nations 1999: A Big League Player?* (Oxford University Press, 1999), 144. Trilokekar, 219.

⁴⁹⁰ Graham, 146. Trilokekar, 219.

⁴⁹¹ E-mail from Brian Long, August 5, 2008.

⁴⁹² Lincoln Depradine, “Long-distance learning”, *Share*, November 27, 1997, 2.

⁴⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹⁴ Hilary Perraton, *Open and Distance Learning in the Developing World* (2nd edition, 2007), 118.

⁴⁹⁵ E.P. Brandon, “New External Providers of Tertiary Education in the Caribbean” (International Institute for Higher Education in Latin American and the Caribbean, July 2003), 20.

⁴⁹⁶ Robert Farmer and Carolyn Nobes, “Extending the Campus Reach: To Local and Global Community using Innovative Teaching Technologies” (2004); located at <http://www.unb.ca/naweb/04/papers/FarmerNobes.html>

⁴⁹⁷ *Ibid.* A 2007 report from MSVU on their global distance initiatives, including the Caribbean plan, is currently at press and was not made available to this researcher.

⁴⁹⁸ Brandon, 20. Memorial still trumpets this accomplishment at <http://www.distance.mun.ca/partners/caribbean.php>

⁴⁹⁹ “Evaluation of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan and Government of Canada Awards”, October, 2002, accessed December 15, 2007 at <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/departement/auditreports/evaluation/evalCSFP02-en.asp>

da', and other strategic objectives."⁵⁰⁰ This new list of objectives for the plan was far different than the aims of the Smith era in the 1950s, and show the effect which the 1994 policy deliberations had affected thinking at External Affairs. The report noted that CIDA and DFAIT offered scholarships in the same countries, and even though the CIDA awards were "not generally open to the public" there might be merit liaising with CIDA "when planning nominations each year."⁵⁰¹

The review was unable to determine the contributions which past scholarship recipients had made "to their countries' economic, cultural or political development", since tracking of former scholars had generally been poor. They were also unable to prove that past scholarship recipients had taken steps to improve "Canada's relations with their country." The report did find, on average, that scholars brought an average of \$15,000 dollars with them and spent that money in Canada. "While this is not an intended outcome of the programs", the report deadpanned, "the fact that the net cost of the programs to Canadian taxpayers is less than the actual program costs may be of value in public discussions of the programs."⁵⁰² Since the budget of the CSFP was still over \$5 million a year, this issue was not to be easily brushed aside. The general conclusions of the report were that the situation had to be monitored more closely.

ICCS lost their contract in 2005 to manage the plan and it was given back to the CBIE. The consequences of that loss were "far-reaching" for the organization, as they were forced to lay off staff and move their offices from downtown Ottawa to the suburbs. As their historian noted, "Some see in this rather painful dismemberment a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to refocus the efforts of the Secretariat on its 'core business', which is Canadian Studies."⁵⁰³

Soon after the CBIE regained administration of the CSFP (and other Canadian scholarships), a federal election led to a change in government, with the Liberals (who had served since 1993) being replaced by a Conservative minority government led by Steven Harper. The Harper cabinet was sworn in on February 6, 2006 and scant months afterward, on June 21, 2006, the Treasury Board limited its funding for "academic relations at the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade" for only one year, with all programs to expire on June 21, 2007. The reason given by the responsible minister was that federal authorities wished to remove themselves from "areas of provincial responsibility."⁵⁰⁴ Most of the press attention focused on the cutting of funding for the Canada-U.S. Fulbright program, because Canada would have been the only country ever to consider pulling out of that program.⁵⁰⁵ One columnist noted that "the academic relations program is exactly the sort of clubby Establishment sinecure that Tory outsiders have always resented."⁵⁰⁶ However, several individuals and groups rallied to support the Commonwealth Scholarships, including prominent Conservative Senator Hugh Segal, the editorial desks of the *Toronto Star* and the *Montreal Gazette*, The University of British Columbia and the Royal Commonwealth Society.⁵⁰⁷ Oddly, few letters to the editor on the subject have been located, the only one which was published appeared in the *Edmonton Journal* a month after the decision was announced in the press.⁵⁰⁸ But the combined pressure led the Prime Minister's Office to override the Treasury Board and extend funding of the program for five years through 2011.⁵⁰⁹ However, the nature of scholarships under the Plan changed, no longer being long-term funding for masters and doctoral studies, but rather twelve-month awards for post-doctoral researchers only. Fewer awards, it seems, are also granted annually.⁵¹⁰ But the Plan continues under the same name and with, one hopes, the same general aims as set down in 1958.

With the Canadian scholarships in place until 2011, attention has now been focused on the availability of scholarships for Canadians to study abroad. In March of 2008, the U.K. government announced that it would no longer offer Commonwealth Scholarships to a number of countries, including Canada. The British declared that the CSFP had not been "well aligned to foreign policy goals" and the countries of primary importance in the future

⁵⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁰¹ Ibid.

⁵⁰² Ibid.

⁵⁰³ Jaumain, Epilogue.

⁵⁰⁴ "Ottawa poised to axe scholarships", *Toronto Star* July 28, 2006, A1.

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid., A14.

⁵⁰⁶ John Ibbitson, "PMO throws lifeline to overseas scholarships", *Globe and Mail*, August 2, 2006, A4.

⁵⁰⁷ "Preserve Scholarships", *Toronto Star*, August 3, 2006; "Pennywise maybe, but plain foolish", *Montreal Gazette*, August 4, 2006; The Royal Commonwealth Society *Annual Report 2007*.

⁵⁰⁸ "Studying Abroad", *Edmonton Journal*, September 10, 2006, A15.

⁵⁰⁹ The Royal Commonwealth Society *Annual Report 2007*.

⁵¹⁰ "Canadian Commonwealth Post-Doctoral Fellowships 2007-2008", <http://www.csfp-online.org/hostcountries/ca.html>; accessed May 23, 2008.

would be India and China.⁵¹¹ Here the British were making the same decision which had flowed in Canada from the Carin report in 1992. The decision was derided in Canadian international education circles, and as of this writing the matter has yet to be settled. As will be shown below, if the decision is sustained, it will essentially eliminate the opportunity for Canadians to study abroad under the plan.

Commonwealth scholars since 1990

There have been 1,843 Commonwealth scholars connected to Canada since 1990. 594 of these were Canadians who went abroad, 1249 were foreign scholars in Canada. Although both of these numbers are higher than the period 1980-1989, it should be remembered that there have been 18 years since 1990, so the yearly averages are less, 33 Canadians and 69 foreign students per year (as opposed to 47 and 123 for the 1980-1989 period). The Nicosia pledge proved not to be sustainable, if these figures are to be believed.⁵¹² The Canadian Bureau of Education reported in 1997 noted that they only awarded 275 scholarships in 1996, and continued "In 1985 the number of awards offered by Canada was increased from 350 to 500 but there has been a steady decline over the past ten years."⁵¹³

Canadians Abroad

If available statistics are to be believed, 563 of the 594 Canadians since 1990 have studied in the U.K., followed by 20 in New Zealand and 6 in Australia, leaving only 5 students spread amongst India, Ghana, Jamaica and Hong Kong. This would mean that 99% of Canadians were studying in the old Commonwealth, 95% in the U.K. alone (see Table 2). These figures also would make it very significant if the U.K. carries through on its policy of no longer offering Commonwealth Scholarships to Canadians, as they have next to no experience attending in any other country.

The institution of first degree is known in 437 cases, and the numbers are more spread out than before (see Table 3). The list is headed by the UBC at 38 (9%), followed by U of T at 35 (8%), Queen's at 32 (7%), McGill at 29 (7%), York University at 27 (6%), Dalhousie at 16 (4%), the University of Ottawa at 16 (3%), Carleton at 14 (3%), and Concordia and the University of Montreal with 13 each (3%). The rise of York, Ottawa, and Concordia are somewhat surprising, but all have improved their research programmes extensively since the 1960s. Prominent on the list in this period are Canadians whose first degree is from the United Kingdom, 28 of them exist, previous to this period only one student had ever gone from a U.K. university to a Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship, in the 1960s. 24 students also took degrees in U.S. Universities.⁵¹⁴ The University of Toronto has taken its high standing in the Commonwealth program quite seriously, its high relative numbers have become part of the performance indicators which it measures and reports on annually under "prestigious exit awards," commenting "receipt of these external awards and scholarships by our students at the end of their studies... demonstrates the quality of the University's performance in educating and providing students with the necessary environment to achieve excellence."⁵¹⁵

Course of study is only known in 498 of the 594 cases (see Table 5). Social Sciences continued to lead in course of study, with 156 (31%), followed by English at 43 (9%), Legal Studies at 41 (8%) Fine Arts at 39 (8%), History at 34 (7%), and Biological Studies at 26 (5%). 22 scholars studied Philosophy, 18 Area Studies, 16 in Health Sciences, 15 in Physical Sciences, 13 in Multi-disciplinary Studies, 12 in Engineering, and 10 each in Mathematics and Modern Languages. Only 5 studied Agriculture and none were in Education. Again, the humanist bent of Canadian scholars was evident.

The three largest institutional groups were, as might be expected, in London (134/24%), Oxford (126/22%), and

⁵¹¹ "Award's demise 'shortsighted', supporters say", *Globe and Mail*, May 7, 2008, A4.

⁵¹² Available data undercounts the number of Canadians who studied in places other than the U.K., it is believed.

⁵¹³ Canadian Bureau of International Education, *The National Report on International Students in Canada 1996-1997*, 66.

This was not strictly true, the AUCC reported 500 students in both 1989 and 1990.

⁵¹⁴ As more research is conducted, the numbers for the U.K. continue to drop, but not for the United States. It seems that certain students already in postgraduate study in the U.K. received scholarships during this period; their first degree was from a Canadian institution.

⁵¹⁵ University of Toronto Performance Indicators 2005, www.provost.utoronto.ca/Assets/publications/perform/averages.pdf; University of Toronto Performance Indicators, 2007, www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=4887; both accessed May 23, 2008.

Cambridge (110/20%). Sussex was a distant fourth, with 28, followed by 18 at Edinburgh, 13 at Leeds, and 10 each at Essex and York. On the whole, however, 47 U.K. universities received Canadian Scholars in this latest period, even if 65% attended the three historic priority institutions (see Table 4). Institutional information on only 11 of the 20 New Zealand scholars is available, and of those Otago leads with three. No significant cluster of subjects by institution was detected.

Impact – Canadians since 1990

Large numbers of the scholars in the post-1990 period are still in early or mid-career so analysis of their careers paths and prominence is most likely premature. However, even at this early point, about sixty are known to be professors/teachers, 21 lawyers, about fifteen research/scientists, 11 in business, 10 civil servants, eight consultants, three editors and two archaeologists. Single individuals were each found as volunteer, architect, engineer, psychologist, peace advocate, and nun (see table 21).⁵¹⁶ Of the professors, 11 are known to have supervised 66 graduate students to date, this number will most certainly rise in the years to come.

Eleven of the professors are in the United Kingdom and six in the United States. Among the Canadians, the highest number are found at the University of Western Ontario (6), with four each at the University of Montreal, Queen's, and Waterloo. The remainder are spread amongst twenty-three other institutions. Two clusters, both in law, have been found at UWO (five of six professors) and the University of Montreal (three of four). Neither are currently explicable.

As noted above, it is premature to evaluate the leadership credentials of this group, but two names can be mentioned. Mark Carney is currently Governor of the Bank of Canada. And Jordanna Fraiberg was recently a V-P of Film Production at Village Roadshow Productions, a company responsible for screen successes such as *Ocean's Eleven*, *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, and *Get Smart*.

In terms of individual impact of the award on careers, three scholars were successfully reached for comment. Anna Lindholm, now a Zoological researcher in Zurich, declared "I would never have studied in the UK had I not received a Commonwealth Scholarship... Having a degree from Cambridge, as well as a network of contacts from the University, opened a lot of doors all over the world... there is no doubt the Scholarship had a big influence on my decision to stay in science."⁵¹⁷ Francine Mackenzie, who currently writes on the history of international trade and is a professor at the University of Western Ontario, said her scholarship "allowed me to concentrate on my doctoral studies at Cambridge, instead of worrying about how I would pay the bills." She adds, "My interest in the Commonwealth really developed while I was a student at Cambridge, as did my interest in international trade," as did her interest in Commonwealth cross-comparisons.⁵¹⁸ Mary Steggles, Professor of Art at the Univer-

Table 21: Occupational choice of Canadian Scholars, 1990s.

	Years after graduation	
	5	10
Professor	32 (37%)	57 (53%)
Researcher/Scientist	15 (17%)	12 (11%)
Lawyer/Judge	13 (15%)	14 (13%)
Consultant	8 (9%)	2 (2%)
Student	6 (7%)	3 (3%)
Business	2 (2.5%)	7 (6%)
Editor/Journalist	2 (2.5%)	1 (1%)
Civil Servant	1 (1%)	4 (4%)
Engineer	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Arts/Musician	1 (1%)	0
Other	5 (6%)	6 (6%)
Total	86	107

⁵¹⁶ Table 21 is problematic because of the continued fluidity of scholars' careers.

⁵¹⁷ E-mail from Anna Lindholm, June 12, 2008.

⁵¹⁸ E-mail from Francis McKenzie, April 15, 2008.

sity of Manitoba, says “the scholarship committee placed me with my top choice in advisors... these advisors have become colleagues and now friend with whom I collaborate on various projects.” She noted that she began classes late in life and the scholarship meant that she “could complete my dreams and go on to help others fashion theirs” and as an academic she has “supported applications by several of my students and encouraged others to apply and study in the UK or other Commonwealth countries.”⁵¹⁹

Foreign scholars in Canada since 1990

Of the 1249 foreign scholars in Canada, 185, or 15% came from the United Kingdom, followed by 114 from India (9%), 56 from Bangladesh (5%), 50 from Nigeria, 47 each from Ghana and Tanzania, 44 from Pakistan, 42 from Jamaica, 40 from Uganda, 38 from Sri Lanka, 36 from Kenya, 35 from Australia, 34 from Zimbabwe, 29 from Trinidad, 27 from New Zealand, 24 from South Africa, 22 from Barbados, and 21 from Guyana and 20 from Malta. The return of South Africa and Pakistan to the Commonwealth can be noted as significant developments. 21% of all awards went to the old Commonwealth (South Africa included), and nearly 80% to the developing world. Awards were granted to 58 countries and territories (see Table 7).

Subject of study (see Table 8) was dominated by Engineering (179/15%) and Social Sciences (141/12%), followed by Education (93/7%), Biological Sciences (81/6%), Business Studies (80/6%), Agriculture (76/6%), Computer Science (68/5%) Natural Resources and Conservation (62/5%), and Physical Sciences (61/5%). The only other subjects with 30 or more scholars were Mathematics at 40, Legal Studies at 36, Health Sciences at 32 and English at 30. Apart from repeating the technical assistance focus of most of these choices, the main significant points are the surge in Education and the appearance of Natural Resources fields in the top 10.

In terms of institution of choice (see Table 9), the University of Toronto was first at 143 (12%), followed by UBC (140/11%), McGill (115/8%), Alberta (94/8%), Guelph (83/6%), Waterloo (78/6%), Dalhousie (67/5%), Carleton (58/5%), and York (41/3%). These institutions combined to take nearly 75% of the scholars, although forty-two institutions were included on the list. The strong showing of York University is the only surprise on this list.

Nations and programmes

The most interesting change in the choice of programmes by nation is that Indian Engineers do not lead the list. Instead, the largest grouping in this period is U.K. Social Scientists, at 37. Indian engineers are second at 22. The profile of Indian scholars as well is significantly different. Only 51 of the 114 are in agriculture, science, technology and engineering. Indians since 1990 have also studied Social Science (20 scholars) Health Sciences, (seven) Natural Resources and Conservation (six), and Library Science (four). Although none of these are strictly humanist subjects, the focus of India has moved away from the heavy technological orientation of earlier decades.

The old pattern does hold for other countries, such as Tonga (four out of five in Engineering and Natural Science), Bangladesh (33 of 56 in Science and Technology), Mauritius (10 of 18 ditto), Nigeria (22 of 50 in Science and Technology plus another 4 in Agriculture), and Ghana (21 of 47 in Agriculture, Science and Technology). For other countries the pattern is more subtle but still overwhelmingly developmental, such as Tanzania, where 36 of their 47 scholars were in Science, Technology, Agriculture and Education. Zimbabwe as well had 24 of their 34 scholars in those fields. Indeed 39 of the 75 students who studied Agriculture in this period were from Africa. A different story was told by some island nations. Jamaica had 27 of their 42 scholars in Computer Science, Engineering, and Business Studies, while five of the six from the Cayman Islands were in Education and Business. The old Commonwealth too had its peculiarities, accounting for 22 of the 30 students in English and 20 of the 21 in Fine Arts. Humanism for the old Commonwealth and development for the new continued to be the pattern of Commonwealth scholars in Canada.

In terms of institutions attended, only two numbers stand out, both for Guelph. 15 students from India and 13 from Sri Lanka attended Guelph in this period, the largest number for both countries.

Differentiation of institutions in terms of subject studied, however, continued in the post 1990 period. Guelph had the highest numbers in both Agriculture (25) and Biological Studies (23), while Waterloo led in Engineering

⁵¹⁹ E-mail from Mary Steggles, August 17, 2008.

(21). 13 of the 32 students at the University of New Brunswick were in Engineering, 22 of the 24 at OISE were in Education. For Waterloo as a whole 41 of the 77 scholars they hosted studied Computer Science, Engineering, and Mathematics. 10 of the 41 at York were in Business Studies. The University of Toronto claimed 10 of the 21 in Multi-disciplinary Studies. Five of the nine journalism students were at Carleton. Seven of the 10 studying Modern Languages were in Quebec Universities. And 54 of the 62 students in Natural Resources and Conservation attended only six universities – UBC (18), Alberta (10), York (9) Guelph (7), Toronto (6), and New Brunswick (4). The last strong showing to be noted is Dalhousie in Social Sciences, which ranked fourth with 18 scholars, after the big three of Toronto (24), UBC (23), and McGill (19). Those four universities, with the addition of Carleton (16) accounted for 100 of the 140 students in Social Sciences. Additionally, OISE, Alberta and UBC accounted for 60 of the 93 in Education. In this period, as for previous periods, it is difficult to know whether these patterns were because of the choice of individual scholars or the guiding hand of the Canadian Committee (which had endured despite several changes of administrators in the plan.) Certainly, however, the fact that certain universities were stronger in certain graduate programmes would be well known in Canada; it is less clear how much this information traveled overseas.

Impact – Foreign scholars in the 1990s

The general career breakdown of the foreign scholars who have been traced is similar to that of previous eras, despite the fact that many are still in the beginning or middle of their careers (see Table 22). Nearly ninety are known to be professors or teachers, twenty-five in research⁵²⁰, sixteen in the civil service, fourteen in business, 7 in law, 5 in engineering, 5 in consulting, as well as 5 artists/musicians, 2 accountants, 2 librarians, and two archivists. Single individuals were identified as Arts Council Director, writer, photographer, editor, politician, OAS employee, coastal service director, pollution abatement officer, and AIDS control co-ordinator.

Table 22: Occupational Choice of Foreign Scholars since 1990

Occupation	Years after Graduation	
	5	10
Professor	37 (33%)	89 (50%)
Student	19 (17%)	6 (3%)
Researcher/Scientist	16 (14%)	24 (13%)
Civil Servant	7 (6%)	16 (9%)
Business	6 (5%)	14 (8%)
Consultant	5 (4%)	3 (2%)
Engineer	4 (4%)	5 (3%)
Lawyer/Judge	4 (4%)	2 (1%)
Artist/Musician	3 (3%)	5 (3%)
Librarian/Archivist	3 (3%)	3 (2%)
Writer	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Editor/Journalist	0	1 (1%)
Other	5 (4%)	10 (3%)
Total	110	179

Ten of the professors are known to have supervised 59 students, and this number will certainly rise in future years. The professors are spread around twenty-four countries, with the most being located in the United States (14), Canada (13), the United Kingdom (13), Australia (6), New Zealand (6), Sri Lanka (5), Tanzania (4), India (4), Malta, and Bangladesh (3 each). In Canada the foreign professors were spread among 11 institutions, with only Alberta and Waterloo having more than one (both had two).

No significant professors have been identified as yet, but scholars even in this early part of their career have risen to prominence in other fields. Politically, Jacqui Clarissa Quinn-Leandro of Antigua has served as a cabinet minister, and Mohammed Munavvar of the Maldives as Attorney-General. Helena Leonce is currently government archivist in Trinidad. Colin Ross was permanent secretary for Personnel in the Cayman Islands. In the world of

⁵²⁰ Many of these are research fellowships held by recent graduates.

science and advocacy, Rhan Anya Salmon is Education Co-Ordinator for the International Polar Year.

Scholars who took up awards since 1990 have made positive comments about the experience. Owen Atkin of Australia notes it provided him “with an opportunity to undertake my PhD at a top foreign university and to obtain excellent training in research and teaching.” He also adds “the support of the Commonwealth Scholarship meant that I did not have to worry about money during my final two years of my PhD... I think that my productivity during that period was due in part to this support.”⁵²¹ Imran Tassaduq of Pakistan says “I was lucky to have been granted this scholarship otherwise I wouldn’t have been able to earn a PhD. It is this degree that has enhanced my credentials to a great extent and I have been fortunate to get recognition and leading positions in universities.”⁵²² Samuel Essah of Ghana agrees that the scholarship “made me enter into grad school... where I had one of the best academic training in my career.”⁵²³ Navsharan Singh of India says “the Scholarship allowed me an opportunity to explore the field of international development and exposed me to several world class institutions... [it] transformed me from a small town young woman to a mature researcher and an expert in the field of international development as well as a career with a reputed international development institution.”⁵²⁴ Ayana Glasgow of the British Virgin Islands emphasizes the personal development aspects of the award, noting “being raised by a single parent, I am not sure that I would have been afforded the same benefits attending university without a scholarship... [it] definitely made my college experience worthwhile and unforgettable in a great way both academically and socially.”⁵²⁵ Other scholars have spoken to the more direct impact the scholarship has had on national development. David Abednego of the British Virgin Islands says “as a result of the scholarship and opportunity provided to me I am now able to provide specialist service to the people of the Virgin Islands.”⁵²⁶ Clara Sadombe of Zimbabwe says “having the scholarship allowed me... to get a first class education at McGill University in a subject very relevant to my country, where mining and mineral processing is a key contributor to the country’s economy. Having attained this qualification from a world renowned university, I had my pick of employers within the mining industry on my return home.”⁵²⁷ Fiona Holder of Guyana notes that she is still working for the government there long after her contractual obligation to do so.⁵²⁸ These are just anecdotes but they speak to the individual and collective impact of the plan.

In terms of overall impact, the Canadian Bureau of International Education conducted a survey in 2008 of former Commonwealth scholars from outside Canada. Their decision to conduct this survey delayed any efforts by this researcher to survey the same field (because of worries of confusion and/or survey fatigue). The questions that the CBIE asked were not the same sort of question this researcher would have chosen. Of the 155 respondents to the survey (of 333 sent out), 145 indicated that they had maintained contact with Canada of one sort or another, and 112 indicated that they had returned to Canada since their scholarship for various reasons. The vast majority of respondents indicated that their time as scholars had substantially improved their understanding of Canadian Society and culture, Canadians in general, and the Canadian educational system. Nearly all of them indicated they would recommend Canada as a study destination. In terms of careers, 143 of them indicated that the scholarship was very useful to their future career, and 129 of them indicated that they returned to their home country to work after the award (this 83% figure will be challenged in a few sentences.) Respondents were from forty-three separate awarding countries and were currently living in forty-five different places. Although the responses represent approximately 3% of the total awards given under the scheme to non-Canadians and the sample is apparently not random, the responses do give a sense of how the scheme allowed for knowledge of Canada to permeate the Commonwealth. The CBIE survey thus followed the same lines of analysis of the Plan that the Government of Canada has instituted since 1994. Since “knowledge of Canada” was not one of the original ideas which animated the plan, this researcher is not sure what to make of these findings.

Did scholars go home?

During the 1994 foreign policy deliberations mentioned earlier, Bob Mills, then a Reform Member of Parliament for Red Deer, continually asked about the whereabouts of former scholarship recipients of all types. He stressed, “I am asking about Canadians who are paid by Canadian taxpayers in various ways to become educated outside

⁵²¹ E-mail from Owen Atkin, August 12, 2008.

⁵²² E-mail from Imran Tassaduq, September 5, 2008.

⁵²³ E-mail from Samuel Essah, August 25, 2008

⁵²⁴ E-mail from Navsharan Singh, September 5, 2008.

⁵²⁵ E-mail from Ayana Glasgow, September 5, 2008.

⁵²⁶ E-mail from David Abednego, September 5, 2008.

⁵²⁷ E-mail from Clara Sadomba, September 2, 2008.

⁵²⁸ E-mail from Fiona Holder, September 3, 2008.

of Canada and then come back here looking for jobs. How do we get them back here?... How do we keep track of these people?”⁵²⁹ Respondents to him noted that there was no systematic attempt being made to keep track of former scholarship holders.

The available data on scholarship holders in the 1990s shows that this was still a valid concern. The figures given below are for five and ten years after the award was taken up – later periods have yet to occur (see Table 23). When analyzing these figures, three important things should be kept in mind. The first is that many scholars are still finishing their studies even as late as ten years after the awards are granted, so the institution they may be located at is not necessarily where they will spend the bulk of their careers. Second, the way data was collected might obscure scholars who have returned home for short periods after their studies or during their careers, and thus who might be considered to have “returned home” within the language of the scholarship programme. Third, the numbers are collected from 10% and 15% non-random samples of the total, and may be skewed by the availability of data in the developed world as opposed to the rest of the world. Still, as with earlier periods, the numbers of returns home are disappointing. Yet again, the United States casts a large shadow. 12% (24) of the scholars five years after graduation and 15% (43) ten years after were located there. Other major locations ten years after graduation were Canada (22 non-Canadians located there) and the United Kingdom (19 non-U.K. located there.) On the positive side, as in previous decades a significant percentage (83%) of Commonwealth scholars remained in the Commonwealth.

Table 23: Percentage of scholars returning home since 1990

Years After Award	%return home	%Canadians	%Others	Scholars in Sample (1843 total)
Five	59%	64%	54%	196
Ten	62%	66%	60%	282

1 In some cases, locations only for one or two of the four time-points. For this decade, scholars from “Pakistan” located in Bangladesh were counted as returns.

As in previous periods, there were many reasons for scholars not to go home. One example, from Ramaswamy Kalyasundaram of India, currently Professor and Head of Department of Biomedical Science at the University of Illinois, Rockford, must suffice. He was “pleased to state that the training offered through the Scholarship was a major turning point in my academic and research career. It is not simply the financial support, but the care and strenuous effort taken by the Canadian Commonwealth Office in placing the students at the right institution and matching them with appropriate academic mentors.” Upon receiving this excellent training at Calgary, however, “when I returned back to my parent institution in India, I fell prey to the bureaucracy and was given no facility or funds to conduct research. After 6 months of frustration, I felt I am going to lose all the training advantage I gained through the scholarship.” He left India to take a job in the U.S., paying a financial penalty for doing so. He says, “I wish the Commonwealth Office had followed up with the Indian Government immediately or just before I was due to return to India to ensure that I am placed appropriately so that the academic benefits of the training continues in the home country.”⁵³⁰ As has been shown, no mechanism for such contact seemed to exist.

A comment on “Brain Drain”

Table 24 represents this report’s comment on the question of whether the Commonwealth Scholarships contributed to “Brain Drain.” It lists the 504 scholars who at one point in their careers took a position in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand or the United States by the country which nominated them for scholarship. This can be best compared with Table 1 which outlines how many scholars from each country were actually tracked in the study. For example, 135 scholars from the U.K. were tracked, and 133 of these at one point had careers in the developed world, as did all of the Australians and New Zealanders.⁵³¹ In this case, the Commonwealth Scholarship can be seen as a north-north exchange programme.

However, for countries such as India (50 of 92 having careers in the developed world), Bangladesh (19 of 33), Pakistan (14 or 27), Sri Lanka (18 of 35), Nigeria (18 of 33), and Zimbabwe (7 of 13), the experience of having a scholarship has contributed to the “brain drain” of intelligence from south to north. Most of the Caribbean islands

⁵²⁹ *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons of Reviewing Foreign Policy*, Issue 29, June 7, 1994, 40-41.

⁵³⁰ E-mail from Ramaswamy Kalyanasundaram, September 5, 2008.

⁵³¹ At this point the discrepancy between the figures for New Zealand cannot be explained.

Table 24: Nominating country of inward scholars to Canada with careers in developed world

	Total traced	Career in Developed world	
		no.	%
<i>Industrialised countries</i>			
UK	135	133	98.5
Australia	69	69	100.0
New Zealand	47	47	100.0
<i>Africa</i>			
Nigeria	33	18	54.5
Ghana	21	8	38.1
Sierra Leone	11	8	72.7
Kenya	35	14	40.0
BLS	6	0	0.0
Cameroon	1	0	0.0
Gambia	5	4	80.0
Malawi	9	4	44.4
South Africa	6	2	33.3
Tanzania	27	7	25.9
Uganda	21	10	47.6
Zambia	10	3	30.0
Zimbabwe	13	7	53.8
Mauritius	9	3	33.3
Seychelles	3	1	33.3
<i>Asia</i>			
India	92	50	54.3
Bangladesh	33	19	57.6
Pakistan	27	14	51.9
Sri Lanka	35	18	51.4
Maldives	3	3	100.0
Hong Kong	25	9	36.0
Malaysia	15	1	6.7
Singapore	14	0	0.0
<i>Caribbean</i>	113	33	29.2
<i>Europe</i>			
Malta	19	7	36.8
Cyprus	10	5	50.0
Gibraltar	1	1	100.0
<i>Pacific</i>			
PNG	3	1	33.3
South Pacific	11	5	45.5
Total	862	504	58.5

have escaped this problem, as have some African countries (most remarkably Tanzania, where only 7 of their 27 scholars tracked ended up in the developed world at any significant point in their careers) and Hong Kong (only 9 of 25 in the developed world).

This calculation can only be done for 504 of the over 4000 students currently known to have studied in Canada on Commonwealth scholarships, and (as has been pointed out repeatedly in this study) is a non-random sample skewed by the ability to find information in the developed world. However, it does suggest that the overall effect of the scholarship plan has been to increase the talent pool available to developed countries from the underdeveloped world.

As for Canadians who took Commonwealth scholarships, less than a dozen have been identified as pursuing their career in the non-developed world. Three-quarters of them returned to Canada (although this has not been consistent by decade) and 22 of the remaining 25% ended up in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, the United States, or Europe.

Conclusion

At the 50th anniversary of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan, its long-term survival is in question. In terms of Canadian involvement, the main axis of traffic between Canada and the United Kingdom is only funded at the Canadian end until 2011 and may no longer be funded at the United Kingdom end at all. The wish of the founders in 1958 for “traffic in all directions” has somewhat faded, especially for Canadians who are most keen to study in the U.K. if they take a Commonwealth Scholarship.

In terms of incoming scholarships to Canada, questions emerge. Is the scholarship plan a leadership exchange programme or a technical training program for developing countries? The sheer number of engineers, agriculturalists, and hard scientists who have taken up scholarships in Canada suggest that most members of the Commonwealth saw the plan as an extension of traditional development strategies, and not the bold humanist initiative envisioned by Sidney Smith and Douglas LePan in the 1950s. In personal terms, scholars from the developing countries who have been sent for this training have not necessarily returned to their home countries to help with development or leadership. They have on the whole stayed in the Commonwealth, and this is a positive development, but no cadre in each developing country with strong Commonwealth linkages seems to be present as the result of the Commonwealth Plan.

Canada made a clear commitment in 1958 to be a major supporter of the plan, but this report has shown that its commitments on paper have not always been matched by action. Only rarely has Canada provided its full quota of Commonwealth scholarships, and declarations of intent to increase them have brought Canada praise, even when these increases have not been sustainable. The plan has rarely emerged as a major plank of Canadian foreign policy, or even Canadian Commonwealth policy.

On an individual level the story is much brighter. Many individuals have used the experience of a Commonwealth scholarship to broaden their horizons, explore new fields of study, make contacts within the academic communities of the Commonwealth, and further their careers. Some of these careers, in turn, have had a clear impact on the policy directions of their countries. While definitive “turning points” are difficult to spot, there are institutions that would not have been founded and innovations which would not have been discovered without the existence of the CSFP. Since the plan was based at the outset on individual applications and excellence of scholarship, this outcome is not surprising. But it is pleasing to see.

Canada, thus, has benefitted itself and the world by proposing and supporting the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. In turn, the CSFP has proven the value of providing funds for bright individuals to study for graduate degrees in foreign countries. Whatever the future of the plan might be, it is hoped that support in Canada for international academic exchanges will persist in the future.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Carleton University Archives

Selected papers from the Office of the President

Library and Archives Canada (LAC)

Government records – Record Groups 25, 26, 74, 76

Douglas LePan Papers, MG31

McMaster University Archives

Presidents Fonds

Documents forwarded from Natalija Marjanovic, Deputy Director, International Education and Youth Division, DFAIT, June 27, 2008.

Roopa Trilokekar research papers

Trent University Archives

Dean of Arts and Science Papers

T.H.B. Symons Papers

University of New Brunswick Archives

Presidents Papers 1967-1968

University of Toronto Archives (UTA)

Records of the Office of the President (various accession)

Sidney Smith Personal Papers

WUSC Proposal for “Administration of the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan”, undated, page 2, forwarded from Peter Szyslo, 2008

Books and journals

Administering the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan: A Pan-Commonwealth Meeting: Report of the Meeting. London: Commonwealth Secretariat, 1988

Association of Universities and College of Canada. *International Division Progress Report 1992-1993.* Ottawa, 1993

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting.* Ottawa: 1965-1986.

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, *Trends: The Canadian University in Profile* Ottawa: Research, Policy and Planning Division, AUCC, 1990

“Award’s demise ‘shortsighted’, supporters say”, *Globe and Mail*, May 7, 2008

Bartlett, D.W. “Foreign Students Under Official Auspices.” *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1954.*

Bothwell, Robert. *Laying the Foundation: A Century of History at the University of Toronto.* University of Toronto Press, 1991.

Brandon, E.P. “New External Providers of Tertiary Education in the Caribbean.” International Institute for Higher Education in Latin American and the Caribbean, July 2003.

Brebner, John Bartlett. *Scholarship for Canada: The Function of Graduate Studies.* Ottawa: Canadian Social Science Research Council, 1945.

Bumstead, J.M. *St John’s College: Faith and Education in Western Canada.* University of Manitoba Press, 2006.

Canada. Parliament. Special Joint Committee on Reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy. *Canada’s Foreign Policy: Principles and Priorities for the Future: Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons Reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy.* Ottawa: November 1994.

Canadian Association of Graduate Schools *Statistical Reports.* Toronto and Ottawa: 1967-2004.

Canadian Bureau for International Education, *Annual Report.* Ottawa: 1975-2000.

- Canadian Bureau of International Education. *The National Report on International Students in Canada 1996-1997*. Ottawa: 1997
- Canadian International Development Agency, *Annual Reports*. Ottawa: 1967-1993.
- CIDA's Scholarship Program for Canadians: *Its Background and its Development*. Human Resources Directorate, CIDA Scholarship Committee, June 1984.
- Clarke, D.B. "A Review of the Present Situation." *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1954*.
- Commonwealth Education Liaison Committee. *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Annual Report*. London: 1960-1987
- Corbett, E.A. *Sidney Earle Smith*. University of Toronto Press, 1961.
- The Daily* (Statistics Canada), July 30, 2004.
- Depradine, Lincoln. "Long-distance learning." *Share*, November 27, 1997.
- Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *Fall Enrolment in Universities and Colleges 1960*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1961.
- "Evaluation of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan and Government of Canada Awards", October, 2002, accessed December 15, 2007 at <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/departement/auditreports/evaluation/evalCSFP02-en.asp>
- Falardeau, Jean-C. "Scholarships for Foreign Students." *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1954*.
- Farmer, Robert and Carolyn Nobes. "Extending the Campus Reach: To Local and Global Community using Innovative Teaching Technologies." (2004); located at <http://www.unb.ca/naweb/04/papers/FarmerNobes.html>
- Filteau, Carolyn, ed, *Proceedings of a Conference on Women in Graduate Studies in Ontario*. Toronto: Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, September, 1989.
- Friedland, Martin. *The University of Toronto: A History*. University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Frost, Stanley Brice. *McGill University for the Advancement of Learning Volume II*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984.
- Gabriel, Solomon. *Foreign Policy of Canada: A Study in Diefenbaker's years*. New Delhi: Upsal Publishing House, 1987.
- Gibson, Frederick W. *Queen's University: To Serve and Yet be Free*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983.
- Gilmour, G.P. "Higher Education in the Commonwealth." *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1953*.
- Graham, John. "Third Pillar or Fifth Wheel? International Education and Cultural Foreign Policy." In Fen Osler Hampson et. al, eds., *Canadian Among Nations 1999: A Big League Player?* Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Granatstein, J.L. and Robert Bothwell. *Pirouette: Pierre Trudeau and Canadian Foreign Policy*. University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Haley, Ella. "Support Systems for Women in Graduate School." In Filteau, Carolyn, ed, *Proceedings of a Conference on Women in Graduate Studies in Ontario*. Toronto: Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, September, 1989.
- Helwig, David. *The Names of Things*. Erin, Ontario: The Porcupine's Quill, 2006.
- Ibbitson, John. "PMO throws lifeline to overseas scholarships." *Globe and Mail*, August 2, 2006.
- ICCS Contact*, 14, 2 (May 1995)
- Jaumain, Serge. *The Canadianists: The ICCS/25 Years in the Service of Canadian Studies*. Ottawa: International Council for Canadian Studies, 2005.
- Kruger, Rona. *Increasing Women's Participation in International Scholarship Programs: An Analysis of Nine Case Studies*. New York: Ford Foundation, 1996.
- Landsberg, Michelle. "Canada works stubbornly for international women's rights." *Globe and Mail*, April 26, 1986
- Levi, Charles. "'Decided Action has been Taken: Student Government, Student Activism and University Administration at the University of Toronto and McGill University 1930-1950.'" MA Major Research Paper, York University, revised version September 8, 1994.
- Levi, Charles Morden. "Where the Famous People Were: The Origins, Activities, and Future Careers of Student Leaders at University College, Toronto, 1854-1973." PhD Thesis, York University, 1998.
- MacMillan, Brad. "The Flow-Through Hypothesis: A Review of the Data." In Filteau, Carolyn, ed, *Proceedings of a Conference on Women in Graduate Studies in Ontario*. Toronto: Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, September, 1989.
- McCalla, Douglas. "The Rhodes Scholarships in Canada and Newfoundland." In Anthony Kenny, ed., *The History of the Rhodes Trust 1902-1999*. Oxford University Press, 2001.
- McKillop, A.B. *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario 1791-1951*. University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- Melakopides, Costas. *Pragmatic Idealism: Canadian Foreign Policy 1945-1995*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's

- University Press, 1998.
- Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons of Reviewing Foreign Policy* (Ottawa: 1994-1995)
- Monahan, Edward J. *Collective Autonomy: A History of the Council of Ontario Universities 1962-2000*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2004.
- “More Commonwealth Scholars Needed”, *Share*, September 14, 1988
- Morrison, David R. *Aid and Ebb Tide: A History of CIDA and Canadian Development Assistance*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1988.
- “Ottawa poised to axe scholarships”, *Toronto Star* July 28, 2006
- “Pennywise maybe, but plain foolish”, *Montreal Gazette*, August 4, 2006
- Perraton, Hilary. *Open and Distance Learning in the Developing World* (2nd edition, 2007)
- Plumptre, A.F.W. “Perspective on Our Aid to Others.” *International Affairs* 22, 3 (Summer 1967).
- “Preserve Scholarships”, *Toronto Star*, August 3, 2006
- National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges. *Proceedings*. (1950-1964)
- The Right Mix: The Report of the Commission on Foreign Student Policy in Canada* (Ottawa: CBIE, 1981)
- The Royal Commonwealth Society *Annual Report 2007*.
- Saul, John Ralston. “Culture and Foreign Policy.”, In *Canada’s Foreign Policy: Principles and Priorities for the Future: The Position Papers*. Ottawa: Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons Reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy, November 1994.
- Smith, Sidney. “Higher Education in the Commonwealth.” *Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1953*.
- “Studying Abroad”, *Edmonton Journal*, September 10, 2006
- Symons, Thomas H.B. and James E. Page. Chapter X of *Some Questions of Balance: Human Resources, Higher Education and Canadian Studies*. February 1987 reprint for Canadian Higher Education Research Network
- Trilokekar, Roopa Desai. “Federalism, Foreign Policy and the Internationalization of Higher Education: A Case Study of the International Academic Relations Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada”. Ed.D Thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, 2007.
- Underhill, Frank. *The British Commonwealth: An Experiment in Co-operation among Nations*. Durham, N.C: Duke University Press, 1956.
- University of Toronto Performance Indicators, 2005 and 2007.
- Waite, P.B. *The Lives of Dalhousie University Volume Two 1925-1980 The Old College Transformed*. McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998.
- Walmsley, Norma. *Canadian Universities and International Development*. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1970.

Interviews

Many Commonwealth Scholars were contacted during this study by e-mail and by other means. The list would be too large to reproduced here.