

*External Aid*

there are not widespread initiatives by governments, by the year 2,000 the present population of the world, which is about three billion three hundred million people, will be seven billion. This is a prospect that I am sure should cause people in positions of responsibility very serious misgivings.

In the few minutes I have I want to comment on what I think is an important element in the motion, and that is contained in what to me is a clear understanding that assistance in this regard should be given to developing countries that require it. There is no suggestion in the motion of any efforts to coerce a country into instituting a program of population control. I think it would be a very serious thing if the western so-called developed and rich countries were to tie aid, assistance or funds through the World Bank, or any other initiatives that we might want to take in the development field, to an undertaking by the recipient countries to institute population control. I am afraid there is a tendency to use methods that amount to coercion. I suggest that these methods are now gaining favour at high levels in the international community, and I would like to object in the strongest possible terms to any suggestion or possibility that our country become a party to such methods, either in respect of aid programs financed by international agencies or through our own external aid program.

What I have in mind is that on September 30 of this year Mr. Robert S. McNamara, president of the World Bank, spoke to the board of governors of the bank and left the very clear impression that the World Bank would give preference in the allocation of development funds to those countries that have initiated programs of population control. Mr. McNamara, to my knowledge, has never denied that this is implicit in his remarks to the World Bank. Indeed the press reports written by those who covered Mr. McNamara's speech were almost unanimous in making the interpretation that he intended that the World Bank would give a preference to countries which had initiated programs of population control. I repeat that Mr. McNamara has never challenged that interpretation of his remarks.

What concerns me is that the first person who volunteered his enthusiastic support for Mr. McNamara's statement was none other than the Canadian Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). According to a press report carried in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of October 2, referring to the speech of the minister in

[Mr. Fairweather.]

Washington, our Minister of Finance said that—

—he specifically endorsed the former U.S. defence secretary's intention to link birth control programs with injections of development funds.

The Leader of the Opposition raised this matter during the question period on October 1, but it was not until October 7 that the minister was back in Ottawa and offered an interpretation of Mr. McNamara's speech, and therefore of the minister's own support of it,—which has not been offered by anybody else, including Mr. McNamara. On October 7 the minister said it should be apparent that Mr. McNamara did not envisage giving first preference for World Bank loans to countries which are willing to initiate population control. It is apparent to whom? I ask because the minister himself quoted from the speech of Mr. McNamara, outlining the plans and intentions of the World Bank as follows:

First: to let the developing nations know the extent to which rapid population growth slows down their potential development, and that, in consequence, the optimum employment of the world's scarce development funds requires attention to this problem.

• (6:40 p.m.)

The statement was phrased delicately and skilfully, I suggest, but there is no doubt as to what it means. What it says, in effect, is this, that scarce development funds must be sent where there is optimum potential development. Rapid population growth will stunt potential development, and therefore scarce development funds must be sent to developing nations that are willing to control rapid population growth. To insist, as the editorial noted, that development funds will go to countries conditional on those countries embarking on programs of population control, should of course be quite unacceptable to Canadians. To establish or support such a policy would inspire deep resentment and bitterness amongst the very countries that it is our objective to help. Most of them, of course, are not people of the white race. This policy would be construed by people in those countries as evidence of a feeling of racial superiority on the part of the wealthier countries. In the long run, it could only be a serious setback to world progress and harmony.

Perhaps at some time during this debate, although I see it is rapidly drawing to a conclusion, or at any rate at any early opportunity, some spokesman for the government will, I hope, dissociate our country categorically from any such policy. In an editorial, the