

Supply—External Affairs

I do not need to emphasize this too much because apparently the minister is well aware of the problem. I must confess that I had not realized this until I read two of his recent speeches. I wish to quote briefly from both of them. The first is a speech he made in Banff on August 24, 1964, to the second annual Banff conference on world development. The reproduction of the minister's speech is entitled "Latin America: Challenge and Response", and he had this to say:

In rough terms the population of Latin America is now over 200 million, rather more than that of the United States and Canada together. However, the demographic projections of United Nations experts indicate a very different situation by the end of the century. Latin America may then contain up to 600 million people, while North America will have not much more than 300 million. This fantastic population increase—the highest rate of any region in the world—cannot fail to add to the relative international importance of Latin America. There is reason to believe, however, that it will at the same time increase its serious economic and social problems. Very great economic growth will undoubtedly result but, when considered in relation to population, the material benefits may well fall short of popular expectations.

Again, in a speech the minister delivered in Cleveland on September 26 last, entitled "The Challenge of Underdevelopment", he had this to say in a section headed "Population Outruns Development":

Of course, the problem presented by the underdeveloped world is not a simple one and it is not capable of any single or simple solution. A few facts and figures will, I think, help to illustrate its scope. In the decade from 1950 to 1960, the countries of the underdeveloped world were able to increase their production of goods and services from \$110 billion to just under \$170 billion. This means that, at the beginning of the decade as at the end of it, these countries accounted for only three tenths of all the goods and services produced in the free world as a whole. Over the same period the total population of these countries increased from 1,000 million to 1,300 million people. That is a rate almost twice as high as that experienced in the advanced countries of the free world. When the growth of production is discounted by the growth of population, we find that the less developed countries were able to increase their average per capita income over the decade by no more than \$25, from \$105 in 1950 to \$130 in 1960. In other words per capita income in these countries rose by a mere \$2.50 a year.

So the problem is apparently understood by the minister and his advisers in the Department of External Affairs. In his speech in Cleveland the minister outlined seven points by which Canada could give aid to Latin America and other developing countries. They are all perfectly good points, but he failed altogether to mention that they might be given some help on this question

of population control, which is certainly an important point. No more than the minister do I want to oversimplify the problem of population and resources and the relationship between the two, and how you make any real advance in the standard of living in these countries. Population control is only one of the approaches that must be taken. The production of food in these countries by all means is very, very important and there are agencies working at this. Better trading relationships, better distribution of goods are other parts of the problem as well. But I think you have to attack the problem on all fronts and I am suggesting that one particular aspect of this is being ignored.

Not all countries are ignoring it. One of the most significant things which emerged from the debate at the United Nations in 1962 was the fact that at that time the United States government changed its position. Prior to that time they had been taking the same position as Canada; that is, they abstained from votes on these matters. However, in 1962 they changed and I would suggest that they did so with the obvious approval of the late President Kennedy. The importance that the United States government attached to this was underscored by the fact that their statement to the committee was read by Mr. Richard N. Gardner, deputy assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs. This is from a statement delivered by Mr. Gardner at the United Nations on December 10, 1962. I want to read one paragraph of his statement because I think it is the correct approach and is the one the Canadian government should follow:

While the United States will not suggest to any other government what its attitudes or policies should be as they relate to population or the adoption of specific measures in its implementation, the United States believes that obstacles should not be placed in the way of other governments which, in the light of their own economic needs and cultural and religious values, seek solutions to their population problems. While we will not advocate any specific policy regarding population growth to another country, we can help other countries, upon request, to find potential sources of information and assistance on ways and means of dealing with population problems.

The government of the United Kingdom have also announced that they are willing to take the same position. The Earl of Aberdeen, who was then minister of state for foreign affairs, made such an announcement last spring in the House of Lords. However, the United States government has gone quite a bit further than that. A year ago there was an amendment to their foreign aid act, called the Fulbright amendment, which