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INTRODUCTION

Humanity has achieved so much. We have eradicated many diseases, reduced child mortality, made tremendous advances in technology and science, and we now produce more than enough food to feed the world. Why then are extreme poverty and global inequality still with us? Globalization has undoubtedly contributed to greater wealth, an integrated market system and worldwide technological advances; however, the benefits of these advances are very unevenly shared and, by most accounts, global inequality is worsening. While progress is evident in countries like China and India, poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa has increased: even wealthy countries are seeing widening income disparities. While there is some debate over statistical measurements and precise numbers there is a general consensus that inequality remains a concern. Consider these statistics:

- The poorest 1 billion people live on roughly $1 a day and account for only 1.5% of the world’s income. The poorest 40% live on $2 a day and have just 5% of the world’s income.¹
- The world’s 500 richest people have a combined income of more than $100 billion. That exceeds the combined incomes of the poorest 416 million people.²
- 20% of the world’s population (in developed nations) consumes 86% of the world’s goods.³

Global inequality affects the day to day lives of billions of people, impacting their life expectancy and access to food, clean water / air, shelter, education, health services, employment and safety. Canada and other wealthy countries cannot insulate themselves from the consequences of such inequality. It threatens to increase migration pressures on the northern hemisphere, spread pandemics and other communicable diseases and spur the growth of political or religious extremism. How should Canada deal with this problem of global inequality? If we commit to reducing inequality, what actions should we take? What tradeoffs are we prepared to make as a country and as Canadians? This discussion guide is intended to help you learn more about this complex issue and think through important choices that reflect our values, interests and assets.
Map illustrating the percentage of the population that lives on less than $2 per day.
BACKGROUND

Absolute and relative poverty are measured in different ways. Often, a country’s gross national product (GNP) is used to determine its standing relative to other countries. In 1990, in response to the inadequacy of using GNP as a measurement, the United Nations created the Human Development Index. It uses three measures to rank a country’s level of development: health, education, and income.

Several different terms have been used to describe poor countries. The term ‘Third World’, very popular in the past, is viewed by some as a derogatory descriptor. Other terms, like ‘developing countries’ or ‘underdeveloped countries’ are also widely used, but are sometimes criticized for their focus on development, as it is understood in the West (where it is closely connected to the idea of industrialization). This discussion guide will refer to poor countries as ‘the global south’ in an attempt for a more neutral expression.

WHAT CAUSES GLOBAL INEQUALITY?

The question of what causes global inequality is complex and controversial. This discussion guide summarizes the main arguments put forth by experts but please remember that there is considerable disagreement about which are the most important causes.

1. NEGATIVE LEGACIES OF COLONIALISM

Those who single out colonialism as a key factor emphasize the negative consequences of European exploitation of their colonies’ human labour and resources. While this contributed to increased wealth in what we now consider the developed world, the colonized countries in Africa, Central and South America, and Asia lost vital human and natural resources without gaining the benefits of a growing economy. When these colonies gained their independence, they entered the global market on an unequal footing with richer countries.

ABSOLUTE VERSUS RELATIVE POVERTY

Absolute Poverty: Anyone without set of minimum necessities or essentials for living is said to be in absolute poverty.

Relative Poverty: Describes a person as poor in comparison to other members of their society. If the vast majority of people in a particular society have access to particular goods and services, the minority who are excluded from these goods and services on financial grounds can be said to be in relative poverty.
2. Debt

Many countries in the global south, having suffered the negative economic and political consequences of war and colonialism, turned to banks and governments in the developed world for loans. In many cases these loans were used to finance projects that did not contribute to alleviating poverty. The money was often squandered due to corruption and civil wars. Interest rates on loans quickly increased to unmanageable amounts and many countries in the global south were trapped in debt. Paying off this debt load consumes money that could be spent on social services, education and infrastructure.

FACTS ON DEBT

⇒ In 1970, the world’s poorest countries (roughly 60 countries classified as low-income by the World Bank), owed $25 billion in debt.
⇒ By 2002, this was $523 billion – despite over $550 billion already paid by the global south in interest and loans.
⇒ Debt cancellation initiatives have been started worldwide, and have freed approximately $2 billion in annual savings for participating countries, most of them in Africa.

Source: http://www.globalissues.org/TradeRelated/Debt/Scale.asp

3. Unequal Trade

Most developed countries spend considerable public funds in subsidizing their agricultural sector, increasing the incomes of farmers to ensure profitability and subsidizing the market price of agricultural products. The countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)\(^5\) collectively spend $1 billion per day to subsidize their agricultural sectors.\(^6\) Because poor countries are unable to match these subsides, it is very hard for them to compete. If agriculture in the developed world was not subsidized in this way, poor countries would have better prospects of gaining greater world market share for their agricultural goods. Instead, for many poor countries cheap labour becomes their principal comparative advantage. This means that labour laws must remain flexible and workers poorly paid in order for the country to have any ability to sell its goods in the global market.

Also, to protect domestic industries many developed countries charge extra fees on imports from the global south, or limit the amount of imports they will allow into the country. For instance, partly in order to ensure that there is still a clothing industry in the US, the US restricts the level of clothing imports from China. These sorts of restrictions also hinder poor countries from competing in the global market.

In 2001 the World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations in Doha, Qatar established the Doha Development Agenda\(^7\). This was an attempt to make it easier for poor countries to build their
capacity to compete with richer countries in the global market. These were positive adjustments, but most observers still feel more change is necessary in order to make trade fair. With the suspension of negotiations in 2006, further advancements have been difficult.

4. NEOLIBERAL ECONOMIC POLICIES

International institutions like the World Bank and IMF have also provided loans to the global south. These loans were granted with what was called ‘conditionality’, meaning that in order to qualify for loans countries had to agree to certain economic arrangements. These arrangements, previously called Structural Adjustment Programs, usually required countries to remove restrictions to trade and to cut funding to public services such as education and health care. Some people argue that these programs actually made global inequality worse by limiting peoples’ access to essential services, and by further disadvantaging countries in the global south compared to their developed counterparts, who are still able to control their trade.

5. CORRUPTION AND CAPITAL FLIGHT

Another set of arguments about global inequality focuses on the role of corruption. According to this view, countries in the global south are poor because corrupt and greedy leaders have stolen much of the wealth generated by these countries. Some estimates put the amount stolen by elites in Africa alone at $148 billion per year. A related issue is capital flight – the trend for money to leave countries characterized by instability or safety concerns. This means that even wealth that is generated in poor countries may not stay there, but will be invested in developed countries that seem to pose less risk to investors. Moreover, where risks are high, foreign investors are likely to demand very high rates of return and to minimize their long-term investments in ‘host’ countries.

6. NATURAL CAUSES

Political and economic factors are not the only possible causes of inequality – environmental factors also play a significant role. One element of this is scarcity: many countries in the global

What are the World Bank and IMF?

World Bank: The World Bank is a global bank that makes loans to developing countries on behalf of its 185 member countries, including Canada.

International Monetary Fund (IMF): The IMF is a global financial institution that promotes international cooperation in economic matters. It provides temporary financial assistance and advice to countries in financial trouble. It is composed of the same 185 members as the World Bank.

Together the IMF and World Bank are sometimes known as the Bretton-Woods financial institutions, as they were created by the Bretton-Woods agreement in 1945.

Sources: www.worldbank.org and www.imf.org
south have inadequate water supply or arable land. In addition, poverty has contributed to forests being cut down, which has contributed significantly to water shortages and soil erosion. Moreover, it is projected that climate change will have considerable more serious ecological repercussions for the global south than for the north. This means that those countries that can least afford to deal with these environmental effects will be the worst affected.
Canada’s Contribution

Development Assistance

In 1990 the United Nations recommended that developed countries aim to give 0.7% of their gross national income to poor countries as development assistance. Since then, this has become the standard by which developed countries are judged. Canada has never met this target – the highest percentage we have ever given in development assistance was 0.53%, in 1975, under Prime Minister Trudeau. Since then, Canadian aid has fluctuated, but has fallen throughout the mid 1990s to 0.30% in 2006. Canada ranks 15th among the major donor countries in terms of gross national income (GNI).

Canada was a founding member of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. In 1968 the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) was established, with a mandate to provide development assistance to poor countries. In 1970 the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) was created as a public corporation to fund research to support work with developing countries.

Debt Relief

Canada has been largely supportive of the movement to erase the debt of countries in the global south. Prime Minister Martin was a strong advocate of this cause while in office. He participated in the 2005 Group of 8 (G8) Summit of Industrialized countries in Gleneagles Scotland, which produced a commitment to cancel debt as part of what is called the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC). To date, the HIPC has freed approximately $2 billion in savings for countries that qualify, most of which are in Africa. Canada made a firm, unqualified pledge of $30 million to the International Development Association (a part of the World Bank) for 2007-2008, and a qualified pledge of $79 million for 2009-16. While this debt relief is a positive step, some point out that it has made only a small dent in the existing debt burdens of countries of the global south and has often come with difficult and restrictive conditions.

Millennium Development Goals

In 2000, 187 countries, including Canada, came together at the United Nations to create the 8 Millennium Development Goals dedicated to eliminating extreme poverty and creating a more equitable world by 2015. The countries pledged their support to the following goals:

- **Goal 1:** Eradicate extreme hunger and poverty
- **Goal 2:** Achieve universal primary education
• **Goal 3:** Promote gender equality and empower women
• **Goal 4:** Reduce child mortality
• **Goal 5:** Improve maternal health
• **Goal 6:** Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases
• **Goal 7:** Ensure environmental sustainability
• **Goal 8:** Develop a global partnership for development

The goals involve a partnership between the rich countries and the poor countries "to create an environment at the national and global levels alike which is conducive to development and the elimination of poverty". Halfway to 2015, the world has made progress. Reduction in extreme poverty is evident throughout the global south. Most dramatically since 2000, more than 34 million additional children in the developing world gained the chance to attend and complete primary school. More than 550 million children were vaccinated against measles, driving down measles deaths in Africa by 75%. The number of developing-country AIDS patients with access to antiretroviral treatment increased from 240,000 in 2001 to over 1.6 million at mid-2006". However, “all regions are off-track on the child mortality goal, and several regions are off-track on at least some of the other MDGs. The two regions that lag the furthest behind are South Asia (SAR) and Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)”.

The two greatest obstacles to achieving the MDGs by 2015 flow from the difficulties involved in achieving equality for women and the challenge of working with fragile states.

**MAKE POVERTY HISTORY CAMPAIGN**

In 2005 campaigns led by many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were launched around the world to combat poverty and pressure governments to keep their commitments to the Millennium Development Goals. Canada launched its own Make Poverty History campaign linked to other global efforts (www.makepovertyhistory.ca). This campaign “calls for urgent and meaningful policy change” based on four demands:

1. *more and better aid* – by increasing aid by 15% every year we could reach the UN target by 2015.
2. *trade justice* - by pressing for better trade and investment rules that protect poor countries.
3. *debt cancellation* - by pressuring the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to grant immediate and unconditional debt cancellation for the global south.
4. *end child poverty in Canada* (one in six Canadian children is poor) - by raising the annual Canada Child Tax Benefit to $4,900 per child and involving the vulnerable sectors of the population in designing and implementing a domestic poverty reduction strategy.
This campaign is working to uphold the eighth Millennium Development Goal of establishing a global partnership between rich and poor countries. Canadian NGOs have been very vocal advocates for this campaign although some observe that their advocacy has only been partially successful in altering Canadian policy.
Ending or at least reducing global inequality and creating a more peaceful and equitable world challenges the power and privileges of the rich. If the poor countries found in Africa, the Americas, Asia, and the former Soviet bloc, are to become more equal with wealthy countries of the global north, like Canada, this means that richer countries must be prepared to reduce some of their dominance in the world (that is, wealth and power). Are the wealthy countries ready to commit to alleviating global inequality and if so, what actions need to happen to make that commitment real?

Deciding on what Canada’s contribution should be is not about finding the correct technical solution – our decisions and actions should reflect Canadians’ beliefs, values and assumptions. In the final section of the discussion guide, four value-based approaches are presented as a starting point for your discussions on what actions you think that Canada should take in lessening global inequality. Accompanying a brief overview for each approach are some arguments in favour and against each, which reflect different viewpoints in society on the approach.

These approaches are not exhaustive, definitive or mutually exclusive. They are meant to stimulate your thinking about the most important steps to take, the choices you are prepared to commit to and why. You are not being asked to pick one approach. Rather, we invite you to use these approaches as a starting point for considering other options or combinations of approaches.
The first approach would cancel the debt load of global south and increase the quantity and quality of aid. Canada would increase its Official Development Assistance (ODA) to the global south, committing to a firm timetable to reach the 0.7% target. The ODA we provide would not be made conditional on also advancing our economic and corporate interests. The aid we provide would not be one dimensional – it would come in different forms, including: direct cash donations to the governments of countries in the global south; financing the work of community-based groups; supporting micro credit loans to poor entrepreneurs; providing overseas technical and technological expertise (people); and funding Canadian development projects and programs within countries in the global south.

Canada would also pass the Better Aid Bill (C293) that promises to greatly improve the quality of aid to poor countries by freeing aid from political motivations.

Canada would also work to wipe out all the bilateral debt owed to us by countries of the global south. We would pressure institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to cancel multilateral debt (loans made from multiple sources to countries in the global south channeled through larger institutions).
ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR

- Development aid is needed to fill the huge gaps in basic health care, education and social services. These services are absolutely essential to the creation of conditions needed for the growth of democracy and healthy communities.
- Aid for the global south not only benefits poor populations, but also simultaneously works towards sustaining the global market economy, worldwide prosperity and security that will benefit Canadians in the long run.
- Countries in the global north must accept responsibility for their legacy of colonization and exploitation in the global south, which did much to create our current global inequality. Canada should lead by example (for instance, by increasing aid and canceling debt) and apply diplomatic pressure on former colonial powers to take responsibility for their past actions.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

- Too much aid money is misused and abused by unstable and corrupt politicians, governments and business people. Also because of poor coordination among different donors in the delivery and use of aid, too much money leaks away before it ever reaches those who need it. Other tools may be more effective in addressing global inequity, e.g. trade and investment.
- It is not practical or sensible to think that we can separate aid from national and corporate self-interest. Untied and unconditional aid is impractical. We should be looking for win-win approaches that provide needed aid and advance our trade and investment interests.
- Aid is a blunt instrument that continues to foster a relationship of dependency between countries of the global south and northern countries instead of empowering them to stand on their own. It is a patronizing form of international development.

QUESTIONS

1. Are Canadians willing to increase the Overseas Development Assistance budget? Does it mean increased taxes or reduce spending in other priority areas like health, defense, education or research?
2. Is the issue about providing more money or just spending the money we use now more wisely? Can we reduce the money we spend in Canada in administering our aid budget and ensure more goes overseas?
3. Can we target our aid specifically to eradicating poverty rather than using our aid to advance more political ends?
4. Do developed countries like Canada have a responsibility to make reparations for things done in the past – like the colonization of Africa and the Americas? And should these reparations be made by channeling them money?
**APPROACH 2**

**Emphasize Trade, not Aid!**

Canada would take steps to encourage countries in the global south to change their protectionist policies and help them integrate more completely in the global economic market. This offers better prospects for reducing poverty, as Asian countries, like China and India have demonstrated. By increasing their international trade many Asian countries have experienced unprecedented economic growth, which has led to significant poverty reduction. Increased trade will go a long way to solving the problems of poverty and inequality. The opportunities that come with increased trade and open markets, and the resulting increases in productivity would enable the global south to solve its own problems.

Canada would open up its markets to countries in the global south, giving them opportunities to sell their products. We would lower our protectionist barriers – especially our tariffs on agricultural imports. Canada would push hard at the World Trade Organization for fairer trade agreements for poor countries. Our commitment to fair trade would be evident in our bilateral trade agreements with countries in the global south. We would also provide supports like technological and export assistance to businesses in the south and we would work with the governments and business sector to promote safe and fair labour standards and skills training. Canada would continue to provide generous humanitarian aid as required to help developing countries deal with catastrophes.
ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR

✔ Focusing on helping countries in the global south integrate into the global market by increasing their international trade rather than simply donating aid, treats countries in the global south as equals rather than victims.
✔ Trade and market-based approaches work: (‘a rising tide raises all boats’) – as capitalist growth increases, global inequality will diminish. With fair access to international markets, people in the global south will have more opportunities to find markets for their goods.
✔ Integrating the global south into international trade gives them access to foreign technology, science and research that will increase their productivity and competitiveness. This offers better prospects for wealth creation that can lead to a better standard of living for all.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

✘ International free trade is extremely competitive. The structure of the global market is stacked against the global south because so much capital is held by a relatively small number of transnational corporations that are situated within the global north. A wholesale opening of markets in countries in the global south will devastate domestic business as they will be unable to compete against transnational corporations.
✘ Free trade may benefit the rich and the powerful, and even the middle-class within countries in the global south, but the very poor run the risk of being left even further behind. Trade alone is unlikely to solve problems of inequality between and within countries.
✘ Capitalism is based on exponential growth, and an integrated international market has accelerated this growth. This is problematic. We need sustainable practices that take into account costs to local, national, regional and the global ecosystems not more of the same.

QUESTIONS

1. If other developing countries develop as quickly as China will our environment be able to sustain the global level of industrialization and international trade? On the other hand, do the rich Northern countries have any right to dictate how poor countries develop their economies?
2. By focusing on trade instead of aid, are we avoiding our responsibility to poor countries?
3. During their development stages, many of the world’s rich countries used protectionist policies to develop domestic business and increase wealth. Why should the global south not have this protection as well? On the other hand does today’s globalization make protectionist policies a thing of the past?
The World Bank’s Global Monitoring Report 2007 warns that to reach the MDGs by 2015 more international effort must be directed towards stabilizing the ‘fragile states’. This approach would prioritize support for these fragile states, which have “weak governance, institutions, and capacity”\(^{20}\). This approach suggests that it makes most sense to start with those countries in greatest need – those in conflict zones, post-conflict zones, or suffering from natural disasters. If these countries are ignored, they may become the biggest obstacle to achieving the MDGs. These states account for “27 % of the extreme poor, and nearly one-third of all child deaths”.

Under this approach Canada would commit to rebuilding these countries, by focusing on creating more stability and security, enhancing democratic development and good governance. This would mean more investment in the work of CIDA’s Office for Democratic Governance (promoting “freedom and democracy, human rights, the rule of law and open and accountable public institutions in developing countries”).\(^{21}\) Under this approach, these fragile states (like Afghanistan and Haiti) would receive the largest amount of Canadian aid.
**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR**

- When people feel their lives are at risk, it is difficult to make development gains. This approach puts the emphasis on creating a stable and secure environment, which is a prerequisite for reconstruction and development.
- Neither aid nor trade alone is going to reduce poverty in an unstable country. By making good governance a priority, Canada can make a real contribution towards a reducing global inequality, meeting the MDGs, and creating a more stable world.
- Rebuilding countries and promoting democracies ensures that the development process includes the most marginalized and vulnerable sectors of the population.

**ARGUMENTS AGAINST**

- Direct intervention in fragile states is controversial and the motivations behind the intervention are often suspect. Poor countries should be allowed to build their own institutions and government systems on their own timetable. We have no business imposing our value system on them.
- Open-ended interventions by Canada in fragile states can lead to deployment of troops or police forces. We are not well equipped to undertake such interventions, that may be needed for years.
- Poor countries and fragile states need to focus on economic development, increasing productivity and trade. Democracy will evolve once conditions of life have improved and people have time and energy to deal with more than survival.

**QUESTIONS**

1. Canada’s involvement in fragile states like Afghanistan and Haiti is controversial. Do we really know what we are getting into and that our efforts are going to make a difference? Are we clear about what our purposes and motivations for intervention?
2. In extremely fragile states fraught with violence and/or humanitarian disasters, what ways, other than direct intervention, can we help them to stabilize and rebuild?
3. By trying to forcefully establish democracies in fragile states, are we imposing our Western standards on a different culture?
**APPROACH 4**

**FOCUS ON SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY BASED GROUPS**

This approach would focus on connecting the local with the global (walking the talk around “think global, act local”). With less emphasis on the national level, this approach would promote grass roots, bottom-up strategies as a way of reducing poverty and inequality. Success is much more likely to result when projects are led by leaders who are part of the communities being targeted for help. Canada would empower community-based groups – enabling them to lead the way in international development by providing support and helping them to build alliances with other groups across cultures and countries.

Key actions for this approach would include expanding programs like CIDA’s 2003 pilot project - the Indigenous People’s Partnership Program. This program is designed to create beneficial partnerships between indigenous peoples in Latin American countries and Aboriginal people in Canada. Its focus is on poverty reduction among Latin American indigenous people and an increased international role for Canadian Aboriginal people. The requirement that the Latin American partner group must be “community or stakeholder driven and/or have the strong support of its community”22 is one that would be replicated in other aid programs. So far the program has had great success due to the many community based groups who have formed cross-country partnerships with each other. Other actions would include financial and technical support for community-based groups (e.g., sporting clubs, agricultural and production cooperatives, women’s groups).
ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR

✔ This approach to development doesn’t patronize nor condescend but rather empowers. Instead of treating the poor as victims or undermining their culture, this approach recognizes the central role of local communities in designing their own development.

✔ Community members understand the needs of the community far better than foreign organizations. They are best equipped and well positioned to reach the poorest of the poor and to organize themselves to advocate for changes within their countries.

✔ Bottom-up, locally based development strategies promise to be sustainable and effective ways of reducing inequality. They don’t need to wait for international agreements, which are cumbersome and slow. They put their energy into local action that delivers tangible results in people’s lives.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

❌ Each local community group has specific values and interests and sets its own priorities, which can be quite different. Without a policy framework and coordination at the national level, these groups would be pursuing their own individual activities. It would be much more difficult to build alliances in order to address global inequality.

❌ Focusing on the local can be limiting. It is difficult for community groups to combine a focus on improving local conditions and playing a role at the national and international levels. It is asking them to spread limited resources too thinly and runs the risk of failing at both tasks. It would also be difficult for Canada to monitor and determine progress and results when funding community based groups from a distance.

❌ It is unrealistic and naïve to expect local community based groups to have the expertise, training and resources to engage in such complex work independently. Tackling global inequality requires a concerted and coordinated strategy that must collaborate with national governments and international institutions.

QUESTIONS

1. How can we balance giving control to community-based groups to set their own priorities with the need to be accountable to Canadian taxpayers?
2. Is it realistic to think that local community based groups have the capacity, even with support, to engage in policy advocacy?
3. How can development aid make the most difference at the local level? Are we prepared to accept that there will be mistakes made and that some projects will fail? How would we define acceptable success and failure rates?
4. Community-based organizations can get caught up in political struggles whose outcomes are not predictable. For those organizations we fund, what parameters for political involvement at the local level may need to be in place?
CONCLUSION

So now, it’s your turn. What do you think? As we have noted above, the information and the approaches outlined in this discussion guide offer a starting place for your discussions. They are intended to stimulate questions, help you consider options and develop your own views on how to best position Canada in addressing global inequality in the current context.

This issue, like any foreign policy issue, is complex. The conditions within the international arena are always changing and it is often difficult to navigate the best course for Canada. We can decide not to do anything and get swept up in the current or we can set sail in a direction that we have mapped out and defined.

Imagine you are the Prime Minister or the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the weekend. What ideas, insights, questions and options would help you in making decisions about what actions Canada should take?


End Notes


Twenty countries originally signed the Convention on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development on 14 December 1960. Since then a further ten countries have become members of the Organisation. The Member countries of the Organisation and the dates on which they deposited their instruments of ratification are:

AUSTRALIA: 7 June 1971
AUSTRIA: 29 September 1961
BELGIUM: 13 September 1961
CANADA: 10 April 1961
CZECH REPUBLIC: 21 December 1995
DENMARK: 30 May 1961
FINLAND: 28 January 1969
FRANCE: 7 August 1961
GERMANY: 27 September 1961
GREECE: 27 September 1961
HUNGARY: 7 May 1996
ICELAND: 5 June 1961
IRELAND: 17 August 1961
ITALY: 29 March 1962
JAPAN: 28 April 1964
KOREA: 12 December 1996
LUXEMBOURG: 7 December 1961
MEXICO: 18 May 1994
NETHERLANDS: 13 November 1961
NEW ZEALAND: 29 May 1973
NORWAY: 4 July 1961
POLAND: 22 November 1996
PORTUGAL: 4 August 1961
SLOVAK REPUBLIC: 14 December 2000
SPAIN: 3 August 1961
SWEDEN: 28 September 1961
SWITZERLAND: 28 September 1961
TURKEY: 2 August 1961
UNITED KINGDOM: 2 May 1961
UNITED STATES: 12 April 1961


11 In OECD - DAC (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development - Development Assistance Committee) which are recorded on a calendar-year basis, Canada’s ODA reached 0.55 percent in 1975 (OECD – DAC, Development Co-operation: Efforts and Policies of the Members of the Development Assistance Committee 1977)
12 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, “Canada (2007), DAC Peer Review: Main Findings and Recommendations”. http://www.oecd.org/document/49/0,3343,en_33873108_33873277_39509628_1_1_1_1,00.html


For example, the Kamloops Indian Band in BC successfully secured funding through this program for their project entitled *International Indigenous Tourism Entrepreneurship Training*:

“The main objective of this project was to train 16 Chilean youth in Indigenous tourism entrepreneurship through a two-month classroom and experiential program in Canada. This was followed by Canadian advisory support after the youth return to Chile. Subsequently, with funding from other sources, 10 Canadian youth being trained in tourism joined the Chilean youth for a month and a half to gain experience in the Chilean tourism sector.”
For complete text see: http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/cpo.nsf/vWebWBSEn/B561630CBB5A5524852573930049A00D