

The Evolution of the International Development Research Centre

An Interpretation by Shirley Seward

Second Draft  
May 28, 1974

### A Note on Sources -

The author has had free access to all the early documents contained in the Archival files of the Centre. For the purposes of this work, the most important, to which extensive references are made, are listed chronologically as follows:

- 1) Strong, M. F., Speech delivered to Women's Canadian Club of London, November 23, 1967.
- 2) Pearson, The Right Hon. Lester B., Speech delivered Canadian Political Science Association, Carleton University, June 8, 1967.
- 3) Plumptre, A.F.W., "Proposed International Development Research Institution", January 24, 1968.
- 4) Report of the Steering Committee, September 3, 1968.
- 5) Papers written by members of the Steering Committee's Task Force.
- 6) Hopper, D. W., "Statement to the Inaugural Meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Development Research Centre", Ottawa, October 26, 1970.
- 7) International Development Research Centre, Annual Report, 1972-73.
- 8) Hopper, D. W., "Research Policy: Eleven Issues", Outline Statement to the Board of Governors of the International Development Research Centre at their meeting in Bogota, Colombia, March 19, 1973.
- 9) Plumptre, A.F.W., Letter sent to Canadian University Service Overseas with respect to Board of Governors, February 21, 1974.

The following public sources were also consulted:

- 1) House of Commons Debates  
Senate Debates
- 2) House of Commons Committee Proceedings including Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of Subcommittee on International Development Assistance  
Senate Committee Proceedings.
- 3) Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons  
Votes and Proceedings of the Senate
- 4) Bill C-12

In addition, the following individuals were personally interviewed:

- 1) Hopper, W. D., President, member of the Executive Committee and Finance Committee, International Development Research Centre
- 2) Hulse, J. H., Director, Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences, International Development Research Centre
- 3) Brown, G. F., Director, Population and Health Sciences, International Development Research Centre
- 4) Zagorin, R. K., Director, Social Sciences and Human Resources, International Development Research Centre
- 5) Woolston, J. E., Director, Information Sciences, International Development Research Centre
- 6) Pfeifer, J. C., Secretary, International Development Research Centre
- 7) Plumptre, A.F.W., Member of Board of Governors (until 1972), Member of Executive Committee and Finance Committee (1971-72), Special Advisor to the President
- 8) Bene, J. G., Member of Board of Governors, Member of Executive Committee, President of Finance Committee, International Development Research Centre; Special Advisor, Canadian International Development Agency.

Brecher, I., Member of Board of Governors, Member of Executive Committee, International Development Research Centre; Economic Council of Canada

- 10) Oldham, G. H., Associate Director, Social Sciences and Human Resources, International Development Research Centre; Science Policy Research Unit, University of Sussex.
- 11) Laquian, A. A., Associate Director, Social Sciences and Human Resources, International Development Research Centre.

The author is most grateful to the above-named for the generous time and interest they contributed to this work. A special thanks is extended to A.F.W. Plumptre for his continual guidance and inspiration.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Phase I - Earliest Germination of Ideas	8
Phase II - The Activities and Philosophy of the Steering Committee	13
Phase III - Drafting of the Legislation, and its Journey through Cabinet, House of Commons, and Senate	21
Phase IV - The Vision of David Hopper and Its Implementation	27
Part A - The Vision of David Hopper	27
Part B - The Senior Staff of the International Development Research Centre	34
Part C - The Board of Governors	37
Conclusions -	41
References and Notes -	45
Appendix -	49

".....there is no joy in the hot stench of poverty, no colorfulness in rags and tatters, no gaiety in disease and illiteracy, no hope in hunger, no goal to strive for, and few personal satisfactions in life itself. For such conditions there can be, on our part, no proper mixture of sympathy of aloofness".

Maurice Strong,  
Director General of External Aid Office,  
November 23, 1967.

Speech given to Women's Canadian Club  
of London.

"If free civilization is to survive and grow, we must very soon find vastly improved methods for extending the benefits of modern existence to the world community of man".

Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson,  
Prime Minister of Canada.

Speech Delivered to the Canadian Political  
Science Association, Carleton University,  
June 8, 1967.

"Despite the fact that this need is fundamental to the whole development process and that this field is a new and complex one, less than one-half of 1 per cent of the aid budgets of donor countries is currently devoted to development research at a time when the average growth corporation in North America spends approximately 6 per cent of its annual income for these purposes."

Hon. Mitchell Sharp,  
Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Speech delivered in House of Commons,  
January 12, 1970.

"The report of the Pearson Commission identified an aid weariness in many donor nations. I am sure the Commission also encountered an aid weariness among the recipients. It is a weariness born of being too long a supplicant suffering the donor's quiet arrogance and his implicit denial of sovereign equality. In the case of research institutions that play a donor role, this recipient weariness is aggravated by a fear that the alleged benefits of collaboration are in reality illusory."

W. David Hopper, President,  
International Development Research Centre.

Statement to the Inaugural Meeting  
of the Board of Governors of the  
International Development Research  
Centre.

October 26, 1970.

## INTRODUCTION

The International Development Research Centre, established in May 1970 with the passage of an Act of the Canadian Parliament, is a Crown corporation characterized by political independence and financial freedom and flexibility unprecedented in the international scene. The most striking evidence of the Centre's independence is inherent in the international character of the Board of Governors, consisting of 21 members, 10 of whom are non-Canadians (including many from the developing countries). The flexibility and freedom of the Centre are exemplified by its financial arrangements. Allocated a substantial sum of money over an initial five year period, the Executive and Board are permitted to plan flexibly over a long period of time, unconstrained by the usual annual budget of other Crown corporations.

The raison d'être of the Centre, as outlined in the corporate objects of the Act, is "...to initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means for applying and adapting scientific, technical and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of these regions, and, in carrying out these objects

- (a) to enlist the talents of natural and social scientists and technologists of Canada and other countries;
- (b) to assist the developing regions to build up the research capabilities, the innovative skills and the institutions required to solve their problems;



- (c) to encourage generally the coordination of international development research; and
- (d) to foster cooperation in research on development problems between the developed and developing regions for their mutual benefit." (1)

With respect to the introductory broad statement of purpose, the Centre undertakes to encourage and support research - focused on science and technology - into the problems of developing regions. In popular jargon, this is referred to as "developmental research". Moreover, in the quest for direct solutions to specific development problems, the Centre has maintained "a strong orientation to assisting research that has a practical, or an applied, significance for the economic and social advancement of developing nations." (2)

The most recent Annual Report (1972-73) of the Centre states that "particular pride of place" has been given to objective (b): for, "in major measure, Centre support has focused on building the research skills of scientists and technologists in the developing countries". (3) This emphasis on the "indigenization of research", as it was apparently once coined by Rex Nettleford, reflects the outstanding and unique style of the Centre's operations.

The philosophical bias towards concentration on implementation of objective (b) has several implications for policy: Firstly, the Centre endeavours to place strong emphasis on acceptance of, and support for, project priorities as defined by the developing countries themselves, rather than through an ethnocentric exercise of Centre judgement as to the "proper" priorities. Secondly, the Centre

has focused support on researchers indigenous to the developing regions, involving Western scientists only when there is a clear advantage in doing so. Thirdly, in addition to support for the finding of solid research results of "international standard", ("product-oriented" research), the Centre recognizes the great importance of "process-oriented" research, i.e. the provision of on-the-job research opportunities and training for the LDC research scientists and technologists. These three policy issues are subsumed under the Centre's central ideal of "responsiveness" to LDC requirements; or, in colloquial terms, the ideal of research in, for, and initiated and executed by the developing countries.

Objective (a) - the enlistment of the talents of natural and social scientists and technologists of Canada and other countries - has been implemented in as much as an international staff has been recruited and competence has been sought throughout the world. Wherever possible, staff has been recruited from the LDCs. Otherwise, preference is given to Canadians over individuals from other developed countries.

Objective (d) - with its emphasis on mutual benefit for developed (especially Canada) and developing countries - can better be phrased as the element of mutual cooperation. Mutual benefit implies that research activities be undertaken to solve problems common to Canada and the developing countries. This is clearly not the case. The Centre's pre-eminent concern is with problems of the developing countries. Although there are examples of project results which could have relevance for

Canada, any spin-off is incidental, and the possibility of mutual benefit is not a criterion for selection of projects. The aspect of mutual cooperation, on the other hand, is important in the Centre's operations. The solution of certain LDC problems - especially in the "hard" sciences - requires a substantial amount of "basic" research to support the specific, applied research undertaken in the LDCs. This "basic" research can often best be done in a developed country such as Canada, where the scientific infrastructure already exists. In this way, the Centre taps Canadian expertise in dealing with developing country priorities.

Finally, objective (c), the co-ordination of international development research, has been operationalized along three dimensions of the Centre's activities. Firstly, there is the concern with the establishment of international information and data banks. The Centre's role is to support cooperative initiatives in the United Nations family, devoting particular attention to ensuring that developing countries are able to exploit the banks to meet their local needs. The Centre has no substantial inhouse activity in this area, concentrating rather on using its flexibility and dynamism to initiate, support, or improve the facilities of large, established, international bodies. The second dimension of the Centre's coordinating activities is the organization of "research networks" in the developing countries. This is a truly innovative mechanism by which LDC researchers from different developing countries are brought together to discuss, in work-shop fashion, problems of common interest. Through the networks,

a dual purpose is realized: (a) the coordination of research efforts in several developing countries, thus preventing the duplication of results, and (b) the creative opportunity for LDC researchers to clarify and articulate their priorities through a concerted effort. Thirdly, in order to minimize duplication of efforts, close informal links are maintained with other donor agencies. (4) In addition, the Centre plays an important coordinating role in the Regional Research Centres located in the developing countries. (5)

In order to place a manageable limitation on the broad, overall purpose of supporting research into the problems of developing countries, activities have so far been restricted to four programme areas: Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences (Directed by J. Hulse); Information Sciences (Directed by J. Woolston); Population and Health Sciences (Directed by G. Brown) and Social Sciences and Human Resources (Directed by R. Zagorin). The cumulative total program projects approved as of March 31st, 1973 (6) indicate that the greatest percentage of the Centre's funds are devoted to Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences (37%), followed by Social Sciences and Human Resources Division (29%), Population and Health Sciences (19.9%), and, lastly, Information Sciences (14.1%).

To further narrow the Centre's breadth of concerns, the predominant focus is on research to improve the well-being of rural peoples, both farm and non-farm. This choice is made on two grounds: firstly, the greater part of the population of developing countries is

located in the rural areas; and, secondly, it is the people living outside the relatively modernized, urban areas who are most directly affected by change and development.

Even such a cursory overview of the philosophy and early operations of the IDRC ignites the imagination to pose several questions. Firstly, through the inspiration of which individuals, and in what philosophical medium, did the concept of the Centre take root and evolve? Secondly, what was the genesis of such elements as independence, internationalism, flexibility, developmental research in science and technology, coordination, and responsiveness?; and when and why did other ideas, such as mutual benefit, languish along the path? Thirdly, how, in operational terms, does the Centre currently function? For example, to what extent can the Centre achieve the ideal of responsiveness, i.e., its orientation to research in, for, and initiated and executed by the developing countries. Finally, in what ways has the Centre's unique style affected the international community?

In order to answer these fundamental questions, it is necessary to examine the evolution of the IDRC, from its earliest germination in 1967 to the present date. For purposes of clarity and elaboration, the evolution of ideas is considered below in four distinct, but overlapping phases. Phase I identifies the earliest germination of ideas in the minds of Maurice Strong and The Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson. Phase II considers the activities and philosophy of the Steering Committee established by Cabinet. Included in the activities of the Committee are the Plumptre feasibility study, and the establishment of a supporting Task Force. Phase

III discusses the drafting the legislation, and its journey through Cabinet, the House of Commons, and the Senate. Phase IV, consisting of three parts, describes the vision of David Hopper, and its implementation. Part A outlines Hopper's proposals and considers the mechanism involved in fulfilling the ideal of responsiveness. Parts B and C are devoted to the Centre's senior staff and Board of Governors respectively. Finally, a concluding section speculates as to what affect the Centre's style and operations are having on the international community.

Phase I - Earliest Germination of Ideas

Maurice Strong, presently Under-Secretary General of the United Nations, spent his childhood in humble circumstances. Regarding education as the vehicle by which he could emerge from his surroundings, he finished High School and applied to the University of Manitoba. However, he was refused acceptance on the grounds that he was too young for entrance. (7) Nevertheless, undaunted by this disappointment, he subsequently embarked on a career that was to startle his contemporaries.

Strong's background reflects a mixture of business and humanitarian interests. While still in his teens, he was a member of the Secretariat of the United Nations (N.Y.C.), and was Assistant to the President of Dome Exploration Ltd. At this time, he also became intimately associated with the Young Men's Christian Association - both nationally and internationally. In 1954 he formed his own management company and completely restructured the ailing Canadian Industrial Gas Ltd. At the age of 35 (1964), he was a wealthy man and the president or director of several corporations.

Familiar with struggle in his own early life, Strong was a man deeply committed to the eradication of poverty on a global scale. So sincere was his concern, that, when invited in 1966 to head Canada's External Aid Office (later the Canadian International Development Agency), he gave up his successful business career and entered the development forum.

Emerging from this business background, Strong was very cognizant of the fact that any respectable and viable corporation spends at least five or six per cent of its total annual sales on research and development. Therefore, regarding the business of development to be a crucial world concern, he expected that substantial sums were being devoted to research on problems of development. Consequently, on assuming the Directorship of the External Aid Office, Strong was appalled that Canada was spending virtually nothing on development research.

Early in 1967, Strong visited India where he met David Hopper, one of the fathers of the Green Revolution. This was Strong's first introduction to the field-work of the Rockefeller Foundation. Inspired by what the Green Revolution could mean for India's food problem, and excited by the success of Rockefeller's research efforts, Strong became concerned as to how Canada could be as innovative as Ford and Rockefeller in establishing research programs. At this point, he imagined that such programs could be implemented as part of CIDA's activities. As a preliminary step in this direction, Strong endeavoured to get support for the International Rice Research Institute from CIDA. However, the attempt was a failure. It is said that Cabinet refused on the grounds that support for the Rice Institute - which was endeavouring to increase rice yields - could have a damaging affect on Canada's wheat exports to the developing world.

Convinced of the crucial importance of developmental research, and frustrated by the lack of political independence and financial freedom in CIDA which the IRRI failure exemplified, Strong conceived the



the idea of the IDRC. He envisioned a politically independent research organization, with a high degree of flexibility, unconstrained by the bureaucratic forces at work in CIDA. He perceived the Institute's main role as research into the application or adaptation of the newly-evolving technologies of the industrialized countries to the problems of the developing countries . Moreover, because he suspected that Canada's lack of development research was common to other countries as well, he foresaw the organization as serving not only the Canadian, but also the world need for research. It is not clear whether he felt such research should be carried out in Canada or the developing countries; but the fact that he wished the institute to function along the lines of Ford and Rockefeller research programs indicates that he may have conceived at least some of the research being undertaken in the LDCs themselves.

In the spring of 1967, Strong discussed his brainchild with The Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson. Mr. Pearson, infected by Strong's conviction and enthusiasm, was himself excited by such a concept. Consequently, on June 8, 1967, in a speech delivered to the Canadian Political Science Association at Carleton University, the Prime Minister made the first public mention of the Strong proposal. In this speech, Pearson portrayed an institution which could bring to bear the fruits of technology to development. He presented the idea of a "think-tank" consisting of an international group of experts from a variety of disciplines, working together in one centre to find solutions to the problems of development:

"The rapidly advancing technology and the complex interrelationships of to-day's global society

demand that the fundamental problems of man be dealt with on an international and an inter-professional basis....One idea for a new Canadian initiative in meeting this challenge.... is for the establishment of a Centre of International Development." (8)

In addition to the focus on developmental research in science and technology, both Strong and Pearson conceived an important role of the organization in the area of the coordination of information. The issue of information had always been one of Pearson's priority concerns. Moreover, during the late sixties, the Prime Minister's own emphasis on the importance of information was reinforced by a study undertaken by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The premise behind the study was that the availability of information is an important resource in the economic development of industrialized countries. The OECD surveyed member nations to determine what national efforts were being made to collect and organize information about economic development.

The result of this influence - the Prime Minister's own concern reinforced by a comparative study amongst developed countries - was that information was an important national concern at the time. Therefore, with such emphasis on information as an important factor in the development of industrialized countries, it was a logical extension for Pearson and Strong to regard information as an even more crucial element in LDC development. Consequently, they were hopeful of the new organization developing a large, inhouse, developmental literature data-bank, to which the think-tank experts would have ready access.

During this same period, in the excitement and ambiance of Expo '67, several other individuals besides Strong and Pearson were making proposals to continue the spirit of internationalism that the World's Fair had sparked in Canada. On July 4, 1967, a number of these, together with the proposal for the international research institute, were submitted to Cabinet by the Hon. Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs. The reaction to the Strong/Pearson concept was favourable, as indicated by the August 11 recommendation that a Steering Committee be established to consider the proposal in greater detail.

Phase II - The Activities and Philosophy of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee, under the Chairmanship of Maurice Strong, was composed of an impressive membership of senior public servants:

J. R. Baldwin	- Deputy Minister of Transport
R. B. Bryce	- Deputy Minister of Finance
M. Cadieux	- Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs
G. F. Davidson	- Secretary of Treasury Board,
J. F. Grandy	- Deputy Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs
A. D. P. Heeney	- Chairman Canadian Section, Permanent Joint Board on Defence and President, Canadian Institute International Affairs
C. M. Isbister	- Deputy Minister, Department of Energy, Mines and Resources
T. W. Kent	- Deputy Minister, Department of Manpower and Immigration
L. Rasminsky	- Governor, Bank of Canada
S. S. Reisman	- Deputy Minister of Industry
R. G. Robertson	- Clerk of the Privy Council and Secretary to the Cabinet
G. G. E. Steele	- Under-Secretary of State
O. G. Stoner	- Deputy Clerk of the Privy Council and Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet
J. H. Warren	- Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce
J. R. Weir	- Director, Science Secretariat, Privy Council
J. W. Willard	- Deputy Minister of Welfare
S. B. Williams	- Deputy Minister of Agriculture Canada

As the above list suggests, the membership, embracing a number of senior government officials, represented the "Establishment" in Ottawa. Predictably, then, the Committee's reaction, and, in fact, its task, was to take a critical view of such an extraordinary new proposal. There was considerable scepticism with respect to two issues: firstly, was

there a need for an institution to undertake developmental research; and, secondly, would the Canadian institution be duplicating the efforts of other bodies in the world? In short, was there an "international basis" for the proposed institution? In order to allay or confirm this scepticism, the Steering Committee decided that an independent feasibility study be undertaken. For this purpose, two Toronto Principals were recommended: A.F.W. Plumptre of Scarborough College, and D.V. LePan of University-College. Both Plumptre and LePan had long experience in the public service and an interest in aid. As LePan was engaged in other activities at the time, Plumptre was invited to undertake the feasibility study.

In order to assess whether there was an "international basis" for the proposed institution and, if so, what implications this might have for the institution itself, Plumptre had conversations not only with Canadian officials, but also with officers of international and national bodies in the U.S., Britain, and France. The resultant Plumptre report of January 24, 1968 is summarized briefly below.

As a result of his discussions, Plumptre verified that there was indeed an international basis for the proposed research institute in Canada. He concluded that "the need for research in the field under consideration is world-wide and urgent." (9) In addition, he discovered that the fear of the possibility of duplication was unfounded. On the contrary, he was assured that "the world is very short of research in some of the fields we are considering." (10) Moreover, it was not implied in any of the conversations that Canadian funds might better "be

contributed to some existing research centre, or added to the Canadian bilateral aid programme, or donated to I.D.A. (11). In fact, it was suggested that Canada had several advantages in this field of research not enjoyed by other industrialized countries.

Having established the need for the Canadian organization, Mr. Plumptre then investigated the Strong/Pearsonian conceptions of (a) research into science and technology, (b) the think-tank operation, and (c) the data-bank role.

Firstly, with respect to the type of research that the Centre should do, there was great support for Strong's proposal of research into the "application or adaptation of the newly-evolving technologies of the industrialized countries to the problems and possibilities of the developing countries." (12)

Secondly, in discussions of the think-tank operation, the Pearsonian concept was considerably altered. Plumptre observed that there was "unanimous opposition to the idea that the research operations..... should be gathered together into a single "centre" - (and housed, as at least one enthusiast has proposed, under one vast plastic dome!)" (13) Rather, it was felt that research should be, to a considerable extent, carried out in the developing countries themselves; or, if in Canada, in industry or universities where research facilities already existed.

Thirdly, in investigating the concept of a data-bank role for the organization, Plumptre encountered marked scepticism. There was a general feeling that "data-banking and processing should grow slowly out of and be associated with an operating programme," (14)

rather than there being a substantial computer element in the project from the outset.

Finally, in addition to investigating the three Pearsonian/Strong conceptions above, Plumptre's report also introduced the concept of "mutual benefit". The basic objective, he concluded, "should be to develop research that responded to the needs of developing countries and which at the same time had application to Canadian experience and Canadian problems." (15) As such, he felt it would enlarge and enrich Canadian research experience.

\* \* \* \*

The Plumptre report had significant input in two respects. Firstly, and most important, the study alleviated the Steering Committee's scepticism with respect to the international basis of the proposed institution. This was evidenced by the Committee's submission to Cabinet on September 3, 1968, recommending the establishment of the Centre. Secondly, as outlined above, Plumptre also made suggestions which somewhat altered the previous Strong/Pearsonian conceptions as to what the organization should do. As will be discussed below, some of these suggestions were articulated in the Report of the Steering Committee.

\* \* \* \*

The Steering Committee Report described the institute as a Canadian sponsored, independent, non-profit organization with an international character. The independence, however, was to be accompanied by close informal relations with External Aid and other

government agencies. Moreover, as Strong had conceived, it would be designed to undertake research in science and technology into the problems of developing countries.

The medium for organizing such research was Pearson's "think-tank" operation, referring to the process of "policy research". This would involve the assimilation and analysis of data related to particular issues, the development and evaluation of various policy alternatives, and their presentation in usable form to the decision-makers. Largely as a result of Plumptre's input, the original Pearsonian concept of research activity taking place in one Centre was modified to include the contracting out of research, both to institutions in developing countries and to universities and industry in Canada. The Centre's role would be to define the developing country priorities for developmental research, to initiate research activities, and to co-ordinate efforts in Canada and abroad. There was no stated belief, in this Report, that priorities should be defined, and activities initiated, by the LDCs themselves. It was hoped that the new institute could play the role for developing countries that the U.S. Rand and Hudson bodies were filling for developed countries.

Despite the scepticism that Plumptre had encountered with respect to data-banking, this role was much emphasized in the Steering Committee Report. No doubt there was considerable pressure from the Strong/Pearson caucus not only for political reasons (recall that information was an important national concern at the time), but also because there was a serious gap in international data collection, and



consequently a hope that the Canadian organization would fill this gap.

The element of mutual benefit, which had been introduced by Plumptre, was reflected as exceedingly important in the Report. In fact, the institute was portrayed as having a dual role: an International Development Role, and a Domestic Role, involving research into problems having relevance for both Canada and the developing regions. It was the main thesis of the Report that both interests could be preserved and enhanced by combining them into one international Centre. It was expected that whereas the International role would be one of initiation of activities, the separate Domestic division would be responsive to Canadian requests. The importance of mutual benefit, with the inclusion of a separate Domestic Division, reflected the general interest of the Establishment in catering to Canadian needs. However, it has been suggested that a more specific motive may have been involved. At the time, the possibility of the establishment of a new "Brookings Institution" type organization was being investigated by R. S. Ritchie. The latter recommended the organization on the grounds that it would fill the need for domestic research that the Economic Council of Canada was not undertaking. Therefore, it is said that the Steering Committee included in their proposed institution the Domestic Role in order to divert the government from establishing an additional research body.

The above discussion outlines the basic strategy recommended by the Steering Committee for the new institute. The Committee agreed that the submission to Cabinet and later to Parliament would have to include a sample of initial work programs. To formulate such a sample,

Strong instructed Stuart Peters, Special Advisor at CIDA and Coordinator for the proposed institute, to invite interested Canadian professional people to offer suggestions for research undertakings that seemed to them likely to be relevant to the Centre's purposes. The members of this loosely structured Task Force (16) made proposals with respect to a number of areas of activity:

<u>Member of Task Force</u>	<u>Suggestions for Research Undertakings</u>
John Bene, President, Weldwood of Canada Limited, Vancouver, B. C. and Special Advisor (Forestry) External Aid Office, Ottawa	Forestry
C. F. Bentley, Dean, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Alberta, Edmonton	Agriculture
Irving Brecher, Director, Centre for Developing- Area Studies, McGill University, Montreal.	Social Sciences
Tillo E. Kuhn, Professor of Economics, York University, Toronto.	Transportation
Roy A Matthews, Private Planning Association of Canada, Montreal.	General
C.H.G. Oldham, Senior Research Fellow, Science Policy Research Unit, University of Sussex, Brighton, England.	Science Policy
Garnet T. Page, Director, Pilot Projects Branch, Dept. of Manpower and Immigration, Ottawa.	Human Resources

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| E. G. Pleva,<br>Department of Geography,<br>University of Western Ontario,<br>London, Canada.                             | Water Resources            |
| L. B. Siemens,<br>Associate Professor Agriculture,<br>University of Manitoba,<br>Winnipeg, Manitoba.                      | Triticale<br>Development   |
| R. B. Toombs,<br>Assistant Chief, Mineral Resources,<br>Department of Energy, Mines and<br>Resources,<br>Ottawa, Ontario. | Well-drilling<br>Equipment |

The Report of the Steering Committee, supported with sample papers written by the Task Force, was submitted to Cabinet on September 3, 1968, at which point The Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the Hon. Mitchell Sharp had replaced the Pearson-Martin team. The Throne Speech of September 12, 1968 indicated the new Government's intention to proceed with the legislation. Finally, on December 17, 1968, a Cabinet Directive gave approval in principle to the proposed institute, subject to detailed consideration of the legislation. The time had now come for the formal drafting of the legislation, and Phase III of the evolution of the IDRC.

PHASE III - Drafting of the Legislation, and its Journey through  
Cabinet, House of Commons, and Senate

In March 1969, a drafting team was assembled under the direction and guidance of Maurice Strong. The team originally consisted of three full-time members: Stuart Peters, CIDA's coordinator for the research institute, Geoffrey Oldham, senior research fellow of the Science Policy Research Unit, Sussex University, and Earl Doe;(17) and two part-time members: Irving Brecher, Director of the Centre for Developing Area Studies, McGill University, and D. Wilson of the Science Council. By June 30, 1969, draft legislation had been prepared, and was attached to the final memorandum to Cabinet. The memorandum was approved by Cabinet, and the draft legislation sent to the Minister of Justice in order to translate it into legal language. James Pfeifer, a draftsman with an interest in international law and formerly legal adviser at CIDA, was chosen to undertake the task. In September 1969, the final legislation was presented before two Cabinet committees: External Affairs and Science and Technology.

During this drafting period of six months, Maurice Strong had an extremely influential input with respect to three issues: political independence, financial flexibility, and the information role of the "International Development Research Centre of Canada", as it was now titled.

Partly as a result of earlier frustrations with CIDA, specifically with Cabinet questioning as to how resources be spent,

Strong was eager to create an organization as politically and financially independent as was conceivably possible considering it was to be a government organization funded by Canadian tax money. Therefore, with the help of James Pfeifer, a truly innovative corporation was created. The resulting species was a Public Corporation, structured very loosely on the form of existing corporations such as the National Arts Centre or Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The corporation created was not to be considered part of the public service, not to be taxable, not to be subject to Treasury Board rules, and not to be subject to certain extremely important sections of the Financial administration which governed all departments and corporations of the public structure.\* The acceptance of such a corporation by the Department of Justice and the Treasury Board was the result of the influence of Maurice Strong, and a work of legal art on the part of Pfeifer.

Strong was also concerned that the idea of information and data-banking remain significant in the Centre's operations. This stress was apparent in the overall statement of purpose of the Act, with its reference to the application and adaptation of "knowledge", and in the first "power" of the Act, permitting the Centre to

"establish, maintain and operate information and data centres and facilities for research and other activities relevant to its objects."

During the Cabinet journey, the legislation embodied three of the four objects ultimately included in the Act:

- (a) to enlist the talents of natural and social scientists and technologists of Canada and other countries

---

\* See also page 40

- (b) to assist those regions to develop the scientific research capabilities and innovative skills required to solve their problems
- (c) to further scientific and technological cooperation in economic and social development between the economically developed and underdeveloped regions for their mutual benefit.

Objective (c) clearly reflects that the concept of mutual benefit, first encountered during the Steering Committee stage, had stood the test of time. It was particularly important to Irving Brecher and Stuart Peters, who felt that it was crucial both to ~~tap~~ and augment Canadian resources in development. To the other team members, it was considered useful from the point of view of getting it through Parliament.

Interestingly, the think-tank concept, although undoubtedly still in the mind of Pearson and others, was ~~not~~ articulated in the three objects of the Centre. Rather, the objects were subject to wide interpretation and clearly not limited to the earlier Rand or Hudson type concept.

There was considerable discussion amongst the members of the drafting team as to whether Parliamentarians would accept the notion of the Centre transferring most of its resources to the developing regions, which the implementation of objective (b) would no doubt involve. However, Oldham's personal background in developing countries made him an advocate of promoting technological self-reliance, and the objective was finally included. It is significant to note that the inclusion of the objective was the first articulation of the concept of promoting LDC self-reliance.

\* \* \* \*

On October 29, 1969, the legislation to establish the IDRC of Canada was introduced in the House of Commons. On January 12, 1970, the Honourable Mitchell Sharp moved that the Bill be read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. This Committee delegated authority to the Sub-Committee on International Development Assistance to consider the legislation in detail. The Standing Committee then reported back to the House of Commons which gave its final approval.

At the time of the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Sharp in his speech reinforced the concept of the promotion of technological capability in the LDCs, which had first been articulated in the drafting of the legislation. Apparently, Mr. Sharp's speech was drafted by Maurice Strong, so that it is reasonable to assume that the following quotation reflected Mr. Sharp's as well as Strong's philosophy with respect to the Centre's role:

"It will give high priority to programs that assist the developing countries to build their own scientific and technological capabilities so that they will not be mere welfare recipients, but contributors in their own right to the solution of their own problems." (18)

During the activities of the Subcommittee, the need for more coordinated effort with respect to the availability of developmental information was repeatedly stressed. In his testimony, Maurice Strong stressed that "... one of the best pay offs that you can get from a Centre like this .....would be in helping less developed countries to get and make use of existing information in various fields of science and technology and in avoiding duplication." (19) This need

was deemed important enough to include a fourth object:

" to encourage generally the coordination of international development research".

The inclusion of an additional object added weight to the two other legislative references to information discussed above. The data-bank role was seen as an essential mechanism for coordinating research, and a crucial resource in development.

A second amendment made during the Subcommittee stage was the deleting of the words "of Canada" from the institute's title. It was felt that the inclusion of the words would have a detrimental impact on an otherwise "international" organization. The corporation was to be called the "International Development Research Centre."

The third and final amendment made in the House of Commons was the provision of a clause permitting one of the Governors, of the Centre to be a Parliamentarian. Interestingly, Mr. Sharp made it clear that he would not enforce the appointment of a Parliamentarian to the Board of Governors.

\* \* \* \*

In March, 1970, the Bill was introduced into the Senate by Senator Martin, and, according to usual procedure, was referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs. Following



amendments with respect to the number of governors who could be appointed from the House of Commons or the Senate (one changed to two), and regarding the Income Tax and Estate Tax Acts, the Committee reported back to the Senate, which approved the Bill.

\* \* \* \*

On the 13 of May, 1970, the Bill received  
Royal Assent.

Phase IV - The Vision of David Hopper and Its Implementation

Part A - The Vision of David Hopper

At the Inaugural Meeting of the Board of Governors on October 26, 1970 Dr. Hopper articulated his vision as to what the style of the Centre's operations should be. To fully comprehend this vision, it is essential to first examine the nature of the experience the president had enjoyed and the mood of development aid which had evolved during the late sixties.

When Dr. Hopper assumed the presidency of the IDRC in May 1970, his personal background in development was characterized by experience in both the developed and developing countries. Having acquired a B.Sc. degree in Agriculture in 1950, he spent two years in India doing research which became the foundation of his Ph.D in Agricultural Economics and Cultural Anthropology. He then spent five years (1957-1962) in the academic community as Associate Professor at the Ontario Agricultural College in Guelph, Visiting Professor at Ohio State University, and Assistant Professor at the University of Chicago. In 1962, he returned to India as Agricultural Economist with the Ford Foundation, and was particularly involved with the early work that led to the Green Revolution. During this time he was also a consultant to the World Bank. Finally, between 1966 and 1970, Hopper held the position of Associate Field Director, Indian Agricultural Program, for the Rockefeller Foundation.

As a result of this rich experience, Hopper was cognizant of the mood of development aid, which he described as being one of "aid weariness", not only on the part of the donor nations, but also among the recipients. With respect to the latter, the President explained:

"It is a weariness born of being too long a supplicant suffering the donor's quiet arrogance and his implicit denial of sovereign equality. In the case of research institutions that play a donor role, this recipient weariness is aggravated by a fear that the alleged benefits of collaboration are in reality illusory." (20)

In order to mitigate this recipient weariness, fear and distrust, Dr. Hopper felt that three ingredients were essential: (a) the willingness of the Centre to sustain its interest and support, (b) the competency of the non-local personnel, and (c) a unique style of operation - geared to "responsiveness" to the requirements of developing regions.

The third ingredient - the ideal of a responsive style - reflects the philosophical stance with which Dr. Hopper interpreted the Act and dealt with the smorgasbord of ideas conceived by those individuals who preceded him. His prime purpose was to put the organization not at the edge of the Canadian perception of what would be useful in the LDCs, but at the edge of the developing countries' perception. In pursuing such a purpose, several previously conceived concepts had to suffer.

Firstly, the element of mutual benefit, considered fundamentally important to this point, was pushed very much into the background. The theme of the Centre being a Ford Foundation for Canadian scholars - an idea fostered by Irving Brecher and Stuart Peters - clearly

did not fit into Dr. Hopper's vision of responsiveness to the LDC needs. Consequently, as was stated at the outset of this paper, the objective of mutual benefit was transformed into that of mutual cooperation, implying that, when useful, basic research might be carried out in Canada to help solve LDC problems.

Secondly, Dr. Hopper's new style did not envisage "the early creation in Ottawa of a large inhouse research capacity, nor the residence of more than a few very senior research workers." (21) He expected that the major portion of the Centre's resources would flow to institutions and professionals in the developing countries. Moreover, he proposed that resources be used to supplement locally supported activities. In short, he was advocating research activities in, for, and initiated and executed by the developing countries. Obviously, such a viewpoint was not conducive to a Canadian think-tank operation, even if such an operation involved some contracting out of research. The emphasis was to be on promoting indigenous self-reliance. As a result, as mentioned above, objective (b) of the Act:

"to assist the developing regions to build up the  
research capabilities, the innovative skills and  
the institutions required to solve their problems

was given "particular pride of place."

Finally, the stance against inhouse activities, together with the ideal of responsiveness, had important implications for the objective of coordination of efforts. With respect to the data-bank legacy, neither Dr. Hopper nor John Woolston, Director of Information Sciences, felt that the new and inexperienced Centre could, or should,

undertake to establish a large inhouse capacity. (Recall Plumptre's similar scepticism previously ) It seemed more logical for the Centre to devote its resources, through the strength of a separate information Division, to the improvement of existing, or the initiation of new efforts within the U.N. family. Thus, the data-bank concept was put into a realistic working relationship within the Centre's activities. The second aspect of coordination, mentioned at the beginning of this paper, was entirely Hopper-initiated. In order to be responsive to LDC requirements - both with respect to the coordination of research efforts and the articulation of priorities by LDC professionals themselves - Dr. Hopper proposed the building up of "research networks" within the developing countries:

".....we would open a wider traffic in international scholarly exchanges by building into our collaborative understandings substantial support for visits and meetings amongst researchers within and between the developing regions." (22)

The third type of coordination - close informal links with other development bodies - was considered usual procedure for any organization. However, the important role of the IDRC in the Regional Centres, as will be discussed in the Conclusion of this paper, was the result of the initiative of the Executive and Officers of the Centre.

\* \* \* \*

The above discussion includes the salient features of Dr. Hopper's philosophy as outlined in his Inaugural Speech

in October, 1970. In order to implement his proposals, Hopper selected his senior staff and secured the seal of approval of the Board of Governors. In order to throw light on the importance of the staff and Board, it is first necessary to examine in greater depth Hopper's conception of responsiveness. Through what mechanism, and to what extent, has the Centre been able to achieve the ideal of responsiveness; i.e., the ideal of research in, for, and initiated and executed by the developing countries?

The mechanism facilitating the achievement of the ideal of responsiveness is implicit in the "philosophy of the dialogue". The "response" is a dialogue between Centre professionals and those in the developing regions. Out of this dialogue comes the final shape of the projects.

In order to promote such dialogue, three ingredients are essential: (a) first rate professionals on the Centre's staff, (b) the placing of responsibility for projects on the developing country researchers themselves, and (c) the maintenance of flexibility throughout the programs.

In concrete terms, the dialogue is initiated by travelling on the part of Centre staff. The purpose of travel is twofold: firstly, to identify people and institutes capable of absorbing resources; secondly, in talking to LDC people, to discover what the priorities are and to reflect these back and forth. When it becomes clear that there are several countries interested in the same priority, a workshop is called. In this way, "research networks" are established

in the developing countries. Out of the work-shop meetings may come specific projects, or at least an awareness amongst the participants of what is being done in other areas, thus facilitating the coordination of research. If research activities do emerge from such workshops, the participants themselves are responsible for shaping the final projects, and for monitoring and evaluating the progress. Throughout the duration of the projects, flexibility is maintained.

To the extent that the IDRC has "discovered" the priorities and brought people together, perhaps it could be argued that the Centre is pointing a direction. However, it is not an action which is distorting the priorities of the developing countries themselves. It is the danger of distortion that must be continually guarded against. Therefore, there is a very narrow line between abdicating professionalism and being responsive. Without David Hopper's lead, this line would be extremely difficult to walk.

The extent to which the Centre can be responsive to the developing countries varies from Division to Division. In Social Sciences and Human Resources, it is critical that the Centre be responsive. Because it touches so closely on philosophy, culture, etc., there is a strong suspicion and concern in the developing countries with respect to pressure from outside. Also, it is difficult to determine priorities in this field. Therefore, workshops are essential as mechanisms for identifying projects. In Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences, on the other hand, the LDCs are still very receptive because there is complete agreement between donors and recipients with respect to the

ultimate objectives. Therefore the LDCs accept the infusion of outside knowledge and people in order to achieve their needs. Because the priorities are more obvious in the hard sciences, workshops are not essential as mechanisms for identifying projects. However, they are becoming increasingly more important in order to define new areas for research. The Population and Health Sciences Division lies somewhere between the social and hard sciences. In the population area, the Division has been extremely responsive; in health, where more basic research is needed, there has been less direct response. However, in both areas projects are seldom undertaken without work-shop meetings beforehand. The chief exception to the rule of responsiveness is in the Information Sciences Division - which is primarily a developed country activity. There is not, moreover, the infrastructure in the developing countries to warrant many workshops; for, although there are libraries in the LDCs, the librarians are not accustomed to making proposals to international organizations. Information Sciences is a fairly new concept, and therefore LDC librarians do not have the similar experience or expertise in suggesting proposals as do their fellow social science academics or agricultural researchers.

However, notwithstanding the Divisional differences with respect to the extent to which the ideal can be implemented, there exists in all the Centre's operations a sensitivity to the fundamental importance of responsiveness to the needs of the developing countries.



Part B - The Senior Staff of the IDRC

As was discussed above, the responsive style of the Centre is achieved through a dialogue between professionals of the Centre and the developing countries. In order to initiate and sustain this dialogue, Hopper deemed it essential that the Centre's senior staff be first rate professionals with experience in the developing countries. The President made this very clear in his Inaugural Speech to the Board of Governors:

"In assembling the staff of the Centre it is my intention to hire only from among those whose professional dedication and capability are without question. And I intend to select from among this group for career appointment only those who demonstrate a sensitivity to and a respect for the personal and cultural heritage of their colleagues and associates in the developing regions." (23)

In order to implement this intention, Hopper selected competent professionals to direct the four divisions. (In doing so, he built around academic disciplines rather than geographic divisions.) Moreover, all of these individuals - with the exception of John Woolston, who was to direct a basically DC activity - had had extensive experience in the developing countries. (See Appendix for curricula vitae).

Joseph Hulse (Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences), had for sixteen years been actively involved in international development in the fields of agriculture, food, and nutrition. From 1954 to 1961, he was Head of Food and Nutrition Research, Defence Research Board of Canada. For the next six years, he was Director of

Research, Maple Leaf Mills. Between 1967 and 1969 he held positions at the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) as Assistant Director, Nutrition Division, and Head of Food and Agriculture Industries Development. Finally, in 1970, Hulse was a Special Advisor to the President of the Canadian International Development Agency.

George Brown (Population and Health Sciences)

M.D., M.P.H., had enjoyed a long LDC experience in population and health involving four years in Iran, Algeria, Senegal and Ivory Coast (1965-69), two years in Tunisia and Morocco (1964-66), and one year in Haiti (1962-63). His background in the DCs (U.S., Canada) included membership on the overseas staff of the Population Council Inc., New York (1966-69), and the position of Special Advisor at the Canadian International Development Agency.

Ruth Zagorin (Social Sciences and Human Resources),

M.A., Ph.B., had acquired five years experience in the developing countries - serving as administrator and consultant in the field of education in India (1959-63), and as consultant to the Department of Social Welfare in the Phillipines (1968-69). In the developed world (U.S.), she had functioned as consultant, advisor, and special assistant to the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C. (1964-67, and 1969-70), and was a participant on the Presidential Task Force on Poverty in America (1964).

John Woolston (Information Sciences) B.Sc., had an internationally oriented background in information. Between 1953 and 1967, he formed and headed the Technical Information Branch of the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. In 1967, he was appointed Director, Division

of Scientific and Technical Information, International Atomic Energy Agency (Vienna). During this period (1967-70), he designed and established the International Nuclear Information System.

Part C - The Board of Governors

According to the Act of Parliament establishing the Centre, the Board of Governors is empowered to "appoint such officers, agents and employees as are necessary for the proper conduct of the work of the Centre." Therefore, the initial task of the first Board was to formally appoint the senior staff which the President had selected. In addition, the Board put the seal of approval on the vision of David Hopper. The manner in which this approval has been given can best be perceived through an examination of the nature and activities of the Board of Governors. The first Board, Chaired by The Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, was composed of the following members:

- \* The Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson,  
Chairman of the Board of Governors,  
Ottawa, Canada.
- \* Louis Berlinguet,  
Vice-Chairman of the Board of Governors,  
Chairman of the Executive Committee,  
Quebec City, Canada.
- \* W. David Hopper,  
President and Chief Executive Officer,  
Ottawa, Canada.
- Pierre Bauchet,  
Paris, France.
- \* John G. Bene,  
Vancouver, Canada.
- \* C. Fred Bentley,  
Edmonton, Canada.

Irving Brecher,  
Montreal, Canada

\* Roberto Campos,  
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

John Crawford,  
Canberra, Australia

A. L. Dias,  
Calcutta, India

Rene Dubos,  
New York City, U. S. A.

Lila Engberg,  
Guelph, Canada

Paul Gérin-Lajoie,  
Ottawa, Canada.

\* Lady Jackson (Barbara Ward)  
London, England.

Ralph M. Medjuck,  
Halifax, Canada.

\* Rex M. Nettleford,  
Kingston, Jamaica.

\* H. A. Oluwasanmi,  
Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

\* A.F.W. Plumptre,  
Toronto, Canada.

M. Sankalé  
Dakar, Senegal.

Maurice F. Strong,  
UN Conference on the Human Environment,  
Geneva Switzerland.

\* Puey Ungphakorn,  
Bangkok, Thailand.

\* - Member of the Executive Committee

As was mentioned in the Introduction of this paper, one of the most striking examples of the independence of the Centre is inherent in the international nature of the Board of Governors. Under the Act, ten of the twenty-one members can be non-Canadians. Accordingly, as the above list indicates, the first Board was composed of eleven Canadian Governors, six from the LDCs, and four from developed countries (U.S.A., U.K., France, and Australia).

It has been suggested that the decisions of the Board (which have given approval to Hopper's philosophy of responsiveness) "have gained, both in quality and also in authority, from its international character." (24) Firstly, with respect to quality, the Act stipulates that at least eleven Governors "must have experience in the field of international development or experience or training in the natural or social sciences or technology." In fact, the original six from abroad were "persons of very high standing and reputation as well as very wide experience." (25) As for authority, the relationship between the international character of the first Board and the fact that Hopper's concepts could be implemented has been explained by Plumptre as follows:

"As for authority, I believe that the status of the Centre is enhanced, in the eyes of the Canadian Parliament, by its international character, and I feel sure that our relations with "host" Governments of countries and regions where our projects are being executed also responds to our international character. It conforms very closely with the policy of the Centre to support research not only for developing countries but also in developing countries and carried on, for the most part, by the researchers of the countries themselves." (26)

The Board, which meets twice annually, participates in the consideration of projects, policies, and personnel. At each meeting, the President "places before the Governors, both specific project proposals and also general policy proposals". (27) The Board has mitigated the problem of bureaucratic red tape by delegating to the President and Executive Committee the authority to approve all projects except the very large ones, which must go before the full Board for consideration. (28) Thus, the Executive is given the power to act quickly and flexibly when necessary. In addition, <sup>because</sup> the Board recognizes Hopper's conviction of the importance of senior staff competence, the Governors appoint, or re-appoint, the senior Officers annually. Since it is upon these Officers that the real burden lies for implementing the ideal of responsiveness, it is "difficult to overestimate the importance to be attached to the scrutiny of the Board of Governors".(29)

The Board, as has been noted above, is endowed by the legislation establishing the Centre with very wide and independent authority in matters of finance and administration. It has, however, exercised these powers with discretion, having regard to the fact that the headquarters of the Centre are located in Ottawa, where comparisons of salaries and working conditions are easily made, and the fact that the Canadian Parliament is the source of its funds.

## Conclusions

In retrospect, it appears that the current operations of the IDRC reflect a mixture of elimination and incorporation of the earlier conceptions of the Centre.

The legacy of the think-tank, the idea of a large inhouse data-bank, and the originally conceived element of mutual benefit, (implying a Ford Foundation role for Canadian academics), could not stand up to Dr. Hopper's concept of the Centre, despite the fact that they all received some support from the Board of Governors and a number of Canadian academics.

By contrast, the elements of internationalism, political independence, financial freedom and flexibility, and the focus on scientific and technological research into the problems of developing countries, clearly had their roots in the early conceptions of Maurice Strong. Moreover, the indigenization of research, which had received its first impetus from Plumptre's feasibility study, evolved into the concept of the promotion of LDC capabilities during the drafting stage.

Notwithstanding all of these inputs, the creation of a truly unique style, with its ideal of responsiveness to LDC requirements, is unquestionably the result of Hopper's leadership. Through the selection of a competent, experienced staff, and the support of the international Board of Governors, the President has implemented his proposals as outlined in the Inaugural speech. This assertion leads to the posing of a final question: what effect is the Centre's unique style having on the international community?



In his Inaugural Speech, Dr. Hopper stated that "it is the philosophy of approach to our endeavours that will establish the welcome accorded to the Centre among developing peoples." (30) It appears that, after 3½ years of operations, the Centre's responsive style has accorded it a high reputation in the developing countries. It has been suggested that there is an excitement on the part of the LDCs that a Canadian-based agency encourages a freedom for the developing countries to define and carry out their own programmes, with minimal supervision from the outside.

Perhaps one of the most important contributions of the IDRC is in the coordination of research efforts. Firstly, the Centre is one of the only agencies in the world which has a separate Information Division with substantial sums of money. Therefore, it is in a position to initiate world efforts in the field of data-banking. For example, the Information Division is initiating a study on the feasibility of an International Information System for the Development Sciences (DEVIS). It appears that this could result in an important break-through in data-banking. Secondly, the establishment of "south-south" research network represents a novel innovation in the coordination of efforts. "Because of the nature of most aid arrangements, it has been easier to bring an African or an Asian research worker to North America or Europe, or to send a North American or European to Africa or Asia, than to effect visits by Africans and Asians across their national and regional borders." (31) Thirdly, it seems that the Centre is playing an important role in the

Regional Agricultural Research Centres. (See reference 5). Together with the World Bank, the IDRC was active in the formation of the International Livestock Centre for Africa (ILCA) in Ethiopia. Also, there was IDRC staff on the survey team studying the feasibility of the International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISTAT) in India; and, in addition, Professor Bentley, member of IDRC's Board of Governors, became the first Chairman of ICRISTAT's Board. Moreover, once a year the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), chaired by the World Bank, holds a meeting of representatives of donor agencies and Regional Centres. Hopper, as a member of the Consultative Group's Technical Advisory Committee and Hulse, as the IDRC representative, attend these meetings. It has been suggested to the present author that Hopper and Hulse, through their past and present association with both the donor agencies and Regional Centres, have had some influence in facilitating dialogue between the two; thereby assisting the donor agencies to be more responsive to the priorities of the Regional Centres, and, by extension, the developing countries. Interestingly, there is presently a new move - initiated in part by the IDRC - to create a World Health Group similar to the agricultural family described above.

It is reasonable to assume that the Centre's style, with respect to its internationalism, may also be affecting the international community. At the time the IDRC was established, it was apparently unique in that the effort of indigenizing research was to be financed by Canadian tax money on the say of an international Board of Governors. This was a truly innovative contribution to development

assistance, and seems to have inspired many other agencies. No countries had tried this before, but apparently several are attempting it now.

Finally, it has been implied that older, established bodies, such as Ford and Rockefeller, have expressed a respect and envy for the independence, flexibility, and responsiveness of the IDRC. Although it is difficult for established agencies to change quickly, it seems possible that the Centre could have its impact on the longer-run planning of such organizations.

Hopefully, the positive impression that IDRC appears to be making on both recipients and other donor agencies can concurrently assist in the alleviation of aid weariness. Only through such an alleviation can a partnership between developed and developing countries be created, which "replaces fear with trust, suspicious withdrawal by eager collaboration". (32)

Reference and Notes -

- (1) International Development Research Centre Act, Assented to 13th May, 1970, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, 1st Supplement, Ch. 21.
- (2) Hopper, David, "Research Policy: Eleven Issues", Outline Statement to the Board of Governors of the International Development Research Centre at their meeting in Bogota, Colombia, March 19, 1973, IDRC-014e.
- (3) Ibid.
- (4) The Centre maintains close informal dialogue with several other donor agencies, important amongst which are:
  - Ford Foundation (U.S.)
  - Rockefeller (U.S.)
  - IBRD (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) and CGIAR (Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research)
  - Also other UN Specialized Agencies including FAO and WHO
  - UNDP (UN Development Program)
  - OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development)
  - CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency)
  - AID (U.S.)(Agency for International Development)
  - ODA (U.K.)(Office of Development Assistance)
  - Agencies in LDCs
- (5) The Regional Research Centres are as follows:
  - (i) CIAT - Centre for International Tropical Agriculture (Bogota, Colombia)
  - (ii) CIMMYT - International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre (Mexico City, Mexico)
  - \*(iii) CIP - International Potato Centre (Peru)
  - (iv) ICRISAT - International Crops Research for Semi-Arid Tropics (Hyderabad, India)

Reference and Notes (cont'd)

- (v) IITA - International Institute of Tropical Agriculture  
(Ibadan, Nigeria)
- (vi) ILCA - International Livestock Centre for Africa (Ethiopia)
- (vii) ILRAD - International Laboratory for Research on Animal  
Diseases (Kenya)
- (viii) IRRI - International Rice Research Institute (Phillipines)

\* The IDRC has had, or is presently engaged in, projects in all of the Centres except CIP.

- (6) Annual Report, 1972-73, Table B - Program Projects Approved to March 31, 1973 (Cumulative Total), pg. 57.
- (7) Ironically, Strong now holds honorary degrees from Queen's, Sir George Williams, Brandon, Calgary, Guelph, Ottawa, W. Ontario, Toronto and St. Francis Xavier Universities.
- (8) Pearson, The Right Hon. Lester B., Speech Delivered to the Canadian Political Science Association, Carleton University, June 8, 1967.
- (9) Plumptre, A.F.W., "Proposed International Development Research Institution", Jan. 24, 1968.
- (10) Ibid.
- (11) Ibid.
- (12) Ibid.
- (13) Ibid
- (14) Ibid
- (15) Ibid.

Reference and Notes (cont'd)

- (16) The Task Force did not generally act as a unit. In fact, only one meeting of the members was held, organized by Plumptre at Scarborough College.
- (17) After a short time, Doe was pulled away from the mainstream of activities, and devoted his time to the aspect of information.
- (18) Sharp, The Hon. Mitchell, Speech on International Development Research Centre, Delivered in the House of Commons, January 12th, 1970.
- (19) Strong, Maurice, Testimony before Subcommittee on International Development Assistance, Issue #13 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Committee (External Affairs and National Defence)
- (20) Hopper, David, "Statement to the Inaugural Meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Development Research Centre", Ottawa, Canada, October 26, 1970.
- (21) Ibid.
- (22) Ibid.
- (23) Ibid.
- (24) Plumptre, A.F.W. Letter sent to Canadian University Service Overseas, February 21, 1974.
- (25) Ibid.
- (26) Ibid.
- (27) Ibid.
- (28) The President can approve any project up to a value of \$ 50,000.00 and the Executive Committee can approve any project up to \$ 650,000.00.

Reference and Notes (cont'd)

- (29) Plumptre, A.F.W., Letter sent to Canadian University Overseas, February 21, 1974.
- (30) Hopper, David, "Statement to the Inaugural Meeting .....", op.cit.
- (31) Ibid.
- (32) Ibid.

## APPENDIX

J. H. Hulse, Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences.

### Professional Background

- 1954 - 1961 Head of Food & Nutrition Research, Defence Research Board of Canada
- 1961 - 1967 Director of Research, Maple Leaf Mills
- 1967 - 1969 (a) Assistant Director, Nutrition Division, FAO.  
(b) Head of Food and Agricultural Industries Development, FAO
- 1970 - Special Adviser to the President of the Canadian International Development Agency.
- 1970 - Programme Director, Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences, IDRC.

### Honorary and Voluntary Appointments:

- 1954 - 1961 Canadian Representative on the Commonwealth Defence Food Science Committee.
- 1958 - President, Canadian Institute of Food Technology
- 1960 - 1967 Canadian Representative to the International Union of Food Science and Technology
- 1967 - 1969 FAO Representative to the International Union of Food Science and Technology.
- 1954 - 1967 Member (for two years as Vice-Chairman) of Canadian Committee on Fats and Oils
- 1954 - 1961 Member of the Canadian Committee on Food Preservation.
- 1961-1967 Member of the Grain Research Committee of the National Research Council.
- 1966 - Member of the President of NRC Special Review Committee on Grain Research in Canada.
- 1962 - 1965 Vice-Chairman of the Canadian National Freedom From Hunger Committee and Chairman of the Canada-Mysore Project.



- 1964 - 1967 Chairman of the Canadian National Freedom from Hunger Committee and Chairman of the Canadian Hunger Foundation.
- 1970 - Special Adviser and Consultant to U Thant the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the World Protein Problem.
- 1970 - Member of the Defence Research Board of Canada Advisory Committee on Nutrition and Metabolism.

George F. Brown, Population and Health Sciences

Date of Birth: February 2, 1936

Nationality: Canadian

Marital Status: Married

Education:

1961 - M. D. Degree, University of Toronto, Faculty of Medicine

1964 - Master of Public Health Degree, Harvard University, School of Public Health

Professional Background

1961-62 - Internship, Kaiser Foundation Hospital, San Francisco

1962-63 - International Medical Practice, CARE/MEDICO Team in Haiti

1964-66 - Medical adviser in family planning to the Governments of Tunisia and Morocco

1966-69 - Member of the overseas staff of the Population Council Inc., New York

1965-69 - Special missions to Iran, Algeria, Senegal and Ivory Coast in association with Ford Foundation, World Health Organization and Population Council.

1970 - Special Adviser, Public Health and Population to the Canadian International Development Agency.

Ruth Kramer Zagorin, Social Sciences and Human Resources

Date of Birth: June 19, 1922

Nationality: American

Marital Status: Married

Education:

- Ph.B., University of Chicago
- M. A., History, University of Chicago

Professional Background

February, 1970

to Present - Consultant and Acting Director Special Projects, IDRC.

1969 - 1970 - Consultant, Tracor Computer Corporation, Washington, D.C. Working on proposals for the Office of Economic Opportunity, Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Dept. of Housing and Urban Affairs, and the Peace Corps.

1968-69 - Consultant to the Department of Social Welfare, Government of the Philippines.

1966-67 - Advisor to Director and member of Information Analysis Staff, Information Centre, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C.

1964-66 - Special Assistant to the Director and Chief of the Reference and Inquiry Branch, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C.

1964 - Participant on Presidential Task Force on Poverty in America.

1962-63 - Special Consultant to World University Service to review facilities for students at 21 selected Indian Universities, New Delhi, India.

1962 - Contracted by the United States Information Service to prepare materials on educational opportunities in the United States available to Indian students, New Delhi, India.

Ruth Kramer Zagorin, Social Sciences and Human Resources (cont'd)

- 1960-61 - Principal, Jr. Senior High School, American International School, New Delhi, India.
- 1959-60 - Member School Board and Consultant on the Development of New School Facilities, American International School, New Delhi, India.
- 1957-59 - Director, Cooperative Pre-School, Fall Church, VA.
- 1949-56 - Housewife, self-employed in making comprehensive survey of the British educational system, London, England.
- 1947-48 - Instructor in History, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois.
- 1946-47 - Employed by the University of Chicago to review and evaluate the University's Home Study Program, Chicago, Ill.

John E. Woolston, Information Sciences

Date of Birth: 1924

Nationality: Canadian

Marital Status:

Education:

1944 - B.Sc. (Honours Physics) University of London,  
King's College

1947-48 - Graduate Studies at University of Paris, France

Professional Background:

1944-47 - National service with U.K. Ministry of Supply  
(electronics research and administration of  
university and industrial research contracts)

1948-50 - Headquarters administration work at Department  
of Scientific and Industrial Research, London,  
England.

1950-53 - Assistant to the Director, U.K. Scientific Mission,  
Washington, D. C. (scientific liaison work, mostly  
on computer development)

1953-67 - Staff appointment in Office of the Vice-President  
(Science), Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Chalk  
River. Later formed and headed AECL's Technical  
Information Branch. Member, NRC Associate  
Committee on Scientific Information. Member,  
Editorial Board of Canadian Nuclear Technology.  
Member, Canadian Delegations to U.N. Conferences  
on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva, 1955,  
1958, 1964. Represented Canada at various inter-  
national meetings in Vienna and Washington.

1967-70 Director, Division of Scientific and Technical  
Information, International Atomic Energy Agency,  
Vienna. Responsible for an annual budget of  
\$US1.5 million and a staff of 85. Division

John E. Woolston, Information Sciences (cont'd)

operated Agency's IBM 360 computer and the Library; it also organized the Agency's program of scientific conferences (about 15 each year, including many away from Vienna). Main project was the design and establishment of the International Nuclear Information System - see attached reprint. When he left Vienna in July the system had been operating for four months and 33 countries were committed to participate.