FORGING THE LINK BETWEEN FAITH AND DEVELOPMENT:

THE HISTORY OF THE

CANADIAN CATHOLIC ORGANIZATION FOR

DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE

1967 - 1982

By

Peter Ernest Baltutis

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of Theology of the University of Saint Michael’s College
and the Historical Department of the Toronto School of Theology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Theology
Awarded by the University of Saint Michael’s College.

© Copyright by Peter E. Baltutis 2012
ABSTRACT

This dissertation is the first historical examination of the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace (CCODP), the official international development organization of the Catholic Church in Canada. Founded in 1967 by the Canadian bishops as a response to the Second Vatican Council’s “The Church in the Modern World” (Gaudium et Spes, 1965), Development and Peace was entrusted with a two-fold mandate: to provide financial support for socio-economic development projects in the so-called “Third World” (Latin America, Africa, and Asia) and to educate Canadians about the causes of global injustice. After fifteen years of experience, dialogue with local partners, and critical reflection, CCODP experienced a substantial maturation in how it understood its mandate. From 1967 to 1982, Development and Peace was transformed from a seasonal fundraising agency with a paternalistic understanding of economic development into a nationwide democratic movement that facilitated year-round educational campaigns and supported a proactive vision of social, political, economic and cultural development.

This dissertation explores the evolution of Development and Peace’s understanding of its original mandate across three main themes. First, CCODP’s approach to international development slowly advanced beyond providing primarily economic assistance to a program of development that supported social, political, economic and cultural liberation. Fifteen years of field experience taught CCODP that lasting improvement in the Third World could only be
achieved through projects that provided skills to members of local communities to take charge of their own lives and press for structural change. Second, Development and Peace expanded its education program from an isolated fundraising experience into an integrated year-long educational enterprise. During these years, the pedagogical approach of CCODP’s Canadian education campaign moved from promotion to education to action. Third, Development and Peace spent much time and energy creating a democratic movement of active members across Canada that was empowered to guide the basic principles and orientation of the organization. Drawing theological inspiration from post-conciliar Catholic social teaching (Populorum Progressio, the Medellín Conference in 1968, and “Justice in the World”), Development and Peace became an active participant in the liberation of the world through solidarity, structural change and advocacy.
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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is the first historical examination of the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace (CCODP). Development and Peace was founded in 1967 by the Canadian bishops as a response to the Second Vatican Council’s “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World” (*Gaudium et Spes*) that, in 1965, called Catholics to engage the modern world and to promote justice for the poor. Taking its name and ethos from Pope Paul VI’s influential social encyclical on international development from 1967, “On the Development of Peoples” (*Populorum Progressio*)—that proclaimed “Development is the new name for Peace”¹—CCODP served as the official international development organization of the Catholic Church in Canada. From the outset, CCODP operated with a two-fold mandate: to provide financial support for socio-economic development projects in the so-called “Third World” (Latin America, Africa, and Asia) and to educate Canadians about the causes of global inequality and injustice. While this mandate remained unchanged, the organization would need fifteen years of experience, dialogue with partners in the Third World, and critical reflection to arrive at a notion of development that was consistent with Catholic social teaching and to create a structural organization to actualize it. From 1967 to 1982, Development and Peace was transformed from a seasonal fundraising agency with a paternalistic understanding of economic development into a nationwide democratic movement that facilitated year-round educational campaigns and supported a proactive vision of social, political, economic and cultural development in the Third World.²

¹ This is the sub-title for the final section of the encyclical (sections #76-87). Pope Paul VI, *“Populorum Progressio: On the Development of Peoples,”* in *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*, eds. David J. O’Brien and Thomas A. Shannon (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992), #76.

² There is no consensus in the international development community over which term best classifies the poorer regions of the world (which are concentrated in Latin America, Africa, Asia and the Middle East). Thus, the terms “developing countries,” “Third World,” “Global South,” or “Two-Thirds World” are often used interchangeably (although, technically, each term employs different criteria and, as a result, may include or exclude
The maturation of Development and Peace’s understanding of its original mandate is explored in three main themes. First, CCODP’s approach to international development slowly evolved from providing primarily economic assistance into a program of development that supported social, political, economic and cultural rights. During its early years, CCODP operated with a “paternalistic” approach of providing funding to the poorest regions of the world without any genuine collaboration with their partners outside of Canada. Realizing the limitations of this traditional donor-recipient relationship (where one side held all the power), in 1972 Development and Peace implemented a radical new model of “partnership” that sought to empower local communities through co-responsibility in decision making. Another important moment came at the influential CCODP international seminar of 1975. From this point forward, the organization adopted the analysis that underdevelopment in the Third World could no longer be explained in terms of a technological gap; rather it was the provoked phenomenon of an unjust international economic system. As a result, Development and Peace realized that development could not be realized by simply providing large infusions of financial help from the outside. By the late 1970s, CCODP had expanded its understanding of development to helping people liberate themselves from all forms of social, political, economic and cultural oppression. Projects still focused upon improving the economic vitality of regions, but they also branched out to include promoting human rights and mobilizing local groups for political change. People of the Third World were empowered to be the architects of their own development.

---

certain countries from these regions). The term “Third World” was first employed during the Cold War to define countries that remained non-aligned with either the “First World” capitalist countries of NATO or the “Second World” communist countries led by the Soviet Union. Since “Third World” was the term universally employed by CCODP during 1967-1982, I have decided to use this term in this dissertation.
Second, Development and Peace expanded its education program from an isolated fundraising experience into an integrated year-long educational enterprise. Initially, the organization’s educational activities were limited to providing information for the annual Lenten fundraising campaigns. Each year, however, the organization devoted an increasing amount of human and financial resources towards this half of the mandate. In 1970, the first two animateurs were hired (one for each linguistic sector of the country) to establish a network of members and to build awareness of the problems experienced by the peoples of the Third World (by 1982, thirty-three CCODP employees served the two education sectors).

Gradually, special information kits were prepared for outside of Lent, and by 1978, two types of permanent solidarity campaigns were established making the educational program a true annual operation. The “Lent campaign” educated Canadians on the global aspects of underdevelopment and the “fall campaign” focused on a particular country and proposed actions (such as mailing cards to political prisoners in South Africa). Both campaigns were unified under a single theme and were prepared in collaboration with Third World partners. By 1982, the education materials no longer asked Canadians to give “aid” to the developing world, but it to be in “solidarity” with it.

Third, Development and Peace spent much time and energy creating a dynamic and democratic movement of active members across Canada that was empowered to guide the orientation and operations of the organization. While the Canadian bishops created CCODP, they did not view the work of development and solidarity as theirs alone. Rather—consciously

---

drawing upon Vatican II’s “Dogmatic Constitution on the Church” (*Lumen Gentium*) that defined the Church as the “People of God”\(^5\)—all Catholics (bishops, priests, religious and laypeople) were called to fulfill these objectives. Thus, the Board of Governors for Development and Peace (the ultimate decision-making body for the organization) was comprised of twenty-one individuals: nineteen members of the laity who were democratically elected from across Canada and two bishops who were appointed by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCB),\(^6\) one for English Canada and one for French Canada. Over its first fifteen years, the governors worked hard to grow local sections of CCODP in each diocese. These local sections were made-up of active volunteers who came together to implement the education campaigns, coordinate the Share Lent fundraising campaign, and submit annual recommendations to the national Board of Governors on the orientation and operations of the organization. Members of the organization were also empowered to guide the policies of CCODP by serving on the project review committees (that determined which international project request were to receive funding) and the education committees (that prepared, developed and evaluated the educational campaigns for each linguistic sector). The ultimate example of member participation was, from 1977-1982, Development and Peace conducted an extensive national consultation that surveyed all members of the organization in order to formulate CCODP’s basic principles and orientation for the future. By 1982, Development and Peace was no longer an agency but a true pan-Canada movement.


\(^6\) The national episcopal conference for Canadian bishops was known as the Canadian Catholic Conference (CCC) from 1943 until 1977, when it became the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCB) to emphasize it was the association of bishops. Throughout this thesis, CCC is used for events prior to 1977 and CCCB for subsequent events.
While Development and Peace has played an important role in the Canadian Church and in the development community, it has been largely ignored by scholars. The only published work on CCODP was *Journey of Solidarity: The Story of Development of Peace*, a collection of thirty-one essays written by those connected to the organization (members, employees, bishops and international partners) in 1992 to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the organization. Given the democratic nature of the movement, the authors consciously represented a diversity of gender, language, and region (within Canada and the developing world). These personal reflections were an invaluable resource to this dissertation, since they provided unique insights into the evolving identity of CCODP from those who worked within the movement (many of whom have since passed away or are of advanced age). On the other hand, these essays were intentionally written as “historical reflections” and they were not intended to be a definitive history. Thus, the essays (written for a general audience) are of varying length, depth and quality. Another difficulty, for this project, is that the book was arranged thematically, with little attention given to providing a proper historical chronology of the organization.

Despite the lack of studies exclusively on Development and Peace, numerous scholars have turned their attention to the development of Catholic social teaching in Canada in the years following Vatican II. In particular, much interest has been shown to the statements from the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCB). Previously only printed in individual copies and difficult to obtain, the CCCB social statements, briefs and letters were compiled by theologian Edward F. Sheridan, SJ and published with a lengthy introduction in two book-length volumes.

---

7 Susan Eaton, Gabrielle Lachance, Fabien Leboeuf, and Eileen McCarthy, eds., *Journey of Solidarity: The Story of Development and Peace* (Ottawa: Novalis, 1992). It is worth noting that this work is not well known to scholars or those outside of CCODP. This work is not contained in the University of Toronto library system, which is one of the most extensive in the world. I was generously given a copy by the CCODP office in Toronto.
collections, in 1987 and in 1991 (which used a wider definition of “social teaching”). Comparing these episcopal documents from the 1950s to those of the 1980s, theologian Lee Cormie argued that Canadian Catholic social teaching underwent a fundamental revolution after the Second Vatican Council. Exploring this theme in greater detail, Robert McKeon wrote an unpublished doctoral dissertation on the birth, growth, and decline of a distinct “paradigm” of Canadian Catholic social justice that existed from 1965-1991. While McKeon’s study of the period offers a thorough theological analysis of post-conciliar social teaching in Canada, the scope of his project was limited to the initiatives of the Canadian bishops (thus relegating CCODP to only a few footnotes). Narrative accounts of the historical development of the social teaching of the Canadian bishops—as a complement to the theological perspective of Cormie and McKeon—were written by Peter Baltutis, Joe Gunn and Monica Lambton, and Bernard Daly.

Popular, accessible presentations of Canadian Catholic social justice were also prepared by leading figures from within this movement. Bishop Remi De Roo of Victoria published a book articulating the vision of “Ethical Reflection on the Economic Crisis,” the landmark statement by the CCCB in 1983 on social justice that was the subject of newspaper headlines

---

13 Joe Gunn and Monica Lambton, *Calling Out the Prophetic Tradition: A Jubilee of Social Teaching from the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops* (Ottawa: Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1999).
and legislative debates all across the country.\textsuperscript{15} Former social policy advisor for the CCCB during this period, Tony Clarke, also wrote an autobiographical account of the broader Canadian Catholic and ecumenical social justice movement from 1972 to 1994.\textsuperscript{16} In 1987, one of Canada’s best known theologians, Gregory Baum, delivered the prestigious Massey Lectures on CBC Radio on the post-Vatican II faith and justice movements in the Canadian churches and internationally.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, a biography of William Ryan, SJ, one of the leading Canadian voices for social and religious change, provided a helpful overview of the application of Catholic social teaching during the latter half of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{18}

Interest in social justice was not limited to the Catholic Church during this period. A hallmark of the late 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s was ecumenical cooperation among Canada’s five major Christian churches (Presbyterian, Lutheran, United Church of Canada, Catholic and Anglican Church of Canada) for economic and social justice.\textsuperscript{19} Key statements from these Christian churches on public issues were published, with commentary, by John R. Williams.\textsuperscript{20} Specialized essays on the innovative faith-based national social justice coalitions were compiled by Christopher Lind and Joseph Mihevc.\textsuperscript{21} A theological assessment of the church-related “liberationist” activity during this period was carried out by Oscar Cole-Arnal.\textsuperscript{22} Despite this plethora of theological investigations into the influence of Vatican II on the theology and praxis

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{16} Tony Clarke, \textit{Behind the Mitre: the Moral Leadership Crisis in the Canadian Catholic Church} (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1995).
\textsuperscript{17} Gregory Baum, \textit{Compassion and Solidarity: the Church for Others} (Toronto: CBC Enterprises, 1987).
\textsuperscript{18} Bob Chodos and Jamie Swift, \textit{Faith and Freedom: The Life and Times of Bill Ryan, sj} (Ottawa: Novalis, 2002).
\textsuperscript{21} Christopher Lind and Joseph Mihevc, eds., \textit{Coalitions for Justice: the Story of Canada's Interchurch Coalitions} (Ottawa: Novalis, 1994).
\textsuperscript{22} Oscar Cole-Arnal, \textit{To Set the Captives Free: Liberation Theology in Canada} (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1998).
\end{flushleft}
of Catholic social teaching in Canada, this literature is limited to a discussion of episcopal statements and ecumenical coalitions. This dissertation will be unique in that it will investigate the dimensions of Canadian Catholic social justice from the perspective of Development and Peace, which was a lay-directed democratic organization.

While deeply immersed in the life of the Canadian Church, Development and Peace was also engaged in the field of international development. To understand the complexities of development, a most helpful resource was Poverty and Development into the 21st Century edited by Tim Allen and Alan Thomas. This text, widely used by universities as the standard textbook for development studies, is a compilation of essays on such topics as the differing conceptions of poverty and development, the evolution of the idea of development, and the global politics of development. While an excellent introduction to the diverse field of international development, the work makes no reference to faith-based development organizations. As a non-governmental organization (NGO), CCODP received matching funds for its international projects from the Government of Canada through the NGO division of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The history of CIDA was carefully chronicled in the magisterial Aid and Ebb Tide: A History of CIDA and Canadian Development Assistance by David R. Morrison. While exquisitely detailed, nowhere in this 450 page tome was there any mention of Development and Peace (despite being one of the largest recipients of the CIDA/NGO funding) or any other religious NGOs. Nonetheless, the work was enormously helpful in contextualizing the development work of CCODP. The best assessment of the unique

---

24 In 2012, Conservative government budget cuts to CIDA and a refocusing of CIDA priorities saw a dramatic cut in the funds received from CIDA by Development and Peace.
relationship between CIDA and Canadian NGOs is the article by Tim Broadhead and Cranford Pratt in *Canadian International Development Assistance Policies: An Appraisal*.\(^\text{26}\) In all of these works on development, there is no mention of the role played by faith-based organizations.

Without the benefit of any secondary studies on Development and Peace, this dissertation is based on an abundance of primary sources. Extensive use was made of the archival collection at the CCODP head office in Montreal.\(^\text{27}\) My point of entry into this complex organization was through the meetings of the Board of Governors (later renamed the National Council in 1981) and the Executive Committee. The Board of Governors was the primary decision-making body for the organization and had ultimate responsibility for the management of its affairs. It was made up of nineteen elected members from across Canada and two representatives from the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops. This body convened twice a year, usually in June and November. Also present at each of these bi-annual meetings were the directors of the National Secretariat (the permanent staff hired by the Board of Governors to manage the organization). These directors presented detailed reports on the education programme in Canada (separate reports were given by the French and English Sectors), the international development projects, and the general administration of the organization. Interestingly, the governors also deliberated over recommendations from each of the annual provincial meetings (which provided helpful spotlights onto issues of importance for the local, diocesan or provincial sections). The Executive Committee was a group of eight


\(^\text{27}\) Development and Peace never had a professional archivist, yet the organization did an impressive job of preserving and classifying its important documentation. Due to spatial concerns several years ago, all of the paper documents were scanned and discarded, thus the collection exists only in digital format. Without any formal system of classification, I have created a system of citation for these documents that, hopefully, allows the reader to easily identify the document being cited and, if desired, to locate the document at the Archives of the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace [ACCODP].
governors who were elected by the full board to function as the main decision-making body between meetings of the National Council. This committee met three times a year (in March, June and November). The recorded minutes are a reliable account of these bodies as they were recorded by a designated secretary, signed by the secretary and the president (ensuring accuracy), and then approved by the entire board at the next meeting (sometimes requiring corrections before approval). On average, each of the five meetings throughout the year produced approximately 200 pages of material.

Also helpful in the CCODP archives were issues of the national newspapers of Development and Peace: *News Views* (1971-1976) and *Solidarités/The Global Village Voice* (1976-present), for French-speaking Canada and English-speaking Canada, respectively. Published by the National Secretariat, these periodicals were the main vehicle for CCODP to share information about the organization (on a national level) with its diocesan and local sections, as well as with the general public. These papers also frequently explored issues of global current events, both within and outside the Catholic community.

Since CCODP was created under the auspices of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCB), and the fact that two bishops continued to serve as governors, the Archives of the CCCB (located in Ottawa) contained a large collection of documents on Development and Peace. The CCCB holdings were especially strong in the early years before CCODP was an independent organization and on the thorny topic of relations between CCODP and the CCCB.

As thorough as these archival collections were in preserving the documentary history of CCODP, they cannot accurately convey the lived experience of the organization. To gain an “insider” perspective, I conducted a series of ongoing interviews with active members of the
organization from 1967-1982. Mike Flynn (originally hired in 1968, one of the first animateurs, a staff member of the projects department, and eventually Director of the English Sector); Fabien Leboeuf (hired in 1976 as the coordinator of the education program for the French Sector, later Director of the Projects Department, and eventually Executive Director of CCODP), and Michel Côté, OP (attended every Board of Governors and Executive Committee meeting—as well as many of the animateur and staff meetings—since 1970 serving as the official French-English translator of CCODP). In addition to these interviews, many of the articles in Journey to Solidarity also provided a privileged view into life within Development and Peace during this formative period under investigation. These “insider” perspectives on the organization served as an indispensable complement to my archival research.

This first history of Development and Peace is presented in four major chapters that are divided chronologically. It should be noted that CCODP’s understanding of international development, domestic education and proactive membership evolved at uneven rates throughout its history. Thus, the task of the historian to assign dates to distinguish distinct periods can be quite difficult. For this dissertation, each chapter concludes with a watershed moment in the organization’s history.

Chapter one provides the historical and theological context for the creation of Development and Peace in 1967. After surveying the history of Catholic social teaching in Canada, the chapter focuses on the experience of the Canadian bishops at the Second Vatican

---

28 All three persons interviewed have given their expressed written consent that material obtained from the interviews can be used in this dissertation.
29 I conducted four separate (face-to-face) interviews with Michael Flynn in 2010-2011. After these interviews, we maintained an ongoing electronic correspondence (via email).
30 Interviews with Fabien Leboeuf were conducted exclusively via email (2012). Leboeuf was given the initial draft of this dissertation and asked for comment. We maintained an ongoing electronic correspondence (via email).
31 I conducted two separate (face-to-face) interviews with Michel Côté in 2010-2011. After these interviews, we maintained an ongoing electronic correspondence (via email).
Council (1962-1965). Working with bishops from Latin America, Africa and Asia—and learning about the dire poverty in these regions—Vatican II served as the primary catalyst for starting a Canadian Catholic international development agency. The chapter concludes with the history of how the bishops translated their powerful experiences at the historic council into a new vehicle for Canadian Catholic social justice. Much attention is given to the founding proposal for CCODP, which articulated the mandate of Development and Peace, clarified the type of work it was to engage in (socio-economic development not evangelization), and defined its role within the Canadian Catholic Church.

Chapter two recounts the challenges of trying to implement the vision of Development and Peace. Under the strong leadership of its first Executive Director, Roméo Maione (1967-1972), CCODP created the Share Lent campaign (to raise funds for the organization, to educate the general public about development work, and to renew the spirit of Lent). Funds raised from these campaigns were soon matched by the Government of Canada, through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). During these early years, the first organizational structures were set up to manage the funds collected and to guarantee that they would be properly sent to the Third World. At this time, the first set of rules and procedures was established for decision making and project administration. The chapter concludes with the 1972 CIDSE-sponsored seminar in Blankenberge where CCODP moved away from the prevailing paternalistic notion of development and articulated a new vision for partnership in the Third World.

Chapter three covers the period 1972-1977, when Development and Peace re-committed itself to the original mandate (intensification) but also branched out into new directions (expansion). In regard to education, CCODP re-affirmed the importance of Share Lent, but it
consciously tried to make these campaigns less focused on raising funds and more concentrated on the educational and spiritual elements. The education program increased its number of full-time *animateurs* and, starting in 1976, it began to move outside the Lenten season. As for the projects department, it continued to grow in size and scope (by collaborating with ecumenical social justice initiatives). Even more importantly, inspired by the influential 1975 International Seminar, the criteria for development projects were more clearly defined (based upon the fundamental question, “Do our projects promote development?”) In 1977, the period came to a crescendo with CCODP’s tenth anniversary celebrations.

Chapter four explores the years 1977-1982, when Development and Peace invested five years into an extensive national consultation with all the various components of Development and Peace: governors, bishops, CCODP personnel, diocesan councils, local sections, ecumenical collaborators, the general public and partners in the Third World. In 1981 this enormous labour resulted in a new constitution and, in 1982, a report *Basic Principles and Orientation* that confirmed CCODP’s structure, organization and operation. In addition to “consolidation,” this period also saw tremendous “growth.” With the launch of the “fall campaigns” in 1978, Development and Peace’s educational program was finally a year-long enterprise. The projects department expanded its understanding of development to include supporting projects that defended human rights, participated in liberation efforts, challenged structures blocking development, and criticized government policies in the Third World. This broadened definition of development would expose fundamental tensions within the Canadian Catholic Church over the proper role of Catholic international development. Some bishops welcomed CCODP’s new approach to development that supported radical changes in socio-economic structures, whereas
others believed that Catholic international development should be restricted to evangelization and catechesis, not social work.

Finally, the concluding chapter summarizes how, from 1967 to 1982, Development and Peace slowly grew into its mandate of financially supporting socio-economic development projects in the Third World (Latin America, Africa, and Asia) and educating Canadians about the causes of global injustice. Over the first fifteen years of its existence, CCODP gradually exchanged its paternalistic method of international development for one of dialogue and partnership with those in the Third World. It also had to experiment with different models of raising awareness amongst Canadians before creating an effective year-long education program. Furthermore, the organization worked hard to slowly grow a grassroots base that allowed Development and Peace to truly become a pan-Canadian movement (yet, still adapting to the unique cultural differences between French and English Canadians). By 1982, Development and Peace had transformed itself from a seasonal fundraising agency with a paternalistic understanding of economic development into a nationwide democratic movement that facilitated year-round educational campaigns and supported a proactive vision of social, political, economic and cultural development in the Third World.
CHAPTER 1:
RESPONDING TO “HISTORY’S GREATEST CHALLENGE”

In 1992 the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace (CCODP) celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of its creation. As part of the festivities, Bishop Alexander Carter of Sault Ste. Marie, who served as vice-president of the Canadian bishops’ conference when it launched Development and Peace in 1967, was interviewed about the impetus for creating the organization. Bishop Carter described the genesis of Development and Peace as responding to a “challenge.”

_Gaudium et Spes_ and our own personal contact with the bishops from Latin America, Africa and Oceania were a major influence in our thinking. I doubt whether many of us returned from the Council unaware that we faced a challenge which could only be answered in the Canadian church with a new vision, new forms of social action and, where necessary, a new vehicle if we were to translate this into action.\(^{32}\)

In this recollection, Bishop Carter was speaking as one of the eighty Canadian bishops who returned to Canada at the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council, which convened in Vatican City from 1962-1965.\(^{33}\) In the words of Carter, the Canadian delegation returned to their dioceses possession a collective awareness that the Canadian church faced a “challenge” that demanded “a new vision” and “new forms of social action.” What was this new challenge?

According to Carter, working with bishops from the underdeveloped regions of the world (Latin America, Africa and Asia) at Vatican II opened the eyes of the Canadians to the alarming fact that an estimated 80 per cent of the world’s population lived in extreme poverty while the other 20 per cent (including Canadians) lived in great prosperity.\(^{34}\) By the mid-1960s,
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\(^{34}\) This figure is offered by a study group that was commissioned by the Canadian bishops in 1966. Archives of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops [hereafter ACCCB], “Fonds Nat. De Secours
approximately thirty-five million people in the world died from hunger or its consequences. Moreover, it was estimated that over the next ten years, hunger would kill more people than all the wars in history combined. Confronted with the reality of widespread human suffering, the world’s bishops at Vatican II committed the Catholic Church to the cause of social justice in the “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World” (in Latin, *Gaudium et Spes*). In this landmark document, the bishops described the widening gap between the affluent nations and the poor of the world as scandalous. “Let us not be guilty of the scandal whereby some nations, most of whose citizens bear the name of Christians, enjoy an abundance of riches, while others lack the necessities of life and suffer from hunger, disease, and all kinds of misery.”

Offering a faith-based answer to this massive humanitarian crisis, the Canadian bishops established the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace. When the bishops first introduced this organization to the Canadian public, they described the creation of Development and Peace as responding to “History’s Greatest Challenge.”

This chapter will explore the historical and theological origins of Development and Peace. Throughout its history, the Catholic Church was no stranger to engaging social issues. The first

---


section of this chapter begins by describing Catholicism’s relationship to society (broadly referred to as Catholic social thought). After establishing a theological definition, this section surveys how this relationship developed over the course of history, from the biblical prophets to the social movements of the late nineteenth century. The history of Christianity is filled with countless examples of committed individuals who prophetically spoke out against injustice and selflessly worked to create a more equitable society.

Importantly, Bishop Alex Carter recognized that the contemporary forms of Catholic social action, as they were being lived out in the Canadian church up to the 1960s, were unable to meet the new challenges of the post-Vatican II church. As a result, Carter argued, Canadian Catholic social thought would need to be infused with a “new vision” and “new forms of social action.” In order to understand the context of this assessment, the second section of this chapter provides a brief summary of the historical development of Catholic social thought in Canada from 1891 to 1962.

Furthermore, Carter indicated that the Canadian bishops only became aware of the limitations of existing Catholic approaches to social issues as a result of their transformative experiences at Vatican II. The third section of this chapter details how working closely with bishops and theologians from outside of the Western world exposed the Canadians to the reality of global poverty and underdevelopment. At the same time, the conciliar debates surrounding the Vatican II constitution *Gaudium et Spes* (“The Church in the Modern World”) revolutionized the Canadian understanding of the role that the Church was being called to play in the world on behalf of the poor and oppressed.

Finally, Carter spoke about creating a “new vehicle if we were to translate this into action.” The fourth and final section of this chapter details how the Canadian bishops creatively
harnessed their experiences at Vatican II to create Development and Peace, a new international development agency for the Catholic Church in Canada. This section focuses on the founding documents of CCODP that clarify the mandate of Development and Peace and its role in the Canadian Church.

**Catholic Social Thought**

Throughout its history, Catholic Christianity has taught that the life and teachings of Jesus Christ have implications for the moral conduct of men and women, both as individuals and as members living in society. These implications received systematic formulation beginning with the promulgation of the papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (“The Condition of the Working Class”) in 1891 by Pope Leo XIII. From this point onwards, Catholic social thought is defined as the collection of ethical principles and moral teachings on the human person and the human community that is articulated in conciliar, papal, and episcopal documents. While Catholic social teaching is limited to magisterial documents from the institutional church, Catholic social thought also includes the writings of theologians and other scholars who develop, comment on, and draw applications from this teaching. Thus, broadly conceived, Catholic social thought includes not only the official teaching of the Church affecting the organization of society, “but all social ideas that can be attributed to Catholic inspiration, whether these ideas are taught formally or only exemplified in the social institutions and popular traditions of a given period of history.”
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39 This dating can be misleading if it gives the impression that prior to 1891 the papacy ignored social topics. Pope Leo himself issued a number of papal letters (called encyclicals) on political matters that predated *Rerum Novarum*. For a study of the social thought that preceded *Rerum Novarum*, see Michael J. Schuck, “Early Modern Roman Catholic Social Thought, 1740-1890,” in *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations*, ed. Kenneth R. Himes (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2005), 99-124.

Distinguished sociologist John A. Coleman has identified eight core ethical principles that define Catholic social thought (although scholars may differ on the exact number and terminology of these principles).\(^{41}\) (1) **Human dignity**: Every human person has been created in the image and likeness of God and is called to be a co-creator of society and culture; therefore each human life is sacred. From this seminal notion flows a series of human rights that satisfy one’s basic needs and encourage prosperity. (2) **The Social Nature of the Human**: Humans are radically (and not incidentally) interdependent creatures that are embedded in families, associations, culture, and civil and economic organizations. Relationship to the community is necessary for the person’s full development. Modelled on the Trinitarian God, humans are to honour legitimate diversity, but work towards the communion of all peoples. (3) **The Common Good**: The common good is the total of all the conditions of social living—economic, political, sociological and cultural—which make it possible for humanity to flourish. The state plays a key role in providing justice, security, equal opportunity, minimal welfare and social peace, but Catholic social thought emphasizes that all human persons are called to participate in the common good. (4) **Subsidiarity**: Higher forms of governance must not co-opt the proper roles of local units (families, local communities, unions, societies). Grassroots organizations are an important source of creativity and wisdom. (5) **Solidarity**: Humans belong to one family. As such, they have a moral obligation to come to the aid and support of others. (6) **The Preferential Option for the Poor**: Catholicism privileges those who lack power and resources. Care for the basic needs of the poor and marginalized should take priority over advancing the opportunities for the wealthy and powerful. (7) **Catholic Theory of Social Justice**: Justice is based on a fair allocation of the burdens and benefits in society. Moreover, all people must have some genuine
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voice and input in determining the arrangements of society that shape their lives. This notion of participation means that all people have equal moral weight. (8) *Integral Humanism*: Humans are deeply rooted to their political, social, economic, cultural, and geographic environments. Humans are participatory subjects of these structures and not objects. They cannot be reduced to economic animals detached from these relationships.

Collectively, these eight principles of Catholic social thought call Christians beyond simply living in society. Instead, they are commissioned to build a more just society. Followers of Jesus should strive for the equitable, just, and peaceful organization of society on local and regional levels, as well as on the national and international scale. Thus, Church authorities promulgate social teaching against “political, governmental, economic, and cultural policies and practices which undermine and threaten a Christian understanding of personal dignity, family life, religious conduct, and purposeful living in community and society.”42 In summary, Catholic social thought links the spiritual mission of the Catholic Church with the economic, political, legal, and social spheres of the world in order to guarantee, enable, and facilitate the full development of the human person.

Catholic reflection on the individual’s relationship to society did not originate during in the late nineteenth century; rather it has deep roots in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. While the Bible is not explicitly concerned with social theory, its authors provide ethical guidelines for living in society. For example, in the prophetic literature of the Old Testament, numerous references are made to caring for the “poor” and the “powerless,” which are understood to be both the economically destitute and the socially outcast (often named as “the widow, the orphan, and the refugee.”) The community has a special responsibility to seek
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justice for those who are unable to care for themselves. This is not just a command to promote social harmony, but the prophets describe YHWH as a defender of the oppressed.43 While Jesus offered no explicit political or economic message, the New Testament is filled with his proclamation of the kingdom of God. Unlike the toil and suffering of this world, Jesus promised a superior reality of grace and redemption, joy and love (which he called the kingdom of God). This “kingdom” would be characterized by love, justice and peace for all people without distinction (the dignity of all human persons would be affirmed, whether master or slave, rich or poor, man or woman).44 This kingdom was understood as having indeed arrived with Jesus, but it is not yet fully realized on earth; it is to come to its fullness in the near future. Membership in the kingdom is the reward for practicing justice and mercy to the outcasts of society (just as Jesus did by associating with tax collectors and sinners).45 Jesus taught his disciples that justice as practiced in relation to one’s neighbour will be the basis of the final judgement (Matthew 25:31-46). Thus, followers of Jesus were expected to continue his mission of compassion and mercy through active involvement with their social world.46

From these sacred texts, a philosophical and theological tradition developed within the Church of addressing the social aspects of Christianity. Generally speaking, the early Christian community (c. 200-600) was not concerned with reforming the social structures of the Roman Empire.47 The Patristic Fathers of the Church wrote mainly about personal reform rather than social reform. Yet, they did not understand Christianity to be merely a private or individual

44 Helen Doohan, “Kingdom of God,” in The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia, 460.
45 Ibid., 460.
46 Donahue, 26.
form of discipleship. Following Christ had social consequences and, hence, the Church had a social mission. Several early Christian authors argued that a society’s institutions should be judged not by the interests of the wealthy elite, but by the justice imparted to all its members.48

Medieval theologians (c. 600-1500) similarly addressed numerous social questions involving the complex relationships between work, family, the economy, civil society and the state. They did not, however, recognize a distinctive corpus of social doctrine. During this period, theologian Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) laid down the foundation for a metaphysical understanding of the human being, created by God not only as rational and free, but also social by nature.49 Aquinas argued for an organically unified universe in which all things were properly ordered by natural law. Individuals occupied particular roles within a hierarchical society; they were bound to one another and to social institutions by inherent norms and ethical duties. According to these norms, it can be deduced what is worthy and unworthy of human beings in their relationships to God and to one another. According to Aquinas’ social theory, social obligations took priority over individual wants and desires.50

As the medieval unity of civilization disintegrated during the early modern period, the Church developed a mistrust of the modern world and withdrew into isolation. In the sixteenth century, as a result of the Reformation, half of Europe abandoned the Catholic Church and became Protestant. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the scientific revolution and the Age of the Enlightenment were built on a foundation of autonomous human reason that left little room for revelation or the transcendent. These movements often attacked Catholic
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49 Skok, 785.
doctrine, authority and ritual. Secular society, which emphasised rationalism and valued the individual person over the common good, was severed from religious faith.\textsuperscript{51} In Europe, religion became increasingly defined as a “private” affair between the individual and God, was relegated to a marginal role in society. For its part, the Church turned inward and condemned the new social, religious and political ideas in Pope Pius IX’s \textit{Syllabus of Errors} (released in 1864).

The catalyst for the Catholic Church to reassert the proper relationship between the individual and society (thus inaugurating a distinctive corpus of Catholic social thought) was the unprecedented social, economic, and political changes that transformed Western Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Foremost among these changes was the process of industrialization that rapidly transformed Europe from a rural, agrarian society into one that was urban and industrial. This societal change resulted in massive social dislocation and widespread unemployment.\textsuperscript{52} Workers in industrial factories encountered miserly wages, deplorable working conditions, and severe strains on family life. Urban life deteriorated as overcrowding and poor sanitation led to inhumane living conditions, outbreaks of disease, and high rates of crime. The human misery brought about by the Industrial Revolution came to be known as “the social problem.”\textsuperscript{53} In additional to economic problems, the expanding new class of urban proletariat was exposed to new ideas of nationalism, political and cultural freedoms, scientific discovery, and political ideologies. This tumultuous period undermined the whole system of


\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 29-30.

Christian civilization on which traditional religious identification depended.\textsuperscript{54} Since the Catholic Church was closely linked to the old order, it was increasingly seen as irrelevant to the modern world.\textsuperscript{55}

Several Catholic social reformers emerged during this period. Initially, these Catholics understood the plight of the workers in the traditional sense of charity, as poor Christians who had immediate needs, such as food and shelter. Catholic relief efforts were limited to individual acts of almsgiving to help the poor and focused on the personal spiritual renewal of the giver. Realizing this approach was no longer adequate to address industrialization and its impact upon the working class, radical Catholic reformers began calling for an overhaul of the entire economic system.\textsuperscript{56} Rather than focusing exclusively on the effects of the problems (such as hunger homelessness), Catholic “social justice” now promoted collective action to combat poverty and addressed the root causes structural injustice.\textsuperscript{57}

Catholic social thought received formal magisterial approval when Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) issued the encyclical \textit{Rerum Novarum} on 15 May 1891. Perceiving secularism as the source of modern problems, \textit{Rerum Novarum} attempted to overcome the divorce of social and economic life from Christian principles. In addressing the plight of industrial workers, Leo perceived two equally harmful movements taking shape. First, he argued against the dangers of socialism by stoutly defending private property as a natural right, asserting that the family is the primal social unit (prior to the state), and rejecting class warfare as a principle of social

\textsuperscript{56} The gradual awakening of Catholics to the challenges of the Industrial Revolution is best chronicled in Paul Misner, \textit{Social Catholicism in Europe: From the Onset of Industrialization to the First World War} (New York: Crossroad, 1991).
change. Second, he criticized laissez-faire capitalism by stating that the worker, as a person, must take precedence over making a profit and that the state has a duty to protect workers against exploitation. Finally, he concluded the letter by clarifying the rights of workers: a right to a “living wage”; protection for women and children in the workplace; a right not to work excessive hours; and the right to form associations or unions. Taken as a whole, the pope’s approach in *Rerum Novarum* was quite conservative in that employers were given the major role as agents for change. Nevertheless, in calling attention to the issue of justice in the social order, Pope Leo XIII was raising the voice of the Church on behalf of the poor. The lasting significance of *Rerum Novarum* is not only that the pope confronted the burning social issues of its day, but also that it challenged Catholics to reform the social order around them. Due to its impact on the wider Church, as well as its subsequent commemoration by later popes, scholars designate *Rerum Novarum* as the initial text of modern Catholic social teaching.

**History of Catholic Social Thought in Canada (1891-1962)**

It is difficult to gauge the immediate impact that *Rerum Novarum* had upon Canadian Catholicism. In 1891, the year Pope Leo XIII published this encyclical, Canada’s bishops were deeply divided over the Manitoba Schools Question and how to protect Catholic and French-language education. Consequently, little episcopal attention was paid to the encyclical and Catholic social thought in Canada only developed in regional pockets of grass roots activism.
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59 Ibid., #15-29.
60 Ibid., #30-44.
63 A classic study of this controversial period is Paul Crunican, *Priests and Politicians: Manitoba Schools and the Election of 1896* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974).
Without a clear program of education or implementation from the bishops, the language and theology of the papal encyclical was too abstract to have any direct influence on the lives (spiritual or economic) of most lay Canadians. Yet, some educated clergy did attempt to apply these lofty ideals from Europe to the practical problems facing Canadians. For example, two “popular catechisms” were published—one by Abbé David Gosselin in 1891 and the other by Alexandre Nunesvais in 1902—that presented the contents of the encyclical, using questions and answers to facilitate comprehension. In 1905, Abbé Stanislas-Alfred Lortie of Quebec City, who studied in Europe just after the release of *Rerum Novarum* and had some familiarity with social Catholicism, established a study group of professionals, clerics and journalists called the Société d'économie sociale et politique at Laval University to introduce the social teachings of Leo XIII. In 1907, Abbé Eugène Lapointe, a class mate of Lortie in Europe, formed a Catholic union in the diocese of Chicoutimi. These priests, however, were the exception. For the most part, Catholics would scarcely have been aware that the encyclical even existed. The famous remark by 1928 Catholic United States Presidential candidate Al Smith—“what the hell is an encyclical?”—would have been the response of most Canadian Catholics when asked about *Rerum Novarum*. Despite the fact that few would have read it, *Rerum Novarum* did have some substantive effects in Canada.

Most notably, *Rerum Novarum* allowed Catholics to join non-denominational or “neutral” trade unions. During the 1880s, bishops in North America were engaged in a public debate about whether Catholics could become members of the newly organized Knights of Labour.


66 Ibid., 84-85.

Established in 1869 in the United States and spreading into Canada during the 1880s, the Knights of Labour was the largest and one of the most important labour organizations of the nineteenth century. The most vocal opponent of this movement was Archbishop Elzéar-Alexandre Taschereau of Quebec (1871-1898). Fearful of its members swearing secret oaths, the sometimes violent strikes that were promoted by unions (which he felt could spark a socialist revolution), and Catholics being brought into contact with Protestants (which might lead to religious indifference), Taschereau had a pastoral letter read in every Catholic Church in the ecclesiastical province of Quebec in 1886 that explicitly condemned the Knights. Based on a 1884 statement from the Holy See forbidding Catholics to join secret organizations, Taschereau’s *mandement* denied the sacraments to any Catholic who was a member of the Knights of Labour.

Taschereau’s anxiety, however, was not shared by all of his brother bishops. Bishop Joseph-Thomas Duhamel of Ottawa, Bishop Edouard Charles Fabre of Montreal, Bishop Peter Richard Kenrick of Saint Louis, Archbishop John Joseph Lynch of Toronto, Archbishop James Gibbons of Baltimore, and Archbishop Francis Xavier Leray of New Orleans, all publicly defended the Knights as a benevolent organization working towards the improvement of the working class. Persuaded by a report from (the newly elevated) Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, Pope Leo XIII on 26 July 1887 announced that the Holy See does not condemn the Knights of Labor and that any bans of Catholics joining this union be permanently removed.
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69 Bishops Duhamel, Fabre and Kenrick are mentioned as “declining to condemn the Knights of Labor in their dioceses” under “Labour Notes” in *The Globe*, 2 April 1886, 8.
71 The strong objections by Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Leray are presented in Kennedy, 86, 92-95.
72 Ibid., 97.
While Leo’s 1887 announcement allowed Catholics to join the Knights of Labour specifically, his 1891 encyclical *Rerum Novarum* allowed Catholics to join any voluntary association, such as trade unions, that was devoted to social action.

Drawing inspiration from *Rerum Novarum*, Catholic social initiatives emerged throughout Quebec. With Pope Leo’s endorsement of labour unions, Quebec developed the unique phenomenon of Catholic labour unions (the only place in North America where religiously based unions were formed). In 1900, Archbishop Louis Nazaire Bégin of Quebec City (1898-1925), successfully mediated a strike of Quebec City shoemakers.\(^{73}\) An important clause in the agreement required that the union’s American advisers be replaced by Catholic chaplains, thus setting a precedent in Quebec of priest-chaplains exercising significant control over lay organizations. Similarly, in Montreal, Archbishop Paul-Napoléon Bruchési (1897-1939) arbitrated strikes by tramway employees in 1903 and carters and plasterers in 1905 that gave Catholic priests greater leadership roles in these unions.\(^{74}\) Coupled with parallel efforts in Chicoutimi, Trois-Rivières, and Hull, Catholic trade unions spread across Quebec. These faith-based unions promoted corporatism, the ideal of good understanding and co-operation between management and workers.\(^{75}\)

During the first half of the twentieth century a strong Catholic labour movement developed in Quebec, but it would have a complex relationship with the church hierarchy. In 1921, multiple unions throughout Quebec came together to form the *Confédération des travailleurs catholiques du Canada* (Confederation of Canadian Catholic Labourers or CCCL). The CCCL—which grouped approximately 20,000 workers in construction, railways, 

---


\(^{75}\) Perin, 207.
machinery, shoes, textiles, garments, pulp and paper, and breweries—was founded by members of the clergy who feared the socialist and anticlerical ideas of the international unions.\(^{76}\) Similarly, some 13,000 farmers were organized in the Union Catholique des Cultivateurs (UCC), founded in 1924.\(^ {77}\) Laborers and farmers knew that the clergy could provide dynamic leadership, networks of influence, and moral security. Many clergy, on the other hand, knew that unions were necessary to address the rights of workers and understood their influence. But not all members of the church welcomed this development. In the eyes of many members of the church hierarchy, unions were based on materialism and class antagonism, principles that stood in conflict with Rerum Novarum.\(^ {78}\) For example, during the Dominion Textile strike of 1937, certain members of the clergy and the Catholic press played an active role in denouncing working conditions, the employers’ intransigence and the government’s collusion. Yet, the behind the scenes mediation of Cardinal Jean-Marie-Rodrigue Villeneuve of Quebec City (1931-1947) was viewed by historians as having lead to the CCCL’s defeat in the conflict and subsequent loss of CCCL membership throughout the province.\(^ {79}\)

After World War II the CCCL’s ideology gradually lost it religious nature and it became more secular in its activism. Non-Catholic workers were allowed to join its ranks and the chaplain’s veto over strike decisions was removed. During the high-profile Asbestos Strike of 1949, when 5,000 miners in the Eastern Townships went on strike over wage increases and stricter health controls, the union position was publicly supported by many Catholic voices, including Archbishop Joseph Charbonneau of Montreal.\(^ {80}\) Shortly after the strike was resolved
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\(^{76}\) Yves Frenette with Martin Pâquet, “French Canadians,” in Encyclopedia of Canada’s Peoples, ed. Robert Paul Magoosi (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1999), 562.  
\(^{77}\) Ibid.  
\(^{78}\) Perin, 207.  
\(^{79}\) Ibid., 237, 252.  
\(^{80}\) Ibid., 252.
through the mediation of Archbishop Maurice Roy of Quebec City (1947-1981), the bishop of Rimouski and several other rural Quebec bishops reported Archbishop Charbonneau to their colleagues in Rome for having “modernist sympathies” (in other words, they feared Charbonneau’s openness to new things coming into Quebec through Montreal). While the Asbestos Strike was unlikely the main issue for Charbonneau’s forced resignation, the timing of his abrupt departure after the strike is suspect.

Aside from the Catholic labour unions, Rerum Novarum also inspired other creative Catholic interventions in Quebec industrial society. In 1900, Alphonse Desjardins created the first *caisse populaire* in Lévis, Quebec. Designed as a co-operative institution that would collect the modest savings of French-speaking Catholics living within the boundaries of the parish, these savings were then loaned to members of the community needing funds to earn a living. In 1903, this idea was expanded into farming communities as *coopératives agricoles*. In 1907 the *Action Sociale Catholique* was created by Archbishop Bégin, but headed by Father Paul-Eugène Roy (the future Archbishop of Quebec City, 1925-1926). This ambitious umbrella movement sought to unite all Catholic undertakings in the Archdiocese of Quebec City and to focus them around the social Catholicism prescribed by Leo XIII. The zealous Roy initiated numerous forms of action: study groups, lectures and congresses, publications of various kinds (including an influential newspaper of the same name), cooperation with religious associations (such as the *Ligue du Sacré-Coeur*), workers’ and professional groups, and economic organizations (credit unions, cooperatives, farmers unions). In 1911, the Quebec Jesuits
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founded the *École Sociale Populaire* (ESP) as a centre for studying the church’s social doctrine and training an elite group of Catholics to put it into practice.\(^8^4\) Organized under Jesuit Father Léonidas Hudon, ESP sought to lead a renewal of the social order through monthly brochures, study groups, and retreats. Beginning in 1920, Jesuit Father Joseph Papin-Archambault facilitated ESP-sponsored conferences entitled *Semaines sociales* to raise awareness of social issues and propose responses based on Catholic social thought.\(^8^5\) Under the leadership of Archambault (director 1929-1959), who built the base of the movement through intense spiritual retreats, the ESP reached the height of its influence during the Depression.

The worldwide Great Depression was triggered by the crashing of the American stock market in 1929. In the midst of global economic crisis, in 1931, Pope Pius XI (1922-1939) commemorated the 40\(^{th}\) anniversary of Leo XIII’s *Rerum Novarum* by releasing *Quadragesimo Anno* (“On the Reconstructing of the Social Order,” or sometimes called “After Forty Years”). The first part of the encyclical reaffirmed the contribution of *Rerum Novarum*, namely that the state has the right to intervene in the economic order to defend the rights of workers and that workers could form trade unions.\(^8^6\) In the second chapter, Pius extended the teachings of Pope Leo on several issues: private property, the relations of capital and labour as social classes, and just wages.\(^8^7\) Making an original contribution, Pius went on to propose a renovated, organic social order based on vocational groups (analogous to medieval guilds) or corporations (hence the term “coporatism”) that would organize workers and employers according to their function in society.\(^8^8\) The final chapter was a scathing indictment of the capitalist system of the day.

\(^8^4\)Ibid., 227-229.  
\(^8^5\) Each conference was dedicated to a special topic. The records of these conferences were published in a journal: *Semaine sociale du Canada* (Montréal: École sociale populaire, 1920-1964).  
\(^8^7\) Ibid., #41-75.  
\(^8^8\) Ibid., #76-98.
(lamenting the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few) and a condemnation of communism and socialism (warning that the emphasis on materialism and class warfare cannot be reconciled with Catholicism). Overall, *Quadragesimo Anno* reaffirmed Leo’s teachings on collaboration rather than class conflict and that a renewal of Christian morals was a prerequisite for social renewal. Yet, Pius went further than his predecessor by more strongly challenging the existing socio-economic model of society and being more insistent on the need for major structural change. Also, this encyclical introduced the term “social justice” to describe the type of justice that “demanded due recognition of the common good, a good which included, and did not contradict, the authentic good of each person.” Social justice is, thus, the ethical imperative for communal, institutional or governmental action to create the social conditions necessary for the full development of the individual, such as the right to work, decent housing, sufficient wages, etc.

While *Rerum Novarum* had received relatively little attention in the Canadian Catholic Church, *Quadragesimo Anno* was well publicized as Canada was hit particularly hard by the Great Depression. From 1929-1939, Canada’s gross national product dropped 42 per cent, unemployment reached 30 per cent (in 1933), and Canada’s major exports (farming, fishing, mining and logging) shrank by 50 per cent between 1929 and 1933. During this period of unparalleled economic crisis, *Quadragesimo Anno* inspired local experimentation in Catholic social action. In 1933, Archambault along with a small group of socially active clerics produced their own thirteen part program from social renewal known as the *Programme de restauration*
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sociale (“Plan for social regeneration”). Inspired by Pius XI’s encyclical, this doctrinal manifesto outlined a comprehensive package of social and political reforms calling for economic planning, state intervention, social-welfare legislation, and protection of consumers, farmers and workers against exploitation. The *Programme* had as its ultimate goal the creation of a Christian corporatist society (as advocated by Pius XI) in which class conflict, though not class differences, would vanish and the common good would triumph through regulation and planning. A short time later, a group of lay people under the auspices of the ESP published a second, more detailed and technical *Programme de restauration sociale*, which addressed moral reform, rural renewal, the labour question and financial and political reforms. Well received by the newspapers *Le Devoir, L'Action nationale,* and *L'Action catholique,* elements of this program were later borrowed by the political parties *Action libérale nationale,* Maurice Duplessis’ *Union nationale,* and even the Liberals in the 1936 election.

Depression-era Quebec also provided fertile soil for the Catholic Action movement, an organized apostolate of young lay men and women. In 1922, Pope Pius XI issued the encyclical *Ubi Arcano Dei,* which organized Catholic laity, under the close supervision of the bishops, to actively spread Catholic values and political ideals through secular society. In the mid 1920s, Belgian priest Joseph Cardijn adapted this movement to young workers (ages 16-25) by organizing the *Jeunesse ouvrière chrétienne* (JOC; also known by the English translation Young Christian Workers or YCW). In 1928, he founded the *Jeunesse étudiante chrétienne* (JEC) for Catholic university students. The movement spread to other social settings so that organizations
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were adapted for rural youth (Jeunesse agricole chrétienne: JAC), working middle class (Jeunesse independent chrétienne: JIC) and even youth working in ports and on ships (Jeunesse maritime chrétienne: JMC). These organizations adopted an innovative method of careful inquiry and research, judging their findings against church social doctrine, and creating a plan for action. Using this “See-Judge-Act” methodology, Catholic Action encouraged their young followers to go beyond pious practices and to become active in the social concerns of their daily work experience. Linking religious values to labour concerns, these rapidly expanding youth movements came to Canada in 1932 and thrived. In 1946, Cardinal Cardijn referred to Canada as “the second birth-place of the YCW [Young Christian Workers].” At that point, the JEC movement alone, aided by its popular newspaper of the same name, had 1,200 sections with 12,000 leaders present in 23 dioceses of Quebec. From the 1930s through 1960s, Catholic Action was the most important social action movement of the Catholic Church in Canada. While Catholic Action was successful in recruiting a large number of Quebecois youth, its relationship to the established Church was a constant source of friction. Not all the bishops were comfortable with the activist message of this movement or with laity demanding active leadership roles within the Church.

In English-speaking Canada, Catholic social action took a different direction. In Quebec, where the majority of the population was Roman Catholic, the Catholic labour and Catholic Action movements kept the church relatively engaged in social issues. Within these
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movements, Francophone Catholics worked exclusively with their fellow believers in religious organizations that were directed by the clergy. In other words, Catholic social action was within the visible confines of the Catholic Church. In English-speaking Canada, however, Catholics were a minority of the population and needed to collaborate with their non-Catholics neighbours in non-religious settings. Here, social Catholicism moved outside the Church and was non-denominational. As a result, Catholic social action in Quebec was better organized and formed than elsewhere in Canada. Nonetheless, there were some lone Catholic voices crying in the wilderness in English Canada who opted for a more radical approach to society.

The most dynamic force for Catholic social thought outside of Quebec was Father Neil McNeil. While studying for his ordination in Rome, McNeil was intellectually and spiritually formed by the Catholic social movements that emerged across Europe as responses to the Industrial Revolution (the same movements that provided the theological underpinnings for *Rerum Novarum*).

Shortly after returning to his home diocese of Antigonish in 1880, McNeil founded and edited a local Catholic newspaper *The Aurora*, which applied the basic principles of Catholic social thought to the plight of Maritime fisherman and called for miners to organize a labour union. Appointed Archbishop of Vancouver (1910-1912), McNeil believed the only way to overcome the social problems that accompanied unregulated capitalism was for Catholics to join unions and become their leaders. As the Archbishop of Toronto (1912-1934), McNeil implemented a centralized network of Catholic organizations that utilized advances in the social sciences to effectively serve the social welfare needs of the Catholic
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population. He also publicly lobbied the government to enact legislative reforms that corrected the capitalist system.105

For Archbishop McNeil, an integral part of his social mission was to provide Canadian Catholics with a methodical program of education in Catholic social thought. To organize this endeavour, McNeil recruited British social activist Henry Somerville. Arriving in 1915, Somerville taught student-priests at the newly-opened St. Augustine’s Seminary and instructed the laity by writing columns and editing The Catholic Register (the influential archdiocesan newspaper).106 Leaving Toronto in 1918, but returning from 1933-1953, Somerville’s popular “Life and Labour” columns introduced Catholics to the Church’s social teachings on living wages, property rights, family allowances, government-subsidized low-interest housing loans, and government-sponsored capital building projects to relieve unemployment. Rather than forming exclusive Catholic unions and parties as was the pattern in Quebec, Somerville argued that in a religiously pluralistic society Catholics could best achieve social justice by educating themselves and actively participating in Canadian secular political parties and unions.107

Another important form of Depression-era social activism supported by McNeil was the Friendship House movement begun in 1933 by Catherine de Hueck.108 Alarmed at the popularity of communism among the poorer classes, Catherine (herself a Russian émigré from Russia who escaped the communists) and members of her community took vows of voluntary

poverty. They provided food and clothing to the poor and started a clothing distribution centre, a shelter for single men, after-school recreation for children, and assisted the homeless in finding affordable housing. Friendship House also sought to transform the poor into contributing members of society by providing English-language classes and an employment agency for immigrants.\textsuperscript{109} It waged an aggressive campaign of Christian social activism to combat the communist movement through lectures, workshops, pamphlets, and a monthly newspaper (\textit{The Social Forum}) that provided instruction in Catholic social teaching.\textsuperscript{110} This radical experiment in Catholic social action was repeated in Hamilton and Ottawa. In 1947, Catherine and her husband Eddie Doherty created a Catholic apostolate in Combermere, Ontario known as Madonna House.

In the Maritimes, Fathers J.J. Tompkins, Moses Coady, John R. MacDonald, and many others blended adult education, cooperatives, microfinance and rural community development into the faith-based “Antigonish Movement.” Seeking to empower small, resource-based communities to improve their economic and social circumstances, in 1930 the St. Francis Xavier University Extension Department brought education directly into the workplaces and homes of the surrounding rural population (mainly uneducated blue collar fishermen, farmers and industrial workers). A strong believer that social reform comes through education, Moses Coady held mass meetings to challenge the economic ignorance of the people.\textsuperscript{111} To help the people rebuild themselves and their communities, Coady helped mobilize the local population into small study clubs to analyze their economic situation. Thinking along similar lines to Pius
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XI, Coady taught that cooperatives, not labour unions, were the bases of the new social order.\textsuperscript{112} Thus, once aware of their circumstances, these small study groups would initiate practical community cooperative projects (funded by consumer cooperatives and credit unions). During the 1930s and 1940s, these small-scale cooperative systems spread across Nova Scotia. By 1938, there were 1,110 study clubs, 10,650 members, 142 credit unions, 39 co-operative stores, 17 co-operative lobster factories, 11 co-operative fish plants, and 11 other co-operative ventures.\textsuperscript{113}

Prior to World War II, Canadian Catholic social justice initiatives were regional without any national cohesion or organization. This began to change in 1943 when the Canadian bishops established the Canadian Catholic Conference (CCC) to be a nationwide “organism of vigilance, of consultation and of coordination which would assure the Church in Canada a stronger influence and an increase of prestige.”\textsuperscript{114} From its first meeting, this episcopal body (with a permanent secretariat working in Ottawa) made social concerns an important part of its agenda. The first CCC joint statement in 1943 clarified that the Catholic Church was not against the socialist Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) political party that called for radical social change.\textsuperscript{115} The first major initiative of the CCC was to organize a bilingual
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conference in 1944 on the themes of “Industrial Relations” and “The Rural Problem.” Designed to serve as a catalyst for “building a Catholic-inspired Canadian social system,” the conference brought together bishops, priests, laity representing local dioceses, Catholic and neutral (non-confessional) trade unions, employer groups, cooperatives, credit unions and universities.\footnote{Daly, \textit{Remembering for Tomorrow}, 29-31.} While no definite conclusions were reached, these “study days” represent the first attempt at dialogue between the very different cultural, economic and ecclesial realities of Quebec and English-speaking Canada regarding the implementation of Catholic social thought.

In 1948 the first pastoral office set up within the CCC was a Department of Social Action that was created to aid Catholic displaced persons from European war zones immigrating to Canada.\footnote{Ibid., 23-28.} Its mandate also included studying the socio-economic situation of Canada, maintaining an up-to-date reading of the Church’s social doctrine, providing studies and research, and educating the clergy, religious communities, as well as laity on Catholic social action.\footnote{Joe Gunn and Monica Lambton, \textit{Calling Out the Prophetic Tradition: A Jubilee of Social Teaching from the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops} (Ottawa: Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1999), 10-11.} This commission was led by two directors, each representing different linguistic groups of Canada and a different approach to social action. For French Canada, Father Jean-Charles Leclaire of St. Hyacinthe had extensive experience as a priest-chaplain with Catholic Action groups in Quebec and promoted a clerically-led, exclusively Catholic model of social action. In contrast, the English sector was led by Father Francis A. Marrocco of Peterborough, who was formed by the lay-directed Antigonish adult education model. Continuing to promote collaboration between Catholics and non-Catholics, Marrocco linked the English section of the Social Action Department to Catholic colleges and universities. Here, economists, historians, social scientists and ethicists explored the applications of Catholic social teachings. In addition
to St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish and St. Michael’s College in Toronto\textsuperscript{119} (which had been promoting faith-based activism since the Depression), new Catholic Labour Schools were created: the Institute for Social Action at St. Patrick’s College in Ottawa,\textsuperscript{120} the Pius XI Labour School at Assumption University in Windsor,\textsuperscript{121} and the Jesuit operated Catholic Labour School in Toronto.\textsuperscript{122} In addition, extension courses were offered at the University of Sudbury, Jesuit Regis Theological School in Toronto, and St. Jerome’s College in Waterloo.\textsuperscript{123}

To facilitate collaboration among these institutions, and to bring these initiatives to a broader audience, the English section of the Social Action Department devoted much energy to coordinating annual conferences on Catholic social teaching. In 1953, the Quebec annual study weeks (\textit{Semaines sociales}) were adapted to English Canada as the Catholic Social Life Conferences.\textsuperscript{124} While held in separate locations, the English and French sessions addressed the same theme. These popular annual meetings attracted bishops, clergy, religious and laity from across the country and provided a national forum for social concerns. Out of these gatherings developed “Social Action Sunday” in all the English-speaking dioceses of Canada in 1956.\textsuperscript{125}

That same year, the CCC Social Affairs Commission inaugurated a series of annual Labour Day Messages, whereby the bishops addressed pressing social issues such as labour-management relations, immigration and unemployment.\textsuperscript{126}
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Collectively, these Labour Day Messages—written by the Social Affairs Office, rotating between the English and French sections, and approved by the Canadian bishops—provide an excellent overview of not only the CCC national social action program, but also the ethical methodology of Canadian Catholic social thought prior to Vatican II. Overall, these messages spoke in broad generalizations about social problems and represented religious rather than social discourse. While the bishops noted accurately enough the major social issues of the day, there was no substantive analysis or mention of statistics or social science sources. Rather, injustice was perceived narrowly as having religious, moral, or spiritual causes. Thus, the mission of the Church was to reassert moral and spiritual values. The bishops’ solution to all social problems was personal conversion. Recommendations included sobriety and restraint, practice of good citizenship, and reverence for spiritual values. Starting from the Church’s social doctrine, which was rooted in natural law reasoning, the Labour Day Messages were essentially a deductive exercise, moving from timeless moral principles to specific historical applications. Consistent with this philosophical approach, there were few references made to scripture in the CCC statements (nearly all references were to Vatican documents). Furthermore, these documents were focused exclusively on injustice in Canada; little mention was made to the international scene. Taken as a whole, Catholic social thought in Canada from 1891-1962 existed in a one-way relationship to the world. It saw itself as “having much to give and little to receive from the world outside the clearly set church boundaries.”
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A New Experience of Church:  
The Canadian Experience at the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965)

The theology and practice of Catholic social thought in Canada would drastically change due to the formative experience that the Canadian Catholic bishops shared at the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). The impact of this council upon the Canadian bishops cannot be underrated (although the council had an even greater impact on the Anglophone bishops than the Quebecois bishops, who were already influenced by the Catholic labour and Catholic Action movements than dominated Quebec in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s). Reflecting back upon his experience as a participant at Vatican II, Bishop Remi De Roo of Victoria wrote, “The Second Vatican Council was the most intense and meaningful period of education in my entire life.” Vatican II influenced the Canadian bishops in two interrelated, but distinct ways.

First, the Council provided a unique opportunity for the Canadian delegation to encounter bishops and theologians from all over the world. Vatican II was the biggest meeting (a gathering with an agenda on which the sustained participation of all parties was required and which resulted in actual decisions) in the history of Christianity. A grand total of 2,860 bishops, abbots and superiors-general of male religious orders participated in part or all of the four council sessions. In contrast, Vatican I (1869-1870) which had been the largest gathering prior to that date, only had 773 bishops. At Vatican II, many of the “council fathers,” as the bishops came to be known, brought with them theological experts (periti), which numbered 484 by the end of the council. Vatican II also marked the first time that a large number of non-Catholics were invited to attend as guests and observers, as well as women—lay
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and religious—who were present as “auditors.” Other individuals or groups having direct, indirect or intermittent business with the council raised to an estimated 7,500 the number of people present in Rome at any given time because of Vatican II.\textsuperscript{138}

Even more impressive that the size of the council was the diversity that it represented. Vatican I had bishops in attendance from five continents, though the overwhelming majority were Europeans, either with dioceses in Europe or in terms of their ethnic origins (for example, 35 per cent were Italians and 17 per cent were French, amounting to over half the total).\textsuperscript{139} At Vatican II, the bishops came from 116 different countries: approximately 36 per cent from Europe, 22 per cent from Central and South America, 20 per cent from Asia and Oceania, 12 per cent from North America, and 10 per cent from Africa.\textsuperscript{140} Thus, over half of these bishops gathered (52 per cent) were indigenous to areas outside of Europe and North America. While a relatively small group of prelates and theologians from northwestern Europe composed the documents that were eventually approved by council, participation of bishops representing virtually every corner of the world changed the atmosphere of the council.\textsuperscript{141} According to the distinguished Jesuit theologian Karl Rahner, Vatican II represented (albeit in a rudimentary form) “the Church’s first official self-actualization as a world church.”\textsuperscript{142} He describes the participation of indigenous bishops at the Second Vatican Council as contributing to a new epoch in church history. No longer was Catholicism a “Christianity of Europe (with its American annexes).”\textsuperscript{143} Rather, Rahner argues, Vatican II provided a new paradigm of
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Catholicism, one in which the Church was influenced by all of its diverse peoples (not just those from a small and particular cultural region).

Over the course of the four years that the council convened, the eighty Canadian bishops gradually awakened to the idea of participating in a world church. This transformation occurred as the Canadians worked side-by-side with bishops and theologians from the so-called “Third World” of Latin America, Africa and Asia. From these non-Western bishops, the Canadian delegation learned an appreciation for how the gospel can have different interpretations in diverse cultures. In the words of Bishop Alex Carter:

It was a real education to meet with various groups of Bishops from around the world, including Bishops of Africa, India, and East Asia. We knew theoretically that the Church was catholic and varied in colour and language. However, the lived experience of listening to those Catholic Bishops from nations wherein the Catholic reality was just beginning to take root and blossom taught us a great deal. It was a “greening” of the European and Western Church.\textsuperscript{144}

This same sentiment was echoed by Archbishop George Bernard Flahiff of Winnipeg:

You cannot but be impressed by the zeal, the deep seriousness and complete frankness with which the bishops from all parts of the world present their opinions on these and many other detailed matters. Those from China and Japan, Indonesia, and Viet Nam, India, Ceylon, and the Near East, Africa and Madagascar, South and Central America, as well as from Australia and Europe, come up often enough with a point of view you simply had not thought of. You begin to realize how insular and sometimes narrow we can be, and you begin to appreciate something of the universality of the Church.\textsuperscript{145}

Equally educational, the bishops were exposed to the new currents of theological thought that were emerging from around the globe. Every Sunday afternoon, Archbishop Philip Pocock of Toronto and Bishop Alexander Carter of Sault Ste. Marie arranged for leading scholars to
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address the Canadian delegation on topics such as Scriptural renewal, liturgical reform, collegiality, lay ministry, religious freedom, ecumenism, and interfaith dialogue.\textsuperscript{146}

In addition to working with bishops and \textit{periti} during the council sessions, a large part of Canadian bishops’ education occurred outside of the formal deliberations and commissions. According to Canadian observer Roméo Maione, Bishop Dom Hélder Câmara, auxiliary of Rio de Janeiro and later archbishop of Olinda y Recife (Brazil), roamed the corridors of St. Peter’s during coffee breaks and between council sessions, delivering a profound message to the bishops of the industrialized world. “We all read the same gospels. In our country we interpret them as a mandate to help the poor to develop. How do you people in the rich countries read these same gospels? How do you interpret them?”\textsuperscript{147} Living and working with bishops from all over the world, the Canadians experienced a broadening of their own views and a deepening respect for the opinions of others. The experience of Vatican II gave the Canadian bishops, according to Alex Carter, “a new experience of Church.”\textsuperscript{148}

Challenged by these exchanges with their counterparts from non-Western countries, the Canadians developed a deep sense of responsibility, not just for the parishioners of their own dioceses, but for the welfare of all humanity. This shift in their perspective was summarized by Jesuit theologian Father Phil Land of the Social Science Institute at Gregorian University in Rome, who was invited to consult with the Canadian bishops in 1966. “The human family has to be our concern. We cannot be concerned with ‘my little diocese,’ ‘my little parish,’ ‘my province,’ ‘my state,’ ‘my city,’ or even ‘my country,’ anymore.”\textsuperscript{149} After the council the
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Canadian bishops no longer understood the church in a geographic sense, but as the people of God throughout the world.

The second manner in which Vatican II influenced the Canadian bishops was the Council’s rigorous debates that resulted in the promulgation of “The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World” (Gaudium et Spes in Latin). Though not included in the preparatory schema drafted before the council, the topic for this document was proposed during the first session by Léon-Joseph Suenens, cardinal-archbishop of Malines-Brussels (Belgium), who wanted the council to address the Church ad extra, or in relation to the world. It would take numerous revisions and session debates before Gaudium et Spes would be officially approved at the last session, on 7 December 1965. Many catalysts affected the drafting of this document, but paramount among these was the searing experience of the Second World War (including the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the Holocaust), where Christian nations had engaged in acts of inhumanity on both sides and the churches had been largely passive in the face of such death, destruction and atrocities. As a response, Gaudium et Spes challenged Catholics not to divorce religion from their cultural, social, and political engagement with the world, but rather to promote justice as integral to the Church’s mission.

The position taken by the world’s bishops at Vatican II was part of a new stage in Catholic social teaching. Whereas Rerum Novarum in 1891 and Quadragesimo Anno in 1931 spoke about justice in a local or national context, after World War II Catholic social teaching spoke on an international scale. This move was initiated by Pope John XXIII in his first encyclical “Christianity and Social Progress” (Mater et Magistra) in 1961. Addressing the severe imbalance between rich and poor in the world, this letter spoke to the situation of countries
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which were not fully industrialized. John XXIII opened a new chapter in Catholic social teaching with his emphasis on equitable distribution and social solidarity between nations. “On a world-wide scale governments should seek the economic good of all peoples.” He called on committed Christians and “all people of good will” to work together to create local, national, and global institutions which would both respect human dignity and promote justice and peace. He emphasized that the growing interdependence among nations in a world community and called for an effective world government which would look to the rights of the individual human person and promote the universal common good.

Pope John XXIII’s 1963 encyclical, “Peace on Earth” (*Pacem in Terris*) was an appeal to all people of good will. Issued shortly after the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) and the erection of the Berlin Wall, the pope addressed the need for nuclear disarmament, demanded an end to the arms race, and earnestly appealed for world leaders to respect human dignity. Moreover, the encyclical stressed the responsibility of each individual to take an active role in public life so as to reconstruct social relationships based on truth, justice and charity. These two encyclicals introduced to papal documents a new style of experienced-based religious reflection (using the “observe, judge, act” methodology of Catholic Action) to social questions and gave people a new vision of the church in service to real people in the concrete circumstances of human history.
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At Vatican II, the bishops of the world took John XXIII’s message of the Church engaging the modern world and brought it a new level. *Gaudium et Spes* began by proclaiming that since the Church was concerned with all human struggles for life with dignity, it had the responsibility of reading the contemporary situation of the human race (“the signs of the times”) and “interpreting them in the light of the Gospel.”157 Chapter one established the inherent dignity of the human person (namely that humans were created in the image of God and redeemed by Christ) as the foundational principle for the church’s concern in the social, economic, political and cultural domains.158 Chapter two moved the discussion to the human community, where *Gaudium et Spes* argued that humans can only attain their full potential by participating in community (building up solidarity).159 Thus, equality and justice require a morality that goes beyond individualism to an ethic that is grounded in community participation. Chapter three recognized that human creativity in the world was a continuation of the creative activity of God, but such activity (i.e., scientific and technological labours) also has a rightful autonomy and that these two forces need to collaborate, not control, one another.160 Ultimately, as Chapter four concluded, the Christian community can both contribute to and learn from “secular” domains of life.161 Thus, the Church-world relationship was to be one of dialogue and mutual cooperation. The second half of the document dealt with more specific areas of social life, such as marriage and family life, culture, social and economic development, and international politics (specifically war and peace).162 In presenting a more explicitly developed theological basis for the Church’s social commitment to the world than is found in earlier papal encyclicals,
*Gaudium et spes* launched the Catholic Church on a new path in its involvement in social and political affairs.

In contrast to the earlier social encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*, as well as the preconciliar Labour Day Messages of the Canadian bishops, *Gaudium et Spes* introduced several revolutionary shifts in how the Church approached social justice. Most notably, it expanded the scope of the Church’s social concern from being limited exclusively to the problems of industrialization to a discussion of social problems that affected the whole human race (such as world peace, poverty, and political oppression).  

Equally important, there were three significant shifts in methodology. First, the Council Fathers abandoned the exclusive appeal to “natural law” for a more theologically and scripturally informed approach to social justice. Second, the deductive approach of applying ethical principles was exchanged for a more historically conscious and inductive understanding of ethics. The Council focused on the person as the new subject and, thus, on freedom, equality, and participation as central goods in social life. Third, “Church in the Modern World” shifted from a primarily hierarchical understanding of ecclesiology to one that also emphasized the pilgrim character of the journey of the people of God in this world. Succinctly stated, “[t]he hierarchical teaching office has changed from an authoritative source of eternal and natural law applied to human problems to a dialogue partner that has something to contribute to the world but can also learn from the world.”

In promulgating *Gaudium et Spes*, Vatican II offered a firm expression of faith in the
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presence of God in the world, and a desire to discern authentic “signs of the times” in order to further God’s activity.

These radical shifts in Catholic social teaching were clearly influenced by the extraordinary participation of bishops from developing countries. Beginning at the first session, many of these bishops called upon the council to address global economic injustice and to become a “Church of the poor.” The council responded in *Gaudium et Spes* by presenting justice as central to the issue of poverty and peace. Importantly, justice was measured in *Gaudium et Spes* by the needs of the poorest and by what is necessary to bring about the development that will free the poor from their plight. This meant that those in wealthier nations have a particular obligation to stimulate economic growth beyond simply giving alms out of an abundance of goods, but to reform global economic and social structures so that marginalized voices are heard, the most vulnerable are protected, and polices are assessed in terms of their impact on the poor. According to commentator David Hollenbach, “[t]his approach is a clear anticipation of what came to be called the ‘preferential option for the poor’ in social theology and ethics after the council.” Speaking on behalf of the world’s bishops, this prophetic document made global economic injustice an integral aspect of the religious mission of the Church.

The Canadian bishops were active participants in the discussions surrounding the relationship between the Church and the modern world. Of the sixteen documents promulgated by Vatican II, none had greater Canadian content that *Gaudium et Spes*. The Canadian bishops made seventeen interventions during debates on this document, by far the most Canadian
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comments on any discussion at the council. Furthermore, Cardinals Paul-Émile Léger of Montreal and Maurice Roy of Quebec, as well as Dominican theologian Bernard Lambert, were heavily involved in finalizing the text. It should be noted that all of these individuals were from Quebec, which had a stronger history of the church engaged in social issues than English Canada. For Bishop Remi De Roo of Victoria, *Gaudium et Spes* was the key to understanding the work of the entire council. “If there’s one thing that Vatican II says to us, it is that the era of the total separation of the temporal and spiritual as two spheres, practically identified with good and evil, is over.” The alienation of the Church from the modern world (that characterized the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) was over. Summarized by Alex Carter, no longer were the Canadian bishops limited exclusively to “spiritual concerns,” but *Gaudium et Spes* challenged them “to work for social justice.”

**Creation of Development and Peace (1965-1967)**

While the Canadian council fathers saw the clear link between faith and social justice as a result of their intense experience at Vatican II, the challenge was, in the words of Archbishop Joseph-Aurèle Plourde of Ottawa, how “to translate the preferential option for the poor into concrete action so that it would not be only so many words.” The type of action against underdevelopment on a global scale that was called for by Vatican II did not exist in preconciliar Canadian Catholic social thought. Something new was needed. Shortly after the council ended in December of 1965, two proposals for how the Canadian bishops could respond to global economic injustice arrived at the general secretariat of the Canadian Catholic
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Conference (CCC) almost simultaneously. Within each of these proposals were key points that would eventually shape the ethos of Development and Peace.

The first letter came from Cardinal Paul-Émile Léger of Montreal on 5 May 1966. Citing the successful collaboration of the Canadian dioceses in raising funds for Pope Paul VI’s “Aid to India Fund,” Léger envisioned creating a permanent nationwide foreign aid institution that would provide financial assistance to developing countries. This proposed “organisme national” would have three distinct objectives: “1) to inform the Christian community on the situation and the real needs of the third world; 2) to participate in the financing of projects of developing communities; 3) to provide a contribution to emergency relief.” Importantly, Léger’s primary objective was educating the Canadian community about the needs of those in the third world and, secondly, on raising funds. This emphasis on education would be significant as the new organization would be distinct from already existing Caritas Internationalis, the Vatican’s official development effort that was strictly a fundraising organization. Also noteworthy, Léger speaks about “financing projects of developing communities.” The scope of this proposed organization would be to fund projects that promoted long-term economic development, as opposed to meeting immediate needs such as food and water. To accomplish these goals, Léger suggested that the twenty-year old Montreal diocesan anti-poverty organization known as La Croix d’Or (Gold Cross) be transformed into a national inter-diocesan project. Initially founded by the Archdiocese of Montreal in 1948 as a response to Pope Pius XII’s pleas to help the poor in Rome after World War II, La Croix d’Or was

177 Total dollar amount raised as of 25 March 1966 was $89,623.33 (despite minimal advertising). Figure cited in ACCCB, “Fonds Nat. De Secours (CANADAIDE)/Nat. Fund to Help Developing Countries, 1966” [5226], Report on “National Organization for Relief of Poverty CANADAIDE—Preparatory Steps” by Gordon George, 24 August 1966, Ref. # 181, 2.
179 Ibid, (translation by author).
granted a federal charter in 1960 to distribute goods all over the world.\footnote{ACCCB, “Fonds Nat. De Secours (CANADAIDE)/Nat. Fund to Help Developing Countries, 1966” [5226], “AIDE-MEMOIRE au sujet de l’établissement d’une Œuvre canadienne catholique pour la lutte contre le Faim, et de l’élargissement des cadres de la CROIX D’OR,” 22 August 1966, 2.} Operated by an administrative council composed of laity and the rector of the Notre Dame Basilica in Montreal, Léger believed this model would be relatively easy to enlarge to include all of Canada.\footnote{Ibid., 1-2.}

The next day, on 6 May 1966, Archbishop Philip Pocock of Toronto wrote a similar letter to the CCC requesting that a “Canadian Catholic Fund for the Relief of Hunger” be added to the agenda of the next meeting of the Canadian bishops or the Administrative Board of the CCC. Like Léger, Pocock saw this new fund as an expansion of the already existing Canada-wide “Aid to India Fund.”\footnote{ACCCB, “Fonds Nat. De Secours (CANADAIDE)/Nat. Fund to Help Developing Countries, 1966” [5226], letter from Archbishop Philip Pocock of Toronto to Gordon George, SJ, 6 May 1966.} According to Bernard Daly (an employee of the CCC during this time), the catalyst for Pocock’s letter came from Jesuit Father Gordon George, who served as the Anglophone general secretary of the Canadian Catholic Conference (CCC).\footnote{Daly, \textit{Remembering for Tomorrow}, 89.} George felt strongly that the Canadian Church needed an organization that would motivate Canadian Catholics to give more aid to the poor in developing countries. On one hand, the George/Pocock proposal seemed less innovative than Léger’s in that its aim was to alleviate worldwide famine. Nowhere in George/Pocock plan was there any discussion of educating Canadians about the causes of such conditions nor is the word “development” (implying long-term socioeconomic solutions) used even once. Yet, on the other hand, the George/Pocock letter does provide one key innovation. While it was implied that Léger’s expanded \textit{La Croix d’Or} would continue to operate with an administrative council of laity, lay people were not discussed in his letter. In contrast, the George/Pocock proposed fund was to be “set up apart from the Canadian Catholic Conference [of bishops], under a board of Governors composed of
some bishops and an outstanding group of laymen, both English and French.”

This board, composed of bishops and lay representatives, would raise money, accept bequests, control the dispensing of funds and encourage continuing research. Thus, the George/Pocock letter made clear that lay people were to play a prominent role in the new organization.

Prompted by the two letters, the general secretaries of the CCC established a task force to study the feasibility of creating a “permanent foreign aid institution under aegis of the Catholic Church of Canada.”

Meeting on 15 July 1966, a sixteen-person committee was convened with participants from both French and English Canada who had experience in international development work as well as domestic social issues. After the morning session, the task force unanimously agreed that a national Catholic organization should be created. Its three aims would be “public education on the responsibilities of Canadians to the less wealthy, emergency relief, and aid to development programs.” These aims closely paralleled Léger’s proposed objectives and maintained his emphasis on education. Also adopting the George/Pocock suggestion, the committee stated that this organization should provide a high degree of lay involvement. Finally, the task force agreed that the new organization should cooperate with other Churches and public programs. Despite agreeing upon an overall vision, the committee was unable to come to a consensus over whether the organization-to-be should be a
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transformation of the existing Gold Cross (La Croix d’Or) diocesan program or an entirely new program. Considerable discussion also surrounded whether one organization could fulfill all three aims or it would be better to have two parallel organizations, one for the development and emergency relief programs and another for educating Canadians on the problems of global poverty. Important questions also remained over how “full and active participation” of the whole Canadian Church could best be achieved (especially the laity). Finally, the committee wrestled with what to name such an organization (“Canadaide” was the working title).193

The afternoon session was devoted to presentations from two guest consultants. Father Philip Land, SJ, professor at the Social Science Institute of the Gregorian University in Rome and consultant to Vatican II’s discussion on poverty, provided a theological summary of the importance of Gaudium et Spes. James Norris, assistant to the executive director of the U.S. bishops’ Catholic Relief Services in Washington, DC and a member of the special Vatican secretariat for world justice and development, discussed the challenges of international development. Both speakers applauded the initiative being taken by the Canadian bishops in addressing global injustice, particularly the emphasis on education. Norris warned that while aid programs were helpful in the short-term, real development could never in happen in poor countries unless wealthy governments introduced massive aid and fair trade policies.194 For the governments of the wealthy nations to make these necessary changes, pressure needed to come from informed citizens. Thus, to enact any substantive change in the developing world, Norris challenged the task force to create an organization with an educational campaign that would:

...penetrate every level of the Church. It has to start at the Bishops’ Conference. It has to go down through the pastors, the priests, the seminaries, through lay organizations, so that they [Canadian Catholics] understand ultimately the responsibility that the wealth of the nation carries with it. We will then ultimately
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create a strong articulate lobby on behalf of what the governmental agencies are trying to do.\textsuperscript{195}

Yet Catholics are only part of the Canadian population. Thus, Philip Land, in his comments, pushed for this proposed education program to “work with non-Catholic forces and with purely secular forces” to build a public consensus on global development.\textsuperscript{196} Norris and Land made clear that without an effective program of “massive education” that successfully mobilized all members of the Catholic and non-Catholic community, “we can never help these countries to develop.”\textsuperscript{197} The meeting concluded with the naming of a four-person interim committee to research the unresolved questions, survey the existing Canadian Catholic agencies that worked in foreign aid, and to prepare a report for the CCC General Secretaries.\textsuperscript{198}

Shortly after the meeting, the CCC received a letter from Robert M. Bedolfe on behalf of a group of Catholic laity called the Toronto Laymen’s Committee on World Poverty. Bedolfe wrote a letter advising of a 28 July 1966 meeting that their organization had held at the Catholic Information Centre in Toronto that had brought together representatives of the Canadian labour movement, management, and various Catholic organizations (such as the St. Vincent de Paul Society). This “ad hoc” committee had met “to study the problem of world poverty and to discuss the possibilities of a Canadian commitment to overseas aid in the form of an organized structure under Catholic auspices.”\textsuperscript{199} This organization sought to collaborate with the Canadian bishops on a proposed Canada-wide weekend conference to study world poverty “and search for

\textsuperscript{195} Ibid., 5-6.
\textsuperscript{197} ACCCB, “Consultation on the Establishment of a Canadian Bishops’ Overseas Aid Organization,” 5.
\textsuperscript{198} The committee included Monsignor Robert Ridendeau, director of l’Office des Oeuvres of the Montreal archdiocese; Father John Shea, director of the CCC social action department in Ottawa; Bernard Daly, Information Service of the CCC; and Monsieur André Tremblay, Président de la Fraternité Saint-Jean-Valparaiso. Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{199} ACCCB, “Fonds Nat. De Secours (CANADAIDE)/Nat. Fund to Help Developing Countries, 1966” [5226], letter from Robert Bedolfe to Gordon George, August 1966, 1.
the best means for setting up a Canadian Catholic agency.”

Having arrived at similar conclusions as the bishops’ task force, the Toronto Laymen’s Committee on World Poverty urged that the Catholic Church work with an “ecumenical perspective” and coordinate efforts with other Christian churches. Furthermore, members of this committee argued that a national aid agency “should have a board of lay directors, with some clerical members.” To help organize the weekend conference and to help establish a Canadian Catholic aid agency, this committee offered its services as competent lay specialists in the various fields of economics, agriculture, engineering, education, advertising, and fund-raising. Accepting the offer, John Shea (director of the CCC Social Action Department in Ottawa) invited Bedolle and R. Helling of the Laymen’s Committee to join the CCC interim committee’s 19 September 1966 gathering in Ottawa.

At this decisive meeting, the enlarged committee (now totalling eight members) needed to incorporate all of the previous consultations into one final proposal that would be presented to all the Canadian bishops at their annual plenary assembly in October. The document it drafted, the “Proposal for a National Fund to help Underdeveloped Countries,” was considered the founding document of the organization. It began by clarifying that the purpose of this “Fonds national d’aide aux pays en voie de développement” was to provide “socio-economic aid and international assistance” which would be given to “concrete projects which display an attitude of international co-operation based ‘self-help.” As a point of clarification, the proposal specified that this new relief fund was to be distinctly separate from the missionary activity of
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the Church. The proposed organization was to be “concerned with funds to be used in community development on the essentially ‘temporal’ level, whereas the missionary activity of the Church, as such, is essentially ‘spiritual.’”\(^{206}\) Such a division is not without precedent. For example, the Church in Germany has two distinct funds for charitable purposes and missionary activity, each under separate administration.\(^{207}\) Despite this apparent division, the committee felt that development and mission need not be in opposition to one another. In fact, the opposite was envisioned. Catholic activity in the temporal sphere of development was to be “a concrete expression of the pastoral charity of the Church and ought to complement her other [pastoral and missionary] activities.”\(^{208}\)

The “Proposal” continued to outline the fund’s three objectives, which remained virtually untouched since Léger’s initial letter. The first goal, and the highest priority, would be “information and education.” Education, however, would not be limited to the Catholic population. With the hope of creating a national consensus on the importance of development work, the new organization would commit itself to educating “not only the Christian community at the diocesan or national level, but also the entire Canadian community.”\(^{209}\) To accomplish this lofty goal, the new organization was encouraged to work with other churches and secular agencies.\(^{210}\) Importantly, this educational objective was envisioned as “an activity throughout the course of the year and not only at the time of the annual campaign for funds.”\(^{211}\) The second and third objectives—“financing of community development projects” and to “provide funds for
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emergency needs”—were listed with little explanation.\footnote{Ibid.} While education was considered a top priority, half of the funds collected would be designated for projects of economic and social aid (50 per cent). Of the remaining funds, 20 per cent was designated for emergency relief, 20 per cent would be used for education, and final 10 per cent would be allocated for administrative costs.\footnote{Ibid., 9.}

The bulk of the document outlines “Characteristics of this Fund.” Since the drafters had to reconcile several outstanding issues, this section detailed each suggested structure and explained why they chose it against other possibilities. First and foremost, the committee proposed one organization for all of Canada, as opposed to two completely distinct and autonomous bodies separated on the basis of language.\footnote{Ibid., 4.} Since the program was focused on relationships between the Canadian Church and those in foreign countries, having one national organization would reduce confusion and expenses (for duplicate administrations). Yet, the organization would have two semi-autonomous secretariats in Montreal and Toronto and engage in separate activities for French and English Canada. It was hoped that similar secretariats could eventually be set-up in the West and in the Maritimes. All of these secretariats, however, would be within the jurisdiction of the one director-general in Ottawa.\footnote{Ibid., 5.}

A difficult question for the drafting committee was how to balance the competing desires for empowering the laity to have a substantive role in the new organization and working closely with the bishops to create a massive education program?\footnote{ACCCB, “Fonds Nat. De Secours (CANADAIDE)/Nat. Fund to Help Developing Countries, 1966” [5226], Report on “National Organization for Relief of Poverty CANADAIDE—Preparatory Steps” by Gordon George, 24 August 1966, Ref. # 181, 3.} The committee envisioned everyone
collaborating together as “a Bishops-Clergy-Lay Association.” The drafters were very clear that they rejected the notion of a “purely lay organization” outside of the hierarchy as well as one that was “purely Episcopal.” Citing the Vatican II “Dogmatic Constitution on the Church” (Lumen Gentium), the drafters wanted this new organization to “illustrate a living and eloquent example of the ‘opening’ of the Church to the laity and a new spirit of co-operation which animates it.” While striving for equality between clergy and laity, the document specified that the organization must “submit itself to the ‘ordinary magisterium’ of the Church when there is question of its doctrinal orientation and to the hierarchical authority of the Church when there is a question of its ‘general policy.’” In summary, the laity were to cooperate as partners with the hierarchy of the church, but the bishops reserved the right overrule the laity’s decisions if the institution’s policies or programs ever ran counter to the Church’s doctrinal teachings on faith and morals.

In addition to promoting the laity, this organization would also advance the Vatican II ideal of greater unity among Christians. This new organization of the Church would be firmly committed to working in an ecumenical environment to encourage greater “rapprochement” between Christians. Yet, the document was careful to reject being an “ecumenical structure,” where the organization would not be identified with any denomination. The organization had to maintain a Catholic identity. Despite this openness to ecumenism, there is no mention of inter-religious collaboration (with non-Christian religious development organizations).
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In terms of administration, the organization was conceived as a national undertaking with a diocesan base. Ultimate governing authority of the financial and social orientations was vested in a 150-person general assembly of members. Individual dioceses would choose 50 per cent of the members and the other half would be appointed by the assembly of bishops (competent persons chosen from among national Christian organizations interested in international development). In turn, this group would choose twenty-four board members to run the organization between annual assemblies. It was stipulated that at least 50 per cent of this board would need to be lay and equal representation would be given to French and English sectors. This board would hire a full-time bi-lingual general director and support staff to manage the organization. This “national secretariat” would establish the “over-all plan” for the collection of funds; evaluate and award requests for funds from abroad; and create a program of activities which will be balanced and adapted to the three goals of the organization.

Initiatives of the national secretariat would be implemented by diocesan teams of volunteers within their local dioceses and parishes.

Before this proposal was discussed and voted on by the entire gathering of Canadian bishops, the committee initially presented its suggested organization to twenty-seven bishops during an “optional day” session on 12 October 1966. A motion to approve the proposal was moved by Bishop Philip Pocock, Coadjutor of Toronto, and seconded by Bishop Maxime Tessier of Timmins. The proposal was accepted unanimously by the bishops present on the condition that three amendments be made to the text. The first amendment further clarified the educational objective as creating among Canadian Catholics “a collective responsibility to
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countries in need.”228 The second amendment specified that funds provided for emergency needs would be used for “food, clothing, shelter and related needs to be given regardless of race, colour or creed.”229 Thus, in the case of emergencies these items would be given to all people without any concern for their religious beliefs. Yet, the bishops also wanted to be clear that this organization was not a secular institution. Thus, the third amendment removed from the “Objectives” section “NOTE: This organization should not have a ‘missionary’ or ‘evangelization’ objective.”230 The bishops were fearful that this organization would be devoid of any Catholic identity. The following day, 13 October 1966, the “Proposal for a National Fund” and was brought before the entire plenary assembly of Canadian bishops. Moved by Bishop Albert Sanschagrin, OMI, apostolic administrator of the Diocese of Amos, and seconded by Archbishop Martin M. Johnson of Vancouver, the bishops unanimously adopted the proposal as amended (by the previous day’s optional session).231 With the approval of the plenary assembly, the president of the CCC, Louis Lévesque, Coadjutor Archbishop of Rimouski, authorized an episcopal commission of six members (three from the French sector and three from the English sector) to launch this organization. It was recommended that this committee actively consult lay specialists in implementing this fund.232

The episcopal committee met on 8 February 1967. The bishops who Lévesque appointed to this committee were Cardinal Paul-Emile Léger of Montreal, Philip Pocock of Toronto, George Flahiff, CSB of Winnipeg, Martin M. Johnson of Vancouver, Alexander Carter of Sault Ste. Marie, Gérard-Marie Coderre of Saint-Jean-Longueuil, Joseph-Aurèle Plourde of Ottawa
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These bishops elected J.A. Plourde as their Chair. At the February meeting the committee heard extensive reports from consultations with Canadian laity (which had taken place between November 1966 and January 1967). Father Francis Hennessy, OMI (Executive Director of the Catholic Charities Council, for the English Sector) reported on his consultations in English-speaking Canada and Father Robert Riendeau (Director of the Department of Social Welfare, for the French Sector) presented his findings from the French-speaking regions of Canada. Since these reports were overwhelmingly favourable for the proposed new organization, along with offering some minor constructive critiques for improvement, the committee members unanimously recommended to the Board of the CCC that this project be put into effect. Despite the enthusiasm expressed in the lay consultations, there were some voices of concern that social justice may be beyond the scope of the Catholic Church. For example, Archbishop Johnson (who ultimately resigned from the episcopal committee over this issue) felt Catholic resources and energy were better steered toward “real charity” such as helping “the retarded, handicapped and starving children.” The committee noted that the fund does have a concern for this type of “charity”, as is clarified in its description of the funds for emergency needs, “especially food, clothing, shelter and related emergency needs to be given regardless of race, colour or creed.” To progress forward, the board
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retained the services of Montreal lawyers Jean Goulet and Roger L. Beaulieu\textsuperscript{238} to draft a tentative constitution.

Reconvening on 8 March 1967, the episcopal committee examined the draft constitution closely. At this meeting, the structure of the new organization was revisited. The committee decided to scrap the cumbersome 150-member general assembly and 24-member administrative board and replace it with a 21-member national board of directors. Procedures were clarified for the composition of this board. Quebec would have six members (two from Montreal, one from Quebec, one from Sherbrooke, one from Rimouski, and one from Hull, Amos or Mont-Laurier); New Brunswick would have two members (one English-Canadian and one French-Canadian); Ontario would have four members (either three English-Canadian and one French-Canadian or two from Southern Ontario and two from Northern Ontario) and, finally, each of the seven other provinces would have one member per province.\textsuperscript{239} This total of nineteen lay members would be complemented by two episcopal members of the CCC. Thus, the new Board of Governors would have a grand total of twenty-one members, each with equal authority (ensuring that the bishops had no special privileges). With these corrections, the members of the committee approved the new constitution.

At the 6 April 1967 gathering of the Canadian bishops, the final preparations were made. A vote was held to determine the official name of the new organization. The English-speaking bishops voted with near unanimity for “CO-AID” (Canadian Organization for Aid to

\textsuperscript{238} This name appears in various documents spelled as both “Beaulieu” and “Beaubien.” I have used the name “Beaulieu” here and throughout the dissertation as this version of the name appears in the official minutes of meetings that have been approved by the participants, whereas the spelling “Beaubien” appears in personal notes that were kept by various members of committees (which were not approved).

International Development) as opposed to “The Gold Cross.”240 The French section voted for the opposite by an equally large margin. As a compromise, the name “Canadaide” continued to be used until it was changed to Development and Peace in September 1967. Each linguistic section also voted on an episcopal representative to the board of governors. The English section chose Archbishop Pocock of Toronto and the French section chose J.A. Plourde (both of whom were natural choices given their involvement with the proposed organization).241 To accompanying these bishops on the inaugural board, it was agreed that bishops from the ecclesiastical provinces outlined in the March 8th meeting would appoint lay representatives (for subsequent boards elections would take place within the organization). Criteria for these appointments included interest in development, involvement/commitment to the Catholic Church, recognized professional competence related to development, the ability to commit to five meetings a year and being under 50 years of age.242 With a selection process in place for the first board of governors, the special ad hoc episcopal committee permanently ceased to exist. From this point onwards the organization was no longer part of the CCC but its own independent organization.

**Conclusion**

Although the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace was officially launched in 1967, the idea of creating a permanent nationwide fundraising organization to help the poorest regions of the world arose from the Second Vatican Council. In a 1977 pastoral
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letter, issued on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of Development and Peace, the Canadian bishops underlined the influence of Vatican II in creating CCODP.

In retrospect, Development and Peace was conceived in the cradle of Vatican II. During the Council, the Bishops of Africa, Asia and Latin America conveyed to the Canadian Bishops the harsh realities of poverty and underdevelopment in the Third World. It became clear that the growing gap between the rich and poor peoples in this planet is a great threat to mankind. The Council also made us aware of our responsibilities to work together as a universal church, to erase these injustices.

Transformed by their experiences at Vatican II, the Canadian bishops returned home keenly aware that the Church needed to respond to the escalating challenge of widespread poverty and economic underdevelopment in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Led by a cadre of reform-minded bishops—Paul-Émile Léger, Cardinal Archbishop of Montreal; Philip Pocock, Coadjutor Archbishop of Toronto; Alexander Carter, Bishop of Sault Ste. Marie; George Flahiff, CSB, Archbishop of Winnipeg; and Joseph-Aurèle Plourde, Archbishop of Ottawa—and a new generation of motivated clergy, the CCC launched a year-long program of consultation with laity and international relief experts across Canada in order to develop a new vehicle capable of providing Canadians with an effective way to respond to “history’s greatest challenge.”

The results of this nationwide consultation were set forth in the “Proposal for a National Fund to help Underdeveloped Countries.” Approved on 13 October 1966, this new organization (later named Development and Peace) had two distinct features that were remarkable when viewed in comparison to the other seven Catholic international development organizations or the existing Canadian Catholic social initiatives. First and foremost, Development and Peace was
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given a unique mandate: public education on the responsibilities of Canadians to the less
developed nations of the world, financing community development programs in the Third
World, and providing funds for emergency relief. The order of these objectives was significant.
Development and Peace prioritized educating the Canadian people about their collective
responsibility to countries in need. This component was absent from other fundraising
organizations such as the American-based Catholic Relief Services or the Vatican’s official
development agency Caritas Internationalis.245 Also noteworthy, unlike any other Canadian
Catholic organization, this national fund focused exclusively on socio-economic development
beyond Canadian borders. Development and Peace was distinctly separate from the existing
missionary activities of the Church, although it was to work as a complement, not in opposition,
to the Church’s global efforts at evangelization. Finally, Development and Peace was to serve
all people, regardless of race, creed or ideology. Funds would be granted on the basis of need
according to the intrinsic value of the community based development project, not for religious,
political or economic reasons.

Second, as was foreshadowed by the Catholic Action movement, Development and Peace
was founded as a “Bishops-Clergy-Lay Association.” The framers of the organization explicitly
rejected a “purely lay organization” outside of the hierarchy as well as one that was “purely
Episcopal.” Balancing the two, Development and Peace was to be administered by nineteen lay
persons from all regions and two representatives of the Canadian Episcopate. This structure was
intended to mirror the image of the Church described in Lumen Gentium, where lay people
worked in close collaboration with the bishops and priests. To ensure equality among the
twenty-one governors, the organization was intentionally created at arm’s length from the

245 Eileen Egan, Catholic Relief Services: The Beginning Years (New York: Catholic Relief Services, 1988),
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Canadian bishops’ conference (unique among all other Catholic development agencies, which were attached to their national episcopal conferences). Also, unlike most Canadian social justice initiatives that were regional, Development and Peace was a nationwide organization of the entire Canadian Church even if the organization would have two semi-autonomous secretariats for French and English Canada. This “new vision” of Canadian Catholic social justice was unanimously approved by the Canadian bishops and launched on 8 June 1967.
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CHAPTER 2: IMPLEMENTATION (1967-1972)

At 10:00 am Thursday morning, 8 June 1967, the newly-appointed Board of Governors for the “National Fund to Help Developing Countries” (also known as “Canadaide”) gathered for the first time at the offices of the secretariat of the Canadian Catholic Conference (CCC) in Ottawa. There was a sense of optimism in the air. The CCC office was just down the street from Parliament Hill where politicians and their advisors were busily attempting to build Canada’s welfare state. Since taking office in 1963, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson’s Liberal government had introduced universal health care (1966), the Canada Pension Plan (1966), and Canada student loans (1964). The year 1967 was also Canada’s centenary and celebrations were held across the nation. There was an equal sense of excitement within the Canadian Catholic Church over the changes ushered in by Vatican II. From 1967-1969, the President of the CCC was Bishop Alexander Carter of Sault Ste. Marie, one of the leading reform-minded bishops within the Canadian Church. Bishop Alex Carter, along with his close circle of friends—Archbishop George Flahiff of Winnipeg; Archbishop Philip Pocock of Toronto; his brother, Bishop Emmett Carter of London; and Archbishop Joseph-Aurèle Plourde of Ottawa—brought a strong reform impulse to the CCC. According to Everett MacNeil, who arrived at the CCC in 1966 to serve as the assistant general secretary and soon became the general secretary, these were “wonderfully heady times in terms of the Church. Renewal. Openness. Everything was possible.”
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Governors had inherited a twelve-page “Proposal” from the Canadian bishops for an international development organization. Their task now was to make this vision a reality.

The principal items discussed during this inaugural day-long meeting—vision for the organization, organizational structures, fundraising campaigns, international development projects, and emergency relief—would become permanent standing items on the agenda of national gatherings and they form the outline of this chapter. Decisions made and actions taken on these areas would define the priorities and establish important precedents for the next five years of Development and Peace and beyond.

This historic board meeting opened with introductory remarks by Archbishop Joseph-Aurèle Plourde of Ottawa. Archbishop Plourde exhorted the Board of Governors to model their efforts on the teachings of Populorum Progressio (“On the Development of Peoples”), the most recent social encyclical issued by Pope Paul VI.250 The first section of this chapter will explore important developments in post-conciliar Catholic social thought. In addition to Populorum Progressio, this section will also discuss Justitia in Mundo (“Justice in the World”), produced by the bishops assembled at the 1971 Roman synod. These documents in Catholic social thought provided the theological underpinnings of Development and Peace during this period.

The second section discusses the efforts of the early boards to establish organizational structures. Not only did the “National Fund to Help Developing Countries” need a proper name, but it also needed to form a permanent secretariat to administer this organization. The secretariat would hire a small staff to administer an organized educational program and to animate a participatory network of committed volunteers in dioceses across the country. These permanent education offices laid the foundation for a future year-round education program.

The third section focuses on the fundraising efforts of Development and Peace. Much of the energy of the organization went into creating profitable nationwide Lenten campaigns (known as Share Lent) to assist developing countries. Revenue raised by Share Lent would be augmented by local fundraising walks known as “Miles for Millions.” These fundraisers were intended to not only collect funds for overseas projects (and cover administrative costs), but also to educate Canadians about global inequalities. Large amounts of money also became available through matching grants from the newly-formed Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

Once funds were raised, an administrative apparatus needed to be created that would receive, study, and review socio-economic projects in the developing world. The fourth section looks at the international projects department. Priorities needed to be set that would determine what type of development projects would receive funds from this new organization. The relationship between development and evangelization was constantly being negotiated during these early years. Also during this period, the organization would work hard to make itself known in the developing world.

Along with financing development projects, the organization was also mandated to provide emergency assistance to natural and human-made disasters all over the world. The fifth section reviews emergency relief. Protocols needed to be created to determine which relief efforts would be supported, how much funding should go to these efforts, and what kind of long-term relationship (if any) was expected to develop these devastated regions. Responses to the famine in Biafra (1968-1970) and the refugees from Bangladesh (1971-1972) gave rise to a key question over the identity of the organization, specifically whether funds should be used for long-term socio-economic development or immediate disaster relief.
The final section of this chapter covers the 1972 conference in Blankenberge, Belgium, where the world’s leading Catholic development agencies met to discuss how members of the industrialized world could best promote development. At this historic conference, Development and Peace Executive Director Romeo Maione co-wrote a prophetic minority report that rejected the existing paternalistic method of bilateral aid. Instead, Maione proposed a radical new model of “partnership” that sought to empower local communities through co-responsibility in decision making. This watershed moment represented the end of one era of Development and Peace (a paternalistic approach to development) and the beginning of another.

**Post-Conciliar Catholic Social Thought (1967-1972)**

The first-ever meeting of the Board of Governors began with an address by Archbishop Joseph-Aurèle Plourde of Ottawa, president of the episcopal committee charged with launching the “National Fund to Help Developing Countries.” Archbishop Plourde briefly reviewed the reasons for creating this new organization and he retraced the steps that the Canadian bishops had taken over the past year. After formally dissolving the episcopal committee, Plourde articulated the vision that he hoped would guide the work of this new organization.

...[M]ay the encyclical, *Populorum Progressio* be our common inspiration throughout our future action and continually serve as our point of reference. It serves to remind us that since Pius XII denounced the sharp disparity between the developed regions and the underdeveloped countries (7 December 1953), the situation has only become worse. Today, a billion and a half men continue to suffer from starvation or malnutrition...The Canadian Church must hear this call. You are called to be the instruments of its response, at a time when the destiny of humanity is at a crossroads.

In this exhortation, Plourde made clear the pressing need for this national fund in the world. Equally important, he urged the newly formed Board to Governors to draw theological inspiration from Pope Paul VI’s encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (a copy of which, along with
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a brief analysis, was sent to the governors in preparation for the first board meeting along with several other relevant documents).

Promulgated by Pope Paul VI a few months before the meeting, on 26 March 1967, *Populorum Progressio* (“On the Development of Peoples”) addressed the effects of economic expansion, industrialization and international trade on the poorest nations and their peoples. In this encyclical, Paul VI enlarged the scope of his predecessors’ treatment of the struggle between rich and poor classes to encompass the conflict between rich and poor nations. During the 1960s, the world was divided into thirds: the “First World” of North America, Europe and Australia; the “Second World” of the Soviet Union and China and independent socialist countries; and the “Third World,” the so-called developing nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Many of these countries, especially in Africa, were just emerging from colonial rule. There was excitement and hope mixed with considerable apprehension regarding whether these former colonies would prosper as newly independent nations. Within this global arrangement, cold war rivals from the First and Second Worlds invested considerable economic aid, propaganda, and military assets in the Third World with the hope of acquiring new clients and expanding their strategic interests. Sometimes these competing interests clashed with deadly consequences. For example, the lengthy Vietnam War escalated substantially during this decade.

Reaffirming the strong social justice concerns of Pope John XXIII’s pontificate and of Vatican II, *Populorum Progressio* vigorously asserted the connection between Christian faith and the pursuit of economic justice for all. The encyclical began by stressing the urgent need to
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confront the appalling reality of poverty in the world.\textsuperscript{255} As a response to growing inequalities in wealth, power, and access to food among nations, Paul VI offered a new humanistic vision of international development. Moving the concept of development beyond economic and social terms, he insisted that authentic development must be \textit{integral} in that it helps people move from less human to more human conditions of life.\textsuperscript{256} This definition involved not only ensuring a food supply, shelter, and access to health care and education, but also freedom from oppression so that people could assume responsibility for their own lives.\textsuperscript{257} According to Pope Paul VI’s vision of integral development, the world’s resources and technology existed to meet the needs of all humanity.\textsuperscript{258} Thus, rich nations had to be concerned with the poor ones. This concern was to be shown in practical ways, such as a better distribution of wealth through direct aid, establishment of more equitable trade relations, and seeing that no one was left behind as development advanced.\textsuperscript{259} True solidarity, Paul argued, would guarantee more equality of economic opportunity, the end to racist and nationalistic policies, and more international cooperation.\textsuperscript{260} Pope Paul VI concluded with an appeal that directly connected the struggle for economic justice with the pursuit of lasting peace in the world. This final section of the letter was entitled “Development is the new name for Peace.”\textsuperscript{261}

At the time of its publication, \textit{Populorum Progressio} was one of the first major critiques of the prevailing notions of development. For this reason, commentators referred to this encyclical as “Catholic social teaching’s Magna Carta on development.”\textsuperscript{262} In emphasizing \textit{Populorum Progressio}, Plourde was making clear to the Board of Governors that this new
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“fund” was to do more than merely provide charitable economic assistance to the world’s poor. The post-Vatican II bishops expected this new organization to promote *integral* human development. Money raised by the Canadian Catholic community was to help create conditions so that people could live with greater dignity, specifically by overcoming dangers to health and social security, advancing education and promoting culture.

In addition to *Gaudium et Spes* and *Populorum Progressio*, another important source of theological inspiration for Development and Peace during this period was *Justitia in Mundo* (“Justice in the World”), the statement produced by the bishops assembled at the 1971 Roman synod.263 In 1971, the situation of the Third World was only getting more desperate. As the bishops stated at the beginning of the document,

> we have been...able to perceive the serious injustices which are building around the world of humanity a network of domination, oppression and abuses which stifle freedom and which keep the greater part of humanity from sharing in the building up and enjoyment of a more just and more fraternal world.264

This somber assessment was all the more disappointing when one considers that the 1960s had been filled with such optimism about the possibility of improving the situation. The United Nations had declared the 1960s as the “Decade of Development.” World leaders—and many of the bishops who approved *Gaudium et Spes* (1965)—had been taken with the idea that the unprecedented economic productivity of the postwar period would provide the opportunity to eliminate poverty once and for all.265 As a result, development was viewed during the 1960s in
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linear terms and was measured exclusively by economic growth. While *Populorum Progressio* was one of the first major religious critiques of this prevailing and inadequate notion of development, it accepted the term “development” and did not propose a clear alternative. Many third world economists, social activists and liberation theologians became uncomfortable with the uncritical use of the term “development” and spoke, instead, about a “theory of dependency.” According to influential liberation theologian Gustavo Gutiérrez:

> The underdevelopment of the poor countries...[was] the historical by-product of the development of other countries. The dynamics of the capitalist economy lead to the establishment of a center and a periphery, simultaneously generating progress and wealth for the few and the social imbalances, political tensions and poverty for the many.

The Conference of Bishops of Latin America (CELAM) elaborated on this theme in considerable depth at its 1968 meeting in Medellín, Columbia. Looking at the Latin American social reality, they concluded that the crushing poverty suffered by the vast majority of the population could only be addressed by recognizing the structural injustice that undermined hopes for social and individual peace. By 1971 there was considerably less innocence among development advocates—and the world’s bishops—about the challenges of international justice.

In 1971, 190 bishops were elected to represent their local episcopal conferences at the second post-conciliar extraordinary synod held in Rome. Significant for this assembly was that
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more than half of the bishops came from countries of the Third World. Unlike at Vatican II where European bishops were the dominant voice, at this synod “the bishops of the Third World were heard from in an unprecedented proportion.” As a result, there was an intentional effort in “Justice in the World” to describe the social question from the vantage point of those who lived in nations with widespread and serious poverty. The document opened with the reality of systemic injustice in the world and the need for Christians to join with one another and all persons of good will to overcome injustice. This introduction concluded with the often-quoted sentence, “action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the Gospel, or, in other words, of the Church's mission for the redemption of the human race and its liberation from every oppressive situation.” Here, the Catholic Church clearly expressed that its mission was concerned not simply with personal conversion but with the social transformation of the world.

The first major section of the document was an overview of the situation in the world. Importantly, “Justice in the World” used social analysis that acknowledged and named structural injustice. The bishops highlighted the “tremendous paradox” in the modern world: forces for achieving human dignity were strong, yet the divisions and tensions of the human family only appeared to be increasing. Confronted with the injustice and oppression that marked international life (migrants and refugees, religious persecution, human rights violations, torture, political prisoners, war, dishonest media, etc.), the right to development was proclaimed as a
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fundamental human right. 276 Among the many who suffered from these injustices were the “silent, voiceless victims” who deserved the Church’s particular attention.277

The second major section outlined a biblical and theological reflection on why the Church must take up the struggle to achieve justice in the temporal life. Appealing to both the Old and New Testaments, the bishops asserted that “Christian love of neighbour and justice cannot be separated.”278 Thus, preaching the Gospel required a dedication to the liberation of humanity in this world. Interestingly, the bishops noted that the religious mission of the Church did not give it special competence in formulating concrete solutions to particular problems in local situations. In other words, “Justice in the World” employed a dialogical style of teaching that did not offer ready-made answers drawn from Catholic natural law tradition. Rather, it issued an invitation for individual Christians listen to how God was speaking in their situation and to take action that promoted the common good.279

The final section provided guidance and encouragement for enacting the commitment to justice. The Church called for certain rights to be upheld in the world, such as: a decent wage, security, freedom of thought and expression, proper judicial procedures and participation in the decision-making process.280 Perhaps even more significantly, for the first time, the bishops of the world recognized the need for the Church to bear witness to justice in its own life if its call for justice in the world was to be credible.281 The bishops emphasized the need to educate for justice and endorsed a methodology that would awaken the consciences of believers. There were also calls for the local and regional churches to work cooperatively, especially for rich and
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poor churches to develop networks of mutual action. This cooperation was also to be extended to include ecumenical and inter-religious activities. After listing eight proposals for international action (such as supporting initiatives of the United Nations), the document concluded with a statement of hope that Christians would find the Kingdom of God as the fruit of their efforts.

The fact that “Justice in the World” emerged as a consensus statement from an assembly representing the worldwide episcopate awarded it particular interest within the Catholic world. After its release, there was an upsurge in interest in matters of global justice within the Church. For those Catholic institutions that were already engaged in social justice, such as Development and Peace, “Justice in the World” was influential for three main reasons. First, it offered an even stronger and clearer statement on the relation between Christian faith and justice than was provided in *Gaudium et Spes*. Second, “Justice in the World” provided a more complete understanding of development. According to the Synod of 1971, development was a fundamental human right. Development, however, was more than one’s economic or material condition. Adopting language and social analysis from the documents of Medellín (which spoke of domination, oppression and liberation), the bishops presented development as a process of liberation from “social structures” that were “objective obstacles” to progress. Development now entailed social and economic participation, as well as the promotion of human dignity and human rights. It would take some time before Development and Peace internalized this message in its programs, but “Justice in the World” provided the theological vision for Catholic
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development in the 1970s and beyond. Third, “Justice in the World” placed an emphasis on education as means of eliminating injustice. This affirmed the dual mandate of Development and Peace: financial support of international projects and education of all Canadians on global inequality.

**Organizational Structures**

Much of the discussion at the board’s initial meeting—and most of the board’s activity throughout 1967—dealt with establishing organizational structures to ensure that the founding vision of the organization would be realized. During his introductory address, Archbishop Plourde stressed that this new organization was to be characterized by a spirit of lay-clergy cooperation. “If the Canadian bishops had decided to form such an organization five or ten years ago we would have gone ahead and done the job ourselves.” Instead, the bishops insisted that this fund would be best served by a team of lay-people working in partnership with the bishops. As outlined in the constitution that was drafted by the ad hoc episcopal committee on 8 March 1967 (and approved by the CCC on 6-7 April 1967), nineteen of the twenty-one board members were to be lay people from across Canada, according to the distribution of the Catholic population: six from Quebec, four from Ontario (with at least one being francophone), two from New Brunswick (representing both the English and French speaking populations) and one from each of the seven provinces. The remaining two positions were to be held by two bishops chosen from the CCC, representing both linguistic groups. This national Board of Governors was to function as the ultimate decision-making body for the organization.
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For their initial meeting, each of the lay board members was recommended by the bishops of their province after consultation with groups of lay people. Although the CCC had appointed the first board and sponsored its first meeting, future boards were to be elected by the laity and to operate independently of the bishops’ conference. Rounding out the first board were the two bishops, Archbishop Joseph-Aurèle Plourde of Ottawa (representing French Canada) and Coadjutor Archbishop Philip F. Pocock of Toronto (representing English Canada). It is important to note that these bishops were not assigned as “chaplains,” with positions of power over the board. Rather, as recalled by Roméo Maione, the first Executive Director of the organization, the bishops “didn’t try to dictate. [Archbishops Plourde and Pocock] felt that they were part of the church along with the laity. Around the table everybody was elected...They truly reflected how the whole church should work, with that kind of democratic structure...We just talked and the decisions were made. There was no master plan.”

This new organization was not merely a new bishops’ fund nor was it an operation of the laity independent of the Church. Rather, this new organization was, in the words of Judge Alfred Monnin, the first President of the Board of Governors, “of the whole Canadian church where bishops, priests, religious, laymen and laywomen work together.”

While the entire Board of Governors would meet an average of twice a year (usually in June to review the fiscal year and in mid-October to prepare for the annual Share Lent fundraising campaign), a smaller group was elected to serve as an Executive Committee that would meet on a more regular basis (an average of three times a year outside of full board meetings).
meetings) to make appropriate recommendations to the full board. In the case of the first executive, they were asked to prepare the annual fundraising campaign, form a permanent secretariat, and craft the first budget. Most decisions made by the Executive Committee would then be brought before the full Board of Governors, where they would be subject to a vote before being accepted and implemented. Chosen for the first Interim (provisional) Executive Committee were Alfred M. Monnin of St. Boniface, judge on the Manitoba superior court (also elected as president of the board); Archbishop Plourde of Ottawa; Louis C. Roy, a financier from Quebec City; R.S. Rooney, a chartered accountant from Ottawa; Marthe Legault, an administrator of a Caisse Populaire at Longueuil (and the only woman on the Board of Governors); Lucien Fontaine, managing editor of the weekly newspaper in Val d’Or; and Hugh Wadey, a businessman from Islington, Ontario. Wadey was also elected to serve as chair of the allocation sub-committee that would recommend to the board where the aid would be distributed.

The first issue to be addressed by the full board was incorporation. To provide legal advice, Roger Beaulieu and Jean Goulet, the lawyers who drafted the organization’s constitution in collaboration with the ad hoc episcopal committee, were present. Beaulieu and Goulet explained the structure of the organization and outlined the responsibilities at each level (diocesan, regional and national). The only substantive change that the board made to the constitution was to define the limits of the governors’ terms (which were unspecified in the
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The board unanimously decided that each term would last three years (with a maximum of two terms) and that each term would be “rotated” so that only a third of the governors would be retired/elected every year. The first seven governors (three from Quebec, two from Ontario, one from New Brunswick and the English bishop) would be elected in Fall 1969, the second seven governors (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Alberta) in Fall 1970, and the final seven governors (three from Quebec, two from Ontario, one from New Brunswick, and the French bishop) in Fall 1971. These elections happened at regional meetings, which were open to all members of the organization (since, in addition to elections, these meetings were intended to serve as “an excellent opportunity to educate the population about the problems of the Third World”). Travel and lodging expenses were provided for one person per diocese (who would have the right of proxy vote for all other delegates who are unable to attend). With this procedure agreed upon, all that remained for incorporation was for the “fund” to choose a name for itself and for the governors to sign the request for incorporation.

Several names were proposed, but due to a lack of consensus, the board voted to retain “Canadaide” (13 votes) as the temporary title. Other leading options that were defeated included: “Canadian John XXIII Fund” (3 votes); “John XXIII Fund” (2 votes); or the “Canadian Catholic Organization for Development of Nations” (0 votes). At this point, the board unanimously approved the constitution and signed the request for incorporation. While
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processing the request, the Registrar General rejected the name Canadaide because it felt that this name may connote federal aid on behalf of the government of Canada. The governors were not upset about renaming the organization as, over the course of the first month, several governors reported to the Executive Committee that the name Canadaide did not have a strong impact on various people who were consulted. At the August 1967 meeting of the Executive Committee, André Tremblay (hired as the first staff person for the new organization) proposed the name “the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace” (abbreviated as CCODP) after he facilitated a workshop and this name was considered the most popular.

This title made a clear reference to Paul VI’s post-Vatican II vision of integral development that was articulated in *Populorum Progressio*, where the final section was entitled “Development is the New Name for Peace.” This choice beat out “The Canadian Catholic Organization for International Development” (second choice) and “The Canadian Catholic Fund for International Cooperation” (third choice). Tremblay’s suggestion was unanimously adopted by the Executive Committee and formally approved at the next Board of Governors meeting in September 1967.

With the name finalized, the board could move forward with incorporation. The official "Letters Patent to incorporate the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace"
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was drafted on 20 October 1967. This short document was a succinct summary of the October 1966 “Proposal.” The twenty one members of the first Board of Governors were listed as the official petitioners for incorporation. With an official name and the Letters Patent filed in October, the Board of Governors was no longer “provisional” but was now permanent. Also, the Interim Executive Committee was unanimously voted to serve as the official Executive Committee. The Registrar General of Canada would formally approve the Letters Patent and officially grant CCODP a charter on 8 January 1968.

While the “Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace” worked as a full name for legal purposes, a catchy “trade name” was needed for fundraising and education. Several public relations experts were consulted (in both English and French Canada), but they could not agree upon a name. Since the governors were anxious to begin publicizing the new fund, Tremblay suggested that the full title of the organization be used, but the words “DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE” be emphasized. This form was both shorter (sometimes abbreviated to simply D&P) and it still retained the connection to Paul VI’s vision of integral development. Furthermore, since the organization needed a symbol, Tremblay also proposed using the symbol of the [Catholic] Pastoral Animation Centre from the 1967 International and Universal Exposition (commonly known as Expo’67) that was held in Montreal from 27 April to 29 October 1967. This symbol worked on two levels. First, the symbol was connected to the extremely popular Expo’67, which was widely considered to be the most successful World’s
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Fair of the 20th century. Second, the symbolism behind the logo matched the mission of CCODP. The main theme of Expo’67 was “Terre des Hommes/Man and His World,” which was derived from the title of the 1939 international bestselling book by the French author, poet and aviator Antoine de Saint-Exupery. In this work, Saint-Exupery expressed the human need for solidarity. As a graphic symbol of this concept, Montréal artist Julien Hébert created a design based on one of the oldest known drawings of a human being (a vertical line with outstretched arms). The complete logo for Expo’67 contained eight identical twin groupings of these early human drawings that encircled the world. This logo was designed to be a symbol of unity and friendship among all people. The Pastoral Animation Centre symbol was a variation of this logo; two interlocking figures (with arms outstretched) in front of a globe. Tremblay had already obtained permission to use this symbol free of charge. After viewing a draft of the proposed letter head, and suggesting the lettering be slightly modified, the Board of Governors unanimously approved the trade name and the symbol.

Another pressing issue for the board was the formation of a permanent secretariat (the hiring of full-time professionals to manage Development and Peace according to the directives of the Board of Governors). The most urgent need was to hire an Executive Director for the organization, who could then hire an assistant and staff. Until a thorough search and interview process could be conducted, the Executive Committee hired two consultants from the ad hoc episcopal committee to be the “temporary” secretariat. Father Robert Riendeau (director of the CCC’s Office of Health and Social Welfare in Montreal) and André Tremblay (president of the Fraternité Saint-Jean-Valparaiso, a co-operative program between the diocese of St. Jean,

---

316 Ibid., 125-36. To see the complete logo for Expo’67 see Appendix 2, Figure 2.
Quebec and Valparaíso in Chile), were hired to do the full-time work required to start the “fund” and to provide stability during the transition process. Riendeau and Tremblay arranged for use of office space provided by the Archdiocese of Montreal (at 1452 Drummond Street), which would serve as the administrative headquarters of Development and Peace. This space was given free of charge until 1 July 1970, when rent began being charged. Riendeau and Tremblay were also directed to outline the first fundraising campaign, which the Board of Governors had agreed would be held during Lent 1968 and the first budget. To finance the start-up costs of paying the temporary and permanent secretariat, as well as launching the first fund-raising campaign (that would fund the organization from that point forward), Riendeau obtained a loan for $25,000 from La Croix d’Or de Montréal.

Eager to find a permanent Executive Director for the secretariat, Riendeau and Tremblay drafted an advertisement for the position and publicized it through the governors in each of their regions across Canada. The search committee of Rooney (chair), Wadey and Roy interviewed three finalists and unanimously chose Roméo Maione of Montreal as the first Executive Director, which was subsequently approved by the Board of Governors (effective as of 15 October 1967). Maione—fluent in English, French, Italian and Spanish—had an extensive record of leadership within the Catholic Action movement (also known as the
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Jeunesse ouvrière chrétienne or JOC. From 1956 to 1957 he worked at the Vatican preparing the Second World Congress for the Laity (held in 1957). This was followed by four years in Brussels as President of the International Young Christian Workers (1957-1961). From 1961 to 1967, Maione held posts as Assistant Director of the Social Action Department of the CCC; Assistant Director of the International Affairs Department of the Canadian Labour Congress; and International President of the World Assembly of Youth (WAY). Maione later marvelled that the position with CCODP was openly advertised and applicants had to submit their curriculum vitae for review, as opposed to a secret selection. Such a process, he exclaimed, was “incredibly revolutionary” for a Catholic organization at this time. To assist Maione, André Tremblay was hired as his (permanent) Assistant Director.

Hired in fall 1967, the first task of the new secretariat was to organize and launch Development and Peace’s first nationwide fundraising campaign, Share Lent’68. After the campaign finished, Maione hired Tom Johnston to organize the newly created diocesan sections (that were formed during the initial Lenten campaign) and help prepare for the next years’ campaign. Tremblay was assigned to manage the funds collected and to guarantee that they would be properly sent to the Third World (in 1970 Tremblay was named Director of the Projects Department). Being such a young organization, all three members of the secretariate helped out with projects, education and promotion. With the initial organizational mechanisms in place for the Lenten fundraising campaign and a projects department, the secretariat turned its
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attention to the other half of their mandate, education. In the original proposal for Development and Peace from 1966, the Canadian bishops specified that their intent was “to make of the operation a true collective education activity” in order “to create an awareness of collective responsibility...and develop concern for international cooperation and social justice on an international scale.” To fulfill this objectives, in May 1969 Maione unveiled an ambitious educational program to take education beyond the Share Lent campaigns. With the approval of the Executive Committee, Maione hired two full-time staff members, experienced in education and international affairs, to organize public education campaigns in each linguistic sector of Canada, Denyse Gauthier, who was to prepare the program for French-speaking Canada and Andrew Paul, who was to open a new field office in Toronto and coordinate the program for the English Sector.

The CCODP education program had three objectives: (1) informing public opinion of the real problems in the developing regions and the role played by wealthy countries, both in alleviating these problems (such as international aid) as well as making them worse (through unfair international trade arrangements); (2) changing the general attitude towards poor countries; and (3) getting Canadians more involved as individuals and as groups. Thus, these new education sectors were envisioned as being not merely “information centres” on the developing world, “but rather a dynamic force to arouse Canadian public opinion to seek solutions [to global injustice].” The hope was that this new education initiative would provide a “solid program of formation” to local members of CCODP, who in turn, would
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become the “principal animators of public opinion.”\textsuperscript{338} To accomplish these lofty goals, the education offices would operate year round (but would reach a crescendo during the annual Lenten campaign). To assist the two education departments in this task, the Executive Committee also approved the creation of two separate education committees.\textsuperscript{339} These education committees, comprised of grassroots members of Development and Peace and experts from various sectors of the community (educators, missionaries, community organizers, union activists), would assist Gauthier and Paul in specifying educational objectives, developing pedagogical methods and educational tools for implementation, and evaluating the educational program.\textsuperscript{340} Rather than tackling all the problems of development at once, the education committees would select individual issues for in depth study.\textsuperscript{341}

The two education department directors (Gauthier and Paul) dedicated one year, September 1969 - September 1970, to surveying the needs of the diocesan committees, defining an orientation for the education program, creating a grassroots organization, and forming the envisioned educational committees for their sector. While Gauthier and Paul worked together to create a common national vision for the CCODP education program, they also adopted different approaches and working methods to fit their linguistic audiences (for example, the English sector invested heavily in collaborating with other Christian churches, whereas these churches were not very active in Quebec.)\textsuperscript{342} In addition to forming their own CCODP education committees, Gauthier and Paul also consulted with other agencies in their sectors, such as
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Oxfam and the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC), as well as Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC)/Radio Canada to prepare educational materials. These short films, kits, brochures, fact sheets, and bulletins were designed to present the various issues related to development in terms that the average person could understand. Finally, Gauthier and Paul each visited elementary schools, high schools, and CEGEPS (junior colleges in Quebec) to speak about development issues.

After this year of study and before the education program would officially launch, in the fall of 1970 some organizational restructuring took place within Development and Peace. Gauthier was promoted to assistant director and was delegated to coordinate the education department for French-speaking Canadians. Her equivalent for English-speaking Canada was Tom Johnston, who was also named as associate director. In this capacity, these assistant directors of education were responsible for the Share Lent campaigns, Miles for Millions walkathons, diocesan sections, regional meetings, and publicity (newspapers) within their linguistic regions. To implement the proposed education program, Gilles Frenette was hired as the “education officer” or animateur for Quebec (based in Montreal) and Andy Paul was his counterpart for English Canada (working out of Toronto). These new animateurs were responsible for launching and developing sections; educating youth in social justice; assisting with the Share Lent campaigns; and assuring a CCODP presence on local March for Millions
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Importantly, their role was to assist local volunteers and diocesan sections, not to replace them.

A victim of their own success, during its first year of operation the education department received numerous requests from local sections for a stronger presence in local communities and schools (which was impossible to do from the Montreal or Toronto offices). For the 1971-1972 fiscal year, the number of animateurs grew. The English Sector now had three regional animators (Mike Flynn in Edmonton for Western Canada, John Murphy in Halifax for Atlantic Canada, and Andy Paul covering Ontario), as did the French Sector (Marc-André Laliberté in Quebec City, Micheline Côté, in Montreal/North West Quebec and Antonin Dumas-Pierre in Montreal/Eastern Quebec). These animators were especially active within local grade schools, high schools and CEGEPs (in Quebec) to create educational experiences that made Canadians aware of their collective responsibility to countries in need. A notable example was during 1971-1972 CCODP and several Protestant churches received a $67,000 grant from the Government of Canada to organize “Poster Expo 72” that invited young people across Canada, ages 9-15, to create posters focused on world development. By expanding the
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350 ACCODP, Archives DG, Conseil National Reunions, CN Reunions 1972, CN PV Juin, CN.PVA.JUIN.1972, “Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors,” 16-17 June 1972, “Education Report (English Sector),” 74. While all three would serve as animateurs for several years, Mike Flynn would serve CCODP for several decades in multiple leadership positions.
Animator program across Canada, the education department was actively trying to decentralize its services.

In March 1972, the Executive Committee agreed that Tom Johnston and the English Sector’s Education Department should move its office from Montreal to Toronto (67 Bond Street). Establishing a second office in Toronto was a realization of the original 1966 proposal that stated “given the bi-lingual and bi-cultural character which the organization should have, it is desirable that the official centre be at Ottawa and that Montreal and Toronto be centres of operation of two semi-autonomous secretariats, both within the jurisdiction of one director-general.” The only variation from this original vision was that there was never a centre in Ottawa, although this city was listed as the location of the Head Office in order to obtain the Letters Patent (the Executive Director and his staff were always based in Montreal). Since 1967, the general consensus of the board was to have two secretariats as indicated in the 1966 proposal (along with hope of adding additional offices in the West and in the Maritimes). Toronto was chosen as the new home for the English sector of the education department because it was the largest English-speaking diocese in Canada. Moreover, Toronto was also the home to the national headquarters of most Protestant churches, which was important as CCODP was active in building ecumenical cooperation for development projects. While the English sector of the education department would move to Toronto, the other members of the secretariat (the Executive Director, the projects department, and the

---

education department-French sector, along with their staff) would continue to be based in Montreal (which remained the national headquarters).

When hiring his initial staff for the secretariat, Maione recruited heavily from his network in the Catholic Action movement. André Tremblay (Assistant Director), Tom Johnston (Associate Director and Director of the English Education Department), Denyse Gauthier (Assistant Director and Director of the French Education Department), Gilles Frenette (animateur, Quebec), Mike Flynn (animateur, Western Canada), John Murphy (animateur, Atlantic Canada), all had worked previously with Catholic Action (both within Canada and on the international level). Hiring from within Catholic Action was not surprising given that this movement provided Maione with a reservoir of Catholic social activists with an intimate understanding of popular education.

Catholic Action served as an effective training ground for many young men and women to explore social issues (such as unemployment, housing, and issues related to youth) in light of Catholic social teaching. Its members developed strong practical and organizational skills, such as conducting surveys, writing newspaper articles, preparing briefs, arranging conferences, travelling, and organizing public education campaigns. Equally important, its members were formed with a strong faith conviction that a commitment to social justice was a fundamental part of being a Christian. With a critical vision of society and a detailed knowledge of Catholic social teaching, members of the Catholic Action movement went on to hold leadership roles within the Church, as fully responsible lay people, as well as in secular society.
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Timing was also an important reason why Development and Peace attracted so many members of Catholic Action. Just as CCODP was being formed, Catholic Action was experiencing a fatal “crisis” in Quebec (where the vast majority of the Canadian Catholic Action sections were based).\textsuperscript{364} In 1966, the Quebec Bishops’ Conference voted to cease funding the Catholic Action movement due to the political stances taken by the leadership of the various movements, the groups losing financial autonomy due to loss of membership and the lack of income-generating services, the desire to have greater control over the laity, and changing orientations within the movement (from educational to confrontational).\textsuperscript{365} This episcopal vote came against the backdrop of changing pastoral priorities after Vatican II, major socio-economic changes in the 1960s (especially in Quebec), the lack of follow-up from youth to adulthood in the movements, and a crisis in identity for Catholic Action.\textsuperscript{366} Without funding from the bishops, many Catholic Action leaders and staff were dismissed. From 1966-1968, one of the largest and most influential socio-religious movements in Canada suddenly disappeared. For many of those who were leaders in the Catholic Action movement, Development and Peace became a natural place to work and continue their faith-based social activism.\textsuperscript{367}

According to Mike Flynn, former staff member of both Catholic Action and Development and Peace, the spirituality and methodology of Catholic Action provided several important paradigms for Development and Peace. In regard to organization, CCODP tried to create local groups at the diocese and parish level just as Catholic Action was organized into small groups. The notion of these local groups acting in concert, as a nationwide “movement,” (though it would take many years to develop) “was an effort to recapture the notion of militancy that

\textsuperscript{365} Ibid., 16-19.
\textsuperscript{366} Ibid., 19-24.
\textsuperscript{367} Fabien Leboeuf, interview with the author, 19 April 2012.
Equally important, Development and Peace’s strategy for education—members being the primary animateurs of the education program—was borrowed from Catholic Action. This principle of formation through action (education was not an end in itself but a process of self-formation) was the very ethos of Catholic Action. Finally, most of the CCODP educational materials adopted the “see, judge, act” methodology of Cardinal Cardijn (observing problems using the tools of social science, judging them in light of Catholic social teaching, and creating a specific plan of appropriate action). Thus, while Catholic social teaching provided the theological vision for the organization, the methodology of Catholic Action gave the CCODP a way of putting that vision into action.

**Fundraising**

**Share Lent Campaigns**

During the early years of Development and Peace, almost all of the organization’s energy was aimed at fundraising for the Third World. At their first meeting in June 1967, the governors studied various other Catholic international development organizations, as well as the work of Canadian missionaries in Latin America. They carefully reviewed the method of fundraising done by: Catholic Relief Services (from the United States), Misoreor (Germany), Secours Catholique (Caritas-France), Entraide et Fraternité (Belgium), Caritas Internationalis (Vatican City), and several other non-governmental organizations (NGOs). While each organization was unique in its fundraising approach, most of the churches in Europe all launched successful appeals for the “Third World” during Lent (the liturgical season of preparation for Easter).
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Also, several dioceses in Canada had similar existing Lenten appeals (for example, the Archdiocese of Montreal held Lenten fundraisers for *La Croix d’Or*). As recalled by Judge Monnin, since “Lent is always a time when Christians are supposed to question their ways so as to renew their lives,” the board decided that this would be an appropriate time to launch their fundraising campaign (beginning in 1968).\(^{374}\) While CCODP would adopt the European schedule of fundraising during Lent, it added a new educational dimension to the campaign that was absent from its counterparts.\(^{375}\) The campaign was envisioned as not only a single collection on one Sunday, but a full Lenten campaign. Each diocese in Canada would devote the first four weeks of Lent to “intense publicity” for the fund and the actual collection would happen during the fourth Sunday.\(^{376}\) This educational/fundraising campaign was named Share Lent.

To introduce this new Lenten campaign to Canadian Catholics a pastoral letter was published by the Canadian bishops on 14 March 1968.\(^{377}\) The primary goal of the letter (as well as the entire Share Lent campaign) was to awaken the Christian conscience of Canadians to the plight of peoples in the developing world. To this end, the pastoral letter framed the misery of the developing world not only in statistics (“during the next ten years hunger will claim more victims than have all the wars of history”),\(^{378}\) but it also appealed to its readers in spiritual terms. “As Christians we cannot remain strangers to this tragedy [of world hunger] that involves the Mystery of Jesus Christ in Whom all are brothers and sisters. We are Christians only to the degree that we show compassion for the hungry and suffering people of the world.”\(^{379}\)

\(^{374}\) ACCODP, “Beginning of DP,” [address given by Judge Monnin on 10-12 September 1971], 2.

\(^{375}\) Roméo Maione, in Boyd, “CCODP’s Significant Moments,” 37.

\(^{376}\) ACCODP, “Minutes of the first meeting of the Board of Governors,” 8 June 1967, 5.


\(^{379}\) Ibid., #3.
development a moral obligation, the letter issued a strongly worded warning: “Canadians simply must not tolerate the scandal of universal misery which provides a violent contrast to the high standard of living we enjoy. To remain indifferent or to be content with symbolic aid would be to sin gravely through egoism.”

In this letter, the Canadian bishops clearly told their followers that ignoring the problems of the developing world was sinful.

The other purpose of the letter was to introduce Development and Peace as a new solution. The bishops pointed out that contemporary efforts to offer assistance by wealthy countries (such as Canada) and the United Nations were “insufficient and are often poorly planned.” These institutions often acted out of self-interest and, as a result, economic aid benefitted the donor countries. While Canadian missionaries were praised for their generous contribution to poor regions of the world (in bringing education, healthcare and other social services), the bishops noted that “this record is not without shadows cast by unintentional mistakes, for the priority of needs has sometimes been misjudged.”

Presenting a new model, the bishops unveiled Development and Peace. Not simply a charity, Development and Peace had three objectives: to educate and inform public opinion in Canada, to fund development projects of a social and economic nature in the Third World, and to renew the “spirit of Lent” by giving Canadians opportunities to share with their less fortunate brothers and sisters.

The Share Lent campaigns served as the primary source of revenue for the organization. Beginning with its inaugural campaign in 1968, Development and Peace received most of the Share Lent funds through an annual collection within Canadian parishes (usually on the fifth
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Sunday of Lent). From 1968-1972, this annual collection raised a grand total of $7,150,012. These funds represented 69.1 per cent of Development and Peace’s total income from 1967-1971.\textsuperscript{386} By 1971, CCODP estimated that 30 per cent of Canadian parishes participated in this “collection of Lenten sacrifices.”\textsuperscript{387} Share Lent was also the principal means by which most Canadians interacted with Development and Peace’s education program.

**Table 2.1: Revenue from Share Lent Campaigns (1968-1972)\textsuperscript{388***}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme [French Sector/English Sector]</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>“Real” Amount in 1967 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)\textsuperscript{389}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Donnez-leur vous-mêmes à manger/ Give them Something to Eat</td>
<td>$1,352,846</td>
<td>$1,303,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Ils veulent changer/They Want to Change</td>
<td>$1,431,450</td>
<td>$1,316,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>L’Éducation une deuxième faim/ Education - the Second Hunger</td>
<td>$1,385,963</td>
<td>$1,237,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Un espoir...le développement/ Development Is...Hope</td>
<td>$1,429,013</td>
<td>$1,233,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Se développer=se libérer/ Development Is...People</td>
<td>$1,550,740</td>
<td>$1,278,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,150,012</td>
<td>$6,368,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first Share Lent campaign warrants close attention as this experience established the paradigm for future campaigns. In 1967, the original campaign plan, sketched by the “temporary secretariat” of Riendeau and Tremblay, called for a national campaign that worked on a diocesan level.\textsuperscript{392} Each governor assumed the responsibility of identifying (in consultation


\textsuperscript{388} There were some discrepancies in the early financial records of Development and Peace. Annual financial statements that were compiled by an independent accounting firm (Samson, Bélair, Côté, Lacroix et Associés) did not appear in the archives until 1970-1971. All of the amounts cited in this table were obtained from Development and Peace’s official report to the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops in 1977, see ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” “Annexe 6: Campagne Carême de Partage/Share Lent Campaign,” 39.

\textsuperscript{389} These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/

\textsuperscript{392} ACCODP, “Minutes of the second meeting of the Board of Governors,” 5 September 1967, 2.
with local bishop) a “key man” to supervise the fundraising in each diocese within their region. These key-men were to establish and work with diocesan committees that included all classes of society (priests, religious, professionals, teachers, labourers, etc). These committees were to organize the campaign and, ideally, promote the work of CCODP year-round. To help build these diocesan networks the governors took proactive roles and Executive Director Maione made two extended trips to recruit potential volunteers, one to the West (based out of Vancouver) and the other to the Maritimes (based out of Halifax). In total, Development and Peace was able to establish fifty-three diocesan sections (out of sixty-seven Canadian dioceses) in time for the first Share Lent campaign in 1968. Each year, CCODP staff would continue to tour sections of Canada to help establish more and more diocesan sections.

These diocesan sections publicized the campaign materials that were prepared by the secretariat. The inaugural campaign focused on one specific aspect of underdevelopment—“Hunger in the World”—rather than covering all aspects of this complex situation. Designed for a general public with little knowledge of the problem, the campaign materials adopted the Catholic Action method of “observe, judge, act.” First, the materials used statistical data to describe the reality of the Third World. Examples included: “In this age of rockets and computers, out of every 3 people—only 1 has enough to eat—2 suffer from hunger”; “Every
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day, 100,000 persons die of hunger or the effects of hunger”; or “One fourth of the world’s population earns less than $100 annually—half as much as the average smoker in this country spends on tobacco a year.”399 Next, this reality was judged in light of scripture and papal social teaching. Accordingly, the brochures contained quotes from John XXIII, Vatican II’s Gaudium et Spes and Pope Paul VI’s Populorum Progressio.400 These overtly religious references also made people aware that development work was within the scope of the Catholic Church.401 It was also for this same reason that the campaign name for 1968 was taken from the biblical account of Jesus feeding the five thousand. Drawing from Jesus’ command to his disciples to share their resources with the hungry crowd, the name of 1968 Share Lent campaign was “Donnez-leur vous-mêmes à manger/Give them something to eat” (Matthew 14:16).402 Finally, the “action” was donating money to Development and Peace.

Along with having a sound spiritual foundation, it was equally important to Maione that campaign materials emphasize the achievements, energies and potential of less-developed societies. This was particularly important to the poster campaign that was to avoid depicting the poor as pathetic.

Our posters would have to show people who are trapped in poverty are working harder than we are. We wanted to show that they are not beggars. They are human like us and want to get ahead. We had to explode the mythology in our society that the poor are those in the village who couldn’t work so you had to help them. That was the kind of mythology that kept charity going. There’s nothing wrong with charity but, without justice, it’s incomplete.403

403 Roméo Maione, taped conversation with Mary Boyd, 8 September 1990, quoted in Boyd, “CCODP’s Significant Moments,” 36-37.
As a result, on the cover of the 1968 CCODP brochure were two African boys in school. Inside were scenes of farmers working, adults learning in a classroom, mothers washing their children, women sowing in a factory, and groups of men and women gathering. For Maione, each image in the campaign materials had to show the “great dignity and importance of every person.” Yet, despite Maione’s best intentions, the main poster of the 1968 Share Lent campaign undercut that message. Instead of featuring the industriousness of those in the developing world, the main poster that was distributed across Canada was the close-up of a starving child from the developing world. While some campaign materials (like the brochure) were consistent with Maione’s focus on dignity and hard work, the most dominant image used in this campaign perpetuated the very paternalism that Maione was trying to avoid.

Development and Peace received formal criticism for paternalism in its poster during Share Lent’69, which depicted an “action shot” of African boys working in a field. Four members of the African Student Body at Saint Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, NS met with the school’s President, M.A. MacLellan, to express their strong objection to this poster, which they felt “was an unfair image of any of the under-developed countries.” These students supported the campaign, but expressed their displeasure over the pictures, which “contribute a great deal to the conventional misconceptions about developing areas, and do more harm than bring peace and understanding among people.” They requested that the administration remove the posters from the university campus. It would take several years to remove paternalism (intentional or inadvertent) from the campaign.
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Share Lent educational materials were directed primarily at Catholics in their parishes. Materials (including copies of the pastoral letter and “suggested homilies”) were sent directly to pastors, who were asked to inform their parishioners. With the permission of the CCC, a second collection was taken up during Mass. Another major target was Catholic schools. Publicity materials were addressed directly to spiritual directors or chaplains. Over fifty high schools organized walks, conferences, films, or expositions supporting Share Life. Also, 150 monthly religious publications were contacted, most of whom wrote an article on Development and Peace and a few devoted entire monthly editions to the issue of global hunger. To reach beyond the Catholic environment, the secretariat also created mass media kits for local media. The secretariat paid for advertisements in the principal newspapers across Canada (as well as in the Catholic press) and asked radio and TV stations to contribute free of charge (which they did by conducting interviews and offering broadcast on the problem of hunger).

The first Development and Peace Share Lent campaign in 1968 raised $1,352,846. This sum is quite impressive considering that on 6 October 1966 the Canadian bishops received a report from Marcel Dagenais, an economist, who estimated that “a well-organized and carefully carried out collection would probably result in more than $750,000, or between $800,000 and $850,000. On the other hand, I believe it is extremely unlikely that the results of such a collection could in any way exceed $1,000,000.” In its first effort, Development and Peace surpassed even the highest estimate by 35 per cent.
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The administrative costs of Share Life, as well as CCODP’s entire operations, were a sensitive matter. As recalled by Bishop Alexander Carter of Sault Ste. Marie, “during this time period there were stories in the media about exaggerated expenses in some ‘aid’ organizations.”416 This point was emphasized by Judge Monnin, “the general public had serious reservations about the high costs of administering funds by organizations in the field of development. ‘How many funds are really going to get to the poor?’”417 As stipulated in the 1966 proposal, the administrative budget of Development and Peace would not exceed 10 per cent of the overall budget. Archbishop Pocock warned Development and Peace that he would withdraw his support if the administrative costs exceeded that percentage.418 To administer Share Lent 1968, the secretariat spent $20,503.76 on campaign materials and publicity (which represented 1.5 per cent of the money raised).419 This figure was kept extremely low thanks to a strong network of volunteers who donated their time and professional services free of charge. With this precedent set, the budget for each year’s upcoming Share Lent campaign was set at 2 per cent of the expected total. To keep this number low, the Board of Governors informed all diocesan sections that their Share Lent expenses’ should not exceed 2 per cent of their expected revenue.420

In 1968 CCODP took in a grand total of $1,405,100, of which 94 per cent came from the Share Lent campaign.421 An additional $84,400 (the remaining 6 per cent) was received from a

416 Alexander Carter quoted in Panozzo, 33.
418 Alexander Carter quoted in Panozzo, 33.
421 For Development and Peace, the fiscal year runs from June 1st to May 31 (of the following calendar year). The full financial report for 1 June 1967 – 31 May 1968 was not preserved in the archives. Yet, in February 1969, Development and Peace published its first ever bulletin, which provided financial data for the calendar year 1968. This report is found in ACCODP, Archives Promo, CCODP Annual Reports, “1969 Développement et Paix 1968”, 1.
special fundraising effort for emergency relief in Nigeria/Biafra.\footnote{422} When factoring in the cost of the salaries of permanent members of the secretariat as well as the costs of creating/maintaining a CCODP office in Montreal, Development and Peace spent $86,000 on administration in 1968 (representing just over 6 per cent of the overall budget), well below the stipulated 10 per cent.\footnote{423} From 1967-1972, administrative costs were kept consistently at 6 per cent of the annual budget (which was extremely low in comparison with other related agencies.)\footnote{424} Thus, having surpassed the $1,000,000 barrier for Share Lent and having kept administrative expenses to a minimum, Maione was able to confidently report to the Board of Governors that “Development and Peace has been well launched and is working successfully.”\footnote{425}

As strong as Share Lent’68 was from a financial standpoint, several governors saw room for improvements. The sentiment of the governors was best summarized by Lucien Fontaine (Quebec) who stated that he was “not satisfied with our first experience but is still happy with the results.”\footnote{426} The most severe criticism came from Archbishop Pocock of Toronto, regarding the ineffectiveness of the materials prepared by the secretariat. Pocock reported that “the propaganda, public relations, etc., including his own pastoral letter had been hopeless in his Diocese...the documents received from the secretariat were of no use to the campaign.”\footnote{427} This negative assessment of the educational and publicity materials was shared by Lawrence Tritschler (British Columbia), who stated that his committee found the prepared materials “poor” and that they arrived late.\footnote{428} Being constructive, Henri Roy (Quebec) suggested that the secretariat “should keep in mind that the publicity addressed to the urban population should not

be the same as the one used for rural areas and that, therefore, the material should correspond with the needs of the sections.\textsuperscript{429} Addressing these critiques, in the summer of 1968 Tom Johnston was hired to create more effective educational materials.\textsuperscript{430}

The model employed by Share Lent’68, of diocesan-based committees of local volunteers, continued to be used throughout the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. There was some confusion, however, over whether Share Lent was a one-time campaign (limited to 1968) or a permanent national church collection.\textsuperscript{431} According to Bishop Alexander Carter of Sault Ste. Marie (vice-president of the CCC when Development and Peace was approved), “The working paper from which Development and Peace took shape [the 1966 proposal] clearly indicates that diocesan teams would assume most of the initiative in the collection of funds, publicity programs and education.”\textsuperscript{432} The 1966 proposal did not mention a national collection anywhere in the text. To Carter’s understanding, “an initial collection (Share Lent’68) would be taken up to provide seed funds for the first year, after which various fund-raising methods would be devised or initiated in each diocese.”\textsuperscript{433} Thus, since Development and Peace was an organization independent of the Canadian bishops, fundraising was to be left to the organization. This understanding of CCODP fundraising outside of Church structures was shared by Bishop Gerald Emmett Carter of London,\textsuperscript{434} and Bishop Bernard Hubert of Saint-Jerome (and of later Saint-Jean-Longueuil).\textsuperscript{435}

\textsuperscript{429} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{430} ACCODP, “Minutes of the second Executive Committee,” 5 September 1968, 2.
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\textsuperscript{435} ACCODP, Archives DG, CN Reunions, CN Reunions 1979, CN PV Novembre, CN.PVA.NOVEMBRE.1979, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 10-11 November 1979, 29.
This position surprised Maione, who stated that he understood Development and Peace not primarily as a fundraising organization but one that was trying to renew Lent through education and collection. He was under the impression that CCODP was a permanent fixture in the Canadian Church each Lent. This interpretation was shared by several bishops who understood the Share Lent campaign to be an annual collection sponsored by the CCC. Unfortunately, there was nothing noted in the minutes of the bishops’ initial discussion to help clarify the matter and ease the tension. Whether the bishops had previously seen Share Life as a temporary measure or a permanent collection, most bishops in 1969 realized that “if the Share Lent collection were cut out, the organization’s income would face a serious decline, threatening its existence and the work in the Third World to which the bishops had committed the Canadian church.” For 1969 and beyond, Share Lent would continue as a national church collection endorsed by the Canadian Bishops and it would not be combined with any other organizations. As result of this decision, tension would develop between CCODP and certain members of the Canadian Bishops’ Conference over the question of funding. It is worth noting, however, that in 1971, when the CCC re-organised its national collections, the whole period of Lent was reserved exclusively for Development and Peace to hold its Share Lent campaign within the churches.

In 1971, Share Lent introduced a new ecumenical approach to the annual appeal. Maione credited the media with inspiring this move. Each of the churches wanted publicity for their own international development fundraising campaigns, but the media could not cover every
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faith-based campaign. The media “told the churches to get together.” That challenge sparked Maione to invite the five mainline Christian denominations who had similar international development funds—the Anglican Primate’s World Relief & Development Fund, the World Development & Relief Fund of the United Church, the Presbyterian Church’s Committee on Interchurch Aid, and the Canadian Lutheran World Action & Relief—to come together and hold one joint Lenten campaign. A model for this type of ecumenical cooperation around social justice was established in 1968 when these same five churches hosted a workshop in Montreal entitled Christian Conscience and Poverty. An Inter-Church Campaign Committee was created with Maione and Reverend R.D. (Bob) McRae of the Anglican Church elected as co-presidents. In 1971, the five organizations: held simultaneous campaigns; had one common theme (“Un espoir...le développement/Development Is...Hope”); and utilized the same ecumenical publicity (television commercials, public service announcements for the radio, etc.) The campaign came to climax during the final ten days of the campaign, 18-28 March 1971, when several ecumenical events—called “Ten Days for the Third World”—were staged across Canada aimed at bringing Christians together to study, pray and give “a just share” to those in the developing world.

While the ecumenical collaboration was embraced in English Canada, these campaigns met resistance from the French-speaking population. In 1972, the French Sector reported that the previous years’ ecumenical campaign was criticized by both their own Education Committee

444 Daly, Remembering for Tomorrow, 59-60.
and several other groups for “having a theme that was too vague, badly translated and not properly adapted [to Quebec].” As a response, the French Sector formed a committee of ten volunteers who studied the ecumenical theme chosen for Share Lent 1972 by the Inter-Church Campaign Committee, “Le développement c’est l’homme/Development Is...People.” The working group decided that the French Sector of CCODP should focus on “the liberation of man,” which was advertised on posters as “Se développer=se libérer.” This campaign theme was inspired by the CCC Labour Day statement, “Liberation in a Christian Perspective.” For the first time, the French Sector prepared its own education materials independent from the English Sector/Inter-Church Campaign Committee. For the next several years, Anglophone and Francophone Canadians would have independent Share Lent campaigns.

By 1971 the Share Lent campaign represented the single largest annual collection in the Canadian Church. While an impressive accomplishment, governor Julian Michalski (Ontario) asked his fellow governors if they were “satisfied” with such a slight annual increase in revenue (in 1971 Share Lent raised only $76,167 more than it did in 1968; representing only a 5.6 per cent increase). When one factors in the rate of inflation during this period, which was 3.7 per cent per annum (or 11.6 per cent over the period), the Share Lent campaign was actually raising less “real dollars” in 1971 than it was in 1968. Michael Cantin (Quebec) agreed with Michalaski and noted the danger of relying too heavily on parish collections as participation in
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religious practices was decreasing.\textsuperscript{454} Furthermore, given the low revenue from some dioceses, Cantin asked each governor to make a serious study of their sections and propose new ways of bringing in money from their dioceses.\textsuperscript{455} Judge Monnin (Manitoba) and Allen Wachowich (Alberta) reminded the board that Development and Peace had two aims, educating Canadians about the Third World and collecting funds for socio-economic projects. Thus, “the influence of CCODP must not be measured exclusively by its collection of funds” during Lent.\textsuperscript{456}

From this discussion, the governors unanimously adopted a new Share Lent policy (which originated from recommendations from the Ontario and Quebec regional meetings): campaigns should raise awareness throughout all of Lent (not only a single Sunday offering); diocesan sections should explore the possibility of door-to-door collections as an alternative to a church collection (which had been successful in Toronto); a greater effort should be made to involve clergy in the campaign (dioceses with clergy active in the campaign had higher revenues); campaign materials should be sent out to diocesan committees in the fall prior to the campaign); efforts should be made to engage the non-Catholic population; and a “complete and integrated liturgy” should be prepared for Share Lent Sunday (which most dioceses held during the fifth Sunday of Lent).\textsuperscript{457} While these directives were helpful, one of the financial challenges for Development and Peace was that when the organization was launched, a large number of Francophone dioceses were already twinned with dioceses in developing countries or had financial commitments to religious congregations with foreign missions.\textsuperscript{458} By 1973, however,

\textsuperscript{454} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{455} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{456} Ibid., 3-4.
\textsuperscript{457} Ibid., 6-8.
\textsuperscript{458} ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” 14.
many of these relationships were renegotiated and the French Sector began showing impressive increases that would continue throughout the 1970s.\textsuperscript{459}

**Miles for Millions**

Another source of income for CCODP came from fundraising walks. In 1967 Canada celebrated the 100\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Confederation. As part of the year-long celebration, the Government of Canada launched the Centennial International Development Program (CIDP) to focus attention on the needs of people, the “millions,” in underdeveloped countries. To alleviate poverty and hunger crises in these nations, the Canadian government partnered with Canadian-based international development agencies to coordinate fundraising walks across Canada known as “Miles for Millions” ("des Marches Rallyes Tiers-Monde" in Quebec). In the words of one of its early organizers, Miles for Millions was “Canada’s gift to the world on its birthday.”\textsuperscript{460} Modeled after the successful Oxfam walkathon in the United Kingdom, Canadian participants in the Miles for Millions collected pledges to cover a large distance (usually around 26 miles). Sponsors would make donations based on how far people walked; there was no lump-sum giving. In its inaugural year of 1967, Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson led the walk through Ottawa. That year, walkathons were held in over fifty communities across Canada. André Tremblay and Romeo Maione were members of the Montreal organizing committee (along with Oxfam Canada and *Entraide Internationale*, the French equivalent of CIDP), while Hugh Wadey helped organize several walks in Toronto.\textsuperscript{461}

\textsuperscript{459} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{460} Michael Flynn, interview with author, Toronto, ON, 3 June 2011.  
\textsuperscript{461} ACCODP, “Minutes of the first meeting of the Board of Governors for the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace,” 24 November 1967, 8.
Funds collected in the Miles for Millions program were controlled by the local organizing committees. These committees distributed the proceeds to individual organizations that made funding requests. A portion of the funds was also sent to the National Committee, which was composed of representatives of different international development agencies that prepared educational materials and provided field staff to assist local committees. Wishing to maximize profits from this type of fundraising, Maione hired Michael Flynn (previously a full-time organizer with Catholic Action), to organize Miles for Millions marches across English-Canada and serve on the National Committee, as well as Pierre Tremblay to cover marches in Quebec. Flynn and Tremblay were responsible for getting CCODP people on the local committees (which assured that funds would be sent to Development and Peace). Equally important, Miles for Millions was another way of educating Canadians about international development and social justice. CCODP educational kits were distributed at the local marches. In 1969, Flynn coordinated CCODP participation in fifteen walks across Canada (from Charlottetown to Vancouver) and Tremblay organized five walks in Quebec (Amos, Mont-Laurier, St. Hyacinthe, St-Jean, and Sherbrooke). Miles for Millions soon became profitable for Development and Peace.

Miles for Millions was initially a solid source of revenue for Development and Peace. From 1968-1971, these walkathons accounted for 7.9 per cent of CCODP’s total income.

---
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Table 2.2: Revenue from “Miles for Millions Walkathons” (1969-1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>“Real” Amount in 1969 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>$221,620</td>
<td>$215,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>$383,191</td>
<td>$359,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>$429,225</td>
<td>$384,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>$116,052</td>
<td>$96,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>$67,087</td>
<td>$50,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>$34,136</td>
<td>$23,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>$8,233</td>
<td>$5,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>$7,921</td>
<td>$4,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,267,465</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,138,909</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After peaking in popularity in 1972, Miles for Millions rapidly declined. The primary reason for waning participation was that local committees broke away from the National Committee and formed their own unofficial fundraisers. For example, in Quebec, local committees complained that none of the materials were in French nor were any personnel provided. As a result, the local Quebecois committees became increasingly independent and they refused to share their proceeds with the National Committee. Over time, more local committees formed their own independent community fundraisers that focused primarily on local concerns. Ultimately these similar fundraisers competed with Miles for Millions and the walkathons were discontinued.

**Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)**

A third, and increasingly major, source of funding for Development and Peace was the Government of Canada. Canada had been modestly distributing official development assistance...
(ODA) to the developing world since 1950, but aid was primarily a tool of Canadian foreign policy. These aid allocations helped to contain Communism, expand overseas markets for Canadian exports and promote international security.\footnote{Cranford Pratt, “Humane Internationalism and Canadian Development Assistance Policies,” in \textit{Canadian International Development Assistance Policies: An Appraisal}, ed. Cranford Pratt (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996), 341.} Seeking to expand and improve the effectiveness of its ODA, in September 1968 the Canadian government separated this program from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce (ITC) and External Affairs to create the independent Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). No longer functioning as an appendage of Canadian economic and political interests, this agency made funds available to help the poorest peoples around the world to meet their basic needs.\footnote{Ibid., 341-42.} Operating with largely humanitarian motivations, CIDA immediately created a “Special Programs Branch” to fund projects proposed by non-governmental organizations (NGOs). CIDA accepted that NGOs—like Development and Peace—had relationships with institutions and communities in the developing world that were more intimate and closer to the grass roots that could ever be achieved by an official aid agency.\footnote{Tim Brodhead and Cranford Pratt, “Paying the Piper: CIDA and Canadian NGOs,” in \textit{Canadian International Development Assistance Policies: An Appraisal}, ed. Cranford Pratt (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996), 92.} NGOs could, therefore, produce projects that would reach poor communities and help meet their needs. It was also recognized that the cost of some types of development assistance, particularly of recruiting and sending volunteers overseas, was much less when undertaken by NGOs than when done directly by the government.\footnote{Ibid.} Thus, the formula was that individual projects were proposed to the Special Programs division by the NGOs and, if funded by CIDA, were then administered by the NGOs. The work of CIDA’s NGO division was therefore appropriately labelled the “responsive program.”\footnote{Ibid., 91.}
Reaching a formal agreement with CIDA in October 1969 over which types of projects would be eligible for funding (those requesting more than $5,000 and met specific development criteria), Development and Peace began receiving substantial amounts of government funding. CIDA would not fund projects outright; rather they would “match” funds from Development and Peace (with the exact ratio determined by CCODP, but not normally more than 50% of the total cost of the project). Also according to this CCODP-CIDA agreement, Development and Peace (with the support of the Canadian bishops) agreed to serve as the “sole liaison” of all Canadian Catholic organizations (such as religious congregations) to CIDA. This meant that all requests for funding that originated from Catholic organizations would first be vetted by CCODP before they were sent to CIDA. If CIDA approved the funding request, then payment would be made to CCODP, who would supervise the project. Recognizing this increased administrative burden (screening additional projects), CIDA provided Development and Peace with a one-time $35,000 administration grant to help offset these costs.

While CIDA’s contributions began rather modestly (1969-1970), they soon became very large (a 350 per cent increase the following year, which nearly doubled again the year after that). This substantial increase was due to an ever-expanding CIDA budget. During fiscal years 1971-1972, CIDA’s budget nearly doubled, from $7 million to $13 million. While this increase of CIDA funds allowed Development and Peace to fund many more international projects, the Executive Committee made clear that the government should never be the largest
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source of its revenue for its projects. Rather, CCODP must maintain a fifty-fifty split with CIDA “to avoid becoming a government disbursing agency.”

Table 2.3: Contributions from CIDA (1967-1972)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>“Real” Amount in 1969 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>Percentage of Annual Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>$225,500</td>
<td>$218,900</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>$1,030,600</td>
<td>$967,403</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>$1,990,617</td>
<td>$1,784,382</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,246,717</td>
<td>$2,970,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Development Program

The vast majority of money received from the Share Lent campaigns, the Miles for Millions marches, and CIDA, was spent on development projects in the Third World. In their pastoral letter, the Canadian bishops introduced Development and Peace as “an organization dedicated to international cooperation for the socio-economic development of poor nations.”

The bishops were clear that this cooperation was oriented toward development, not pastoral action.

Such a relief fund should not be part of the funds earmarked to promote the missionary activity of the Church. In the present proposal, we are concerned with funds to be used in community development on the essentially ‘temporal’ level, whereas the missionary activity of the Church, as such, is essentially “spiritual.”

---
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To support community development on the “temporal level,” Development and Peace financially supported social and economic improvement projects that were submitted by groups in the Third World. Within this international development program, a distinction was made between long-term socio-economic development projects and short-term emergency relief. During its first five years, CCODP worked hard to organize a development program, set priorities for aid allocation and publicize itself in Canada and the Third World.

At the first meeting of the Board of Governors in June 1967, governor Hugh Wadey (Ontario) was appointed as chair of the allocation sub-committee that determined “the work, politics, orientation and method of aid given by the Fund.”\(^{499}\) At the press conference following this meeting, Archbishop Plourde stated that the only directions given to this committee were to select “concrete projects” (such as irrigation and emergency relief) and to distribute funds to needy countries without reference to religion or race.\(^{500}\) In order to assist Wadey in this challenging task, the Executive Committee invited several foreign experts to Canada to share their expertise. For example, Father Albert Cauwe, Director of Caritas-Belgium, spoke to the Executive Committee on 31 August 1967 about the projects supported by Entraide et Fraternité (the Belgian equivalent of Development and Peace founded in 1961).\(^{501}\)

To allocate the funds raised by Share Lent’68, Hugh Wadey’s “Project Review Committee” met twice in the fall of 1968. Along with Wadey as chair, the Board of Governors appointed Marthe Legault (Quebec) and R.S. Rooney (Ontario).\(^{502}\) Assisting these governors on the first committee was a diverse group of eight specialists with experience in development:

\(^{499}\) Appointment is made in ACCODP, “Minutes of the first meeting of the Board of Governors,” 8 June 1967, 6. This description of his responsibilities is given in ACCODP, “Minutes of the third meeting of the Executive Committee,” 31 August 1967, 3.
\(^{501}\) ACCODP, “Minutes of the third meeting of the Executive Committee,” 31 August 1967, 3.
\(^{502}\) ACCODP, “Minutes of the second Executive Committee,” 5 September 1968, 5.
Fernand Jolicoeur (Department of Adult Education in the Ministry of Education of Quebec); Father P. Patrick O’Byrne (Executive Director of the Council of Social Affairs in Calgary);503 William Dyson (Executive Director of the Federation of Catholic Charities in Montreal); Dr. J. Arthur Boudreau (Director of the Institute of Fisheries in Memramcook, NB); Denyse Gauthier (former International Secretary of the Young Christian Workers in Montreal); Dr. Paul-Yves Denis (Professor of Geography at University of Montreal and Laval University); Jim MacDonald (Executive Secretary of the National Labour Co-operative Committee); and Father Roger Tessier of the Society of Missionaries of Africa (Secretary of the Canadian Religious Conference and representing the Canadian Catholic Conference).504 These members made a (minimum) two-year commitment to this committee.505

In 1968 the committee had received funding requests for projects totalling over $2,000,000 (well beyond the $1,352,846 raised from Share Lent’68).506 This initial Project Review Committee needed to set priorities. According to their mandate, as stated in the “1968 pastoral letter” issued by Canadian bishops, projects selected would take no account “of the religious belief or ideologies of the people to whom aid is given. The only consideration will be intrinsic value of the projects, their conformity with criteria of priority, and the evaluation of their human and social effectiveness.”507 Initially, it was easier to identify what type of projects CCODP did not want to support. The initial committee drew up a “criteria of refusal” list: large infrastructure proposals (too expensive), construction of schools (the proper responsibility of national or local governments), formation for women religious or seminarians (too pastoral),

---
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construction of chapels (too pastoral), and individual study grants (helps individual not community). Over time, certain concepts became clear which would become important features for approval: participation (people taking active responsibility in the project) and projects enabling people to help themselves or others (personal formation and community development). In making distinctions between what type of projects it did or did not want to support, CCODP was slowly working toward a definition of development, which would not be formally defined until 1982.

**Socio-Economic Development Projects**


**Table 2.4: Funds Allotted to the Socio-Economic Development Projects (1967-1972)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>“Real” Amount in 1968 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>$1,475,697</td>
<td>$1,408,957</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>$2,134,374</td>
<td>$1,978,200</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>$2,735,509</td>
<td>$2,451,635</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>$4,232,322</td>
<td>$3,622,258</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,577,902</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,461,050</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Over these four years, CCODP’s development program increased by 186.8 per cent. This impressive growth was primarily spurred on by increasingly larger grants from CIDA. According to the original proposal from 1966, projects of economic and social aid were to represent 50 per cent of the total annual expenses.\(^5\) During these years, however, socio-economic projects represented 82.6 per cent of CCODP’s budget. There were two main reasons for this increase. First, the education program (which, according to the original proposal, was to account for 20 per cent of the budget)\(^6\) needed time to develop. Second, all of the revenue received by Development and Peace during this period that came from CIDA was designated for international development projects.\(^7\)

During these early years: about half of Development and Peace’s projects were concentrated in Latin America (a third of the projects were in Africa; and Asia had the fewest).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The early pattern for the location of CCODP work was largely determined by the location of Canadian missionaries. From 1968-1970, 45 per cent of the funding requests received by CCODP came from Canadian missionaries (which had an 80 per cent approval rate).\(^8\) The missionaries, from dioceses or religious communities, were among the first to know

\(^7\) ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” 9.
\(^12\) Rousseau, 75.
Development and Peace existed and to have recourse to it. Thus, the countries receiving the most funds during this period were the ones with the greatest numbers of Canadian missionaries.\textsuperscript{524}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Principal Beneficiary Countries (1967-1972)}\textsuperscript{525}
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
1967-1972 \\
\hline
Brazil ($1,025,000) \\
Peru ($983,700) \\
Haiti ($601,700) \\
Bolivia ($593,800) \\
India ($476,400) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

From 1967-1972, these top five beneficiary countries received a total of $3,680,600, which represented 34.8 per cent of the total development budget. Many partners and projects in the Third World were also found through the international network of Catholic Action. As a worldwide movement, Catholic Action provided Development and Peace with a vast network of local groups engaged in social action.\textsuperscript{528} While these initial projects were helpful to the local communities and met the Project Review Committee’s criteria, Development and Peace wanted to be sure that its funds were going to places where it was most needed (not which countries happened to have Canadian missionaries or active branches of Catholic Action).

To make Development and Peace known in the Third World, CCODP staff members began making regular trips to the Third World.\textsuperscript{529} These multi-country trips served several important functions. For members of the project department, these excursions provided unique opportunities to evaluate the types of projects that had requested funding, to become more familiar with geo-political realities and to dialogue with partner organizations on how to

\textsuperscript{524} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{525} ACCODP, Archives DG, DP Historique, DP Anniversaires, DP 20\textsuperscript{ème} anniversaire, DP 20ème anniversaire EV, “20 years cooperation in international development,” 12.
\textsuperscript{528} Fabien Leboeuf, interview with the author, 9 May 2012.
improve development.\textsuperscript{530} Equally important, during these trips contacts were made with new indigenous “liaison” groups who could provide “third-party” evaluations of projects. For members of the education department, these trips allowed them to experience the reality with which they spoke about in their Canadian education program. Finally, these trips also helped to make Development and Peace better known in the developing world. As a result of these trips, by 1971-1972, only 24 per cent of the funds went to Canadian missionaries doing development work.\textsuperscript{531} This does not mean that the number of projects submitted by missionaries decreased significantly, but rather that the number of projects originating from other types of partners increased.

**Emergency Relief**

According to the October 1966 proposal, 20 per cent of CCODP funds were to be used for “urgent cases.”\textsuperscript{532} CCODP’s mandate was to promote socio-economic development; however, since the Canadian Catholic Church had no other organization to help victims of natural or human-made disasters, CCODP was asked to set aside a certain sum of money each year for emergency humanitarian aid.\textsuperscript{533} While volunteer agencies (like Development and Peace) were not able to provide large amounts of resources, their value lay in the speed in which they could provide food, water, shelter and medicine.\textsuperscript{534} While governments needed time to gather resources, Development and Peace was able to provide a rapid response because it was the Canadian member organization of *Caritas Internationalis*, a confederation of 165 Catholic relief, development and social service organisations working in 200 countries and territories.

\textsuperscript{530} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{531} ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” 19.  
\textsuperscript{532} ACCCB, “Proposal for a National Fund,” 3.  
\textsuperscript{533} Rousseau, 74.  
(making it one of the largest NGO networks in the world). The value of this network was that it could provide immediate aid until other agencies were able to fully mobilize themselves. Furthermore, in the case of human-made tragedies (such as civil war), the money raised by the Catholic Church provided a moral voice that went beyond the politics of the two sides.

During 1968-1969, it was decided that the amount of funds for emergency relief would be limited to 10 per cent of Share Lent Revenues (but this could be raised as high as 20 per cent). CCODP did not wish to give more than 10 per cent because that would decrease resources available for development, the organization’s primary objective.

Table 2.7: Funds Allotted to Emergency Relief (1967-1972)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>“Real” Amount in 1968 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>$183,980</td>
<td>$175,659</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>$182,600</td>
<td>$169,239</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>$149,300</td>
<td>$133,807</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>$1,221,720</td>
<td>$1,045,616</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,737,600</td>
<td>$1,424,321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To receive funding, projects must have been requested from reliable sources (such as national episcopal conferences) and valid channels must have existed for dispersing aid. Examples of projects receiving emergency relief included $12,500 for medication in Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) to combat a malaria outbreak (1968-1969); $10,000 to help victims of war in Honduras.

535 ACCODP, “20 years cooperation in international development,” 21.
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540 These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/
and $5,000 to the Malagasy Republic (now Madagascar) to help victims of a cyclone (1971-1972). On rare occasions, emergency aid was also allocated outside of the Third World. For example, in 1970-1971, $5,000 was sent to help victims of a tornado in Sudbury, Ontario. The main criterion for these funds established by the Project Review Committee was that they must be used for isolated events and not for long-standing relief programs. Thus, in 1970-1971, $5,000 was sent to help victims of flooding in India and $5,000 was sent to “immediate” victims of war in Jordan, but applications for funding from Sudan and Cambodia were not accepted “because of their ongoing relief nature.”

For catastrophic situations, special appeals were launched (separate from the Lenten campaign) with all funds collected used exclusively for the emergency. From 1968-1972, two such situations demanded immediate attention. In 1967, the same year that Development and Peace was launched, civil war erupted in Nigeria. Due to economic, ethnic, cultural and religious tensions, the state of Biafra attempted to secede from Nigeria. During the ensuing Nigerian-Biafran war, the Nigerian military formed a food blockade that was intended to deliberately starve the civilian population. The resulting humanitarian crisis received international attention due to the efforts of French doctor Bernard Kouchner, who called for an

546 Ibid.
international response to the situation.\textsuperscript{548} In 1968, Development and Peace collaborated with the Canadian churches, the Red Cross, Oxfam, and UNICEF to organize the “Nigeria Biafra Relief Fund of Canada.” From 1968-1970, CCODP was able to raise $147,527 through this fund (which was augmented by an additional $122,000 in regular emergency aid).\textsuperscript{549} These funds were channelled through \textit{Caritas Internationalis} to airlift food and medical supplies to the victims of famine and war.\textsuperscript{550}

In 1971 the world’s attention was focused on the war for independence in East Pakistan/Bangladesh, which created millions of refugees and victims of war. On 26 March 1971, army units directed by West Pakistan launched a military operation in East Pakistan (Bangladesh) against Bengali civilians, students, intelligentsia, and armed personnel who were demanding separation of East Pakistan from West Pakistan. During the subsequent “Bangladesh Liberation War” (which officially ended on 16 December 1971), the Bangladesh-India border was opened to allow safe shelter in India for Bengali refugees fleeing genocide by West Pakistan’s Army. As the massacres in East Pakistan escalated, an estimated nine million refugees fled to India causing financial hardship and instability in that country as well as regional conflicts.\textsuperscript{551} In response, Development and Peace joined with the Canadian Red Cross, Oxfam Canada, World Vision, the Canadian Council of Churches and others to create the “Combined Appeal for Pakistan Relief Fund” (CAPR). From 1971-1974, Development and Peace raised $399,146 from the CAPR fund, diocesan collections, personal donations and matching funds from CIDA.\textsuperscript{552} In addition, CCODP also allocated $1,025,190 in regular

\textsuperscript{548} As a result of this experience, Kouchner and a small group of French doctors and journalists would create \textit{Médecins Sans Frontières}/Doctors Without Borders in 1971.
\textsuperscript{549} ACCODP, “20 years cooperation in international development,” 22.
\textsuperscript{552} ACCODP, “20 years cooperation in international development,” 22.
emergency aid during these three years.\textsuperscript{553} Most of these emergency funds were channelled through Caritas India and the Christian Organization for Relief and Rehabilitation (CORR) in Bangladesh, an economic development project with the objective of reconstructing the region for the return of the refugees.

In 1971, Development and Peace reassessed its role in providing emergency relief. The question was what image did Development and Peace want to project to the public, one of emergency relief or long-range development?\textsuperscript{554} Maione and the Executive Committee felt that development was the main mission of CCODP. “When public opinion in Canada thinks about development, they should think about us.”\textsuperscript{555} Emergency relief, they argued, should be the concern of the entire Catholic Church. With the full endorsement of the Canadian bishops,\textsuperscript{556} a joint CCODP-CCC committee of six persons (three from each organization) was established to dispense emergency funds. For particularly serious crisis situations, Development and Peace was permitted to hold special appeals within Catholic churches, but CCODP was also encouraged to collaborate with other Canadian churches, the government of Canada (through CIDA), and other NGOs (such as Caritas Internationalis).\textsuperscript{557} All funds received would be channelled through CCODP. Press releases, however, would alert the public that the “Church in Canada” responded to the crisis (not exclusively Development and Peace).\textsuperscript{558}

\textbf{From Development to Partnership: The Blankenberge Declaration}

Development and Peace was not the only Catholic international development organization in the world. In 1967, seven Catholic agencies that carried out Lenten campaigns to support

\textsuperscript{553} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{555} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{556} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee,” 5 November 1971, letter from Bishop Gilles Ouellet to Roméo Maione, 8 September 1971, 60.
\textsuperscript{557} ACCCB, “CCC-OCCDP Staff Meeting: Emergency Aid Committee,” 5 September 1972, 2-3.
\textsuperscript{558} Ibid., 3.
development initiatives in the Third World formed a loose association called the International Cooperation for Socio-Economic Development (abbreviated as CIDSE) to better coordinate their efforts. Development and Peace joined this consortium in May 1969.\textsuperscript{559} Benefits of membership included: a list of technical experts in different countries; monographic studies and research; details on international projects (some of which might apply to Development and Peace for future funding); and coordination of programmes and experience sharing.\textsuperscript{560}

From 14-19 May 1972, CIDSE sponsored its first ever seminar with its member organizations to discuss their development policies in the global south. Collectively, these members from Western Europe, the United States, Canada and Australia raised over $50,000,000 for development each year.\textsuperscript{561} Meeting in Blankenberge, Belgium, each of the ten members of CIDSE sent five delegates. Also attending were ten representatives from the developing world. The CCODP delegation was composed of governor Paul Robinson (Ontario); André Tremblay (Director of the Projects Department); Roméo Maione (Executive Director); Father Bob Ogle (former missionary and member of the Project Review Committee, who was on a personal trip to Europe) and Mr. G. Sicard of CIDA (also president of the CCODP section in Hull, who was en route to Africa for CIDA business).\textsuperscript{562}

One of the major goals of the five-day conference was greater coordination of efforts. Pressure against church bilateral aid (given by one country directly to another) in an uncoordinated fashion was increasing at the local level and from the Vatican.\textsuperscript{563} As of 1972, the ten different CIDSE members administered ten independent national funds in a given country or

\textsuperscript{559} ACCODP, “Minutes of the second meeting of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace,” 30-31 May 1968, 8.
\textsuperscript{560} ACCODP, “Minutes of the second meeting of the Board of Governors,” 5 September 1967, 3.
region. If a project request was received by one CIDSE member, letters had to be written to the other nine members to inquire whether or not anyone else had already responded with funding. Additional correspondence was required with the project holder and then with a “trusted” third-party agency to check out the project. This lengthy process took six to eight months to complete. After all this, decisions for funding were made in isolation from other development agencies.\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors,” 16-17 June 1972, “Possible Asian Consortium: Appendix 2; Information Document #2,” 25.} Within this system, duplication of funding was not uncommon. In 1971-1972, Development and Peace discovered that several of the projects that it had approved for funding were being simultaneously considered by two other CIDSE members.\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors,” 16-17 June 1972, “Report: Socio-Economic Department and Emergency Relief,” 59.} Maione called this existing system “absurd.”\footnote{Ibid.}

The dominant topic of conversation, however, was “how to establish a more balanced partnership in development work.”\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors,” 16-17 June 1972, “CIDSE and the Second Development Decade: Appendix I; Information Document #2,” 21.} Partnership was broadly defined as “complementarity, joint responsibility, mutual understanding and agreement, participation in risks and successes...collaboration for the achievement of the common task jointly agreed upon.”\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors,” 16-17 June 1972, “A Synthesis of Performance in the Seminar: Information Document #3,” 29-30.} All the seminar participants agreed that the existing donor-recipient relationship reinforced domination and dependency, no matter how kindly the gift was given. While there was agreement that “the donor-recipient relationship should be eliminated and replaced by a relationship between men and endowed with equal rights,” but there was substantive disagreement on the strategy.\footnote{Ibid., 30.} For some CIDSE members, partnership meant simply hiring someone from the developing world to provide sound information for future projects, or having
a local contact in the developing world who could report back to the donor nation to ensure that 
money was spent wisely. In order to foster a new relationship that gave an increased 
responsibility to the people in the developing countries, the majority recommended broadening 
CIDSE so that developing countries could join as members. Existing CIDSE members would 
help Catholics in the developing world establish their own development organizations that were 
linked to their own national episcopal conferences. From this perspective, membership in 
CIDSE was seen as an expression of equality.

For Development and Peace, these resolutions did not go far enough. Along with the 
French Comité catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement (CCFD), CCODP wrote a 
dissenting minority report that is now known as the “Blankenberge Declaration.” The 
declaration proposed greater coordination among CIDSE members through the creation of one 
common Christian fund for an entire region. This proposed fund would receive money from all 
members; receive projects from all concerned; maintain one overall project list for each region; 
study and check each project; and develop one overall aid program for the region. Most 
importantly, this regional consortium proposed by CCODP and CCFD would be administered 
by CIDSE members as well as representatives from the region. The “Blankenberge Declaration” insisted that “all significant aid should be discussed and decided with the 
participation of the Third World in a majority.” In other words, members of the developing 
countries should have an equal voice in whether or not projects were funded.
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For Roméo Maione and his co-signatories to this minority report, the problem with the recommendations from the majority was that, despite the lip-service paid, CIDSE and its member churches had yet to put real partnership in action. The key issue was not the offer of membership to members of developing countries but rather the sharing of power. Maione argued, “real partnership means going to the bank and setting up joint bank accounts where each signature is equal to the other. We are far from this reality.”

When groups in the developing world sent their projects to the various CIDSE members requesting funding, the final decision of whether to transfer funds was made by the churches in the developed world. Those in the poor countries were effectively excluded from the decision-making stage. Since as Maione shrewdly observed, “those who have the money make the decisions,” the regional consortium would make the relationship more equal by “allowing those who suffer or benefit the consequences of the decisions of others to be present when these decisions are made with full voice and voting power.”

Maione concluded, “People in rich countries do not give to our national churches but rather through them to the poor. We are responsible to report to people how the funds were used but the distribution must necessarily be a co-responsibility with the poor countries.”

Equally important to allocating funds, this proposal sought to establish a new paradigm for relations between the two parts of the world that would “liberate men from the sins of domination and dependency.”

At the Board of Governors in June 1972, the “Blankenberge Declaration” was unanimously approved with the notation that “more decisions must be put in the hands of people
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in the developing regions.” The board then established a working committee to study the feasibility of creating the proposed regional consortiums. Prior to this CIDSE seminar in 1972, Development and Peace was operating with a “paternalistic” approach of providing funding to the poorest regions of the world without any genuine collaboration with their partners outside of Canada. Out of a growing dissatisfaction with the bilateral structure of aid and the existing processes of decision making, CCODP embraced a “partnership” model that addressed the problems of underdevelopment through power-sharing with the people of the Third World. The 1972 seminar in Blankenberge served as a “tipping-point” in this maturation. After this conference, CCODP moved away from the traditional donor-recipient relationship to one that was characterized by co-responsibility in decision making which marked a new era in the history of Development and Peace.

**Conclusion**

From 1967-1972, Development and Peace worked hard to implement the “Proposal for a National Fund to Help Developing Countries.” Initially, most of the organization’s resources were devoted to creating structures for raising funds and ensuring that these funds were properly sent to the Third World. In regard to fundraising, the vast majority of revenue (almost 70 per cent) came from the annual collection within Canadian parishes known as the Share Lent campaign. Beginning in fiscal year 1970-1971, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) began matching all funds raised by CCODP (essentially doubling Development and Peace’s budget for international development projects).

Over 80 per cent of all CCODP revenue was distributed to projects in the Third World. As kindly as these funds were given, projects were funded with a paternalistic approach that lacked any genuine collaboration with the partners who received the funds. This traditional
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donor-recipient relationship only perpetuated the dependency of the Third World on the industrialized nations. Recognizing this problem, Justice Monnin (Manitoba) warned the Board of Governors in 1971 that Development and Peace must “slay the dragon of paternalism for paternalism is the antithesis of real development which is people growing in responsibility for their own future.”

Attempting to counteract the existing dynamic of domination, CCODP Executive Director Roméo Maione co-authored the “Blankenberge Declaration” in 1972 that proposed a new partnership model that was not based on money, but on the sharing of power. This new paradigm of partnership would revolutionize how CCODP understood and engaged in “development.”

As lucrative as the Share Lent campaigns were—raising over seven million dollars in four years—they also served as the principle means by which CCODP fulfilled its mandate to educate Canadians about the causes of global injustice. While trying to raise the collective awareness of the general public, early educational materials often erred on the side of paternalism. For example, the first Development and Peace poster for their inaugural Share Lent collection in 1968 stated “Give Them Something to Eat,” beneath the image of a hungry child. The second campaign poster was removed by St. Francis Xavier University after members of the African Student Body complained to the administration that the poster was too offensive. According to one long-term member of the organization, “At the time of foundation, the organization was basically seen as a pump in Canada sharing funds with the have-nots of the world; it used education as a way of priming that pump.”

Despite these initial growing pains, out of these early campaigns Development and Peace was able to lay the foundation for a Canadian education program. In 1969, an education
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department was created for each linguistic sector of Canada. These education departments convened their own standing committees composed of experienced educators from the community to explore new initiatives in raising the consciences of Canadians about their collective responsibility to countries in need. These departments produced materials that presented the various aspects and issues related to development in terms that were easily understandable. To create a stronger CCODP presence the local communities, field officers were hired to serve Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Central Canada and Western Canada as animateurs.

Much time and energy was also devoted to building Development and Peace into the prototype post-Vatican II organization that involved cooperation among all elements within the Catholic community (especially the laity). Diocesan councils were formed for the purpose of executing the Share Lent campaigns, but it was hoped that these sections would remain active year-round and make Catholic social justice a pastoral priority of each diocese and parish. This vision would prove a difficult challenge. Lay participation in official Church structures was a new concept coming from Vatican II and it would take over a decade of hard work to overcome the pre-Vatican II ethos of a passive laity.\footnote{Fabien Leboeuf, interview with the author, 19 April 2012.} As a result, the nationwide participatory structure envisioned in the 1966 proposal was still many years away. After five years in the field, in 1972, the French Sector reported, “very few lay people are involved in the work of Development and Peace at the local level.”\footnote{ACCODP, CN.PVAJUIN.1972.SUITE, “Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors,” 16-17 June 1972, “Education (French Sector),” 4.} For those that had committees, most were often composed of only two or three generous individuals and they were only active during the Lenten
season. In the entire province of Quebec, only two dioceses (Montreal and Huterive/Baie-Comeau) held general meetings." Furthermore, it was estimated that by 1972, only 25 percent of the parishes organized the Share Lent campaign as it was designed (an integrated educational, fundraising and spiritual experience). For the remainder, the campaign was limited to the collection of funds. While this action of making a donation undoubtedly touched the conscience of many Christians, it did not bring any concrete awareness of solidarity with the developing world. When reviewing the overall work of Development and Peace during this period, Judge Monnin concluded “We still have a great task before us.”
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CHAPTER 3: 
INTENSIFICATION AND EXPANSION (1972-1977)

The February 1973 meeting of the Board of Governors for Development and Peace was an important moment in the organization’s young history. Having completed five full years of operations, the board decided that the organization needed a thorough self-examination. This bi-annual gathering was focused around the central question, “how well has [CCODP] lived up to the mandate given it by the Canadian bishops?” Working papers on Share Lent, funding of projects, home poverty, education, relations with other churches and internal organization were prepared and circulated by the secretariat to facilitate discussion. Adding to the importance of this event, one month before the board was scheduled to meet, Executive Director Roméo Maione submitted his letter of resignation. Not only was Maione the first and only executive director of CCODP (1967-1973) but, perhaps more importantly, he was regarded as the “soul of the organization” for his deep Christian commitment to justice. Articulating the magnitude of this board meeting, Paul A. Robinson (Ontario) wrote to his fellow governors: “At the coming meeting, we shall have before us probably the most serious obligation which we, as Governors, have ever had to face—the seeking of a new Executive Director...We are nearing a turning point and there is much at stake.”

The February 1973 Board of Governors meeting was, indeed, a turning point for the organization. At this influential meeting the governors not only reaffirmed their commitment to the original directions given by the bishops in their 1968 pastoral letter—“to educate public opinion in Canada; to raise funds for projects of a socio-economic nature; and to renew the spirit...
of Lent”—but they called for an intensification and expansion of these objectives. Specifically, during 1972-1977, the budget and scope of the Canadian education program would grow substantially. Leading into this meeting, education was only a small part of CCODP activities and limited to the annual Share Lent fundraising campaign. While Share Lent would continue to expand in terms of revenue during this period (which was further increased by matching contributions from CIDA and, for the first time, by provincial governments), the governors were concerned that CCODP was viewed by the public exclusively as “a money-raising organization.” As a corrective, beginning with Share Lent’73, the educational and spiritual components of this campaign were intensified. The governors wanted to go beyond informing the Canadian population of the grave situation in the Third World to the next step of helping Canadians to “understand that the obstacles to development are found within our own mental, social, economic, industrial and political structures, and that we must first accept to change these.” Rather than a unified nationwide campaign, separate educational campaigns were organized for French-speaking and English-speaking Canada.

Along with an increasing emphasis on the educational dimension of their mandate, the governors also wanted to expand and intensify their international development program. During this five-year period, the amount of funds sent overseas for development projects and emergency relief increased at a steady rate. More importantly, inspired by an influential International Seminar in 1975, the international projects department questioned how effectively CCODP projects encouraged sustainable development. This led to an intense review of the guidelines for socio-economic projects to receive funds and a more rigorous application of this
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revised criteria. A key part of this self-reflective process was to prioritize development projects that empowered impoverished peoples to take ownership of their own socio-economic development (through initiatives such as the Asia Partnership for Human Development). Furthermore, CCODP would expand the scope of its development program to include working in ecumenical coalitions (such as the Inter-Church Fund for International Development) and fighting poverty in Canada (exemplified by its support of PLURA, an interchurch association to promote justice in Canada). If the first five years of Development and Peace (1967-1972) were characterized by implementing and establishing an international aid organization, the next five years (1972-1977) were devoted to intensifying and expanding the work of this organization.

**A New Executive Director**

The most pressing task for the Board of Governors in February 1973 was to select a new Executive Director for CCODP to replace the outgoing Roméo Maione. Seeing himself as a “starter”—and having already devoted five years to establishing Development and Peace—Maione felt ready to move on to a new challenge.\(^{594}\) Maione accepted an appointment as director of the international affairs branch with the Canadian Labour Congress.\(^{595}\) During the discussions on finding a new executive director, the senior staff of the secretariat (Maione; Tom Johnston, the Assistant Executive Director; and André Trembaly, Assistant Director for International Projects) expressed their view that the new executive director should be: “a churchman, stronger in French, a good administrator, involved socially, with some knowledge
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\(^{594}\) Michael Flynn, interview with author, Toronto, ON, 9 August 2011.

\(^{595}\) In addition to his work with the Canadian Labour Congress, in 1973 Maione was named chair of the National Council of the Welfare Advisory Board to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. He was also appointed in the same year to by Pope Paul VI to Cor Unum, an international council of distinguished citizens who advised the Vatican on international development issues. In 1975, Maione left the Canadian Labour Congress to become the director of the non-governmental organization division of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). ACCODP, Archives Promo, News Views 1971-1976, 1975, “1975_ShareLent_FinalResults,” *News Views*, 4.
of international problems and to have the confidence of the staff.” Based on these criteria, they recommended the appointment of Jacques Champagne. A recent addition to the staff of CCODP, Champagne was hired in 1972 to organize the Share Lent ’73 campaign for the French Sector. Prior to this appointment, Champagne had twenty years worth of experience working for the Catholic Church in Canada in a variety of capacities, most recently serving as the secretary of the Dumont Commission. This high-profile commission was established by the Quebec bishops from 1968-1972 to study the future of the Catholic Church in that province’s uncertain spiritual and social environment. During the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s, Quebec was rapidly secularized as the provincial government took control over the vast network of ecclesiastical organizations that had provided the province’s education, health and social welfare systems. As a result, the Catholic Church lost a great deal of its cultural power and institutional presence in Quebec.

Published in 1971, the final report of the Dumont Commission concluded that the Church in Quebec needed to recognize the inevitability of political modernization and cultural pluralism and reconcile itself to the loss of its institutional power and prestige. Rather than looking to its past, the Dumont Commission made two recommendations on how the Church should chart a new course forward in Quebec. First, the Catholic Church needed to “assume a socio-critical function in society.” The Church needed to redefine its role in society to become a strong
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moral voice for building a modern, just and humane society. Second, the Church needed to “become more democratic in its own self-organization.”603 To facilitate the democratization of the Church within the framework of the existing hierarchy, the Report recommended creating regional centres of discussion that would formulate pastoral policy and allow for active dialogue from a variety of viewpoints. As a member of the Dumont Commission, Champagne envisioned the Canadian Church as being committed to social justice and collaborating with its laity.604

While Champagne came with sterling credentials and the support of CCODP’s upper management, an influential group of governors (led by Paul Robinson of Ontario605) proposed another candidate, André Verret.606 Verret was a professional fund raising advisor who had extensive experience working with corporations and NGOs throughout North America. The two candidates represented different visions of Development and Peace moving forward. Verret embodied the idea of making of CCODP into a more efficient and professional charity for the Third World. The emphasis would be on steering CCODP toward a “charity-model” of raising the maximum amount of money for the poor. Such a business model would shield donors from difficult arguments about development, laud the donor’s financial contribution as the objective of the exercise, and exaggerate its own ability to better the lives of poor people of the Third World.607 In contrast, Champagne symbolized Development moving forward with a “justice-model” that understood the problems of international development could not be solved with money alone. While money was important for funding socio-economic development projects in
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605 When Archbishop Pocock of Toronto withdrew from the United Way in 1976 and established his own Catholic parallel organization, the ShareLife Trust, Paul Robinson was named the Executive Director. Under the direction of Robinson, ShareLife flourished. In December 1982, however, Robinson was convicted of “misappropriation of funds” over the course of several years and was sentenced to six years in prison. See: Michael W. Higgins and Douglas R. Leston, My Father’s Business: A Biography of His Eminence G. Emmett Cardinal Carter (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1990), 210.
606 Michael Flynn, interview with author, 9 August 2011.
607 Michael Flynn, interview with author, 16 May 2012.
the Third World, education of the Canadian population was equally important. As an organization, CCODP needed to help Canadians understand that poverty in the Third World was not simply an economic condition, but rather the result of economic, political, social and cultural oppression. \(^{608}\)

On a vote of sixteen to three, Jacques Champagne was appointed as executive director. \(^{609}\) The three governors who voted against Champagne specified that they were voting against the method used for the selection of a new executive director—they proposed forming a formal search committee and consulting with the various sections across Canada—and not against Champagne himself. \(^{610}\) With Champagne at the helm, Development and Peace would expand its education program, both during Share Lent and beyond.

**Canadian Education Program**

According to the original proposal of 1966, the primary objective of Development and Peace was “Information and Education...to create among our Canadian people an awareness of their responsibility to countries in need...and develop the concern for international cooperation and social justice as it applies to the international level.” \(^{611}\) During his final address as the outgoing Executive Director on 11 February 1973, Roméo Maione reminded the Board of Governors that this aspect of the mandate, education and mobilizing of public opinion, was the most important task of CCODP.

Our mobilizing of public opinion is not orientated to raising money but rather to raise the hearts of Canadians to the level of international cooperation....There must be no confusion between public relations and education. Public relations is to better the image of our organization. I leave feeling that our policy of “letting our deeds
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“speak” has made Development and Peace known in Canada. Education is the conversion, the turning around of people’s hearts and minds. This mission of prophecy, i.e. telling it as it is, cannot be given to an advertising agency. This is the deepest work of the church.612

While the funds available for self-help development projects were becoming more substantial (especially due to matching funds from CIDA), they could never provide the ultimate solution to bridging the widening gap between wealthy and poor countries. Funding of projects needed to be balanced with education.

In her address to the Board of Governors on 22 November 1975, CCODP President Molly Boucher (British Columbia) reaffirmed Maione’s position: “the most important work we can do is to educate our Canadian people regarding the basic causes of underdevelopment and to work in Canada towards remedying some of the injustices caused by our policies and actions, and by our prodigal use of the world’s resources.”613 Yet, Boucher cautioned, educating the average “person in the pew” was a complex task. People would not automatically become deeply interested in sophisticated issues of trade structures, tied aid, or multi-national corporations. An effective program would need to begin with clear communications.

We must always seek to express these issues within the framework of the gospel message of hope; that is our distinct task as a church agency. We must seek to explain complicated matters in non-technical language easily comprehended by the uninitiated lay person. We must always accompany education with a plan of action, otherwise we invite our people to despair.614

Helping the average Canadian to understand the complicated world of international development was the primary goal of Development and Peace’s Canadian education program.

Succinctly stated, the importance of this program was “not only to better inform the Canadian

populations of the realities of under-development, but also to help Canadians understand its causes and mechanisms, and thus influence politics at various government levels in Canada in the fields of trade and development." As Boucher later said in her final address as President of the Board of Development and Peace in 1977, “If through education at home we can diffuse an understanding of the underlying causes of underdevelopment and create within our own country the political will for a more just society, then we will have made the quantum leap that is urgently required if development indeed is to be the new name for peace.”

**Share Lent Campaign**

In 1973 the “most known activity of Development and Peace” was the annual Share Lent campaign. It was during this forty-day period that Development and Peace did most of its educational work and collected most of its funds for the Third World. Income for CCODP was divided into two categories: income from private sources (money raised independently by CCODP, accounting for 62.2 per cent of the annual budget from 1967-1977) and income from governmental sources (supplying the remaining 37.8 per cent during this same period). Over its first ten years, the Share Lent campaign consistently accounted for 70 to 80 per cent of Development and Peace’s “private” income revenue (or 44.1 per cent of CCODP’s overall income). Within the majority of the parishes, the collection was held in the church (making Share Lent the principal annual collection in Canada). These “second collections” held during Mass allowed Development and Peace to keep its administrative costs low (5 to 8 per
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cent for CCODP as compared to 25 to 30 per cent for other comparable NGOs).\(^{621}\) Other sources of private income would come from private individual and institutional donors (outside of Lent), special appeals throughout the year for specific humanitarian crises, and interest on investments.

**Table 3.1: Revenue from Share Lent Campaigns (1973-1977)**\(^{622}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme [French Sector/English Sector]</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>“Real” Amount in 1972 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)(^ {623})</th>
<th>% of income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td><em>Faut pas lâche, on s’en sortira pas tout seuls!!</em> Development Is...People: The Glory of God is Man Fully Alive.”</td>
<td>$1,641,753</td>
<td>$1,518,622</td>
<td>N/A(^ {624})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td><em>Nous autres on a des problèmes, le Tiers monde est encore plus mal pris, personne peut s’en sortir tout seul!</em> Our World Broken by Unshared Bread</td>
<td>$2,356,605</td>
<td>$1,966,791</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td><em>La solidarité gagne du terrain</em> Share...Dignity, Justice, Hope to Help a Broken World</td>
<td>$3,360,254</td>
<td>$2,528,734</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td><em>La terre est à tout l’monde, mais...</em> The Earth Is for All</td>
<td>$3,564,601</td>
<td>$2,528,247</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td><em>La terre est à tout l’monde, mais...il faut y voir</em> The Land Is for All, But...</td>
<td>$3,898,966</td>
<td>$2,553,305</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,822,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,095,699</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After remaining stable during its first five campaigns, from 1973-1977 the amount of funds collected through Share Lent showed signs of impressive growth. These strong results were due to the consistent support of the Canadian bishops and the sustained actions of clergy
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\(^{622}\) The amounts raised each year were obtained from Development and Peace’s official report to the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops in 1977, see ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” 39. These numbers were verified (by the author of this dissertation) using the annual financial statements that were compiled by the independent accounting firm, Samson, Bélair, Côté, Lacroix et Associés.

\(^{623}\) These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: [http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/](http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/)

\(^{624}\) The audited annual financial statements are mentioned in the Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors, but they were not preserved. ACCODP, Archives DG, CN Reunions, CN Reunions 1973, CN PV Octobre, CN.PVA.OCTOBRE.1973, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 20-21 October 1973, 6
and thousands of volunteers nationwide. While the Share Lent revenue continued to increase, these numbers can be deceptive. When one adjusts these figures for inflation (8.8 per annum or 42.7 per cent during this period), CCODP’s Share Lent collection showed signs of stagnating or losing ground between 1975 and 1977. Thus, while the raw numbers continued to increase on an annual basis, the organization was beginning to lose ground in constant or real dollars.

While pleased with the overall financial success of Share Lent (growing from $1.3 million in 1968 to $3.9 million in 1977), the Board of Governors during their thorough self-examination in February 1973 questioned whether CCODP had done enough to educate public opinion to the demands of justice during the campaigns. The governors wanted the campaign to be much more than a recipient of traditional Lenten almsgiving. They envisioned the Share Lent campaign as “a highly motivated Lenten renewal program” that provided deep spiritual education to Christians and was accompanied by wider actions influencing public opinion. To realize this vision, the Share Lent campaign was delegated from the national secretariat to the newly-formed English and French education sectors, who would organize two independent campaigns for their respective regions. Each sector developed its own campaign theme and materials in consultation with their own education advisory boards. Certainly the English and French sectors tried to collaborate as much as possible, but both sectors were conscious of the cultural and political differences between the two communities.

During the 1960s and 1970s, Quebec became a highly politicized society. Quebeckers increasingly saw themselves as participating in a liberation movement of national self-determination. The anti-colonial struggles in Africa, the Algerian war and the civil rights

---

625 These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/
629 For example, see Appendix 2, Figures 8 and 9 (both used during the 1973 Share Lent campaign).
630 Michael Flynn, interview with the author, 16 May 2012.
movement in the United States were creating a political discourse that growing numbers of Quebecers used to define their own political and cultural nationhood.\textsuperscript{631} Quebec society wanted to free itself from the economic domination of the English-Canada elites as well as the cultural and institutional oppression of the Catholic Church (which was criticized for impeding the entry of Quebec into North American modernity).\textsuperscript{632} To assume full responsibility for themselves, the people of Quebec embraced a process of secularization (the so-called “Quiet Revolution”) whereby the provincial government took over the fields of education, health care, and social services from the Catholic Church. Politically, the movement for independence was encouraged in July 1967, when Charles de Gaulle, President of France, proclaimed “\textit{Vive le Québec libre}!” (“Long live free Quebec!”)—the slogan of Quebec sovereignty—to a frenzied crowd of thousands in Montreal. Things took a violent turn in 1970, when a small group of terrorist-separatists known as the \textit{Front de liberation de Québec} (FLQ) kidnapped British Trade Commissioner James Cross and Quebec Labour Minister Pierre Laporte (who was later found murdered). The “October Crisis” galvanized support for political means (not violence) for attaining greater autonomy and independence. Over the next ten years the sovereigntist movement steadily gained momentum until, in 1980, the first referendum on the sovereignty for Quebec was held.\textsuperscript{633}

Against this backdrop of secularization, the Church in Quebec assumed an increasingly critical voice in society and it encouraged its followers to engage in social action (as recommended by the Dumont Report). Following the recent evolution of Catholic social teaching that assumed a distinctly progressive orientation (Vatican II’s \textit{Gaudium et Spes}, the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[631] Gregory Baum, \textit{The Church in Quebec} (Ottawa: Novalis, 1991), 70.
\item[632] Baum, “Catholicism and Secularization in Quebec,” 151.
\end{footnotes}
1968 Latin American Bishops Conference at Medellin, Columbia and the 1971 World Synod Bishops), the French Canadian bishops were increasingly looking upon Quebec society from the perspective of the poor and disadvantaged. Following Vatican II, in particular, there was a concentrated effort to develop *une pastorale sociale* (“a social ministry”) in each diocese in the province. Moreover, during the 1970s, scores of Catholic missionaries were returning to Quebec from Latin America (Chile, Brazil, Central America), after being expelled by the ruling the ruling military juntas for their socio-political involvement and activism. Collectively, these influences—from above and below—created an openness in the Quebec Church for social change. As a result, the Church in Quebec (bishops, priests, religious orders and laity) supported and collaborated with labour unions, cooperatives, women’s organizations and popular movements in their struggles for greater justice and in their efforts to transform society. Thus, to have a voice in a society that was increasingly secular and anti-religious, the Church in Quebec needed to collaborate with politicized social movements.

While the French Sector formed relationships with secular organizations, the English Sector made partnerships with the mainline (Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian and United) Protestants to create common faith-based campaigns. In response to the spirit of renewal that followed the Second Vatican Council, Catholics in English Canada were reaching out to experiment with new ecumenical relationships in the building of new models for justice and peace. Protestants were pushed by the energy of the Catholics to rediscover their own Social Gospel tradition. Initially, ecumenical social action was focused on the war against domestic 
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634 Baum, “Catholicism and Secularization in Quebec,” 155.
635 Fabien Leboeuf, interview with the author, 19 April 2012.
636 Ibid.
637 Baum, “Catholicism and Secularization in Quebec,” 155.
poverty. The 1968 national conference “Christian Conscience and Poverty” led to the creation of the Coalition for Development. This ambitious attempt to co-ordinate the antipoverty struggles of a wide range of organizations did not survive, but the desire to work together remained strong.\textsuperscript{639} International emergencies such as the Biafra and Bangladesh crises of the late 1960s and early 1970s and the growing gap between rich and poor nations heightened the churches’ desire to co-ordinate relief and development activities.\textsuperscript{640} These ecumenical coalitions were limited to English Canada as the Protestant churches were small in Quebec and those that did exist were mostly unilingual Anglophone.\textsuperscript{641}

The first major step taken by the English Sector toward ecumenical partnership was the Ten Days for World Development program. In 1971 and 1972, the Share Lent campaign was coordinated with CCODP’s sister relief and development agencies of the Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian and United Churches (this common fundraising campaign was but one initiative of the ecumenical coalition known as the Inter-Church Consultative Committee for Development and Relief or ICCCDR). While the various denominations all used the same theme and materials (allowing each church to minimize their expenses), control of the funds and the decisions regarding the use of the funds remained within the control of the particular denomination.\textsuperscript{642}

In 1973 the ICCCDR launched a new high profile educational venture, a ten-day nationwide speaking tour featuring leaders from each of the five major Christian congregations (Archbishop Edward W. Scott, Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada; Bishop William E.

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{639} Boyd, “PLURA,” 134.
\textsuperscript{640} Marjorie Ross, “Setting the Table for All God’s People: Canadian Churches and Development,” in \textit{Canadian Churches and Foreign Policy}, ed. Bonnie Greene (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, 1990), 72-77
\textsuperscript{641} Fabien Leboeuf, interview with the author, 19 April 2012.
\end{footnotes}
Power, President of the Canadian Catholic Conference; Dr. John Zimmerman, President of the Lutheran Council in Canada; Dr. Max V. Putnam, Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Canada; and Dr. N. Bruce McLeod, Moderator of the United Church of Canada).\(^{643}\) Entitled “Ten Days for World Development,” this ecumenical endeavour was intended to be strictly educational; no funds were collected. Coordinated to also kick-off the Share Lent campaign in 1973, the Ten Days began in Ottawa, where the church leaders presented a position paper, entitled “Development Demands Justice,” to the federal government and parliamentarians. The ecumenical statement, on behalf of the five church relief and development agencies, informed Canadians that they faced a “basic choice” between striving for “ever-increasing growth, earnings, and consumption or joining the poor in a struggle for a just distribution of income and decision-making.”\(^{644}\) The tour continued to diverse public events organized by local committees (such as public receptions, forums, workshops, meetings and press conferences) in Quebec City, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, London and Halifax.\(^{645}\) The fact that the leaders of the five major Christian churches in Canada had taken such a public position regarding Canada’s global responsibilities was a major story for the media.\(^{646}\)

Since ecumenical activity was virtually non-existent in Quebec, the French Sector organized its own Colloque National/National Symposium in Montreal on 9-11 March 1973. Importantly, to move past the paternalistic model of years past, members of the developing world were invited to participate. The opening address was given by the Father Gonzalo Arroyo, SJ, a leading liberation theologian from Chile. Of the 150 symposium participants,

\(^{643}\) Moffat, “Ten Days for World Development,” 156.


\(^{646}\) Moffat, “Ten Days for World Development,” 156.
eleven were from the developing world (representing Brazil, Chile, Peru, Haute Volta/Burkina Faso, Togo, and Argentina).\textsuperscript{647} Afterwards, the visitors toured fifteen different regions of Quebec and New Brunswick, giving presentations about international development.\textsuperscript{648} In addition, Father Vincent Cosmao, OP, a French theologian who specialized on questions of faith and development, was invited to speak at the Universities of Montreal, Quebec, Sherbrooke and Ottawa.\textsuperscript{649}

With the publicity of Ten Days for World Development, Share Lent ’73 set a new record in fundraising, reaching $1,641,753 (an increase of almost $100,000 from the previous year).\textsuperscript{650} Despite this success, it was decided to disconnect the two events due to confusion among the Canadian public.\textsuperscript{651} People associated Share Lent exclusively with fundraising (ignoring its efforts at spiritual renewal) and Ten Days with education. To avoid this false distinction, it was decided to keep the two programs separate and hold Ten Days outside of Lent.\textsuperscript{652} Throughout the 1970s the Ten Days program would continue to grow, with much help from Development and Peace. Each year important guest speakers would continue to travel on Canada-wide speaking tours: Peter Kwasi Sarpong, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Kumasi in Ghana and member of the Pontifical Commission Justice & Peace (1974);\textsuperscript{653} Dom Héldar Câmara, the Catholic Archbishop of Olinda and Recife in Brazil (1975);\textsuperscript{654} Canon Subir K. Biswas, Vicar of St. Paul’s Cathedral of the Church of North India, Calcutta (Anglican) and Dr. Marion Gallis, an

\textsuperscript{648} Ibid., 4-6.
\textsuperscript{649} Ibid., 6.
\textsuperscript{650} ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” 39.
economist/researcher for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development or UNCTAD (1976); and Frances Moore Lappé and Joseph Collins, founders of the Institute for Food and Development Policy (1977). By 1977, the number of Ten Days local committees had expanded from eight in 1973 to forty. Development and Peace was heavily involved with two-thirds of these groups. By the late 1970s, however, CCODP membership in local Ten Days Committees declined significantly (mainly due to overloaded volunteers who needed to prioritize their time toward the Share Lent campaign).

The English and French Sectors had worked independently on the Share Lent campaigns in 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975. It is worth noting that holding two parallel campaigns caused confusion for francophone parishes in predominantly English provinces (such as in the diocese of St. Paul, Alberta), as well as in bilingual parishes and regions (such as Ottawa). When this practice was reviewed by the governors, Denyse Gauthier, Director of the French Sector, maintained that operating separate campaigns tailored towards a particular linguistic/cultural group was more effective than one nationwide campaign with mutual materials. This sentiment was affirmed by Executive Director Jacques Champagne. To rectify the problems that occurred in regions where the francophone population was less numerous, English materials would be translated into French.
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659 Ibid.
660 Ibid., 4. See Appendix 2, Figure 10 (from the 1974 Share Lent campaign). The slogan for the English Sector is translated into French for Francophone parishes in a predominately English diocese.
For Share Lent’76 the two sectors re-united to collaborate on the *La terre est à tout l’monde, mais...*/The Earth is for All...” campaign.\textsuperscript{662} Examining the causes and consequences of the global food problem/agricultural crisis in the developing world—“at least 500 million inhabitants of this planet are currently suffering from hunger and malnutrition. 20 per cent of the world’s population is in danger of dying and starvation”\textsuperscript{663}—the campaign reminded Canadians that a just world requires fundamental changes in their attitudes and economic relationships both on the national and international levels. The paradigm of one unified nationwide Share Lent campaign would continue in 1977 and beyond.\textsuperscript{664}

The 1976 Share Lent campaign was also noteworthy as it drew attention to Canadian political policies that negatively affected international development. Development and Peace sent an open letter, signed by CCODP President Molly Boucher and approved by the Board of Governors, to Prime Minister Pierre E. Trudeau asking the Canadian government to exercise leadership at the upcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) that was to be held in Nairobi, Kenya in May 1976 and it asked that Canada give strong support to nations in the Third World in their efforts to form a new economic order that was assured a more just distribution of the world’s riches.\textsuperscript{665} On a domestic level, the letter also called for redistribution of wealth among the different social groups in Canada.\textsuperscript{666} To accomplish these goals, the letter specifically asked the Canadian government to:

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{665} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 12-13 March 1976, Letter to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, 23 March 1976, 91.
\textsuperscript{666} Ibid., 92.
\end{footnotesize}
1) spend 0.7% of the GNP on official development assistance as recommended by the Pearson Report. This aid should be a response to the real needs of developing nations and not be applied to further Canada’s own economic interests.

2) effectively apply the anti-inflation measures for control of prices and corporate profits in order to ease the burden of inflation on Canadians with low or fixed incomes.

3) end waste expenditure in the area of Canadian military defence, forbid the sale of arms to foreign countries, and most important exert concerted effort to achieving world disarmament in the nearest possible future.667

This letter was accompanied by 25,000 postcards that were signed by individuals who supported Development and Peace’s position.668

Ultimately, the most effective educational and promotional tool for Share Lent was the media’s coverage of international crises. For example, the largest annual increase in Share Lent revenue during this period came in 1975, which raised a total of $3,360,254 (an increase of $1 million, or 42.5 per cent, from the previous year).672 More specifically, Share Lent’75 saw an 85-100 per cent increase in French Canada and a 20 per cent increase in English Canada.673

According to the staff of the French Sector, the biggest reason for this dramatic increase from Quebec was that the large amount of media attention to the global food crisis in the early to mid-1970s.674 Briefly stated, from 1972 to 1974, erratic weather patterns in Africa, South Asia and Latin America produced prolonged drought in some areas and floods in others, which limited the ability of these regions to produce their own food supply.675 Due to the shortage of wheat (caused by historically poor harvests in the USSR and the United States), as well as the high

667 Ibid., 93.
cost of fertilizer and fuel, developing nations were not able to feed themselves.\textsuperscript{676} In effect, after two decades of annual increase, world food production declined in 1972 and again in 1974.\textsuperscript{677} As a response to the food crisis, in November 1974, the United Nations convened the first ever World Food Conference in Rome (135 countries attended). The conference concluded with the adoption of the Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition which declared, “Every man, woman and child has the inalienable right to be free from hunger and malnutrition in order to develop their physical and mental faculties.”\textsuperscript{678} Due to the extensive media coverage of the food crisis (highlighted by a massive famine in Bangladesh throughout 1974), Share Lent’75 witnessed an increased number of requests for materials and educational resources, which in turn led to a record collection.\textsuperscript{679}

While the Share Lent campaigns were financially successful (raising $14,822,179 from 1973-1977), they were not without their problems and controversies. Most notably, during Share Lent’74, Development and Peace (for the first time in its seven-year history) encountered open criticism during the campaign. A small group called “Christians Against Terrorism” distributed a broadsheet during Lent that contained numerous charges against Development and Peace and called for a boycott of the Share Lent campaign. The catalyst for the attack was that during 1973-1974, the French Sector collaborated with Oxfam and CUSO (Canadian University Students Overseas) in “Operation Angola,” which supported Angola in its attempt to gain independence from Portuguese colonial rule. The education materials—entitled Québec-

\textsuperscript{676} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{677} Ibid.
Angola, zones à libérer/“Quebec-Angola, regions in need of liberation”—also caused problems within the Canadian Church as CCODP was seen as supporting the separatist movement in Quebec (an especially delicate topic after the October crisis of 1970). “Operation Angola” was capped by a visit by the MPLA delegation (Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola or the People’s Movement for the Liberation of Angola), which fought against the Portuguese army in the Angolan War of Independence (1961-75).

Christians Against Terrorism had strong ties to an extreme right-wing group called Tradition, Family, Property (TFP), which was a pro-Portuguese nationalist groups who defended Portugal’s right to maintain its colonial empire. Christians Against Terrorism felt that Development and Peace was inappropriately supporting Angolan terrorists, as well as publicly maligning the Portuguese government.

Calling for a boycott of the Share Lent campaign, the circular was mailed to every pastor in the Archdiocese of Toronto (where Christians Against Terrorism was headquartered) and copies were distributed on the doorstep of twenty Toronto churches during the Sunday of the Share Lent collection (specifically those with large Portuguese populations). Fortunately for CCODP, none of the allegations were reported by the media. Archbishop Pocock of Toronto, however, took the situation seriously and sent a letter to all pastors in his diocese repudiating the charges and urged them to support Share Lent. Furthermore, an emergency meeting was
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convened with the national secretariat and the Toronto Section, which issued an official response to the Canadian bishops. The financial results of Share Lent’74 (a record of $2,356,605) indicate that this attack did not have an impact on the overall campaign.

Aside from content, another ongoing problem with the Share Lent collection was that several dioceses retained the money collected for ten to eleven months before sending it to the head office in Montreal. These delays meant that Development and Peace was forced to delay the payment for certain projects that were approved for funding. Further complicating the situation, certain dioceses kept a percentage of the money collected for their own missions or for other purposes. For example: Charlottetown kept 50 per cent of the funds raised for its diocesan mission team; St-Jean, QC withheld 50 per cent for its diocesan chancery; and Toronto divided its collection among three parties (in 1977, CCODP received $800,000; St. Augustine’s Seminary received $237,973; and Catholic Charities in the archdiocese received $1,224,142). These financial arrangements, which prioritized diocesan needs, prolonged the transfer of money from the individual dioceses to the national secretariat in Montreal.

**Government Funds (CIDA and Provincial Governments)**

Funds raised by Development and Peace were matched by governmental dollars. While the Federal Government (through the Canadian International Development Agency or CIDA) had been providing funds to Development and Peace since 1969-70, in 1974-75 CCODP also began receiving funds from the governments of the four Western provinces (British Columbia,
Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba). These additional sources of funding were welcomed by CCODP, but the Board of Governors made clear that it would not accept any funds that were “tied aid” (foreign aid that must be spent in the donor province providing the aid). The permanent policy of Development and Peace was that “materials should be purchased in the developing country itself, or the groups responsible for the projects be given the freedom to purchase the necessary materials in the places and conditions they see fit.” As important as these provincial funds were, 91 per cent of all government funds came from CIDA.

Table 3.2: Contributions from CIDA and Provincial Governments (1972-1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIDA</th>
<th>Provinces</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Amount in 1972 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>% of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>$2,535,905</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$2,535,905</td>
<td>$2,345,712</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>$2,666,016</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$2,666,016</td>
<td>$2,225,021</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>$2,405,544</td>
<td>$202,778</td>
<td>$2,608,322</td>
<td>$1,962,873</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>$4,199,139</td>
<td>$519,500</td>
<td>$4,718,639</td>
<td>$3,346,766</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>$2,544,482</td>
<td>$227,883</td>
<td>$2,772,365</td>
<td>$1,815,531</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$14,351,086</td>
<td>$950,161</td>
<td>$15,301,247</td>
<td>$11,695,903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

691 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 9-10 November 1974, 12.
693 These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/
695 The CIDA contribution for 1973-1974 is listed as $2,666,016 in the audited annual financial statements (see ACCODP, CN.Eng Documents.NOVEMBRE.1974.SUITE.1, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 9-10 November 1974, “Auditor’s Report,” 6.) Yet, in the special 10-year edition of the Global Village Voice the amount is reported as $2,716,016 (see ACCODP, The Global Village Voice, vol. 1, no. 3 (February 1977), 10). Here, and throughout this section, I will use the dollars from the audited financial statements.
698 Government contributions for 1976-1977 are listed as $2,772,365 in the audited annual financial statements (see ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 26 - 27 November 1977, “Annual Financial Statements: August 31, 1977,” 89). Yet, in the special 10-year report to the Canadian Bishops, the amount is reported as $2,895,365 (see ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” 38).
During 1973-1977, governmental funds averaged 40.1 per cent of CCODP’s income. The contribution by CIDA was equal to the amount already allotted by Development and Peace for a development project (doubling the original amount). In the case of a provincial government’s participation, CIDA’s contribution would match that of a provincial government and CCODP (quadrupling the original investment). Thus, the amount received from government sources was dependent on how much revenue could be raised initially by Development and Peace.

During 1972 to 1977 CIDA contributions were relatively stable (with the exception of 1975-1976. After that year, CIDA’s NGO Division had set up much tighter control over its funds and a maximum “ceiling” was set up for each NGO in a given year).\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 20-21 November 1976, 4.} As important as these government funds were to CCODP (40 per cent of its operating budget), when these rates were adjusted for inflation (8.84 per cent per annum or 52.7 per cent for the period), CIDA’s contribution to CCODP was actually decreasing (in terms of constant 1972 dollars). This trend of stagnating or decreasing revenue by the late 1970s (in terms of real dollars), led several members of the CCODP leadership to re-evaluate the direction of the organization as it approached the 1980s.

Education (Outside of Lent)

Despite the bold words of Maione and Boucher promoting the value of education, the amount of funds that were committed to educational programming remained rather modest. On average, from 1972-1977, CCODP spent 7.5 per cent of its total expenditures on educational programming in Canada. These numbers fall well below the suggested guideline in the 1966 proposal of allocating 20 per cent of the annual budget to education.\footnote{ACCCB, “Proposal for a National Fund to help Underdeveloped Countries,” 9.} Yet, considering that
more than a third of the revenue received by Development and Peace during this time period came from governmental sources and was designated for international development projects, it is perhaps more revealing to consider the education budget as a percentage of revenue raised by Development and Peace (private income). On average, from 1973-1977, Development and Peace spent 12.4 per cent of its own revenue on education (increasing on an annual basis, reaching as much as 19.5 per cent from 1976-1977). This figure is much closer to the original intentions of the fund.

Table 3.3: Canadian Educational Program Expenses (1972-1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount in 1972 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>% of Total Expenses</th>
<th>% of CCODP Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>$218,606</td>
<td>$202,211</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>$284,301</td>
<td>$237,274</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>$370,062</td>
<td>$278,487</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>$720,864</td>
<td>$511,284</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>$953,323</td>
<td>$624,300</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$2,833,327</td>
<td>$1,853,556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

707 It should be noted that beginning in 1971, CCODP also received a small amount of CIDA funds through its Public Participation Program (PPP), to support initiatives which were directed towards stimulating Canadian public interest in international development. ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 12-13 March 1976, “Special Committee on Education.”

708 These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/

709 According to the audited annual financial statements, the amount spent on education in 1972-1973 was $208,535, but this number was corrected by Jacques Champagne to $218,606 (the discrepancy was over what constituted “education” and what constituted “administration”; see ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 20-21 October 1973, 6). Yet, in the special 10-year edition of the Global Village Voice the amount is reported as $310,066 (see ACCODP, The Global Village Voice, vol. 1, no. 3 (February 1977), 10).

710 According to the audited annual financial statements, the amount spent on education in 1973-1974 was $284,301 (see ACCODP, CN.Eng Documents.NOVEMBRE.1974.SUITE.1, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 9-10 November 1974, “Auditor’s Report,” 6). Yet, in the Global Village Voice the amount is reported as $445,441 (see ACCODP, The Global Village Voice, vol. 1, no. 3 (February 1977), 10).

711 According to the audited annual financial statements, the amount spent on education in 1974-1975 was $370,062 (see ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 21 November 1975, “Auditor’s Report,” 56). Yet, in the Global Village Voice the amount is reported as $615,900 (see ACCODP, The Global Village Voice, vol. 1, no. 3 (February 1977), 10).

712 According to the audited annual financial statements, the amount spent on education in 1975-1976 was $720,864 (see ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee,” 19-20 November 1976, “August 31, 1976 Financial Statements,” 94).

713 According to the audited annual financial statements, the amount spent on education in 1976-1977 was $953,323 (see ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 26 - 27 November 1977, “Annual Financial Statements: August 31, 1977,” 89).
Interestingly the push to increase CCODP funds for education came from the annual provincial meetings (in other words, from the members in the provinces) not from the national secretariat or the governors. In 1974 the Quebec and Atlantic regional meetings proposed that CCODP education expenses be increased to 10 per cent of overall revenue (although special projects that would exceed this limit would be voted on by the Executive Committee, as long as it did not exceed 15 per cent of CCODP revenue),\textsuperscript{716} which was approved by the Board of Governors.\textsuperscript{717} The 1975 Quebec provincial meeting made a recommendation to the Board of Governors that the education budget be increased to 20 per cent of the annual budget. Such a large jump was seen as too drastic by the governors and this motion was defeated by a vote of six to eleven.\textsuperscript{718} Instead, they passed a motion that called for a more gradual increase of the education budgets (up to 14 per cent for 1976-1977).\textsuperscript{719}

The cornerstone of the education departments was the field staff who promoted the aims of Development and Peace at the local level in particular ecclesiastical territories. These \textit{animateurs}: assisted in the formation and expansion of local section committees; helped develop the Share Lent program; fostered the participation of local sections in educational programs; established links with schools and student organizations; facilitated contacts with official church activities; and promoted contact with community organizations and resources.\textsuperscript{720} As part of Development and Peace’s continual efforts to narrow the territory for which a person was responsible, in 1977 the number of full-time Anglophone \textit{animateurs} had grown from three to seven (serving Southern Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ottawa, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick,

\textsuperscript{717} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 9-10 November 1974, 14.
\textsuperscript{718} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 20-21 November 1976, 6.
\textsuperscript{719} Ibid., 7.
Similarly, the French sector had increased from four *animateurs* in 1972-1973 to nine by 1977 (three in Montreal, and one in Hull, Timmins, ON, Quebec City, Manitoba, Trois-Rivières, and New Brunswick). The animators from each sector would gather as a group on a monthly basis to assess and plan their work, and they would meet twice a year with their colleagues from the other sector. At the March 1976 meeting of the Executive Committee, the guideline was established that both the French and English sectors have one *animateur* for every four archdiocesan/diocesan sections.

In 1976 Development and Peace launched an ambitious three-year plan of education for the entire organization centered on the general theme of “A New World Order” (which included the combined Share Lent campaign). This theme was inspired by the concept of the “New International Economic Order” or NIEO that was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1974. The NIEO was a set of proposals made by “Group of 77” non-aligned countries in the developing world at the United National Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 1972 in Chile to restructure the international economic system to permit greater participation by (and benefits to) developing countries. These proposals included allowing developing countries to regulate the activities of multinational corporations operating within their territory; nationalize foreign property; establish associations of primary commodities (similar to OPEC); and improve the terms of trade (specifically by changing the terms of tariffs that benefitted industrialized nations). In its analysis of the NIEO, the Pontifical Commission
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721 ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” 37. As an experiment in ecumenism, from 1974-1976, the one *animateur* for British Columbia was hired by the Roman Catholic Church, the Anglican Church and the United Church to serve all three faith communities. ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 22-23 November 1975, “English Sector: Reports 1974-1975,” 63.
722 ACCODP, “10 Years of Achievements,” 37.
723 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 12-13 March 1976, 7.
on Justice and Peace stated that while economic issues were important, the church must also focus on non-economic values such as freedom of expression, participation, control of one’s destiny and personal and collective self-realization.\textsuperscript{726}

Moving beyond economic issues, the Development and Peace plan of action was to answer the question, “What can Christians do to build a new and better society, to overcome the widening economic, social and political gaps which separate people and nations? How do we build new relationships among people?”\textsuperscript{727} Within this larger theme, there were three specific sub-themes of the campaign. The first theme was the worsening “food/agricultural crisis,” which sought to address the fact that three quarters of the population of the developing countries lived in rural settlements and these people were exposed to unemployment, underdevelopment, hunger, malnutrition, disease, lack of education, etc.\textsuperscript{728} The second theme was the repression of “human rights,” (not just politically, but also culturally, economically, socially and religiously).\textsuperscript{729} The final theme to be addressed was “faith and development,” that tried to discover the means to help transform despair into hope through the resources of Christianity.\textsuperscript{730}

To have a greater national impact than previous years, Development and Peace consolidated the education programs from the English and French Sectors (including the Share Lent campaigns), into one clearly defined year-round educational initiative.\textsuperscript{731} The goals of this joint educational programme were:

1. To bring about a profound transformation in mentality, attitude and behaviour in order to achieve the conditions necessary for the development of mankind in solidarity.

\textsuperscript{727} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{728} Ibid., 27.
\textsuperscript{729} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{730} Ibid., 28.
2. To form agents for social change.
3. To induce the largest possible number of persons and groups to commit themselves to specific action for development here and in the Third World.
4. To arouse responsible political consciousness (individual and collective) able to judge the attitude of the Canadian government toward the countries of the Third World and to exert the political pressure necessary to remedy the deficiencies.\textsuperscript{732}

Succinctly stated, the ultimate aim of the Development and Peace education policy was to not only to transmit knowledge of the Third World, but to promote “bonds of solidarity between the people of Canada and those of the Third World.”\textsuperscript{733}

For 1976-1977, the first year of “The New World Order” campaign, the focus was on the agriculture/food crisis sub-theme. This sub-theme was explored through studies of specific countries (chosen because of their relationship with Development and Peace) Brazil, Guatemala, Vietnam, Peru, Bangladesh, Haiti, the Sahel,\textsuperscript{734} India, the Philippines, Tanzania, Chile, and South Africa.\textsuperscript{735} Despite these grandiose plans, the French Sector reported to the Board of Governors that “The overall theme has proven a sensible choice, but so vast that it was impossible to cover it in a significant or satisfactory way...as a whole the results appear clearly to have fallen below the objective determined.”\textsuperscript{736} The main problem was that the educational departments felt that they did not have the appropriate pedagogical tools (films and slide shows) that were produced with partners from the Third World.\textsuperscript{737} As for programming around “faith and development,” the French Sector reported that “this theme did not hold the attention of the local teams who did not seem to find a way of working it into their work in a fruitful

\textsuperscript{732} ACCODP, \textit{The Global Village Voice}, vol. 1, no. 3 (February 1977), 4.
\textsuperscript{734} The Sahel is a biogeographic zone in northern Africa that covers parts of: Senegal, Mauritania, Burkina Faso, Algeria, Niger, Nigeria, Chad, Cameroon, Sudan, and Eritrea.
\textsuperscript{737} Ibid., 48.
manner.” To address the theme of “human rights,” members of the French Sector helped prepare the Brazilian Bishops’ “International Days for Societies Overcoming Domination” project and helped to coordinate a symposium on South Africa, both of which would occur during the 1977-1978 year. Despite these challenges, the education sectors felt strongly that the issues were too important to abandon and the project should continue (at least) for the next year. In its report to the Board of Governors, the French Sector boasted that “no other organization in Canada has attached such importance to [the world food] problem which is of primary importance.”

During the June 1977 Board of Governors meeting, when the education program was being voted upon for renewal, many governors expressed concern that the “New World Order” education program was “going too fast for a majority of Canada’s Catholic Population.” This critique implied that the education campaign, which called for a justice-based approach to restructuring the international economic system, did not connect to the average Catholic, who still operated with a traditional charity approach towards development of giving alms to the poor. As evidence, these governors pointed to the fact that despite launching this new education campaign, the grassroots of the organization were no longer growing in numbers (and, perhaps, were even shrinking in some areas).

During this debate over the educational campaign, the names of governors were not recorded. Yet, this tension over education was most certainly divided along linguistic lines. According to Mike Flynn, who served as the coordinator of the English Sector during this
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period, the intellectual content for the campaign came primarily from the French Sector.\(^744\) As was mentioned earlier, the Church in Quebec was more radical in its approach towards social justice than the Church in English Canada. Thus, the Anglophone governors were concerned that the current campaign only resonated with a minority of Catholics in Quebec and risked alienating the rest of the English Church who had not necessarily accepted the view that the economic system that created affluence in the industrialized world (such as Canada) was the same system that created poverty in the developing world.\(^745\)

During the debate, other governors (presumably Francophone) defended the education program and felt that Development and Peace had a prophetic obligation to “make people aware of their commitments and the actions that result from them.”\(^746\) According to Governor Nicole Riberdy (Quebec), the challenge was that the education program was aimed primarily at Christians in parishes who had little or no formation in Catholic social justice. Development and Peace, however, “was founded to drastically change consciousness through the audacity of proposing a practice which emphasizes the link between faith and justice.”\(^747\) Ultimately, the board agreed that Development and Peace education program was intended to have a prophetic role in society and the “New World Order” campaign was unanimously renewed.\(^748\)

Another key part of CCODP’s educational thrust during these years was, in 1975, André Tremblay was named the first Director of Information.\(^749\) Tremblay’s new responsibilities were to: “prepare pedagogical instruments for the education sectors, transmit information concerning CCODP to various sectors of the public, ensure good rapport with the communications media

\(^{744}\) Michael Flynn, interview with author, 16 May 2012.  
\(^{745}\) Ibid.  
\(^{746}\) ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 18-19 June 1977, 8.  
\(^{748}\) ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 18-19 June 1977, 8.  
\(^{749}\) ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 4 July 1975, 3.
and aid the Organization generally in the area of information.”\textsuperscript{750} Tremblay was well-qualified to fill this position, not only because of his intimate knowledge of the organization’s work in the developing world (he had been with Development and Peace over seven years, the last five as Director of the Projects Department), but he also spent a sabbatical year in Paris (1974-1975), where he participated in the \textit{Institut Œcuménique pour le Développement des Peuples}/Ecumenical Institute for the Development of Peoples whose founder and first president was Paulo Freire, the famed Brazilian educator and theorist of critical pedagogy.\textsuperscript{751}

The principal method that Tremblay used to publicize the work of Development and Peace was through the publication of a regular newspaper. Entitled \textit{Solidarités} in French and \textit{The Global Village Voice} in English, the periodical appeared in regular format four times, in eight pages and with 10,000 copies in each language.\textsuperscript{752} In terms of content, the newspaper addressed subjects, activities and situations directly related to the work of Development and Peace, while at the same time engaging larger issues of development that would be interest to readers. Launched in October 1976 (the same time as the “New World Order” campaign), the newspaper once again exposed tensions between English and French Canada. During their first year (1976-1977), the papers were warmly received on the French side, but they were openly criticized by the English Church.\textsuperscript{753} The principal criticisms were that the language was too radical; the presentation was too heavy; too much importance on political analysis in general and not enough directly related to development; the paper was too theoretical and “not human enough”; little support of the education work and themes of the program; and a lack of content reflecting

\textsuperscript{750} Ibid., 2. \\
\textsuperscript{753} Ibid., 71-72.
the activity of Development and Peace locally.\textsuperscript{754} Aware of these initial concerns, these papers invested more time into vetting each version of the paper through an English and French editorial team.\textsuperscript{755}

While the governors were concerned that the unified education program was too radical, many of the local sections felt that the education campaign was not doing enough. At the 1977 annual Manitoba provincial meeting, it was reported that “after ten years of existence of our organization, signs that this goal [of sensitizing Canadians to our duties in regard to solidarity and social justice] has been even modestly achieved are difficult to perceive.”\textsuperscript{756} The Manitobans passed a resolution that “the Board of Governors as well as the National Office, through its animators’ program as well as the diocesan sections, in particular, strive towards a much greater intensification of this effort to sensitize Canadians to become more aware of the tremendous injustices existing because of the widening gap between Canada and the Third World.”\textsuperscript{757} Similarly, the British Columbia provincial meeting resolved that “CCODP take a serious look at increasing the percentage of money being spent on research and education.”\textsuperscript{758} Despite the new intensity to the educational program, clearly more work was needed to be done.

**International Development Program**

During 1972-1977, CCODP’s international development program expanded in terms of dollar amounts allocated to projects, the number of projects supported, and the countries where Development and Peace funded projects. More importantly, however, Development and Peace became more reflective about the type of development projects that it chose to support. During

\textsuperscript{754} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{755} Ibid., 72
\textsuperscript{757} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{758} Ibid.
this five-year period, studies were undertaken that defined the priorities, criteria and policies of Development and Peace’s aid program with greater clarity.⁷⁵⁹ A key moment in this reflective process was the May 1975 International Seminar, hosted by Development and Peace at McGill University in Montreal during 17-18 May 1975.⁷⁶⁰ The stated purpose of this seminar was “revising and redefining, more clearly, the priorities and policies of Development and Peace’s aid program.”⁷⁶¹ This gathering brought together all members of CCODP (governors, members of the project selection and education committees, staff members and delegates from diocesan sections) as well as partners from the developing world.⁷⁶² The presence of these international participants was crucial. As highlighted by Executive Director Jacques Champagne in his opening address, “To achieve the objectives of this seminar, we must face the problems of development and underdevelopment as perceived and experienced by the people of the Third World themselves.”⁷⁶³ Representing the developing world were twelve participants, representing Africa (Zambia and Senegal), Asia (India, Vietnam, Philippines, Bangladesh and two from Sri Lanka) and Latin America (Brazil, Panama, Mexico and Chile).⁷⁶⁴ Each of these international representatives made brief presentations to the general assembly and participated in each seminar workshop to offer their concrete experiences.⁷⁶⁵

After the seminar, international participant Jeffrey S. Pereira of the Christian Organization for Relief and Rehabilitation (C.O.R.R.) in Bangladesh commented that Seminar’75 was “an unusually valuable exposure to the realities of the First World, and it allowed me to express my

⁷⁶⁰ Rousseau, 76.
⁷⁶² Ibid., 64-65.
⁷⁶³ Jacques Champagne, quoted in Mary Boyd, “CCODP’s Significant Moments,” in Journey of Solidarity, 38.
⁷⁶⁵ Ibid., 6.
views on conditions in the Third World before a responsible and most receptive audience.\textsuperscript{766}

The strong voice of the developing world at the seminar presented the Canadian participants with new ideas about development and challenged them to reassess their own personal attitudes. In the words of CCODP President Molly Boucher, in 1975 most members of Development and Peace still operated at “the first level” of commitment and understanding—“an awareness that two-thirds of the world’s people go to be hungry, and [CCODP members were] willing to share with them from our bounty. We were at the ‘band-aid’ stage, anxious to treat the symptoms, to bind up the wounds.”\textsuperscript{767} At the seminar, CCODP participants were bluntly told by representatives of the developing world that they must decide if they were really on the side of the poor and the oppressed. If so, they must move to the next level of commitment, which means not only supporting grass roots self-help projects in the developing world (“the second level”), but voluntarily moderating their lifestyles (“the third level”). To achieve this top level, Canadians must “begin to simplify their lifestyle, to reduce personal prodigality in relation to our world’s finite resources; or to commit themselves to political action aimed at moderating our national laws and practices that allow us to prosper at the expense of the developing countries.”\textsuperscript{768} For many members of CCODP, this was the first time they were truly challenged to make this level of commitment.

The keynote address at the seminar was delivered by François Houtart, a professor of sociology at the Catholic University of Louvain (Belgium) and executive member of the\textit{International Federation of Institutes for Social and Socio-Religious Research (FERES)}. A Catholic priest, Houtart served as a\textit{peritus} at Vatican II and played a key role in the formation

\textsuperscript{766} Ibid., 2.  
\textsuperscript{767} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 22-23 November 1975, “President’s Message – Annual Meeting 1975,” 20.  
\textsuperscript{768} Ibid., 21.
of *Gaudium et Spes*. His presentation on “Underdevelopment: An Induced Phenomenon” provided a historical overview of how underdevelopment in Asia, Latin America and Africa was not a natural occurrence, but a deliberate result of Western economic domination.\(^{769}\) According to Houtart, increased aid would never succeed in overcoming underdevelopment. The only remedy was political action to exert pressure on industrialized countries to exercise control of economic power and to promote responsible foreign policies.\(^{770}\) From this point forward, Development and Peace would adopt Houtart’s language in their educational and promotional materials. For example, in the document entitled “Policies of Education” that was adopted by the Board of Governors in 1977 for its 10 year anniversary, the problem of under-development was described as being “provoked” by “colonization enabling extension, on a world-wide scale, of a mercantile system resulting in the exploitation of Third World countries.”\(^{771}\) From 1975 onwards, the problem of under-development was understood by Development and Peace as being the result of the oppressive domination of an unjust international economic system.

The seminar was not a deliberative assembly and no decisions were put to a vote. Yet, a consensus emerged on two key points. First, organizations such as Development and Peace needed to devote more importance to education in Canada in order to expose alienating economic and political structures.\(^{772}\) As articulated by Jeffrey Pereira, but echoed by all international guests of the seminar, “The true friends of the underdeveloped world are those who work at heightening the awareness of their fellow-citizens and who work with fervour for the coming of a just economic order for all men.”\(^{773}\) To promote international development,

\(\footnotesize{769}\) ACCODP, Archives Promo, “1975 Seminar issue of *Developax*,“ 12.
\(\footnotesize{770}\) Ibid., 13.
\(\footnotesize{771}\) Ibid., 13.
\(\footnotesize{773}\) Ibid., 15.
wealthy countries needed to end their political, ideological and structural domination of the developing world. Second, people of the “recipient countries” needed to have an equal voice in the development of their country.\footnote{Ibid., 6.} Father Demetrio Imperial of the Philippines articulated: “We must go beyond a simple transfer of funds to achieve a true relationship of partners in a spirit of brotherhood.”\footnote{Ibid., 15.} Asking for more than money or technical assistance, he wished for a human presence and a moral relationship in development work. Attempting to fulfill this desire for solidarity, CCODP redefined its international development program.

**Socio-Economic Development Projects**

Socio-economic development projects represented long-term endeavours that were classified into eight categories: (1) training of local leaders and animators to coordinate and facilitate different projects; (2) growing agricultural economies through reclaiming land, promoting new methods of cultivation, introducing suitable agricultural equipment, utilizing fertilizer more efficiently, and building adequate irrigation systems; (3) expanding and diversifying rural and urban cooperative movements; (4) promoting literacy and education; (5) funding community development projects that involved and stimulated the local population to identify their needs and initiating action to fulfill them; (6) promoting skilled tradesmen through cottage industries; (7) introducing cattle-breeding and fishing into rural economies to increase income and create more balanced diets; and (8) promoting health and welfare by establishing mobile clinics and initiating programs of preventive medicine (such as vaccinations).\footnote{ACCODP, *The Global Village Voice*, vol. 1, no. 3, (February 1977), 5.}

These international development projects accounted for the vast majority of CCODP expenses (an average of 76.9 per cent during 1972-1977). This percentage spent on projects of economic and social aid (three-quarters of the annual budget) exceeded the original
approximations that were outlined in the founding documents of CCODP, which listed these types of expenses at 50 per cent. The main reason for this budgetary adjustment was that more than a third of the revenue received by Development and Peace came from government sources, which was required to be spent on international development projects.

Table 3.4: Amounts Allotted to the Socio-Economic Development Projects (1972-1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>Amount in 1972 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>% of Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>$4,199,602</td>
<td>$3,884,632</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>$4,445,734</td>
<td>$3,710,349</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>$5,250,896</td>
<td>$3,951,522</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>$7,666,977</td>
<td>$5,437,920</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>$6,079,543</td>
<td>$3,981,294</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$27,642,752</td>
<td>$20,965,717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding for these types of long-term development projects increased at a modest rate in terms of dollars raised. When these figures are adjusted for inflation, however, the amount of money allotted to development projects remained relatively stable in terms of 1972 dollars. The
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779 These figures include funds spent on: the general funds for projects; small projects; mini-projects as well as CCODP contributions for PLURA, the Asia Partnership for Human Development (AFHD), and the Inter-Church Fund for International Development (ICFID). What is not included are: the emergency relief fund and funds received during special fund-raising campaigns.

780 These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: [http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/](http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/)

781 Without the official audited financial statements, this figure is the one reported in the special 10-year edition of the Global Village Voice (see ACCODP, The Global Village Voice, vol. 1, no. 3 (February 1977), 10).


substantial drop from $7,666,977 (1975-1976) to $6,079,543 (1976-1977) was due to CIDA’s NGO Division setting a maximum “ceiling” for each NGO in a given year.\textsuperscript{786}

The $27,642,752 spent on development projects from 1972-1977 was spread over seventy countries. Nearly half of these projects were in Latin America.

### Table 3.5: Project Distribution by Continent (1974-1977)\textsuperscript{790}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa-Asia</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.6: Principal Beneficiary Countries (1967-1977)\textsuperscript{791}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1967-1972 (5 years)</th>
<th>1972-1977 (5 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil ($1,025,000)</td>
<td>Brazil ($1,577,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru ($983,700)</td>
<td>India ($1,256,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti ($601,700)</td>
<td>Peru ($1,088,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia ($593,800)</td>
<td>Chile ($995,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India ($476,400)</td>
<td>Cameroon ($676,500)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 1972-1977, the top five beneficiary countries (receiving a total of $5,593,900) represented 20.2 per cent of the total development budget. Of these five countries, Brazil, India, and Peru, were also principal beneficiary countries during the first five-year period (1967-1972).

Since its creation, Development and Peace received an increasing number of projects requesting financial support. Despite its increased revenue, Development and Peace was not able to support every project that it received. Some were turned down because they were outside the priorities and criteria of CCODP. Even among those projects that corresponded to CCODP’s concept of development and were eligible for funding, financial constraints and a

\textsuperscript{786} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 20-21 November 1976, 4.
\textsuperscript{791} ACCODP, “20 years cooperation in international development,” 12.
more intense application of criteria meant that an increasingly smaller percentage of projects were supported.

**Table 3.7: Number of Projects Submitted and Percentage Approved (1968-1977)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Projects Submitted</th>
<th># of Projects Approved</th>
<th>% Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 1972-1977, the percentage of projects approved dropped from 66.2 per cent down to 42.9 per cent.

Generally speaking, the selection process involved three steps. First, the project requests were received by CCODP’s Projects Department and referred to a local “third-party” group for an on-the-spot evaluation. It should be also noted that officers from this department also made personal visits to their assigned regions on an annual basis. At this stage, certain projects would be rejected if they were too far outside of CCODP’s funding criteria. Second, CCODP’s Project Review Committee would review the project to see if it was in accordance with the orientations and priorities of CCODP. This committee met three times a year and was divided into two sub-groups: one for Latin America and one for Africa/Asia. Each sub-committee was composed of three governors named by the national board, one person appointed by the CCCB and seven other members possessing “knowledge of the problems and socio-economic programmes of specific regions of the Third World” (through work experience in co-
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operatives, health, adult education, unions, rural development, etc.) There was also a “special study” sub-committee composed of the executive director, two governors, and two members nominated each year by the Latin America and Africa-Asia sub-committees who studied projects worth less than $5,000 and involving some degree of urgency. Third, the Project Review Committee would make funding recommendations to the Executive Committee of CCODP, who would vote on final decisions for funding.

From 1972-1977 Development and Peace formally articulated the orientations and priorities it would use to determine the types of projects it would fund (which were based on the criteria which were informally established when CCODP was first founded). In principle, projects supported by CCODP needed to have the following characteristics:

1. Projects which support those who are trying to eliminate the causes of under-development rather than the symptoms;
2. Projects in which the beneficiaries themselves contribute according to their capabilities either by working or contributing financially;
3. Projects which involve or encourage the active participation of the local populations;
4. Projects which presumably become self-supporting after a reasonable amount of assistance;
5. Projects which could serve as examples for other local communities;
6. Projects which concentrate on the development of the area or country concerned.

These priorities would continue to serve as the reference for the selection of CCODP projects from 1977-1982. A minor change to these priorities occurred in 1977 when the Executive Committee, in dialogue with the Projects Department, added to point 6 that selection of projects
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was to be done “in constant dialogue with the local hierarchy of the Church.”\textsuperscript{802} Also, in 1976, the Projects Department added that it also prioritized projects that were concerned with the defence of basic human rights (often against authoritarian “military” governments) and the promotion of native peoples (enabling those who have been historically excluded from participating in the economic cultural life of a given country).\textsuperscript{803}

While the official criteria and policies remained largely the same since 1968, from 1972-1977 these priorities were interpreted in a new light. The fundamental question being asked by Development and Peace during this five-year period was “Do our projects promote development?”\textsuperscript{804} To answer this question, it was decided that projects had to give top priority to empowering local communities and grassroots groups (points #2 and #3 above). According to Executive Director Jacques Champagne, “one of the most important criteria for D&P, when approving projects, [is] the support of groups that are working in the struggle against the causes of under development.”\textsuperscript{805} To empower local communities to be involved in their own development, CCODP insisted on the participation of the local community in all phases of the project: its preparation, its realization, its administration and its evaluation. To this end, every project needed to have an educational component (otherwise projects would be rejected).\textsuperscript{806} In other words, development for a country had to come from the local people themselves, not from international development agencies alone. While each project did not meet all of these criteria, this was the ideal. With this new ethos, CCODP re-evaluated its existing development program and criteria for project funding became much stricter.

\textsuperscript{802} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting,” 11-12 March 1977, 12, 13.
\textsuperscript{804} Rousseau, 75.
\textsuperscript{806} Rousseau, 76.
An illustrative example of this new understanding of development was CCODP’s relationship with Haiti. At the May 1973 meeting of the Executive Committee, the Project Selection Committee requested a revision of the CCODP aid program in this tiny island country. Several “red flags” prompted the investigation: 90 per cent of project proposals for Haiti came from Canadian religious missionaries (not the Haitians themselves); a disproportionate amount of funds for Latin America were spent in Haiti (as of 1 June 1972, projects in Haiti accounted for $381,501, or 41.9 per cent, of the $908,709 spent in Latin America); 80 per cent of the projects submitted did not meet the criteria established by CCODP for funding; and since there appeared to be very little coordination between the Haitian church and the Canadian religious missionaries, Development and Peace did not have sufficient evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of these proposed projects on Haiti’s development.\(^{807}\) To gain a better understanding of the situation, a study was commissioned of all CCODP projects in Haiti.\(^{808}\) Submitted in May 1974, the final report recommended that funds to Haiti should not exceed 15 per cent of the Latin American budget, and these projects should prioritize forming indigenous Haitian leaders.\(^{809}\) The Executive Committee not only adopted this recommendation, but it also hired a part-time person to coordinate CCODP efforts in Haiti and the Caribbean. This person also maintained close contact with CADEC, Christian Action for Development in the Caribbean, an agency of the Caribbean Conference of Churches.\(^{810}\) The net result of the report was a drastic reduction of CCODP support to the development programs in Haiti.\(^{811}\)


Another example of how Development and Peace paid careful attention to local participation was a project in Upper Volta (now Burkina Faso). In June 1976 the Executive Committee considered a project request from a Quebec-based group called “Operation Upper Volta” (# HVO/76B/84P) that was seeking funds to complete a $2,500,000 rural development project that had already been initiated in Upper Volta. This project request was denied funding primarily because “it is run by non-Africans.”\(^{812}\) Development and Peace made clear that to receive funding, projects must be operated by indigenous people from the developing world. Unless these people actively participated in their own development, the pattern of neocolonialism would continue, which was considered one of the principal causes of underdevelopment in Africa.\(^{813}\) Another example, a project for a Rice Cooperative in Belize (# BEL/76A/01P) was not granted funding because “the project benefitted only one individual instead of a whole community.”\(^{814}\)

These stricter priorities could also be a source of tension, especially with members of the Canadian episcopate who submitted projects that were denied. For example, in 1975 the Project Review Committee rejected a project submitted by Archbhishop Plourde of Ottawa to build a community centre for a parish in Brazil (BRE/75C/283P) since it was strictly a construction project and, thus, fell under the category of “parish work” and not socio-economic development.\(^{815}\) This decision was supported by the Executive Committee, but to ensure that good relations were maintained, the project was referred to the National Conference of Brazilian Bishops as a possible source of funding and a detailed letter was written (signed by the Chair of...
the Executive Committee) explaining to Plourde why the project was denied funding. Similarly, that same year two projects in Nigeria, building a school for the deaf (NIG/75C/119P) and housing for the school staff (NIG/75C/120P) were recommended by Msgr. O’Mara, Rector of St. Augustine’s Seminary in Toronto. They were both rejected by the Project Review Committee (with the support of the Executive Committee) as “this type of work is not considered as one of our [CCODP] priorities and also because they come from Nigeria whose government takes responsibility for much of this work.” Once again, a letter was sent on behalf of the Executive Committee to O’Mara explaining the reasons why funds were denied.

As its development program expanded, the projects department became more conscious about certain projects that might be considered too controversial or cause political problems for CCODP. The Director of the Projects Department, Nelson Soucy, explained to the Board of Governors that two types of projects were considered especially problematic: projects concerning “population control” and projects presented by “liberation groups.” With regard to the first, as was unanimously agreed by the Board of Directors at their November 1974 meeting while discussing the Inter-Church Fund for International Development, Development and Peace would not finance any projects that involved family planning (through artificial contraception) and/or abortion, as this would violate the teachings of the Catholic Church. As for the second type, the practice of the Selection Committee was to defer these cases to the Executive Committee. For example, at the February 1974 meeting of the Executive Committee, it reviewed two project requests from Zambia (ZAM-46P and 47M) that concerned groups of refugees who had come to Zambia from countries fighting for liberation. The Selection
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Committee had tentatively approved the projects, but referred them to the Executive Committee for review. After much discussion, the Executive Committee approved the two projects on the condition that funds were used for humanitarian purposes and that the funds be channelled through a source other than liberation movements.

An important question to ask about the development program during this period was who was responsible for submitting the projects. In 1976-1977, Development and Peace received more than 800 project requests and accepted approximately 350. Of these accepted projects, approximately 70 per cent had been presented by official organizations of the Catholic Church (such as bishops’ conferences, dioceses, parishes, missions, national or international Catholic organizations) and approximately 30 per cent were submitted by secular groups (although the persons responsible were often Christians). This distribution corresponded to CCODP policy that was open to funding projects from all groups, regardless of race, creed or ideology. Yet, due to its very nature as an official organization of the Canadian Catholic Church for international development, CCODP considered the local Churches and Christian groups as “privileged partners” that shared the same concern for faith-based social justice.

Emergency Relief and Special Appeals

An emergency fund of 10 per cent of the funds received during the Share Lent campaign was used to provide “emergency relief” to victims of natural disasters, such as droughts, earthquakes, floods, wars, etc (with the possibility of increasing this amount to 20 per cent). For particularly serious crises, Development and Peace, with the permission of the CCCB,
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would carry out special fundraising campaigns among the Canadian public. The funds raised as a result of these special appeals were accounted for outside the regular development program of the organization, and were used exclusively for the populations for whom they had been collected.

Table 3.8: Emergency Relief Projects and Special Appeals (1972-1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount in 1972 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>% of Total Expenses</th>
<th>% of CCODP Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>$303,616</td>
<td>$280,845</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>$705,700</td>
<td>$588,968</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>$1,016,334</td>
<td>$764,834</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>$599,677</td>
<td>$425,330</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
<td>$136,212</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$2,833,327</td>
<td>$2,196,189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, from 1972-1977, funds for emergency relief and special appeals accounted for 8.8 per cent of the total Development and Peace expenses. This figure is well below the 20 per cent for urgent cases that was in the 1966 proposal. But, if the percentage was calculated in terms of campaign revenue and special appeals, it would be 13.6 per cent, a figure closer to the original proposal.

During this period, Development and Peace launched three special appeals. From 1971-1973, funds were raised from across Canada for the refugees in Bangladesh. These special
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funds assisted the millions of East Pakistan/Bangladesh refugees who had escaped genocide during the "Bangladesh Liberation War" (from March-December 1971). From 1971-1973, CCODP special appeals would raise $399,146 for Bangladesh (in addition to $1,025,190 in regular emergency aid).\(^{832}\) In total, Development and Peace sent $1,424,336 in emergency aid for the crisis in Bangladesh: $1,221,720 in 1971-1972\(^ {833}\) and $202,616 in 1972-1973.\(^ {834}\)

An even larger appeal was launched in 1973-1975 to help victims of a massive six-year drought in the Sahel area of Northwest Africa (Niger, Upper Volta/Burkina Faso, Mali, Chad, Senegal, and Mauritania) affecting twenty-four million people (more than Canada’s entire population at that time).\(^ {835}\) In late September 1973, a combined appeal to Canadian Christians called “SOS SAHEL” was organized by several churches (including the Canadian Catholic Conference and CCODP). As of spring 1974, Development and Peace had allocated $400,000 to the drought-stricken area ($90,000 for emergency aid and $310,000 for specific development projects requested by Africans).\(^ {836}\) In addition, CCODP provided $80,100 to Ethiopia, also affected by the widening drought and famine conditions.\(^ {837}\) From 1973-1975, this fund raised $1,111,034 for the Sahel region ($539,100 was allocated in 1973-1974\(^ {838}\) and $571,934 was sent in 1974-1975\(^ {839}\)). This high-profile Sahel campaign explains why these years had the most funds spent on emergency relief. In light of the Sahel crisis, on 15 February 1974, members of the joint CCC-CCODP Emergency Relief Commission met to review their operations (which

\(^{832}\) ACCODP, “20 years cooperation in international development,” 18.


\(^{835}\) ACCODP, News Views, 5 (Fall 1973), 1.

\(^{836}\) ACCODP, News Views, 7 (Summer 1974), 4.

\(^{837}\) Ibid.


began in September 1972). Due to donor fatigue after two major appeals, the commission decided that from this point forward, there would no longer be any national collections for emergencies, as happened in the case of Sahel.\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee,” 15 February 1974, 4.} Each local Church, however, was free to hold its own individual collection.

A special appeal in 1976 raised $446,078 for Guatemala\footnote{ACCODP, “20 years cooperation in international development,” 9.} after a 7.5 magnitude earthquake hit that country on 4 February 1976, resulting in over 23,000 people killed and 1,066,063 people left homeless.\footnote{ACCODP, The Global Village Voice, vol. 1, no. 3 (February 1977), 8.} In 1975-1976, $258,296 was earmarked for immediate rebuilding projects in Guatemala for this disaster; meaning that the remainder of $187,782 was reserved for long-term development projects in Guatemala.\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee,” 19-20 November 1976, “August 31, 1976 Financial Statements,” 94.} In 1977, Development and Peace allocated $165,100 for development projects in Guatemala.\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 26-27 November 1977, “Annual Financial Statement August 31, 1977,” 88.} During 1976-1977, there was no special appeal, which explains why this year had the smallest contribution to emergency relief.

In the fall of 1976, Development and Peace became involved in providing a very different type of “emergency relief.” In 1969, the Dene Assembly (an aboriginal group of First Nations who live in the northern boreal and Arctic regions of Canada) formed the “Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories” to seek legal recognition of Dene rights and land claims from the Federal Government of Canada. Since this organization had little to no funds of its own, and was awaiting a subsidy from the federal government, they reached out to Canadian religious communities to help them present their land claims. The Social Affairs Commission, from the Canadian bishops, asked that CCODP grant $50,000 on behalf of the CCC and guarantee an
equal amount of $50,000. Development and Peace was asked to pay this additional $50,000 from the emergency relief fund. President of the Board Molly Boucher questioned whether this project met the criteria of the emergency fund, but she was challenged by the Social Affairs Commission that believed that this project did qualify as an emergency since this situation was considered “a manmade disaster” (a position that was supported by Bishop Remi De Roo of Victoria). The Executive Committee unanimously voted to grant these funds (in the form of emergency aid). By March 1977, the situation had changed. The federal government subsidy had been received by the IBNWT and there was no longer an immediate need for additional funds from CCODP. The Brotherhood asked if these funds could be held in trust for future use. The Executive Committee voted that the unused $50,000 be put back into circulation (for other groups) and that, if future needs arise, formal requests be re-submitted. While these funds were not used by the Dene, it set important precedents for CCODP emergency funds the criteria for these funds was expanded; CCODP funds could be used within Canada; and the pull of Canadian bishops on CCODP in regard to project adjudication.

Asia Partnership for Human Development (APHD)

From 1972-1977 CCODP’s international development program was consciously exploring new ways to implement the new orientation for development work that was proposed by Development and Peace at the 1972 CIDSE seminar in Blankenberge. At this influential conference, the CCODP delegation called for an end to paternalism in international development (lamenting the fact that funding decisions were made without any real participation from those in the developing world). As a result of this conference, CCODP’s Projects

845 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee,” 19-20 November 1976, Letter from Molly Boucher to Jacques Champagne, 26 October 1976, 84.
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848 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting,” 11-12 March 1977, 2-3.
Department refocused its policies on ensuring that representatives of poor countries had equal responsibility in the decision making process. Simply put, new efforts were directed towards regionalization (less emphasis on bilateral donations to individual countries). These priority changes were reflected in several new initiatives from Development and Peace, all of which were supported by the Board of Governors. These initiatives were designed to make the CCODP’s international development program less focused on isolated project requests and more attentive to the needs of entire regions.

The pilot project for the post-Blankenberge approach of shared responsibility in development was a regional fund for Asia, which became known as the Asia Partnership for Human Development (APHD). Attempting to change the traditional idea of aid based on a “donor-recipient” relationship, Australian Catholic Relief (ACR) and Development and Peace pooled their Asian resources and invited the episcopal conferences of several Asian countries (Indonesia, Philippines, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka) to join them as partners in administering a multilateral fund for specific self-help projects within Asia. CCODP and ACR authorized APHD to make its own decisions on which projects should receive funding (a member of the projects department served as the CCODP representative on this selection committee). At the initial meeting of APHD in Sydney on 11-13 September 1973, CCODP contributed $50,000 for the first year and Australian Catholic Relief pledged another $70,000. The project selection committee allocated $165,219 to socio-economic projects in eleven countries throughout the continent. This pioneering effort of “partnership” allowed both parties (representatives from
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the industrialized and developing world) to decide how resources were best spent in the region. Furthermore, cooperative links were established between local grassroots groups and international development organizations working towards social justice.

In September 1974 Catholic international development agencies from Ireland, France and New Zealand joined APHD. By the September 1975 meeting of AFHD in Bangladesh, representatives of the five participating Asian countries led the meeting. CCODP delegates reported that the “highly active involvement of the Asian representatives of the Selection Committee was very noticeable” and that this situation “was welcomed.” In 1975-1976, APHD funded ninety-eight projects totalling $753,048. These projects were chosen by representatives from the five donor countries and thirteen Asian countries. While the APHD was an important new method of development, it only accounted for 4.4 per cent of CCODP’s budget from 1972-1977. Funding for APHD rose substantially in 1976-1977, when CCODP obtained matching funds from CIDA.

Aside from the projects funded, another significant aspect of APHD was its “exposure program.” When the eighteen members of the Asia Fund gathered for their meetings every six months in one of the member countries, they would also tour the projects sites, and analyze the project with those who are involved with the work being done. These exposure programs were crucial in helping to understand injustice in a new light. For example, during the September 1975 meeting in Bangladesh, CCODP delegates commented that the situation in this
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region of Asia was a shock to all representatives, even those from Asia. The poverty in Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan was referred to as “The Fourth World” and deserving of special attention.\textsuperscript{860} The importance of such experiences was best articulated by Molly Boucher after her experience in the Philippines and Thailand for an evaluation seminar on the Asia Fund (May 1976). “No amount of study, reading, listening, can substitute for actual face to face encounter with people struggling to improve their own situation against tremendous odds.”\textsuperscript{861} Upon her return, Boucher recommended to the Board of Directors that every effort be made to provide exposure programs in various areas for members of the board and diocesan sections.

Table 3.9: CCODP Contributions to APHD (1973-1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>Amount in 1973 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)\textsuperscript{862}</th>
<th>% of Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>$113,459\textsuperscript{863}</td>
<td>$102,369</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>$330,000\textsuperscript{864}</td>
<td>$268,475</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>$158,390\textsuperscript{865}</td>
<td>$121,449</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>$741,611\textsuperscript{866}</td>
<td>$525,034</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,343,460</td>
<td>$925,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another initiative conceived in “the spirit of Blankenberge” refined how funds were used in India, which was receiving an increasingly large amount of CCODP funding (during 1971-1972, India received $98,000 for twenty five projects).\textsuperscript{870} The existing administrative process for projects in this part of the world was cumbersome, as funding requests for projects in India

\textsuperscript{862} These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/
\textsuperscript{864} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 21 November 1975, “Auditor’s Report,” 56.
\textsuperscript{866} $441,611 came from CCODP and $300,000 came from CIDA. ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 26-27 November 1977, “Annual Financial Statements: August 31, 1977,” 89.
\textsuperscript{870} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 10-11 February 1973, “Indian Programme,” 36.
were sent to CCODP, who forwarded the requests to Caritas India (CI) for further study, who then provided Development and Peace with detailed studies on the project, and finally the funding allocations were made by CCODP in Canada. In order to expedite this process, and move the decision-making process for how aid for social development was spent closer to India, requests for projects would henceforth be submitted directly to CI. No longer only a technical study agent, CI would now be empowered to evaluate the merits of each project and (aware of CCODP guidelines) make requests totalling $70,000 worth of projects to CCODP. In effect, this new procedure would not only cut down dramatically on time-consuming administration, but it also empowered Caritas India to decide which projects were worthy of Canadian funding in their country. By 1975, the CCODP annual grant to the CI program rose to $100,000 per year.

Regional Consultative Team: Latin America

A similar initiative to the Asia Fund for Human Development was proposed for Latin America. In 1972 CCODP called for a twenty-two member organization representing the entire continent, with two members coming from Development and Peace and the other twenty representing various Latin American countries (who had expertise in development and had “an active role in the life of the [Catholic] Church”). This new “Latin American-Canadian Foundation” would receive project requests, distribute funds in a fair way among the geographic and political regions (avoiding national pressures) and evaluate the results. CCODP would contribute $1,000,000 a year during a period of five years (plus an additional $1,000,000
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Such a foundation would ensure that representatives from the Latin American churches were equal partners in the allocation of CCODP funds. This project, however, proved too ambitious and never was realized.

In 1974, Development and Peace (representing the Canadian church), and its sister organizations Trocaire (Ireland), Comite Catholique contre le Faim et pour le Développement (France), Cooperacion al Desarrollo (Spain) formed the “Group of Four” to pool their resources and work on large-scale projects. These four Catholic development organizations were considered the more progressive voices within CIDSE. They felt that CIDSE was too paternalistic in its approach toward development, due to the strong influence of the two largest Catholic international development agencies, Catholic Relief Services (United States of America) and Misereor (Germany). The following year, in 1975, the Group of Four expanded as Entraide et Fraternité (Belgium) and Vastenaktie (Holland) joined and the organization was renamed “the Group of Six,” also known as the “Concertation Group.”

Inspired by the CIDSE seminar in Blankenberge, the Concertation Group proposed creating a “Regional Consultative Team” in Latin America that would have a twelve-member team composed of representatives of the supporting organizations and representatives from grassroots groups in one of five large regions of Latin America. This emphasis on regionalization was to “surpass the artificial, socialized limits of the national state” that often hindered development work. This project was formally approved by the Board of Governors in November 1974.
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The key difference between APHD and the Regional Consultative Team [for Latin America] was the former networked exclusively with Catholic organizations approved by their local episcopal conferences, whereas the latter worked with Catholic and secular groups. This difference proved crucial. The first region chosen was Central America (from Mexico to Panama). A seminar to study the feasibility of the project was held in Guatemala in September 1975. Representatives came from Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama, as well as from the Group of Six.\(^{880}\) Several months after this meeting, in April 1976, an angry letter was sent from Bishop Roman Arrieta Villalobos, President of the Episcopal Conference of Costa Rica and a member of Episcopal Secretariat of Central America and Panama (SEDAC), to the Canadian bishops (as well as the five other episcopal conferences). Arrieta was outraged that some South American groups that were invited to the seminar were “political extremists” who were “openly opposed to the church hierarchies of their home countries.”\(^{881}\) His concern was that if CCODP and the other Groups of Six nations supported these radical groups, they would be using Catholic aid to fund groups that operated contrary to the general pastoral objectives of the various national episcopal conferences.\(^{882}\) At the heart of the issue was that fact that the local bishops of Latin America were not aware of these Regional Consultative meetings and they were not invited to directly participate.\(^{883}\)

To diffuse the tension, on 25 September 1976 a meeting was held in San José, Costa Rica with Bishop Arrieta, Archbishop Marcos McGrath of Panama, Basile Maes (Director of \textit{Entraide et Fraternité} in Belgium), Eduardo Lizano Faith, (an economist from Costa Rica and


\(^{882}\) Ibid., 42.

member of Cor Unum) and Jacques Champagne (representing Development and Peace). At this meeting, Bishop Arrieta reiterated his concerns over the non-Catholic groups participating in the regional committee.\textsuperscript{884} Bishop McGrath (who served as an “honest broker” at the meeting) cautioned the Group of Six about the “narrow limitations” of the groups they were consulting and their lack of ongoing consultations with the local bishops and official Catholic agencies.\textsuperscript{885} At the conclusion of this meeting, it was agreed that members of the International Working Group (the Group of Six) could proceed to work with groups officially recognized by the Church as well as those groups that have no link with the Church, but there was to be greater collaboration with the local bishops.\textsuperscript{886} Due to tensions existing between many of the participatory grassroots groups, as well as with the non-Christian groups and local episcopates, it was decided to cancel the Regional Consultative Team and to work on a national level instead.\textsuperscript{887} Thus, the idea of a regional committee for Latin America (similar to the APHD) never came to fruition.

The Inter-Church Fund for International Development (ICFID)

While each of the five mainstream Christian churches (Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Anglican, and United Church of Canada) already had their own international development funds, there was a desire to combine efforts into one joint ecumenical fund to explore new avenues of cooperation between churches and to collaborate on large development projects overseas. The idea for such a fund originated with Roméo Maione, and was realized by Rev. Robert MacRae of the Anglican Primate’s Fund and Tom Johnston of CCODP.\textsuperscript{888} The

\textsuperscript{884} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 20-21 November 1976, 8.
\textsuperscript{886} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 20-21 November 1976, 8.
\textsuperscript{887} Ibid., 7.
primary goal of this Inter-Church Fund for International Development (ICFID) was: “to increase the capacity of the participating Canadian churches to respond quickly and effectively to expressed development needs: a) by working toward mutual responsibility among all participating development groups, and b) by working toward the goal of shared decision-making and accountability.” These ideas of “mutual responsibility” and “shared decision-making” strongly echoed the idea of partnership that was expressed at the Blankenberge Seminar in 1972.

Before the ICFID would receive funding from Development and Peace, its proposal had to be approved by a CCODP provisional committee. While studying the initial proposal, the committee flagged an important area of concern that was brought to the attention of the full Board of Governors. Within the list of projects and programs entitled to receive grants from this proposed fund were projects listed as “health and welfare.” The committee feared that this broad category could potentially possess dimensions related to family planning and abortion. The governors unanimously voted that “D&P not accept the financing of projects which involve family planning programmes contrary to the teachings of the [Roman Catholic] Church.” This decision set a precedent that CCODP would not fund any projects concerning “population control.” With this condition, the ICFID was granted $100,000 from CCODP for one year to fund ecumenical projects on an experimental basis.

The structure of the fund had one board member from each of the four Protestant member agencies (as well as one from the Canadian Council of Churches)—five in total—and four from Development and Peace, which provided half of the church funds ($100,000). Launched on 8
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October 1974, the ICFID funded five projects worth a total of $157,000 over its first fiscal year. Most of these projects originated from ecumenical groups in the developing world. Satisfied that administrative costs were kept low ($6,050) and that CIDA funding would begin the following year (which funded the ICFID above the standard dollar-for-dollar match that the individual denominations received), the Board of Governors supported the recommendation of the provisional committee that CCODP keep funding the ICFID on a permanent basis.

Table 3.10: Annual Financial Contributions to ICFID (1974-1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCODP (50%)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican (16%)</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran (4.5%)</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian (5.5%)</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Church (24%)</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$249,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$276,600</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$476,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$549,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 26 November 1976, the ICFID Board created a Task Force with representatives from each of the participating bodies to evaluate the experience of ICFID over the past three years. According to the evaluation, the main strengths of the ICFID were increasing “understanding between people, churches, organizations, coalitions and international bodies;” “growing confidence within secular agencies (i.e., the Canadian Government) in the leadership of the
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churches in pressing for change”; and this historical relationship “has demonstrated a measure of Christian unity at home and abroad.”\(^\text{905}\) Despite these significant accomplishments, the evaluation also noted critical weakness with the fund, such as “slowness in finding our identity,” “delays into moving into new ecumenical partnerships or exploring new models”; and “too many projects were denominationally oriented and/or were inadequate in long-range effectiveness.”\(^\text{906}\) Overall, the Task Force was positive in its assessment and proposed that the ICFID move toward a more permanent model (which included hiring a full-time Executive-Secretary in Ottawa).\(^\text{907}\) With the full recommendation of the CCODP representatives to ICFID, the Board of Governors approved this new formula and agreed to increase their annual contributions to $200,000.\(^\text{908}\)

**PLURA**

Another ecumenical coalition that Development and Peace financially supported was PLURA. Unlike ICFID that funded development projects overseas, PLURA focused on development within Canada. After the initial Share Lent campaign in 1968, questions were raised about why the Church was “helping others but not our own.”\(^\text{913}\) At the time, Executive Director Roméo Maione believed that it was the job of the Canadian government, which had ample resources, to provide for Canadians caught in poverty.\(^\text{914}\) Yet, Maione also believed that “If we preoccupied ourselves with the needs of the poor on the international level and didn’t do something here [in Canada], we would be perceived as hypocrites.”\(^\text{915}\) The idea for a faith-
based poverty fund in Canada originated with the Federal Government, through the Department of National Health and Welfare, and was brought to the attention of the mainline Christian churches in October 1971 through the Inter-Church Consultative Committee on Development & Relief (ICCCDR). 916 In early March 1972, a special subcommittee, including Maione, studied this idea and drafted a proposal for joint church action on domestic poverty. During its November 1972 meeting, the Canadian Catholic Conference (CCC) Administrative Board endorsed in principle this proposal to assist low-income, self-help groups in Canada, but asked that CCODP (given its mandate to educate Canadians on justice issues) provide the funds on behalf of the Canadian Church. 917 The bishops thought that this new proposal would complement at the domestic level what was already happening with the work of CCODP overseas.

At their February 1973 meeting, the Board of Governors discussed CCODP support of a “National Poverty Fund.” Maione recommended to the Board of Governors that CCODP support the fund because, aside for the merits of such a fund, if CCODP does not support this new fund, a parallel “national fund” would most likely be created within the Catholic Church that would compete with the Share Lent program that would result in diminished revenue for both. 918 As an example, Maione cites the fact that Catholic Relief Services in the United States was losing funds due to the creation of “The Human Resources Fund,” which is also supported by the United States Catholic Church. Furthermore, as Maione pointed out, the other churches

918 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 10-11 February 1973, “Funds to Organize the Poor in Canada: Director’s Comments,” 76.
in Canada had already agreed to have one central fund.\footnote{Ibid., 77.} After a lengthy discussion, the governors agreed that CCODP will contribute $100,000 (over half of PLURA’s budget) to launch the “National Poverty Fund.”\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 10-11 February 1973, 7.} Contributions from CCODP for this new fund were not to exceed 10 per cent of Share Lent revenue. To preserve the international character of CCODP, the CCC would be the official Catholic representative for this new fund (although a CCODP member would also sit on the board) and would receive all the publicity.\footnote{Ibid.}

This new organization was officially launched on 25 November 1974 as PLURA (named after its Presbyterian, Lutheran, United, Roman Catholic and Anglican sponsors). Adopting the decentralized model of Development and Peace, this new association was a partnership of church and low-income groups working together in provincial committees on a volunteer basis to empower low-income self-help groups to struggle against poverty.\footnote{Boyd, “PLURA,” 138, 140.} Essentially, PLURA operated like Development and Peace, except that it channelled small sums of “seed funds” to low income groups within Canada, not overseas. These funds were not intended as charity handouts, rather they would empower the poor of Canada to struggle for social justice.

In June 1976, representatives of the five churches that constituted PLURA reviewed the status of the organization to determine if it was worth continuing to fund.\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 18-19 June 1976, 5.} The representatives considered how well PLURA was fulfilling its five stated objectives:

A. Promote research and education into the underlying causes of poverty.
B. Inform the public of the issues and problems arising from poverty.
C. To promote and encourage participation of local churches and associations with low income, self-help groups.
D. Make financial and other resources available to associations, organizations, societies, or other groups of low-income – disadvantaged citizens of Canada for socio-economic programs to be carried out locally, regionally or nationally.
E. To receive, seek, and disburse money and other resources on accordance with the purpose of the Association.  

The committee concluded that despite failing to fulfill four of the five stated objectives of PLURA (the only objective being met was letter D), the committee ultimately concluded that “the pain and struggle of working on PLURA is worthwhile since it is an evidence of the churches’ solidarity with the poor...this is more important than the money itself.” With this (ultimately) positive evaluation, CCODP continued its support of PLURA.

Conclusion

When the Board of Governors of the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace gathered for their biannual meeting in February 1973, there was a sense of uncertainly in the organization. Their influential Executive Director Roméo Maione had announced his resignation and the governors had dedicated their meeting to critically examining how well CCODP had lived up to the mandate given it by the Canadian bishops: “to educate public opinion in Canada; to raise funds for projects of a socio-economic nature; and to renew the spirit of Lent.” While the governors affirmed the work of the organization over its first five years, they also saw tremendous room for improvement. Having dedicated its first five years (1967-1972) to implementing and establishing itself as an international aid organization, the Board of Governors devoted the next five years to building on this solid foundation. The years of 1972-1977 were devoted to intensifying and expanding the work of the Development and Peace.

In electing Jacques Champagne as its new Executive Director, the Board of Governors signalled that it was ready to re-commit itself to its first objective—“to inform, animate, and mobilize public opinion here in Canada on the problems of global poverty.”

From 1972-1977, the Canadian educational program would expand in exciting new directions. The most intense period of education remained during the annual Share Lent campaign. While these annual campaigns remained the major source of revenue for CCODP, they were given a more intense educational component (for example, the ecumenical Ten Days for World Development). After experimenting with separate campaigns in English and French Canada, the two sectors re-united for Share Lent’76 and ’77. Moving beyond simply informing the general population of the grave situation in the Third World, these united campaigns took the next step of calling for a transformation of social structures that cause poverty and human suffering. In particular, in 1976 CCODP publicly challenged Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau to devote 0.7% of Canadian GNP to development assistance. Outside of Lent, the CCODP budget for education steadily increased on an annual basis and the number of animateurs more than doubled throughout Canada. The French and English Sectors also combined in 1976 on a joint nationwide educational campaign entitled “A New World Order.” This campaign would provide the foundation for a year-round educational endeavour.

The pinnacle of CCODP’s Canadian educational program came in 1977 during its tenth anniversary celebrations. To properly mark the occasion, a series of educational activities were planned for dioceses across Canada. The common theme of these programs was “MAGOSHAN,” from the Algonquin word signifying meeting, sharing friendship, celebration,
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or dance. The focal point, and most successful event, was an interactive “Encounter with the Third World,” which took place for three days (13-15 February 1977) at the Place du Complexe Desjardins in downtown Montreal. Over a dozen different ethnic groups (complete with their own dancers, musicians, poets and singers) were grouped together like villages (an additional interactive kiosque featured the work of Development and Peace). Approximately 60,000 persons circulated through the complex on a daily basis. Complementing this exhibition, Archbishop Dom Hélder Câmara of Olinda and Recife in Brazil, participated in conferences at the Universities of Montreal, Loyola and McGill. Joining the well-known “apostle of non-violence” were Philippe Farine (journalist and President of the Comité Catholique contre le faim et pour le développement de France), Marcel Pepin (President of the World Federation of Workers in Brussels), Robert Garry (professor in the department of geography at the University of Montreal and specialist in Asia), and Paul Gérin-Lajoie (President of CIDA). The MAGOSHAN culminated in a closing Mass for 2,000 people at the Complexe Desjardins, celebrated by Archbishop Câmara, which was televised by Radio-Canada and Channel 10 and viewed by approximately one million persons.

The events in English Canada were on a much smaller-scale, but still significant. In Toronto, 2,000 people participated in a public celebration entitled “Hope in Solidarity” that was held at the Royal York Hotel that was facilitated by Archbishop Câmara, Archbishop Pocock of Toronto and Roméo Maione (former Executive Director of CCODP). In Edmonton,
Archbishop Joseph MacNeil presided over a celebration for 250 people at St. Joseph’s Cathedral, where the keynote address was given by Father Bill Ryan, S.J., the former director of the Social Action Department of the Canadian Catholic Conference who was, at the time, working with the Center for Concern in Washington, DC. In Regina, a “CCODP Day” was held, where Father Terry Gallagher (of the Scarboro Missions) led workshops for 150 people.

Collectively, the goal of these MAGOSHAN activities was to inform Canadians that “As Christians, we stand in a biblical tradition where to know God is to seek justice for the disinherited, the poor and the oppressed. The Gospel calls us to a new way of life, to a transformation of personal attitudes and social structures that cause human suffering.”

Much like the education program, from 1972-1977 the international development program also experienced a period of expansion and intensification. During this five-year period, the amount of funds for socio-economic development projects increased at a steady rate. As impressive as these dollar amounts were, even more important was the intense self-study that more clearly defined the priorities, criteria and policies of Development and Peace’s aid program. The fundamental question being asked during this five-year period was “Do our projects promote development?” To answer this question, CCODP insisted that projects needed to involve members of the local community in all phases of the project: its preparation, its realization, its administration and its evaluation. Also significant, CCODP took active steps to eliminate paternalism in its projects by working in partnership with people in the developing world (through programs like APHD). The scope of CCODP’s development program was further expanded by working in ecumenical coalitions (such as the Inter-Church Fund for

International Development) and fighting poverty in Canada (exemplified by its support of PLURA).

As successful as Development and Peace had been from 1972-1977, it was no time to rest on its laurels. In giving his annual report of activities to Board of Governors in November 1977, Executive Director Jacques Champagne believed it was time for Development and Peace to have another review of its mandate (reminiscent of the self-analysis previously undertaken in 1973). Champagne envisioned this “evaluation seminar” as a “debate between all the elements of D&P, which would strengthen the organization for relaunching it toward a new stage.”

This meeting would be an “Estates-General” of the organization that would seek a collective understanding and a more coherent articulation of the objectives, the policies, the overall structure, and the “message” of Development and Peace. The Board of Governors unanimously adopted the proposal for a national seminar to be held in late 1978 or early 1979. This seminar, and its eventual outcome of a new constitution, would push Development and Peace into a new chapter of its existence.

939 Ibid.,11.
CHAPTER 4:
A MORE PROFOUND UNDERSTANDING OF DEVELOPMENT, 1977-1982

In May 1982, G. Emmett Cardinal Carter, the Archbishop of Toronto, publicly announced that his diocese would drastically reduce its annual contribution to the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace. Following the 1982 the annual Sharelife Lenten fundraising campaign throughout the Archdiocese of Toronto, Carter decided that of the nearly five million dollars raised, only $500,000 would go to Development and Peace (which was half the amount received in 1981). Cardinal Carter also announced that his archdiocese had allocated $750,000 to form a new Toronto Pastoral Missionary Council, which would fund evangelical and pastoral projects in the developing world. By shifting his wealthy diocese’s financial priorities away from Development and Peace and creating a parallel Canadian Catholic organization in the developing world, Cardinal Carter was sending notice that he had lost confidence in CCODP and its work in the Third World.

This announcement caused a crisis at Development and Peace for two reasons. On an immediate level, this reduction of funds from the Archdiocese of Toronto—Development and Peace’s largest benefactor—had a significant effect on the CCODP annual budget. Since funds raised by Development and Peace were matched by CIDA, the $500,000 difference represented an actual loss of $1,000,000 (approximately 7 per cent of Development and Peace’s $13,588,487 income for fiscal year 1981-1982). Could the organization continue to meet its financial obligations when its largest benefactor drastically reduced its contributions? On a deeper level, Development and Peace worried about the unprecedented withdrawal of support from English-speaking Canada’s largest and most influential diocese. Did Cardinal Carter’s

---

940 Higgins and Leston, My Father’s Business, 207.
actions imply a lack of episcopal commitment to the mandate of Development and Peace? Did the investment in a new Catholic missionary council (that operated with a charity approach) signal a new direction in how the Canadian Church sought to best help the poor in the developing world?

While both Carter and CCODP had the same goal of eliminating global poverty and injustice, their respective visions of how to achieve this goal were quite different. During 1977-1982, Development and Peace came to understand that true development required not only donating money, but advocacy and structural change, a move which most Canadian Christians, who were still operating with a charity-based model of development—including Cardinal Carter—saw as too radical or leftist for the Catholic Church. CCODP’s more profound understanding of development was the result of over a decade of experience and reflection, but also a changing perspective on the Third World that was occurring during the mid- to late-1970s. During these years, the “human rights movement” exploded onto the world geopolitical scene. There were a number of reasons for the sudden interest in human rights including the search by European countries (and Canada) for an identity outside of cold war terms; the reception of Soviet and later Eastern European dissidents by Western journalists and intellectuals; and the American liberal shift in foreign policy in new, moralized terms, after the Vietnam catastrophe. Ultimately human rights gained acceptance after the romantic hopes for decolonization were proven illusionary by the harsh military regimes of Third World. Thus, in 1977, President Jimmy Carter made human rights a pillar of United States foreign policy his inaugural speech. In that same year, human rights advocacy organization Amnesty International won the Nobel Peace Prize. In Canada, Parliament passed the Canadian Human Rights Act in
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1977, which created the Canadian Human Rights Commission to investigate claims of discrimination and the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal to judge cases. In 1982, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, that guaranteed political and civil rights for Canadians, was signed into law after several years of high-profile debate. Theologically, this period witnessed the dissemination of liberationist theologies from throughout the Third World, especially from Latin America (Gustavo Gutiérrez of Peru, Leonardo Boff of Brazil, Jon Sobrino of El Salvador, and Juan Luis Seguindo of Uruguay, among many others). CCODP was certainly aware of these developments in human rights and liberation theologies as these were the kind of articles that dominated the pages of Solidarités and the Global Village Voice during these years.

Within this rich context, from 1977-1982, Development and Peace experienced several important changes in how it understood its mandate. First, the English and French Sectors developed an action component to their Canadian education program. In 1978, CCODP launched a second solidarity campaign in the fall to complement the Share Lent campaign. Whereas Share Lent combined development education and fund-raising, the fall campaign was a focused education program that led to action. These fall campaigns mobilized local sections to engage in advocacy work against human rights violations in South Africa, Argentina, Guatemala and the Philippines. Coordinating unified fall and Lenten campaigns under an annual theme, the Canadian education program was truly a year-round enterprise. While adding an action component made pedagogical sense for CCODP, it would take time before Canadians were able to replace their charity approach to the problems in the Third World with a justice approach that called for structural change.

Important changes were also happening in CCODP’s international development program. Through its partnerships in Latin America, Africa and Asia, CCODP’s understanding
of “development” expanded beyond helping people to develop economically and become self-sufficient to emphasizing full social, political, economic, and cultural liberation.  Specifically, CCODP increasingly funded international projects geared around the protection and promotion of human rights in areas of political oppression and organizing popular movements that could press for change. Like the new fall campaigns, this more profound understanding of development recognized that poverty was rooted in systematic injustice that could only be overcome with structural changes to the international order.

The same time as the organization was arriving at new ideas for domestic education and international development, it was also engaging in an unprecedented process of critical self-analysis. During 1977-1982, Development and Peace revised its constitution and conducted an extensive nationwide consultation with all of its stakeholders: governors, bishops, CCODP personnel, diocesan sections, local groups, ecumenical collaborators, the general public and Third World partners. The lasting result of these exercises was not only administrative clarity on pressing issues, but a unified orientation for future activity in Canada and abroad. These processes of mass consultation and collaboration with its grassroots base transformed Development and Peace from an agency into a democratic movement.

Moving Beyond Lent: Building A Year-Round Education Program

Since the inception of Development and Peace in 1967, education on international development was one of the two mandates. Yet, despite increases to the education budget, cooperative efforts with other churches and an increasing number of animateurs, the education program remained focused around the Share Lent campaign. In 1976, Development and Peace had created the “New World Order” campaign, which unified the French and English Sectors
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around a common theme for their educational programming. From 1977-1982, the Canadian education program took the next step of growing beyond a concentrated Lenten fundraising campaign into an annual nationwide education program that led to concrete action. This was an important step for the education program as Development and Peace was no longer claiming that the Third World’s problems could be solved exclusively through funding small-scale socio-economic problems. Rather, beginning in 1978, the education program included an action component that was aimed at structural change.

From 1977-1982, this growth in programming was matched by an increase in the annual budget of the education program.

Table 4.1: Canadian Educational Program Expenses (1977-1982)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount in 1977 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>% of Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977-1978</td>
<td>$1,025,110(^{946})</td>
<td>$934,173</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-1979</td>
<td>$1,273,868(^{947})</td>
<td>$1,071,566</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1980</td>
<td>$1,376,523(^{948})</td>
<td>$1,043,940</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>$1,559,390(^{949})</td>
<td>$1,050,961</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1982</td>
<td>$1,846,169(^{950})</td>
<td>$1,125,632</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,081,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,226,272</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over these five years, the education program budget increased by $821,059, or 80 per cent. Yet, when adjusting these figures for inflation (which was 10.4 per cent per annum or 64.1 per cent

\(^{945}\) These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: [http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/](http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/)


over the period because of the effect of compound interest), the seemingly generous increase of 80 per cent spent on education was, in fact, a more modest 20 per cent in 1977 dollars. While the dollar values increased each year, the average percentage of CCODP’s total budget spent on education was only 12.3 per cent (which was regulated by the existing financial policy of spending a maximum limit of 14 per cent of the overall budget for education purposes).  

The objectives of new the Canadian education program during this period were:

(1) Making a deep change in minds, attitudes and behaviour to produce the conditions required for the development of humanity in solidarity
(2) Leading a greater number of people and groups to commit themselves to development of the Third World and here, since the causes of under-development are the same everywhere
(3) Raising responsible political awareness (individual and collective) able to judge the attitude of the Canadian government towards the Third World and to exercise the political pressure required to correct situations.

The first objective sought a fundamental change in how Canadians approached development. According to Marjorie Ross, a member of the World Affairs staff of the Canadian Council of Churches in the mid-1980s, during these years, the “overwhelming majority of Canadians, including Canadian Christians, still approached issues of development from a perspective of charity.” The task of the education program was to help Canadians realize that many institutions, structures and systems do not operate to everyone’s benefit. Taking the popular slogan about teaching people to fish:

What good did it do a people to know how to fish (assuming they hadn’t known before) or to have better boats and nets as gifts from Canadian Christians if their traditional fishing grounds were polluted by the waste of a factory or mine owned by a foreign corporation? What use was better equipment if their government, a corrupt dictatorship, leased their beach to a foreign-owned tourist hotel and declared it off-
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limits to fishing boats? What use was the equipment if foreign-owned trawlers with mile-wide nets stripped their fishing grounds bare?\textsuperscript{954} Once people were aware that such systems were not just and needed to be changed, the second objective was to have Canadians commit themselves to changing the structures that were responsible for it (which often involved recognizing that these structures that negatively affected the Third World often benefitted Canada). Once people gained this new worldview, they needed an adequate way to respond. Otherwise development education could become an essentially negative experience for those involved. Thus, the third objective proposed concrete action.

To realize these objectives, a general unifying theme was chosen for each year.

During 1977-78, the general theme was “A New World Order” (which was a continuation of the program launched the previous year, 1976-1977).\textsuperscript{955} In 1978 a new campaign was launched under the theme “the Right of Men and of Peoples to Development” (this general theme would be renewed each year up to 1981-1982).\textsuperscript{956} With this four-year campaign, CCODP wanted to expand the definition of “development.” Not dealing exclusively with economic issues, this campaign presented development as entailing freedom of expression, participation, control of one’s destiny as well as personal and collective self-realization.\textsuperscript{957} While this general theme remained the same from 1978-1982, each year it was presented with different focal points. While the French and English Sectors still had the freedom to take different approaches in implementing the general theme in their regions,\textsuperscript{958} the period 1977-

\textsuperscript{954} Ibid., 75.
\textsuperscript{956} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{957} Ibid.
1982 witnessed the English and French staff working together in “better coordination and greater cooperation” than at any other time in CCODP’s young history.\(^{959}\)

The “preferred medium” for popularizing the theme of the educational program to the general public was through their two newspapers: *Solidarités* (from Francophone Canada) and the *Global Village Voice* (for Anglophone Canada).\(^{960}\) The circulation of each periodical rose rapidly during these years. In June 1978, *Solidarités* printed 12,700 copies of each issue, but by March 1981 that number had nearly doubled to 22,000.\(^{961}\) Similarly, the circulation of the *Global Village Voice* increased from 22,000 in November 1979\(^{962}\) to 34,000 in March 1981.\(^{963}\) Approximately half the newspapers were mailed directly to individuals (mainly in Canada, but also in many Third World countries) and the other half were sent to institutions (parishes, religious orders, schools, religious organizations) for distribution.\(^{964}\) As the readership grew, so did the quality of the journalism. The newspapers provided in-depth stories on current issues in social justice and international development, as well as detailed studies on current education campaigns and CCODP partners in the Third World. In March 1982, for the first time, a brief survey was conducted of all subscribers. These results were very positive and the newspapers received many compliments. Some readers, however, requested a “simpler, less complex treatment of information” (specifically, shorter articles that were presented in more accessible

\(^{959}\) ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 10-11 June 1978, 5.


language and with more illustrations). The other suggestion was for a larger section of regional news and activities.

**Mobilizing the Organization for Action: Fall Campaigns**

Beginning in 1978, Development and Peace doubled its education program by launching a second solidarity campaign in the fall. The purpose of the campaign was to invite the general public to examine the global aspects of underdevelopment based on the example of one particular country. Importantly, these campaigns proposed collective actions through which Canadians could manifest their solidarity with the country being studied (either against one of the causes of underdevelopment and/or in support of one of the positive forces of development in the population). Thus, this educational endeavour combined development education with action. Furthermore, these campaigns were also effective at creating a year-round CCODP presence in a number of dioceses which previously concentrated solely on Share Lent.

These education campaigns were first conceived by Fabien Leboeuf, a Catholic theologian who was hired in 1976 to coordinate the French Sector’s education program. Aware of requests from several diocesan sections and provincial meetings for additional educational programming beyond that of the Share Lent campaign, Leboeuf created a new education campaign during the liturgical season of Advent (to echo the fundraising campaign during the
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The inaugural “Advent Campaign” for 1978 was entitled “South Africa: A Time to Act.” During the four weeks of Advent leading up to Christmas, Canadians were educated on the living and working conditions in South Africa, with a particular focus on the repression of human rights through apartheid. Apartheid was the system of racial segregation enforced through legislation by the governments of South Africa, between 1948 and 1994, under which the rights of the majority non-white inhabitants of South Africa were limited and white Afrikaner minority rule was maintained. Under this system, Black South Africans received segregated education, medical care, and other public services that were inferior to those of white people. This education campaign was inspired by the United Nations declaration that 1978 was “International Anti-Apartheid Year.”

Moving beyond education to action, the campaign organized a massive letter-writing campaign. Canadians were asked to write letters to South African officials advocating “for the liberation of prisoners because the message of Christmas was that the Messiah came into the world ‘to feed the hungry, free the prisoners, etc.’ In addition, as a gesture of solidarity, Christmas cards were sent to black South Africans who were banned, detained or imprisoned and/or their families. Approximately 20,000 cards were sent from the French Sector and 60,000 were sent form the English Sector. In addition, in French Canada, 11,600 people...
signed a petition asking the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs (now known as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade) to abolish existing bilateral agreements (such as the British Preferential tariff status given to South Africa). Reaction from South Africa was hard to gauge as few responses were received due to the fear that South Africans who assisted in this action might be open to reprisals from South African authorities. Canadians, however, were very supportive of this new programme. The vast majority of the 465 comments received by CCODP suggested that similar programs should be continued annually (only three replies were negative).

In connection with the anti-apartheid campaign, Development and Peace became concerned that its bank, the Royal Bank of Canada, was making loans to the South African government, as well as to the government of Chile, which under the military junta of General Augusto Pinochet was also suppressing human rights. After much research and deliberation by the Board of Governors, in October 1979 Executive Director Jacques Champagne wrote a letter to the Royal Bank Chairman and CEO Rowland C. Frazee asking RBC to adopt an explicit policy of total refusal to grant any loan or other financial support to South Africa and Chile as long as the political systems that supported apartheid and repression remained in these countries. When RBC refused to make such a blanket policy, Development and Peace transferred all of its “salaries/payroll” and “general expense” accounts from the Royal Bank to
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the local *Caisse Populaire*. CCODP kept its “development program” account at RBC, which was used to transfer funds for projects in the Third World, since all the other major Canadian banking institutions also had a presence in South Africa and transferring funds through *Caisse Populaire* (via third-party banking institutions) was more expensive and took substantially longer for the transfers to be received.

When Toronto Dominion Bank adopted a definite position of refusing to make loans to South Africa (and it charged the same fees as RBC to transfer funds to the Third World), Development and Peace publically transferred all of their funds to TD. By investing in Toronto Dominion Bank CCODP was not naïve enough to believe that this bank was “more pure” in its behavior to the Third World than RBC, but the Board of Governors felt that the position on South Africa was the highest priority. Unfortunately, within the first year of making the high-profile change to TD, Development and Peace experienced long delays in transferring funds to the Third World. After successfully using *Caisse Populaire*’s newly opened international centre to transfer funds for a small number of projects on a trial basis, Development and Peace switched all three of their accounts to this institution which made no investments outside of Canada.
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In preparing for the 1979 campaign, several bishops informed Development and Peace that they could no longer hold the campaign during Advent.\textsuperscript{991} The rationale was that CCODP already had the specific liturgical space of Lent and should not try to occupy any other. From 1979 onwards, the educational program was known as the “Fall campaign” and it was no longer linked with the Church’s liturgical calendar. Unfortunately, the absence of any link between the Fall campaign and any specific Church event was falsely perceived by some people as CCODP’s “wish to move out of the Church” by left-wing staff members (mainly from Quebec).\textsuperscript{992} This view gained some momentum and created tensions within the organization and with some bishops.

The 1979 campaign—“Whatsoever you do to the least...”—was very similar to the previous year’s campaign except that Argentina was chosen as the target country. In 1976, the Argentine military (led by General Jorge Rafael Videla) seized power in a coup d’état following the death of President Juan Domingo Perón. During the “national reorganization process” of 1976-1983, the controlling military junta sponsored a program of forced disappearances, illegal arrests, torture, and rape to eliminate political subversives in what is commonly known as “the Dirty War”.\textsuperscript{993} According to Argentinean human rights organizations, as many as 30,000 had “disappeared” at the hands of the military or the police.\textsuperscript{994} On the occasion of 1979 being declared the “International Year of the Child” by the United Nations,\textsuperscript{995} CCODP focused its fall campaign on the children kidnapped by Argentine military or paramilitary groups. Once again, the campaign asked that Christmas cards be sent in solidarity to the Plaza de Mayo.

\textsuperscript{991} Fabien Leboeuf, interview with the author, 20 April 2012.
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\textsuperscript{994} Rita Arditti, 	extit{Searching for Life: The Grandmothers of the Plaza de Mayo and the Disappeared Children of Argentina} (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999), 44.
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grandmothers whose grandchildren had been kidnapped.\textsuperscript{996} As many as 170,000 of these cards were received in Argentina from Canadians (over double the cards from the previous campaign).\textsuperscript{997} One major reason for the huge increase in numbers was due to “enthusiastic” support of the campaign from the Catholic Women’s League of Canada.\textsuperscript{998} The campaign also asked Canadians to write a letter to the wife of the President, Mrs. Videla, asking for her intercession on behalf of the disappeared.\textsuperscript{999} Finally, Canadians were asked to sign a petition asking the Canadian government to apply diplomatic pressure in favour of human rights in Argentina (only 1,500 people from the English Sector signed this petition, which was much lower than expected).\textsuperscript{1000} To educate Canadians on this human rights issue, Development and Peace arranged for Rev. Enzio Guistozzi of Argentina’s Permanent Assembly for Human Rights to tour Quebec, Ontario and Saskatchewan, where he visited with individual bishops, the CCCB Secretariat, the Inter-Church Committee for Human Rights in Latin America, representatives of the Argentine community, and various other groups.\textsuperscript{1001}

In 1980-1981 and 1981-1982, Development and Peace emphasized the sub-theme of “Militarization: Obstacle for Development.” According to Development and Peace literature, “militarization” posed “the greatest threat to development” for three key reasons. First, in the Third World, militaries were involved in the direct repression of those who were working to

\textsuperscript{999} ACCODP, Global Village Voice, vol. 4, no. 1 (September-October 1979), 4.
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promote change on behalf of the poor. Second, the meager financial resources of a nation struggling to overcome economic and social hurdles were being channeled into building a stronger military structure, often to the benefit of a small group of military elites who exploit the poor. This was considered a waste of financial resources, human resources, raw materials, technical capacity, as well as research and development potential. Third, the sale of arms kept developing countries in a perpetual state of dependence on the industrialized countries. By way of comparison, in 1979, the world spent $400 billion annually on military activities while global economic aid to Third World nations did not exceed $22 billion. In short, Development and Peace believed that militarization represented an enormous waste of resources that had a disastrous economic, political, and social consequence on the most poor.

To bring attention to the growing phenomenon of militarization in the Third World, the 1980 fall campaign was “To Let the Oppressed Go Free” (quoting Isaiah 58:7). In French Canada, the focus was exclusively on Guatemala (which was voted upon in their annual assembly since three francophone animateurs had recently spent time there and CCODP already had a large number of projects and partners in that country). In 1978, General Romeo Lucas Garcia took power after a fraudulent election and carried out a campaign of political repression and assassinations against the progressive opposition. The widespread abuse of human
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rights violations gave rise to an intense guerrilla warfare led by The Guerilla Army of the Poor (EGP) and the Organization of the People in Arms (ORPA). The difficult situation in Guatemala would come to the attention of the Canadian public the following year after the tragic death of Raoul Léger, a Canadian lay missionary who died in Guatemala during a gun battle between Marxist rebels and government forces in 1981.1009 The French Sector kicked off its campaign on Guatemala with a 275-person National Seminar in Montreal on “Militarization of the Third World” (31 October–2 November 1980).1010 Following the seminar, four of the speakers from Guatemala went on a month-long information tour throughout Canada addressing government, university, union, church and student groups.1011 The action called upon Canadians to mail a letter of solidarity to the Democratic Front Against Repression (FDCR) in Guatemala and postcards were sent to the Canadian Government and to the United Nations requesting that the FDCR be recognized, that support of the military junta in Guatemala be discontinued and that an international inquiry on repression be held.1012 It was difficult to evaluate public participation in this campaign as no count on letters or postcards were kept. However, the French Sector reported that the previous campaign on Argentina seemed to have generated more interest due to its more “emotional nature.”1013

In the English Sector, the 1980 fall campaign was less focused. Three third world nations were chosen (one from each continent) that suffered under military dictatorships or police states that repressed human and civil liberties: South Africa (focus of the 1978
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campaign); Argentina (focus of the 1979 campaign); and the Philippines (new in 1980). In 1972 democratically-elected President Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law, suspended the constitution and the Congress, arrested all opposition leaders and activists, and eliminated freedom of the press. Throughout the seventies, the military had virtually unlimited powers to search, arrest, and detain civilians without reason and without recourse to legal representation (an estimated 60,000 people were arrested and tortured between 1972 and 1977 and over 500 political activists “disappeared” from 1975-80). To raise awareness of militarization, several Argentinean grandmothers toured thirteen different communities across English-speaking Canada. In Francophone Canada, Rev. Luis Guirriaran of Guatemala visited Manitoba and Northern Ontario. As an action of solidarity, Canadians were asked to send a Christmas card or letter to a person suffering from repression at the hands of one of these three governments. Tied to this action, Canadians were also asked to sign a petition to the Government of Canada protesting the military and arms linkages between Canada and each of these three governments. While it is impossible to give a figure as to number of letters sent, the English Sector did receive significant growth in the number of signatures on the petition; 2,643 forms were received (over 1,000 more than the previous year). The English Sector’s report on the campaign to the Board of Governors was mixed, “while the fall action was reasonably successful in presenting to the public the problem of repression in the third world, the program
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was less successful in enabling the various publics to understand the broader phenomenon of militarization as it impacts on development possibilities.”

Committed to the issue of militarization in these nations, the fall action in 1981—“Justice Guatemala” and “Justice Philippines”—was essentially the same campaign as “Let the Oppressed Go Free” in 1980. While the campaign on militarization was renewed for a second year, it was not without some controversy.

The theme of militarization was not uniformly welcomed within the CCDOP community. While some local sections got very involved in the campaign, others refused to participate. During the November 1981 Board of Governors meeting, both the English Sector and French Sector annual reports indicated that while the theme of militarization was very well received in some areas, it “caused unease” and was “not too enthusiastically greeted” in others. Many of the governors experienced similar reactions in their regions. The problem seemed to be over what exactly was meant by “demilitarization.” As one governor asked, “was it not normal for countries to defend themselves against their enemies?” The Director of the French Sector, Denis Thibeault, clarified that the campaign against militarization implied much more than the production, purchase and sale of arms. It involved an economic and political system that linked itself to a military system, resulting in a society in which those who govern often resort to repressive measures in order to maintain the system if power. At the suggestion of the governors, Thibeault agreed to add a theological aspect to future campaigns that focused on the biblical notion of peace, which represented more than the absence of war but
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eliminating all things which serve to crush and oppress humanity.\textsuperscript{1027} It was noted that more materials were needed that directly connected militarization to underdevelopment.\textsuperscript{1028}

Not only were some of the local groups uncomfortable with the fall campaign, but so was the federal government. On 17 October 1981 a story ran in \textit{The Gazette} (Montreal) that Development and Peace was in danger of losing a $400,000 grant from CIDA’s Public Participation Program (PPP) because its “Militarization: Obstacle to Development Campaign” was too critical of the Canadian government.\textsuperscript{1029} According to the article, Tom Johnston received a tip from a “friendly source” within CIDA that the organization’s influential project review committee had found CCODP’s 1980-1981 public education theme (focused on militarization in the Third World) to be “unpalatable.”\textsuperscript{1030} Some persons in the government felt that CCODP was engaging in partisan politics.\textsuperscript{1031} CCODP’s position was it was not engaging in partisan politics, but that it could not remain silent when government decisions were not in the best interest of the oppressed peoples of the Third World. Thus, in its education campaign, Development and Peace was asking the Canadian government to reconsider and change policies which were counterproductive in terms of human development.\textsuperscript{1032} In the article, Jacques Champagne clarified that never before had Development and Peace faced any CIDA pressure to modify to public education campaigns. The following week, on 28 October 1981, it was reported that Development and Peace did receive the requested $400,000 grant (which was received just prior to the deadline for approval of grants). While the grant was
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approved after a lengthy delay, CIDA did ask CCODP for a signed statement that none of CIDA’s money would be used to fund the anti-militarization campaign. Champagne assured Development and Peace supporters that the education campaign would continue (but it would be funded from other non-governmental sources).

A More Engaged Share Lent Campaign

While much energy was devoted during this period to establishing the fall campaigns, the Share Lent campaign remained the most recognizable aspect of the educational program. This campaign remained an extremely important source of income for Development and Peace (accounting for 41.1 per cent of CCODP annual income from 1977-1982).

From 1977 to 1982, CCODP’s Share Lent campaign increased from $4.1 million to 5.1 million. Despite this $1 million increase, however, Development and Peace was actually losing ground in terms of real dollars. During the late 1970s/early 1980s, Canada was in the midst of a recession that was characterized by “stagflation” (high unemployment and high inflation) as well as decreased spending power among Canada’s middle class. During this five-year period, inflation was 10.4 per cent or 64.0 per cent due to compound interest. In light of this difficult economic reality, CCODP would have to earn $6,723,301 in 1982 to have the same buying power it had in 1978. Due to this high rate of inflation, the figure of $5 million in 1982 actually represents a decrease of almost $1 million. During these years, there was much concern at the national level that revenue from Share Lent (and other private donations) was not growing in the same proportion as administrative and educational expenses. As a result,
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Development and Peace increasingly looked to CIDA grants for education and administration to cover these expenses.

### Table 4.2 Revenue from Share Lent Campaigns (1978-1982)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme [French Sector / English Sector]</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>“Real” Amount in 1977 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>% of income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td><em>Pour que le terre soit à tout l’monde...ensemble, voyons-y/</em> “The Earth Can Feed All”</td>
<td>$4,099,279&lt;sup&gt;1037&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$3,735,633</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td><em>Pour le droit des peoples au Développement et à la Paix/</em> The Right of Peoples to Development and Peace</td>
<td>$4,643,489&lt;sup&gt;1038&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$3,906,061</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td><em>Partageons pour ouvrir l’avenir/</em> Together for Tomorrow</td>
<td>$4,724,894&lt;sup&gt;1039&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$3,583,309</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>*Développement, nouveau nom de la paix/*Development: New Name for Peace</td>
<td>$5,081,728&lt;sup&gt;1040&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$3,424,862</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td><em>Ensemble c’est possible/</em> Together, it’s possible</td>
<td>$5,051,526&lt;sup&gt;1041&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$3,079,977</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$23,600,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,729,842</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 1977-1982, the Share Lent campaign was managed independently by each linguistic sector, but there was close collaboration between the two offices over choice of theme and production of materials. In fact, each sector had identical themes. The collaboration could have been even closer, but according to the French sector this was hampered by the English Sector’s membership in the Inter-Church Committee on Campaign Funds. This group produced

<sup>1036</sup> These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: [http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/](http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/)


materials that were used in common by all the member Churches. According to the French Sector, this ecumenical coalition carried with it “obligations and constraints which had repercussions on cooperation between the French and English sectors; the dialogue was ‘bound’ in part.”

Over this five year span, three important components of the Share Lent campaign emerged. First, priority was given to having representatives from the Third World tour Canada promoting the importance of investing in international development. These so-called “solidarity visitors” toured regions of Canada speaking about the Share Lent theme from the perspective of those who suffered from social injustices. For example, for Share Lent 1978 Archbishop Peter Dery of Tamale, Ghana and Rev. Demetrio Imperial (Executive Secretary of the Office of Human Development for the Federation of Asian Bishops) toured English Canada. That same year, the French Sector launched its Share Lent campaign with an international conference exploring the campaign theme of the world’s worsening food situation (specifically, more effective instruments to combat famine, creation of grain reserves against future crises and support for the efforts of Third World nations to become self-reliant in their capacity to feed themselves). Fifteen resource people from the Third World attended the conference in Montreal to address this theme.

The second important aspect of the Share Lent campaigns during this period is that they were designed to be part of an overall annual theme for the year. For example, in 1979-1980, the main educational theme was “the Right of Men and of Peoples to Development,” and one of
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the sub-themes dealt with indigenous peoples. Within this theme, the slogan for Share Lent was “Partager pour ouvrir l’avenir/Together for Tomorrow,” and the educational kit was entitled “The Rights of Indigenous People to Shape their own Destiny.” To raise awareness of the problems faced by indigenous people around the world, the education kit highlighted the plight of the Bontoc people in the Philippines who were facing extinction as a people. In this case, the Filipino government proposed building a giant dam on the Chico River which threatened the ancestral home lands and culture of the Bontoc (as construction would wash away homes and cause flooding to the rice terraces). The objective of the campaign was to illustrate how legislative and development proposals, negotiated without reference to native communities, threatened the livelihood of local populations. To support the campaign, CCODP organizers brought Bishop Francisco F. Claver, SJ of Malaybalay-Bukidnon of the Philippines (himself a Bontoc) to Western Canada and Sr. Felicitas, who spoke about the human rights violations against indigenous tribes in the Philippines, to groups in Eastern Canada. The French Sector coordinated a speaking tour for Bishop Tomás Balduino, OP of Goiás, Brazil and Vice-President of CIMI (Missionary Indigenous Commission) throughout Quebec. The English Sector reported that while the materials were well received, some local sections complained that the focus on indigenous peoples was “too specific.” The lesson learned was the fall
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campaign was better suited to theme-related programs and Share Lent was better served with general development materials that promoted the entire organization.

The third point of interest in the Share Lent campaigns was that they provided increasingly more information about CCODP development projects. One of the biggest challenges that local Development and Peace groups had in fundraising for the Share Lent campaign was the limited information about actual CCODP-funded projects in the Third World. Potential donors wanted to know what happened to the money once it was sent. How would they know if a project was successful? As a response, beginning with Share Lent 1979, the Projects Department included a “project sampler” in the education kits that provided background information on eighteen projects funded by CCODP to diocesan sections. Around this same time period, the Global Village Voice and Solidarités began publishing more detailed reports of projects supported by the organization on a more regular basis.

**Pushing International Development in New Directions**

Development and Peace funded two types of projects in the Third World. The “Regular Program” included socio-economic development projects that were requested by groups in the Third World. These projects were developed, administered, and evaluated by Third World groups. Development and Peace supported these projects by providing additional financial resources.

**Regular Program: Continued Expansion**

The period 1977-1982 was a time of financial growth for the projects department. Over this five-year period Development and Peace allocated over $40 million dollars to the Third World (which was $12.4 million, or 45 per cent, more than the previous five year period).
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Table 4.3: Amounts Allotted to the Socio-Economic Development Projects (1977-1982)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>“Real” Amount in 1977 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</th>
<th>% of Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977-1978</td>
<td>$5,757,003</td>
<td>$5,246,301</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-1979</td>
<td>$6,308,463</td>
<td>$5,306,623</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1980</td>
<td>$8,571,731</td>
<td>$6,500,709</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>$10,237,774</td>
<td>$6,899,812</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1982</td>
<td>$9,189,354</td>
<td>$5,602,862</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$40,064,325</td>
<td>$29,556,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 1977-1982, socio-economic projects averaged 69.2 per cent of Development and Peace’s total expenses. When combined with the emergency relief fund (which accounted for an average of 10.8 per cent of the budget), a grand total of 80.0 per cent of all funds collected by CCODP was sent to the Third World during this period. Each year the amount of funds allocated to socio-economic development projects increased, except for 1981-1982 (when the amount dropped $1,048,420, or 10.2 per cent, from the previous year). This should be viewed as less of a “decrease” and more as 1980-1981 being an unusually good year. Since 1977, Development and Peace had accumulated a $750,000 surplus. To ensure that this money was used for development projects in the Third World, the Board of Governors voted that during 1980-1981, no projects were refused due to a lack of funds. Furthermore, 1981-82 was the
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fiscal year that was affected by Cardinal Carter’s decision to reduce the Archdiocese of Toronto’s contribution to CCODP, resulting in an unexpected loss of $500,000.\textsuperscript{1068}

Perhaps even more important than financial growth, during these five years the projects department actively expanded its network of partners in the Third World.\textsuperscript{1069} In establishing dialogue with a broader set of groups and organizations, CCODP was able to deepen its understanding of under-development and jointly launch new projects. One way of measuring the growth of these networks is through the number of projects submitted to Development and Peace for funding. In 1977-1978, 792 projects were submitted to CCODP (not including projects referred to the APHD, nor emergency aid, nor projects financed by special appeals).\textsuperscript{1070} By 1981-1982, these requests increased to 1,040 (a 31.3 per cent increase).\textsuperscript{1071} Another way to measure the size of these networks was the number of foreign countries in which Development and Peace was invested. In 1976-1977, CCODP was funding projects in seventy countries. Five years later (in 1981-1982), Development and Peace was involved in eighty countries (a 14.3 per cent increase).\textsuperscript{1072}

In terms of distribution of projects, in 1977, the Executive Committee established fixed percentages based on the number of requests and the amounts involved in each of the different sections: 47 per cent for Latin America; 47 per cent for Africa/Asia; and 6 per cent for International Projects (groups situated in industrialized countries whose actions and research work have direct implications in the Third World).\textsuperscript{1073} These ratios were unchanged until 1981-1982, when they were slightly tweaked by the Executive Committee (due to India’s entry into
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APHD: 50 per cent for Latin America; 44 per cent for Africa/Asia; and 6 per cent for International Projects.

During 1977-1982, $40,064,325 was allocated to development projects in eighty countries across the globe. Yet, five countries accounted for 25.3 per cent ($10,120,000) of this total.

Table 4.4: Principal Beneficiary Countries (1967-1982)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1967-1972 (5 years)</th>
<th>1972-1977 (5 years)</th>
<th>1977-1982 (5 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil ($1,025,000)</td>
<td>Brazil ($1,577,000)</td>
<td>India ($2,730,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru ($983,700)</td>
<td>India ($1,256,100)</td>
<td>Chile ($1,982,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti ($601,700)</td>
<td>Peru ($1,088,400)</td>
<td>Peru ($1,970,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia ($593,800)</td>
<td>Chile ($995,900)</td>
<td>Brazil ($1,846,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India ($476,400)</td>
<td>Cameroon ($676,500)</td>
<td>Nicaragua ($1,590,600)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these statistics, four of these five nations (India, Chile, Peru and Brazil) were on the chart during the previous five year period, and India, Peru and Brazil were principal beneficiary countries since the beginning of Development and Peace.

Redefining the Principles of Development

The figures mentioned are revealing, however, they only tell part of the story. What is more important is the quality of development assistance that CCODP brought to the Third World. To understand the kind of development that this organization wanted to promote, it is instructive to analyze its principles for development during this period. The main criteria for the Project Review Committees—during these years there were five or six separate committees, each composed of up to six non-paid members, both members of CCODP and external experts—remained the same six-points outlined in the previous chapter. Yet, during this
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period the projects department wrestled with specific issues in each region and, in solving these challenges, developed several guiding principles for 1977-1982.

In Latin America, Development and Peace found theological inspiration from the strong social justice witness of bishops and cardinals—such as Archbishop Dom Helder Câmara of Olinda and Recife (Brazil), Cardinal Paulo Evaristo Arns, OFM of São Paulo (Brazil) and Bishop Tomás Balduino, OP of Goiás (Brazil)—who were strong supporters of Development and Peace and made regular visits to Canada. After Vatican II, the Catholic Church in Latin America became increasingly committed to helping the poor majority in the struggle for liberation from global economic forces that caused widespread poverty, repression, and dependency. These emerging liberation theologies revived the prophetic dimensions of Christianity—in the line of Moses, the Hebrew prophets and Jesus of Nazareth—that called upon people to live out their faith in God through action for justice. Rooted in the lived experience of those who suffer under conditions of poverty and oppression, liberation theology analyzed the political, economic, and ideological causes of social inequality and constructed a theology that called for an end to all forms of oppression.

Many of these ideas regarding liberation were taken up by the Second General Conference of the Latin American Episcopate (CELAM) that met in Medellín, Colombia in 1968. Noted scholar of Catholic Social Thought, Donal Dorr, has described the documents issued at Medellín as “a turning point in the life of the Latin American Church—and indeed of the Catholic Church as a whole.”

\[\text{References:}\]
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XXIII and Paul VI, liberation theology and the reality of life in Latin America, the documents on justice and peace made a seminal and fundamental criticism of the existing economic “development” strategies imposed by outsiders as engendering an unhealthy dependency on the industrialized nations of the West.\textsuperscript{1082} These models only resulted in greater hunger, malnutrition and a dramatic rise in the cost of basic food staples.\textsuperscript{1083} Speaking with a prophetic voice, the Latin American bishops committed themselves, “to defend the rights of the poor and oppressed according to the Gospel command.”\textsuperscript{1084} Most important for Development and Peace, the bishops came out in favour of a process of “conscientization” of the poor; this process involves educating the poor to an awareness of the basic causes of the marginalization they experience, and helping them to organize themselves to overcome injustice and achieve liberation.\textsuperscript{1085} After Medellín, small grassroots (base) communities—loosely organized small groups of Catholics drawn largely from the poor urban and peasant masses who came together to pray, worship, and to apply the Gospel to their situation of poverty and oppression—exploded across Latin America.

The document issued by CELAM at their next gathering in Puebla, Mexico in 1979, confirmed the statements made a decade earlier at Medellín. With the support of the newly-elected Pope John Paul II, the Latin American bishops emphasized the importance of local (base) communities and the laity in helping the Church carry out its mission of liberation. The document concludes with a strong affirmation of the option for the poor (requiring changes in
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unjust political, economic and social structures) and the option for young people. Taken together, the documents of Medellín and Puebla describe the institutional violence and the exploitive relations of dependency in Latin America and they point to the need for cultural and economic liberation.

According to René Lacoste, the Director of the Projects Department, “Medellín and Puebla marked a new point of departure in the reading and interpretation of the reality [of Latin America].” With this new theological approach, CCODP moved beyond what they saw as a more limited notion of development to “a more clear and more scientific understanding of social conflicts. We come then to define development as the process of the liberation of the peoples of the continent [Latin America].” Thus, during this period, CCODP was less concerned with supporting traditional development projects such as agricultural production and increasingly invested in new “liberation” projects that sought to put in place a more just society by surmounting every kind of political, economic, social and/or religious obstacle. Just as the documents of Medellín called for a process “conscientization,” CCODP projects were aimed at mass education of popular groups and organizations (through analysis of local situations of injustice) and promoted action. The leadership of CELAM also inspired Development and Peace to support groups engaged in the defense of human rights, which was now of equal importance to economic development. The great majority of people in Latin America lived under military regimes that imposed highly sophisticated systems of repression. Favour was shown to projects that protected basic human rights and defended those persecuted for the

---

1087 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 7-8 June 1980, “Projects Department: Perspectives and Directions 80-81,” 103.
1088 Ibid.
1089 Ibid., 104.
human rights activities. Finally, Medellín and Puebla also prompted Development and Peace to support the rights of indigenous peoples, who were often the most marginalized in societies. Specifically, CCODP prioritized projects that mobilized the indigenous population to defend their rights (such as the Native People of Central America project) and developed the culture of indigenous peoples.

In Africa, a special effort was made to assist the reconstruction efforts of newly independent nations (which came from both the general projects funds and emergency relief). Historically, CCODP had not worked with local governments but rather with private organizations, groups and communities. After long wars of liberation, however, many young nations, such as Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Tanzania, Cape Verde, Vietnam, and several others were requesting assistance. Development and Peace set a new precedent by working with these governments in the reconstruction of their countries, especially in promoting literacy and education programs and agricultural reform in rural areas. With several nations still under colonial rule or engaged in civil war, such as South-West Africa/Namibia and Rhodesia/Zimbabwe, the Executive Director pointed out the need for prudence on the projects submitted by “liberation groups” seeking independence. Development and Peace would continue to accept projects of the reconstruction type within these areas as long as the aid was for humanitarian purposes and not for the promotion of violence. To make this distinction, it was important to consult with local references in each region. In addition, Development and
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Peace continued to support efforts in South Africa and Equatorial Guinea to confront systematic repression, racism and violation of human rights.\textsuperscript{1095}

In Asia, Development and Peace remained a committed partner in the Asian Partnership for Human Development (APHD). Collectively, from 1977-1982, Development and Peace invested $3,693,028 in the APHD (representing 9.2 per cent of the total amounts allotted to the CCODP regular development program during this five-year period, excluding emergency aid and special appeals). For Development and Peace, the APHD was an important step in changing the traditional idea of aid into a more dynamic course of action that shared financial resources among peoples and their organizations in order to create a spirit of solidarity capable of bringing changes necessary for true integral development.\textsuperscript{1096} The goal was less concerned with finances and more concerned with stimulating these people to actively participate in their own development.\textsuperscript{1097} From 8-12 December 1977, the APHD convened its first international general assembly in Bangkok, Thailand. At this gathering, APHD resolved having all partners contributing to the APHD fund from their own local resources (some Asian nations launched their own Lenten collections); promoting “education-conscientization” as a basic methodology; and supporting projects involved in issues of human rights.\textsuperscript{1098} In 1981-1982, Caritas India (CI) was granted full membership the APHD.\textsuperscript{1099} Thus, in 1981-1982 all CCODP funds that had been going to India—worth $500,000—where now channelled through the APHD (bringing the annual contribution to $1,100,000).\textsuperscript{1100}

\textsuperscript{1095} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 7-8 June 1980, “Projects Department: Perspectives and Directions 80-81,” 104.
\textsuperscript{1097} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1099} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 14 & 15 March 1981, 9.
\textsuperscript{1100} Ibid.
Collectively, Development and Peace projects in Latin America, Africa and Asia during 1977-1982 articulated a vision of international development as a complex process which could no longer be reduced to a simple economic operation. During these years, CCODP projects expanded their scope to include defending human rights, participating in liberation efforts, challenging structures blocking development, and criticizing certain government policies in the Third World. In other words, CCODP projects began to address social, political, cultural and religious conditions as well as economic conditions as a means of battling underdevelopment and establishing a more just society. Given the complexity of this task, the methods of fighting under-development varied according to local conditions and regions. To be better attuned to each local situation, Development and Peace sought to work in closer “partnerships” with people in the Global South. Working as equals, more and more decisions concerning policies and the financing of projects were discussed with the populations affected. These partners also helped to evaluate the development projects funded by Development and Peace. Ultimately, Development and Peace wanted to be more than “mere fundraisers” in the Third World, it sought to be in solidarity with the liberation of the Third World. Arriving at this more profound understanding of development that promoted radical structural change, Development and Peace found itself at odds with those in the Church who would rather baptize and bury the faithful than take sides in a political struggle (such as Cardinal Carter of Toronto).
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1102 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 7-8 June 1980, “Projects Department: Perspectives and Directions 80-81,” 103.
1104 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 7-8 June 1980, “Projects Department: Perspectives and Directions 80-81,” 103.
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Special Activities: Responding to the Refugee Crisis in Southeast Asia

Development and Peace maintained its policy of allotting 10 per cent of its development program to emergency relief, which could, in some cases, be increased to 20 per cent. These funds were classified into two different programs. First, funds for “emergency aid” would help victims of natural disasters (droughts, floods, earthquakes, etc.) or disasters caused by human factors (war victims, refugees, etc.) by providing food, medication, shelter, etc. These supplies were for immediate and urgent care. Once the first emergency had passed, populations also needed aid for reconstruction to rebuild houses and community centres, acquire agricultural tools, etc. For this second phase, in 1977 CIDA established a “Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Fund.” These funds were often matched by CIDA at a higher rate: $3 (of CIDA funding) for every $1 (of CCODP funding).  

Table 4.5: Emergency Relief Projects and Special Appeals (1977-1982)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Relief</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$505,000</td>
<td>$667,153</td>
<td>$737,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction and</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$393,000</td>
<td>$315,554</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Appeals</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal Project</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,094,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$863,000</td>
<td>$1,780,554</td>
<td>$1,187,153</td>
<td>$1,969,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Real” Amount in 1977 Dollars</td>
<td>$592,339</td>
<td>$725,948</td>
<td>$1,350,353</td>
<td>$800,089</td>
<td>$1,200,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Expenses</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1106 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 9 November 1979, 3.
1112 These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: [http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/](http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/)
From 1977-1982, Development and Peace spent an average of 10.8 per cent of its annual international development budget on “special activities.” In particularly serious crisis situations, CCODP (with the agreement of the CCCB) carried out “special appeals” to raise funds among the Canadian public. From 1977-1982, CCODP held two such appeals.

From 1978-1980, Development and Peace raised $185,000 in a special appeal for Indochinese Refugees. This appeal was to help refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia/Kampuchea and Laos that, since the end of the Vietnam War in 1975, were steadily fleeing the region and arriving at overflowing refugee camps in Thailand, Malaysia and Hong Kong. People from all three countries were fleeing persecution for political or religious reasons, civil war, and threat of impending famine. According to the United Nations, as of June 1979, 162,600 “land cases” and 195,000 “boat people” combined for a total of 357,000 Indochinese refugees in Thailand refugee camps that were beyond capacity. Money raised was used for medicine and clothing, as well as trying to find permanent resettlement.

From 1979-1980 a second appeal raised $825,000 for Cambodia. These funds were used to help 2.25 million people facing starvation in the wake of the Cambodian-Vietnamese War. After years of border clashes between the two nations, on 25 December 1978 Vietnam launched a full-scale invasion of Cambodia/Kampuchea and subsequently occupied the country. The Vietnamese removed the Khmer Rouge from power and established the People’s Republic of Kampuchea. The Khmer Rouge’s Democratic Kampuchea retreated to the countryside and formed an armed resistance to fight the Vietnamese occupation. The appeal, in conjunction with twelve other organizations (European Catholic agencies, the World Council of Churches, and
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the European Economic Community) helped supply the people of Cambodia with food; medicine; fishing nets, vitamin supplements; school equipment; and seeds.\footnote{1118}

**New Relationship with CIDA**

Government funds, from CIDA and provincial governments, continued to be a major source of funding for Development and Peace.

**Table 4.6: Contributions from CIDA and Provincial Governments (1977-1982)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977-78\footnote{1119}</th>
<th>1978-79\footnote{1120}</th>
<th>1979-80\footnote{1121}</th>
<th>1980-81\footnote{1122}</th>
<th>1981-82\footnote{1123}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIDA</strong></td>
<td>$3,506,583</td>
<td>$4,343,303</td>
<td>$5,500,901</td>
<td>$6,392,318</td>
<td>$5,554,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provinces</strong></td>
<td>$381,410</td>
<td>$631,018</td>
<td>$677,916</td>
<td>$701,108</td>
<td>$939,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Financing</strong></td>
<td>$19,358</td>
<td>$57,040</td>
<td>$81,405</td>
<td>$47,855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,887,993</td>
<td>$4,959,025</td>
<td>$6,235,857</td>
<td>$7,174,831</td>
<td>$6,542,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Real” Amount in 1977 Dollars (Adjusted for Inflation)</strong> \footnote{1126}</td>
<td>$3,543,090</td>
<td>$4,171,488</td>
<td>$4,729,207</td>
<td>$4,835,522</td>
<td>$3,988,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Income</strong></td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{1119}{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 10-11 November 1979, “Financial Statements as at August 31, 1979,” 134.}
\footnote{1122}{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the National Council,” 13-14 November 1982, “Financial Statements as at August 31, 1982,” 176.}
\footnote{1124}{The Quebec government, through the Department of Cultural Communities and Immigration, has mostly provided additional amounts towards emergency relief projects. The governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta have directed their contributions to regular development programs (Manitoba and British Columbia discontinued their programs). In Spring of 1982, CCODP formally withdrew from participating in the Alberta provincial fund in favour of a provincial regrouping of NGOs more directly involved in development education. ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the National Council,” 13-14 November 1982, “1981-82 Activity Report: Projects Department,” 108.}
\footnote{1125}{Co-Financing means amounts that come from other organizations similar to Development and Peace or from persons who have channelled their donations through a particular sector. ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 9 November 1979, 3.}
\footnote{1126}{These figures were obtained using the Bank of Canada’s online inflation calculator: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/}
From 1977-1982, CCODP received $28,799,729 from these government sources. During these years, they accounted for an average of 49.6 per cent of CCODP’s annual income.

In 1978-1979, CIDA announced a new program for NGOs known as the “Global Grant” program. This innovative program helped NGOs (like CCODP) and CIDA cut through red tape and prevented delays in receiving funds, which in turn meant that projects could start faster in the field.1127 Prior to that year, CCODP submitted individual projects to CIDA seeking matching grants.1128 From 1978 onwards, CIDA made three block grants to CCODP and trusted CCODP’s Projects Review Committee to determine which projects CCODP would sponsor as long as the projects fit with CIDA’s intervention priorities for development.1129 CCODP would forward copies of the funded projects back to CIDA after the money was used. The approved projects continued to be funded at the same ratio of 50:50.1130 The advantage of the Global Grant program for Development and Peace was that it was more efficient to receive CIDA funds in lump sums rather than having to wait for CIDA to review each individual project prior to releasing the money, which greatly simplified the administrative process.1131 This new financial arrangement demonstrated the confidence that CIDA had in CCODP’s criteria and operations. By 1982, Development and Peace was the single largest recipient of grants from the NGO section of CIDA.1132

1128 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the National Council, 14-15 November 1981, “President’s Report [Brian O’Connell, President of the National Council], 41.
1129 CIDA’s priorities during this period were: community and rural development, food production, professional formation, health and nutritional instruction, preventive medicine and family planning, housing, irrigation and potable water, co-operatives and small industries, and development planning. ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 17 & 18 March 1978, “Outline [Global Grant],” 90.
1130 Ibid.
1131 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the National Council, 14-15 November 1981, “President’s Report [Brian O’Connell, President of the National Council], 41.
1132 Ibid.
In 1981-1982, CIDA approached Development and Peace about another new initiative, the Country First Program. This unique program was initiated by CIDA’s new president, Marcel Massé, in an endeavour to shift from the concerns of CIDA’s various programs to the full scope of needs in each of the developing countries assisted by Canada. Specifically, CIDA wanted to concentrate its resources in integrated development programs within specific countries for longer periods of time. CIDA contacted Development and Peace about implementing a three-year agricultural program in Senegal. Development and Peace was chosen to administer this project because all four of the proposed Senegalese development projects were run by Catholic clergy or religious orders and CCODP had a long history in the region, funding Senegalese projects since 1968. CCODP would be responsible for coordinating CIDA funding to OFADEC (an integrated rural development program in Eastern Senegal); CARA-AFFINIUM (a rural development program that trained teams of young people in agricultural techniques on an experimental farm in Southern Senegal); women’s development and health programs in the Soutou region of Southern Senegal); and CARITAS SENEGAL (a hydro-agricultural development program in the capital of Dakar). As opposed to matching CCODP’s funds dollar-for-dollar, in the Country First Program CIDA would match CCODP contributions at a ratio of 10:1. Thus, of the $3,520,000 total budget for the Senegal Project, CIDA would pay $3,200,000 while CCODP would only contribute $320,000.

When reviewing CIDA’s proposal, the Board of Governors had some major reservations. First and foremost, some member expressed concern that CIDA’s contribution would exceed

1137 Ibid., 6.
CCODP’s by a ratio of 10:1, which blatantly ignored the long-standing policy, since 1972, that “no one source of funding should exceed CCODP’s contribution.” A second hesitation was that the Canadian government was the one who determined which country would receive funding and not the NGO. This represented a new model for CIDA. Up to this point, the formula was that individual projects were proposed to CIDA by the NGOs and, if funded by CIDA, the projects were then administered by the NGOs. CIDA had accepted that NGOs—like Development and Peace—had relationships with Third World institutions and communities that were more intimate and closer to the grass roots than could ever be achieved by an official aid agency. NGOs could therefore produce projects that would reach poor communities and help meet their needs better than the government could. For this reason, the work of CIDA’s NGO division was appropriately labelled the “responsive program.” With the Country First Program, some governors did not feel it was appropriate that decisions of foreign aid were to be determined by the Canadian government based on political, economic and commercial reasons as opposed to which countries were the poorest or the most in economic need.

A final point of contention was whether Development and Peace would be able to retain its autonomy from CIDA. Development and Peace proudly operated as a “non-governmental organization” (NGO). In name and reality, CCODP clearly separated itself from the government of Canada on international development matters; it represented the Canadian Catholic Church. If CCODP participated in the Country-First program would it cease to be an NGO and become simply an extension of CIDA? Ultimately realizing that this was an
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exceptional opportunity—and considering that all four of the projects were strongly
recommended by the CCODP Projects Review Committee—the National Council approved the
Senegal Project (SEN/82A/114/PC) on an experimental basis from 1981-1984. In accepting
this new three-year project, Development and Peace was establishing a new paradigm for its
development program in the future.

An Examination of Conscience: Revising the Constitution and Orientations of CCODP

While Development and Peace was redefining its understanding of domestic education
and international development, it was also engaging in a thorough process of critical self-
analysis of its basic principles and orientation. At the November 1977 Board of Governors
meeting, Executive Director Jacques Champagne presented a report on the organization’s ten
years of achievements. The report highlighted the numerous successes of Development and
Peace such as building an expansive international development program and orchestrating the
financially profitable Share Lent campaigns, all while keeping the administrative costs at 5 per
cent and it also pointed out inherent weaknesses in the organization (namely the uneven
quality of the educational program and the underdevelopment of the Christian dimension of the
organization). The experience of compiling this report convinced Champagne that “some
aspects of the life of CCODP should be corrected or improved in order that the program of
action and reflection be intensified and expanded to meet the even greater challenges of the next
decade.” As a solution, Champagne recommended to the board that CCODP organize an
evaluation seminar be held to study the structure of the organization for the purpose of seeking
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“a collective understanding and a more coherent articulation of the objectives, the policies and the ‘message’ of Development and Peace.”

Supportive of an “orientation seminar,” the Board of Governors went a step further and proposed also reviewing CCODP’s constitution in order to clarify lingering questions over such sensitive topics as the criteria for becoming a member of Development and Peace, the exact role of a diocesan section, and the relationship of diocesan sections to the local bishop. This “orientation seminar” was also welcomed by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCB), as the bishops felt that they were not as involved in the work of Development and Peace as they wanted to be. Realizing that the scope of this proposed seminar was too large for one project, in March 1978 the Executive Committee decided that there would be two concurrent, but connected activities: a study to revise the CCODP constitution and a national consultation/seminar to decide the future orientations of Development and Peace.

**Constitutional Overhaul and Challenges**

To revise the existing constitution (which consisted of two documents: the original Letters Patent from 1968 and the General By-Laws that were last amended in 1974), a special nine-member committee was created that included four members of the Board of Governors representing each of the four regions of the country— President of the Board Jacqueline Guyette (Nova Scotia); Vice-President Father Roger Poirier (Quebec); Robert O’Neill (Ontario); and Edward Zerr (Saskatchewan)—two delegates from the CCCB who were not serving as governors (Archbishop Joseph-Aurele Plourde of Ottawa and Bishop William E. Power of Antigonish); and three members of the general management (Executive Director Jacques
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Champagne, Associate Executive Director Tom Johnston and Assistant Executive Director Robert Morin).\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 18-19 November 1978, 10.} This “constitution committee” was given an broad mandate to review membership in CCODP; structures of the organization (diocesan sections, regional teams, grassroots sections, etc.); links to local diocesan churches (which was of particular importance to the CCCB\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 9 & 10 June 1978, 9.}); possible regrouping of diocesan and regional sections; structure of the Board of Governors; level of participation by members; location of the different offices; and the power and structure of the general management.\footnote{Ibid., “Revision of the Constitution,” 81-82.} Importantly, the constitution committee was instructed to review certain aspects of the constitution, but “not remake it.”\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 9 March 1979, 13.}

The committee met on nine occasions from 16 December 1978 through 6 October 1979. Their guiding principles for approaching each area of their mandate were “Development and Peace as a Church movement; participation; accountability; flexibility and unity.”\footnote{ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 10-11 November 1979, “Report: Constitution Committee,” 147.} To aid them in their project, the committee consulted the historical documents of CCODP; the results of the “long questionnaire” from the National Consultation held during that same year; and the constitutions of similar organizations.\footnote{The organizations studied included: the Catholic Women’s League, Canadian Save the Children Fund, Oxfam, Canadian University Service Overseas (CUSO), UNICEF, and the Primate World Relief Fund (of the Anglican Church of Canada). Ibid., 159.} The final report was submitted to the Board of Governors in November 1979.\footnote{Ibid., “Report: Constitution Committee,” 146-164 .} The governors were given several months (until March 1980) to review and discuss the report with their constituents. Copies of the final report were also sent to diocesan sections seeking their feedback.\footnote{Ibid., 24.}
On 15-16 March 1980 the full Board of Governors reconvened for a special two-day meeting to review the final report of the constitution committee in detail. Twenty submissions on the proposed constitutional changes from diocesan and provincial committees were also considered. Most of the committee’s recommendations were readily approved by the Board of Governors. Yet three proposals drew considerable attention: criteria for membership, role of local groups, and relations with the local bishop. Among these items, the discussion was usually more over wording than principle.

Surprisingly, conditions for membership in Development and Peace were never defined in the existing General By-Laws. The constitution committee recommended that to be a member of CCODP one must “accept the Gospel of Jesus Christ as proclaimed by the Catholic Church and accept the aims and objectives as stated in the Letters Patent, Statues and By-Laws.” Any person who accepted these two tenets was a “member,” whereas those who only accepted the aims and objectives of the organization (essentially, a non-Catholic) was an “associate member” and could not hold office in the organization. Some governors found this new article too restrictive in that it would not permit individuals of other faiths or no faith to join. In response to this concern, it was pointed out that Development and Peace was a movement of the Catholic Church. It was also noted that non-Catholics could become associate members and were still able to work at CCODP. After much discussion, the proposed article was approved with the addition of a third condition for membership, “make a

162 Ibid.
164 Ibid., 223-224.
commitment to take an active part in the activities and programs of Development and Peace."\textsuperscript{1165}

The second issue of importance concerned officially recognizing local groups of Development and Peace, which constituted a vital component of the organization but were absent from the existing By-Laws.\textsuperscript{1166} The constitution committee defined these grassroots sections of CCODP as “within a territory of each diocese, there could be a number of local groups...based on natural groupings of peoples, i.e., pastoral groups, regions, communities (cities, towns, villages). The function of the local groups will be: to implement objectives of the organization at the local level; to elect representatives to the Diocesan Council; to participate in the activities and programmes of the Diocesan Council....”\textsuperscript{1167} The governors all agreed that local groups strengthened the outreach of the organization and made it easier for members to participate beyond the diocesan council, provincial meetings, or the national Board of Governors.\textsuperscript{1168} The governors supported this proposal and added an important function to the local groups, “to accept individuals who wish to become members.”\textsuperscript{1169} These local groups had no minimum size as the governors felt that each section should have the flexibility to adapt to its own unique regional situation.\textsuperscript{1170}

Finally, the governors spent a good deal of time discussing the relationship between CCODP and the local bishops. Since the constitution committee had not addressed this point

\textsuperscript{1165} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1167} ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 10-11 November 1979, “Report: Constitution Committee,” 149.
\textsuperscript{1169} Ibid., 226.
\textsuperscript{1170} Ibid.
directly, the governors drafted a new article to cover the entire pastoral dimension of the bishop’s role in the organization:

1. The local bishop is in solidarity with the action of Development and Peace in his diocese, as part of his pastoral mission.
2. He expresses his solidarity with the members of Development and Peace through dynamic relations with the Diocesan Council.
3. He supports the activities of the Diocesan Council. He also collaborates by participating in preliminary consultation before members are named to positions of major responsibility on the Diocesan Council and on the Board of Governors.1171

These suggestions (on membership, local groups and bishops, along with several other minor adjustments) were turned over to a small ad hoc committee that prepared a formal proposal for the future constitution.1172 This committee met with a legal advisor who reviewed the wording of the language and further altered the ordering of the document.1173

At the June 1980 Board of Governors meeting, a large part of the gathering was set aside for workshops to review the revised draft of the proposed constitution. The board supported the document and made only minor changes to the wording of a few articles. Specifically, the term “Board of Governors” was officially changed to “National Council” and “governors” were now known as “members of the National Council.”1174 Pleased with the document, the board unanimously declared that the final version of the constitution was ready to be voted upon at the National Council meeting in November 1980.1175

At the November 1980 meeting, before voting on the proposed constitution, the governors resolved two additional questions that had arisen during the constitution review

1174 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors,” 7-8 June 1980, 54.
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process. Ed Hudek, the President of the Board, had asked the governors to also consider the role of Ukrainian Catholics within CCODP (who were part of the Catholic Church and their bishops were involved in the creation of CCODP, but until now were not included in present structures). The National Council decided that no special representation was required for Ukrainian Catholics since it was possible for them to participate in the existing mechanisms (also they feared setting a precedent for all ethnic groups to qualify for special provisions).

Also, the Toronto section had requested that Ontario have an additional governor given its increased Catholic population. The National Council agreed that Catholic population in Ontario had indeed increased, but felt that the increase was not sufficient enough to warrant any additional governors (which had remained at twenty-one since the founding of CCODP). With these issues resolved, the board moved through a final review of each proposed amendment.

In reviewing the wording of proposed Statue #4, which stated that “The Head Office of the organization is in the city of Montreal, Canada,” G. Emmett Cardinal Carter (Archbishop of Toronto and governor-bishop for English Canada) surprised the board by challenging this article. Cardinal Carter indicated that, although he did not have a clear mandate from the Bishops, he was aware of “a certain malaise” that existed among a large number of them with regard to the location of the head office and that there was a need to examine and clarify the issue. He quoted the section from the founding document of CCODP (the original proposal for a “National Fund to help underdeveloped countries” from 13 October 1966) that

1176 ACCODP, “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting,” 9 November 1979, 22.
1180 Ibid., 17-18.
stated given the bilingual and bi-cultural characteristics which the organization, it was desirable that the official centre should be in Ottawa. Concerned that the proposed Statutes (which located the head office in Montreal) seemed to contradict the founding documents of the organization (which placed the office in Ottawa), Cardinal Carter proposed deferring this specific article of the constitution for one year so that the question could be studied further by the bishops and members of the organization.

While Carter’s stated objection to the board of governors was over the consistency of the new constitution to the founding documents, the real issue was over the orientation of Development and Peace. While Development and Peace and Cardinal Carter both had the same goal of eliminating global poverty and injustice, their respective visions of how to achieve this goal were not always in unison. According to Tony Clarke, who worked with Carter as a staff member of the social affairs department of the CCCB, Carter never felt comfortable with the post-Vatican II mandate for justice and social transformation. “He was still operating out of the church’s traditional charity model of giving alms to the poor. Nor, it would seem, did he fully accept the view that the economic system that creates affluence is the same system that creates poverty.” Moving amongst the rich and powerful from a privileged position, Carter wanted the Church to serve from above, not from below. For Development and Peace, however, it had long since moved away from the charity model to a deep concern for justice. After François Houtart gave his keynote speech, “Underdevelopment: An Induced Phenomenon,” at the influential 1975 seminar, Development and Peace has approached the problems of the Third World as being the deliberate result of Western economic domination. For CCODP, Christians
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were not only required to give water to the thirsty, clothe the naked and feed the hungry, but to work for structural change. Thus, Carter subscribed to a “charity” model of giving from our abundance to help the poor, whereas CCODP advocated a “transformational” model that supported radical changes in social structures to affect social justice.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 212.}

For Cardinal Carter, the problem with Development and Peace was with its French Sector. Throughout the 1970s, the French Sector was collaborating with secular social groups (trade unions, community organizers, secular NGOs, etc.), which it saw as the opening of Development and Peace to all people of goodwill in the spirit of Catholic social teaching since John XXIII’s \textit{Pacem in Terris} from 1963. Cardinal Carter, however, saw these associations of Development and Peace being invaded by non-Catholics.\footnote{Fabien Leboeuf, interview with the author, 20 April 2012.} In a confidential memorandum to the CCCB three months before the November vote on the constitution, Carter reported to his brother bishops that Development and Peace had “a definite leftist trend” and that it was relying too heavily on liberation theology and Marxism.\footnote{ACCCB, “Confidential Memorandum” from Cardinal G.E. Carter, 18 August 1980, 7.} For Carter, the danger of liberation theology was its reliance on a Marxist-based ideas of class struggle. In 1977 he warned, “If ever there was a stark opposition, Jesus and Marx are it: both are insisting on community, but [Marxism] is a community of hatred, contestation, opposition, and total materialism...Jesus said, ‘Love thy neighbour.’”\footnote{Quoted in Higgins and Letson, \textit{My Father’s Business}, 208.} Carter was convinced that Marxism (and its derivative strains found in liberation theology) was ultimately pledged to conflict and, as a result, was irreconcilable with the type of integral humanism espoused by Catholicism. Carter attributed this left-wing slant in CCODP to the Québécois influence, in particular the fact that the majority of the senior management and staff of Development and Peace were from Quebec. Furthermore, he was also
concerned about influential Francophone governors “who had strong ideological views...not exactly in accordance with the basic tenants of Catholic social justice. At the very least it has caused a proliferation of a certain type of activist mentality which looks with suspicion on the Institutional Church and with favour upon anything which seems to be more to the left.”

As evidence of this “leftist trend” within CCODP, Carter cites a revealing section of the National Consultation of 1979 that asked various groups: “Before you were involved with Development and Peace, did you feel that the social dimension of the Christian message raised worthwhile solutions to the problem of underdevelopment? Now that you know the Organization, do you feel this so?” Of the French-speaking staff, meaning all those who were working directly with CCODP as paid employees, only 26.7 per cent believed that the social dimension of the Christian message raised worthwhile solutions. After their contact with CCODP, the proportion rose but only to 56.2 per cent. In contrast, the English-speaking staff showed a 50 per cent response to the first question and 100 per cent as to their present attitude. For Carter, this statistic was the most devastating part of the report. “In a word, the people who went to work for CCODP on the French side, this is the overwhelming number, were only one in four convinced that the social dimension of the Christian message was of any use to the problem of underdevelopment. Even today we have slightly over 50 per cent of the people working for us who have that conviction.” He concluded his report to his brother bishops that “there is something very wrong in this whole situation...CCODP did not evolve as was planned.” To rectify this problem, Carter believed that the head office needed to be
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moved from Montreal to Ottawa; away from the dangerous Québécois influence to the careful watch of the Canadian bishops’ conference.\textsuperscript{1195}

Cardinal Carter’s proposal over the location of the head office was openly challenged by the Francophone bishop on the Board of Governors, Bernard Hubert of St. Jerome, Quebec.\textsuperscript{1196} Bishop Hubert stated that while he shared Carter’s view that there was “a certain malaise” among some bishops, he felt that this issue should be resolved through discussions at a general meeting of the CCCB, not through the new CCODP constitution.\textsuperscript{1197} Thus, Hubert emphasized to the governors the bishops’ wish that CCODP be an autonomous body and, as such, he felt that the decision over the location of the head office should be made by the CCODP Board of Governors (not by the CCCB).\textsuperscript{1198} He concluded his remarks by alluding to the unpleasant political undertones which such a decision to move the head office to Ottawa could have in the province of Quebec (especially after the failed 1980 referendum over the succession of Quebec from Canada).\textsuperscript{1199}

During the ensuing discussion by the governors over Carter’s proposal, it was noted that the location of head office had been included in the National Consultation and that the majority had indicated that the office should remain in Montreal.\textsuperscript{1200} Moreover, it was pointed out that three bishops had attended the special meeting on the constitution that was held in March 1980 and this issue was never raised by any of them. Finally, the governors worried about the legal difficulties of implementing the other Statutes and Internal By-Laws while the location of the head office was held in abeyance.\textsuperscript{1201} Thus, when Cardinal Carter’s proposal to have the
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location of the head office to be held in abeyance for one year came to vote among the Board of Governors, it was defeated five for and sixteen against.\textsuperscript{1202}

Since the majority of governors wanted to show goodwill towards the bishops on this issue of the head office, a letter was sent to the CCCB inviting the bishops to offer their opinion on the matter.\textsuperscript{1203} The Executive members of the CCCB discussed the issue and wrote back to Development and Peace that “Archbishop Joseph MacNeil [of Edmonton, President of the CCCB] questions whether such procedure [moving the head office to Ottawa] would be beneficial to either of our organizations at this time.”\textsuperscript{1204} Thus, the CCCB made no formal objection to the head office being in Montreal and the issue was considered resolved.

Despite Carter’s reservations concerning the orientation of CCODP, he remained persuaded that its goals were fundamentally good and that the organization must continue to be supported by the Canadian hierarchy.\textsuperscript{1205} But, he also believed that any attempts at restructuring Development and Peace would be impossible since the Quebec hold on the organization was too great.\textsuperscript{1206} Thus, Carter decided to correct CCODP’s excesses to the degree that he was allowed, by complementing its social justice labours with more conventional pastoral activity. Thus, in May 1982, Cardinal Carter publicly announced that the Archdiocese of Toronto would drastically reduce its annual contribution to CCODP and these funds would be re-allocated to a new Toronto Pastoral Missionary Council. This new initiative would fund more traditional catechetical and pastoral projects in the developing world. By shifting his diocese’s financial priorities away from Development and Peace that supported radical changes in socio-economic
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structures, Cardinal Carter was sending notice that he believed that Catholic international development should be principally engaged in evangelization and not socio-economic projects.

After a lengthy discussion amongst the Board of Governors, a letter was sent to Cardinal Carter. Interestingly, this letter never asked Carter to reconsider his opinion; it respected his decision and his authority. After all, Development and Peace operated within each diocese at the invitation of the local bishop. There was no tribunal of appeal which could order a reversal of an episcopal decision. Aware of this power balance, the letter was cordial (congratulating the Cardinal on the new initiative) and expressed a desire for close cooperation between Development and Peace and the new Missionary Council. The letter continued to address two key points that were of particular importance to Development and Peace. First, in Cardinal Carter’s announcement there was an implicit criticism that in prioritizing socio-economic projects, CCODP had abandoned its original mandate of proclaiming the Gospel. The letter rebutted this charge by making clear that socio-economic development, as distinct from evangelization, was the founding purpose of Development and Peace and that this was not a new orientation. Second, the letter articulated the financial repercussions resulting from his decision coming at end of the fiscal year without any warning. Specifically, the amount of the Share Lent 1982 campaign had been budgeted in June 1981 and that, as a result, the amount had already been committed to projects. Thus, for the first time in its history, Development and Peace had an operating deficit of $452,998.

In addition to the letter from CCODP to Cardinal Carter, the two bishops on the Board of Governors (Paul J. O’Byrne of Calgary and Gérard Drainville of Amos in northern Quebec) sent
their own letter to the Executive Committee of the CCCB expressing the “deep hurt” which this action has caused CCODP and expressing the concerns that the Board of Governors had over Carter’s action setting an example for other dioceses to also reduce from CCODP.  

Ultimately, these fears of other dioceses withholding funds from the Share Lent campaign proved to be unfounded. Instead, Development and Peace received notes of strong support from Canadian bishops—English and French-speaking—from across Canada. While encouraged by these gestures of episcopal support, in effort to avoid future public demonstrations of division, Development and Peace and the Canadian bishops’ conference both agreed that the executives of both organizations should have a scheduled face-to-face meeting once-a-year to discuss their ongoing relationship.

The only other constitutional article that garnered serious discussion at the November 1980 Board of Governors meeting covered the relationships with the local bishop. The first part of the proposed text was deemed too awkward and was sent to a special committee to review. The text that was drafted during the March 1980 special meeting was reworded to read: “The local Bishop, by virtue of his pastoral mission, shares in the objectives of Development and Peace. Whenever possible, he promotes the action of Development and Peace within his Diocese.” With each article passing a final review, the Board of Governors unanimously voted to replace the existing By-Laws of CCODP with the proposed Statutes and Internal By-Laws. The new constitution was approved by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and took effect on 11 February 1981. During the annual plenary assembly of

---
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the CCCB from 26-30 October 1981, the Canadian bishops passed a motion expressing “their satisfaction with the results of the revision of the constitution.” The bishops also passed a series of resolutions at their assembly that encouraged each bishop to pursue an active and healthy relationship with CCODP in their dioceses. In accepting the constitution of Development and Peace, the CCCB reaffirmed the autonomy of the organization, even in the wake of Cardinal Carter’s concerns over CCODP’s orientation.

From the Grassroots on Up: National Consultation

Parallel to the revision of its constitution, Development and Peace also sought to define how it was going to chart its course for the next ten years. In order to do this for the first time in its history CCODP proposed uniting all the different levels of the organization (secretariat, governors, sections, bishops, donors, etc.), as well as Third World partners, for the purpose of “reflection, confrontation and pooling of resources...[to] bring about the revitalization of the organization and steer it towards a new stage.” This seminar sought to achieve “a collective comprehension and a coherent connection of the goals, orientations and policies of Development and Peace” as it moved into the 1980s. Originally the project proposed a series of consultations with the diocesan sections, the CCCB, personnel of both linguistic sectors, and the Board of Governors. The results of these broad consultations would be consolidated into working documents that would be discussed at a culminating orientation seminar in September 1979. Envisioned as “an encore” to the highly successful 1975 seminar, the 1979 seminar
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would go a step further by producing specific recommendations for the future of the organization.\(^{1221}\)

During the process of the initial consultations with several diocesan sections and CCODP personnel in April and May 1978, the dimensions of the orientation seminar began to change. The initial reports that came back to the Executive Committee raised important issues, such as the effectiveness of educational campaigns and need to “answer to pressures and tensions coming from the people at the base in regard to the structure of the organization.”\(^{1222}\) Based on these preliminary consultations, the Executive Committee concluded that this project should be more than just a one-time seminar; rather it “should be first and foremost an operation in education touching in priority and as widely as possible all those who, in the Church, are concerned with the work of the organization.”\(^{1223}\) Agreeing that the emphasis had to be placed on discussion at the grass roots level in the local groups and diocesan sections, the Board of Governors resolved that the “consultation would be much more important than the holding of the seminar itself” and the plans for the culminating conference were abandoned.\(^{1224}\)

In November 1978, the Board of Directors adopted a revised project for a National Consultation instead of an Orientation Seminar.\(^{1225}\) A national “consultation committee” was formed that was comprised of eleven people: two governors, President of the Board Jacqueline Guyette (Nova Scotia) and Pierre Dupras (Quebec); two delegates from the CCCB, Rev. Dennis Murphy (Anglophone General Secretary of the CCCB) and Rev. Guy Poisson, who was replaced mid-way through the consultation by Rev. André Vallée (both served as successive
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Francophone General Secretaries of the CCCB); two representatives from the diocesan sections (Wilf Borostede of Edmonton and Germain Tardif of Quebec City); one member of the Priests’ Senate (Rev. Roy Carey); one representative from *Entraide Missionnaire* (Rev. Aubert Bertrand); and three representatives from the National Secretariate (Associate Executive Director and Director of the English Sector Tom Johnston; Director of the French Sector Fr. Denis Thibeault; and Assistant Executive Director and Personnel Director Robert Morin).  

This committee was assigned to create a questionnaire, seeing that it reached the broadest audience possible, analyzing the results, and making recommendations to the Board of Governors. To ensure that this consultation was done to highest standards, the committee hired the specialists at the “Centre de sondage de l’Université de Montréal” to assist as each stage of the consultation.  

The consultation committee met seven times from 17 December 1978 to 26 October 1979. Initially, to aid the committee in its work, all diocesan sections and all Canadian bishops were informed of the undertaking and they were invited to submit questions they wanted taken up during the consultation. The committee also prepared a sample questionnaire that was sent to forty-five people across Canada as a preliminary test. Based on the comments and suggestions received from the sections, the bishops and the preliminary tests, the members of the committee finalized a “long questionnaire” that was sent to 13,414 people across Canada (of which 1,287, or 9.6 per cent, were returned). Since this twenty-page version of the questionnaire had 138 questions on twelve topics related to Development and Peace, which
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would take an estimated two hours to complete, participants were invited to fill out the answers in collective consultation.\textsuperscript{1230} In addition, 2,000 “short questionnaires” were sent to the public and donors in general (of which 224, or 12.2 per cent, were received).\textsuperscript{1231} Finally, 317 letters with open questions were sent to partners in Canada and the Third World allowing more freedom to express their opinions (of which 115 replied).\textsuperscript{1232}

At the June 1980 Board of Governors meeting, the National Consultation committee presented its final report, known as the “Dupras Report” since Pierre Dupras served as the president of committee. In general, the results of the National Consultation supported the founding vision of Development and Peace and what the members, directors and collaborators had done up to that point. Specifically, the respondents commended the fundamental objectives, grass roots structures, priorities and orientations, and essential characteristics of Development and Peace.\textsuperscript{1233} Equally critical, the results of the consultation made clear that the organization was not perfect and certain changes needed to be made. To rectify these problems, the Dupras Report made concrete recommendations for future action in ten areas: participation in CCODP; membership and structures; education of the Canadian public about development; impact of CCODP; work in the Third World; work in Canada; social and political involvement; Christian character of CCODP; cooperation with other organizations; and sources of income.\textsuperscript{1234}

Copies of the Dupras Report were forwarded to all diocesan sections and groups of CCODP, who were invited to study the report and submit their reactions back to Board of
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Governors by the end of 1980. To study the consultation report in greater detail, the governors divided themselves into two equal committees, who met in special study sessions to review relevant sections of the report and the responses from the local groups. The first study committee, “solidarity with the Third World and financial aid to development,” met on 12–14 March 1981 to review project policy, partnership, the assistance dimension, aid to projects in Canada, financial aspects, and other related questions such as collaboration with other organizations. The second study committee, “education and its implications in Canada,” met on 28–19 March 1981 to study policies, education tools and activities, the Christian character of the organization, impact, participation, organization, and collaboration with others. Both committees prepared reports. As a follow-up to these meetings, a group of National Council and staff members were chosen to integrate the reports coming from these two meetings into one comprehensive and integrated document.

When the National Council reconvened at its June 1981 meeting, it worked through—and approved—seventeen recommendations from the integrated report. These recommendations can be divided into three broad areas education, international projects, and operations. Recommendations related to education included giving a higher priority to creating and supporting grassroots groups (such as providing adequate training and the proper human and material resources to carry out their work); creating more effective educational tools (which were adapted to the different segments of the public, used more audio-visuals, and were better coordinated with mass media); and continuing to collaborate with other organizations for action
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in Canada, such as the CCCB and PLURA (but only when issues were related to international
development and the Third World).\footnote{1239} Recommendations that dealt with international projects
included promoting partnership with Third World partners based on a common vision of
development (but clarifying its criteria, conditions and methods); reaffirming the priority given
to socio-economic development projects but also focusing on the importance of human rights
projects; and continuing to utilize knowledgeable experts via the Project Selection
Committee.\footnote{1240} Finally, recommendations regarding operations included searching for
additional sources of revenue (as long as these auxiliary sources did not exceed CCODP’s own
contribution) and maintaining CCODP’s existing allocation of resources (a maximum of 8 per
cent for administration, a maximum of 14 per cent for education and a minimum of 78 per cent
for Third World projects).\footnote{1241} The full Integrated Report on the National Consultation and the
approved list of recommendations was sent to all CCODP groups (diocesan councils, sections,
education committees, projects committees, personnel, and the bishops).\footnote{1242}

To implement these recommendations, a series of “Tasks and Studies” were assigned to
the Education Sectors, National Secretariat and/or the Projects Department.\footnote{1243} Of these tasks,
two stand out as most noteworthy. First, a motion was passed that “Development and Peace
should establish mechanisms with the CCCB which would foster ongoing dialogue and
discussion of matters of mutual concern.”\footnote{1244} Apart from the two bishops who served as
Members of the National Council, no regular mechanisms existed (meetings were only called as
needed between the two). In November 1981, the National Council passed a resolution calling
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for a delegation of six representatives from CCODP (two members of the Executive Committee, two members of the National Secretariat and the two bishop members of the National Council) to meet once a year with the Executive of the CCCB.\textsuperscript{1245} After delays due to difficulties in scheduling, the first such meeting was scheduled for Spring 1983.\textsuperscript{1246}

The second noteworthy task was that the National Council passed a motion: “Development and Peace’s objectives and its twofold mandate of education and cooperation with the Third World should be well defined and outlined in a special document dealing solely with policies on education and cooperation.”\textsuperscript{1247} Under the direction of Michel Rousseau, the Assistant Executive Director, a preliminary draft was prepared in consultation with the staff, the Education and Projects Review Committees, the National Council and diocesan councils across the country.\textsuperscript{1248} After a thorough review of the draft was undertaken by the National Council at its June 1982 meeting,\textsuperscript{1249} the final version of the document—entitled “Basic Principles and Orientation”—was unanimously approved by the National Council on 13 November 1982.\textsuperscript{1250} This document represents a comprehensive updating and integration of CCODP’s various policy documents concerning development education and the funding of projects in light of the conclusions of the National Consultation. In other words, this lengthy document is best understood as a summary of how Development and Peace describes itself after fifteen years of experience (its fundamental orientation, policies, activities, structures and operations).\textsuperscript{1251}
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In “Basic Principles and Orientation,” for the first time, the organization defined what exactly it meant by “development.” Going beyond notions of development in terms of international trade or economic growth, development is conceived as:

a process of improving the conditions of life of people and their liberation from all forms of oppression and servitude: a process by which a people in a given social and economic milieu at a particular moment in history transforms its structures of production, establishes new social links, and renews its social, political, economic, cultural and sometimes religious institutions with the intention of altering a better quality of life.\textsuperscript{1252}

CCODP also acknowledged that as an organization, it cannot accomplish this alone, regardless of how many projects it funded. True development will only be achieved by working in partnership with those in the Third World. Left intentionally vague, “partnership” was understood as a goal of more active participation with those in the Third World to arrive at a common analysis of the situation and mutual aid in the action for development.\textsuperscript{1253} The document was clear that this important work undertaken by Development and Peace was being done within the Church and as a part of the Church. It stated that evangelization and development are two indispensable, but distinct aspects of the same mission of the Church. International development, which was entrusted in a specific way to CCODP, was an “integral part” of the Church’s mission and it strove to work “in harmony” with evangelization and pastoral care.\textsuperscript{1254} Equally important to work done internationally, education (transforming the mentalities and attitudes of the Canadian public) was viewed by CCODP as a necessary component for successful development in the Third World. Yet education, to be effective, must result in action at the moral, financial and political levels.\textsuperscript{1255} Being adopted by the National
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Council in November 1982, “Basic Principles and Orientation” represented the capstone to the exhaustive five-year National Consultation.

**Conclusion**

In November 1982, after fifteen years of operating in Canada and internationally as the official international development organization of the Canadian Catholic Church, CCODP finally defined what exactly it meant by “development.” This definition was much broader than sharing technology or providing economic relief in times of emergency. While these small scale efforts were helpful in an immediate way, any real or lasting improvement in the Third World would have to come as the result of systematic political and economic changes. The notion that development was teaching people in the Third World industrialized techniques for better economic output was supplanted by a new awareness that no truly valid development could take place unless it was initiated by the people themselves. From 1977-1982, CCODP funded projects that organized communities of the Third World to push for land reform, democratic government, and respect for basic human rights. Essentially, development meant empowering people to work for structural change. For those individuals who still conceptualized development in the charity model of giving money to the poor (such as Cardinal Carter of Toronto), this new paradigm of development work seemed outside the scope of the spiritual mission of the Catholic Church.

Development not only required structural change, it involved advocacy. During these years, CCODP’s education campaigns grew beyond Share Lent to become a year-round enterprise. The fall campaign was an important pedagogical development because it offered Canadians a way, however small, to act on their new awareness of the fundamental problems in the Third World. This action (in the fall) was in addition to their continued contributions to
projects that addressed the symptoms of underdevelopment (during Lent). While some of the fall campaigns received mixed reviews, such as the 1980 fall campaign on militarization, by 1982 the Director of the English Sector, Michael Flynn, concluded that these new fall actions had “made an important contribution to the life of CCODP across Canada. The specific goals of the program have strengthened Diocesan Councils in their vision of the organization’s role in the education of Canadian public opinion.”

Most importantly, these fall campaigns served as an impetus to create a year-round presence of CCODP in dioceses.

This definition of development was articulated in “Basic Principles and Orientation,” which was the end product of an extensive five-year national consultation of all the various components of Development and Peace: governors, bishops, CCODP personnel, diocesan councils, local sections, ecumenical collaborators, the general public and partners in the Third World. Articulating a notion of development was only one of the dozens of areas studied in this consultation, which included such topics as: membership, the structural links within the organization (the interaction between local, diocesan, provincial and national sections); the relationship with local Church; education programming and operations in the Third World. This remarkable process demonstrated the great lengths that the organization went to, during 1977-1982, to ensure that all stakeholders in the organization were able to participate in the planning, administration, and evaluation of the work of Development and Peace as it moved forward. Parallel to this consultation, in 1981 Development and Peace adopted a new constitution that resolved lingering questions of membership, the role of the local group, and its relationship with local bishops.

---

While CCODP’s definition of development was in line with post-Vatican II Catholic social teaching that presented poverty as a product of oppression and development as a liberation process (Gaudium et Spes, Populorum Progressio and “Justice in the World”), it unearthed fundamental theological rifts within the Catholic Church (both locally in Canada and throughout the Church universal). While Christians were affirmed in their engagement in the liberation struggle by the Latin American Episcopal Conferences at Medellín (1968) and Puebla (1979), Josef Cardinal Ratzinger, as head of the Vatican congregation in charge of doctrinal orthodoxy, issued documents in 1984 and 1986 that were extremely critical of many aspects of liberation theology.\footnote{1257} These same tensions existed with the Canadian Church. Several Canadian bishops, most notably Remi de Roo of Victoria, and Adolphe Proulx of Gatineau-Hull\footnote{1258} supported the ideals of liberation whereas G. Emmet Cardinal Carter (Archbishop of Toronto) believed that the Church’s role in the Third World should be less socio-political and more evangelical. These issues came to a head during the Development and Peace’s constitutional reform in 1980 and again in 1982 when Cardinal Carter reduced his diocese’s contributions to Development and Peace.
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CONCLUSION

Since 1967, the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace (CCODP) has served as the official international development organization of the Catholic Church in Canada. Created by the Canadian bishops as a response to their formative experience at Vatican II (1962-1965), CCODP was given a two-fold mandate: to provide financial support for socio-economic development projects in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, and to educate Canadians about the causes of global inequality and injustice. After fifteen years of experience, dialogue with partners in the Third World, and critical reflection, Development and Peace experienced a substantial change in how it understood its mandate. From 1967 to 1982, Development and Peace was transformed from a seasonal fundraising agency with a paternalistic understanding of economic development into a nationwide democratic movement that facilitated year-round educational campaigns and supported a proactive vision of social, political, economic and cultural development in the Third World.

This dissertation traced Development and Peace’s transformation across three general themes. First, CCODP’s understanding of “development” evolved from economic prosperity to social, political, economic and cultural liberation. During the first several years of operations, funds raised by CCODP were spent on small-scale projects aimed at economic improvement. The paternalistic belief was that people in the Third World were going hungry because they lacked the technology that the industrialized countries like Canada had acquired. As generously as these funds were given, projects were funded without any genuine collaboration with the partners who received the funds. Development and Peace believed that this traditional donor-recipient relationship only perpetuated the dependency of the Third World on the industrialized nations. Attempting to counteract this flawed dynamic, CCODP’s first Executive
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Director Roméo Maione co-authored the “Blankenberge Declaration” in 1972 that proposed a new partnership model that was not only based on money but also the sharing of power. Through such initiatives as the Asian Partnership for Human Development (APHD), local communities were given an equal voice in how international funds were spent in their region. A significant moment in CCODP’s understanding of development was the international seminar that it organized in 1975. From this point forward, the organization adopted the analysis that underdevelopment in the Third World could no longer be explained in terms of a technological gap; rather it was the provoked phenomenon of an unjust international economic system.1260

The more time was invested in dialoguing with Third World partners, the more CCODP came to realize that the small-scale projects they funded could never come close to addressing the problems of underdevelopment or to righting global injustices. It became clear that any real or lasting improvement in the Third World would have to come as the result of profound political and economic change. This was a move from a focus on charity to a deep concern for justice. With this new perspective, Development and Peace articulated new priorities, criteria and policies for the distribution of financial resources.1261 CCODP insisted that projects needed to involve members of the local community to take charge of their own lives, because unless local peoples actively participated in their own development, the pattern of neo-colonialism would continue. Projects also were required to be educational, in that they increased awareness of systematic deficiencies and provided tools and skills to create change. By 1982, after fifteen years of critical reflection, CCODP finally defined what exactly it meant by “development.” Much more profound than sharing technology or providing emergency relief, development was “a process of improving the conditions of life of people and their liberation from all forms of
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oppression and servitude.”

CCODP projects still focused on improving the economic vitality of regions, but priority was given to projects that aimed at building awareness and developing organization at the community level as the first steps towards building the popular movements that could press for structural change.

Second, from 1967-1982, Development and Peace’s educational program moved from promotion to education to action. According to the original proposal in 1966, development education (transforming the mentalities and attitudes of the Canadian public) was viewed by the founding bishops as equally important to the work done internationally. Initially, the organization’s educational activities were limited to promoting the annual Share Lent fundraising campaigns. For example, the first Development and Peace poster for their inaugural Share Lent collection in 1968 stated “Give Them Something to Eat,” beneath the image of a hungry child. Each year, however, the organization devoted an increasing amount of human and financial resources towards this half of the mandate. In 1969, an education department was created for each linguistic sector of Canada that produced materials that presented the various aspects and issues related to development in terms that were easily understandable. These departments convened their own standing committees, composed of experienced educators from the community, to explore new initiatives in raising the consciences of Canadians about their collective responsibility to countries in need. The following year, in 1970, the first animateurs were hired to travel the country developing networks of committed activists at the local level. Moving beyond simply informing the general population of the grave situation in the Third World, these educational programs took the next step of calling for a transformation of social structures that cause poverty and human suffering.

1262 ACCODP, Archives DG, “Basic Principles and Orientations,” (November, 1982), #2.3.
1263 See Appendix 2, Figure 1.
In 1978, the Canadian education program grew beyond the Lenten campaign to become a year-round operation. That year, the first fall solidarity campaign was introduced that not only focused on a particular country but also proposed a collective action, such as mailing cards to political prisoners in South Africa in 1978 or writing letters to grandmothers of disappeared persons in Argentina in 1979. The fall campaigns provided an important pedagogical step of providing people with a concrete way, albeit a small one, to act on their new awareness of the fundamental problems in the Third World. This fall campaign served as an important complement to the successful Lenten solidarity campaign as CCODP was able to establish a year-round presence in the dioceses.

Third, Development and Peace grew from a small fundraising agency in Montreal into a Canada-wide movement. When the Canadian bishops created CCODP, they did not view the work of development and solidarity as theirs alone. Rather, Development and Peace was founded as a “Bishops-Clergy-Lay Association.”\[1264\] Intended to project the image of the Church described in *Lumen Gentium*, Development and Peace was conceived as a project of the entire people of God and as an opportunity for the involvement of the entire community of God’s people. Thus, Development and Peace was administered by nineteen lay persons from all corners of the country and two representatives of the Canadian episcopate. Over its first fifteen years, the governors worked hard to establish local sections of CCODP in each diocese. These local sections were made-up of active volunteers who came together to implement the education campaigns, coordinate the Share Lent fundraising campaign, and submit annual recommendations to the national Board of Governors. Members of the organization were also empowered to guide the policies of CCODP by serving on the project review committees and the education committees. The tipping point that made Development and Peace into a

democratic movement was the National Consultation from 1977-1982. Over five years, Development and Peace conducted an extensive national consultation that surveyed all stakeholders in the organization in order to formulate CCODP’s Basic Principles and Orientation for the future of the organization. By soliciting the advice and opinions of its thousands of members, and adopting their recommendations into policy, Development and Peace had grown beyond being a top-down fundraising agency. After the consultation finished in 1982, members began referring to Development and Peace as a “democratic movement,” as well as an organization or institution. According to long-time staff member of the CCCB, Bernard Daly, Development and Peace was Canada’s “most successful collaboration between bishops and laity.”

While the transformations that occurred within Development and Peace from 1967 to 1982 were celebrated by most members within the organization, CCODP’s new paradigm of development also had its critics. Most notably, Cardinal Emmett Carter of Toronto expressed doubts about CCODP’s fidelity to the social teachings of the Church (to the point of questioning the faith and morals of a sizeable portion of the staff), and he attempted to delay adoption of the constitutional reforms in 1980. Furthermore, in 1982, he publicly reduced his diocese’s sizable contributions to CCODP and used the funds, instead, to create a parallel Canadian Catholic organization in the developing world. At their core, both of these episodes revealed disagreements over different models of Catholic development. For the critics of CCODP, like Cardinal Carter, development was best fulfilled with a charity approach of providing financial

---

1266 Daly, Remembering for Tomorrow, 88.
assistance to the poorest countries. The Church’s role was primarily evangelization and catechesis. Development work that focused on political activism was outside the scope of the spiritual mission of the Catholic Church.

Development and Peace, in contrast, adopted a justice-based perspective in which true development was inextricably linked with social, economic and political justice. Trying to educate people from charity to justice was very difficult partly because giving money was a natural and convenient way of responding to others’ problems and also because adopting a justice approach required a transformation of one’s own view of the world.\textsuperscript{1269} For Development and Peace, however, it wanted to be more than “mere fundraisers” in the Third World. Drawing theological inspiration from post-conciliar Catholic social teaching (\textit{Gaudium et Spes}, \textit{Populorum Progressio}, the Medellín Conference in 1968, and “Justice in the World”), Development and Peace sought to be an active participant in the liberation of the world both in the Third World and within Canada. Operating with this paradigm of development that promoted solidarity, structural change and advocacy, Development and Peace created friction within the Canadian Church from 1967-1982 and it continues to do so. Specifically, over the past several years Development and Peace has been the target of repeated allegations by LifeSiteNews, a pro-life internet group. In 2000, LifeSiteNews publicly attacked Development and Peace for its support of the World March of Women (WMW), an international feminist action movement that worked to eliminate the root causes of poverty and violence against women. LifeSiteNews accused CCODP of supporting the right to abortion and funding groups in the global south that support the right to abortion.\textsuperscript{1270} Similarly, in 2009, LifeSiteNews again alleged that Development and Peace was funding groups that were in opposition to established

\textsuperscript{1269} Ross, 83-84.
Catholic moral teaching on abortion. Both of these situations have caused considerable tension between Development and Peace and some Canadian bishops in recent years.

This dissertation was the first history of Development and Peace, the official international development organization of the Canadian Catholic community, from 1967-1982. The study of faith-based development is a virtually unexplored field. With the United Nations Millennium Summit (2000) and renewed worldwide efforts to combat economic and social inequality in the context of globalization, development has moved up the global agenda. Religious communities, which have long been among the most engaged in the fight against poverty and disease and for education and human rights, are taking on increasingly larger roles. Despite the fact that faith-inspired NGOs like Development and Peace have established themselves as an essential part of global civil society, development professionals in governments and secular NGOs have tended to view religion as marginal—or as divisive or dangerous. In order to help illuminate the little-understood role that religious actors play in global development, much more work needs to be done on international faith-based organizations. For example, there are no historical accounts of Development and Peace’s fellow (and much larger) Catholic development agencies, such as Catholic Relief Services (United States), Comite Catholique contre le Faim et pour le Développement (France), or Misereor (Germany). These Catholic agencies do not always act as a unified whole. For instance, the “Group of Four” was originally formed in the 1970s as some Catholic members of CIDSE were frustrated by the type of development that was promoted by other members. Each agency presents its own unique theological orientation and organizational structures to accomplish its common objective. Studies are also waiting to be done on other religious NGOs such as World

Vision (Christian), Aga Khan Development Network (Muslim), or any of the mainline Protestant Churches in Canada.

Being such a large and complex organization, there remains many areas of CCODP history that await exploration. Specifically, my point of entry into this organization was at the national level relying primarily on the documentation produced by the democratically elected Board of Governors, the ultimate decision-making body within the organization. Future scholars may wish to do a closer investigation of the activities of Development and Peace at the provincial, diocesan and/or parish level(s). Also, scholars may wish to explore in greater detail the contribution of Development and Peace to the dozen or so Canadian interchurch coalitions that were created during the 1970s and were only briefly discussed in this dissertation such as PLURA, The Interchurch Fund for International Development, etc. These faith-based national social justice collaborations were a distinctly Canadian contribution to the social justice movement and their story remains largely untold.¹²⁷²

¹²⁷² The only scholarly work on these coalitions is: Christopher Lind and Joseph Mihevc, eds., Coalitions for Justice: the Story of Canada's Interchurch Coalitions (Ottawa: Novalis, 1994). Each chapter is a first-hand account from a member of each coalition. This volume is a solid beginning, but much more work remains to be done.
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APPENDIX 2: ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1
Logo from the Pastoral Animation Centre at Expo’67 that was adopted by CCODP

Figure 2
The Expo ’67 Symbol
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Figure 3

Poster from Share Lent 1968[^1276]

Figure 4
Poster from Share Lent 1969\textsuperscript{1277}

\textsuperscript{1277} ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, “1969.”
Figure 5

Poster from Share Lent 1970\textsuperscript{1278}

\textsuperscript{1278} ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, “1970.”
Figure 6
Poster from Share Lent 1971

Figure 7

Poster from Share Lent 1972 (French Sector)\textsuperscript{1280}

\textsuperscript{1280} ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, “1972.”
Figure 8
Poster from Share Lent 1973 (French Sector)

\[\text{aut pas lâcher}\]

Partout dans le monde y a des injustices sociales
Y a du monde odieux qui luttant pour s’en sortir
De a besoin de tout le monde pour en venir à bout

\[\text{ons’en sortira pas tout seuls!}\]

Dimanche, le ler avril, contribuez à
DEVELOPPEMENT ET PAIX
Un programme de solidarité qui apporte prévena-
tement plus de 350 projets de développement com-
munautaire dans 51 pays en voie de développe-
ment.

\[\text{NOUS}\]

\[\text{LE MONDE ORDINAIRE}\]

\[\text{1281 ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, 1973.}\]
Figure 9
Poster from Share Lent 1973 (English Sector)\textsuperscript{1282}

Figure 10

Poster from Share Lent 1974
(from the English Sector, translated into French for bilingual parishes)

1283

Figure 11

Poster from Share Lent 1975 (French Sector)\textsuperscript{1284}

\textsuperscript{1284} ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, 1975.
Figure 12
Poster from Share Lent 1976 (French Sector)\textsuperscript{1285}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig12.jpg}
\caption{Poster from Share Lent 1976 (French Sector).}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{1285} ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, 1976.
Figure 13

Poster from Share Lent 1977 (French Sector)¹²⁸⁶ and Share Lent 1978 (French Sector)¹²⁸⁷

Figure 14

Poster from Share Lent 1979 (French Sector)
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Figure 15
Poster from Share Lent 1980 (French Sector)\textsuperscript{1289}

\textsuperscript{1289} ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, 1980.
Figure 16

Poster from Share Lent 1981 (French Sector)\textsuperscript{1290}

\textsuperscript{1290} ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, 1981.
Figure 17
Poster from Share Lent 1982 (French Sector)\textsuperscript{1291}

\textsuperscript{1291} ACCODP, Archives Education, Share Lent, 1982.
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