



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

---

FAAE • NUMBER 049 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Thursday, June 16, 2005**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Bernard Patry**

All parliamentary publications are available on the  
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

## Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Thursday, June 16, 2005

•(0850)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Order, please.

We have a motion that, in the opinion of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, the government shall demand that the State of Israel be afforded the same rights of any other member nations to participate in the deliberations of all United Nations bodies, and that the chair report the same to the House.

Mr. Day, it's your motion.

**Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to members for consideration of this.

There has been a grievous—we can call it an anomaly, but I believe it's more than that—situation in the United Nations related to Israel. In fact, for over 50 years Israel has been excluded from sitting on a number of—and, in fact, most—United Nations bodies.

This is the reason. Any country that is going to have membership in any of the number of UN bodies, even the rotating memberships, has to be in a regional group of countries. Israel should be in a regional group that includes the other Arab countries of the Middle East. Consistently, the members of that regional group, non-democratic countries, vote against it. In fact, they bar or ban Israel, which is bizarre, from sitting on that particular group.

On May 30, 2000, what happened is that another regional group called the Western European and Others Group, WEOG, voted to temporarily—and this is the key point, temporarily—accept membership from Israel within their regional group. Because that has been temporary, the discrimination against one of the few democracies in the Middle East, which of course is Israel, has continued.

As a matter of fact, that status means Israel is not allowed to present its candidacy for open seats in any UN body. Israel is not allowed to compete for major United Nations bodies itself. For instance, Israel cannot even compete to sit on the UN Economic and Social Council. Israel's representatives are not even allowed to run for positions on the United Nations council, and besides those restrictions, Israel is only allowed to participate on a temporary basis in the WEOG in the New York office itself of the United Nations. Israel is actually excluded from its regional group discussions and consultations at the United Nations offices in Geneva, in Nairobi, in Rome, in Vienna. Israel is not allowed to participate, which is bizarre, and it is because of being voted against primarily by non-

democratic nations. Israel can't even participate in the United Nations talks on human rights, racism, and other important issues handled in those offices.

That's why, Mr. Chair, I'm simply asking that this committee state that in the opinion of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, the government should demand that the State of Israel be afforded the same right as any other member nation to participate in the deliberation of all United Nations bodies, and that this chair report hopefully the agreement of that, in this committee, and that we report back to the House.

**The Chair:** Are there any comments?

Madame Lalonde.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** We had quite a lengthy debate on this issue. I clearly recall the Committee requesting that the motion be redrafted so as to clearly state.

It has come to my attention that the Israeli ambassador to the United Nations was appointed vice president of the United Nations' General Assembly. I am sure that Stockwell has followed this development. It was in the *Ha'aretz* newspaper either yesterday or the day before.

[English]

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** As you know, I've had this motion before our committee for a number of weeks. There was an occasion when I wasn't here and so it was passed...and then our committee business has kept us from addressing this earlier.

As a matter of fact, as a committee, because we had this on the table, we were actually ahead of the curve and ahead of the discussion...even from the United Nations. Just last week, with some actions proposed and taken by the United States, a similar type of action was taken at the UN, so we're on record as being ahead of them at the United Nations, because this motion has been on the table for a number of weeks here in Canada.

But in fact, they've already moved on it. They did that just last week. That's why you saw some designations as late as last week. But if anything, it gives more force to our motion, that we should be seen as agreeing and making sure that our government, now that the United Nations appears to be moving on this.... I'm not anticipating our government to be resistant at this point, but I'm asking that we make the statement here—now it is a supportive statement—that the State of Israel simply be afforded the same right as any other member nation to participate in the deliberation of all UN bodies.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Lalonde.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Perhaps Mr. Day did not hear what was said, but when we debated the issue a couple of days ago, the Committee asked him to clarify what he was referring to. To my knowledge regional groups are not official United Nations' bodies. They are informal or voluntary associations.

In addition, the motion refers to "the same right of any other member nation to participate in the deliberations of all United Nations bodies". I would like to know from which United Nations bodies Israel is excluded. As I have just said, the Israeli ambassador to the United Nations has been elected vice-president of the UN General Assembly. This does not seem to suggest that Israel's rights are being trampled. I would like to know exactly which organizations we are referring to here. The entire Committee requested that the motion be clarified. I was expecting Mr. Day to table a motion specifying the bodies in question.

• (0855)

[English]

**The Chair:** Alexa McDonough.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** I'm just reading this motion, listening to what Mr. Day has said, and trying to get my head around the notion of doing UN reform on the fly by the seat of our pants. I think there are issues, for sure, of UN reform we need to be addressing. I think some of them will probably come up in the context of the IPS, but I'm wondering, particularly given that we're not going to be meeting as a committee over the next couple of months, whether we might come to an agreement that there are serious issues here and that this addresses one of them.

But it raises in my mind questions about whether there are arbitrary exclusions of other countries, in fact or in practice, because of similar processes. I'm wondering if we might as a committee come to a decision to ask the staff if they would bring back, basically, a research paper that we could look at to see this question in the larger context of UN reform.

I personally would be voting in ignorance of the question of whether there are many arbitrary exclusions as a practical matter because of regional tensions and divisions in various parts of the world. So we might be addressing what has happened in practice; in the case of Israel, from what Stockwell has said this morning, perhaps that situation has in fact been addressed at the UN. I just would feel a lot more comfortable about it, frankly, if I had more background and a broader picture of the situation of exclusion and inclusion of other countries as well.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. McTeague.

**Hon. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Scarborough East, Lib.):** I was shocked to learn, as I am sure you were, this morning that a young Canadian had been killed in Cambodia. We have just received confirmation. I was giving a series of interviews. I would like to apologise, Mr. Chair and Mr. Day, for being so late.

[English]

for being so late.

*Deux ans. En tout cas...*

This motion has been here for some time, Mr. Day; that's why I'm going to read it. It's been some time since I actually put my mind to it, but I did refresh it when you suggested the other day that you would want this raised this morning.

Your motion, actually, is a demand.

I should point out it's already Canadian policy that Israel is able to exercise its full rights as a member state of the United Nations. We've spoken in favour of Israeli participation as a country at all international fora on a number of occasions. It doesn't, in my view, make a lot of sense to "demand", as your motion reads, Mr. Day, something we already support and something Israel already currently enjoys.

I should put out something here as background. In 2000, because Israel was not able to seek election to UN bodies within something called the "Asian Group" due to opposition from Arab and Islamic states, Israel sought to reach an agreement with the members from western Europe and other groups that permitted it to become a member of that group for a period of four years and to seek election to UN bodies on the agreed basis with the other members of the group. Israel was to continue to seek entry into its natural regional group, which of course was the Asian Group. Israeli candidates have been elected to a number of UN bodies with Canadian support.

Just so you'll know, we supported the renewal of this agreement in May 2004—so about a year ago—for a further four-year period, and this was agreed to. During the last few years Canada has also supported Israel's participation in a number of informal consultative groups in UN bodies in centres such as New York, as Madame Lalonde has pointed out, and in Geneva, in order to enhance their ability to participate effectively in the work of the United Nations.

I therefore will not be supporting this motion.

**The Chair:** Ms. Phinney.

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** I'm just wondering if Mr. Day would agree to an amendment that would just soften the wording a little bit, to say, rather than "demand", that we support the stand of the Canadian government, the policies that the government has...[*Technical difficulty—Editor*]...since it's already the Canadian government policy.

• (0900)

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** How about "should demand to reaffirm"?

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Yes, "reaffirm" would be fine.

**The Chair:** Mr. Day, you say "the government should demand", but who do we make the demand to?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** The United Nations.

**The Chair:** It's not clear.

I always try to get a consensus. If we say, instead of "the government", "That this committee reaffirm that the State of Israel should be granted the same", because the committee would like to get the State of Israel to be reaffirmed with the same rights as any other... Mention "to participate in the deliberation of all United Nations bodies", something like that, but to ask our government to do it.... The parliamentary secretary says it's already done.

Mr. Day, do you have any other comments?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** First, to Mr. McTeague—and I appreciate he wasn't here, for the stated reasons, at the start—I did cover the history. You have affirmed what I covered, and you did mention that Canada has spoken about Israel being allowed full participation in the New York office of the UN. There are still restrictions related to Israel participating in Geneva, Nairobi, Rome, and Vienna.

Also, to Madame Lalonde, I addressed that in my initial remarks, maybe not to your satisfaction, but I have come back with areas of restriction Israel still has to live with, and Mr. McTeague has somewhat acknowledged that.

If Ms. Phinney is proposing a motion, the only reason I would suggest any reluctance.... I have no reluctance to take Mr. McTeague at his word, so I would say I'm open to that amendment, but on a slight cautionary note, I would want to see on record.... I'm going to take him at his word on this because I want to see this move forward. Obviously, if in checking the record we see it shows that Canada has not been asking for Israel's full participation, then I would have to be back with some kind of motion to acknowledge that.

Can I hear from Ms. Phinney again what her suggestion was for an amendment here?

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** That...*[Technical difficulty—Editor]*

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Just take off the word “should”... “demand and reaffirm”.

Sorry, go ahead.

**The Chair:** That the government should reflect strongly, or reaffirm, or something like that.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Just a moment, he asked me for my comments.

**The Chair:** That's fine. I was waiting for you. Go ahead.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** I said “reaffirm”. I said that the government should “reaffirm”.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I'm happy, Ms. Phinney, with that.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Say “The committee should support the Canadian government stand that...”.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I appreciate the direction. I'd suggest we can make it even tighter—and I'm going to take Mr. McTeague's evidence here as fact—“That the government should reaffirm that the State of Israel...”

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Yes, okay.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I would be happy with that; just change from “demand” to “reaffirm”.

*[Translation]*

**The Chair:** Ms. Lalonde.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I would appreciate someone telling me just what exactly is going on here. Can you tell me one thing? Just because Israel has not been elected, - which is what you are telling us - how can we contend that its rights have been violated?

*[English]*

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** It's a fact. It's simply fact.

*[Translation]*

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** It might very well be a fact but we are talking about rights here. Non-democratic countries have chaired the United Nations Commission on Human Rights for many years. Given that not all members of the United Nations are democratic nations, then this is bound to happen from time to time. I agree with Alexa that to a certain extent, this situation stems from the very nature of the United Nations.

How can we help Israel? It seems quite pointless to endorse this motion, which will have no impact at all. In reality, Israel has the same rights but has simply not been elected. As far as I understand, you want it to be elected so as to be able to participate in specific organizations. Have I understood you correctly? Has Gerry researched this issue? It seems to me that it would be interesting to see just what the situation really is.

• (0905)

*[English]*

**The Chair:** Ms. Phinney.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** I'm saying they don't have the right to be elected, and you're suggesting that they're just not elected. There's a big difference. Which is the case? Do they have the right?

**The Chair:** If I understand, any country is entitled to all the rights within the United Nations. There's not such a right for such groups and other rights for any other group.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Well, then, the whole motion is not valid. You shouldn't say “the right”. What you're saying and what the researcher is saying—and we don't have his name, so we don't know who he is—is that everybody, including Israel, has the right to be elected, but unfortunately they don't get elected. Is that what the situation is now?

**The Chair:** This is within the United Nations body, but some groups are formed, as Mrs. Lalonde pointed out earlier, as structural groups that are not within the United Nations body itself. You could decide to get a caucus of such of a region, call it a group, and Israel is not part of these groups.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Mr. Day mentioned a whole bunch of groups. According to this motion, you are saying they do not have the right to belong to all those different groups, or are you saying they just don't get elected to those groups? I'm asking the researcher to tell us which is correct.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** It's both. In fact, if they had full status within the WEOG group, the Western European and Others Group, instead of temporary status, it would open the door for them to have full consideration. Without having that, they don't have that ability, so we are—

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Who says they can't have that?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** It's within the charter of the UN. If you are a temporary member of a regional group, you simply don't have the same rights. What happened on May 30, 2000, was an improvement from being banned totally. It was an improvement, but it is still second-class citizen status. We are simply saying that they have the same right, and if in fact Canada has already asked for this, as Mr. McTeague says, and which I'm willing to accept, then let us reaffirm it, especially at a time when that movement literally, in these last several days, is already taking place. Let's be on the record to reaffirm it.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Let's have the motion. Let's have some wording on what that motion is.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** The amendment to the motion is simply to change the word "demand" to "reaffirm".

**The Chair:** I need to suspend for 30 seconds because we have problems with the mikes. We're just going to suspend for 30 seconds; we can talk among ourselves.

It's out of my control, but we need to suspend for this.

• (0908) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (0912)

**The Chair:** We're back.

Now, Mr. McTeague, do you have anything else?

Where do we stand?

Mr. McTeague.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Some of the members seem to be suggesting we ought to have the department provide context to the motion before going to the motion or any amendment therefrom. I'm in the hands of the committee as to whether or not we should proceed with that first, but I'd like to do this very quickly. Mr. Day has had his motion here for some time. It's been at least a month and a half, or even more. I don't even know the dates; I didn't date this when I got it.

Ms. McDonough and Ms. Lalonde have both expressed an interest.

[Translation]

It is in our interest to get more facts. I am not opposed to the amendments but I do not know whether Mr. Day is prepared to agree to them. I think that we have to try to reach a consensus, since there is a fine line between housekeeping and United Nations reform.

[English]

**The Chair:** But my understanding is that Mr. Day wants to pass his motion this morning. That's my understanding.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I have no problem, Mr. Chairman, with further research on the item. I think Madam McDonough raises important issues related to broader reform. We know that reform at the UN moves at the glacier-like speed of government and we could be waiting a long time, but let's look at other areas of reform and more information if we want. I brought forward more information, as requested, and I would like to call the question on this.

**The Chair:** Before we call the question, I have an amendment. I understand we're going to discuss the amendment from Ms. Phinney.

Are we going to vote on the motion, or do you want to...? The motion passer doesn't pass—

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Mr. Chair, why don't we wait until we get this document?

**The Chair:** When are you going to get this document?

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** We think we can have it tomorrow. We'll have it to every member by tomorrow morning.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Mr. Chairman, we've already alluded to the fact this motion has been before us for quite a period of time. If I understand the House leaders, we are looking at adjournment of the House very soon. I don't think there is a meeting scheduled for tomorrow. The next meeting is scheduled for, what, Tuesday? There's a strong possibility we're out of here. I'm not telling tales out of school; I'm saying it's a possibility.

**The Chair:** Madame Lalonde, you didn't read the *Globe and Mail* this morning?

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** No. I read the international press.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** It was not in *Le Monde*.

[English]

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I saw the speculation in the *Globe and Mail*, so it has to be true.

I'm just saying there is a possibility we may not be here next week. Given that possibility, and still allowing for time, we can get all kinds of further research. I believe, to be procedurally correct, Ms. Phinney had proposed a friendly amendment, which I accepted, that the word "demand" be changed for "reaffirm".

I'm happy with the amendment that's before us. I'd like to see the question called on that. If we vote it down, we vote it down, but let's call the question; that's what we do.

• (0915)

**The Chair:** Are there any other comments concerning Mr. Day's remarks? Mr. Day's remarks are that he's agreed to the friendly amendment from Ms. Phinney. Instead of "that the government should demand", it will read "that the government should reaffirm". That's the amendment of Ms. Phinney, if I understand it correctly. If we're voting on this, we're voting on it as amended.

Madame Lalonde.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** As far as I understand, the motion is asking the United Nations to amend its Charter so as to scrap the permanent member requirement. Mr. Stockwell Day has told us that this is the intent of the motion. Israel is currently a temporary member of a new regional group. Prior to this, it was part of the Asia group and had no chance of being elected. Even if I do not read the *Globe and Mail* early enough in the morning, I read in the international press last week that Israel was a member of the new Western Europe and Others group. I found out this morning that the UN Charter prevents Israel from being elected because it is not a permanent member.

Endorsing this motion would be tantamount to asking the United Nations to amend its Charter. However, we have to at least make the intent clear.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** : We're going to have to end.

Madam McDonough is next. After that, I'll give my comments.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** I have no difficulty supporting the motion as amended—that we reaffirm the existing position. I just don't know what we have advanced here. We could pass it. It seems to be virtually meaningless.

At the end of the day, whether we pass it or not, I would still like to have some information. It could come perhaps from a departmental note or perhaps from a research undertaking by our staff. The information will give us a bigger picture of what the situation is as it relates to Israel today, notwithstanding some improvement that we've heard about, and as it relates to other countries that may be similarly affected by the current geopolitical realities and the current processes and structures that result in people being excluded. Whether we see that as the next step following this motion or whether we inform ourselves about it before we pass a virtually meaningless motion isn't as important as our getting on with those UN reform questions that arise from it.

**The Chair:** I have a comment from Ms. Phinney and then from Mr. MacAulay. I'll give my comment, and Mr. Sorenson will wrap it up.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** There are a couple more words in there that Mr. Day didn't pick up on to say to support the present position of the Canadian government—"that the State of Israel..." That way we're just reaffirming the Canadian government's position.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I think "reaffirming" states that.

I'm giving Mr.—

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** By reaffirming what?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Reaffirming—if the government is reaffirming, it means they've already affirmed it. I don't want to stretch it out. I don't want to start getting into a debate on what dates our government did this or how strong their wording was. Really, I don't know why we're wanting to break down into these technicalities.

The point of the motion is that Canada—I hear, I understand—is a great influence and we want to be seen as an honest broker. We are dealing with a nation that is continually frustrated by being voted against by non-democratic nations. According to Mr. McTeague, Canada has already done this. Let's reaffirm it.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.):** Why don't we leave this? Why don't we leave it to the next meeting and deal with it then? The fact of the matter is that we're not going advance anything.

**The Chair:** Mr. Day is entitled, like any other member, to pass his motion this morning. It's up to the committee to say yes or no.

I have Mr. Sorenson next, and then I have a comment.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC):** I was basically just going to reaffirm.... I appreciate, Mr. Chair, that you've looked for consensus, first of all. I think we have accepted a friendly

amendment on the reaffirmation of this. I don't think we need to continue to try to stretch it out any longer.

I also appreciate some of the recommendations from Ms. McDonough and others that we move through this motion. Later, if it's the department or if it's people who are primarily those involved in the issue at the UN, let's get them in to brief us on the breakdown and why this is happening. In the meantime, let's reaffirm the motion that Mr. McTeague says the government has already acted on, and let's do it soon.

● (0920)

**The Chair:** My understanding of this, Mr. McTeague, is that it's in the deliberations of all United Nations bodies. For me, there is nothing wrong with reaffirming, because that is the official one. We're not talking about caucuses or unofficial ones such as regional caucuses, which are not official bodies of the United Nations. We're asking something that's already there. Canada said it has already affirmed this.

Could we have a motion to reaffirm?

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Mr. Chair, I do want to comment on one thing. When it comes to all bodies—Mr. Day may be able to help me on this—he certainly wouldn't mean the Security Council, but that isn't clear here.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** If you look at the motion, it's saying "the same right" to participate in the deliberations of all United Nations—"the same right" is what we're talking about.

**The Chair:** Canada doesn't have the right. It doesn't sit as a permanent or non-permanent member on the Security Council. We're not requesting this for Canada. We're not requesting this for Israel.

We're going to need to talk. We have the amendment of Ms. Phinney. The vote is on the motion of Ms. Phinney, as amended by Ms. Phinney.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Are you taking my amendment, or are you only putting in the one word "reaffirm"?

**The Chair:** Do you want to read it back, please, Mr. Clerk?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Andrew Bratholomew Chaplin):** I would ask Ms. Phinney to reread the motion.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** It is "that the government should reaffirm the position of the Canadian government that the State of Israel be afforded..."

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** On a point of order, that wasn't the initial friendly amendment.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Yes, it was.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** We had the one word, "reaffirm", and then we had the break, and that was what we were almost ready to call the question on.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Excuse me, I did not even say the word "reaffirm". I said "support". Dan changed it to "reaffirm". But I did say "the present position of the Canadian government". That's what I said. I said "support the present position of the Canadian government". It was Dan who changed it to "reaffirm".

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** On a question of procedure, if I may—if this amended motion, as Ms. Phinney is suggesting, comes to a vote and it passes—let's say we vote against it, and it passes anyway—procedurally, can I still bring forward an amended motion that simply says “reaffirm”?

**The Chair:** Procedurally, if it's amended, we will vote on the main motion as amended by Ms. Phinney.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I could do it at a later date, I suppose.

**The Chair:** Yes, at a later date.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I'm not delighted, because I'm taking Mr. McTeague at his word that Canada is on record as doing that. I want that to be clear. I'm taking his word that Canada is on record.

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Vaughan, Lib.):** You're going to move this motion and you don't know Canada's record on this issue? You've got to do research.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I think there's some question there, and Mr. McTeague has brought it forward as the parliamentary secretary. If Mr. Bevilacqua doesn't like the motion and he doesn't want to support Israel's full status, that's fine—but yes, let's bring forward that motion. Bring it forward.

**The Chair:** Ms. Phinney, do you want to read it?

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Are you happier if it says “that the government reaffirm its position that?” Do you like that wording better?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** No, I liked the other one.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Propose the motion, have a vote, and then that's it.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Exactly.

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Sorenson and then Madam McDonough.

Mr. Sorenson.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** I will pass.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Mr. Chairman, everybody here is struggling to try to come to a consensus, but the discussion illustrates what the problem is with the motion, amended or unamended. Without the background information, without actually having a clear indication of what the government's position is, I, for one, couldn't honestly say I know what I voted for, if what I vote for is something that says we reaffirm the government's position, because I don't know exactly what the government's position is.

If the government's position is anything other than that every member nation should have the same right as any other member nation, we'd all vote for that, but then why are we having the motion? That's exactly the position we all hold, is it not?

• (0925)

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Mr. Chair, I would like to see this thing advance, but I take into account what Madame McDonough and Madame Lalonde have said and what seems to be some difficulty here. It may be best to postpone this until Tuesday. I will promise to get that clear position document so that it won't be a question of Mr. Day's worrying about taking my word; he'll have an official document, as well, to support what we've done. I think a question of credibility has been foisted on me, and I want to make sure I have the benefit of being as scrupulous and as honest as possible.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Mr. Chair, I appreciate your trying to bring this to a conclusion and doing it in a fair-minded way. I'd like people to note, for the record, what has happened here.

I brought forward a certain motion. There was some discomfort with it. An amendment, or a proposed amendment—maybe we misunderstood it—suggested that it be changed to “reaffirm”. I didn't like that, but I said it was all right; we'd do it. Then a whole new era of concern swept over certain members. They wanted to amend it even further. I didn't like that, but I said it was okay. I personally think some members were surprised to see that I was being so flexible. Then when I agreed to that, everybody took another step back.

I ask Ms. McDonough, who says she has discomfort because she doesn't understand the full implications, if she can look at us honestly and say that every time she has voted in the House of Commons, she has understood the full implications of the thing she was voting for. We're talking about a motion here—

**The Chair:** That is not the question.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Can we call the question? If people want to vote me down—vote us down—then vote it down. That's what we're doing here. This is a committee. This is democracy. Let's vote. Let's call the question.

**The Chair:** No.

Mr. Bevilacqua.

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** Mr. Day, it's interesting that you say that you wanted to—well, “I'm taking Mr. McTeague's word.”

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Yes.

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** When you propose a motion, I expect you to research it and I expect you to know the facts before you even propose it.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Mr. Bevilacqua, I do know the facts. I've brought them forward as I understood them.

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** This is very—

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Mr. McTeague himself just said he is not 100% sure, so talk to your colleague. I'm going on his advice.

Can we call the question?

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** You're the person proposing the motion.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** And these are the facts.

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** What kind of homework have you done on this? Have you done your research?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** A lot. A lot. These are the facts.

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** Well, obviously not. You're asking whether the facts that he's presented are right or wrong.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** First he said they were. Now he's said he'd like more time, until Tuesday, and I've said we may not be here on Tuesday.

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** Look, you're the person moving the motion. That means—

**The Chair:** Please, let us have no comments in between.

I have a proposition from Mr. McTeague to postpone it to next week. If the House is sitting on Monday, we're going to get a meeting on Monday. If the House is not sitting on Monday, we cannot get a meeting.

We have a motion from Mr. McTeague. I'll take the motion of Mr. McTeague to postpone the discussion on this until the next meeting. I'll get it as soon as possible—not tomorrow, but if the House is sitting on Monday, we'll get in on Monday.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I know there's no debate on...you're saying this is a motion to defer, or to table?

**The Chair:** Not deferring the debate. It is to defer the motion until next Monday, to the next meeting, but I'll get it as soon as possible. That's the motion of Mr. McTeague. Now, we're voting on this one.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Yes. Now, is there debate on the motion?

**The Chair:** We're going to close in three minutes. You've got another motion on Bombardier.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I do, and I want to look at the Bombardier matter, and I want people to really see what happened here today, because I agreed to every change, every amendment. I didn't like them, but I continued to be flexible, and even Mr. McTeague now has backed out. He is not willing to support a motion to reaffirm the government's position. I want that to be clear.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** I have a point of order. Mr. Day, the record will clearly show in my—

**The Chair:** It's all clearly in the record. Now I'll take the vote to postpone it to the next meeting.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** No. I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. Mr. Day has made an insinuation that is totally fallacious and incorrect.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I've stated fact.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** My recommendation is that we do not support this motion.

**The Chair:** There's nothing else I can say. You're all on record.

Now, we're going to vote to postpone it to the next meeting of the committee. All who agree to postpone it, show yes or no. All in favour, raise your hands, please.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Mr. Chair, on the basis...?

**The Chair:** On the basis of getting the information.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** It's on the basis that we may not be here, and there may not be another meeting. Let's make that clear also.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** We could still meet. Nothing prevents us from doing so, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Fine.

[English]

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Okay, now we have another motion from Mr. Day, that pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee invite the Minister of Foreign Affairs and representatives of Bombardier to appear in relation to the Canadian government's significant

investment in Bombardier Inc. and the latter's railway project originating from central China and continuing through Tibet.

Are there any comments on this?

Mr. Paquette.

● (0930)

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Mr. Chair, I think that the wording of the motion is confusing. It refers to the "Canadian Government's significant investment". This suggests that the Government is providing subsidies. To my mind, the wording should be changed. The Government may possibly provide loan guarantees, etc, but to the best of my knowledge, this initiative will not receive any subsidies.

I am not even sure we should refer to this at all. It might be an idea to meet with Bombardier with a view to getting more facts.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. McTeague.

[Translation]

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** This is Mr. Day's second motion. This one relates more to the Minister of International Trade than the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

[English]

I would suggest it may be more contextual to have the trade minister here. If you look at the motion, it reads, "significant investment in Bombardier Inc. and the latter's railway project originating from central China and continuing through Tibet". I would suggest and perhaps even propose an amendment, or a friendly amendment, that it be the minister for trade.

That seems to be more within the context of what is being demanded here, and I'd certainly be willing to agree to Mr. Day's motion on that basis.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Speaking to that amendment, Mr. Chair, I don't have a problem if we're saying the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of International Trade. The reason this goes beyond a trade issue is the whole question of Tibet, China, and the full rights of the people of Tibet. The history of what has happened to them over decades is a factor here.

This goes beyond a simple Canadian investment. There is concern being raised—and this is why we should have a good airing on this—that in fact the railway going into Tibet could be used for political purposes; it could be used for a mass shift of population into Tibet from China. I think that needs a good airing and a good discussion, so it's for the purpose of that discussion. That's what takes us beyond a matter of just trade, Mr. Chair. It is clearly a matter of foreign affairs with a Canadian company.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Paquette.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Mr. Chair, there is slight mistake in the French version. There is a period after “Bombardier Inc.” Then a new sentence starts with “A comparaitre”.

I have no problem with inviting the Minister of International Trade to appear in relation to the railway project in China, for which Bombardier is a subcontractor.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** It is a sub-contract.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** It is suggested that there is significant Government of Canada investment, which there is not, and that this is Bombardier’s project. However, Bombardier is a mere subcontractor. It is manufacturing the rail cars.

If the wording is not changed to reflect the real situation, I will be forced to vote against the motion.

**The Chair:** Indeed.

Mr. McTeague.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** I understand what Mr. Paquette is getting at. I am keen to deal with it. He has made an important point here.

Nevertheless, I do not believe that the wording need be changed. I am not saying that just because I am the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs but because the Minister of International Trade’s mandate also includes a social responsibility aspect.

My amendment is solely designed to enable us to meet the Minister or his representatives with a view to discussing humanitarian issues in greater depth.

[*English*]

Among the concerns Mr. Day has raised are the political implications. I think the social responsibility mandate of the Minister of International Trade is well understood. We must, as a government and under the mandate of that minister, ensure we reinforce the idea that any international trade we or any of these companies are doing has a component of responsibility to the current situation, political or otherwise.

I also point out that it would be helpful to glean more information from people who are experts in the field. I have conflicting information—and this is only anecdotal, so it’s not the department, it’s Dan McTeague—in reading some of this concern that you raise, Mr. Day. I understand the Dalai Lama in principle did not have difficulty with this and thought it would be a good thing for the economic development for Tibet. However, that’s only my understanding, and I think it’s more incumbent on us to get the right person in front of us. That’s the Minister of International Trade, with his representatives, notwithstanding that Mr. Paquette has said he’d want to see that reflected in a change in nomenclature of your motion.

• (0935)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Paquette

I am sorry. In fact, I meant Ms. Lalonde.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Of course, we really are very close to each other.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** We are very close and our interventions intersect.

Mr. Chair, is the Parliamentary Secretary saying that we are to invite the Minister of International Trade to discuss this issue? The problem is that Bombardier is a subcontractor. If Bombardier had not bid on the contract, another subcontractor would now be manufacturing the rail cars.

It is important to clarify the situation. I believe we should. However, this would require a study on corporate social responsibility. I know of several Canadian mining and oil exploration corporations operating, not in Tibet, but in other countries where wars are going on.

Indeed, I think that we should look at corporate social responsibility, but we need a clear motion here too. Why don’t we begin by inviting the Minister of International Trade and give him a chance to explain to us that Bombardier is involved in China and Tibet, for example, because EDC supports this project? We really need to get a handle on Canada’s position. I would have no objection to meeting with Bombardier after that. However, I think we really need to grasp Canada’s position first. EDC is behind Bombardier’s involvement here. We need to get at this issue, as well as Canadian policy and corporate responsibility. I am in wholehearted agreement.

Let’s first invite the Minister of International Trade.

**The Chair:** There are so many changes that need to be made that it is going to be difficult to reach consensus. We will come back to this motion as well as that of Mr. Day, probably on Monday. I believe that we will be sitting on Monday.

[*English*]

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Day.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I’ll agree to the amendment.

**The Chair:** You agree to the amendment? No—

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Sure. Then, at a future time, if we feel we haven’t had our questions exhausted, we can pursue it.

**The Chair:** I just want to hear his amendment, please.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** It’s that the words “Minister of Foreign Affairs” be changed to the “Minister of International Trade”. I don’t have any difficulty with the question of representation. Perhaps that’s something.... Just switch “Foreign Affairs” with “International Trade” to make it more pertinent to what you’re seeking here.

I realize that “Foreign Affairs” looks like it covers everything, but given the specific mandate here as far as commerce is concerned, it seems to me to be a no-brainer that we invite the minister for trade and not the Minister of Foreign Affairs. If other people are being suggested, that could be the next step.

**The Chair:** I just want to point out something. The French translation is not clear. In French, it looks like the Canadian government is investing in the construction of a project in central China through to Tibet. That’s how it reads in French. It’s not the Government of Canada doing the investing there; it’s Bombardier—maybe through EDC, which is another matter—but it’s not the Canadian government. This is why...it’s a problem.

Monsieur Paquette.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I think that the motion could be worded as follows:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108 (2), the Committee invite the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of International Trade, representatives of Export Development Canada and representatives of Bombardier to appear concerning the railway project from China to Tibet, for which Bombardier is a subcontractor.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** That's fine. That's great. That's the idea.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** That is a good point. As a former finance minister, I know that when a government provides a loan guarantee, it is the equivalent of an investment because the Government is signalling to creditors that it will invest if problems arise.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Mr. Day, your motion states that construction of the railway is a Bombardier project. That is not the case. I cannot vote for something that is factually wrong. Your motion suggests that Bombardier is the one building the railway when in actual fact it is merely the manufacturer of the locomotives. China is leading this project.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think Mr. Paquette's motion is very clear. It is that we invite the government, the trade minister, EDC, Bombardier, and every stakeholder in that project between China and Tibet to appear in front of the committee. This is the idea.

• (0940)

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** But I have a question: are you excluding the Minister of Foreign Affairs?

**The Chair:** No, no, not at all.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** All right. Thank you.

**The Chair:** This is every stakeholder we're inviting.

I think we'll take the motion of Mr. Paquette—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I cannot agree to the suggestion that Bombardier is heading up this project.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** You're right.

Madam McDonough, to close.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** The first point I want to make is that I think a lot of this confusion underscores the reason why it's sheer madness to be splitting Foreign Affairs and International Trade, because both are involved.

I'm not suggesting we get into that whole discussion, although it's not a bad reminder that the House of Commons—

**The Chair:** You make a point.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** —has actually voted in support of that position.

Here is my concern. I'm in support of what I think I understand you're trying to accomplish. It isn't at all clear, however, from the

discussion or when you read this, if what you're really trying to do is get at the implications of the government's investment in Bombardier or get at the impact of this policy decision on central China and Tibet. It's just not clear to me at all.

So I'm prepared to support that we pursue this, but I would think some greater clarity is needed in inviting witnesses to come before the committee to address—

**The Chair:** My understanding, Ms. McDonough, is that it's all in relation to the railway between China and Tibet. That's my understanding.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** So why would we be inviting Bombardier? They're not making—

**The Chair:** It's because Bombardier...and I mean, they will explain. They had their shareholders meeting a few weeks back in Montreal, and there was a big group of people there from Tibet who are opposed to this, for many reasons. But Bombardier can come and explain to us why they've done this. I think it's just fair.

Does everyone agree with Mr. Paquette's motion?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Could I hear his motion, Mr. Chair?

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Could you read your version again please?

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** That, pursuant to Standing Order 108 (2), the Committee invite the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of International Trade, representatives of Export Development Canada and representatives of Bombardier to appear concerning the railway project from central China to Tibet, for which Bombardier is a subcontractor.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** So the Minister of Foreign Affairs can come too. If he has nothing to say, he has nothing to say, and that's it.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I have no problems with it.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** The last motion is from Madam Lalonde:

[*Translation*]

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108 (2) and consistent with the motion adopted by the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade of the third session of the 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament on February 24, 2004, the Committee examine the crisis in Haiti and consider the possibility of requesting permission of the House to set up a mission to that country in order to evaluate the situation and to advise the government on its future decisions concerning the political process, the violation of human rights, the risk of escalation of the situation and what Canada could provide.

[*English*]

It's just to be sure to get a mission to Haiti, when possible; it all depends.

Yes.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I think that the motion is clear. I had worded it differently originally but the Clerk suggested an alternative. I think it is important, and I hope that my colleagues will agree, that our committee, which followed the developments in Haiti very closely, send a delegation of Members to Haiti prior to the elections to report back to us on the situation. You will remember that we heard from officials on several occasions. I had September in mind. We could put this suggestion forward.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** I am pleased that this issue has been raised. I have recently issued a warning to Canadians to refrain from travelling to Haiti, since the situation there is too dangerous. I agree with the principle of what you are suggesting, but with one simple caveat. We might be putting these people's lives in danger. Ms. Lalonde, I am referring to the comments I made last evening on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. I fear that if we say it is all right for members but not for ordinary Canadians to go to Haiti, we might be sending a mixed message.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. McTeague, the motion doesn't say to go; it's to consider the possibility of requesting. Today, I understand, there is no way to go. We don't have any budget for this. This is just considering it, and for me, I don't see any problem in considering it.

• (0945)

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** No, Chair, it's just that I heard Madam Lalonde talk about parliamentarians going there. Notwithstanding what's being said here, I think I heard her very clearly talking about that. It's the only reason I'm commenting.

**The Chair:** Mr. Day.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** In her motion, Ms. Lalonde refers to the "possibility". The safety issue is important. Indeed, children face danger on the streets of Haiti. Consequently, let's look at the issue of safety. We agree with the "possibility" aspect of Ms. Lalonde's motion.

[English]

**The Chair:** I'll take the vote on this motion.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Mr. Chair, I don't think there's any objection on this side here, and I don't hear any from there. So let's just pass this; it's to consider.

**The Chair:** I agree. I'll call the motion.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** We now will go to our study of the international policy statement.

Sorry, sir, to be a little bit late.

This morning it is our pleasure to welcome, from the Conference of Defence Associations,

[Translation]

Colonel Alain Pellerin, Executive Director,

[English]

and from CARE Canada, Mr. Kevin McCort, the vice-president of operations.

[Translation]

You are the first out of the blocks, Mr. Pellerin. Do you have a presentation?

[English]

Please go ahead.

[Translation]

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin (Executive Director, Conference of Defence Associations):** Mr. Chair, members of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, thank you for inviting me to speak to you.

[English]

Today my remarks will focus on the crucial link the Canadian military plays as a tool in the achievement of foreign policy goals and advancing Canada's role in the world.

The CDA, through its institute, has conducted several in-depth studies on the current state of the armed forces and Canada's defence policy. Our most recent publication, copies of which I'll leave with the clerk, is entitled "Understanding the Crisis in Canadian Security and Defence". The CDA has also conducted an analysis of the five components of the international policy statement. I've left copies of that with the clerk.

In summary, we are encouraged by the overarching approach the government has taken in the IPS, that links national and international security concerns and prescribes solutions affecting Canada's major national tools of power—i.e., diplomatic, defence, development, commerce, and trade.

In essence, the Conference of Defence Associations fully supports the leadership of Canada's military and the minister in their visionary approach to transforming the Canadian Forces. The recent policy announcements send a clear signal that the decade-long military transition from Cold War thinking to present realities is at an end.

Despite the fact that many legacy issues regarding personnel, infrastructure, and capital equipment acquisition require resolution, the major thrust of the new defence policies are rooted in a coherent assessment of strategy determinants that shape Canada, a sound base from which to move forward. However, the CDA does have the following misgivings.

The Canadian Forces' zeal to implement the defence policy paper appears to be greater than that of other federal, provincial, and municipal government departments and agencies, many of which play vital roles. If this large-scale integration of effort—historically, rarely achieved save in war time—is impeded by a lack of focus or experience, policy implementation will surely be delayed, inadequately carried out, or made impossible. The current state of government leadership, federal government impediments to public administration of defence policy, and the DND/CF desire to transform virtually everything in a short space of time also weighs against success.

The IPS also makes no mention of any real role for Parliament in overseeing the implementation of government defence policy. In order to ensure long-term policy consistency and in order to develop a culture of knowledge and awareness amongst members of Parliament and future ministers, such a role is in our view essential for long-term policy success. There is no recognition of this in the IPS.

In general, the defence portion of the IPS gives little sense of the real crisis that the CF is now in. The 2003 report by defence experts at Queen's University and the CDA Institute, entitled "Canada Without Armed Forces?", noted that the failure of key CF capabilities is now a certainty due to past government neglect of defence. Two years later, this is still the case. Achieving the goals of the IPS will require both long-term funding consistency—not a strength of past governments, you would agree—and complete reform of the existing approach to administering defence policy in Canada.

Allow me to highlight, for instance, one existing impediment: capital equipment acquisition contributed to mainly, but not exclusively, by other government departments and central agencies. At present, DND has inadequate numbers and expertise, both military and civilian, to execute the existing departmental plan, the strategic capital investment plan.

• (0950)

In recent months, those responsible for advancing capital acquisition projects have missed 90% of their milestones. When that staff was twice its current size, it took 15 years to process major acquisitions. In the case of the maritime helicopter program, with which we're quite familiar, by the time the helicopters are operational it's going to be close to 30 years.

Today, existing government policy concerning military acquisitions and a dearth of project expertise leads to the troubling conclusion that transformation of the Canadian Forces, based on the implementation of the existing plan, would not be possible much before the year 2020.

Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, without the cooperation of other departments and central agencies, and personal involvement from the very top of the government, this transformation of the CF, which is essential if the vision of the Prime Minister and the government is to be met, will not be possible. This will severely limit the foreign policy tools at the disposal of Canadians and our government. A credible foreign and defence policy is not based on well-written policy documents but rather on the national tools at hand on the day of need.

Canada is currently suffering an indeterminate period of shortage of military tools. The length of that period is governed not by a lack of vision, leadership, defence policy, or even money. It is governed by the inefficiencies of the public administration of defence.

The government currently finds itself in a period in which its foreign policy options are fewer in number than they could be, in part because of the limitations of its military; this at a time when options would need to be greater in number. The loyal, disciplined force of last resort, the Canadian armed forces, should not find itself ill-equipped and under-strength at this juncture.

The Conference of Defence Associations believes the impediments in the public administration of defence are on Canada's foreign policy decision-making critical path, and need to be reduced or eliminated. If they aren't, the required transformation of the Canadian Forces will suffer time delays that will put the men and women of the Canadian Forces at risk and continue to provide Canada with a limited number of security, defence, and foreign policy options. This issue is of great importance to the nation, and by its nature will require the personal attention of the Prime Minister.

IPS 2005 is a good start. However, it still remains a vision. Until the Canadian Forces are restored, transformed, and modernized, many of Canada's foreign policy objectives will languish.

[Translation]

Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attention. I am at your disposal to answer any questions you may have.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Pellerin.

Ms. Lalonde.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I have been trying to find the French version of the policies in the documentation. Unfortunately, there only appear to be a few paragraphs in French.

[English]

**The Chair:** Madam Lalonde, I talked about this with the clerk. The clerk will get the electronic version in French and distribute copies to members.

• (0955)

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I am sorry?

**The Chair:** The clerk tells me that the electronic version of the whole document will be available in French. It will be distributed to all members of the Committee.

Having said that, you would be quite within your rights to ask the Clerk to take in all the copies that have been distributed. Ms. Lalonde, do you want us to do that?

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I do.

**The Chair:** Fine, that is your prerogative. Yes, Mr. Pellerin.

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** Could I just say something?

As you know, we are a not-for-profit organization. Canadian organizations, such as ours, find it difficult to make ends meet.

**The Chair:** Fair enough, Mr. Pellerin, but that is not the issue here. We have to abide by the Standing Orders...

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I think that Mr. Pellerin raises a good point, Mr. Chair. It changes everything if he did not receive money for translation. I understand his predicament.

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** We endeavoured to at least produce the introduction and a summary of each issue in both official languages. That was the best we were able to do. Perhaps you could help us out. I had the same discussion with Mr. Bachand. Producing these types of papers in both official languages is always tricky.

**The Chair:** We hear you, Mr. Pellerin.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** French-speaking soldiers are also entitled to have access to your paper in French.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. McCort, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Kevin McCort (Senior Vice-President, Operations, CARE Canada):** Mr. Chairman, honourable members, thank you very much for the invitation.

My name is Kevin McCort, and I represent CARE Canada, a humanitarian charity founded in 1946. We manage programs in 48 countries, and we deliver over \$150 million in development and relief assistance every year. We're a member of CARE International, a federation of 12 members, which are active in over 70 developing countries and collectively responsible for \$700 million in annual assistance. We do all of this with a staff of over 10,000 people. The vast majority are nationals of the countries in which we work.

Again, thank you for inviting me here today.

My comments on the international policy statement start with some reflection on my own life. My father learned how to plow behind a horse, and his generation witnessed a remarkable transformation in economic and social development. I grew up hearing about how much better things were for me than they were for him when he was a boy, and I became enthralled with the idea that such dramatic change was possible in the span of one lifetime.

What stories could I tell my children about the hardships I had endured? In fact, I have no such stories to tell about myself.

However, in 1983, as a teenager with the Canada World Youth Exchange to Indonesia, I met and lived with people who were still learning how to plow behind animals. My father's generation had moved on, but I learned there were many more farmers who remained trapped in a subsistence livelihood and were being left behind. As an idealistic and enthusiastic 18-year-old, there seemed to me to be no reason why the amazing development we saw here in Canada should not be experienced by others, no matter where they lived. Ever since that time, I have worked in international development, doing what I can to help eliminate poverty in this generation.

That is the story I want to tell my children.

You have invited me here today to comment on the international policy statement, and I am very pleased to do so. I hold it and its promises up to a simple, but incredibly difficult, yardstick. Is it the best we can do? I certainly hope so. There are many good ideas within the IPS, but there is always room for improvement.

I will focus my comments on three key components. The first is the role of Canadian civil society, known as NGOs. The second will be the challenge of failed states and humanitarian intervention. The third is the opportunity of market-based development.

The IPS acknowledges that Canada slipped in its support to development during the 1990s, and I wholeheartedly welcome the government's return to this field of endeavour. Canadian NGOs never left, and indeed we predate government involvement in this work. Many NGOs were created well before CIDA and have

remained committed through thick and thin. Perhaps as recognition of this dedication and expertise, there are many positive references to the role that Canadian civil society can and does play in moving the IPS forward. However, in two major areas, the IPS has the potential to go in the opposite direction and undermine NGO involvement.

First, Canadians have many existing organizations that are fully engaged in putting Canadians and their knowledge to work in eliminating poverty. In my opinion, the Canada Corps would be better off becoming a movement or a policy direction that aims to support and utilize this pre-existing capacity, as opposed to becoming an institution itself.

Second, while I understand and accept the role of multinational agencies in building a safe and prosperous world, there are two weaknesses with our current practice. To begin with, many multilateral agencies in fact turn to Canadian NGOs and ask us to deliver programs on the ground. We are major implementing partners for the UN, UNICEF, etc. Few in government appreciate this or realize the savings that could occur if multilateral agencies were in fact used to establish the framework and direct support was provided to the actual implementing agencies. Yet, given domestic events, I doubt this will happen.

Multilateral agencies now deliver 40% of Canada's aid program. In many of our dealings with CIDA, this appears set to grow, but for a perverse reason. It seems much easier and faster for the government to provide support to UN agencies, due to increasingly stringent regulations for providing funding to Canadian partners. The IPS states that selection should be based on results, but I fear it is increasingly based on ease of disbursement.

Failed states and humanitarian intervention: I have worked alongside refugees, internally displaced, and desperately poor people in many failed and failing states. I am encouraged by the acknowledgment in the IPS of the critical importance of remaining engaged in these places, yet I am left with the nagging sense that the emphasis is more on containment than on resolution, and more on political stability than on humanitarian principles. For example, I'd like to see more discussion and agreement on how we will move these states into development partner status, as opposed to focusing on how we will prevent them from becoming threats.

•(1000)

We are advocates of the three-legged stool theory of dealing with humanitarian crises. The IPS explores in depth the substantial ways and means that multilateral agencies and the military will be involved and strengthened, but there is comparatively less discussion on how humanitarian NGOs will be supported—certainly an essential leg of the stool. We have a long history of working together. We can and should build on this relationship.

The principles of good humanitarian donorship cited in the IPS fully support the concept of building the response capacity of the NGOs who actually deliver such a large proportion of humanitarian aid and keep these crises in the public eye. We need to replace the ad hoc crisis-by-crisis type of collaboration we currently have with more thoughtful and strategic support.

As for the role of the military, we're a frequent commentator on the subject so I'll only briefly mention our main contention: the three-block army should stay off our block. Specialization and division of labour pays. We have our roles; the military has theirs. We believe the military can play a useful role in ensuring security or supporting relief operations through logistical prowess. But we fear that the engagement of the military in development work in complex emergencies blurs the lines between us, and is a factor behind the increasing targeting of NGOs by militant groups.

Finally, on the opportunity of market-based development, in our work we are making markets work for the poor, and we welcome the attention the IPS is bringing to this work. In addition to relieving poverty, it helps make development understandable to Canadians. That is in all of our interests, as we need the sustained commitment of the public to this work in order to prevent another slide in our international engagement. As the public comes to better understand development and sees that it is achievable, the demand to meet the 0.07% of GDP will become unstoppable.

My observation of the IPS is that it understands the importance of economic development in poor countries and seeks to enable the Canadian private sector to become more involved in this field. However, the gap between what is happening at the bottom of the pyramid, where the poorest of the poor live, and the economic strata, where the average Canadian company engages, is what we refer to as the missing middle. The Canada Investment Fund for Africa, while undoubtedly serving a need, will not reach this missing middle if it remains focused on large-scale, capital-intensive investments. We need strategies and resources dedicated to linking the poor to the formal economy—not just the independent expansion of both spheres, but their integration. That is where the potential for rapid growth exists. Perhaps then we will be able to relegate animal plowing in the developing world to the hobby that it is here.

Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. McCort.

Now we'll go to questions and answers. The first will be 10 minutes, and the second round will be five minutes.

We'll start with Mr. Day, please.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to both gentlemen for the presentations.

I'm pleased to see the two people here for the areas you represent—one being military, national defence, and the other being aid. I agree with Mr. McCort, who said we need to be careful we don't blur the lines of these two very important institutions, if I can use the word in a non-institutional way.

In my view, it should be very clear that the safety and security of our citizens is the government's first responsibility, and the primary purpose of the military is to deter or, if necessary, destroy an enemy. The purpose of aid is to bring aid to people in need. The military assists in securing the ability and capability of groups to provide aid, and a blurring of those lines is problematic. Soldiers who are disciplined and trained, and as loyal and courageous as the Canadian soldiers are and always have been, should not be the ones performing the humanitarian aid itself. They should have a humanitarian face when necessary, but they should be there to provide the safety, the umbrella under which that can be accomplished.

Colonel Pellerin, it is a huge concern to us, and of course to many Canadians, that the state of our Canadian Forces has been allowed to dilapidate. When I say that, I'm not talking about the members or the forces themselves, either full-time or reserve; I'm talking about their logistical capability to do their job. Everybody has agreed that we don't have the capability to accomplish our foreign mission policies, which is a grievous state for any nation to be in. We always think of that in terms of the actual soldiers, the boots on the ground, and we know we don't have the capability to do what we'd like to do.

You have commented not just on that but on the fact that there's a capital plan in place, which we agree is deficient. But even with the capital plan in place, the people aren't there to implement the capital plan that would get the resources to the soldiers to do the job. In fact, in terms of capital acquisitions, just in the planning stage—correct me if I'm wrong in this—you said they have missed 90% of their milestones. That's no reflection on their capabilities; it's sheer mass of people.

First, how do we correct that? We know we need to increase the number of full-time forces and reserves, but now we're talking about people who are actually there to look for the helicopters and make sure the resources are there, whether it's helicopters, uniforms, or whatever. How do we address that? Is that strictly a hiring problem, and we need to hire more people? We know and accept that we don't have the capability established to be in other parts of the world that desperately need help.

I want to go one step back now and talk about our own national defence, our border defence, our continental defence. The official opposition has long been concerned about the capability, whether it's coast guard capability, to maintain and properly survey our own coastline, for instance....

Could you comment on those two areas?

•(1005)

**The Chair:** Mr. Pellerin.

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** Those are two very important issues. I know the minister is personally involved in trying to address the issue of the capital acquisition. Otherwise, as I mentioned, the defence policy will not move forward.

There are two parts. Internally at DND, when the forces were reduced by some 25% in the nineties, a lot of the project managers, that expertise, also disappeared, but the projects have increased. There aren't enough people to manage the projects, so that has to be addressed.

The more difficult issue to address is to a large extent outside the control of DND, and that's capital acquisition. For instance, for a contract that is more than \$200 million, some 12 departments and agencies would be involved in the process and have signed on. If it's less than \$200 million, the same 12 agencies and departments would be involved, but you'd add another three, including Indian Affairs—and that's beyond the control of DND. That's why I say it has to be addressed at the highest level of government. The acquisition policy has to be streamlined, has to be addressed. A time lag of some 15 years is not acceptable.

I think we're very lucky now that we have an excellent chief of defence who has a great vision, and I think we can all agree with that. Also, the last two defence ministers were, in my view, excellent. They're on board, and I think they're working hard as a team, but these impediments are outside their control, so the government has to be involved to try to reduce the time lag.

As an example, the maritime helicopter acquisition was identified in 1983 as a priority for the Canadian Forces. By the time the helicopters are available as an operational fleet—the 28 helicopters that have been purchased—it's going to be 2011 or 2012. So it's a period of 30 years, and that's the big problem. We can talk about transforming the forces, but it's like a big ship, it takes a very long time to turn around, and that's part of the problem.

Now, you mentioned also the capabilities that are required for projection abroad, and also for protection of Canada. We've identified the problems of the modernization of the fleet to protect our air space, the modernization also of the ships. Very quickly, ships 20 years of age have to be modernized, and not just the hulls. Communications change rapidly, as you know; every two years or sooner you want a new computer.

But I'll just give you an example of projection abroad. We are talking about projecting our forces, whether they're in Afghanistan, now, or Darfur or Bosnia. I think we all agree that they do a wonderful job, once deployed, and help the population there provide security. One of the big problems, for instance, is that our airlift is almost non-existent. It's based on a fleet of 32 Hercules. Almost two-thirds of those are over 40 years old. Therefore, you have a fleet that is becoming very rapidly obsolete, and there's no plan yet to replace that fleet. In 10 years' time the full fleet will be obsolete. You might as well close down the base at Trenton—because that's the *raison d'être* of Trenton—because of all that neglect of the last 10 or 20 years.

And I don't point the finger only at the Liberal government. I think it's the nature of the beast in Canada. I think we should all read Jack Granatstein's recent book, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* You'll find out that, unfortunately, the military in Canada has been treated as a spectator sport by whichever government is there. We talk a lot; unfortunately we don't provide them with the required tools and spend the money on them.

•(1010)

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Is there still time on that?

**The Chair:** Do you have any comments, Mr. McCort, on this?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I had a question for Mr. McCort.

**The Chair:** Okay, go ahead.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Related to aid, I agree there should be more emphasis on NGOs and less on government institutionalizing some of the functions themselves. The notion of Canada Corps is a good notion. I also worry that the government taking it and running it in-house as an institution will just bring all the problems that government brings—massive bureaucracy, inability to make decisions.

How do you see a Canada Corps policy direction being implemented by NGO groups?

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** Thanks for the question.

The Canada Corps actually has grown out of the realization that Canadians have been sending themselves overseas through volunteer agencies for decades.

The Canadian International Development Agency spends apparently some \$400 million already on the volunteer-sending agencies in Canada. Agencies like CUSO, WUSC, CECI in Quebec, and Oxfam already send hundreds of Canadians abroad every year. There is also Canada World Youth, where I started Youth Challenge International. There are many organizations that do this work. They're perfectly able to adapt to what's demanded.

If developing countries are looking for governance assistance, then these agencies are perfectly well placed to provide that, as in past years they have provided agricultural technical assistance or election observers. There's a well-established infrastructure in Canada that we would say exists and is fully supportive of the goals of Canada Corps, but which would like to be used and apply its skills in fulfilling the desire to have more Canadians abroad.

•(1015)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Lalonde, you have the floor.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Thank you.

Thank you, Colonel Pellerin and Mr. McCort.

I would have liked to be able to read your paper in French, but I understand that I shall be able to do that soon. I was able, however, to listen to your presentation. Could you expand a bit more on the types of soldiers that we need in your opinion?

I would just like to give you a brief example. I accompanied Minister Axworthy to Pristina, in Kosovo. While I was there, I met with soldiers responsible for keeping the peace. They were doing all sorts of other work at the same time, including refitting the roof and plumbing system of a school. I was present when it was reopened. Hundreds of young Kosovars were able to go back to school.

The European Union has debated the issue of training a new type of soldier for peacekeeping missions. They would be somewhere between a soldier and a police officer. It seems to me that we are increasingly seeing two types of soldier emerging. There are those that are deployed as peacekeepers and those sent into conflict zones with modern equipment. This phenomenon has been raised at several meetings we have had.

Some stakeholders want our military to be multi-tasking, but I am not so sure that that is the way to go. The Government's foreign policy ought to clearly state that Canada focuses on peacekeeping. Indeed, it is common knowledge that these missions are often tough. As a result, our military has to be prepared but they do not need to be Rambo types.

My second question is for both of you. I saw that NGOs were also operating in Pristina. There needs to be co-operation between these bodies and the military. However, from what my NGO friends have told me, it is extremely important that people perceive these entities as being totally separate. I have been told that if the military is perceived as assisting humanitarian organizations, then they may also be seen as enemy targets. Indeed, by definition, humanitarian organizations are non-partisan.

Lastly, I would like to fully understand the justification for the presence of the Canada Corp. There are already a large number of volunteers and NGOs with experienced staff providing support on the ground.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I think that the third question is one for the Minister. It is not up to our witnesses to answer that question. They can comment but they are not in a position to explain the justification.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I would like them to answer the question anyway since it might help us in questioning the Minister.

**The Chair:** Indeed.

Mr. Pellerin or Mr. McCort.

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** Ms. Lalonde has made a very good point. It is a fundamental issue, given the current context, for the Armed Forces, be they Canadian, U.S. or any other nationality for that matter.

I had an infantry career spanning 36 years in the Royal 22<sup>nd</sup> Regiment. Needless to say, we are very familiar with the type of missions you have mentioned.

The Government's approach, and I think it is the right one, is to train soldiers for military operations, but not necessarily for ColdWar-type situations involving thousands of assault tanks in the European theatre. The Government feels that this type of training prepares military personnel for all types of missions, be they peace keeping or humanitarian in nature.

Consequently, in terms of national defence policy, the Chief of Defence Staff and the Minister of National Defence refer to three types of military operation. The first of these is humanitarian assistance, such as the support provided in Kosovo that you alluded to earlier. It is important to understand that we do not normally provide direct humanitarian aid as such, but we often operate in situations where we are called upon to help in providing humanitarian aid or to ensure the safety of NGOs and humanitarian organizations

Situations often change without warning. This requires soldiers to adapt to a new type of military operation. A case in point would be Afghanistan.

The second type of military operation is that of stabilization. The presence of U.S. troops in Iraq is an extreme example. The war has been over for two years, but U.S. troops are still engaged in stabilizing the country. These troops require specific skills.

Lastly, armed forces must be prepared to fight in specific situations. For example, the Canadian Forces mission to Afghanistan will change this summer. There will be more focus on humanitarian support. Under this new mandate, teams will be deployed to Kandahar. The situation there is reminiscent of the Wild West. In February, a 1,000-strong combat detachment will also be sent in. You only have to see the recent events reported in the newspapers to see that the situation is far from being under control in Kandahar.

As a result, if the Government intends to deploy military personnel to areas of conflict, soldiers have to be prepared for the worst. If in fact the worst possible scenario fails to materialize, then at least they were prepared to face it had it happened.

The whole issue of humanitarian support should be discussed. For instance, we took part in a seminar with Hugh Segal at Queen's University last week on these very issues. The chairman of CARE, Mr. Watson also took part. It is very important to ensure there is co-operation between the military and NGOs on the ground so everyone knows what they have to do. This allows progress to be made.

It is just as important to undertake pre-deployment preparation in order to gain a better understanding of the various organizations operating on the ground. This can be done by talking to organisations such as CARE and the Red Cross prior to departure. I think that this goes to the heart of the problem. Very often, the various organizations are not very aware of each other. The military does not know much about the operations of the humanitarian bodies in the field. In turn, the humanitarian agencies shy away from associating themselves with the military, because they feel that they will become a terrorist target if they do.

• (1020)

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Consequently, in your opinion, is the training strategy set out in the policy statement the right one?

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** Your points are well taken. Throughout my career, I have worked alongside soldiers from various countries.

[English]

In all honesty, the Canadian soldiers have been the best. If you're asking about what type of soldier is required in the future, Canadian soldiers seem to have the right mix of expertise, humanity, and personality. It's a strong formation.

What has happened is that soldiers have learned a little bit about our world, and as the world has gotten more dangerous, we have learned a little bit about theirs. As NGOs, we know only a little about security, and as soldiers, they only know a little about relief and development. The works soldiers are engaged in are often quite useful for them as morale builders, as ways to engage the community; they're very superficial when it comes to meeting the ongoing, long-term needs of the communities where they're based. They're not going to address the underlying problems, and they shouldn't try to.

We're always open to exploring ways to work in a collaborative fashion, where we support each other. But we don't want to learn any more about security than we have to, and the military shouldn't learn any more about development and relief than they have to.

On the third question about Canada Corps, in our experience, this message of using and building on existing capacities is being listened to. Many of the organizations I've spoken about are working with government officials to find ways where the idea of Canada Corps can be used to support the mandate of the organizations. They are pushing to try to find an alternative to a government bureaucracy called Canada Corps. They are pushing for a solution that builds on the existing capacity of NGOs. In many cases, this is starting to be heard.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** We should continue along this path then? Do you believe it will help you?

• (1025)

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[English]

Do you have a question, Mr. MacAulay?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** First of all, thank you for being here.

There could be a different view coming from each of you on how we should respond to issues in foreign lands, and how our military should behave. You have said that there is not enough money in the military. The changes haven't taken place. What do you feel is needed?

Also, I'd like Mr. McCort to tell us how we should operate when there's a conflict in the area. I'm not sure you're as keen on peace-making as you are on peacekeeping. The military has to be more or less twofold. It's a peace-making operation and a peacekeeping operation as well. As you described the NGOs, they'd rather deal with the peacekeepers, and would probably rather not deal with the peace-makers at all.

I'd like you to expand on that. We want to make sure we don't have a problem. We want to create the peace and then be sure we can keep the peace. I understand that there are not enough dollars in this

country for many things, but in general, what approaches could we take? We have \$5 billion going into the military, but it's not enough, or maybe it won't come soon enough. What should be done? Do we need the carriers to move our equipment? This is the line of thinking I am on.

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** I wouldn't want to get involved in commenting on the force structure and type of equipment that is required. I think the minister and the chief of defence—who's also the principal adviser to the Prime Minister on military issues—have put teams together and will report to the minister at the end of this month on structures. I think what is important is that we're seeing this move ahead well with the current chief of defence and the minister. I think they have a vision, and they know what is required to implement the defence policy. The difficulty, obviously, is how long it will take to implement.

As I mentioned before, when you talk about major capital acquisition, historically it takes 10 to 15 years—and sometimes, as with the helicopters, it will be closer to 30 years—mainly because of the government policy in place, what is required, all the hoops to jump through, to address that. I think this needs to be addressed in order to reduce these time lags, especially since most of them are outside of the control of the Department of National Defence. It's a government policy that you need to go through 12 departments and agencies before you get the agreement on how you will purchase a piece of equipment. Well, that takes two years for most major equipment. It's a very slow process.

What I'm saying is that the defence policy that has come out gives a clear vision of where we should be going, but based on past precedent, it's going to take a good 15 years to implement it. I know the chief of defence would like to have most of it in place for the Olympics in Vancouver five years from now. I think in a lot of cases he'll probably be disappointed.

The other thing, also, is that the government has promised \$13 billion for defence over a five-year period. It is remarkable that a government would promise this over five years. All we hope of those who've followed the file in the past is that they'll deliver—whichever government is in place.

Does that answer your question?

**The Chair:** Mr. McCort, do you have a supplement to this?

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** Yes. It's a question we deal with on a daily basis. Our perspective on peace-making, peacekeeping, and the role of the NGOs is fundamentally based on the fact that in many conflict countries we're there before the conflict starts, during the conflict, and afterwards. In fact, we find that war is not everywhere at all times, and even if there is a conflict in a country, we're either following it around, delivering assistance, or trying to move ahead of it to try to help people who are in need.

The point of most of our collaboration with the military is trying to find out where we can safely work to deliver our humanitarian assistance. Whether the military's engaged in a peace-making or peacekeeping operation to us is not the primary concern; our concern is with what the humanitarian needs are, where they are, whether we can in fact work in that area. That's the basis of much of our collaboration with the military, determining areas of access based on the fact that we really have been in places for many years before the foreign forces arrive, and we will remain there afterwards.

We take a very long-term view of our interaction with those populations. We know that they have known us before the conflict, they will judge us based on our behaviour during the conflict, and that will predicate their relationship with us after the conflict. So we take a fairly different view of our engagement.

• (1030)

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** Do we have enough NGOs, and is there enough involvement?

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** I think there are enough. There are 10 or 12 major international humanitarian NGOs prepared and able to do this work. We're able to draw on a virtually unlimited supply of Canadians, just for an example, who want to do this work. If we advertise one position in our emergency response team, we'll get hundreds of applicants for it. So there are enough people who want to do this.

We are often constrained by our ability to actually get into a place and have resources to deliver a program. But the need is there. The interested people are there to do the action. And like everyone else, we're constrained by finding the resources. But we do have many ideas on how to squeeze more out of the existing system. One of them is very much based on the way we work as opposed to the way that we see the military work.

The military, by its nature, has to be self-contained and reliable. If it is dependent on local resources, it's very vulnerable. Our work is the exact opposite. We insist on being integrated with the local community because that's how we in fact build on their capacities, by getting them involved in the solutions.

Our method of working is, by and large, significantly cheaper. So when it comes to delivering humanitarian assistance in an area, we're going to use as many local resources as possible in terms of personnel and materials. We often see militaries bringing in foreign resources, material and personnel, at a much higher cost. It's all coming from the same source, the Canadian taxpayer, and we see two very different ways of delivering that assistance.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** In your opinion, is the work that's being done in foreign aid, in general, coordinated well? Does there need to be more effort put into this area? Are the dollars spent as well as they could be? Do you feel that sometimes, for the lack of a better word, you find that boots are tripping over one another? Sometimes we hear at this committee that there are problems in this area.

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** There are problems in this area.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** I know there's never enough money for everything. Do you think there could probably be better coordination?

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** One of the things we welcomed in the IPS was in fact the focus on certain countries and the decision that we won't work in as many countries. We think that when it comes to humanitarian assistance, there can be an equal decision regarding focus. We have to say we will work with the following organizations who have a history and who have expertise, and they become the preferred partners of the international humanitarian community.

In fact, that largely is what happens in the long-standing chronic emergencies. There are only a few organizations that have the staying power to remain engaged. It's in the high-profile, media-driven extravaganzas that people trip over each other. It was like that in Bosnia at the end of the war, or in Kosovo with the Kosovar Albanians, or in Rwanda after the genocide. The only thing that's saving us from the same thing in Sudan and Chad is the extreme difficulty of the environment. There are often a lot of organizations that see this as an opportunity. While they often bring useful support, it compromises coordination.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Ms. McDonough.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Colonel Pellerin and Mr. McCort, for your presentations.

There are so many questions that could be pursued, but I just want to make an observation. I often worry—I think lots of people worry—that the military perspective and humanitarian perspective often miss intersecting where they need to. It's very reassuring, actually, to hear how much sensitivity is being expressed from your respective perspectives for each other's importance and role. If we had time, it would be most fascinating to sit back and hear you discuss with each other how to bring together the two perspectives in a way that respects the critically important boundaries and delimitation while also ensuring that there is understanding and coordination.

I want to pursue a couple of lines of questioning very briefly.

One is the concern expressed by Mr. McCort about the role of NGOs being not just respected but elevated in terms of our discharging of our obligations. I'm wondering if you're aware that this committee at its last meeting—Thursday, I guess it was—actually unanimously passed a motion that not only called upon the Canadian government to move in a very immediate and decisive way towards a planned commitment to the 0.7% ODA, but also called for a much greater engagement with civil society, both domestically and internationally. I'm wondering if you might have concrete suggestions, Mr. McCort, as to how that increased engagement should be brought about. What actual initiatives might produce some good solid results along the lines of what you were expressing?

Secondly, if I may say so, Colonel Pellerin, I don't think there's any member of any political party who doesn't share the concern about the fits-and-starts approach to our military. So often over the years, in the absence of a real multi-year comprehensive military acquisition program—I'm not sure if that's the right terminology, but I think it's the concept—we've had decisions being made about what would be funded, what wouldn't, what would be acquired, what wouldn't, more based on quite limited, narrow political perspectives, even of a very immediate local nature, which doesn't make for very good policy.

At the same time, it's also clear that military commitments and military expenditures have considerable impact economically. I'm wondering if you can comment on whether you feel the IPS puts us on track to finally put in place the comprehensive approach to this or you feel we are still very much at risk of the fits-and-starts approach.

I just want to use one limited example. In the province I come from, the ability to produce naval vessels is well demonstrated, but it's also true, in the absence of a comprehensive Canadian shipbuilding policy, that the benefit of the massive investments that have been made to put us in the position of being able to produce really good naval vessels is jeopardized, because you can't keep having an assembly line approach to this.

I'm wondering if you could comment on whether there are additional measures that we need to be considering in addressing this problem.

•(1035)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. McDonough.

Mr. McCort, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** I'll take the first question.

I was aware of the passing of the resolution, and was very pleased by it. And I thank you for your suggestions on how to concretely build on the expertise of the NGOs and civil society. I want to make it very clear, as my first and most important point, that I'm in no way speaking out of a sense of entitlement. Organizations like ours are often accused of just wanting for our own sake. We are always prepared to compete with other agencies, whether it's the UN, whether it's the private sector, whether it's universities or other NGOs, and to compete in the realm of ideas, to talk about their ideas for addressing this problem, about what they will do to resolve this problem.

The government is free to select the agencies that they feel are the best, but it should be a competition based on the ability to deliver and the creativity of the ideas, not based on quotas, with a certain amount for this sector, a certain amount for that sector, and a certain amount for that sector. That's how you create entitlements, by segregating money for different parts of our community. So we're much more comfortable with the free flow of ideas and putting them up for selection.

What we'd also like to see, and there are elements of this in CIDA, is that where there are organizations that have been identified as having a solid set of ideas, they're given programming support. But it's far too infrequent for Canadian actors. Whether they're university, civil society, or private sector, there are often competitions for small,

short programs as opposed to institutional-strengthening, long-term commitments.

•(1040)

**The Chair:** Monsieur Pellerin.

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** The short answer to your question is no, it hasn't been addressed in the IPS. That's the big problem, how to implement the defence policy.

On the issue of capital acquisition, I think you've put your finger on a major problem: we have the tendency to buy things and keep them for a very long time. Our Hercules planes are 40 years old, our Sea Kings, which you're familiar with, are 40 years old or more. Only in Cuba do you find people going around with vehicles that are that old. So that's part of the big problem.

The frigate problem, which you're familiar with, is a good example. In the eighties, when the decision was taken to modernize our fleet and build 12 frigates, first you had to gather a team of naval architects and project managers and what not, and start from scratch. Then the shipyards, Irving and also Lauzon, started from scratch to build a fleet of 12 frigates. Once they were built, nobody from outside bought any. We tried to sell some to Saudi Arabia. It didn't happen. Finally, Irving closed down last year. Lauzon is doing oil platforms, essentially.

We have the largest coastline in the world and we have no naval shipbuilding policy in Canada, which is incredible. Therefore, we're talking now about modernizing the fleet, especially the supply ships. They're talking about an assault ship. Again, one option is to start from scratch and build. That's going to take another 10 or 15 years. But if you want to speed up the process and implement the policy more rapidly, then start looking around the world at countries where they've built similar ships, or at least get the design from them and build them in Canada. Or go out and buy them in the U.S., the U.K., Holland, or Germany.

So that needs to be addressed. It's a big problem in Canada.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** We're not so pleased with the results of the subs at the moment. We might be better to begin to build up our own capacity and keep it going.

Isn't it a problem that if we go overseas to purchase, we will never develop our own capability, and then it becomes all the more difficult for us to make the case for massive investments that have zero economic impact? Politically they're more difficult to sell, and we don't end up having control over our own industry. In a crisis, if we're depending on purchasing from elsewhere and there's a squeeze on their resources, or they're facing major demands to ramp up their own capacity, don't we end up out in the cold, with no control over our own security and defence needs?

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** You're absolutely right, but then are we willing to pay the price? Unfortunately, when the decision is taken to replace major pieces of equipment it is very expensive, even for relatively small projects. For instance, the trucks, starting with the jeep and then medium-weight trucks and heavy-weight trucks, were all built in Canada under licence. You remember the Bombardier Iltis. Well, we could have bought those in Germany—they're essentially built on a Volkswagen Rabbit frame. It would have cost \$26,000, but we said no, we wanted to build them in Canada and it cost \$81,000 per jeep. Then we only sold some to Belgium and the production line closed. But we kept them for 20 years, so we didn't have enough spare parts and we had to use spare parts from other vehicles or go back to Volkswagen to try to get them.

It is a very difficult decision. Obviously we try to get the best equipment for the troops at the best price, or try to have equipment that will satisfy the *retombées économiques* for the various regions of Canada. But there's a price to pay.

• (1045)

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Bevilacqua, I just wanted to tell my colleagues that there is a vote in the House of Commons at 11:15, but we'll be finished here by 11 o'clock.

Mr. Bevilacqua.

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Obviously I want to thank you very much for your presentation.

As you reviewed the international policy statement, one of the things that really struck me was the number of areas we try to deal with as a country. And I often wonder whether, as a world society, we are caught in something that happens even within our own country when roles and responsibilities aren't clearly defined. What I mean by that is the issue of duplication.

Do you think we, as a world community, have come to the point where in fact nations ought to be looking at specializing in certain areas, whether it be education or local economic development, and develop a toolkit, an international toolkit, where resources would be better utilized?

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** There is a danger with the niche approach. In my own experience in NATO, when I was involved in NATO, this issue came up quite often. Normally it was considered a buzzword used by nations that wanted to do less and spend less on defence and therefore raised the issue of niches—we should build a niche to do that. Therefore, when the issue came up, people would say, that particular country is not very serious about its defence; they pretend they want to specialize, but we know what they really want to do.

I'm not sure what the answer is as far as Canada's foreign policy goes and how to implement it. I think there is a sound approach in the IPS, built on the three Ds essentially. I think we'll see that with our new mission in Kandahar, starting in August with the provincial reconstruction team, where an element of the Canadian Forces—maybe 200 to 250 people—the RCMP, CIDA, and I guess the NGOs will play a role together. I'm not quite sure how it's going to work out, but I think it's probably the way to go. Obviously there'll be lessons learned from that particular experience. I think that should be

our approach, trying to get the key elements of the key components of our foreign policy involved.

Now, to coordinate that with other countries is always difficult, although again, the example of Afghanistan is probably a good one. NATO is getting more and more involved, not just providing security around Kabul, but deploying troops around Afghanistan—these provincial reconstruction teams. I think again there'll be lessons learned about whether we're doing the right thing. It won't be easy. It's going to be very difficult, I would suggest, in Afghanistan.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now, you put your question first, Mr. Menzies, and then we'll have Mr. Paquette with a question. We have just a few minutes left.

Mr. Menzies.

**Mr. Ted Menzies (MacLeod, CPC):** Yes, I realize we're short on time, but thank you for your presentation.

I have had a concern for quite a while about CIDA being used as a slush fund for the military. We've seen the budget. From some of your comments, Mr. Pellerin, I sense agreement from you. I would like a comment on that.

Mr. McCort, you said you're adopting a philosophy of making markets work for the poor. Could you elaborate? I don't know that everyone around this table understands. I've had discussions with your group, and I agree with that. So I would like you to tell us a little more.

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** I'm not sure I agree with your comment that CIDA is a slush fund for the military. I think the military has a budget of \$13 billion, and the amounts of money transferred from CIDA and Foreign Affairs to DND are relatively limited. This happens, for instance, when there's a mission like the tsunami, where CIDA had to provide funds for the transport of the DART team.

I agree with Mr. McCort that as a country we need to look at whether showing the flag with the DART team is the best way to invest limited funds in relief of situations like the tsunami. It does show the flag, but I would suggest there are cheaper ways to provide drinking water to the population in the region.

• (1050)

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** Making markets work for the poor is shorthand for a whole range of economic development activities we're involved in with CARE. The main premise is that poor people, as they raise their incomes, will start making smart choices about how to use money. They will decide what to build in their communities. They will put money into education and local health care, and this will displace the need for aid money.

We like trade as well as aid, and we think aid can be used as a great stimulus for local economic development. The focus of our work is to take a poor community and link it to somebody else who is not as poor. We're not looking at just building links among poor people. We want to link them to urban and international markets and have them become part of an international value chain.

We are focusing a lot of our work on trying to reposition the value chain and make poor people owners of industry and enterprises, not just their own labour. This way they will have an opportunity to take advantage of the wealth being generated through their businesses.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Paquette.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** First of all, thank you for your presentations. It was most enlightening to see the link that exists between humanitarian aid and defence. It is not something that we hear a lot about.

Mr. Pellerin, I know that we do not have much time, but I would like you to address the issue of Canada's role within organizations such as NORAD or NATO. What, in your opinion, does the future look like?

Mr. McCort, what, from the Canadian standpoint, is the priority for UN reform?

**The Chair:** Mr. Pellerin.

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** I think that NORAD remains crucial to Canada. As you know, NORAD is part of an agreement under which Canada and the U.S jointly manage the security of North America. This will continue to be necessary. However, requirements change, and it will perhaps be necessary one day to include marine or land security in the NORAD agreement. However, I do not think this will happen the next time the agreement is up for renewal.

As far as NATO is concerned, its purpose may well have changed since the end of the Cold War, but we have witnessed NATO involvement in the Balkans and in Afghanistan, where approximately 10,000 NATO troops are stationed alongside the 18,000 or so U.S troops. Consequently, NATO also has a presence there. For example, at its ministerial meeting last week, NATO decided to provide logistical support to the effort in Sudan.

NATO has undergone a transformation, which, in my opinion, effectively addresses Canada's requirements. In fact, both organizations meet Canada's needs very well.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Pellerin.

Mr. McCort.

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** With respect to reform of the UN, we are focusing on the humanitarian agencies of the UN—the High Commission for Refugees and the World Food Programme. Those are agencies that for us have a critical role. We would like to see them strengthened in their ability to coordinate and develop frameworks, without having to deliver as much humanitarian aid as they do now. They are finding this difficult and are turning to us to help them. We think we can offer a tremendous amount on the

delivery side if they're building the framework, the capacity, and the context.

**The Chair:** Merci.

Ms. Guergis.

**Ms. Helena Guergis (Simcoe—Grey, CPC):** Thank you.

My question is for Mr. McCort and is with respect to the list, the 25 development partners CIDA had announced. We have heard from other witnesses, actually, who have said they were baffled by the selection. I'm wondering if you'd care to comment on the countries that were chosen and say what your thoughts are on that.

I've also had some concern expressed to me that Ethiopia is included on the list but Eritrea is not. Would you care to comment on that?

• (1055)

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** Concerning the list of 25 countries, in our work we refer to 24 because Ukraine, for example, is one that CARE Canada has no expectation of working in. But some of the other countries chosen, again, were a bit surprising to us; they were smaller countries with smaller populations than we expected. We're not aware of a substantive Canadian involvement in a couple of the countries as compared to others. Guyana and Benin are examples of places where we and other NGOs are working, but we don't see there is a substantive presence or links to justify elevation into the focus country selection.

There are other countries where we have seen long-standing Canadian support, like Zimbabwe, and for us it's very surprising that they're not a primary focus of CIDA. It does not meet the criteria for a development partner because it is a failed and failing state, but it's a country with tremendously strong links to Canada and one that is oddly outside of what I would think would be a set of focus countries.

But we welcome the decision within CIDA to focus on fewer countries and think that will be good for the countries that are chosen. There are many deserving countries; we are not going to begrudge any country getting onto that list, and we wish them all well.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I have a question for you, Mr. McCort, and one also for Monsieur Pellerin.

Mr. McCort, in the recent conference of defence association institutions, your president, Dr. Watson, was very critical about the deployment of the DART in Southeast Asia. Can you elaborate on the alternate approach you recommend at such a time?

And my question for Monsieur Pellerin is, do you believe there is a common understanding between the Department of National Defence and Department of Foreign Affairs on the tasks involved in an international operation, from traditional peacekeeping to combat operations?

Mr. McCort.

**Mr. Kevin McCort:** We were involved from the very beginning of the establishment of the DART. We were consulted by National Defence, were involved in some of the initial briefings and training of the DART staff, and feel that there are contexts where a unit like that is appropriate. But we haven't seen very many, and it begs the question of whether the unit should be retained for three deployments in a decade.

Our approach is for alternatives in terms of the DART. For water supply it's usually about securing a local supply and treating that with chlorine, giving a chemical treatment as opposed to physical filtration. For food supply, often the first defence is local procurement and then international beyond that. We find that in many health facilities, with the nature of the illness you find in many contexts, simple first aid is what's required; you don't really need elaborate hospitals.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Monsieur Pellerin.

[Translation]

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** I think that the relationship between the two Departments is better now than it has ever been. One of the reasons for this, in my opinion, is that the International Policy Statement process has forced the two Departments to discuss a wide range of issues and to reach an agreement on the way forward. There has never before been an over-arching policy providing a framework for co-operation or discussion.

I have worked very closely with the Department of External Affairs in the past. I believe that the working relationship is better now.

[English]

**The Chair:** Merci.

We could add one question from Ms. McDonough.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Thank you.

I recently saw the film *Peacekeepers and Peacemakers: Canada's Diplomatic Contribution*, which was funded in part by CBC and DFAIT, and it certainly dispelled any notion that peacekeeping is a picnic. It's highly dangerous and demanding work.

My question is whether you have a sense that the film can and should be used as an educational vehicle for Canadians. I raise the question because following the film there was a panel wherein there was a lot of concern expressed about insufficient attention to the humanitarian aid side of the preventive measures needed. Could you comment on that?

•(1100)

**Col (Retired) Alain Pellerin:** I must admit I haven't seen the film, but I'm aware of it.

I've been involved for so many years in this issue of peacekeepers in Canada, and I think there is an element of myth that still exists. For instance, if you look at the peacekeeping monument, the way peacekeeping is portrayed has changed completely. The peacekeeping that is portrayed on the monument—and also if you look at the flip side of your \$10 bill—is the old UN-type peacekeeping that took place in Cypress. The two parties agreed to peace, and it was kept for 30 years. Canada was there for 30 years, and except for the 1974 war, it was benign peacekeeping.

What we see now, starting with Somalia, Bosnia, Sarajevo, and Afghanistan, are more peace-making operations, and it's important for the soldiers to make sure they have the right tools and are well trained for that sort of mission.

To answer your question, it is important to show that film and have these discussions about how peacekeeping has changed over the years. It's not the benign type of peacekeeping we used to do in the 1960s and 1970s; it's much more dangerous and needs robust forces to implement it.

**The Chair:** *Merci beaucoup, Monsieur Pellerin.* Thank you, Mr. McCort. I think it was great to have you both here this morning—both sides.

Ms. Phinney.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** A group of mostly professional people from Hamilton give up one to three weeks of their holidays every year. They pay for all the expenses themselves, including the lumber and supplies, etc., and ship them down to Haiti. There is a group of these people there all year long building schools and rec rooms for the kids.

One of the ladies who went last year wrote a little book about their experience, and I thought you might like copies. I'm sorry it's not in French. The group wrote it themselves, so it's not in French.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** I would like to thank both Mr. Pellerin and Mr. McCort for coming in today.

[English]

The meeting is adjourned.





**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**