



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

FAAE • NUMBER 065 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, November 1, 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

Tuesday, November 1, 2005

• (1910)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.)): Good evening, everyone. Welcome to this hearing of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

As you know, last April the government released its first international policy statement. The committee has been holding hearings on this statement since then, both in Ottawa and now across the country. We have also opened e-consultations on the subject, and you can find those on our website.

Once we have finished our hearings and the e-consultations in December, the committee will prepare a report with recommendations on the government's policy. We hope to table them early in the new year.

My name is Bernard Patry. I'm a member of Parliament from Quebec. I'm a Liberal, and I've chaired the foreign affairs and international trade committee for three years. I've been a member of this committee since 1993.

With me are my colleagues Ms. Beth Phinney, who is a Liberal member; Ms. Helena Guergis, who is the critic for international trade for the Conservative Party; Mr. Roger Clavet, who is a member of the Bloc Québécois and also the critic for the Asia-Pacific area; and Ms. Alexa McDonough, the former leader of the New Democratic Party and the critic for their party on foreign affairs issues.

In terms of the way we will proceed tonight, you are all going to have about five or six minutes. You will come to the mike one by one and we will listen to you. You give your name and the name of your group, or, if you don't represent a group, the subject on which you would like our committee to listen to you. Once in awhile, if some of my colleagues want to ask you a question of precision, they will do so.

I now invite you to come to the mike, first come, first served. Thank you.

Mrs. Shirley Farlinger (As an Individual): My name is Shirley Farlinger. I've made other submissions at other hearings such as this, but times change, so my submission will be a little different from the one you have in your archives.

We face some stark choices with our foreign affairs, international trade, and defence policies. I'm sure you get criticism, so I think I'll give you some good news first.

Canada has supplied the United Nations and its agencies with some of the most capable people in the whole world: Louise

Fréchette, as UN Deputy Secretary-General; Stephen Lewis, as special envoy to Africa—and I have his new book *Race Against Time* here; Lloyd Axworthy, Somalia; Philippe Kirsch, head of the International Criminal Court; and Newton Bowles, a friend of mine from UNICEF; as well as Louise Arbour and Roméo Dallaire. And there are probably many more Canadians who have been instrumental in putting the United Nations forward.

Our support of the UN is crucial to the future of the world. I recommend Kofi Annan's publication *In Larger Freedom*. It describes the year-long work of experts on reforming the United Nations, and this was recently brought to the UN. In spite of the rejection of some of the recommendations, I think it is up to us in Canada to keep working on them.

Canada supported the millennium development goals, and these, too, give us an agenda for future policies. We have to keep working on these goals. These are long-term objectives, but we have to make sure our day-to-day policies fit in with these objectives.

Also notable is the formation of a response team, DART, to deal with catastrophes. I think this is a new thing in our military forces, and it sounds like a very good thing. Perhaps we should concentrate on it more, because we are going to have more and more catastrophes, as we have seen, from earthquakes and floods and storms and all those things.

Turning to where I believe we are going wrong, the policies of foreign affairs must take precedence over trade or military policy. Otherwise, we are not a democracy. The Honourable Minister Bill Graham should understand this better than anyone.

I was shocked to learn recently that the bullets for the war in Iraq are made right in Toronto. Our military production mostly going to the United States is a contradiction of all the UN stands for.

Small arms, as you know, are proliferating around the world. They're cheap and they're available everywhere. This leads to the impoverishment of countries, the rape of women, the abduction of children for armies, and the general ideology that might makes right.

Canada did stop making land mines, as far as I know. In other words, it is possible for the government to stop military production of lethal weapons. To say you can't do it is incorrect.

The International Criminal Court, which we were very instrumental in setting up, must now be enabled to try dictators and must be seen by everyone to be able to do that.

My efforts in the past year have been to follow up on an excellent report done by Physicians for Global Survival. It is called *The Impact of Militarism on the Environment*, and I note that when I go to protests, most of the people there are young and most of those young people are worried about our environment.

There certainly is a strong connection between military activities and the destruction of our environment, so the Canadian Federation of University Women, of which I am a member, passed a resolution urging the Canadian government to call for a United Nations meeting on this topic, to address the destruction of the environment due to military activities in Canada and by Canada in other countries. I hope you will respond to that report.

• (1915)

Women have a special interest in using their own negotiating skills to prevent conflict and foster reconciliation. I was so happy when Security Council Resolution 1325 was passed in October of 2000. In it, it was agreed that women would be included in all such negotiations. It passed by consensus, by the way, in the Security Council. Many countries around the world are taking up this agenda. Women are really using it. In Canada, I think we have been aware of it, but I have yet to see women included in negotiations that must occur in order to prevent war.

Globalization and so-called free trade have not been good for most women and children. Poor countries are privatizing their few public goods, exporting their resources to the rich, and depending on military production sometimes for jobs. We want to get out of the war business—and it is a business. We want to get into the culture of peace. We can do this. Canada really has no enemies.

But Canada cannot have its departments of foreign affairs, international trade, and defence policy all pulling in different directions. A good test for any policy is does it contribute to life, both human and ecological, or is it part of the process of collapse outlined in the recent book by Jared Diamond? Signs of this collapse are all around us.

The United Nations will be meeting in November and December for a global conference on climate change in Montreal. I think it's wonderful the UN is moving to Montreal, maybe permanently—I don't think so, but it's a thought. Getting out of military activities, fostering alternative energy, ending the nuclear cycle—and I brought along David Suzuki's book on smart generation; we don't need nuclear power, as it only contributes to our problems—and ceasing wars for oil and gas will all help us.

Let's alter our policies and priorities to face these new realities—and, I can tell you, women will be glad to help.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mrs. Shirley Farlinger: For anybody who wants to look at these, I'll leave them here.

• (1920)

[Translation]

Mrs. Bruna Mota (As an Individual): Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, good evening. My name is Bruna Mota. I appear before this committee on behalf of Conscience Canada and of Nos impôts

pour la paix. My presentation will be made partly in French, and partly in English. I would like to ask the committee for permission to circulate these documents to the members of this committee, even if they are not all in both languages.

Mr. Roger Clavet (Louis-Hébert, BQ): That is all right. I do not object.

Mrs. Bruna Mota: Thank you.

I would like to add also that we made a request to appear at a specific sitting, but since we were not invited, we knocked a bit harder at the door. I would like to emphasize that the consultation process, especially when ordinary citizens are consulted...

[English]

I think it should probably be a little bit more open and accommodating rather than trying to get us to scramble at the last moment.

The Chair: To answer this, it's difficult because it's a minority government and to travel we need to get the permission from the leaders of every party in the House of Commons. We had the authorization only last Wednesday to travel. That's the reason we had a major problem. But that's why we decided also to have a town hall meeting this evening just to be sure we could give a chance to everyone to participate.

Mrs. Mota, the floor is yours now.

[Translation]

Mrs. Bruna Mota: It helps to know the reasons.

[English]

I would like to take the time to make the presentation.

Conscience Canada works to adhere to the principles of non-violence in accordance with our conscientious objection to the use of violence, especially state-sponsored violence. We are glad the government is calling for a review of its foreign policy. However, it seems this review is quite literally a look-back at decisions the government has already made and not a real opportunity for Canadians to re-think our foreign and security policies to bring them more into line with our fundamental values.

Conscience Canada believes in moving forward with our vision. What is our vision? We believe that peace is necessary, not merely desirable. It is necessary and possible. We also believe that true peace implies justice and ecological sustainability. The armed forces will not provide that, and the emphasis on trade and growth will not provide that. We need to look at the basic assumption about what will lead to long-term peace for Canadians and the rest of the globe.

We believe that our government must set priorities to match the new global reality. In the past, economic health meant continued growth. The new reality is that a healthy economy will be best achieved through sustainability. We are concerned that increasing disparity between rich and poor and environmental degradation are far greater long-term stresses toward peace and security than rogue states, international criminal syndicates, weapons proliferation, and terrorism.

We are very concerned with the increased harmonization of our defence policy with that of the U.S. Their basic foreign policy is very different from that of our nation, as Canadians do not see foreign policy as a war tool, but rather war as a failure of foreign policy and foreign diplomacy.

We trust that you can understand why we see the need for a more thorough review of foreign policies, especially our defence and security policies. Indeed, Conscience Canada joins with the Polaris Institute in calling for a total freeze on defence spending to allow us to look closely at our security and defence priorities. We know that if our government were to decide to base its foreign policies on the principles of non-violence—and this is the international decade of a culture of peace, after all—we would have a good base to build on.

Just one example is this book, *Canada At Peace*, by Dave Schubert. In this book Mr. Schubert, from the Canadian Peace Foundation, provides a comprehensive overview of how Canada could enact policies that would promote sustainable peace and justice here and around the world by allocating differently the same amount of money now allocated to the military and dealing with the environment and the discrepancy between have and have not.

Conscience Canada organized a cross-country consultation on how we could improve security non-violently. Out of that consultation came this report, and you have it in your folders.

• (1925)

[Translation]

There is a summary in French, “Alternatives non violentes pour la sécurité et la défense du Canada”. The full report is in English only, unfortunately. But it is available in French on our Internet site.

We have consolidated the main recommendations resulting from this consultation under the title “Development, diplomacy, and defence”.

[English]

On development, Canada should fulfil its commitment to provide the equivalent of 0.7% of GDP in development aid. Canada initiated these goals, and we are currently losing credibility in the world by not following through. It is also essential that we provide the right type of aid, aid that would help to increase local autonomy, protect food and water self-sufficiency, provide basic medical care, support non-violent movements in conflict areas, and develop green energy sources rather than aid that is really geared to increase Canadian trade.

Diplomacy.... Canada's foreign policy should be guided by the six principles of the United Nations Manifesto 2000. My friend Shirley Farlinger mentioned how rooted we are in the tradition of support for the United Nations and that we are falling behind. The UN Manifesto 2000 for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence talks about respecting all life, rejecting violence, sharing with others, listening to understand, preserving the planet, and rediscovering solidarity. Canada is a signatory to this manifesto.

In this work, it is most important that we seek to support local efforts to improve social justice, remembering, for instance, Resolution 1325, which Shirley Farlinger talked about, which was

passed unanimously by the Security Council and which Canada is not implementing in its own processes.

We need a federal Department of Peace to help us make the necessary changes in our policy. One of its tasks would be to work to get Canada out of the arms trade, starting with an end to all subsidies, including the investment of Canada Pension Plan money in this trade. It is also crucially important that we shift trade agreements to enhance human security and sustainable development for the whole world, rather than cancerous growth.

As to defence, defence should mean upholding the fundamental Canadian value of defending the world from hunger, cold, aggression, and ignorance. Using military force is not appropriate to obtain these goals. It may sound unrealistic to suggest that we shift to non-violent civilian-based peace services, but this is already happening.

People from around the world, Canadians included, have helped protect people in danger of being killed or suffering human rights abuses in countries such as Sri Lanka, Guatemala, Indonesia, and Colombia through Peace Brigades International, which the Canadian government at one time was funding generously, but not any more.

There are other groups doing similar kinds of work. Now in Iraq the Christian Peacemaker Teams have been very effective, and there is plenty of expertise and commitment to non-violent peace intervention in Canada. We should tap those resources. The most effective ways to protect Canadian sovereignty are also non-violent.

We need to encourage the development of informed and creative dialogue through our publicly funded broadcasters as key components of that effort. One creative suggestion is to really honour the sacrifice of Canadian veterans by transforming all the Legion halls across the country into centres of education on non-violence, about the value of non-violence, the tools of non-violence, and the spirituality of non-violence.

Based on our understanding of what non-violent defence would mean for Canada, it is clear that it must include the development of a bio-regionally-based, sustainable, and richly diversified economy. For example, we need to decentralize power generation, making renewable options more viable and making it less likely that a potential attacker could destroy significant power generation capacity in one act. We need to develop local food security, ensuring the livelihood of our farmers, cutting back on polluting long-distance transportation, and stopping the exploitation of farmers around the world.

• (1930)

Defending ourselves non-violently would not entail disbanding our police forces, but it would mean shifting towards more community-based policing models. Canada could help many police forces around the world if we really adopted community-based policing. At present, the RCMP and local police forces are relatively militarized ones.

Once again, Canada has the capacity to change with the help of people such as policing consultant Chris Braiden, whose initiative to implement community policing in Edmonton was remarkably successful.

One way to look at the foreign policy decisions we are making is to think about what it means to be human. Conscience is surely one of the key attributes of humanity. When faced with problems such as over-consumption, overpopulation, and environmental despoliation, do we take the dinosaur approach and worship at the altar of economic growth, let millions starve to death, and protect ourselves from their wrath by increasing military growth, or do we decide to invest in more truly humanitarian solutions such as increasing worldwide access to health care, education, and other basic needs, especially for women, supporting environmental reclamation, sustainable economy, and agricultural practice at home and abroad?

Likewise, when faced with problems like terrorism, do we focus on "enemies" and try to "kill the scumbags", to paraphrase the Canadian Chief of Defence Staff, or do we look at the needs and feelings that give rise to terrorism and commit ourselves to invest in solutions based on respect for international law and human dignity?

Conscience Canada thanks you, I personally and on behalf of the board and of all of our members. This is a great opportunity to educate ourselves, and I hope the writings and input you are receiving will get wide circulation.

Thank you very much. Again, I will leave this book here for your consultation.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mrs. Mota.

Mrs. Bruna Mota: If there are any questions, I am available.

The Chair: We're going to need that. I just want to say that there will be maybe some questions at the end.

I said in the beginning I would like to have five-minute presentations. Now we've been to ten minutes and we've got about 25 people. I would like to have everyone get a chance to talk. This is why I would like to have everyone talk for five minutes and try to get some questions and answers at the end, if it's possible.

Mrs. Bruna Mota: Thank you for listening.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Thanks, Mrs. Mota.

Yes.

Mrs. Ulma Lee (As an Individual): My name is Ulma Lee. I am Korean-Canadian. These days, we have a big problem with North Korea and Communist China. I will just give some examples so that you can think about a policy.

As we all know, North Korea is the most oppressive government in the whole world, especially for the Christians and the intellectual people who don't agree with the communists. Many people escape to China because it is adjacent to Korea, not because they like China. There are many Koreans living in the border area. That's why in last about ten years, almost 300,000 Koreans escaped into China. The problem is that they all want to go to South Korea, but the Chinese government hunts them down and sends them back to North Korea, knowing they will be executed or sent to a labour camp. China signed the 1951 United Nations convention relating to the status of

refugees and the 1967 protocol relating to the status of refugees knowing full well they would just ignore it and act so inhumanely.

Now, at last, the U.S. government has taken notice. Last year, the U.S. Congress passed into law the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, which we can easily get through the Google website. I brought a copy of it here, and I will give it to the ladies from Ottawa.

• (1935)

The Chair I want to give you examples not of theoretical policy, but of what is happening there. Many North Korean refugees, especially young women, will be sold to the Chinese, especially. Usually, they will be sold to the farm country. As you know, because of the one-child policy, there are records of the women in the farm country there, so they will be sold to the farmhouse, and those Korean women will become sex slaves for all the males of the family. Not only that, they will labour all day long.

When she escapes, all the neighbours will catch her, because they treat that woman like an animal. They are not the same race. When they capture them, they will cut off their fingers, one by one.

Is there no law, no God, no morality in this world in this day and age? That is happening. How can we let this happen?

So now, at last, the U.S. government came to the realization that the problem here is China. North Korea is almost a puppet government of China. Without China, they cannot survive.

The U.S. government appointed a human rights ambassador to North Korea, and they decided to tax Chinese imported goods if they don't change their attitude, especially on North Korean refugees.

This is very practical. I hope our government will do the same. Between the Olympics, it will be really effective for the Chinese government, and Christians living in America and Canada are especially working for it. From time to time we go in front of the Chinese embassy and protest, but China has become so big that they are not afraid of anybody. They've become such a lawless country that only practical pressure will be effective.

So reading and hearing that our government will do business with the Chinese government, I want it to rethink. Just because China is a large size doesn't mean they are valuable human beings or a valuable government. Just like the Soviet Union, the Chinese government and North Korea must be treated like what they are.

So please study what the U.S. is doing.

There is one more thing I want to do. Canada sent missionaries a hundred years ago to Korea, and because of those Canadian missionaries, South Korea developed and became a democratic country. Almost 35% are Christian there now.

So we became a developed country and a Christian country. There are now many large Christian churches of many denominations—Presbyterian, Episcopalian, and Pentecostal. The largest churches are in Seoul, Korea.

So what I want to say here is we really believe—not only Koreans, but all Christians all over the world—that the Bible is the word of God. Christianity—any religion—has a really big power to change the people and cause something to happen.

• (1940)

So we believe the Bible is the word of God. Especially, what we are thinking is Israel; it is such a small country. It is a struggle to survive, because—

You're going to need to conclude. Sorry.

Mrs. Ulma Lee: Because we believe the Bible, Israelis have the right to establish their country there, and Jerusalem is the promised capital. We believe that. So if we have Christian traditions, let's help Israel.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Lee. Thank you very much.

Mr. Joseph Shier (As an Individual): Good evening. My name is Joseph Shier. I didn't prepare a presentation because I wasn't aware in advance of this, but from listening to the three presentations up until now, I think I have something to say.

We heard the first two, which talked about the values that Canada espouses, values of peace, of non-violence. And then we heard a woman sit here who told about a real problem, not about sustainability, not about a phony peace, but something that's going on in the world today that makes me ashamed to be Canadian. Canada's foreign policy is based on kowtowing to tyrants at the United Nations.

We have supplied, as we heard Ms. Farlinger say, wonderful people to the United Nations. Why would we provide people to an organization or institution that is a corrupt, immoral, jobs-for-the-boys organization? That is what the UN stands for in the world today. And yet we pretend. Canada's foreign policy is based on pretense.

We allow the Farlingers to continue and to spend ten minutes, but a woman who sits here and tells you about women who are having their fingers cut off is told that her time is up. The lack of concern and care for what's really going on, and asserting our position and the values that we fought for for generations in Canada.... We've all ignored those.

So what do we do about Korea? We pretend that it doesn't exist. What do we do about China? We have a Prime Minister who is prepared to use our trade disputes, our disagreements with our largest trading partner, the United States, as something to preen himself on and use China as though that's some kind of moral value that he can pride himself on by standing up to the United States.

But it's not only Korea that we have fallen down on. The previous speaker spoke about Israel. Israel has been under attack, and yet Canada prides itself on being an honest broker. An honest broker means, of course, trying to be even-handed between an aggressor and the defender. Even if the defender has won battle after battle but is still under threat of annihilation, that doesn't really matter. Canada wants to, as I said, parade itself around the committee rooms of the United Nations, chair the right committees, have its diplomats and civil servants be appointed and be on their expense junkets and be part of that community, that so-called world community, which really represents immorality. And that is the concern.

Time after time, problem after problem in the world, the real problems, the problems in Sudan—what have we done about Sudan? We pretend. What are we doing about the threat of China against Taiwan? Again, we ignore it. What did we do in Cambodia when millions were being massacred? We ignored it. In that particular case, the United States wasn't a whipping boy of the world, so everyone ignored it. We still would rather have tea with the foreign ministers of the tyrants of the world and maintain our access to them than actually have a policy of morality. So we pretend.

That is what our foreign policy is. It is shameful, and I wish you would take this message back to Parliament.

Thank you.

• (1945)

The Chair: Mr. Shier, thank you.

Mrs. Maureen Basnicki (As an Individual): Thank you. Good evening.

I'd like to introduce myself. I'm Maureen Basnicki.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mrs. Maureen Basnicki: I'm very pleased to say that I'm in Helena Guergis' riding up in Collingwood.

Collingwood is the home that my late husband, Ken Basnicki, and I chose. We chose to build our dream home there, our retirement home. In fact, we only finished completing this home in September of 2001.

It's with great emotion, and I'm sorry to be dumping this on everybody here, but my husband Ken, my best friend, my confidant for twenty years, was murdered by terrorists in the 9/11 attacks.

I'm here speaking from the heart. I'm not prepared. I'd like to turn the microphone over to my colleague, Mr. Aaron Blumenfeld, but I would like to make a few comments.

Ken—I won't continue to say my late husband—just happened to be in New York. He'd been promoted as the financial marketing director for an American firm. He was very excited about this. He'd worked for the American firm on and off for the twenty years we were together.

Because he was a hard-working and very successful Canadian, he had often had the opportunity to transfer to the United States. He always declined. Canada was the country that he loved. He wanted his children to be educated here, and it's where his family lived, his parents, and where he wanted to be. He was very, very proud of his country. He turned down numerous opportunities to relocate there.

At the time of his death, I was an Air Canada flight attendant. I was on a layover in Germany. I watched on CNN, as did the rest of the world, knowing that my husband was in the towers. I didn't arrive home until Friday.

Anyway, I won't go through more detail—you all know them—but just say that I didn't only lose my best friend, I lost a very true Canadian. And I would have to say that I'm sure he is disappointed greatly in the reaction of our country, of his beloved country. I would say more: the non-reaction. Canada's complacency started with our former prime minister, who said on the six-month anniversary that these occasions happen from time to time, and he saw no reason to mark it. And on the first anniversary of 9/11, it was said that it was western greed that caused that act.

I will not get into the causes. I don't know what the cure is. I do have some very concrete suggestions as to how I, as a victim, and we, as Canadians, can address this, but I would point out that Canada really has not taken a stance in the global war against terrorism.

This is not an endorsement of what other countries have done. This is only to state that Canada has been affected by terrorism. It was twenty years ago when we had a self-manufactured event. It was executed in Canada.

Two dozen Canadians were murdered by terrorists in 9/11. To date, myself—and I speak for the other 9/11 victims of terrorism—believe Canada's response has not been adequate. Reform policy has not been adequate. We've not been a true voice in this global war against terrorism. We've only been armchair critics.

There are many areas—it's a huge canvas—and, again, I won't go into all of them. I would like Mr. Blumenfeld to talk about CCAT—the Canadian Coalition Against Terrorism—and proposed legislation.

• (1950)

It's a very peaceful means of combating terrorism; it's a means of creating awareness of terrorism in our country.

I would like to say that when dealing with our foreign policy, I invite our country to put terrorism on the proper place on the radar screen. Being reactive to an attack on Canadian soil is not the right way of handling it. We should be proactive. Canadians have been murdered by terrorism in the past. There is every indication that Canadians will be murdered by terrorism in the future. This has not happened on our territory—Canadians travel.

We should be working on a policy that addresses this very real concern in our world.

• (1955)

The Chair: What's your first name, Mr. Blumenfeld?

Mr. Aaron Blumenfeld (As an Individual): My name is Aaron Blumenfeld.

I have a handout.

The Chair: Sure. Can you give it to the clerk?

Mr. Aaron Blumenfeld: I have copies.

The Chair: Fine. Thank you.

Mr. Aaron Blumenfeld: I'm a lawyer. I am assisting CCAT with this legislation.

I'd like first to thank Maureen for speaking on behalf of CCAT and victims of terror and to thank you for this opportunity as well.

The bill, which has been introduced in both the House and the Senate, is attached to the back of this handout. I think it addresses one important aspect of Canadian foreign policy: how this country should deal with rogue states that kill or injure our citizens.

C-CAT is made up of Canadian terror victims—9/11, Air India, Bali, victims of Palestinian terror attacks. The list grows and grows. There are hundreds of Canadian victims, and that's probably not as generally known as it ought to be.

The bill, though it was sponsored by Stockwell Day in the House and Senator David Tkachuk in the Senate, has had quite wide support. For example, Ed Broadbent was very supportive at the opening of the press conference and spoke strongly for this bill. Recently, Jack Layton has also given his support. It's hoped that this is a bill that will receive all-party support.

The bill contains a modest change to the law, to fix an anomaly. There is a bill called the State Immunity Act, an act that provides that Canadians cannot sue foreign states in Canada, other than a very narrow exception, the main one being for breach of contract.

For example, you can sue a foreign country if you have a contract with them to buy oranges and the oranges turn out to be rotten. You can sue them in Canadian courts for that. But if the foreign country sponsors or kills one of your citizens abroad or pays for that, you can't sue them in Canada.

That, I think, to any rational observer, doesn't make a whole lot of sense. It really also puts our citizens at a pretty major disadvantage when you have states that are really willing to do almost anything to your citizens, when you have states that.... We all know what has been done to Canadian citizens, without being at all specific.

Those states then go and do business in Canada and gain money from that, and our citizens cannot have any remedy in Canada against those states, cannot make any civil claim, and so on. That doesn't make a whole lot of sense, I would suggest. They can basically do business with impunity.

The bill really has two provisions. The first is to amend the State Immunity Act to permit civil claims in Canada against foreign states that sponsor any of the 35 terrorist groups that are designated as terrorist groups by the Government of Canada.

Secondly, the bill amends the anti-terrorism provisions in the Criminal Code by adding a clause that would permit civil claims that can be brought by victims in Canada for their own damages for breach of the Criminal Code anti-terrorism provisions.

To date, there has been, to my knowledge, one arrest under those anti-terrorism provisions and no convictions over the past four years or so, yet we have many, many victims in Canada. This would really empower the Canadians who are victims to use the courts themselves, with civil claims to seek civil redress.

There are precedents for this. It's well known that terrorism requires a substantial amount of money and organization, and there is often state sponsorship for it to happen. The record is that civil litigation can be an effective way to fight it.

The origin of this kind of legislation actually was in the U.S., with certain legislation that permitted claims against the Ku Klux Klan, civil remedies under the Civil Rights Act. Ultimately, what happened was that not only was the Ku Klux Klan bankrupted in many jurisdictions, but also much of its leadership was. That turned out to be one effective way to halt the terrible activities of that organization.

• (2000)

This kind of legislation was also brought in in other jurisdictions in the U.S. and has permitted successful claims against foreign states by victims of terror. Apart from just compensating victims for their losses and holding the wrongdoers responsible, even where the criminal justice system may fail, it also brings a certain degree of accountability, because with court proceedings.... With the whole area of terrorism, often what happens is that things tend to get buried; there's a whole level of secrecy. So when you have a civil claim, often the truth comes out, and there's much more accountability and public attention brought to these issues.

The precedents have also shown that it deters terrorists. When the countries realize they may be hit in the pocketbook, when they realize that their business activities in Canada may be stopped or hurt if they don't stop the terrorist activity, then that will also have a deterrent effect. It's a meaningful way to empower citizens to do something about terrorism and not just to be punching bags.

I say all this with some sense of urgency. There are warnings, obviously. Our intelligence agencies have stated that there are warnings about plans for attacks in Canada. We all hope fervently that this does not happen and that we don't have a Canadian city that's added to the list of places that are now too well known: New York, London, Madrid, most recently New Delhi, and so on. I say, with a sense of urgency, that we have to take action.

This is something that I would submit is relatively modest and should have the support of all the parties. So I ask for your help in seeing this bill through.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Blumenfeld. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Kyung B. Lee

Mr. Kyung Lee (As an Individual): My name is Kyung-Bok Lee, representing the International Campaign to Block the Repatriation of North Korean Refugees, Toronto Chapter.

I want to be brief. I have three points to present.

The first point is that as we all know, the human rights situation in North Korea is amongst the worst in our time, and we applaud the United States Congress for its unanimous passage of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 last year. Legislators of Japan and South Korea are in the process of adopting similar measures to help the North Korean refugees, to reach out to the North Korean

people, to ensure that food aid reaches its intended recipients, and to make human rights a central component of any policy dealing with North Korea. I do hope that the Canadian Parliament follows suit.

The second point I want to make is this: I understand that Canada tabled resolutions on human rights in North Korea jointly with the European Union in the last three years with the UN Human Rights Commission. I, as a Korean Canadian, have been exceedingly proud of Canada and our Canadian foreign policy.

According to the recent report, however, if I am not incorrect, the same resolution will be tabled at the UN General Assembly by the European Union only. Canada is not joining the European Union in this honourable endeavour this time. I'm shocked. I'm terribly, terribly disappointed. I hope Canada joins the European Union in this before it is too late.

The fourth point I want to make is about the upcoming APEC summit in Pusan, Korea. I understand that one of Canada's APEC priorities is to enhance security in the Asia-Pacific region by implementation of a counterterrorism agreement, which is the fundamental base for trade expansion and economic growth of the region.

I want to know who, from Canada's point of view, are the security threats, imminent or potential, of the region. Is North Korea included as one of them? The reason I'm pointing to North Korea is that North Korea has a record of bombing presidential aides and diplomats of South Korea in Burma in the early 1980s, and of exploding passenger flights, again in early 1980s. That's why North Korea is still designated as a terrorism-supporting state by the United States State Department. We are hearing that the North Koreans are still engaging in drug trafficking, printing and selling counterfeit, and kidnapping civilians. In other words, North Korea is engaging, at the state level, in terrorism against regional trade and world peace.

In this regard, Canada's foreign powers, it seems to me, are very vague. I want to know, if possible, what specific measures Canada has in mind, if any, to protect cargo, enhance maritime and aviation security, and ensure safety of people in transit.

Thank you.

• (2005)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Lee. Thank you, sir.

Good evening, sir.

Mr. John Howarth (As an Individual): My name is Dr. John Howarth.

• (2010)

The Chair: John Howarth.

Mr. John Howarth: I'm here as a member of the Canadian Coalition for Democracies, although I won't be speaking on their behalf tonight. I'll be speaking as an individual citizen.

Of the many regions I could choose to talk about, I'll limit it to one region, the Middle East. As a Canadian citizen, I want the Government of Canada and Canada's ambassador to the UN to actively support—I mean actively support—the State of Israel as the only functioning democracy in the Middle East. I want them to do this as opposed to tolerating terrorist regimes, as opposed to condoning terrorist regimes, and as opposed to supporting terrorist regimes.

The homicide bombers within and against the people of Israel are not militants, they are not freedom fighters, they are not insurgents—they are terrorists.

With that strong belief, I'm grateful for the UN's and Canada's recent condemnation of Syria—because of their probable implication within the assassination of the former prime minister of Lebanon, Hariri—and of the Government of Iran, because of the president's recent calling for the eradication of Israel.

I want the Government of Canada and I want Canada's ambassador to the UN to force the so-called Palestinian Authority to stop the terrorism against Israel, as opposed to the PA inviting the terrorists to form part of the government.

Secondly, and very specifically, I would like the Government of Canada to send an unequivocal statement to the rest of the democratic world by moving the Canadian embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Dr. Howarth.

Mrs. Wendy Guo (As an Individual): Good night. My name is Wendy Guo. I'm a Falun Gong practitioner representing the Global Mission to Rescue Persecuted Falun Gong Practitioners.

The first issue I'd like to raise here is that last month a Falun Gong practitioner was deported back to China. That's really a terrible thing. Why did these things happen? It might be because some government official might think the persecution hasn't been the main issue, but I think this is very wrong.

The truth is that persecution is going on and it's very severe now. Some of my friends are still in jail within China and the persecution is happening now every day. Every day, a practitioner has been illegally sentenced to jail, to labour camps, to detention centres, and to brainwashing centres. It's happening every day.

So here I hope our Canadian government will continue to protect the persecuted spiritual group, continue to protect the pursuit of freedom of belief and freedom of speech.

And the second issue I'd like to raise here is about the current tide of quitting the CCP. CCP stands for the Chinese Communist Party.

Here is a book named *The Nine Commentaries on the Communist Party*. Some of you may have already heard about this important book. This book was first published last November, and just because of the publishing of this book, during the last ten months, over five million previous CCP members publicly renounced their membership. And the fever is continuing to climb at a daily rate of tens of thousands.

So that's really a significant thing. It's just like what happened in the Soviet Union 15 years ago. At that time, communism in the Soviet Union collapsed overnight.

Maybe the same thing is happening now in China. So it's a very significant thing, as it will impact the whole world economically and politically, and the Canadian government cannot ignore such a significant point in Chinese history.

The last point is that maybe every country, including I think the Canadian government, wants to do business with China. China is now looking like a very big giant in the world and every country wants to do business with China. I just want to ask a question here: How can a country maintain such an amazing growth rate of GDP while it also has such a high percentage of unemployment?

The corruption issue exists in every corner of the society. The environment is seriously polluted and all kinds of protests are happening everywhere in China, but they soon suppress it down. The CCP will not give them an opportunity to make their voices heard and they just crack down on every signal of people pursuing freedom of speech.

So I think just combining what's happening with the tide leaving the CCP, maybe you can have a judgment about CCP's direction. It's important for the CCP to continue pretending there's such an economic boom while there are so many dangerous things happening now inside of China and maybe the outside world has no opportunity to hear the truth, to have a look at the truth of what's happening in China.

So, yes, that's what I want to present here.

Thank you.

•(2015)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Wendy.

Ms. Wendy Guo: And I want to leave this book.

The Chair: You leave it with the clerk, please, yes. Thank you.

Good evening.

Mr. Andrew Miller (As an Individual): Good evening.

My name is Andrew Miller.

I'm happy I got a chance to speak right after this lady, because my concerns also focus on Canada's relationship with China and Canada's poor relationship with Taiwan.

I'm only 23 years old, yet I do pay attention to the news. I read the newspaper every day and I'm quite alarmed with the state of the world today and where it's going. It seems as if, as we all know, the nation of China will be the next superpower. It's almost certain. Of course that raises many concerns. There is a tremendous opportunity in China for economic growth. There's a tremendous opportunity there for advancing democracy as well. However, I don't think Canada has been pulling its weight in terms of forcing China to reform and to become a member of the civilized world.

I suppose the same could be said about the United States. There's no doubt that it is economic concerns that lie underneath this reluctance to pressure China to reform. However, many former world leaders—one I can think of is Margaret Thatcher—came out and said that while China does give a lot of opportunity to the west, it also poses quite a few threats.

As a young Canadian, within the next 20 to 30 years, I most certainly see a country the west is going to have to deal with. I'd like that to be at the most peaceful level as possible, but if China continues with its militaristic agenda, constantly threatening Taiwan, enslaving Tibetans, violating their human rights—not to mention the human rights of their own citizens—denying religious freedom to the Falun Gong, denying religious freedom to Christians, Catholics.... It's truly disgusting. I don't think that my country, Canada, is doing enough to support democracy.

Our country was a very well-respected member of the international community in the 1950s and 1960s. Former prime minister Pearson had a tremendous reputation across the world for his role in the Suez crisis. Canada truly was a respected nation. However, it seems as if our reputation, internationally, has just deteriorated at a really alarming level. That really does cause concern. Thankfully, Canadians are waking up and realizing that our position in the world is just not what it used to be. We want to reassert our peacekeeping and our democracy-promoting values.

That's what brings me to Taiwan. There's no question that Taiwan is a free and democratic country. They hold elections; free, open, transparent elections with fixed dates. That's not something I can say for Canada. Anyway—

The Chair: We're still a democracy.

Mr. Andrew Miller: We are. You could call us that.

The point is that Taiwan is undoubtedly a democratic country, yet it does face a really alarming threat from Red China. I don't see why 30 million people, I believe, on the island of Taiwan, almost the population of Canada, should have to live with this threat.

Canada does not officially recognize Taiwan, and I think that's just an absolute disgrace. Why on earth? Prime Minister Paul Martin recently stated, "Taiwan is an inseparable part of Chinese territory. Canada reaffirms its adherence to its One China policy."

Canada has a one-China policy? That comes right out of Beijing. Why on earth is Ottawa reaffirming a one-China policy? I smell an agenda here. I don't mean to say anything libellous or slanderous, or whatever, but is the Prime Minister trying to court some favour for his business in China? I don't know. I'm not going to allege that.

Given China's emerging economic, political, and—most alarmingly—military force, it's critical that Canada assert its commitment to democratic nations. China's recent interest in strengthening its economic and political ties to Canada must be approached with caution and with the requirement that China not only respect its own people's human rights, but also cease and desist from threatening Taiwan's freedom.

Canadian values are most certainly more aligned with those of Taiwan, rather than Communist China, an aggressive power that oppresses the Tibetan people. Canada has an historic opportunity to

reassert its foreign policy position in the world by protecting and recognizing democratic neighbours, as opposed to coddling and encouraging tyrannical nations such as Red China, Communist Cuba, and Islamic Syria, today's enemies of freedom and democracy—and I might as well add Iran to that list.

As a Canadian citizen and grandson of Hungarian refugees from Soviet-controlled Hungary, I urge the Canadian government to take a stand in today's chaotic and uncertain world by reaffirming its original commitment to democratic government and basic human rights and freedoms. Appeasement of tyranny has always led to catastrophe. Let Canada lead the way in preventing this, as it has the capability and the support of the vast majority of Canadians to do so.

Thank you.

● (2020)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Miller.

Mr. James Hunter (As an Individual): Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you for this opportunity to address you, after a very tumultuous day in Ottawa.

● (2025)

The Chair: We were working over here all day long.

Mr. James Hunter: Well, thank you for getting yourself off the Hill—

The Chair: It's much better.

Mr. James Hunter: —on such a crazy day.

The Chair: Yes, exactly.

Mr. James Hunter: My name is James Hunter. I'm a member of the Canadian Coalition for Democracies, and as such, I am speaking this evening as an individual citizen as well.

I've been sitting back and listening to most of the comments that have been articulated here this evening. One of the points that seems to keep coming to mind is this concept of foreign policy. I think what has been overlooked is the fact that this country has had no coherent foreign policy for a number of years.

The task I see before you and before the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Department of National Defence is to articulate a set of goals that Canada wants to carry out in the world. These have not been clearly articulated. We have tried to do absolutely everything in the world and accommodate absolutely everyone, and in the process, we have done nothing.

If we take a look at a concept such as traditional peacekeeping, Canada led the way for years and years, and as a former member of the Canadian Forces, I can tell you, from many of my colleagues who have served overseas with gallantry, that we have steadily eroded ourselves. We are now ranked 34th in the world when it comes to contributing personnel to concepts such as peacekeeping. We're right behind the tiny African nation of Ghana. This is absolutely absurd for a country held in such high regard as Canada.

Therefore, what do I see as the goal? We talked about many things here this evening, and to me, they all fall under the realm of tactics. How do we achieve and accomplish our foreign policy?

We cannot handle issues like North Korea, we cannot handle issues like the Middle East, we cannot handle issues such as Iran, unless we know who we are and what we want to accomplish in the world. I think that's where the focus needs to be. So come up with a strategic framework, and from there, we can then take a look at what we can do successfully on the world stage.

My recommendation would be, first and foremost, to promote democracy around the world. That has to be first and foremost. We talk about Canadian values. I can't think of any greater value in this country than our democratic ideals, our ability to be able to sit here and protest, our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, all these things. These things should all be actively pursued around the world.

Secondly, tied very close to democracy, we have to get tough on terrorism around the world. It's absolutely shameful that we do nothing. We like to sit here and be armchair generals, quarterbacks, and tell everybody around the world what's wrong with the world and how to handle terrorism. Yet we can't even exercise our own prerogatives on it because we don't know what exactly we're doing.

We should be standing up unequivocally in the UN and through other multilateral organizations such as NATO or the OSCE and be able turn around and say to the Iranian president, "Shame on you", and we should be calling for the expulsion of Iran from the United Nations.

The third objective I see needing to be done is to continue to promote human rights, what Lloyd Axworthy actually called human security. If we can't provide a basic level of security for people, then nothing else matters. We've heard many people here today talk about wonderful idealistic concepts, that Canada should promote non-violence and we should be doing this or we should be doing that. That's all fine and dandy. That's what Joe Nye would call "soft power". But Joe Nye, the Harvard professor, would also tell you that soft power is only as influential as the hard power you can back it up with. So we need to be able to have both soft power and hard power. I'm not talking about going out and looking for dragons this way, but if we want to be able to exert influence in the world, we have to be able to stand on our own two feet and be able to articulate clearly what we want to accomplish and then devote the resources and personnel to be able to accomplish those goals.

With that, I thank you for your time.

Best of luck.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hunter.

Mr. Lin.

Mr. Albert Lin (As an Individual): My name is Albert Lin. I am a member of the Formosan Association for Public Affairs.

This morning when I was here—

The Chair: Yes, I remember.

Mr. Albert Lin: —I did mention something for which I didn't provide the information, especially to some of you; that is, how do we promote democracy through more effective development aid

programs. I didn't mention that I have my paper here, which I would like to share with you later.

This particular paper has effective tools, which I presented in an international conference on conflict transformation through track two diplomacy. Starting from the grassroots, organizing non-violent means—all these are there, including building civil society, peace-building right from this particular program with the people, recipient countries, and so on.

The second point I'd like to mention is related to the bill, Bill C-357, known as the Taiwan Affairs Act, which is currently in the House of Commons. For this particular bill it is not a zero-sum act for the Canadian government or Parliament. It is a non-zero sum. We can make it into a win-win situation with one side continuing to enhance traditional Canadian policy—that is, one-China policy, but excluding Taiwan. Paul Martin Sr. said this clearly in 1966 at the UN General Assembly, when he recommended Canadian policy to be one China, one Taiwan.

So in a sense this is very, very important. On the one hand, Canada would have to face a reality of emerging China, but at the same time, you are honouring all Canadian values—democracy, human rights, peace with justice and non-violent resolution to all international disputes and conflicts. So this is what I feel was not clearly stated this morning; that is, it's a non-zero sum, and yet we are not challenging Canada's one-China policy because it was stated so clearly twice by the UN General Assembly that Taiwan is not a part of China.

Thank you, sir.

• (2030)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Lin.

Mrs. Anna Miller (As an Individual): Hi. My name is Anna Miller and I'm representing Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief, or CPAR.

On behalf of CPAR, I'd like to thank the chair and the honourable members for giving us this opportunity to testify and to comment on Canada's international policy statement.

I'll reserve our comments to two specific comments regarding the IPS—one with respect to the role of civil society, and the other with respect to the intersections between HIV/AIDS and health outcomes.

As some of you may know, Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief has been around for twenty years and we're currently operational in four countries in Africa—northern Uganda, Malawi, Ethiopia, and Tanzania.

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): What was the name of your group, again?

Ms. Anna Miller: It's CPAR, Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief.

It is widely said among our eight Canadian staff members and our more than 200 local staff in our field offices and base camps in Tanzania, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Northern Uganda, that our hidden mission statement or ultimate aim is to run ourselves out of business. That at some future juncture there would be no need for an NGO such as CPAR would be our ultimate aim. In real terms, we continue to do our work because there is a high need for our work.

My first comment is reserved to the role of civil society in the IPS. Specifically, our points relate to the treatment of civil society in the IPS and are reserved to the following.

Obligations to reduce poverty, however prominent in this IPS, are seen as part and parcel of Canada's own interest in improving its regional security, its own prosperity, and what we call, in the NGO world, planting the flag when the flag has already been planted. The main reference to Canadian NGO capacity and its role in public engagement, both here in Canada and abroad, is expressed largely through the Canada Corps lens. Although I praise the Canada Corps and its work on governance and its volunteer-sending capacities, we are concerned that if it is the only lens through which we look concerning public engagement in civil society, we revert to being solely delivery agents and capacity-builders from above, while clearly aware that much of this capacity has already been built in the countries we work in and can be scaled up.

The IPS cites that small-scale programming adds administrative burdens on already strained institutions, causing Canada to lose economies of scale in our own management and overhead costs. This is a dangerous blueprint of thought to have embedded right into the IPS text.

In practice, for us NGOs, this is already translating into a dialogue with the three-D agencies. Approaching bilateral branches at CIDA leads to statements encouraging us to come back in three years' time, and for nothing less than \$5 million, as the transaction cost of partnering with a Canadian NGO with bases in the field is apparently just as high as giving double this to a major UN agency. I would like to say that we support and work with the UN agencies, which are currently targeting 9,000 households who are living with and are affected by HIV/AIDS in Malawi, which is in an impending famine situation, as you know.

It leads to statements such as "we're risk-averse" from the very agents who are administering Canadian development programs, and it reflects a benign neglect of the fact that in countries such as Malawi it is HIV/AIDS that is causing strained institutions as school teachers, government officials, and mothers indiscriminately die from the disease, and that it is HIV/AIDS that is causing an entire generation of young people to be wiped out. If you go to Mtchayi, Malawi, which I just came back from, approximately 20 kilometres outside of Lilongwe, it is grandmothers and kids who form the basis of that community. That is a loss of economy of scale that the IPS should be paying more attention to and that NGOs are often in the best position to respond to.

Our second comment relates to the intersection between HIV/AIDS and health outcomes. Although we applaud the focus on health outcomes in the IPS and the emphasis on the quick win, such as vitamin A supplementation and immunization campaigns, we would also want to recommend the addition of the following in the

area of child and infant health: that psycho-social support, or as Stephen Lewis so accurately states in his current book, "a therapeutic response to profound emotional distress", be also seen as a child health priority in the face of HIV/AIDS, when so many are on a death watch as we speak whom CPAR, through its programs focussed on child- and female-headed households, is reaching, but without keeping up with the demand. No one is keeping up with the demand.

That brings me to my last section, which is the section on improving food security in the IPS; this is the development section of the IPS. While so relevant in the current face of the impending famine in southern Africa and Malawi, which I've just returned from, and to the work that CPAR does, we would argue strongly that this has next to no meaning in the context of Africa without a close interlinking with HIV/AIDS.

I will put it bluntly. Without adequate food and nutrition, HIV/AIDS accelerates in an individual and reverses the gains made by ARV medication. I visited two home-based-care patients who recently ran out of ARV. They are now dead.

• (2035)

Ultimately, it threatens to reverse the many strides Canada has made through Bill C-9 and in support of the global fund for TB, AIDS, and malaria, among others, on getting those infected by HIV/AIDS the treatment they have a right to.

AIDS leads to hunger, and hunger right back to AIDS. Therefore, I would urge the committee to ponder whether the absence of such a link in the IPS is something Canada can take pride in.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Thank you.

Mr. Stanley Lai (As an Individual): Hello. My name is Stan Lai. I'm a student at the University of Toronto. I was born in Toronto, grew up in Toronto, and I cheer for the Maple Leafs. That may be a good point or a bad point.

The Chair: That's a bad point.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanley Lai: I love Canada. I'm a regular Torontonian, and I really love Toronto and Canada.

My parents are from Taiwan, and as I grew up, I got a chance to go back to my home country. I was really impressed. I love going back there and seeing faces of old relatives, and so on.

It's a really amazing country. My impression of it now contrasts with what my parents' stories of Taiwan were back in the days when they were growing up. Of course, that Taiwan was under a dictatorship, and there are really dark and scary stories.

I think of the amazing change Taiwan has gone through. As a child who has grown up in a country that's always been respectful of freedom and democracy, I can't fathom how Taiwan has changed, and how the Taiwanese people cherish their freedom and their democracy.

Although Taiwan has gone through such an amazing transformation to become a country that respects human rights and the freedom of speech and the press, the unfortunate thing is the world keeps slapping it in the face. I find it rather sad, because when the world sees Taiwan, the world should be congratulating Taiwan on its remarkable achievements. Yet it continues to isolate it.

Taiwan's government officials can't attend APEC summits. As Taiwan wants to democratically change its constitution, the world stands up and says no. Unfortunately, Canada is one of those countries. It's really too bad.

I think Canada has an opportunity to be a leader in promoting freedom and democracy in the international arena, like it used to be. There's an opportunity here for Canada to develop a much more Taiwan-friendly policy, to show it really does respect the changes in Taiwan and it's going to reward democratic behaviour.

• (2040)

[Translation]

Democracy and freedom are most important. Canada needs to state very clearly, before any other country does, that it stands for the people in Taiwan, a people who values democracy and human rights.

[English]

I'm not a scholar; I don't know about laws, and so on. But I do know that people who have gone through a dictatorship and have just acquired freedom cherish it. I know that people who have experienced democracy won't go back.

As elected members of a democratic nation of Canadians who also value these, I hope you will support Taiwan and end this senseless practice of isolation.

I'm going to end with an inscription I pass by on Soldiers' Tower at the University of Toronto every day. It says, "Freedom is the sure possession of those alone who have the courage to defend it". As Remembrance Day comes, it's a very appropriate message. But the prerogative of defending freedom in the world does not lie only with our honourable men and women in uniform. It also lies with elected policy-makers who want to stand up for human rights, democracy, and freedom in the world.

I thank you for your time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lai.

Mrs. Margaret Clark (As an Individual): Good evening. My name is Margaret Clark. This is my first time attending a public forum. I have looked forward to coming to one of these, and I will be brief so as not to take up the time of my fellow citizens.

I did not prepare a speech, but I am responding now to what I have felt is a general current from a lot of the speakers before me—a constant repetition of this belief to promote peace, promote democracy across the world.

It is a beautiful principle for Canada to maintain. I feel that I see a lot of different ways in these speakers of maintaining it. Some believe in non-interference, and in that way they do maintain the actual principle; of course, it doesn't actually see much immediate change. Some believe in direct interference right away; of course, in doing that, we would most likely fall into one of the mistakes I feel

the U.S. has made, in that every time you make an action in another country, you are yourself losing more of your right to be the one to interfere in other countries.

Right now Canada is in a special position. It still has that right because it has maintained a non-interference policy in certain ways, and has focused on other endeavours, such as peacekeeping. Recently we have the START task force. This all follows under the line of what Canada should be doing, but I do not feel it goes far enough.

I feel that Canada cannot directly step into a lot of the issues that we hear going on in the world today, but it can effect change in underlying levels. We cannot march into Taiwan and defend its borders from Chinese influence. We cannot march into the Sudan and split the sides apart. What we can do, and what we perhaps should be doing, is to re-envision what the military is supposed to be in Canada—and in this re-envisioning, we should consider that rebuilding efforts and reconstruction efforts are as integral to the stabilization and to the promotion of peace as the actual war itself.

We could work instead on protecting those institutions of democracy that do actually affect the people directly—more so than blockading governments, for instance. Recently there was an issue that Zimbabwe was going to be blockaded and isolated from the rest of the world in many ways. While this may punish the leader in some respects, it punishes the people more.

Canada has a role in the world; it must strengthen its role, but I do not feel it's through the military as we know it, and I do not feel it's through peacekeeping as I know it. It's through protecting institutions of democracy, such as schools, banks, public buildings, hospitals—buildings that protect the people. If we can do that throughout the world, then we can go a long way towards promoting the ideals of democracy without losing our right to be the ones to promote democracy—by not engaging in war-making in the same way, but engaging in the continuance of stability in these countries and in the continuance of human rights for these individuals who, through no fault of their own, were born into situations less fortunate than our own.

I may have rushed through that, but I feel that a lot of people have a lot of other things to say.

Thank you very much for your time.

• (2045)

The Chair: You're very kind. Thank you.

Mrs. Sophia Wong (As an Individual): My name is Sophia Wong. I'm here representing Engineers Without Borders. I don't know if you are familiar with our organization, but—

The Chair: Engineers?

Mrs. Sophia Wong: Engineers Without Borders, yes.

The Chair: That's fine. Thank you.

Mrs. Sophia Wong: That's EWB for short. We're an organization that works overseas but also in Canada to engage young people, mainly university students and young professionals, on international development issues. We have about 12,000 members across the country.

A lot of what our members do is reach out to the public on how we can make Canada a leading global citizen. Well, what does that mean? I think the IPS reflected a lot of the values we're trying to promote to the Canadian public, but it failed on a few accounts, so I'd just like to speak to those.

I'm sure you've heard over and over again—I've heard it mentioned a few times this evening already—that the IPS, as it currently stands, does not have a firm commitment towards reaching our UN promise of 0.7% of our gross national income. If we're not going to commit by 2015, when are we going to commit to reaching that target? To our young membership, university students or professionals just entering the workforce at the beginning of their careers, 2015 isn't that far away. That's ten years from now. They'll still be at the beginning of their working careers. By the time 2015 comes around, our members are going to be the movers and shakers of Canada—business leaders, policy-makers. They're looking for an answer.

Perhaps there is a constituency of people, maybe entering retirement, who are thinking that by 2015 they want to make sure they have a pension and don't want to be giving their money away, while there is a large constituency that feels that foreign aid is very important.

Something else that was missing in the IPS that our members feel strongly about is corporate accountability, corporate social responsibility. That has become increasingly important. Yet there is nothing in the IPS that talked about how the government might link financial and other forms of public support that are offered to Canadian companies operating overseas to human rights and environmental standards. Right now it's all based on voluntary measures, but in the past voluntary measures haven't proved to be very effective in making sure that Canadian companies are abiding by Canadian laws with respect to human rights and environmental standards when they're in the Philippines or in the Congo or wherever they're working.

Finally, I just want to say that my sense is that there's a lack of youth engagement in terms of putting together the IPS and commenting on the IPS, and I would like to see more active engagement of youth organizations. Perhaps as a suggestion, there might be some youth organizations that you might contact ahead of time to make a statement at this type of event or even hold the event at a youth-friendly environment, like maybe at a university campus.

That's all I had to say. Thanks very much.

• (2050)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Wong.

I just want to pinpoint that on two of your three points, the first one concerning the 0.7% was already adopted by our committee unanimously. I think it's report 12. And on the second one, in which you talk about corporate social responsibility, we have also adopted a report about this concerning the mining companies. I think it's report 14, but I'm not sure if it's 14, 13, or 15. This is just to let you know that this one also was adopted unanimously by our committee. That means we fully agree with you on these two issues.

Thank you very much.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Chair, may I just briefly, on a point of information, add to the concerns raised by Ms. Wong?

You're talking about ways in which to engage youths actively, and I'm pleased to add to the two points our chairman has made that we also have launched an e-consultation process as part of the IPS review in collaboration with Canadians. I don't want to stereotype young people, but I think it is true that youth are even more savvy and more used to using the Internet. It's not a substitute for the face-to-face, but it is a universally available opportunity for youth to contribute their views that will be brought together before the committee.

So it would be great if you could encourage your own 12,000 members, which is truly impressive, and other youth through a broader network to participate in that consultation. It's a matter of going onto the website and completing the questionnaire. There's room for individual comments on each section.

The Chair: Our researcher tells me that in Ottawa we heard from Canada25. I think it's the youth organization. The next town hall meeting will be in Montreal, and it will also be at a university, to get many more students. We're really trying hard. We will be at UQAM, l'Université du Québec à Montréal.

Thank you.

Madame Creighton, it's your turn.

Mrs. Phyllis Creighton (As an Individual): My name is Phyllis Creighton. I'm the vice-president of Science for Peace, and I represent Science for Peace on the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons.

I've been engaged in this issue for about 25 years, starting off in the Anglican Church of Canada. There is not an official policy, but I certainly can speak for this nuclear weapons group within Science for Peace. I'm going to confine myself to the nuclear weapons issue and the international policy statement.

The statements on nuclear weapons policies in the international policy statement are few and ill-conceived. In various places in the booklet—on diplomacy, page 13, and on defence, pages one and six—the IPS implies that the problem is irresponsible states and proliferation to these and to terrorists, and it notes a responsibility to deny them these weapons of mass destruction. But the threat posed by the states deploying more than 100 nuclear weapons is far more serious. Arguably, the very threats and implied threats of the old nuclear weapon states are an incentive to states to acquire nuclear arsenals.

The IPS seems content that the U.S. and Russia's nuclear forces will shrink greatly under the 2002 strategic offensive weapons reductions treaty, but these weapons are to be stored, not dismantled. There is no verification mechanism; they could be redeployed at the treaty's expiry in 2012. And with the end goal of 1,700 to 2,200 strategic nuclear warheads on each side, they will both still have massive nuclear destructive capacity.

A proposal that Canada pursue a strategy to reinforce compliance and verification mechanisms is all very well—that's in the diplomacy booklet—but it does not respond to the urgency of pressing forward towards the abolition of these weapons of excruciating mass destruction. There are no good nuclear weapons. The Canadian government should stick to acting on that understanding.

Remember, nuclear disarmament is Canada's legal obligation under the non-proliferation treaty, article VI, and it's not a distant goal but a duty to conclude negotiations and eliminate nuclear arsenals, according to the International Court of Justice advisory opinion in July 1996.

I spent a week in Hiroshima and Nagasaki this summer at a conference, and I heard a lot of interesting information and views. From Judge Christopher Weeramantry, who helped shape that opinion that use of nuclear weapons is, in general, illegal—the ICJ opinion in 1996—Weeramantry this summer warned us that we are in as much danger in the next five years as in the previous sixty years. We are, he says, facing the greatest threat of a 7,000-year history of humankind. Why? Forty countries have the knowledge to produce nuclear weapons, and an illicit market for nuclear weapons exists. Unemployed nuclear scientists are available at a price, and nuclear materials can quite easily be obtained.

The United States has both nuclear first-strike and preventive war policies. I refer to the 2002 nuclear posture review and the 15 March 2005 U.S. doctrine for joint nuclear operations.

We face nuclear catastrophe with some 4,000 nuclear missiles on launch on warning, hair-trigger alert, in the U.S. and in Russia. We are under threat every minute of every day. It is not a question of if, but rather of when. Nuclear devastation by weaponry will happen someday, somewhere, whether by accident, deterioration of warning systems, computer glitch, human failure, or by intent. Nuclear weapons will be used, and the next use will not be on two cities in a nearly defeated nation, but rather, given retaliatory capacities, will likely lead to massive interchanges, even nuclear winter. That's what Judge Weeramantry warned us about.

• (2055)

As first-hand knowledge fades and dies with the aging *hibakusha* in Japan, who sees with clarity, feels in their bones the horror of Hiroshima and Nagasaki experienced sixty years ago—people vaporized into the mushroom cloud?

Have you seen this famous picture of the shadow on the stairs? There are children and their mothers, brothers, sisters, burned like charred logs. There's one, dealt a death not even human; people screaming in the cities, walking like ghosts, flesh dripping from their hands, eyes popped out, crying out for water, and in great numbers throwing themselves in the river to escape the agony.

Come to Hiroshima and Nagasaki and learn, as I did in August, what hell on earth the United States inflicted to end a war that had descended into crusades, carnage, and barbarity.

A Japanese peace delegation that had come to New York to plead with diplomatic missions to take strong action to advance nuclear disarmament at the first committee in the UN brought me these pictures ten days ago.

Listen to this *hibakusha*, who remembers that in 1945, when doctors administered treatments for his burns, he begged them to kill him, because he suffered such unrelenting pain. This man warned us—thousands of us, gathered in a conference session—that until nuclear weapons are abolished, any one of us could become a *hibakusha* like him.

Think about the submarine silently cruising, cruising, cruising, whose missiles could destroy all the cities in the world, all the people and their habitats, many times over. By our inaction we are risking a future for a republic of cockroaches, as Jonathan Schell warned many years ago in *Fate of the Earth*.

What policies do we need for today's realities?

Canada should speak out against the illegal U.S. policies for nuclear weapons use.

Canada should avoid military or other deep integration with the U.S., given its nuclear weapons policies.

Canada should publicly identify NATO's stated reliance on nuclear weapons and its claim that they are essential to preserve peace and stability as wrong—wrong policies.

Canada should initiate a process of review and reform that will shift NATO out of nuclear weapons. And I'm encouraged that 11 NATO nations joined Canada in supporting the New Agenda Coalition—the whole resolution on nuclear disarmament—at the UN First Committee. Last year it was eight. For two years in a row Canada stood alone. I salute Canada for that policy; it's a much more progressive policy than the kind of thing you read in the international policy statement.

Canada should make a clear public commitment to a total ban on nuclear weapons. Say it out loud to the whole country and to the world.

Canada should exert pressure with like-minded states to get the nuclear weapons states to comply with the non-proliferation treaty and, specifically, to get on with the 13 practical steps.

Canada should get honest. Its membership in NATO compromises the integrity of Canadian leadership for nuclear disarmament. If Canada cannot shift NATO out of its nuclear ideology, it should get out of that alliance.

Canada should be working on becoming a nuclear-weapon-free state and on joining a nuclear-weapon-free zone; 80% of the southern hemisphere is involved in nuclear-weapon-free zone regions, and Science for Peace, Canadian Pugwash, and the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons are looking at how that would be done.

Canada should invest in public education on the urgency of nuclear weapons abolition, joining Mayors for Peace, whose conference I attended in New York in May, and the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament in believing that a nuclear-weapon-free world is possible—is necessary.

● (2100)

We can and we must achieve it.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mrs. Shirley Anne Haber (As an Individual): My name is Shirley Anne Haber and I represent the Media Action Group.

I just want to thank you for having this forum. Obviously you have a lot of work ahead listening to all the speakers previous to myself.

Ideally, there should be peace and ideally Canada should be able to cut back and not worry about having weapons or creating weapons or having a strong military. However, there are terrorists who our government already knows about. CSIS has explained that there are terrorists who have sized up our buildings downtown in Toronto—Toronto is the economic engine of the country—and they already have plans about what they are going to do here in Toronto.

It's not a case of if there is going to be an attack or when there is going to be an attack; we know that it's imminent. To say that we have to have no military and no weapons is totally being naive. We really need to make sure that our country is safe and that counter-terrorism measures have been taken to protect our citizens from those radical terrorists who, from outside our country, want to come and destroy. And to say that some of these people are doing so because they're oppressed is not being realistic. We already know that many of them are indoctrinated to believe that they are doing this because it is divinely asked from God. It is because they are indoctrinated by their leaders rather than because they are oppressed. We know that there are many countries where there are oppressed people who do not indulge in terrorist activities.

Canada needs to make sure that we look after our own citizens with counter-terrorism measures. The global reality is that the terrorists want to attack cities around the world. They've already attacked Madrid and London and New York, and we are on the list.

In terms of the United Nations, the United Nations has been hijacked by those who have the worst human rights record, those who provide a safe haven for terrorists. Canada can take a leading role in the UN in support of democracy. You have already heard that from other people here. A lot of people believe that Canada is a democracy and should be providing support for other democracies rather than for totalitarian dictators around the world.

We know that democracies don't make war on their neighbours, democracies such as Israel and India. Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. Somebody has already pointed that out. But in the United Nations, Israel is demonized, de-legitimized, and isolated by others who want the worst for Israel, who want to get rid of Israel. This past week, as you know, Iran stated that they wish to wipe Israel off the map. Our government came out strongly in statements to say that this was unacceptable. Prime Minister Paul Martin and Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew spoke out strongly.

However, words are not enough, and Canada can lead and join others at the United Nations in creating strong sanctions against Iran for wanting to destroy Israel. We have to remember that Iran was very much involved in setting up Hezbollah and Hamas terrorist organizations. And as has been pointed out, Iran already has nuclear capabilities. It's just a matter of time when they will be ready, and they have already indicated where they want to use these nuclear weapons.

● (2105)

The previous speaker spoke about being nuclear-free. Well, when you have a government that believes in peace and is pushing for peace, that is one thing. But when you have a country like Iran, which you already know wants to use these weapons, will use these weapons, and has shown that they are warlike, then we really have to be worried.

Canada values love of family, peace, democracy, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech, and it supports human rights. These are the same values that Israel holds: freedom of the press, freedom of speech, a democratic government, love of peace. It wants peace desperately, but Israel needs a peace partner.

Canada can take an active role in the Middle East by insisting that the Palestinian Authority dismantle the terrorist infrastructure in the Palestinian areas, so that there can be a partner for Israel and they can create peace. Israel has withdrawn unilaterally from Gaza because the Israelis knew they had no partner and had to do this on their own. However, if the Palestinians were to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure, there would be a chance.

There was a lot of hope for Gaza, but what really happened was that as soon as Israel withdrew, the Palestinians went into Gaza, where beautiful hothouses had been left for them, and they destroyed the hothouses. The world was under the impression that there were only synagogues that were left, but there were over 400 buildings that could have been used for libraries, for nursery schools, for government, and they destroyed these buildings and set them afire as well. So Israel needs a partner, and Canada can play a very strong role by becoming that partner.

In terms of the terrorists, in terms of victims of terror, I agree with speakers who spoke earlier. It's very important for Canada to change the criminal law that exists in order that those who pursue terrorism and inflict terror against victims can then be sued from within Canada, on our own land, in our country. That would really help to fight the terrorists and stop the funding of terrorists.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Pixing Zhang (As an Individual): Good evening. My name is Pixing Zhang. I'm a Falun Gong practitioner. I'm also a graduate student at the University of Toronto.

You seem to have heard tonight a lot of issues related to China's problems: the North Korean issue, and the Taiwan issue. I want to raise some issues about Falun Gong and to add two points.

There is the one question, whether there is any hope that we will solve these issues peacefully. I just want to make some points. The crackdown on Falun Gong has lasted for six years, and 1,000 people who have been persecuted have died, and 100,000 people have been sent to labour camps. In the Chinese communist party's history, wherever they want to crack down, they can crack down. They can succeed in a crackdown within three days, actually, but in Falun Gong we have stood up for six years.

Recently, there have been three defectors, two in Australia and one in Toronto. All their duty was to repress Falun Gong practitioners in China. After they came to know our story, they realized it was wrong to oppress Falun Gong practitioners, so they said no to the policy and defected to Australia and Canada. This is a very important sign.

Nowadays, as Wendy just mentioned, there are five million Chinese people who sign on to the Internet to criticize the Chinese Communist Party publicly. It seems that many Chinese people nowadays have found their conscience and say no to all those terrible policies. So this is a very important sign.

We believe the Canadian government should encourage more Chinese people to speak for their consciences, not go against their consciences.

Why is this so important? I want to mention that, for example, two years ago, SARS was a very severe problem, even in Toronto. That arose from China. But there was one doubter, a Mr. Zhong. Before him, the Chinese government always claimed there was no SARS problem in China, but after this doubter spoke publicly and for his conscience and said there were a lot of SARS patients in Beijing, the Chinese government changed the policy totally, and the SARS problem was solved very soon.

Recently, there's also the bird flu problem. Actually, the latest flu originated from China in 1995. It spread to Hong Kong. Nowadays it has even spread to Canada. The Chinese government always wants to cover the truth of many things, but we should encourage more Chinese people to speak truthfully and to speak for their consciences.

So, for example, we believe that if these defectors face some danger or problem in China, the Canadian government should give protection to them. For example, the defector now living in Toronto is facing the problem of whether he can stay here right now. We believe he should have protection.

Recently, because the two defectors in Australia revealed particulars of how they persecute Falun Gong practitioners in China and how they spy on Falun Gong practitioners in Canada, the U.S. Congress has had a hearing for these two defectors. Also recently, one defector went to the European Union and gave a speech. But when we, who are a club at the University of Toronto, tried to invite the defectors to come to Canada, their visa applications were refused.

We believe we should welcome these defectors to come here. We regard the doubter, Dr. Zhong, as a hero because he revealed the truth about SARS, but if all those defectors reveal the truth about persecution, and if they know it, through those bad, terrible policies, we should welcome them here to reveal the truth to the Canadian government and Canadian society.

This is my first suggestion.

• (2110)

I have another suggestion. Recently I heard that the Canadian government will change a trade initiative with China domestically. It seems that we have a lot of problems with trade with the United States, the softwood lumber or something. But while we are in a hurry to find an alternative for this trade relationship, we have to be very careful and make sure that we push China to improve its human rights record. I heard that in China it's very prevalent that behind almost every contract there is bribery. When you want to get a contract, you have to offer a bribe to some Chinese officials. It's a very common practice.

Also, each year we send a lot of aid to China, to the Chinese government. I think last year we sent \$50 million Canadian to China. We have to make sure all these moneys are used properly and not used to repress those Chinese people who want to speak for their conscience and defend their basic human rights. In all the trade initiatives we have with them, we have to make sure all this money can be used properly to improve China's human rights. It's important for China but it's also important for Canada, because if China is involved in a problem, Canada definitely cannot escape the disaster.

• (2115)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Zhang.

Mr. Sheldon Nadal (As an Individual): Hello, my name is Sheldon Nadal. I represent myself, my wife, and my two young children. I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to make my views noted on Canadian foreign policy.

I'm fortunate enough to have been born and raised in a great democracy, but under our current and previous prime ministers, I've seen Canada go from being a supporter of democracy and an enemy of dictatorships to a country that no longer is able to tell the difference between good and evil in the world.

I'm proud that our country fought in Afghanistan, but we have not done our fair share to build democracy in Iraq. I admire what the United States, Britain, Australia, Poland, and the rest of the countries are doing in Iraq, and I'm embarrassed that we're not part of it.

We waste no opportunity to insult the greatest democracy the world has ever seen, namely the United States, and that has to change.

With regard to the other lady who talked about wanting to have a nuclear-free world, I think that's a great idea, but in the meantime I want to be protected and I want my children protected from Iranian missiles, North Korean missiles, and Chinese missiles. We should be part of the missile defence system. It was a no-brainer.

We waste almost every opportunity to support in the United Nations the greatest democracy the Middle East has ever seen, namely Israel. We refuse to support the Democratic Republic of Taiwan against the aggressors and human rights violators of Communist China. We give China \$50 million a year in foreign aid that they are free to use to support their police who harass the Falun Gong, their army which threatens Taiwan, and even their space program.

We criticize Israel for its occupation of the disputed territories that they took following a defensive war, yet we said nothing when it was occupied by Jordan. And our Prime Minister has said that although Syria occupies Lebanon, they're there to keep the peace. We have a double standard.

When Iran threatens to annihilate Israel with atomic weapons, a senator in the Canadian Senate essentially blames Israel for bringing it upon itself by having its own defensive weapons.

We cozy up to dictators like the human rights violators in Cuba. We give millions to the terrorist regime in the Palestinian territories without getting any accounting of how the money is spent. We refuse to ban the Tamil Tigers from raising money in Canada. We only banned Hezbollah and Hamas when B'nai Brith Canada threatened to sue our own government. We emasculate our armed forces by cutting off funding even though we have billions to spend on hot air credits to buy from Russia to support Kyoto.

It is time to realize there is good and evil in the world and it is time Canada started to support the good guys.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nadal.

You'll be the last one. Go ahead.

• (2120)

Mr. Michael Cooper (As an Individual): I'm Michael Cooper.

The Chair: Michael Cooper?

Mr. Michael Cooper: Yes, Cooper.

I'm just an individual citizen, and I will be very quick and short and sweet, because essentially I was going to speak, but Sheldon made exactly every single point I was going to make. I kind of concur with Sheldon, and if we can implement his suggestions, that would be great by me.

Thank you.

The Chair: You were very short.

It was very interesting. I would like to thank everyone for your participation today and tonight.

We always also welcome written communication to the committee. Anyone who wishes to do so is encouraged to send a submission to us. It doesn't need to be in two official languages. It can be done in English, and there'd be no problem. If we need, if a member requests it, we'll translate it.

It is better to hear people in person, though. I speak for my colleagues when I say we have enjoyed the past few hours. With so much information on so many topics, it won't be possible to reflect everything in our report on the international policy statement, but your input helped us to understand the preoccupation and views of Canadians, and your testimony will be available in both languages on our website for others to read as well.

Thank you once again, and have a nice evening. And don't forget our website, if you have friends, and the e-consultation on the website.

Thank you.

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.