



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

---

FAAE • NUMBER 023 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Tuesday, February 15, 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, February 15, 2005

•(0835)

[Translation]

**The Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.)):**  
We are ready to start.

[English]

Our orders of the day, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), are consideration of issues relating to UNICEF. We have, as a witness this morning, Mrs. Carol Bellamy, executive director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

Welcome, Mrs. Bellamy. The floor is yours.

**Ms. Carol Bellamy (Executive Director, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)):** Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, I very much appreciate this opportunity to make a few comments and then respond to any questions you might wish to ask me.

I was encouraged to speak slowly, because there's translation. I've now been at the UN for ten years; I'm always encouraged to speak slowly, and I never do. I will try to remember to do that, but I unfortunately have 60-plus years as a New Yorker, and speaking slowly has never been in my lexicon. I will try.

I also appreciate very much the fact that you're here at 8:30 a.m.

I would like to make a few general comments, and then I would be glad to respond to any issues you wish to raise. I realize that later this morning you will be having a briefing on the tsunami from the Minister of Foreign Affairs. I would certainly be glad to comment from our perspective on that; I'm not going to focus my remarks solely on that at this point.

Let me start by acknowledging the very important role and efforts of Canada over the years—I can say over the years, but there are far many more years than even my experience—and the commitment of Canada as a strong supporter of the multilateral system, very much from the perspective of children.

I would acknowledge Canada's long-standing commitment to children. It was one of the originators of the 1990 World Summit for Children, I remind you, which, while held at the United Nations with all the trappings of the UN, was actually not an official UN meeting, but really did kick off the nineties decade of sessions on key issues. Canada was a key actor in that. Twelve years later, in May 2002, Canada's role was important at the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Children, which was the first-ever official UN meeting devoted specifically to children. I could go on and on—the role of Canada in terms of the land mines treaty,

children in war, and the very important meetings in Winnipeg several years ago, followed by action; the role Canada has played on GAVI, the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization; the fact that you're the secretariat for the global study on violence; and our very important national committee, the UNICEF national committee.

This is just to acknowledge some of the range of areas of commitment of Canada to issues involving children in the multilateral system, and certainly as a strong promoter of the millennium development goals. Here's where I would like to hang my comments generally.

If you look at the millennium development goals, I think it's fair to say that six of the eight relate directly to the rights and needs of children and women. I think that's because it is recognized that the key to achieving these goals resides in investing in children. The point I want to make here, and I refer to UNICEF's annual flagship publication, *The State of the World's Children*, is that for all these activities, not only by Canada but also by others—millennium development goals focused on children, a special session on children, multilateral system—why is it we still live in a world where poverty and ignorance continue to threaten human security as surely as any weapons of mass destruction, where HIV and AIDS and armed conflict have already caused more devastation and heartbreak than any terrorist could dream of inflicting?

We've tried to set forth what we think is the present state of the world's children in our report this year, which concludes that half of all children in the world suffer from some kind of extreme deprivation—lack of water, or health care, or schooling; displacement at war; exploitation due to economic desperation; losses caused by HIV and AIDS. More than one billion children around the world—that's one-sixth of the world's population—are being robbed of the basic necessities of life, and in that they are then losing childhood. Childhood is a very important time of life. We are arguing that virtually one-sixth of the population of the world is being robbed of its childhood.

Let me give you just a couple more figures; I'll try to stay away from too many figures. One in three children has no access to clean water, sanitation, or basic health.

●(0840)

We argue that the definition of poverty that is used globally today is insufficient when it comes to children, and that merely looking at poverty or the reduction of poverty based on income generation is not sufficient when it comes to children, because one has to look more broadly at the deprivation of basic needs and services, such as health and education. That's number one. But we also say that the situation of children is complicated very much by two other key factors; one is the increasing instability and security in the world today caused by war, and the other is the terrible global tsunami, if you will, of HIV and AIDS.

Let me talk about war for just one second, and again I mention the role that Canada played in focusing on the impact of war on children. The nature of war is changing in the world. Since 1990, 55 of the 59 official conflicts have been within countries; in other words, war is increasingly not between two countries but within a country. The actors in war are increasingly not just two national military forces but multiple parties, many of them non-state parties. And increasingly the victims of war are not military—not that it's acceptable that there be any victims of war—but civilian, largely women and children. So the impact of conflict is great.

I won't give you all of the numbers, but if I can speak about HIV/AIDS in children, it's now accepted that more than 15 million children have been orphaned by AIDS. While HIV/AIDS is a global issue and is increasing in many parts of the world, the issue of orphans at this point is still largely a sub-Saharan Africa one; but given the global nature of HIV/AIDS, that will obviously grow.

What do these statistics reflect? In our view, fundamentally it's about the failure of leadership. It has been 15 years since every nation on earth but two signed the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which set out basic universal standards for a healthy, protected, decent childhood. While progress has been made toward that goal, clearly not enough has been made. With half of all children still deprived of childhood, we at UNICEF believe that the world is failing to meet its commitments.

Deprivation of services, conflict, the way HIV/AIDS is spreading—all of these things are related. Poor allocation of natural resources over time often leads to internal conflict, and disrupted childhoods lead to another generation of adults who never reach their full potential, and the poverty cycle continues.

So the bottom line in our view is that childhood is definitely under threat, not for mysterious reasons that strain our imagination, but because of deliberate choices made by governments and others in power. Poverty doesn't persist because of nothing. War doesn't emerge from nowhere. HIV doesn't spread by choice of its own. These are our choices. How we allocate resources, how we assess the impact of our decisions, how often we consider children in our choices—these are the issues that matter. We believe we can do better.

So does the potential exist for doing better? I will conclude my remarks here. As you might expect, since we come from UNICEF, we believe we can do better and that there is room for hope. I want to just touch on a couple of points very quickly.

First of all, I will go to the tsunami now. If the tsunami is a disaster of unprecedented scale, it has also produced a response of an unprecedented nature. I think no one could have imagined the kind of response—the humanitarian response, the financial response, and the global response engaging people, with children helping children, and with governments who have not been actors in the past in responding to emergencies now responding, whether with financial resources or human resources, with their leaderships being affected themselves. So for all the horror of the tsunami, I think one can also ask, is there the potential for seeing some small turning point in the global community, some small crack that might allow for some degree of solidarity? I think we don't know yet, but I think there's some potential for that

●(0845)

There are a couple of other areas that should give one some hope. Look at Afghanistan. It's certainly a country that's still enormously troubled, a country where the drug industry has returned and where there's still violence. Yet there are signs. This is a country where virtually only a few thousand children were going to school at the end of 2001, and by the beginning of 2004, 4.2 million children were enrolled in school, and about one-third of those were girls. It's not evenly spread around the country, but one has to say there is some room for hope.

In the Middle East, clearly again, after yesterday's bombing in Lebanon, one wonders, but there is the potential for hope in Gaza and the West Bank and in Israel. I say this not only in looking at recent events and changes, but I had an opportunity to visit—and I know some of you have been there recently. I truly believe that if the young people were listened to, the young people in Israel and the young people in Gaza—and it's not that they love each other, but they want to know more about each other—if we listened to the voices of young people, the potential for hope exists.

Hope, however, is one of the elements that for us, in UNICEF, keeps us in high gear; compassion is another. But as Susan Sontag wrote in one of her essays, "Compassion is an unstable emotion. It needs to be translated into action, or it withers. The question is what to do with the feelings that have been aroused, the knowledge...".

Our challenge to you, ladies and gentlemen, is that children need more than inspiring words. They need leadership that touches their lives. They need action.

For example, if I might say here in Canada, children should be the heart of the new international policy. They need action that is taken to scale—and I might say, sitting here in Canada, Canada has made a commitment to 0.7% and it needs to move there—action that grows out of a unified and targeted strategy that will protect, respect, and fulfill all of children's rights all of the time. There is no route to rebuilding a world fit for children better than action. As the young delegates at the Special Session on Children reminded us, a world that is truly fit for children is truly fit for all people.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to make these opening remarks. I would be glad to respond to specific questions that you might have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms. Bellamy.

We'll start with Mr. Menzies, please.

**Mr. Ted Menzies (Macleod, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Ms. Bellamy, for those comments and once again reminding us that Canada did commit to 0.7% of GNP in 1969. Correct me if I'm wrong, but this is 2005 and we haven't gotten there; in fact, we're farther away. So we need to be reminded of that, and reminded of that often.

There certainly was a wake-up call through the tsunami, and I'm glad you addressed that. I think that reminded people that we need to look at humanitarian issues certainly differently from how we have in the past.

Your highlight on children I find most fascinating, because those were the most touching scenes we saw in the tsunami. I think that has been a wake-up call to everybody, to remind us all that children are the victims. Whether it's internal strife, whether it's a disaster, or whether it's a food shortage, or bad water, or whatever it is, children are the ones who suffer, and children are not the ones who asked to be put in that situation. So I applaud your efforts.

I have a number of different questions. I was rather critical of Canada's slow response to the tsunami. I'm still concerned. It looks as if your organization and other organizations, NGOs, are going to have to go through a double process. You were designated as accepting of matching funds from our government. Now, whatever your long-term plans are for that money, you have to go through a second vetting process, it is my understanding—and I don't know if that's accurate or not—to actually decide what your long-term goals are and what your plans are for that money. I'd like your comments as to whether you're comfortable with that process and whether you think Canada's commitment is going to be followed through on.

I go back to some of the historical records of commitments and non-delivery on those commitments of all countries in the past. How can Canada play a role in making sure those commitments are followed through on, on delivering that promised aid?

On failed leadership, that's a very interesting comment. How do we address that? The commitments were made through the United Nations, just as Canada committed to 0.7% of GNP. How do we make sure these countries follow through on their promises? I would be most interested, if you have an answer to that.

As a specific question, on micronutrients, how are you dealing with that, and has that been an effective program?

● (0850)

**The Chair:** Ms. Bellamy.

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** I want to make a couple of initial comments. Then I will try to respond to your questions.

When I first started coming to Canada, Canada was very seriously confronting a financial crisis. Having myself, in my past history, been involved in a government that had a major crisis, that being New York's, I fully understood that one had to take actions to respond to that. When I advocated for resources for UNICEF or for the UN or others, I fully understood the constraints. But I think now Canada has had five years of a surplus, so I would just leave it at that. The issue of development funding is one in which I obviously will advocate in part for UNICEF, but I'll advocate for the more general community to remind—to congratulate on a surplus, because a surplus is good, but to just remind.

Concerning the tsunami and children, I want to make one comment, because I think it's important and maybe it's also a learning experience. First of all, in this natural disaster, because of the power of it, the victims were very much the most vulnerable, and that meant children. We said we believed in the first place a third of the victims could be children. Now, based on the data that's out there—and in part UNICEF was able to respond because we actually already had programs in each of these countries—we believe more than a third of the victims are children.

It showed the power of the water and also gave new meaning to the issue of debris, because debris became huge trucks or houses or slabs of cement; it wasn't just little things floating through the water.

It is also a reminder of the demographics of the world today. Something to keep in mind as you think of both foreign policy and development assistance is that the demographics of the world are such that, among most of the countries one would consider to be developing countries or at least transitional countries, on balance a good half of the population is young, in some cases 18 or below, but in at least most cases in their young twenties and below. It's a reminder of the demographics of the world.

As to specific questions, I must apologize. I'm here to meet with government officials. I'm not entirely certain what the "second vetting" is. I will tell you, though, two things.

First, we believe that in all instances, whether it is a high-profile emergency or not, we have a responsibility to try to make sure we are as transparent as possible and that the use of the resources we receive is as clear in people's minds as possible.

Second, particularly for UNICEF—because we are UN, absolutely—because we raise about a third of our funding and in some cases a little more through private sources and not just governments, through our 37 national committees, we are actually tested against our way of responding to our government supporters, but also our private sector supporters. That's a particular test for UNICEF.

But third, we have also, as part of the UN response, committed in this case to trying to provide a more consolidated tracking system for anybody who wants to see the use of the resources that came into the UN agencies for the tsunami. A new system is being put together in conjunction with the office of the relief coordinator in the UN—Mr. Jan Egeland and his office—and the key humanitarian agencies: the World Food Programme, UNICEF, the UN refugee agency. I'm talking about the UN humanitarian agencies; I'm not ignoring the very important NGOs. There will be more capacity to look at this consolidated financial tracking system that will be put in place.

With respect specifically to the second vetting, sir, I'm sorry, I'm going to have to get back to you, perhaps on a bilateral basis, in response.

• (0855)

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** May I just read you—

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Menzies. Your time is up.

We'll go now to Madame Lalonde.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** Could we get an answer on the micronutrients?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** I just wanted to mention micronutrients.

**The Chair:** Okay, very quickly, in 30 seconds.

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** Micronutrients are.... Too many children still die every year from totally preventable causes, though fewer than 10 years ago, for there has been a decline in mortality under five years of age in all parts of the world except sub-Saharan Africa. But the interventions that can be helpful in this area, both in reducing under-five mortality but also in strengthening the health system of children, include things that do not need new scientific breakthroughs. One of them is micronutrients. Vitamin A and other kinds of micronutrients have played a major role. I would just say that Canada has been a major funder in the micronutrient area. UNICEF remains very committed in this area.

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

*Madame Lalonde, s'il vous plaît.*

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for being with us today, Ms. Bellamy.

As members of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, we are regularly called upon to reflect on such issues as poverty and conflict, but too rarely do we consider the fact

that the primary victims of poverty and conflict—and I should add AIDS—are children. Your role is to remind us of that reality.

You said that Canada simply must meet the goal of 0.7 per cent. I am a member of an Opposition party that is arguing very strongly in favour of that. Often government representatives say they have good programs and that they are effective, as though it were a matter of choosing between meeting the 0.7 per cent target and effectiveness.

I'd like you to address that point and explain how the Millennium Declaration aims to meet the goal of fighting poverty.

I may not have seen all the figures, but it seems to me that the consequence of conflict is a rapid increase in the number of children who are deprived, orphaned and utterly destitute, which slows down progress. Perhaps my view of things is incorrect.

[English]

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** I think that the Millennium Declaration and goals are critical in terms of actually a more efficient approach to poverty eradication or poverty reduction. The lead always has to be taken by governments in their own country. I think we have to remember that.

Coming back to the tsunami, one of the factors that played a very major role, even though there was this outpouring of global assistance, is that in each of these countries, in one way or another, the governments themselves took the lead.

Similarly in the MDGs, it can't just be a top-down UN approach, a bilateral approach. They have to become the goals of each of the countries. The millennium development goals allow for there to almost be, if you will, a single blueprint for development and therefore, hopefully, a more efficient use of financial resources and human resources.

How will this move toward poverty? Well, it is a package. Even though millennium development goal number one talks about poverty eradication, look at some of the other goals—and I don't mean to pick them out in any particular order.

Look at the goal that says education for all. We know, first of all, that all children need an education, but we know that if a girl gets an education, she is more likely to grow to be a healthy adult, her children are less likely to die before the age of five, and her family, while not rich, is more likely to have some stability. So again that is a contributing factor.

Reducing the mortality rate for children under five is one of the millennium development goals.

Reducing malnutrition, hunger, again, means the ability for people to be more productive.

On fighting HIV/AIDS, HIV/AIDS is not only a disease that is killing people, it is removing the capacity of society to function in some countries. Your health workers are dying. There are more teachers dying in Zambia each year than a country like Zambia can train.

So I think the millennium development goals allow some consistency in the approach of all those engaged in development, both the countries themselves and the external actors, so that we're not all off in different places. I think that is an efficiency matter.

That being said, I'll just use the under-five mortality rate as an example. Many countries are off target. Some 90 countries are on target, but 98 countries are off target to meet the 2015 goal.

Conflict I mentioned before. The kind of conflict we're seeing in the world today—and again it's not only hitting on children, but largely hitting on children and women, because it's hitting civilians—presents a challenge to government leadership like yours.

I will offer the challenge. Here's the challenge.

Our global instruments for conflict resolution largely focus on conflict between two states. Our conflicts today are largely conflicts within states.

• (0900)

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Yes, you're right.

[English]

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** The issue of, whatever one wants to call it, sovereignty, this is my territory, whatever...fully recognized, and we start seeing little breakthroughs, but until there's a recognition of the need to engage in conflict resolution in the forum of today's conflicts, I believe the problem will continue to be humanitarian assistance just holding on, but the political response not being there.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now we'll go to Ms. Phinney, please.

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Thank you very much for joining us today. Yesterday in our human rights and international development subcommittee, which is a subcommittee of this committee, we heard remarks from our former ambassador to Colombia, Guillermo Rishchynski, and he commented on the fact that in Colombia—I am particularly concerned about this country and I have been there a couple of times myself—a third of the members of the illegal armed groups in that country are younger than 16, and this is not by their choice; that a child is kidnapped in Colombia every 37 hours. And that's what they're kidnapped for, to go into these illegal armed groups.

He also mentioned that there were three new children-related projects in Colombia, and one of them was a UNICEF program. I wonder if you could tell us how you've been able to progress down there, what you've been able to do to help the children in Colombia.

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** I believe Colombia is an example, in part, of the world we confront today, in which there are many forgotten emergencies, if you will. Another example is—I'll come back to Colombia in one second—northern Uganda, which may be the worst children's emergency in the world, where children are being taken

hostage every day by the Lord's Resistance Army, where every night 30,000-plus children literally leave their own homes. They have parents, they have families, but they leave their own homes to race to sleep behind locked gates, even if they might be in the open, so that they will not be taken.

In Colombia we have challenges for the government, but we don't believe the government actually is using underage combatants. But clearly some of the rebel forces are using underage combatants. This is in part because there are parts of the country that are just inaccessible so they are able to control the children, and because the fighting has been going on so long. Frankly, the longer these battles and conflicts go on, the more they're using younger and younger children, because that's what exists.

We've been trying to do a couple of things. One, not just only on our own but as part of the UN team, we've been trying to engage within the authority with some of the forces. We have been working particularly with a group of young people, the Children's Movement for Peace, which has been a very active movement in Colombia, to try to get the word out through radio, through other forms of communication, to young people. We've been trying to urge that the different actors—we want to stop the war, but we can't on our own stop the war—at least allow children to go to school. We've been focusing very much, because people forget about Colombia. Colombia may be the country with about the largest displaced population in the world, and people forget about it, and much of that is a young persons displaced population.

So I'm saying our main focus is on working with young people to get the message to other young people, and working with the fighting forces to allow the children to go to school and not use them to fight.

• (0905)

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Do you have any problems with the illegal armed groups attacking your staff?

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** I'm going to make some general comments.

The issue of safety and security of humanitarian workers in the world today has changed dramatically just over the last few years, not just even from the time of the Baghdad bombing. I've been at UNICEF for 10 years. When I came to UNICEF, even though it wasn't perfect, in those days, whether you were the Red Cross or UNICEF or OXFAM, even if there was a war going on somewhere, humanitarian workers were off-limits. But with this increasingly changing nature of conflict—I don't know that there were ever rules of war—where there are so many different actors out there, the issue of safety and security of humanitarian staff is much more at issue.

So we've had staff killed. In Darfur recently, remember Save the Children finally pulled out because they had four staff killed. Specifically it was land mines and other things. MSF has pulled out of some areas, and they're not afraid to do work in places.

So thus far in Colombia, no, but we don't have access in some places. But the issue of humanitarian workers' security is a major issue in the world today.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Now we go to Mrs. McDonough.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to say it's a thrill to have you before the committee today to address issues that really seize this committee in its work.

I know that among your considerable skills is diplomacy, and because some of us opposition members aren't quite as diplomatic, I just want to say for the record that you were generous in acknowledging that we've had to battle debt, which is why we've really disintegrated to the humiliatingly low level in ODA of 0.24%. But just so you have the picture, it's actually seven years that Canada's been in considerable surplus.

I have some quick questions I want to ask, because I don't want to use up the time that's available for us to hear from you with my lengthy questions.

The first is the issue of multilateralism versus bilateralism. The foreign affairs critics have just returned from a trip to the Middle East with the foreign affairs minister, and one could see on the front line the amount of pressure brought to bear to respond to legitimate, desperately needed bilateral requests. I think we are also wrestling with the fact that some find it convenient to constantly be demonizing the United Nations and its agencies, as a reason for not continuing to engage fully in multilateralism.

I wonder if you might just comment on that issue from the point of view of tied aid, what that means, and what we should be doing to resist the pressures to go more and more into bilateral kinds of arrangements.

Second, I wonder if you could share with us the wisdom and considerable experience I know you've had around the kinds of response models for disaster relief at the national level. We know you're very much involved at the international level, but notwithstanding the unprecedented outpouring of generosity by Canadians and people around the world to the tsunami disaster, I think many of us feel we need to enhance our capacity nationally to be able to respond in a timely, coordinated, and sensible way. I wonder, in addition to any comments you might be able to share with us, whether you could point to any work that's been done on this, or even suggest any witnesses that might come before the committee. Instead of complaining about the slowness or ineptness of any particular agency's or government's response, we're very much interested, in this committee, in looking at how we can improve our own response capacity.

Third, I wonder if you'd comment on your observations and assessment of the women, peace, and security resolution 1325, and operationalizing that at the national level as one of the responses to

the reality that it is women and children increasingly who are the victims of war and the recipients of aid. Do you feel there is some potential for us to put more resources into the women, peace, and security effort at the national level?

I'm going to stop there.

• (0910)

**The Chair:** Do you want to get some answers?

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Absolutely.

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** Well, I think there's room for both multilateralism and bilateralism, if I might say. I believe in the United Nations. I'd be the last one to sit here and tell you the United Nations is perfect and runs everything well. It doesn't. We mess up sometimes.

I think not only for the tsunami, but if you look in other parts of the world today, the reality is that if you look at virtually almost all of the countries in some degree of emergency, you're more likely to find at least a part of the UN family, largely the humanitarian family, not always the peacekeeping family. I won't go through it all, but whether it is the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the Refugee Agency or UNICEF... Again, we have our hiccups. I think people forget sometimes. They think of the UN as this solid thing. The UN is only as good as its member states, frankly. If they want things to work, they'll work, and if they don't want things to work, they won't work .

There are various components of multilateralism. I don't think multilateralism is appropriate in all cases. Clearly in some cases, to be able to make arguments to their taxpayers and to make arguments to others, national governments need to have a face someplace.

That being said, I think it really is balanced. I would argue it's not a fifty-fifty balance. Push the UN and push the UN agencies. If you're looking at an efficiency level, a capacity level, I really think one can make a very strong argument for multilateralism, not to the exclusion of bilateralism, but there is a very important role to play both in development and humanitarian efforts.



On response models, first of all, in part, I think one has to look at slightly different situations in terms of both natural disasters and complex emergencies. I would argue that for response models in natural disasters both your emergency response and your military have the capacity. I would argue that in complex emergencies the blurring of lines between humanitarian efforts and the military is starting to be very problematic. It's one kind of model where there has to be more care. There are a lot of so-called quick impact activities by the military, but it's getting very confused with the humanitarian efforts out there and is putting humanitarian long-term capacity in jeopardy.

There is more of a focus on emergency preparedness. Off the top of my head, I don't know who I would immediately say you would turn to, but I think there is more discussion. Certainly the recent meeting in Kobe, Japan, around issues of emergency preparedness, particularly around natural disasters, would provide some very good information. We would be glad to provide some information, not necessarily UNICEF information. I think there's some good pulling together of information around models that might be used that have been effective. That's the place I would look right now because it's the most recent gathering of those actors who are the most involved in emergency response.

On women, peace and security, the only thing people talk more about and do less for than children is women. I said it again, but I'm not worried about saying it. There's no question today that the majority of people affected by instability, particularly through conflict, are women and children, but they are not just victims. If you look in refugee camps, you are more likely to find women and children. Very often the men are off with the animals or they're off fighting, as the case may be. The women are actually very often arranging things. They've figured out ways to keep everyone alive, frankly. We can help in these types of things.

When it comes to the resolution part and the subsequent part, they're seen as the victims, but they're seldom seen as at least actors in the resolution part. I'm not suggesting they should be the only ones.

● (0915)

I believe the women, peace, and security agenda is a critical one, but I believe it hasn't taken root. In very few situations where you see conflict resolution do you see an engagement of at least women actors who ought to be part of the situation. I think it deserves more attention, not more speeches, not more resolutions, and not more flag waving. It really deserves some attention, because I believe it could play a role in some of the moves towards restoration recovery. It plays much too small a role now.

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

We'll now go to Ms. Stronach.

**Ms. Belinda Stronach (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC):** I'd like to begin by acknowledging your contribution and the respect I have for what you've done. It's your passion that has been and is a huge driving force in UNICEF. I just wanted to point out the respect I have for what you're doing.

Our government is conducting an international policy review of what Canada's role in the world should be and what our foreign

policy should be. What leadership role do you think should be the focus for our country to make a substantial difference toward reducing child poverty in the world?

And could you also give me an update on the Convention on the Rights of the Child?

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** When I first came to UNICEF, I remember the first UNICEF board meeting, and there was Canada in the first row, at "C". They were a board member. Every time they made an intervention, I thought to myself—and again I apologize, this was an unknowing, ill-informed, ill-educated American—my God, they're really right on the mark; that's really rational, it makes a lot of sense. And I haven't changed my mind.

Canada plays a very important role in so many ways; it's engaged in so many ways. It is hard to find a development initiative, a global positive initiative in which Canada isn't found. But maybe that's part of the problem.

I'm not here to tell you where Canada ought to focus. Canadians have to determine where Canada ought to focus. But perhaps the issue is to have more of a focus. This doesn't mean that what you've done in all these areas is wrong. It just may mean you might want to identify....

I realize this development policy is to be released soon. Presumably it's already at the printers, so whatever is there is there. But seriously, it might be not a matter of saying we're disinterested in a range of issues, but attributing a higher priority to a fewer number of issues in which Canada would become so deeply engaged that it would really shape the agenda—or help to shape the agenda. No one single member state shapes the agenda.

I'm sorry I'm not being more specific, but that would be my guidance in that respect.

I couldn't sit here as UNICEF without suggesting that children be a key part of that, but I would also remind you of what I said before about the demographics of the world today. If one is looking at development and developing countries, one has to see there's a huge youth and child bulge. One has a choice, it seems to me, to either see that as an area for potential investment or see it as an area for potential deterioration.

That would be my advice to Canada. I mean, I would be the last one to suggest to Canada what it should do, but that would be my advice.

On the Convention on the Rights of the Child, well, it's a mixed picture. There's no question it has started taking root. It has had an influence on policy. There's no question, however, considering the fact that it is the most widely ratified international treaty in the world, and it takes the agenda from a charitable focus to a level of obligation—it is the obligation of government, the obligation of leaders, to respond, and it's not just out of the goodness of your heart—there has been still too little impact, given the fact that it's been in effect largely globally for close to 15 years. It is taking root. It gives advocates...and advocates can be everything from the Minister of Health advocating with the Minister of Finance to civil society advocates.

I would say also that the Committee on the Rights of the Child is one of the more efficient treaty bodies. It has not become political like some of the other treaty bodies, and it is actually, I think, doing a pretty good job. Therefore, the reports to the committee, although delayed, unfortunately, in being reviewed, are taken seriously.

● (0920)

**The Chair:** You have one question without preamble. Go ahead, Monsieur Paquette.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** I have the sense there has been a proliferation of organizations now working in the area of international cooperation, particularly with children, and that they sometimes compete with one another.

How does UNICEF manage to play a coordinating role, given this proliferation of organizations seeking funds and working on the ground to improve the welfare of children?

[*English*]

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** In some ways there are certainly more organizations. Look at the tsunami. I was just looking at some statistics in terms of Aceh itself. It was a place where none of us had much of a presence beforehand, because we weren't allowed to have a presence. UNICEF only had two national staff in Aceh prior to this, and we had a big presence in Indonesia.

Just to give you an idea of some of the areas and a brief tally of the number of non-governmental organizations working in the tsunami response in Aceh, in food there were 23 different organizations; in health, 30; education, 16; water and sanitation, 20; protection, 10; and so on.

That being said, is coordination perfect? No. But I would say coordination has become much better over the last few years. In the tsunami, to some degree there were some folks who were just showing up totally out of the blue, without any warning, all largely well-meaning but in some cases not really bringing the kinds of capacities needed. That being said, among the key reasonably well-known non-governmental organizations, from the OXFAMs to Save the Children, to the Red Cross movement, and so on, I think there is better coordination these days.

Because of what has been occurring in recent years, whether it's been in Afghanistan, Iraq, Liberia, Haiti, or the tsunami, on balance, because the UN usually has a relationship at least to some degree with the government, the UN agencies have been designated as the sectoral lead coordinators—not lead do-everythings, but the sectoral

lead coordinators. For example, in the tsunami, World Food was coordinator in food, World Health was coordinator in health, and we were the coordinator in water and sanitation, education and protection. That meant we basically were the convenor of a working group on these issues, to try to identify who was doing what and where there were gaps in others.

It was far from the perfect situation, but you don't have a perfect situation in that kind of emergency. However, I am very comfortable sitting here and saying that I've seen a dramatic improvement in coordination and in working together over the last few years. But keep pushing us. We still have to do better, but it has gotten much better.

**The Chair:** We have a question from Mr. Sorenson, and I also will have a question. We'll take both questions together, and we'll close at that time.

Mr. Sorenson.

● (0925)

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC):** Thank you, Ms. Bellamy, for being here today.

Most of us get a very early introduction to UNICEF through the little boxes that our children take out at Halloween. This past Halloween, my daughter and my son went out and gathered money for UNICEF. At the end of the evening, they came back and there was still room in the box, so they were taking money out of my change jar on the dresser to try to fill it. So we do appreciate the work that UNICEF does.

I picked up a paper this morning. It said, "Oil-For-Food Findings Deliver Heavy Blow to UN". In the article, it says all United Nations programs are coming under fairly close scrutiny now, and that may affect the way delivery of programs comes off. Maybe you could just comment a little bit on how UNICEF will be affected as there is closer scrutiny of some of these programs.

Also, when it comes to nations that are in extreme need—nations like Haiti, and perhaps other nations—where there are United Nations sanctions on those countries, how do they impact the way UNICEF can go in and deliver the help that those people need, especially the children?

**Ms. Carol Bellamy:** Oil for Food certainly is having and will have an impact on the UN. I can't tell you specifically what that is, but it will have implications to the extent of, one, just the negative publicity, but also the identification of problems, because there are and have been problems. I'm proud of UNICEF, but that doesn't mean we haven't had our problems in the past.

Maybe this is a little boring, but I was also involved in finance earlier in my life, and I'm proud that in my 10 years we've always had a clean audit from our external auditors. I think that generally everything is okay with us, but nevertheless, if you're in a boat and the boat has a leak at the other end, you're still all in that same boat. Similarly, Oil for Food will have implications for all of us in the UN.

That being said, as a representative of a UN agency that was and is still involved in Iraq, I should report that our national staff are still in Iraq and are still doing things, while our international staff are not in Iraq because they can't be at this point and are still functioning out of Amman. In fact, we are still focusing on the areas on which we've focused in the past: water, sanitation, education, and health. We're still providing vaccines and doing things like that.

We have worked very closely with the Volcker people; all of the UN agencies have worked closely with the Volcker people. At this point we have all gone through the initial report from the Volcker people and have not identified major issues when it comes to the agencies that have actually been on the ground doing humanitarian work. The reports aren't concluded at this point.

I've reviewed all of UNICEF's stuff, and we have very good records. I am not worried about specific problems with UNICEF, but I am concerned that ultimately the fallout from Oil for Food will have implications for the UN, unfortunately, and has potential implications certainly for those of us who do fund-raising. But I think it's too soon to tell at this point.

I'm prepared to continue to tell UNICEF's story, but not just UNICEF's story, also other actors' stories, because I think we—not just UNICEF but those of us who are the operating agencies on the ground—in the long run, through the work of Volcker and others, will be shown to have been reasonably effective in our work and not problematic. But the jury is still out and I await that.

As for countries in extreme need, and sanctions, there are a couple of things, particularly for countries where there's conflict. For example, one of the biggest challenges in immunization campaigns has been people being able to go past the lines in those countries with war. In Darfur right now, where polio has broken out again—and thank you, Canada, because you've helped us with polio funding and immunization funding—we're not able to reach some of the areas, so one answer to your question about countries in extreme situations is access.

A second response is the weakness of the government; it's almost non-functioning. One of the unique things, again, about the tsunami is that all of those governments were functioning—to a lesser or greater degree, but they were functioning.

Third, sanctions are not within our jurisdiction to decide, but we argue strongly that when sanctions are thought of, they ought to be thought of in the context of the implications for humanitarian response. Instead of a sledgehammer, how about a scalpel when it comes to sanctions? Make them more targeted if you're going to use sanctions.

● (0930)

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Bellamy, thank you very much for being with us this morning.

[English]

It was a real pleasure to have you here.

Now we're going to suspend for two or three minutes for the minister.

● (0930)

(Pause)

● (0933)

**The Chair:** Under Standing Order 108(2), we are studying Canada's role in promoting peace and security in the areas affected by the tsunami in Asia and Canada's capability to respond to international humanitarian catastrophes.

[Translation]

Appearing this morning is the Honourable Pierre Pettigrew, Minister of Foreign Affairs. With him today are Mr. Peter Harder, Deputy Minister; Mr. James Fox, Director General, South and South-East Asia Bureau; Mr. Serge Paquette, Acting Director, Emergency Services; and Ms. Marie Gervais-Vidricaire, Director General, Global Issues Bureau.

Welcome.

Minister, I believe you have an opening statement to make.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to appear before the Standing Committee today to share my assessment of Canada's ability to respond to humanitarian crises such as the Indian Ocean tsunami disaster. With me at the table are: Mr. Peter Harder, the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, who lead the Tsunami Interdepartmental Taskforce; Mr. James Fox, who has been leading the Taskforce as the Coordinator for Tsunami Reconstruction; Mr. Serge Paquette, Acting Director for Emergency Services, and a member of the Tsunami Consular Working Group; and Ms. Marie Gervais-Vidricaire, Director General of the Global Issues Branch. Ms. Vidricaire led the Canadian Reconnaissance team to Sri Lanka and Indonesia in the days after the tsunami, and her team has been responsible for coordinating the government's crisis response, including humanitarian aid in coordination with other departments.

At the January 6 leaders' meeting in Jakarta, Indonesia, I said that we rarely have witnessed an event that more vividly demonstrates that we live in an increasingly interconnected world than the disaster that occurred on December 26, 2004. This was evident by the number of nationalities affected; the outpouring of international solidarity; the rapid global humanitarian response to the disaster, and the commitment to reconstruction.

The Canadian government and the people of Canada made a critical contribution to the global effort to respond to the needs of those affected by this tragedy. With the emergency phase now over, and immediate humanitarian needs generally met in all sectors, the transition to early recovery is underway.

The response of the Government of Canada, working in collaboration with provinces and territories, international and non-governmental agencies, was well coordinated, nimble, and innovative. It reflected the best values of the public service, with some 14 departments actively engaged in responding to the needs of Canadians affected by the disaster and those in need of urgent humanitarian aid. It was truly a whole of government response.

Our efforts were timely, needs-driven, compassionate and appropriate. The Canadian response reflects the role Canadians expected the government to play, and our place in the world.

A number of factors contributed to this outcome: effective pre-existing government of Canada disaster response coordination mechanisms, including standard operating procedures for natural disasters abroad; experienced consular officials both in Canada and abroad, and a consular emergency response structure; solid partnerships with international and non-governmental humanitarian partners in Canada and in the affected countries, and knowledge of global best practices for responding to humanitarian emergencies; and finally, established networks with other donor governments and diplomatic contacts.

• (0935)

[English]

On December 26, at 12:25 in the morning, within four hours of the initial earthquake that struck Indonesia, Foreign Affairs Canada completed a preliminary analysis and issued the first of its situation reports, which were issued on a daily basis thereafter. Within the next 12 hours, on the morning of December 26, the Foreign Affairs Canada-led interdepartmental task force, which coordinated the government's response, met. Simultaneously, officers at Canadian embassies and from Ottawa were deployed to the affected areas to respond to consular needs of Canadians and to provide assistance to the local populations.

A tsunami crisis unit was established in the Foreign Affairs operations centre, staffed by hundreds of Foreign Affairs and International Trade volunteers, and operated 24 hours a day from December 26 to January 31. The unit received close to 100,000 calls, resulting in some 4,000 active case files. To give you a point of contrast, the largest number of calls previously received was following September 11, 2001, when the department fielded some 36,000 calls from concerned Canadians. Most affected Canadians were in Phuket, Thailand, where a satellite embassy office was established. In the days that followed, Canadian forensics and public

health experts were dispatched, where they remain to ensure that Canada is well placed to help identify and repatriate our nationals.

On December 26, within 14 hours of the initial earthquake, Canada announced a \$1-million contribution to the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. To that point, this was the only international appeal for aid that had been issued. The Canadian response was more than 10% of the amount requested. This contribution enabled the Red Cross/Red Crescent to begin needs assessments and determine next steps. Within the next 24 hours, as needs became apparent, Canada's contribution was increased by an additional \$3 million and CIDA's pre-positioned relief supplies in Belleville were put on standby for deployment. Within 72 hours of the initial disaster, on December 28, Canada dispatched the first of five relief flights with needed humanitarian aid to the United Nations and Red Cross movement: two to Sri Lanka, two to Indonesia, and one to the Maldives. Pre-existing arrangements with international partners ensured that Canadian goods sent were both needed and distributed immediately. CIDA also established a 1-800 number so that Canadians could make inquiries, and offered technical and other aid, including private sector companies.

Throughout the initial days, government reassessed and adjusted its humanitarian response as needs assessments became available. The government was in close contact with other donors, and Canada was a member of the core group of countries established by the United States in support of the United Nations' efforts.

On December 30, within 110 hours of the disaster, the government dispatched a Foreign Affairs-led multidisciplinary needs assessment team to Sri Lanka and Indonesia. This team reviewed the prospects for additional Canadian humanitarian and recovery aid, including the possible deployment of the DART. The team met with United Nations agencies, NGOs, and the Government of Sri Lanka. At the request of the latter, the government agreed to deploy the DART to the Ampara region of Sri Lanka. Since deploying on January 6, the DART has treated 6,165 patients and operated three reverse osmosis water purification units, which have provided more than 2.7 million litres of clean, drinkable water to local populations.

Canada's total assistance contribution to the relief effort now stands at \$425 million, making Canada the seventh largest bilateral donor. In overall terms, Canada ranks as the tenth largest in per capita terms, at \$10.67 U.S., ahead of all other G-8 countries. Donations by the Canadian public to charities currently stands at \$199.3 million. The matching program and tax deduction in 2004 for donations made until January 11, 2005, announced by the government, provided a clear additional incentive for public donations. The provinces and territories have contributed some \$19.65 million Canadian, municipalities \$605,000, and the private sector and unions \$11.4 million, to Canadian NGOs. On December 30, 2004, Canada also offered a debt moratorium to countries affected by the tsunami.

● (0940)

Canada has been proactive in participating in several high-level international meetings on tsunami response, including the donors conference in Jakarta, which I attended with my colleague the Minister of International Cooperation. While in the region, I also travelled to Thailand to meet with the Canadian team in Phuket and affected Canadians. The Prime Minister visited some of the affected countries, as did the Minister of International Cooperation and the Minister of Health.

We have also tried to keep Canadians well informed on events through briefs to media, websites, and kits for parliamentarians. Canadians can consult the consolidated Government of Canada website, which will provide them with up-to-date information on all aspects of the government's response to the tsunami crisis. The site includes information on the government's initiatives undertaken in humanitarian relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction in the devastated areas.

As we look ahead to reconstruction efforts, my department is working closely with CIDA and with other countries to determine how we can use the opening presented by the tsunami to encourage peacebuilding opportunities in Indonesia and Sri Lanka.

The immediate challenge facing the international community in Sri Lanka is to ensure that the delivery and use of well-intentioned reconstruction funds are done in a manner that supports, or at least does not undermine, an already fragile ceasefire. This will require careful coordination in the delivery of international pledges, and Canada has already taken a leading role in this respect. A bilateral donors group, chaired by Canada, has been established in Sri Lanka to coordinate and rationalize the delivery of post-tsunami assistance. Canada has also been asked to sit on the steering committee established to oversee the delivery of multilateral assistance to Sri Lanka through various international financial institutions.

Through our leading roles in these two bodies, Canada can play an important supportive role in helping the antagonists to devise a joint mechanism for managing the disbursement of international reconstruction funds. If successful, such a mechanism could serve as an important confidence-building measure between the parties.

● (0945)

[Translation]

Holding influential positions on these two key bodies will also ensure Canada remains well placed to continue our monitoring of the

equitable delivery of international aid, particularly within Sri Lanka's conflict zones. This will be in addition to the independent monitoring efforts we intend to continue through teams of Canadian officials periodically dispatched from the High Commission in Colombo to the various tsunami-affected regions of the island.

In Indonesia, the tsunami abruptly ended the enforced isolation of the province of Aceh. In the days following the tsunami, Canada's multi-disciplinary special reconnaissance mission to Aceh identified short- and medium-term options for aid. The Canadian Embassy established a forward staging office in Medan immediately following the disaster, to facilitate humanitarian assistance delivery. It provided services to Canadian nationals, liaised with local authorities, international and non-governmental organizations and other donors. Building on this effort, on January 28, the Canadian Embassy established a temporary office in Banda Aceh—making Canada one of the first countries to establish such a presence. This office will facilitate liaison and coordination of Canadian efforts with all relevant actors, support our reconstruction efforts, and provide up-to-date reporting. This presence that we have established at the epicentre of the disaster will greatly enhance Canadian efforts to identify appropriate conflict mitigation strategies.

Canada, in collaboration with other international partners will seek to ensure that our response to the tsunami supports conflict resolution, does not exacerbate the conflict and contributes to preserving safe and unhindered access for aid workers. Canadian officials are now exploring how this can best be accomplished through Canadian aid and diplomatic engagement.

There is no question that the political climate in Sri Lanka and Indonesia is complex. Canada and its other international partners, including NGOs, are very aware of the challenges we face in reconstruction. However, the key question that the international community must answer is whether or not this tragic natural disaster can provide the international community with an opening to facilitate the conditions for peace processes. Canada will do its part in trying to answer that question.

As Minister of Foreign Affairs, I have had the opportunity in the last six weeks to speak to my colleagues around the world. All have been impressed with Canada's ability to react swiftly and appropriately, with huge generosity and through effective and efficient channels to ensure that we can make the greatest impact with our contributions and efforts.

I want to thank you for your kind attention. I would now be happy to take any questions you may have.

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

I just want to let colleagues know that we have 40 minutes available to us for questions to the Minister. Each party will have 10 minutes. If you wish to share your time with a colleague, feel free to do so.

[English]

We'll start with Mr. Menzies. He's going to share his time with Mr. Day.

Mr. Menzies, please.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** Thank you. I have a number of questions that I would like to ask. Then I would like to leave an opportunity at the end of my ten minutes for Mr. Day to ask at least one question—

• (0950)

**The Chair:** Not at the end, please.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** Before the end of my 10 minutes. I will keep my comments very brief, because I think it's very important that we get some answers to these questions.

Thank you, Mr. Minister, for agreeing to appear today.

I would like an analysis of your per capita on the \$425 million. The way I analyze it, this is over five years, so it's \$2.65 per Canadian per year. Correct me if I'm wrong. I'd like some comments on how you analyze that.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I think that is the case.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** If you don't mind, we'll let him ask all his questions at once, and then you can answer them.

[English]

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** We had reports that the Antonovs, with the heavy lift capacity for moving DART, were ordered the day after the tsunami. Who cancelled them, and how much did it cost us to cancel them and re-order those planes later on?

Who decided what groups were going to receive matching funds? Why weren't municipalities included in that? There's a number of other organizations that weren't included in that. Thursday evening I'm going to a tsunami relief concert in my own home town. That's not going to be matched. How was that decided on?

I have another quick question. Despite the fact that \$200 million has been raised by NGOs, on the CIDA website it states that the exact amount available for reconstruction will only be determined after all proposals from eligible partners have been addressed. Is there a second vetting process for these matching grants?

I wonder if you could answer those, please.

**The Chair:** We'll get the answer, and then go to Mr. Day afterwards. No problem.

**Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC):** Okay. I know he'll save me time for one quick question.

**The Chair:** No, we'll save you some time. I'll double-check this; don't worry.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I listened to your calculations, and they are one way of looking at it, but the \$425 million is not spread evenly over the next five years. So when you get down to \$2 and something, it could vary according to the year you're in; so the first years are higher, then it will come down over the years.

I've never heard of the Antonovs being reserved and cancelled. It's a question for DND. I will answer that when I have the opportunity to discuss it with my colleague at DND.

I want to congratulate and thank Marie Gervais-Vidricaire for having done a great job, in my view, with her mission in the region, where she determined that Ampara was the right place for the DART.

Certainly, as foreign minister, beyond the humanitarian need, I thought it was great that it went to Ampara, where a third of the population is Tamil. I thought it reached some of the goals and that it was worth taking the time.

The matching was devised only for individuals. It was a choice we made that provinces and municipalities could make contributions, but that the matching of the Government of Canada would only be with individuals. It was a choice we made and I think it is quite understandable as a choice per se.

I missed your last question on the NGOs. Mr. Fox will answer that.

**Mr. James Fox (Director General, South and South East Asia Bureau, Department of Foreign Affairs):** In terms of the details with respect to that, it might be better put to the minister responsible for international development. But in general, the process is that the groups concerned have to submit particular projects to make sure the projects are appropriate projects to be able to access the funds. So there is a process underway to review the different project proposals.

**The Chair:** Mr. Day.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Just before your presentation, Minister, we had a presentation from UNICEF. They are one of a number of groups who are experiencing both some headway and challenges in the area, especially related to the LTTE, the Tamil Tigers. There is a rehabilitation project going on, where they're attempting to take children out of the LTTE terrorist ranks and rehabilitate them. But the concern is that LTTE is continuing at the same time to recruit and abduct children, probably at a rate higher than children are being rehabilitated. Given that, and given everything else we know about the Tamil organization.... We heard today in reports that Anne McLellan says it was at your request that the Tamil Tiger organization not be banned in Canada. As you know, most of our allies have banned this horrifying group.

Minister, in light of what I think are your good efforts related to the tsunami relief—albeit recognizing the questions of my colleague—could you clarify why Canada continues to refuse to ban this organization, even when we have reports on how they're obstructing child rehabilitation in the tsunami area by continuing to abduct and recruit children into their armies? As Minister McLellan indicated today, sir, it was at your request that the Tamil Tigers not be banned in Canada. Could you expand on that?

• (0955)

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Of course, we take very seriously these allegations and this information. We absolutely condemn the abduction of children and believe that it is fundamentally wrong to go in that direction, and of course we support the rehabilitation project of UNICEF in all kinds of ways.

It is my view at this time, however, after having consulted many of our partners in the international community—including Norway, which as you know plays a lead role in the peace process—not to list the Tamil Tigers at this time because of the fragility of the whole peace process and ceasefire. We believe it is better to try to work and engage them in a very fragile ceasefire, to strengthen it, and to maintain it. We honestly believe at this time that it would not be useful to list the Tamil Tigers.

The State Department of the United States, as well, has asked us not to list them.

**The Chair:** : Mr. Day, do you have a short supplementary question?

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** I hear what you're saying. I confess I still do not understand how...when we have a good history of what constitutes a diminishing of terrorist activity, which is to stand up to it and not be seen as appeasing or accommodating it. We will continue to have this profound difference of opinion on any kind of accommodation or appeasement to a group that our own police forces, especially those in Toronto, speaking on behalf of the good people of the Tamil community in Canada, especially in Toronto, have asked be dealt with because of their intimidating activities, even in Canada.

If we continue to allow them to exist and not be classified as a banned organization, we will continue to have this difference of opinion.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I respect that; however, I believe our position is the right one at this time. The Government of Sri Lanka has not listed the Tamil Tigers as a terrorist organization. They themselves have not done it. Most of the people we've been consulting, including the United States State Department, which did it, are demanding we do not do it at this time. And Norway is playing a leading role there.

We condemn the acts of abducting children. We absolutely condemn the terrorist activities that are being conducted. But we believe at this time that the Canadian policy is the right one.

We may have a divergence of view, of course, and it is healthy that between the official opposition and the government there be some of that.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** If I condemned a murderer, I'd also suggest the murderer be arrested.

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Paquette, please.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Minister, for appearing in the context of our study. I can't help but seize the opportunity of your presence here to come

back to the matter of the assistance provided Canadians and Quebecers at the Embassy at Bangkok.

I, personally, am aware of two cases which I see as problematic. As a result, I am having trouble agreeing with your extremely positive assessment of services provided by consular and embassy staff, at least in Thailand.

For example, Mr. Desharnais from Saint-Christophe-d'Arthabaska, was refused assistance by the embassy. His member of Parliament, André Bellavance, had to intercede with them to get some answers. Ultimately, it was a local person with a travel agency who helped him extricate himself from the situation he and his family found themselves in. They had lost everything: their passports, plane tickets, money, etc.

I myself was directly involved in the case of my nephew, who was taken to the hospital in Phuket and, using his cell phone, was able to call us to let us know he was there. Like every other good citizen, I used the phone number published in the newspapers the day after the event occurred. I was happy to see that the situation seemed to be well in hand. But there was no follow-up. He called us back several days later to say that he had not been visited either by a consular official or the American authorities. He and his wife were bedridden and unable to move.

So, I phoned the embassy. The first time, the individual who answered the call only spoke English. She was incapable of communicating in French. As a result, I tried as best I could to provide the necessary information. I also had a case number. I then called a second time, because I still hadn't heard anything. They were supposed to call me back: I had given them my cell phone number and I was prepared to answer a call at any time. When I called back the second time, the lady who answered understood French. I waited a few days, but I still heard nothing.

I ended up calling the Department, where my call was transferred to Asia Emergency Services. The lady told me she was going to take note of it. She had noticed that there was indeed a problem with the file. She told me she would call me back during the week. There really was a problem.

Finally, the young lady's parents went over there to bring them back here.

I am not in any way calling into question the good faith of consular services staff or officials. I know that this was an exceptional situation. But contrary to your contention that the response was well coordinated, nimble, and innovative, the impression of people over there—they had a chance to meet with other Canadians and Quebecers—was that all of this had been very hastily cobbled together and that there were not enough resources available. The general impression was that assistance provided by Canada to its own nationals was less effective than what France, Germany and other countries were doing. That was their impression.

I don't want to pass judgment here, because I do understand the situation. I was receiving phone calls from parents. I imagine that you, too, had your share of adventures.

If you had to do it over again, despite the good grades you've given yourself, what do you think could be done better next time? It's not a matter of criticizing the work that was done, but what exactly could we have done better to ensure that these people would at least have had the feeling they were being taken care of and were safe, and so that their families would have had the sense there was some follow-up occurring.

What causes a lot of people to panic here, particularly where children are involved, is when children are left to fend for themselves. As I already mentioned, in the case of my nephew, it's his wife's parents who went to get them and bring them back. I'm sure that if there are hundreds of such cases, that doesn't help with reconstruction and emergency response.

If you had to do it over again, do you believe there are things we could do better?

• (1000)

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you very much for the line of questioning you've raised, because I think it's absolutely relevant.

In our consular and crisis response services, every time there is a crisis, we carry out an in-depth analysis of our actions to determine what we should be doing differently.

I'm going to ask Mr. Serge Paquette to provide you with additional information about this, because he is responsible for that branch and will certainly have very interesting things to say about it.

I do want to reiterate, however, that on a day like December 26, it takes a certain amount of time to send people to Phuket. We also had a problem with telephone communications in Bangkok, since our system would automatically transfer calls to voice mail. It's a fairly complex problem that slowed down the answering process. Of course, there were also some less pleasant anecdotes but I could give you a lot of examples. This morning, for example, I received a letter from a member of the Opposition recounting an extremely positive and favourable anecdote, and thanking me for all that was done. In my opinion, there were both pleasant and unpleasant experiences.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I would have liked to write you such a letter.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** But what I mean is that there were also pleasant experiences. First of all, it's important to realize that we had to repatriate people who were on vacation. Secondly, we immediately sent people from Ottawa, but they had to actually travel to the site. Third, with respect to bilingualism, our ambassador in Bangkok, Denis Comeau, is highly sensitive to that issue. However, you have to understand that we were asking people like the accountant, who generally had no contact with the public, to answer the phone. Canadians who are not part of our regular services came to provide assistance. So, there was no question of our telling those people they could not provide that assistance because they weren't bilingual. We had to beef up the services available to Canadians with the help of ordinary citizens who came to the embassy to help out. We also were able to beef up our services using local employees. So, obviously, we don't ask everyone to be bilingual: no such requirement applies to people who have no contact with the public. In response to a humanitarian crisis, we are sometimes forced to take this kind of action.

I would ask Mr. Paquette to elaborate, since he has followed these issues very closely, particularly as regards what can be done to improve our services in future.

• (1005)

**Mr. Serge Paquette (Acting Director, Emergency Services, Department of Foreign Affairs):** Indeed, on December 26, we had absolutely no idea of the magnitude of this crisis. So, it obviously took a certain amount of time to put things in motion, both at headquarters in Ottawa and in our missions in the areas affected by the disaster.

In the specific case of Thailand, on the very evening of December 26, our ambassador was on route to Phuket with consular officials to try and locate Canadians who required help. When they arrived at the site, the situation was extremely chaotic and they needed to find facilities in order to carry out their activities. It's also very important to consider the magnitude of this crisis. We received more than 100 000 calls during the crisis. We were collecting information about missing persons and sending that information on to our missions in the affected areas. The missions would then try to locate those people to provide assistance.

I am surprised to hear that members of your family were not visited in the hospital, because our teams did go into the hospitals, both in Phuket and Bangkok, to see whether there were any Canadians there who needed help.

The Minister's answer with respect to bilingualism was perfectly appropriate. The service is offered. In some cases, however, service in French was not requested. The priority, obviously, was to help people in need, where possible in the language of their choice. In some cases, however, that was not possible.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** And in future?

**Mr. Serge Paquette:** Well, as the Minister said, part of our normal procedure once a crisis has been resolved—we are not quite at that stage yet, but we are getting there—is to ask all those who were involved in crisis response to look at what was done to see what was successful and what can be improved. So, in terms of improvements, we believe that there should be a greater capacity to respond at headquarters. We were very surprised.

As was mentioned in the opening statement, the most significant crisis we have ever faced took place on September 11. We learned a great deal from that event and we were better prepared in terms of our equipment and physical capacity, although this time, the crisis was of a magnitude four times greater. So, we are looking at requirements.

I remember waking up colleagues in the region in the middle of the night of December 26 to send them off to Bangkok and Colombo to help our consular officers there. They obviously needed some time to get to the airport and get on a plane. We want to improve our ability to respond and have teams ready to be deployed at any time.

As well, it was the holiday period. We didn't hesitate to recall people who were on holiday, but some were away in places nowhere near the affected countries. It took us some time to get in touch with them.

**The Chair:** Thank you, gentlemen.



[English]

Now I'm going to pass to Ms. Phinney and Mr. Bains.

Ms. Phinney.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Thank you for coming with all your staff today.

I was very pleased to hear the whole report, because after a few days when the media and the opposition kept asking what Canada had done, I kept wishing that somebody would stand up and would say what we had done. I'm impressed with what was done immediately and how quickly we reacted to the whole thing.

DART has left now and it is back here in Canada. I'm just wondering what was arranged to replace DART. That's one question.

Second, a lot of the aid is coming from the ordinary individual, from the main street in Canada. People have been offering aid. You've been there yourself, Minister. I just wonder if we're doing enough now and what the individual Canadian can do now.

• (1010)

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you very much.

I will answer the second question and I will ask Marie Gervais-Vidricaire to answer on the DART and the succession of it. I'd like to give them an opportunity to express themselves to this committee, because they've worked so hard.

On the amounts of money and the kinds of generosity that individual Canadians, the government, municipalities, provinces, unions, corporate Canada, and the rest of the international community have been sending, what I understand is that it is sufficient for the humanitarian needs that we've been encountering. As far as the humanitarian needs are concerned, they're met with the amount of money that is available to the organizations.

Down the line, in the reconstruction, we will have to see the evaluations that are made. Some of the re-evaluations in terms of the reconstruction will determine what more or what else is needed, but it is premature at this stage to determine what will be needed for the reconstruction. On the humanitarian front, though, all organizations tell us they have what they need as far as the humanitarian emergencies are concerned.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Will you be informing the public if there's any way the construction industry or people like that can help?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Yes, we have our website that they can consult all the time. I didn't give the number, but it was in my text.

[Translation]

Ms. Gervais-Vidricaire, would you like to address the other part of that question, please?

[English]

**Mrs. Marie Gervais-Vidricaire (Director General, Global Issues Bureau, Department of Foreign Affairs):** As you probably know, the DART mission was meant to be 40 days, so they are coming back as was planned. The DART is conceived as a stopgap measure to give enough time to other organizations to take over once they are in the position to do so.

At the moment in the Ampara region, a large number of NGOs have arrived and are now able to look after the medical services that the DART was offering, as well as the water that the DART was providing. The DART team has been in touch with these NGOs to ensure that there's a smooth transition, that there will be some people to replace the DART when it leaves.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bains.

**Mr. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.):** Thank you very much.

I want to thank you, Mr. Minister and the rest of the guests, for coming out this morning.

I actually had the privilege and honour of accompanying the Prime Minister and being part of his delegation to the areas that were impacted by the tsunami. The first country we visited was Thailand, and specifically Phuket. I was very impressed by the Canadian volunteers from coast to coast whom I met there. From teachers to doctors to engineers, they took it upon themselves to volunteer their time to help out with the relief efforts. Subsequent to that, we went to Sri Lanka and really got to see the devastation firsthand. Essentially, it was really like carpet bombing. Nothing was left; it was all rubble.

What gave me a very interesting perspective was that I understood the local dialect and was able to communicate with some of the individuals I met there. I was very proud of what they had to say about the Canadian efforts with respect to DART, specifically at a clinic that we visited. We went to a clinic where we had an opportunity to meet some of the Canadians who were involved, and they were very impressed by the services provided. The Prime Minister even had an opportunity to drink the water from the water purification facility, which was really nice.

So I just wanted to take this opportunity to acknowledge the efforts of DART, all the Canadian volunteers, and all the Canadians who donated money and so forth to the efforts. I think it was definitely well received by the locals in those specific countries that we visited.

However, with that said, I do have a concern that is shared by many constituents who did call me about this as well, especially with respect to the political tensions that exist in Sri Lanka. There are many areas where people are concerned that the aid was not received in a possibly timely fashion, or maybe aid wasn't received or still hasn't been received by some individuals, due to the political nature and set-up of that country. Can you provide any reassurances that the aid was received by those regions, and specifically by those areas about which people had brought up concerns?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you very much indeed for your visit.

To complement what Marie Gervais-Vidricaire was saying on the transition to DART, CIDA is already there with a team to ensure and facilitate the transition. They're working with the NGOs so they can take over, and all that.

On Sri Lanka, we've been in constant communication with both the Sri Lanka government, of course, as well as the Tamils on what is going on in the north. From all of the information we have received, the assistance was provided all across the country and was reaching the Tamil regions. In my own electoral district, many have family there. They brought me personal testimony to complement the official information I was receiving. Members of their families were calling to say that things seemed to be going well. I hope very much that we will be able to channel the goodwill in the long term toward not just a cease-fire but the peace process.

If you look at European history, it was really through the OEEC at the time, which became the OECD, that after four centuries of war between European nations, the Marshall Plan and aid... The Americans were very enlightened when they did that. They decided to not give individual envelopes to countries, but to give one envelope. That forced the Germans, the French, the Italians, and the Brits to sit around the same table. American foreign policy then made a great gesture, which in my view built the trust between the partners and sowed the seeds of what allowed them to become first the Common Market and then the European Union.

I was discussing with the Norwegian foreign minister that I believe there is a situation here where aid should be used to promote peace. We're very much attached to that, and we have certain indications of that. I'm not saying this situation isn't very complex and very difficult, but I do believe there is an opportunity there to promote peace with that.

• (1015)

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** I acknowledge the concern raised by my colleague in the opposition. I wanted to bring up that question, because the tsunami did not discriminate, so I wanted to make it very clear that Canadian aid should not discriminate either.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** That's all I wanted to say.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** We will move on now to Mr. McTeague. You have two minutes, Mr. McTeague.

**Hon. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Scarborough East, Lib.):** Minister, dear guests, my comments will relate solely to the consular effort.

[*English*]

Minister, if it were up to me and I could do it tomorrow, I would reward every person in your operations centre with the highest distinction I could provide—the Order of Canada. These people came in 24/7, many without compensation, reward, or want of thanks. I have received a number of calls, not complaints from people who were mistreated, but from people who were thankful that we actually had an operations centre that was able to be as effective as it was.

I think it's very clear that Canadians, as they understood the level of the disaster, were comforted by the fact that they could reach somebody rather quickly, no matter what time of day it was, to ensure their loved ones were looked after. Despite those who believe and tend to forget in the month and a half since the disaster took place that we really had a disaster of epic proportions, the reality is that there are many people within your department who are unsung heroes, and I want to compliment them here on behalf of this committee today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paquette, would it be possible for you to provide details as to the volume of input you received, as well as the number of phone calls? Who performed the work? How many people were hired? How many cases were raised?

[*English*]

I learned this morning that as many as 12 Canadians regrettably lost their lives, and eight are missing. Mr. Paquette, could you give this committee an indication of just how much effort—this is a month after the fact—your division had to make to get this done, to get it right?

**The Chair:** You have 30 seconds.

**Mr. Serge Paquette:** Over the period, we've received somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000 calls. At one point—we have three shifts running—we had 40 people on each shift accepting and returning calls and liaising with our missions to try to locate and assist Canadians.

Out of those calls, we documented 4,000 cases of people potentially in the area—and we're talking about a large area; we were focusing on 12 countries. Over time we were able to reduce those numbers to the numbers mentioned this morning, 12 people confirmed dead and 8 still missing, for whom we have serious concern, and as of this morning 13 who are considered missing and could be anywhere in the area.

It took a lot of work. The work is continuing, to bring those numbers down to zero. Unfortunately, the numbers have become quite static now, both on the number of dead and on those for whom we have serious concerns. The identification process is proceeding well. It is a big undertaking for the Thai authorities to identify all those remains, but the work is proceeding well. We have supplied assistance and RCMP forensic experts, and there's a continuing offer to the Thai government to continue in the identification process.

• (1020)

[*Translation*]

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

We will move on now to Ms. McDonough.

[English]

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

I welcome the opportunity to express the appreciation of my leader and colleagues for the unprecedented effort made by departmental officials. I think the response to requests for information, the response to requests for briefings, and so on was much appreciated. It was prompt, competent, and very cooperative.

I hasten to say that the purpose of my having urged the committee to take a look at where to go from here is twofold. One is to figure out how we can actually ensure that our continuing efforts are as coordinated and effective as possible. I have one question around that. Second, I want it to be absolutely clear...not because of any shortcomings in the human effort, but really to look at improved structural provisions to ensure even more effective coordination and readiness to respond to—please, God, let's not see more catastrophes like this—further disasters we will have and to which we must respond.

I have two questions associated with that. First, I want to have an understanding of what structure is in place now to ensure the maximum coordination of effectiveness of the continuing efforts in reconstruction. Is there a designated senior official and agency or a specific team with the coordinating capacity to ensure there aren't gaps and overlaps between Foreign Affairs, CIDA, Defence, and NGOs? One of the early responses of the minister to a couple of questions concerned me a bit. Who is it that can really address the questions? Is it DND, CIDA, Foreign Affairs, and so on?

Second, on the bigger picture, I'm not trying to coax out of the minister answers about what is in the international policy review, but will we be looking at it? I guess I'm urging that we need to look at how we can put in place the kind of mechanism that, for example, the U.K. has put in place—I don't know that it's the model—in terms of disaster emergency capability, which is an ongoing thing. It needs to be a mechanism that permits the allocation of funds, including matching funds, to allow for the creation of a reserve that would permit the issuance of funds immediately, not having to wait for them to come in, in the face of such a disaster, ensuring the best possible mobilization of efforts and so on.

Finally, a very specific question has arisen. Carol Bellamy, who is an outstanding public servant of the world, literally, touched on this very briefly in her comments earlier. It's the very specific question about the appropriate response from the military versus NGOs and government departments in such a crisis. This has become a controversy, not just because CARE Canada has raised it. I certainly have had a number of members of the military approach me to raise this issue about whether DART is necessarily the most appropriate military response when there are other military capabilities. If we were properly funding and equipping them, they might be even more appropriate and more efficient in their response.

Those are my three questions.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you very much, Madame McDonough.

I will ask the deputy minister, who did a great job of coordinating the whole government approach to it, to describe the role of OCHA in the future.

I will deal with the other two questions afterwards.

•(1025)

**Mr. Peter Harder (Deputy Minister, Department of Foreign Affairs):** Thanks very much.

The coordinating role really needs to take place both internationally and domestically. OCHA's coordinating role internationally is one that Canada has supported right from the start and worked with. Indeed, the ginger group that the Americans established on day one, which Canada became a party to, was really designed to sit down with Egeland every night and say, what are the obstacles you're experiencing so that we can—

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** My question was about our response domestically.

**Mr. Peter Harder:** Internally, the coordinating group still meets to ensure that if there are any issues among CIDA, Defence, ourselves, the health agency, and what not, we are coordinating that for quick response. The website I would point to is not just for communications alone. It's also to ensure that we are describing to Canadians who donated how their funds are being disbursed.

A further aspect of coordination, I should add, is that we are looking to work with the NGOs, which themselves have suggested that perhaps we need some mechanisms for quicker response. As you know, in the United Kingdom they take a different approach to disaster response in terms of uniting all of the NGOs early on, and that discussion is being had with CIDA and the NGOs that have been active to see whether quicker mechanisms are available. Of course, we are doing “lessons learned” sessions to ensure that we are able to update our procedures.

I wish to refer to you a document called “Standard Operating Procedures for Response to International Natural Disasters”, which is not a classified document. It does describe very carefully how coordination takes place now, and we are examining how we can update that as a result of the experience we've had.

**The Chair:** Perhaps you could provide that document to the clerk, and we'll transmit it to every member.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** It may answer some of the questions. But a number of people associated with the astounding leadership of Canada in the Ethiopian relief effort have suggested that even at this stage, with the continuing effort there, we still need a designated response capability that would be coordinated, but we also need to drive it so that it would be the focal point. Is that in the works?

**Mr. Peter Harder:** Perhaps I could speak to that specifically. Within CIDA, Michael Jay right from the start was the coordinator of receiving requests from cities, municipalities, and the private sector. Because there was such a workload, we separated the private sector from that group. It's needs based. We have an inventory of what's on offer, and we're getting from the NGOs and the countries themselves an identification of what capacities they're looking for, and we're trying to match them. In the period of Ethiopia, a special office was created to act in that regard. We felt that the existing mechanism was in fact responding to the municipalities, the NGOs, and the private sector. But again, that will be part of lessons learned.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** At the political level, we also have a ministerial ad hoc group that is still meeting and coordinating our response.

On the questions you asked about the international policy review, when we see it you will realize that—

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** When will that be?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** We've been comparing notes with other countries. We've been looking into what other countries are doing. We already had been addressing the issue of funds and that sort of thing. I think this is something you will see we've done good work on—and something that is necessary, in my view.

On the appropriateness of the military versus NGOs' response, it is a very pertinent question. I myself wanted to make sure that the DART and the military was the appropriate response. As you know, first of all, a country has to ask for it. This was the reason I sent Marie Gervais-Vidricaire, precisely to make sure this was the appropriate response. I myself would not have sent it without being absolutely sure first that the country wanted it. You know I was pressured to do it without any close examination. I didn't think that was the appropriate way. This was the reason I sent Marie Gervais-Vidricaire with an observation team to go there and check with the country to see whether it was the appropriate response, both on the water front and on the health front, and all that.

When we made that decision, it was because we'd come to the conclusion it was the appropriate response in this particular case. Right now, as you know, they're coming back, and CIDA is facilitating the transfer to NGOs, and it is going to be very complementary.

In my view, you are asking us a very pertinent question.

• (1030)

**The Chair:** *Merci monsieur le ministre.*

I'll take the last question from Mrs. Stronach.

**Ms. Belinda Stronach:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just to clarify quickly Ms. Phinney's statements regarding the Conservative Party's position, our leader was very careful to say to our MPs that we should not make political hay of this, and that we should be constructive. I would like to address that.

My question relates to debt relief. The minister has said that debt owed to Canada by the countries hardest hit by the tsunami would be

frozen and not forgiven. I would like to know the exact amounts and the details of the actual debt renegotiation offers put to those countries, how much money is involved, and how much debt is held. Has the government changed its mind from considering it to be frozen to being forgiven, and is any part of the debt relief factored into the \$425 million?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I have it for Sri Lanka. Would you agree that we follow up on that question? It has a lot of numbers. I have it for Sri Lanka, but we have it in the books.

**Ms. Belinda Stronach:** Can you give us the overall status of the debt relief, where we're at?

**The Chair:** Can you provide us with some answers regarding this one?

**Pettigrew, Pierre Attendee Minister of Foreign Affairs:** Sure.

**The Chair:** Okay, he's going to provide it to the clerk of the committee, and we'll provide the answer to every member.

Mr. Harder.

**Mr. Peter Harder:** If I could add to this, so that everybody is aware, the cost of the debt moratorium is included in the \$425 million announcement. Of course, it has to be asked for. The discussions with the countries, Indonesia and Sri Lanka, have begun, and we can provide you with the potential funding that this could free up for them. Probably not all countries will ask for it.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

Just before you leave, I also want to make a comment regarding what Mrs. Bellamy from UNICEF told us this morning. She applauded the response to the tsunami catastrophe; however, she referred to the need to continue to respond to what she called... [*Inaudible*]...in emergency. Given the global needs, including being able to reach the millennium development goals, I want to pinpoint that Canada should be sure that this \$200-million matching of personal donations will be new money, and that it will not be taken from CIDA's capacity to respond to other needs.

Mr. Harder.

**Mr. Peter Harder:** Of the \$425 million, \$265 million is in fact new money out of the fiscal framework. The other \$160 million, which is the \$40 million per year for years two, three, four, and five, was unallocated funds within the international assistance envelope that had been sent to CIDA for that period; otherwise, it would not necessarily have gone to CIDA. This is very much over and above, so that we can continue to meet the objectives that you speak to.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister. I want to thank all our witnesses this morning.

[*The meeting continued in camera*]







**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.**