



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

FAAE • NUMBER 040 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Monday, May 16, 2005

—
Chair

Mr. Bernard Patry

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

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

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Monday, May 16, 2005

•(1005)

[English]

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.)): Order.

Welcome, everyone, to this joint meeting of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs. I'm Dr. Patry, chair of the foreign affairs and international trade committee. I'm with Mr. Rick Casson, vice-chair of the national defence and veterans affairs committee.

This morning we will have international and defence policy statements. It is our pleasure to have in front of us the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Honourable Pierre Pettigrew; Mr. Bill Graham, Minister of National Defence; Deputy Minister Peter Harder; and Robert McRae, director general of the policy planning secretariat.

[Translation]

From the Department of National Defence, we also welcome Gen. Richard Hillier, Chief of Defence Staff, as well as the Deputy Minister, Mr. Ward P. Elcock.

[English]

Welcome to all of you.

[Translation]

I am very pleased to welcome, to this joint meeting of our two committees, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of National Defence, who are accompanied by their senior officials. Joint sessions such as these are rare, but they are also important, since they enable us to examine the links between diplomacy, defence and development, the components of a comprehensive and integrated international strategic framework.

[English]

For members of the foreign affairs committee, this is also a welcome opportunity to hear from, and put questions to, the Minister of Defence and the Chief of the Defence Staff. I know that Mr. Graham, as my predecessor in chairing this committee and in following the previous foreign and defence policy reviews, has particular appreciation for the role played by our committees in advancing issues that are vital to both the domestic security and well-being of Canadians and the wider role that Canada can play in the world.

I welcome the invitation from both ministers and from their colleagues, the Minister of International Cooperation and the Minister of International Trade, to study the issues in the

international policy statement released on April 19. You've asked our committees to consult widely with Canadians and to report their views and recommendations on the future direction of Canada's international policy. Although the timing of this is uncertain, given the other developments in the House, I know that all members look forward to engaging Canadians on this major policy question as soon as possible.

[Translation]

I believe that we all want to assist Canada in playing a vital and dynamic role in a world that offers exalting opportunities but, as well, is filled with pitfalls. In keeping with this spirit, I would invite the two ministers to make their opening statements, which will be followed by questions from their colleagues.

[English]

I will start with Minister Pettigrew, please. *Bienvenue.*

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister of Foreign Affairs): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Colleagues, I would like to thank you for your hospitality. I am delighted to have this opportunity to appear, along with my colleague and friend Minister Bill Graham, before a joint session of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs, in order to discuss Canada's new International Policy Statement.

You have already noted, Mr. Chairman, the presence of Mr. Peter Harder, the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Robert McRae, who is the Director General of the Policy Planning Secretariat. I will obviously be turning to them should their expertise be required in answering some of our colleagues' questions.

The International Policy Statement represents the first fully-integrated, government-wide approach to the international challenges and opportunities Canada faces, and presents a vision of a globally-engaged Canada anchored in North America, with a realistic road-map for achieving our goals. It has been given real teeth with the infusion of over \$17 billion over the next five years. Our diplomats and our troops will react smarter, act faster, be more agile and co-ordinated and be equipped with the right tools. Our foreign aid will be targeted and effective.

The IPS makes important choices by establishing clear policy priorities under two broad categories: first of all, revitalizing our North-American partnership; secondly, making a difference globally.

The IPS highlights our relations with the United States, as well as with Mexico. Canada and the United States have a long history of co-operation, tradition and solidarity, but we also have disagreements and disputes. With a new North-American partnership, we have a golden opportunity to better manage our differences with the United States while pursuing common goals regarding the continent's priorities, especially in the areas of security and prosperity enhancement.

•(1010)

[English]

Globally our focus will be on building a more secure world by countering terrorism, stabilizing failed and fragile states, and combatting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; building prosperity for Canadians by strengthening Canada's competitiveness, widening our commercial engagement opportunities, and targeting support for Canadian businesses; and taking responsibility by promoting human rights, good governance, and effective development are essential prerequisites to global security and prosperity. To ensure effective implementation of these priorities, the statement describes how we will employ a more flexible diplomacy and a new multilateralism.

I would like to mention briefly two issues in the IPS to which I attach particular importance as Minister of Foreign Affairs: Canada's role in supporting failed and fragile states, and the transformation of our diplomacy. The new policy focuses on how Canada can help in unstable regions and countries in the world, including rapid response to humanitarian disaster wherever it strikes. With the experience drawn from Haiti, the Balkans, Afghanistan, and the tsunami-ravaged Southeast Asia, we know it is imperative that any intervention coordinate the means and tools at our disposal and vis-à-vis the efforts of other contributors of the international community. We are implementing a plan for renewal and transformation of Foreign Affairs Canada to focus on the objectives identified in the policy review and an enhanced department tool kit to enable better service to Canadians.

Canada ranks last in the G-8 in terms of the ratio of headquarters-based diplomats to diplomats posted abroad, and there is an acute need for officers with capabilities in languages such as Arabic and Mandarin. Australia spends three times what Canada does per diplomatic officer on language training on a comparative basis; New Zealand, almost nine times more.

Security of our diplomatic missions is also a growing concern in this post-9/11 world, and we need to take further steps to protect Canadians who represent us abroad.

[Translation]

To meet these challenges, we are investing \$100 million to increase the proportion of diplomats posted abroad to 50 per cent by 2010; ensure that we maintain a solid global network of missions; intensify third language training for our foreign service officers and reinforce the security of our missions.

As Canadians become increasingly active outside the country, be it for travel, business or education, there is a constantly increasing pressure on my department's consular services. From 1994 to 2004 alone, the number of consular cases jumped by almost 50 per cent to

nearly one and a half million. To ensure we can effectively respond to the needs of Canadians, we are organizing rapidly deployable consular teams who can deal quickly, on site, with crisis situations, such as the Asian tsunami. In addition, we are creating a Consular Consultative Board of key stakeholders to advise on how the department can improve consular services in other ways. I have already requested that, in the event of extraordinary circumstances, such as the tsunami, Canadians be able to receive an emergency passport quickly and at no cost. Finally, to maintain the integrity of the Canadian passport and reduce fraud, new security features are being incorporated.

Colleagues, I am pleased to note that much of the public and media reaction to the International Policy Statement has been positive. It is a reflection, in my view, of a clear recognition that we have got it right. That Canada is now going to have the tools and the policy focus needed to meet our responsibility to ensure Canadians are secure and prosperous and can make a difference in the rapidly evolving globalized world of the XXIst century.

I will now turn the floor over to my colleague, the Minister of National Defence, but I would be pleased to answer your questions after the presentation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman

•(1015)

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

[English]

Now we'll go to Mr. Graham for his opening statement.

Mr. Minister.

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of National Defence): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'm pleased to be here with my colleague Minister Pettigrew and to be once again amongst colleagues and friends on these important committees. I would like to welcome my defence critic, who I see is sitting on the other side of the house. I hope this is an indication of the nature of the proceedings this morning, Mr. Chairman. I welcome the visible symbol of everybody being here to work on this very important initiative.

I'll keep my remarks brief, as we want to be free for your questions, but with your permission I'll take perhaps an extra minute to talk a little bit about Afghanistan. I have an announcement to make that members of the committee will be interested in.

As you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, I'm joined by General Rick Hillier, the Chief of the Defence Staff, and Mr. Ward Elcock, our deputy minister. I'm also joined by Mr. Claude LeBlanc, acting director general of policy planning, and Mr. Ken Ready, acting assistant deputy minister for materiel, in the event that the committee wishes to pose specific questions in those areas.

Colleagues, with our new defence policy statement, we have outlined a bold new course for Canada's military, a course designed to meet, head on, the security challenges of the 21st century. More than at any time in recent memory, events and instability far from our borders pose a threat to the safety and security of Canadians. We have seen this all too clearly in countries like Afghanistan.

In the face of these new security challenges, the first priority of our military will be the defence of Canada and Canadians. After all, there is no greater role and no more important obligation for a government and a society than the protection and safety of its citizens.

[*Translation*]

To do that, our marine and air forces will give greater priority to defending our coasts, our territorial waters and our airspace. We will be improving the way that we collect and analyze and use data obtained from all sources, especially satellites, unmanned aerial vehicles and radars installed throughout Canada.

In addition, we will be setting up a new national command structure called Canada Com, which will mobilize the best available military resources across the country in order to respond rapidly and effectively to national crises.

The impact of our new command structure will also be felt in the North. As a result of intensified surveillance using satellites, unmanned aerial vehicles and radars and a more visible military presence and other improved capabilities, the Canadian Forces will be in a better position to respond to emergencies in the North, and Canada will be able to defend its interests more vigorously in this key region of the country. The absolute priority of our military will therefore be to defend Canada and protect Canadians.

Obviously, given the current security context, we will need to work closely with our American neighbours, as was pointed out by my colleague, Mr. Pettigrew, to strengthen our capability to defend our common continent and respective countries.

Indeed, one of the key priorities outlined in the new Defence Policy Statement pertains to a more developed approach in our relations with the United States, which includes the consolidation of our collective capability to defend North America. More particularly, colleagues, we believe that the time has come to think about increasing co-operation in defence matters, and to include marine and possibly land components.

We do not yet know whether the best way to achieve this would be through a modified NORAD or through other means. However, the government is resolved to explore new ways of working with the United States in order to defend our common continent.

[*English*]

I can assure you, colleagues, that our increased focus on domestic and continental security will not come at the expense of our role internationally. Canadians are proud, and rightfully so, of the role our country plays in the world. This is very much the driving force behind our new vision for the Canadian Forces. We are committed to having a more significant and influential presence in the world, one in which our voice will be heard, our values seen, and our efforts felt.

The government recognizes that a strong, capable, and professional military is essential to the impact that we as a country can have in the world. In fact, we have seen over the past decade in countries around the world that the face of Canada is often that of the men and women in the Canadian Forces. In order to have a greater impact in the world, particularly in failed and failing states—again as was emphasized by my colleague—our new defence policy statement will increase the capacity of the Canadian Forces to participate in overseas operations. The addition of significant new equipment and 5,000 regular force personnel, with the bulk going to the army, will essentially double the capacity of our land forces to undertake challenging international operations anywhere in the world.

Our new defence policy statement also calls for the creation of a standing contingency task force to respond rapidly to emerging crisis. This high-readiness task force will be ready to deploy within ten days' notice, and will provide an initial Canadian Forces presence to work with security partners to stabilize a crisis or facilitate the deployment of larger follow-on forces. We will also create a special operations task group, a special operations group to respond to terrorism and threats to Canadians and Canadian interests around the globe.

Of course, in all of our international military activities we will continue to work very closely with CIDA, Foreign Affairs, and others in order to maximize the impact and effectiveness of our involvement in the world.

An important example of this comprehensive approach is that of Afghanistan. I'm pleased to advise the committee this morning that Canada is now preparing to assume a leadership role in paving the way for a secure, democratic, and self-sustaining Afghanistan. To that end, we will be expanding the scope of our military commitment in that country.

First, we will extend the mandate of our reconnaissance squadron already in Kabul until late this year. In so doing, we will be continuing to provide the international security assistance force with valuable intelligence and situational awareness capabilities. We'll also help facilitate the Afghan election process.

Second, we will be deploying a provincial reconstruction team to the city of Kandahar, in southern Afghanistan, for a period of about eighteen months beginning in August of this year, in accordance with our commitment to NATO and our NATO allies that goes back to over a year now. This team will bring together approximately 250 Canadian military personnel, civilian police, diplomats, and aid workers to provide an integrated 3-D approach to reinforce the authority of the Afghan government in and around Kandahar and to assist in the stabilization of the region. This PRT will conduct security patrols, assist local reconstruction efforts, report on governance issues, and facilitate reforms to the security sector.

Finally, in early 2006 we will be deploying an army task force of about 700 Canadian Force members, and a brigade headquarters of approximately 300 military personnel, to Kandahar for a period of between nine and twelve months. These forces will conduct operations to strengthen the security situation in the country. They will also play a key role in completing the transition from coalition to NATO leadership in Afghanistan.

We are still working out some of the specific details of our new commitment to Afghanistan with our allies and partners and other government departments, but this is a significant new commitment to Afghanistan and to the international campaign against terrorism. It demonstrates, in a real and meaningful way, our willingness to play a leadership role in the world—the goal set out in our international policy statement.

Colleagues, this is an historic time for the Canadian Forces, and it's a privilege for me to be the Minister of National Defence in such an exciting period. With the addition of nearly \$13 billion in new funding for our military in the recent federal budget, we have the resources we need to strengthen our capacity to defend Canada and Canadians and to play a more significant role in the world. With General Hillier and his senior staff, we have a vibrant new military leadership with innovative ideas that are rooted in recent operational experience both here in Canada and throughout the world.

• (1020)

This new leadership team is working right now to fundamentally transform our military into a relevant, responsive, and effective force, a force that is made up of some of the world's most dedicated professional and skilful men and women in uniform.

With our new policy statement you have before you today, we have the intellectual framework required to guide and shape the Canadian Forces to face the defence security challenges of the 21st century.

It is therefore with great pleasure that I join Minister Pettigrew in introducing our international defence policy statements to your committees. I look forward to the discussions they will engender here in Parliament and across the country. I thank you for your attention and look forward to answering your questions.

• (1025)

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you very much, Mr. Minister, for your opening remarks.

As is usually the rule with a minister's appearance, the Q and A will be ten minutes for the first round.

We'll start with Mr. Day, please.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to both ministers for being here. I can say with all sincerity that we wish we could see you more often here, at least for the next few days.

I'd first like to make a comment that we are pleased to see the commitment related to Afghanistan, along the lines of what we've been asking. It's very important that this incredible development in Afghanistan in terms of moving towards democracy is seen more than just as an experiment and as a trend that moves to become a

reality. Clearly, we will endorse what we've been asking for, and that is this level of involvement in Afghanistan.

What I'd like to do in the ten minutes allotted to me is direct my questions mainly to Mr. Pettigrew. I will try to do it within five minutes because we only have ten in our first round. I hope the minister can answer each one within the five or six minutes he'll be given.

I'd like to take your opening statement and cast it into a real-time situation and ask you to reflect on some of the details. In your opening statement you say:

This Statement represents the first fully integrated, government-wide approach to the international challenges and opportunities Canada faces, and presents a vision of a globally-engaged Canada....

Then on page 3 you talk about the ability to stabilize “failed and fragile states”. Let's look at this in terms of the real-time scenario that is Darfur, Sudan, and the announcement last week. I don't have to go into the details here. The world knows, and it's well publicized, the devastation that is Darfur and the hundreds of thousands who have been killed as well as the millions who have been displaced. As we heard from a report earlier this week from somebody who just got back from Darfur, there are nightly raids by the Islamic Janjaweed warriors in the camps, the systematic rape of women, and the pillaging of the camps themselves.

The world knows this is a disaster. We have been asking for action for over a year. We saw the Prime Minister suddenly move to action just last week. I will not presume on his intentions, but the widespread reflection is they were politically motivated to gain one vote.

My first question would be, is the Minister of Foreign Affairs—I have been talking to him about this over the last year—disappointed with the timing of that particular announcement, which seems to undercut the sincerity of it?

Second, there has already been one tranche of announcements related to money, I believe in the neighbourhood of some \$50 million, followed by this announcement last week of \$170 million. Reports we have are that since the \$50 million—if that's a correct figure—was announced last year, quite a while ago, few if any cheques have actually been cut. Has money actually gone forward since the first announcement? The concern is that the money will become deflected and diluted and we won't be able to keep track of it properly as it heads to Darfur.

My third question is this. We all saw the embarrassment for Canadians this weekend when the Sudanese regime said thanks, but no thanks, or appeared to say that. That, of course, caused a lot of red-faced and rushed activity on the government side. I would like to know, within the last week, did the Prime Minister himself talk to the head of the Islamic regime in Khartoum, yes or no? Within the last week, who at NATO and at the UN did the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs specifically talk to, that is, within the last week, to advise them that this announcement was coming?

My second-last question is this. When the Prime Minister made the announcement last week—and I stood there and listened to him—was he aware that none of our troops going into that area would be allowed to carry weapons? Was he aware that they would be going into the most dangerous part of the world and not be able to carry even sidearms with them? That's the report we have.

Would the minister agree—and I'm asking this in sincerity—that the fallout from this announcement has been terrible? The fallout from this announcement over the last few days really hasn't done a lot to increase confidence in this government. How does the minister take this terrible announcement and how it has all broken out? How does he tie that into the intent of the statement, which I'll go back to now, to present a vision of a globally engaged Canada, especially as related to failed and failing states?

• (1030)

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you, Mr. Day.

Go ahead, Mr. Pettigrew.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Thank you very much indeed.

I'm quite pleased to address these questions. I will partly turn to General Hillier, who was himself recently in the region. I think what he will have to contribute might be quite interesting, and some of the questions are pertinent to—

Mr. Stockwell Day: I'm mainly interested in the political side of these, Mr. Chair.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I think the committee will benefit from the views of General Hillier, who was just in the region, and some of the questions are very clear on whether people will be able to carry arms and this sort of thing. So I think it is appropriate that the general, who is here this morning, can contribute to the answer, certainly.

When we talk about fragile and difficult states, states in transition as well, you are concentrated on Sudan and Darfur because of the announcement of last week, but we've also been very active on Afghanistan and Haiti as well. I think this is one of the priorities of our government.

The Prime Minister's commitment to Darfur has been long-standing. I think that relating it to the present parliamentary situation and to one particular vote is really narrowing the Prime Minister's commitment and our government's commitment. We were the first country to pledge money to the African Union, to support the African Union last year. We have had an emissary on the Darfur situation, Senator Mobina Jaffer, named in 1999, and she's been working on that front since 1999.

Clearly, you have yourself stressed that the conditions in which we operate are not easy. You have the Sudan government with whom you have to negotiate. They have accepted soldiers from the African Union. They do not accept interventions from other countries that readily.

My view is that our government's commitment, the Prime Minister's commitment, has been there for a long time.

Now, if the opposition chose to change its approach to confidence in the government after having said that it would support the budget,

and changed its mind after the Brault testimony and decided that it would no longer support the budget, this was not going to change our government's plan on Darfur and Sudan. When we decided to make those commitments as a country, at that time we thought we had your support on the budget.

So we continue to govern, and we will do our job as long as the House maintains its confidence in us. It was not politically motivated at all, that announcement. It followed years of interest in this.

I don't like to comment on the Prime Minister's phone calls. I don't think it is appropriate for a minister or anyone else to comment on the Prime Minister's calls, and this and that. I know that he's had a number of conversations with Prime Minister Bashir, but I would not begin to say when and at what time and all that, simply because it is not appropriate for me to comment on the Prime Minister's agenda and phone calls.

I as foreign minister and my people have indeed been talking to United Nations and NATO people, who have appreciated very much Canada's engagement and commitment. They appreciate that it may, down the line, facilitate a further enhanced role for NATO. And certainly Madam Condoleezza Rice and I have also had very thorough conversations, and many of my people have talked to the State Department in the United States along those lines.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Mr. Graham, do you have something else to add?

Hon. Bill Graham: I will pass the microphone to General Hillier on the technical question.

Mr. Day, you did ask if we have been spending exactly, and I think it's important. Most of the money is being spent by CIDA. No doubt the committee could be furnished with the specifics. But I have to tell you that from a security point of view, the money that has been spent on helicopters, the \$20 million committed to the helicopters—and you may want to ask General Hillier about that—those helicopters have been fundamentally important to the African Union doing its job and to getting a lot of things in and out of those camps. That's money that's been spent by Canada, furnished by Canada. The Canadian flag is on those helicopters going in there day after day, enabling the African Union to do its job. That's the purpose of what we have to do now: to enable the African Union to do its job. That's the way we can be effective with our forces.

If the general can speak to the specific issues you raised, that would be helpful too.

• (1035)

Mr. Stockwell Day: Mr. Chairman, our defence critic will have specifics on defence. The only question I asked on defence was the one on firearms.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): I'm very sorry, Mr. Day, I chair the committee. There is no debate in the committee.

General Hillier, please go ahead.

General R.J. Hillier (Chief of the Defence Staff, Department of National Defence): When I was in Sudan, Addis Ababa, and Darfur almost three weeks ago now, the secretary general of the African Union, the ambassador, the force commander for the Darfur integrated task force, the Government of Sudan, the chief of defence staff—all were adamant that non-AU-formed bodies of troops or contingents or units would not be welcome in the mission, and in fact were not needed. What they all were in agreement on was that the African Union had the troops, and could get the troops, but needed some assistance to enable them to be effective.

I think some of the discussion that's come out—on whether or not people would be going into Sudan, on whether Canadian troops would be welcome in Darfur, on whether they could be armed—has been as a result of some misunderstanding about what we would be sending there. Our intent was to offer military options to enable the African Union. We will start with that as soon as we can possibly get people moving. Much of that work will be done outside Darfur itself, either at the AU headquarters in Addis Ababa or possibly some in Khartoum, or even other places around the region.

I would remind you that the mission in Darfur is an African Union mission working under a United Nations resolution, and the members of that mission are armed. If we have Canadians there, if they show up as part of the African Union mission in Darfur, they would also be armed, with an inherent right to self-defence.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you, Mr. Hillier.
[Translation]

It is now Mr. Paquette's turn to ask questions.

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you for your presentations.

Mr. Pettigrew, you said in your statement that you were pleased that the statement was generally speaking very well received. That is debatable. Nevertheless, what was poorly received was the fact that, in the International Policy Statement, no firm commitments were made with respect to the 0.7 per cent of GDP by 2015, as established in the Millennium objectives, to which Canada subscribed. Over the past few weeks, at least four experts, including the former President of the World Bank, said that, as far as that issue is concerned, Canada's credibility on the international scene was at stake.

As you know, Great Britain, France and Germany made commitments to reach this 0.7 per cent by 2015, as requested by Kofi Annan. We are running the risk of being quite isolated. The excuse given in the paper is that the objective will be reached once our financial resources allow us to do so. With the surpluses that the federal government has raked in over the past few years, the excuse is, in my opinion, weak, particularly when one considers that Germany and France are grappling with budget deficits every year.

I would like you to explain why you did not make a firm commitment to reach the 0.7 per cent of GDP by 2015, given that you made the commitment to do so in the Millennium objectives and given that the UN Secretary General has made such a request.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: You were quite right to say that we made a commitment to reach the 0.7 per cent in the Millennium objectives.

This is a commitment that Canada has had for several years. To say that Canada has reneged on its commitment is false. Canada committed, in the Millennium objectives—and we did so even before the Millennium objectives—to earmark 0.7 per cent of its gross national product for development aid.

What we did not include in this International Policy Statement is a specific timetable, with figures. But our commitment remains. I hope that we will reach our objective. You are right when you say that the international community is expecting a great deal from Canada. It was Lester B. Pearson who was the author of this type of commitment. Our government feels that it is very important and is working very hard to reach it.

Secondly, in my opinion, it is the effectiveness of the aid that counts. We are increasing our development aid budgets significantly. We will be doubling official development aid somewhere between 2003 and 2010. It is therefore very important that we have good partners, people capable of delivering the programs and truly helping the people on the ground. By enhancing budgets considerably, but responsibly, we are ensuring that the money will be invested with the people in a productive and effective manner.

Thirdly, as far as this 0.7 per cent figure is concerned, I will tell you that our commitment to development goes far beyond what is contained in our development aid budget. There is official development aid, where we talk about the 0.7 per cent objective, but there are numerous other very significant Canadian investments, required for the development, but excluded from this 0.7 per cent figure.

● (1040)

Consequently, a great deal of military investment, such as that required for our intervention in Afghanistan or our announcement with respect to Darfur, for instance, is required to stabilize a region, but we cannot begin developing a region until it has been stabilized. That covers, to a large extent, what we are doing in Haiti.

Consequently, Canada is a country which, in addition to official development aid, provides programs, participates in programs representing massive and extremely important investments.

Mr. Pierre Paquette: With the commitments made by the government, we calculated that Canada would reach its 0.7 per cent objective by 2034. Many of us will not be there to see this objective achieved, unfortunately.

I would like to ask another question. My question is for both Mr. Graham and Mr. Pettigrew.

We feel that the document is somewhat ambiguous with respect to the term “multilateralism”. Its definition does not include international institutions such as the UN. When President Bush went to Iraq, he obviously said that he was taking multilateral action, because this was a coalition involving several countries.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: No.

Mr. Pierre Paquette: I would, therefore, like to know how you see multilateralism and how the UN fits into that concept.

Mr. Graham, I would also like you to clarify the role of our military, because we have not been convinced that the primary objective of peacekeeping is apparent in the statement before us.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: If, in terms of the current increases, we do not meet our objective until 2034, that means that the government is embarking in increases more quickly than scheduled to reach the objective by 2015, so as not to spread the sauce too thinly.

As for multilateralism, the UN is central, it is the priority institute with respect to the whole battery of multilateral institutions, the way I see it. I do not know if this has been defined; we will have to check that out. There is a difference between plurilateral action and multilateral action. The actions taken by the United States which you referred to are plurilateral.

Mr. Pierre Paquette: That is a notion which adds to the debate.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Well, you know me!

Mr. Pierre Paquette: Yes. For a long time.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I am trying to demonstrate that a course in philosophy is an investment that is worthwhile.

I do not know whether the political scientists or the big experts make the same distinction between what is plurilateral and multilateral, but, as far as I am concerned, multilateral means that it is recognized by the entire international community. For example, the UN is multilateral, because the entire international community recognizes it as such. The African Union is multilateral, as is the Organization of American States. These are regional organizations but they are multilateral because they are part of a whole system.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. Pierre Paquette: Yes, I find that clarification important. Perhaps, indeed, the committee will have recommendations to make on that issue. In all honesty, the document is not that clear about whether international institutions should be at the heart of multilateralism.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: It is not a bad thing to have a Minister of Foreign Affairs with a vision that is even clearer. Sometimes that is helpful.

Mr. Pierre Paquette: Perhaps only for a few weeks, unfortunately for him.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Canadians will decide.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): We will now turn the floor over to Mr. Graham, please.

Hon. Bill Graham: That is a very good question. In our statement, it is quite obvious that the primary role of our armed forces is to protect Canadians. That is true. Operations outside of Canada can be considered as part of that role.

Our role in Afghanistan, immediately after the events of September 11, is a good example. We were committed multilaterally, under the auspices of world-wide operations in compliance with international law. I am not talking about examples like Iraq, where we refused to participate. In addition to that, we do consider participation in peacekeeping operations, especially in failing states, where we have to do this to establish security. By their very nature, these operations are multilateral. Canada could never be the only country present in countries like Afghanistan, the Sudan or elsewhere in Africa. These are all multilateral operations, and we work with many different allies of various strengths. We are still in Bosnia, to this day.

Still, I would like to point out to what extent peacekeeping operations are different today than those we carried out in the past, especially in Cyprus, in Golan Heights or places like that, where the situation is stable. Today, we intervene in unstable, dangerous situations which require combat-ready troops, troops that can defend themselves, that can establish security but which are also capable of diplomacy and humanitarian aid. This is a very complex role for our troops; we ask a lot of them.

If you ever have an opportunity to go to Afghanistan, for example, you will see a typical operation. Our troops are establishing security in Kabul in conditions that are quite difficult, complex and even dangerous, but at the same time, they are establishing good relations with the local population in addition to providing humanitarian aid. This is a highly-complex peacekeeping operation which is unfolding in conditions that are very different from the ones we have experienced in the past.

● (1045)

Mr. Pierre Paquette: I would like to turn to another subject now. Let me put this to you, even though we may run out of time.

In the statement, I expected that there would be greater elucidation of the role of parliamentarians in civil society. An exercise like this every 10 years is important, but it seems to me that we should have—a bit like the ongoing training that Mr. Pettigrew promotes—constant feedback between parliamentarians, civil society and NGOs in particular. This would prevent having to hold a high mass every 10 years, when nothing is done in between. Other partners are not mentioned very much here.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I would say two things here. First of all, to get back to the previous case, on page 9 of our statement you will find the government's point of view on multilateralism and the place of the UN. It reads:

[...] at the international level, Canada remains firmly committed to the United Nations as the cornerstone of the multilateral system, and to action under its auspices [...]

What I was saying about the role of the UN is reflected here.

With regard to the role of parliamentarians, when I was Minister of International Trade, I had undertaken to table an annual report before Parliament on the status of Canada in international trade. We are in the fourth or fifth year now, and I think it is very important to table a report on trade every year before Parliament. In our International Policy Statement, I picked up on that idea. So 10 years will not go by before we get back to this.

This statement would be much more current than what we usually produce, because every year, the Minister of Foreign Affairs will table before Parliament a report on the status of Canada's international policy, which should allow for additions and adjustments.

I agree with you; we have to do more to enhance the role of parliamentarians.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you very much, Minister.

[English]

Now we'll go to Mr. Lee, please.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Thank you.

I gather that one of the themes of Canadian deployment abroad, whether it be diplomatic, defence, or development, is that it carries with it a theme of interoperability, reasonably rapid deployment, and fulfilling our obligations to our partners. Can I focus on the deployment part?

Minister Pettigrew has already referred to moving deployment of the diplomatic piece out quickly. As for the development piece, I'm not exactly sure how we do that, but I assume it's civilians ready to offer valid-added in a development scenario, whether it's connected to the diplomacy or not. It was the military piece where I wasn't sure we had all the pieces lined up for deployment if there's a military component of an international deployment. I'm seeking some reassurance that in our policy statement and in our plans, financially and otherwise, we are assembling, or already have assembled, the components of deployment for the military part. I recognize that there's a military plan to invest in a joint supply ship. That may take a few years to bring on stream.

Can we somehow reassure Canadians that we have the ability to deploy military components of our international engagements relatively quickly?

• (1050)

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: This question should really go to my colleague Minister Graham. But I would just call your attention to a very important feature of this IPS, which is the global peace and security fund. It is a new agency, if you will, that is within the Department of Foreign Affairs, but there will be Department of National Defence officers and representatives in that unit at Foreign Affairs, and as well, there will be CIDA people. And it has been given \$500 million in the excellent budget of 2005 that we will be voting on this Thursday.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Mr. Graham.

Hon. Bill Graham: Thank you very much. It is an excellent question. I'm going to turn to General Hillier for the technical nature of the answer.

What I have to say, Mr. Lee, from an overarching policy point of view is that it was certainly one of our purposes in the document to draw on the operational experience of people like General Hillier and other officers, who have had a great deal of experience internationally and in Canada, working with the U.S. and the U.K. and with troops from many nations, to make sure we become more interoperable and more effective to deploy quickly.

General Hillier will describe the reorganization of the forces to enable us to do that. But nothing takes place overnight. We are beginning it. We're laying out this policy for you. The Canada Command is new. Some of these issues are new, and I wouldn't pretend they'll be done in 24 hours.

But I think we should hear from the expert.

Gen Richard Hillier: Sir, I would start by saying that really the last piece that is important to us—and they all are important, but this is the last piece—is how you actually get somebody there. First of all, what we want to do, because we believe it is absolutely the right thing to make us deployable, is to establish the right command and control structure. We're working through those pieces now. You saw

part of that, of course, in the defence policy, where we said that we would establish Canada Command to allow us to have a commander responsible for the forces in Canada, one commander to whom we could turn. Equally, we have to get to a similar relationship for international operations.

Perhaps I could put it this way, sir: in the Canadian Forces, we need to move from a staff-centric approach to a command-centric approach to give us a commander and a command team focused on developing the deployable forces. We have laid out, as part of the Canadian Forces vision articulated in the defence policy, some of the pieces that would allow us to be more deployable: a standing contingency task force group, which is at a higher level of readiness and comprises air, land, and sea forces, actually ready to go out the door, whether it's needed internationally or in Canada, largely sea-based; and a special forces operations group to allow us to be able to use that very unique and valuable capacity much more quickly and ensure that it can be successful. Then, as we build those forces and manage their readiness, we need to make sure that we can get them to where we need them. There are three pieces to it. The very final piece is putting that soldier, sailor, airman, or airwoman directly into the middle of an operation—for example, a platoon of soldiers directly into the middle of an al-Qaeda point somewhere in Afghanistan where we need to do some business. For that we need a medium- to heavy-lift helicopter. That was articulated as part of the budgetary money allocated to us on February 23.

As you back out from that, you need to be able to project people right into that theatre or region. Of course, our C-130 Hercules fleet has been the mainstay of that. And we know that we have some investment to do with that fleet.

The last part is how you step from Canada, in those operationally ready forces, into the region itself. We have used a combination of lease aircraft, our own Airbus, the C-130 fleet, and sometimes support from our allies to do that in the past, and we have been successful. We now have to walk through the options in detail to be able to meet all three parts of that equation—the strategic, the tactical, and then the actual last piece with the helicopters—and offer options to our minister to be most effective and efficient, and then bring that forward for his and the Government of Canada's decision.

Right now, sir, we're trying to ensure that we have the assured strategic lift, air and sea, to get us into the theatres where we need to operate when we need to be there. I have to continue to be confident that we can do that and also continue to show our minister that we can do it. Right now we can, and we want to make sure that this can continue.

• (1055)

Mr. Derek Lee: Well, Mr. Chairman, that was a pretty good answer. It certainly answered my questions.

If I have time left, I'll offer it to my colleagues.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Mr. Martin.

Hon. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Lib.): Thank you very much.

I'd like to thank Minister Graham, Minister Pettigrew, and the other gentlemen for being here today.

I think the three singular greatest failures we see internationally are, one, our inability to prevent conflict; two, the issue of governance; and three, the lack of capacity in developing countries. I also think there is an extraordinary alignment of the stars taking place right now with the UN's high-level panel, with Kofi Annan's *In Larger Freedom*, and with Tony Blair's Commission for Africa.

Minister Pettigrew, on the two innovative programs we've put forward—one is the L-20 and the other is the Canada Corps—will it be part of our thrust at the G-8 summit and subsequent international fora to suggest that perhaps the L-20 could be a bulwark for developing a rules-based mechanism for the prevention of deadly conflict, and that the Canada Corps—my personal dream—will be a place where Canadians with certain professional capabilities are tasked to go and fill the lack of capacity that occurs in so many developing countries?

I personally think, sir, there is an extraordinary opportunity for us to take a leadership role on those, and I wonder if the G-8 is something that you think might be fruitful.

Thank you.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Thank you very much.

I agree with you on the three challenges we have: preventing conflicts, developing governance, and developing capacity for development in the developing countries. They're very much interrelated. Very often it is conflict that prevents either governance or development, and it is the lack of governance that will prevent the development capacity in the country. If there is too much corruption and things like that, the capacity for development in the country just doesn't take place.

I do believe very much that both the L-20 and the Canada Corps can play a very useful role here. I think we have learned a great deal from the G-20 of the finance ministers, which our Prime Minister chaired and presided over for many years. As far as financial crises, which we used to be confronted with regularly, they have been avoided with the emergence of this G-20, whose membership goes beyond the G-8, and by going beyond the G-8, it goes to very important partners that must be onside.

So I believe our promotion of that concept of the L-20 is very much related to these important priorities and could be very helpful down the line. It will be certainly supportive of our efforts and energy.

It's the same with the Canada Corps. I agree with you that there is a lot of talent, energy, and professional expertise in the country, either of young people or students who want to practise certain things and acquire experience, or you have retired people, sometimes from the civil service, for instance, or policemen, who we use in a number of functions. I do believe the Canada Corps is really an excellent way of tapping into the energy and enthusiasm of Canadians for international affairs, and it can be channelled in the appropriate way.

So thank you very much for adding these two elements of our foreign policy, which are certainly important tools.

• (1100)

[Translation]

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you very much, Minister.

I will now give the floor to Ms. McDonough.

[English]

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

Thank you to our witnesses, including our ministers, for coming before the committee this morning.

I know many Canadians are happy that we finally have the international policy statement. I just have to say that the subtitle, *A Role of Pride and Influence in the World*, may reflect—I hope it does—Canada's aspirations, but it certainly doesn't reflect how we are seen in today's world, not if you take any heed of the presentations before this committee again and again by international diplomats, bureaucrats, and academics. There has been not a very flattering description again and again of Canada having a shrinking role, a dwindling role, and they have been basically making the point that these days Canada is all talk and no action.

The single most disappointing thing, for sure, in the document was the complete failure to commit to targets and timetables of the implementation plan on 0.7%. I'm just going to quote briefly, but this is only one of probably a dozen highly regarded witnesses who've come before this committee who have said that in various ways. They haven't been quite that rude, but they've said that if Canada were to spend less time moralizing and conceptualizing and actually do what it says it's going to do, then we'd be in a whole different place.

We had Jeffrey Sachs before the committee, who basically asked the question, where's the presumption of leadership on Canada's part without the responsibility of following through on our commitments? He talked about 0.7% in particular, but I think what we now want to see is that *les belles paroles* in these documents actually are going to be followed by what is desperately needed.

I want to shift specifically and with a sense of urgency to Darfur. I happen to think the announcement made by the Prime Minister on Thursday was a positive one. It was welcomed. It was in a direction desperately needed. I mean, what we've had is commitments not acted upon. But it seems to me if you look at even today's presentation by you, Ministers, around Afghanistan—you know, the sense of urgency, the concreteness—that the announcement made on Thursday is anemic by comparison, and anemic compared to what is desperately needed in Darfur.

I absolutely understand the reason, the need for diplomacy. I agree with the general direction that Canada has taken, that we will support the African Union in what they are doing. I think that is the right thing. But I have a couple of questions.

Specifically, I don't understand, knowing how much there is a desperate need for rapid mobilization there on the ground.... When there are uprisings, when there is violence starting to erupt, there is the need on the ground to be able to do rapid deployment. Maybe we can't be on the front line there. I understand the complexity of it. But why are we not committing to armoured personnel vehicles that can, and with that, the training and the personnel that are needed to make sure this is part of the AU's robust response to the desperate conditions there?

The second thing is that we know the UN has authorized a rapid increase, but the rapid increase isn't happening. It hasn't happened. It's not going to happen, I think, overnight. Is there not some way in which we can commit troops, obviously under the AU, that address the need to stop the rapings, to move food into what is going to be a desperate situation? We all know there are no crops being planted and there's no stockpiling of food. We are going to see unbelievable starvation occurring if Canada can't be providing some leadership around some greater mobilization.

• (1105)

So a specific question I want to ask is this. I think you've put together a good task group, if that's the right term, with Bob Fowler, Senator Mobina Jaffer, Senator—I trip over the senator part—General Dallaire. But where is the assurance that they are going to be given the concrete resources that are needed, so that they are in a good position to diplomatically negotiate and get around this problem that we're seen to be acting for political self-interest reasons rather than because it is the government's intention, consistent with this document, to follow through in concrete ways with providing leadership? Otherwise, the responsibility to protect means absolutely nothing, and what we have is more words and no action.

[*Translation*]

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you, Ms. McDonough.

Mr. Pettigrew.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I will not go back on the premises of Madame McDonough's statement in the sense that I've already answered it over the ODA, saying that Canada has committed, among the millennium objectives, to obtain the 0.7% by 2015.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: Can we expect, as a committee, an implementation plan with targets and timetables?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Well, this is something on which we should be working. I agree with you that we should go there.

Now, on "all talk, no action", it's all in the eye of the beholder. I meet a lot of people who are still quite impressed with Canada's international personality and what we do globally. I receive a lot of people who are quite impressed. So it's all in the eye of the beholder. We all want more. We all want to make sure that Canada, as an internationalist country, does its very best.

Now, I will move to your more specific questions briefly, because I think Minister Graham and General Hillier may want to answer them from a more technical point of view.

I want to address your statement that it's an anemic response, given the needs. Canada alone cannot do everything. What we've been trying to do with last week's announcement is to demonstrate a sort of catalytic leadership. By doing what we did last week, we hoped that other international players—NATO, other countries—will be stepping up to the plate as well, and from the reactions I've been having over the weekend, I think it is working. Other countries are now saying, okay, what can we do?

So this idea of a catalytic leadership by Canada, with our announcement of last week, is what I hope will do it, and with the team that you have announced.

On the more specific questions on the armoured personnel, I would prefer to turn to my colleague the Minister of National Defence.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Mr. Graham.

Hon. Bill Graham: I agree very much with your fundamental analysis. One of the frustrating aspects of our desire to be more active in the Darfur region has been precisely the constraints in terms of the international regime, the fact that it is an AU operation and that we must be supportive of that if we're going to have practical consequences on the ground, because we know that where the AU has been there's been a tremendous improvement on the ground.

There are too few AU troops, and our objective here is to provide them with the capacity to be more active and mobile when they are on the ground. That was the helicopters that I raised earlier. That's one of the most fundamental and useful tools they've had for getting themselves in and out and moving around. We have also looked at the issue of armoured personnel carriers, and we are actively examining the possibility of doing that. We have to do that also within an international legal framework, and we're looking at it ourselves and whether or not we could do that with other countries.

The other thing we have to bear in mind is that we have to find every way...and that's why we have General Dallaire there—or as you call him, Senator Dallaire—and others. I met with him the other day and with our other representatives, Bob Fowler, etc. They're constantly feeding us the information as to what we can do. As we said, General Hillier was in the region. We are constantly looking at ways, and if there is any way in which we can back up the African Union, I promise you we will be doing that.

As the Prime Minister said, that announcement wasn't the definitive finished announcement. That is where we're beginning, and we're willing to move if we can find an opportunity to help out.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you very much.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: Just briefly, then—

• (1110)

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Very rapidly. There's only about half a minute left.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: In the budget that's now before Parliament, there's a commitment of 5,000 more troops. There's a commitment of a great deal more humanitarian aid. I want to know whether that task group is already empowered to go beyond what has been announced, because it seems to me, if not, it's nothing but an empty charade. They need to be able to say those resources have already been committed in a budget that needs to pass this week. Can they go forward with committing to respond to the things they're seeing, and rapidly?

Hon. Bill Graham: Yes.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: There's a big gap between the announcement of 100 troops and Dallaire saying we need 44,000 to do the job.

Hon. Bill Graham: Yes. On the military side, we have shown we've had the capacity to react to the needs of the African Union that they've asked for. We've provided them every single thing they've asked for—right, General?—and we will continue to do that. We have just said we are going to put a new task force into Afghanistan. We're going to put in a PR team. We're beefing up our presence in Afghanistan precisely because we believe those elections have to be successful. We believe Afghanistan has to go beyond the cusp. If it slides back into a failed state, it will be a huge problem for the international community, and we cannot and will not allow that to happen.

Do we have additional resources to back up an additional mission in Darfur? Yes, we have the capacity to intervene as well.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: Do we know what the African Union's ask to NATO from Canada is going to be tomorrow?

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Mr. Hillier, just ten seconds.

Gen Richard Hillier: Yes, Madam.

The African Union asked me specifically when I was there for exactly what was offered as options to do. They asked for some very specific enablers, small in terms of people. I'll say for the second time here today that this was emphasized over and over again. This is an African Union mission, and they just needed some enablers. They didn't need non-African Union troops on the ground, and in fact they said they would not be welcome. They asked for some enablers.

First of all, they asked for some strategic planners, a very small number, more like half a dozen than any more than that. They asked for a small intelligence cell to help them collate and analyze the information they get and turn it into knowledge, so they can make intelligent and effective decisions and predict what is going to occur and therefore try to pre-empt some of the violence.

They asked for a geomatics section, which is very small, probably less than half a dozen people, which actually produces maps and images. And of course that's one of the capacities they're missing right now.

They asked us, of course, directly for the helicopters, which they see as the most essential to their operations, and that gives them the capability right now to be as effective as they are. They asked for an aircraft to be able to pick up troops from around the African continent and bring them in when they got offered up in various

countries. They asked for another aircraft, a shorter-range aircraft, a workhorse, if you will, to actually work in Darfur, which is a fairly big region, as big as France, and has very little infrastructure. This would take some of the load off the helicopters so those helicopters could be used for a more high-value, short-term military task itself.

In addition to that, they asked me to look at some of the training of staff officers going into the African Union headquarters, and we're prepared to do that. We're also looking at some of the mission-specific training for some of the soldiers going into Darfur itself, either in the region or else at their home countries, and at some longer-term training to help build the capacity of some of the militaries in some of the nations in the African Union itself.

In fact, we went through the entire litany of what they would see as the most valuable enablers and we have offered options to meet them.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you, General Hillier.

We now have a five-minute question and answer period in the second round.

We'll go to Mr. O'Connor, please.

Mr. Gordon O'Connor (Carleton—Mississippi Mills, CPC): Thank you, Minister Graham, for being here today.

Since I only have five minutes, I'll give you three brief questions, and maybe I can get three brief answers.

I've looked at your policy and I've heard public announcements that essentially you have a plan to implement this in five years. I would question whether it could be implemented in five years, because even if we take your theoretical budgets, I don't think they could afford the policy.

What I'd like to know as a first question is, do you have any priorities? What are you going to do first? You've got the whole kitchen sink, from A to Z, in here.

The second question I have is related to the binational activity going on now. This thing has been going on for more than two years. Where do you see it ending? Where are we going with this binational discussion?

The third question has to do with Afghanistan. If I understand the words here this morning, there's going to be a net increase in our military contribution to Afghanistan. Is that true? If it is true, can we sustain it, given that you're going to take five years to bring on board the 5,000 regular troops and 3,000 reserves?

•(1115)

Hon. Bill Graham: Thank you. I'll take the last one, and I'll ask General Hillier to speak to the implementation plans in the document, because it's very much his strategic vision in terms of the reorganization.

In terms of the binational activity with the United States, yes, we have increased. What we're doing, Mr. O'Connor, is building on our relationship with the United States, built through NORAD and the joint planning group in NORAD, whereby we've been able to expand the nature of how we can collaborate between the two countries. As I've said, we're looking at ways in which we can increase that, particularly in the maritime field for maritime approaches, a greater collaboration with the United States on the maritime approaches and a greater collaboration in the possibility of an event of some terrible nature that is near the border where we could give cross-border military troops as well. That would include, because of the nature of the joint planning group, fire and police and everything.

We are focused on that, but we have to recognize that as our negotiations with the United States go forward, they are also focused on an extensive reorganization of how they are approaching homeland defence, their NORTHCOM, their various arrangements, and we may not be able to achieve our goal of putting these things through NORAD. We may have to do them by a form of relationship with the United States on binational arrangements within specific domains, such as maritime, navy to navy, and other ways.

We are exploring that. It takes two to tango. We have to work with the Americans as they develop, and they are still in a developing process for much of the strategic thinking they have around their various organizations. We believe we'll be stronger than that because of the CanadaCom concept that we have in the paper, because we believe that will enable us to have a direct interlocutor with their NORTHCOM. We have a strong position, but this is still very much a work in progress.

In terms of Afghanistan, there is a net increase. Yes, sir, it's clear. This is now taking place after the operational pause has been completed for the army. It ceases this summer, and the PRT will not go in until this summer. It is not proposed that the task force and the brigade headquarters would take place until next February. So we will be in a complete position to fulfill that requirement at that time; there is no problem whatsoever. Of course we'll be going on with the recruiting and everything else for the 5,000 and 3,000, but we don't need to do that first to enable us to conduct these operations—and indeed take on some other operations around the world, should they come up.

In terms of your first question, I'd turn to General Hillier.

Gen Richard Hillier: Sir, thank you.

I would only add, Mr. O'Connor, to the last one that in September or October we're going to have a brigade training exercise in western Canada, and that will start the reintroduction of operationally ready units from the land force specifically. So as November or December rolls in, those units are now ready to deploy. Clearly, our recommendations for Afghanistan were based on having those units there ready to deploy immediately after the Christmas and New Year's timeframe. That's why there is the January or February timeframe also.

Sir, on the five years, it probably came from me. It probably came because I see a sense of urgency necessary here, that we have an opportunity to change now, and it is absolutely necessary to do so. The longer we take, the more difficult it will become.

Personally, I'd like to have it all completed by next Friday, but that's probably an even greater stretch of our resources to do that. We're not going to get it all done in five years, but we're going to push hard to do it. I think the most important thing, and what we're aiming for, is an attitudinal change here.

First, we're going to be focused on an enemy that is the ball of snakes, from terrorists through to militia forces who beat up on their own populations, and not on the former Warsaw Pact.

Secondly, we're going to be focused on a Canadian Forces culture and attitude and operational entity, not just air, land, and sea separately.

Thirdly, we're going to be focused on managing the readiness of those operational forces from the Canadian Forces perspective so we can build one CF footprint going out the door.

Fourthly, as I mentioned a little earlier, we need to move to a command-centric structure, where commanders with command teams are focused on the operational output, and not staff.

Lastly, we have to get the Canadian Forces focused on being operationally focused, not institutionally focused.

Our priorities that fall out of that all lead to obtaining irreversible momentum: one, the command and control structure has to change first, and we want to establish later this summer CanadaCom, to stand up the first of the two joint regional headquarters and stand up sometime in 2005, later in the fall, in all probability, the special operations group and start developing it in detail.

Secondly, we're going to start developing the inside of that special operations group itself and get it ready to conduct operations in a more efficient manner, a more effective manner, with all the necessary enablers there.

And thirdly, the priority in the very short term is to stand up the framework for the standing contingency force, which will bring together air, land, and sea elements in one Canadian Forces profile, under one commander and one command structure, ready to deploy. I'd like to be able to move to, in fall of 2006, an initial exercise training for that standing contingency task force to start learning the lessons for the way ahead.

In the short term, those are the priorities. Obviously, much in the way of equipment and moves and changes falls out of those three, but that's where we have to go in the short term.

● (1120)

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you, Mr. Hillier.

Now we'll go to Ms. Longfield, and then Mr. Crête.

Ms. Longfield, please.

Hon. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Oshawa, Lib.): Thank you.

My questions actually follow up on Mr. O'Connor's.

I hear that you think CanadaCom will be operational relatively soon. I guess I would like to ask if we expect it will have Americans embedded within CanadaCon in the same sort of capacity that perhaps Canadians are at NORTHCOM. I also want to know if CanadaCom and the creation of CanadaCom is in any way affecting the negotiations with respect to the NORAD renewal. That expires in 2006. Do we expect that we'll have that done?

Maybe I'll stop at those questions, and other questions will depend on the answers to these questions.

Hon. Bill Graham: As I said to Mr. O'Connor, clearly the NORAD renewal is a very important negotiation for us, but the scope of how that NORAD renewal will take place, as I said earlier, very much depends on the Americans themselves. Our objective is to make it as large as possible. We may find that given the state of their own internal organization and reorganization, they may have a different objective. We have to feel that out as we go into the negotiations, but it's clear that we will be doing that.

CanadaCom itself will not affect that NORAD renewal negotiation, but we do believe that the creation of CanadaCom does give us an interlocutor with the Americans, given the fact that they have set up NORTHCOM with a command structure, as described by General Hillier, that in a way makes us a more effective ally of theirs and someone they can turn to and say yes, you guys are going to be able to do the job you have to do in North America with us. So it will be an important tool in our relationship with the United States without necessarily directly being involved in NORAD itself.

And thirdly, I would suggest that I don't believe there's any particular suggestion at this time that we would have Americans embedded in CanadaCom, just as there are no Canadians embedded, if I can put it that way, in NORTHCOM. But I do believe that we are looking for every possible way we can to ensure that we have a seamless relationship with the Americans in terms of the security of North America and security of Canadians and Americans, because we see them as completely linked.

I don't know if you had....

Gen Richard Hillier: Madam, if I could just comment on the first question, CanadaCom will not be operational soon. This is a radical transformation of our command and control structure, and we have to get started at it, so we're going to do that this summer. It is going to take us 12 to 24 months to get that command stood up and functional across our country, and then it's going to take a period of time after that before it matures into final operational capability. I want to get at it quickly, though, because I think that is the most difficult piece for us to do.

From the U.S. perspective of whether Americans are going to be embedded in the CanadaCom, I think what we want to do is be effective. The U.S. have, through NORTHCOM, offered a "lessons learned" précis, if you will, of the mistakes they made trying to stand up, and said if you want to avoid some of those things you might find it helpful. They've been more than willing to help us stand up the concept and mature it, and then we'll see where it goes from there before we make any recommendations, I would think.

Hon. Judi Longfield: Okay.

Just very briefly, on the binational planning group, given that the Americans and the Canadians are sort of struggling and trying to set up their own systems, is there any thought that we could extend the mandate of the binational planning group? I know it's been extended once already.

Hon. Bill Graham: Yes, certainly. We intend to seek not only to extend the mandate of the binational planning group, but to build on the experience. We think this was an excellent initiative. It's enabled us not only to look at how we can collaborate with one another from military to military, but also how we build relations in terms of civilian response to a disaster of any kind that's transborder.

So we see the binational planning group as a really important aspect of the whole of the NORAD experience, and we'll be working on expanding it and making it work even better. We have a lot of experience from what we've got, and we can take it forward.

As I said, however, that does not necessarily mean that the Americans will want to necessarily push that into the area of say maritime controls, where we already have a very good relationship between our navies. I assisted in an exercise a couple of weeks ago. I was in western Canada shortly after they'd had an exercise that brought in the American navy, Canadian navy, the coast guards, civilian operations, all together to try to work together. That's what we have to figure out, how we can bring that together. Whether it's under the NORAD umbrella remains to be seen.

● (1125)

[Translation]

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you, Minister.

We will now give the floor to Mr. Crête.

Mr. Paul Crête (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning. I would like to discuss our relations with our American neighbours.

In the past few years, we have had difficulty obtaining results on the issues of softwood lumber and mad cow disease. Moreover, NAFTA is not aging very well when it comes to decision-making mechanisms, and the Chinese are going to surpass Canada in terms of exports to the U.S.A. All this had led me to expect a major shift in the policy statement, a sort of proposal for rediscovery of the two countries.

When I went to Washington with the Canada—U.S. inter-parliamentary group, I realized that there was quite profound ignorance, notably among parliamentarians. Would it not have been appropriate to propose a new policy that responds to new realities, rather than simply continue with relations that may have worked effectively in the past, but which no longer take these new realities into account?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Thank you very much. Mr. Crête has asked a very relevant question.

I agree that the challenges we face today regarding the American market result from the deficiencies or limits of the free-trade agreement we signed at the time and which did not include these much-talked-about national trade laws. I do not want to criticize the government of the time. It really did try to integrate then. However, in the United States, national trade laws are a sort of sacred cow. As you know, we have a great deal of difficulty in discussing them. Nevertheless, some progress has been achieved in this regard.

Moreover, on two occasions in the past few months, in meetings with Prime Minister Martin, President Bush admitted that we could work on the dispute settlement mechanism and find ways to improve those we have. There is now an active working group with the United States.

In addition, the issue of dispute settlement is also progressing on the multilateral level. For years now, the United States had refused to discuss this issue with the WTO, be it in Doha or elsewhere. However, the Americans have now agreed that there be a working group on this issue. They changed their minds in the face of significant pressure from the international community, of course, but also because of their own interests. Indeed, many countries started to give them a taste of their own medicine and adopted trade laws with relatively arbitrary dumping measures, similar to those the Americans subjected us to, as well as countervailing duties and other measures of that nature.

So there is progress at two levels, both at the bilateral level with NAFTA and at the multilateral level with the WTO.

With regard to the lack of knowledge of Canada by the US that is always frustrating. It is true that Canada is less well known since power has shifted to the south compared to what the situation used to be when it was more concentrated in the northern states. With this evolution of power in the United States in the past 15 or 20 years, the challenge has become more significant.

We have developed a number of tools over the past few years. We opened seven or eight new consulates throughout the U.S. in order to be more visible on their territory. I think we have gone from 13 to 21 consulates in the United States. So there has really been an increase of 30 per cent. Last year, we opened a secretariat in Washington where provinces and parliamentarians can make a contribution beyond the bilateral relation, because that is part of our priorities.

I think that we have developed tools over these past few years, that we have set this as a priority and this must be reflected very significantly in our actions. There is no doubt that the challenge of the presence of China on the U.S. market, which we could discuss from all angles, should be of concern to us. We must make sure that China respects its obligations as a member of the World Trade Organization. Its accession to the WTO gives it privileges, but it also imposes obligations, for example ensuring that it has a genuine domestic market. When the yuan is undervalued, that is one way to manipulate the rules somewhat.

• (1130)

Mr. Paul Crête: Should we not have used this approach, used terms like “new frontier”, in accordance with the image that President Kennedy had? We need a new relationship, a new form of alliance with the United States, for example with regard to China, or something like that. It seems to me that the document has a “business

as usual” tone, whereas we need an approach that would put more focus on Canada in the new international situation.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I disagree. Recently, in February, we signed a new partnership. The President of Mexico, Vincente Fox, the President of the United States, George Bush, and the Prime Minister of Canada, Paul Martin, signed a new North-American partnership deal which contains a very specific action plan, one of the major goals of which is precisely to ensure that the North-American continent is more competitive vis-à-vis Asia and the rest of Latin America. This is certainly one of the major priorities of our government. Since it was signed in February, the document may not reflect its content very much, but the government has certainly taken action on this front.

[English]

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): We're going to go to Mr. Valley, then Mr. Blaikie, Mr. Martin, and Mr. MacKenzie also.

Go ahead, Mr. Valley.

Mr. Roger Valley (Kenora, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My question is to Mr. Pettigrew. In your opening comments you mentioned the pressures on our foreign services, foreign service officers, the consular cases jumping by 50%. We know that you have some plans to increase our capacity by 2010. I'm just wondering if you could comment on that, and explain really what you mean by “rapidly deployable consular teams”. Are they going to be individuals drawn from individual embassies to fit into a crisis? What do you vision that to be?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Thank you very much, Mr. Valley.

We realize that unfortunately during the nineties, probably for budgetary reasons, we greatly limited the number of diplomatic officers deployed around the world, because they cost more than when they are at the Lester B. Pearson Building. But I believe that we have to change that balance where only 25% of our diplomats are in missions abroad and 75% are at headquarters. We will move that up to 50% by 2010. Indeed, that is already budgeted in the 2005 budget presented by Mr. Goodale. We are getting \$42 million for doing precisely that. That will be a better balance among the G-8 countries and a better balance abroad.

On the rapidly deployed, I will ask Mr. Harder, the deputy minister, to answer more specifically or technically to the question. The idea is that when we saw the tsunami we saw in Thailand, where we had thousands of Canadians, there was an extraordinary flow of demands and needs. Of course it was December 26, which made the challenge a bit bigger. We very hastily demanded people of the whole region to focus on Phuket. Honestly, our consular services did an extraordinary job, and I want to commend all those who gave up holidays for this and that.

What we want to do now is to have a team, because we don't know where is the next Phuket. I mean, you cannot have in Phuket a hundred officers just in case, but you have to make sure that you have a number of them who are easy to deploy.

I will turn to the deputy minister to explain how we will be having that team.

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

The minister has given a lot of context to this. What we've determined is that consular needs, while double what they have been over the last decade, will continue to expand. We have to regularize our budget and our support systems for that from an operation centre capacity, even just the technical computer support for it. Our plans are now to maintain about 250 locations abroad in connection with the operation centre to support. We are doing an A-base review of the consular function. As the minister said, we're building in the capacity for rapid deployment with lists of people who are already committed to such rapid deployment, and giving us better tools of communication in the event of another tragedy and our ability to respond.

The third piece of this is to have a better sense of what is right and appropriate to expect from Canadian consular services. In this regard, we're engaging in a consultation with stakeholders in Canada in interested communities and travel agencies and the like, with a review of the level of service that we do provide, and we're doing some comparative work with other countries. This is a more complex issue in the world today, and needs to be aligned with things like travel advisories and making Canadians more aware of the wisdom of registering abroad. Our registry now contains only 174,000 Canadians. It would be wise to have that at a higher level of personal awareness.

• (1135)

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Merci.

Now we will go to Mr. Blaikie, please.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd just like to follow up on one thing raised here and one thing raised in the House.

Our understanding is that the OAU, the African Union, will be meeting with NATO sometime this week, perhaps tomorrow, and I wonder whether or not, after that meeting, Canada, as a member of NATO, will have a better idea of what the African Union is looking for, what it needs, and whether or not on that basis there might be some follow-up to the announcement last week.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: The Secretary General of NATO and myself have been trying to communicate for a couple of days. He was travelling on Friday. We missed each other. We will be speaking in the next hour or two, and I will keep you posted.

The first noises I've had—not directly from his mouth, but from my services, who have organized a phone call for later today, in the next hour or two—are very favourable, in the sense that NATO has seen Canada's contribution last week as really making it a reality for NATO as well, in terms of its own kind of intervention, and he wants to explore that. I don't know, of course, what he will tell me precisely in terms of the sort of engagement he wants.

Ambassador Bob Fowler, who is the Prime Minister's personal representative, will be going to that meeting at NATO.

Hon. Bill Blaikie: I want to follow up with the Minister of Foreign Affairs on a question I asked in the House the other day

about Devils Lake. We talk about revitalizing our North American partnership, and yet it seems to me that the partnership between Canada and the United States is in grave risk of being violated irreparably if the United States is not persuaded to refer the Devils Lake diversion to the International Joint Commission. We could very shortly have contaminated water flowing into a major Canadian ecosystem in Manitoba. I, for one, think many Canadians will find it hard to be persuaded that anything is being done to revitalize this partnership if the United States allows this to happen.

In the House the other day you told me what you had done. I don't need to hear that again. I want to know what you're doing now, between now and June, when that water is scheduled to flow.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: We are keeping up the pressure very much at this time on the State Department and on every legislator in Washington that we can. We do believe it is imperative that both countries agree to bring this matter to the—

Hon. Bill Blaikie: Canada has already agreed. Are the Americans going to agree?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: The Americans are resisting for the time being.

Hon. Bill Blaikie: Has the Prime Minister phoned the President? He told me he would.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: He has.

• (1140)

Hon. Bill Blaikie: Since that question?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I will not comment specifically. I cannot, as you know, but the point is—

Hon. Bill Blaikie: I don't want the details. I just want to know whether he has been in touch.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: The Prime Minister is very much on it at every opportunity he's had with the President. I was there myself at the meeting in Crawford, and as I had with Condoleezza Rice myself—

Hon. Bill Blaikie: Has he called him since my question? He told me afterward he would.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: You'd have to ask him that. I cannot comment—

Hon. Bill Blaikie: You wouldn't know that? What kind of teamwork is this? If you're working together—

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Whether I know or not, it is not appropriate for a minister to comment on the Prime Minister's phone calls.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Mr. Blaikie, it's a comment, so it goes in—

Hon. Bill Blaikie: You said you knew he'd called the Prime Minister of Sudan, but you weren't going to give us the details. You knew that. So I'm asking you if you know whether he's called the President of the United States on the Devils Lake diversion.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: You're asking me what the specific date was. What I'm telling you is that—

Hon. Bill Blaikie: No, I asked you if he has called in the last week. You told me that about Sudan. How come you can't tell me that about the United States?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I didn't say he called Sudan in the last week.

Hon. Bill Blaikie: Well, you guys don't sound like you have your act together on that one.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: No, it's not that. It's a matter—

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Please, it's not a debate.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I've been a minister for ten years. It is not appropriate for a minister to comment on the Prime Minister's agenda. It is just a matter of courtesy, and I will not begin to go into the details about these things. It is up to him to decide when he talks about the phone calls he's had or the meetings he's had.

What I can tell you is that he's been totally committed to that, as I have been with Condoleezza Rice. We are getting more support in the United States with some of the neighbouring states that share Manitoba's and Canada's point of view. We're working very diligently at his level, as we are at my level, and we believe it would do very important damage to the International Joint Commission and to the Boundary Waters Treaty if, for the first time in a hundred years—

Hon. Bill Blaikie: And to the environment. That's more important.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Mr. Pettigrew, thank you very much.

We'll go to Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Minister of Defence, where I come from we always figured that words were cheap and deeds speak. We've heard a lot of words and I think it's time we hear about the deeds.

One of our concerns is this. You've mentioned the 5,000 new troops, the new equipment, and historic times. We've just gone through a long time studying the procurement of the submarines. I'd really like to know what you've done to shorten that 12-year procurement time for military equipment.

Hon. Bill Graham: Thank you very much.

Before we can do any procurement, we've got to get the budget through to get the money to do the procurement. I'm glad to hear this important question.

I totally agree with you that the time is too long for procurement, particularly in a highly technological age. One of the ways that we have proposed...and I am working with the Minister of Public Works to seek to have an experiment whereby National Defence would acquire some military equipment, exclusively working through us, so that we don't end up having two departments doing things and we can move more quickly on that.

We have a lot of things in the department, computers and things like that, that are total fungibles, and they can be across government and everything else. It makes a lot of sense to make them more efficient, to get them all in a package. There are other things that are highly specific to Defence in which I think we should be more engaged, without having any time constraints by other departments being engaged. I am working on that. It's a work in progress. I can't report to you specifically.

We're trying to find two projects at least where we can do this and see whether or not that wouldn't move the process along. I totally agree with your analysis, sir, that it's taking too long, and we must improve our performance in the procurement area.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you.

Mr. Menzies.

Mr. Ted Menzies (MacLeod, CPC): Thank you.

My question will be to Minister Pettigrew.

We've heard a lot of talk about policy coherence, and I believe you mentioned it this morning. Thanks to the opposition, we still have some policy coherence because we still have trade and foreign affairs together.

Regarding the specifics of the question I have, CIDA's statistical report for ODA contradicts what we were told at committee by Minister Carroll, that we are still providing...last year it was over \$34 million in direct government-to-government aid, according to that report. How do we factor in the human rights record and the record of China antagonizing some of the countries around it? How are you factoring that in?

•(1145)

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I'm sure you will have the opportunity to discuss with Mrs. Carroll on her statements. It's difficult for me to comment on what she said or did not say.

Mr. Ted Menzies: The statement was that we were giving \$34 million last year. That's in CIDA's own statements. What relationship does that have to the human rights record in China?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: You're relating the \$34 million to the China bilateral program we have with them.

Mr. Ted Menzies: Why are we still giving government-to-government aid to China with their human rights record?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Madam Carroll has answered this question time and again in the House. She has precisely demonstrated very well that this is because that money is directly related to the improvement of human rights in China, which is very important. It is targeted money to building an effective judicial system, which will lead directly to better respect, both for human rights and for their international trade obligations at the WTO, for instance. If you have a court system that works, it forces them to respect their obligations because you can take them to court. Our money is related to improving the judicial system and their human rights record, which we believe would be of great benefit to Canada and corporate reallocation in the country itself.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): We'll go to Mr. Martin for one question, and then to Madame Lalonde.

Hon. Keith Martin: My question, Minister Pettigrew, is in two parts. The first part relates to Darfur and the conversation you'll have with the Secretary General for NATO. As you know, the problem on the ground right now is that the rules of engagement are not robust. When the Secretary General for NATO speaks to his AU counterpart, I would just make the plea that they talk about robust rules of engagement on the ground, and that either there's an AU agreement for NATO troops to supplement AU troops or there's an agreement to go to the Security Council to ask for a chapter 7 mission into Darfur.

The second part is just a plea for Uganda, which has the largest number of child soldiers in the world. As you know, we have a narrow window of opportunity to actually stop this conflict. I know that Ambassador Fowler is very busy right now, but if he or somebody else can actually move forward with this.... Somebody needs to take leadership right now with respect to the situation in northern Uganda. The window of opportunity is narrow. I just hope we use our good offices to do that, because I believe there are negotiating positions with Uganda to be able to do that.

Thank you.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Mr. Martin, I appreciate very much your calling our attention to both fronts, and to the importance of strong, clear rules of engagement. Clearly that will be part of our discussions with NATO.

On Uganda, it is very important as well that we do not miss that window of opportunity. But we have an ambassador there; we will make sure that we contribute the best we can to the situation in Uganda, which is, you're right, a very threatening one.

[Translation]

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you.

Ms. Lalonde, please.

Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I must apologize, but the farmers' demonstrations kept me away from you far longer than I would have hoped. I have a brief comment to make first and then I will ask a question.

In my opinion and that of people who have come here to testify about this statement, Canada is discrediting itself by not agreeing to set its foreign aid objective to 0.7 per cent of the GDP by 2015, while it is bragging about its sound financial situation and is linking increasing aid to its financial situation. I wanted to state that for the record.

A little over a year ago, during the crisis in Haiti, the Prime Minister said—after having been pressured to do so—that Canada had a special responsibility toward that country, given the Haitian community here, and the proximity and extreme poverty of that country. However, I do not feel, and I am not the only one, that Canada has shouldered any specific responsibility toward Haiti, which it had acknowledged then, and quite rightly so.

I am waiting for this commitment to be concretely implemented soon, because Haiti needs everything. Haiti was extremely ill-served by its former leaders, who helped themselves. Now, there is a genuine opportunity to kick-start the democratic process, but the transitional government has to receive the aid that was promised.

Yet, the disbursements are extremely slow, there are no jobs, there was the damage in Gonaives. I will stop there.

We have to make a real effort. Kofi Annan came here. We can help Haiti get a fresh start. In my opinion, that is fundamental.

• (1150)

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I agree completely with Ms. Lalonde. Haiti is in our hemisphere. We have a large community from the Haitian diaspora in our country. The inhabitants of Haiti speak one of our official languages. The fact that Haiti is in the Caribbean, in our hemisphere, gives us a special responsibility. The Prime Minister is absolutely right.

We have been a donor country for Haiti to the tune of \$180 million at the Cayenne conference of donor countries...

Ms. Francine Lalonde: Those are promised donations, but in terms of actual disbursements, it is a lot less.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: We disbursed over \$90 million. We have now reached \$98 or \$99 million disbursed out of the \$180 million that we committed to disbursing over the next two years, which means that we are fully respecting the pace that we had committed to.

When I went to the Cayenne conference donor countries, in the presence of delegates from the Haitian government, I got nothing but praise regarding Canada's contribution, especially with regard to programs to which Canada was committed. This praise came from Haiti, but also from neighbouring Caribbean countries and other donor countries, which are impressed with Canada's contribution to date.

We also provide a lot of assistance through the Organization of American States. A Canadian woman is leading this organization's contribution to the very important elections which are to take place this fall.

I fully agree that Canada must use everything it can to ensure that the democratic process is respected by this transitional government. I myself went to Haiti twice in the past six months. The Prime Minister also went there.

Ms. Francine Lalonde: With his Liberal colleagues only.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Ms. Lalonde, we will listen to the answer.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: I think that the fact that we have already disbursed over \$90 million has shown that Canada's contribution was something serious. In Cayenne, the countries of the international community all made commitments to 380 specific projects. In my opinion, what is being done in Haiti right now does respect the commitments that were made in quite an impressive fashion.

[English]

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): *Merci, monsieur le ministre.*

Now we're going to go to Ms. Hinton and Ms. Gallant.

Ms. Hinton, just a short question, please.

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): I'd like to begin and then I'll share the rest of the time with Ms. Gallant.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The parliamentary secretary announced just last week in the House of Commons that the 2004 budget had just passed. That one-year delay in passing the budget didn't prevent the government from spending money, so I'm wondering why there seems to be a necessity to politicize this.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: What necessity to politicize this? First of all, it is not true that the budget has been passed for a longer period of time. It had been—

Mrs. Betty Hinton: No, sir, it wasn't.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: —adopted, I think, in June. It was adopted by the Senate, ultimately.

Mrs. Betty Hinton: And passed in the House a week before. It was passed in the House and then—

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: If you want a deal that we pass the budget this week, we can make sure that it does well at the Senate.

Mrs. Betty Hinton: No, but you're politicizing a budget, which I think is inappropriate.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: No, come on, this is not politicizing the budget. There is a budget on the table, and this is a budget that we believe reflects very well the aspirations of Canadian citizens. So you will understand that as an enthusiastic minister of this government, I will not lose any opportunity to say that this is a budget that should be adopted by the House of Commons. I am not politicizing it; I am doing my job as a minister who is ecstatic that we have \$17 billion more in defence and foreign policy and CIDA spending to help us play a bigger role as Canada internationally. You may want to vote against that, but you will have to vote against it if you don't support it.

Hon. Bill Graham: I have to say from a defence point of view, Madam Hinton, if I'm going to get the money to do the things that are contained in this statement we're talking about today, it needs not only the budget, but, as you know, it needs the appropriations policy. The fact that the Senate only approved the budget doesn't change the fact that when the House of Commons adopted the budget last year, following on that we adopted the appropriations, which applied the budget. That's what we need today. If these matters that are before you are going to go forward, if we're going to build our troops, if we're going to make changes that we need to make, we need the budget passed and we need the appropriations necessary to facilitate that. And that depends on the budget.

• (1155)

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Madam Gallant, please.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Canadian ambassador to the United States stated that the U.S. border closure to Canadian beef is a direct result of the Prime Minister flip-flopping on being at the table to discuss BMD. This kind of fly-by-the-seat-of-the-pants foreign affairs policy has killed the prosperity of the agriculture industry. Right now on Parliament Hill we have farmers protesting the fact that they're still closed to going through the border with their cattle, and the government isn't respecting the fact that they've lost the confidence of the people. My

question is how are trade implications measured in the IPS in taking a position on defence matters?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: First of all, we make a foreign policy based on Canadian interests and Canadian values. These are very important to measure.

Certainly you are not implying that we should have signed up to the BMD in order to get certain favours from Washington. It is a very naive way to think, that if you say yes to Iraq and yes to BMD you end up having credits on softwood lumber or mad cow. What is resisting on softwood lumber are very powerful lobbies in Washington.

On the beef issue, President Bush's administration has been doing an outstanding job at accepting Canada's approach to it. They've really been trying to be very helpful. We have seen that. However, in the United States, a judge in Montana brought in an injunction. It is a country like Canada, where there's a rule of law. So I can tell you that we've been working very well with the Bush administration on the beef issue. We have not had the results we wanted because it is a society that has the rule of law, and a judge brought in an injunction.

[Translation]

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you, Minister.

[English]

Before closing, I have a question for both ministers.

This morning you have emphasized the integrated nature of the international policy statement. Both of you have also emphasized that Canada wants to use all of its international instruments, that is, diplomatic, military, and development assistance, to respond to the challenge of "failed and failing states".

Could you elaborate on the specific criteria Canada will use to decide where and when to intervene, and how will the appropriate civil and military nature of Canada's response be determined? Also, how will the joint policy meeting process work between the foreign affairs and national defence departments? Finally, should there be an annual integrated foreign affairs and defence policy statement update?

Thank you.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: On this—and I'll turn to you for other aspects—the specific criteria for choosing action, in my view, is present in our statement. For instance, the priority we are putting on failed and fragile states is one of those criterion that has already been identified and that will certainly continue to be.... I think there will be regional elements. Haiti is certainly part of the regional elements, as it is part of our hemisphere.

My view is that this statement, with the annual update that we will be doing to Parliament every year, will really help us understand better the kinds of priorities we are demonstrating.

Hon. Bill Graham: Mr. Chairman, obviously a decision to intervene in any specific situation is very much a government decision as a whole. It's clearly not military. As we used to say, and still do, we in defence are derivative of foreign affairs, and foreign affairs is dependent on defence, and to some extent on CIDA, or on our aid policy.

If I may speak for the defence department on this, Mr. Chairman, it's clear that once those decisions have been made, there is a level of collaboration now between our departments and particularly of CIDA to enable us to have a whole government approach to these operations. That's certainly been the lesson of Afghanistan. It's clearly our belief that in failed and failing states it will require a great degree of collaboration between us to get diplomacy, defence, and aid together to solve both security and development issues in these countries.

As far as your second question is concerned, the foreign minister has said that he will be putting forward an annual statement. My understanding is that we will be, at the same time, appearing on an annual basis before our committee to enable the committee to get an update on where we're going with the defence policy statement. Of course, on top of that, we look forward to the work of the defence

committee in terms of reporting back as to hearings that it will have held to inform the way in which we go forward and apply the policy statement. It does require the input of our parliamentarians. We are assuming that input will be based very much on consultations they will be making both with experts and citizens as to how they see that playing out.

• (1200)

The Co-Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry): Thank you very much.

Thank you, both ministers, for appearing in front of both our committees this morning.

Merci, Mr. McRae, Mr. Harder, Mr. Hillier, and Mr. Elcock.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

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

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

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