



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

---

FAAE • NUMBER 041 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Tuesday, May 17, 2005**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Bernard Patry**

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

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

## Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Tuesday, May 17, 2005

• (0905)

[Translation]

**The Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.)):** Good morning everyone. Pursuant to section 81(4) of the Rules, today we are considering the following votes for the Main Estimates 2005-2006, referred to the committee on Friday, February 25, 2005: Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, L25, L30, L35, 40 and 45 under Foreign Affairs.

[English]

We have the privilege this morning to have the Honourable Pierre Pettigrew, Minister of Foreign Affairs, appearing in front of us, and also witnesses from the Department of Foreign Affairs: Mrs. Kathryn McCallion, assistant deputy minister, corporate services;

[Translation]

and Ms. Marie-Lucie Morin, Associate Deputy Minister, Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Minister, you have a message to convey? You have the floor.

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

Distinguished committee members, it is my privilege to present this year's Main Estimates. As you pointed out earlier, Mr. Chairman, I am accompanied by my Department's Associate Deputy Minister, Ms. Marie-Lucie Morin, Ms. Kathryn McCallion, who is Assistant Deputy Minister, Corporate Services, as well as Mr. Ross Hynes, who has joined us in case my colleagues have any questions regarding the GPSF, the Global Peace and Security Fund. Mr. Hynes will be able to answer all of your questions. As I have always said, I like to keep the easy questions for myself, and pass on the difficult ones to the officials.

To introduce them to you, let me place them in context, including both the foreign policy challenges we face and the initiatives my Department and the government are undertaking in order to respond. As you are aware, on April 19, along with my Cabinet colleagues from CIDA, DND and ITCAN, I tabled the International Policy Statement that I had the opportunity to discuss yesterday with our colleagues on the Standing Defence Committee.

The IPS is the country's first integrated framework designed to strengthen Canada's role in the world. This Statement identifies five priorities to guide Canada's international engagement: revitalizing Canada's North-American partnership, building a more secure world, increasing prosperity, promoting respect for human rights and

building genuine development, and crafting a new multilateralism and flexible diplomacy.

The IPS presents a vision of a globally active Canada anchored in our North-American neighbourhood, better equipped to handle a rapidly changing in less predictable world, and better able to project influence where interests and values are at stake. This budget will equip us to better meet the challenges and opportunities ahead.

Allow me to elaborate. The headlines on foreign policy inevitably seem to concentrate on crisis, conflict and failure. In the six months since I appeared before you, we have all been shocked by the calamity of the Asian Tsunami, which claimed over 300,000 lives. We have been frustrated by the Security Council's slow response to the humanitarian tragedy in Darfur, and resistance to the International Criminal Court's jurisdiction in trying war crimes and crimes against humanity.

The situation in Haiti remains of great concern. Canada is playing a leadership role in international efforts to re-establish security and stability in Haiti and support longer-term reform and reconstruction. Currently, Canada is making a significant contribution to the civilian police within the United Nations Stabilization Mission and is leading the United Nations' Civilian Police within the framework of the stabilization mission in Haiti. Haiti is now the largest recipient of Canadian aid in the hemisphere.

In the case of Darfur, Prime Minister Martin announced on May 12 that Canada will increase its contribution to Darfur to support international efforts toward peace and stability in Sudan. This pledge includes up to \$198 million for more humanitarian aid and increased support for the African Union Mission, in Sudan, as well as the creation of a special advisory team—made up of Ambassador Robert Fowler, Senator Mobina Jaffer and Senator Roméo Dallaire.

Yet, the last six months have also been filled with a new hope. The Middle-East, which I visited a few months ago, seems to be moving in the right direction. The winds of change are blowing in Lebanon, Israeli-Palestinian relations are warming, and there are grounds for cautious optimism on Iraq following January's elections.

The international community remains strongly committed to helping Afghanistan, and slow, but steady improvements are visible there. The international response to the tsunami, including over \$400 million from Canada, showed what the world could do when the will is there. As well, I am strongly encouraged by progress we are making on key Canadian initiatives.

Let me start with North America. Over the last six months, the prime minister has met with President Bush and President Fox and agreed on roadmaps for this continent. We have established bilateral frameworks with both the United States and Mexico. In March, all three leaders agreed to a new, trilateral partnership to advance our goals in security and prosperity. This partnership will help us achieve our objectives and maintain our quality of life.

I am especially pleased by the new partnerships emphasis on thinking continentally. It is time that we, in North America, looked more seriously, from a continental perspective, on how we relate to a rising China, an enlarging European Union, the rest of the western hemisphere, and how we can contribute together to action on global issues, from health to environment.

It is important to remember that we have made progress in North America while we retaining our commitment to making choices specific to Canada's interests and values—such as our decision on ballistic missile defence. As well, we continue to press for action by the United States on trade disputes, particularly beef and softwood lumber, to ensure that the continental economic space works as it was intended to under NAFTA.

In advocating our positions in the U.S., we are using the new advocacy secretariat in our Washington embassy as well as our expanded network of offices. We recently opened new offices in regions of growing political and economic importance.

A second area of major progress on the Canadian agenda is multilateral reform. It is the 60th anniversary of the United Nations and the institution is showing its age. The prime minister has called for a “new multilateralism” aimed at results not process. He has argued forcefully before the United Nations General Assembly and in meetings with world leaders that countries must take their sovereign responsibilities seriously. This means both obligations towards their own citizens, to ensure their safety and well-being, and towards the global community, to ensure we can together meet the global challenges that no one country can meet alone.

In the UN's High Level Panel report late last year, and in the Secretary-General's response to it this year, the proposals Canada put forward have been acknowledged as important goals for the entire international community. These include the Responsibility to Protect initiative and the L20, a forum in which leaders from key developed and developing nations would work on common problems.

This year, we must seize the opportunities that are opening to take major steps forward in multilateral cooperation. Five years ago the world set targets for poverty reduction—the Millennium Development Goals. This fall, at the United Nations, leaders will take stock of progress on the MDGs, and will look for ways to act on the recommendations in the High Level Panel's and Secretary General's reports, which underscore the inter-relationship among security, including counter-terrorism, good governance and development.

We will pushed for adoption of practical, achievable measures, including the proposed Peacebuilding Commission, which will give the UN a faster, more integrated capacity to better protect people in crisis zones. This will help make concrete the Responsibility to Protect concept.

• (0910)

On Security Council Reform, we will support the idea of an effective body above other considerations.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that multilateral cooperation evolve, and not just at the UN. It is equally important that Canada try to ensure that these different processes complement each other, especially in this year charged so heavily with major summits and other meetings.

[English]

In June I will meet my G-8 colleagues to prepare for the leaders' summit at Gleneagles. This year the G-8 will maintain its focus on Africa. As you will recall, Canada, at the Kananaskis summit, launched a process to work with African leaders, the Africa Action Plan. Today we are moving forward on new ways to help that continent, including through building the capacity of the African Union to bring peace in Darfur and elsewhere. I will also be pressing G-8 colleagues to support the Middle East peace process, remain engaged in Afghanistan, and carefully consider the future of Kosovo.

In the G-8 and other forums I will be urging recommitment to and modernization of the rules governing disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This month in Geneva, Canada and the other 187 members of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty are deliberating on ways to ensure that this cornerstone agreement can be reinforced against growing pressures, especially the apparent efforts of some countries to clandestinely develop nuclear weapons.

On May 2, I attended the opening of the review conference of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, where I advocated a comprehensive approach aimed at maintaining the treaty's role as the authoritative legal instrument relating to nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation, and peaceful users of nuclear energy. Strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and related treaties and agreements is crucial to the security of Canada and all countries.

Canada's new multilateralism also includes leadership on another global issue becoming more critical to Canadians and people everywhere: the state of the world's environment. The Kyoto Protocol recently came into force with Russia's ratification, but as the science on climate change becomes more certain, it is already clear that we must plan for a new protocol to succeed Kyoto. Canada will host in December in Montreal the first meeting of the parties to Kyoto since it entered into force. We will strive for a long-term regime that both fights climate change and sustains economic growth.

In May in St. John's, Canada will host a conference on overfishing to push countries towards accepting their responsibility for stewardship of fish stocks, a vital but endangered global resource.

Mr. Chairman, the budget that was tabled in February represents a major reinvestment in our international capacity. It will go some way in helping to deliver on our IPS commitments. The budget includes almost \$13 billion for defence; a restructuring of our international assistance envelope to make it more responsive to development needs; new program capacity for my department, giving it the ability to act rapidly in failed and fragile states such as Haiti; renewed public diplomacy funding; and new resources to strengthen Canada's diplomatic presence abroad, especially in areas of growing interest to Canada, such as Asia.

These resources are already having an impact. We have, for example, provided \$500,000 to the International Criminal Court to prosecute war crimes committed in Sudan. With these new resources on stream, the Department of Foreign Affairs will continue the restructuring I described when last here before you. As detailed in the diplomacy section of the IPS, we have already reorganized to focus on our priorities more clearly, including North America and a new multilateralism. We will now begin to reverse the imbalance in the ratio of headquarters to field diplomatic personnel. We will rebuild strategic policy capacity. We will make public diplomacy a central part of diplomatic activity, and we will create new integrative tools to make sure we can exercise leadership on the international issues that increasingly involve domestic departments and agencies. To that end, we have begun work on ensuring that our heads of mission bring coherence to the Canadian voice abroad through whole-of-government regional and country strategies.

• (0915)

We will also pay renewed attention to high-quality consular services, an area whose importance was demonstrated by the tsunami crisis and by recent cases involving dual passport holders. As you know, the Auditor General identified challenges at Passport Canada. Action is already well under way, including strengthened security features in the passport itself, beefed up requirements for documentary evidence of identity, additional resources for more examiners, and regional security officers and new arrangements within government, such as the recent memorandum of understanding with Corrections Canada to ensure that Canadians not entitled to passports do not receive them.

This leads me to the issue of the division of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. Our goal is the best possible delivery of both foreign and trade policy in a rapidly changing world. As set out in the IPS, the government will establish an

advisory and consultative process to consider how this can best be achieved.

Allow me now to turn to the highlights of the main estimates themselves.

Planned spending for 2005-2006 will total just over \$1.9 billion. This is \$70 million greater than last year, reflecting, among other things, the need for new spending under the global partnership to clean up material in the former Soviet Union that could be used for weapons of mass destruction, enhanced representation in the United States, and spending to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the climate change action plan for Canada.

The department is also taking steps, under the expenditure review process, to improve efficiency of its operations while maintaining high standards. We are examining, for example, where savings can be made through better management of corporate and administrative services at headquarters and abroad.

In line with the department's new, more focused structure and priorities, spending will be allocated principally to three strategic outcomes. First, to advance Canada's interests internationally, just over \$90 million will be used to support four multilateral organizations whose role, as I have described, grows increasingly important. It will enable us to build strategic policy capacity and promote a more targeted strategy for bilateral relations. Second, to serve government abroad, \$830 million will provide for the provision of common infrastructure and services for the 15 departments and six agencies that are active abroad. Third, to serve Canadians abroad, almost \$50 million will support strong consular and passport services.

Mr. Chairman, let me re-emphasize that my department is committed to the changes that will allow our diplomacy to continue to excel, to maintain Canada's global influence, and to make a distinctly Canadian contribution.

Before concluding, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of an announcement with regard to our relationship with Iran. As you know, the Tehran court of appeals held a formal session yesterday to hear the Kazemi appeal. The lawyers representing Mrs. Kazemi's family were arguing in favour of a fresh investigation and arguing that a case of premeditated murder must be dealt with within a provincial court. Spectators were not permitted to enter the courtroom; only the Kazemi family lawyers were allowed to be present. However, they were given no opportunity to present any evidence. After two hours, the presiding judge called a recess to consider whether or not his court had proper jurisdiction to process the appeal. The lawyers waited, but the court was not reconvened. There is no indication when the court may reconvene.

Yesterday's events illustrate once again that the Iranian justice system has neither the capacity nor the will to confront the perpetrators of the brutal murder of Zahra Kazemi. Canada will not accept justice being denied. We continue to insist on a proper investigation and trial of those guilty of Mrs. Kazemi's murder, and the return of her remains to Canada, in accordance with her family's wishes.

• (0920)

We will continue to pursue our demands for justice bilaterally and with Iranian officials, as well as multilaterally with support from international partners, but the bilateral relationship with Iran cannot proceed as normal. We have decided to constrain our bilateral relations with Iran until Iranian authorities are prepared to deal with this affair in a serious and credible manner. Effective immediately, we are further tightening our policy of controlled engagement. We will limit our encounters with Iranian officials to the Kazemi case, Iran's human rights record, and Iran's nuclear non-proliferation performance. No visits or exchanges by Iranian officials to Canada will be permitted, nor will Canadian officials engage with Iran except relating to these three issues. The Iranian embassy in Ottawa will need to have any meetings with officials of the Government of Canada approved in advance by Foreign Affairs Canada.

[Translation]

We will not prohibit private Canadian companies from having trade relations with their Iranian counterparts. However, we will continue to enforce rigorous controls on the export of sensitive goods and we will continue to advise Canadian companies about the political environment when they do business with Iranian clients.

In addition, all existing co-operation programs between Government of Canada agencies and their counterparts in Iran will be suspended. Our relations will remain as such until Iran has taken the desired steps to hold a credible and independent inquiry and a trial worthy of this name with respect to the Kazemi case. These proceedings should result in real consequences for those responsible for her death. We have not made any decision to recall our ambassador or close our embassy in Iran. We believe that we need to maintain a professional dialogue about serious issues that damage our relations with this country. In order to resolve this matter, it is absolutely essential that we deal with these legitimate concerns.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

• (0925)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. We will now go to questions and answers.

[English]

I'll start with Mr. Day, please.

**Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC):** Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister, thank you for being here. As I've said before, we enjoy you so much we'd like to see you here more often. However, we'll use the time we have as expeditiously as possible.

I have some specific questions. If you have the answers, that's fine, but if you don't have the answers—and I wouldn't suggest you would on the specifics—you could get back to us in writing.

On page 88 of your estimates book, table number one, in your column on "Global and Security Policy", forecast spending for 2004-2005 is \$570.8 million, and your planned spending under "Global and Security Policy" is \$738.7 million. That's almost a 30% increase. I don't have a problem with the increase in and of itself, but could we get a breakdown of what that actually entails, what that increase entails?

Again, I realize you may not have some of this at your fingertips. I'll give you my questions first and then whatever is left of the ten minutes, feel free.

Page 91, table three, third line, under "Grants and Contributions", you go from \$492 million to \$642 million. That's about a 30% increase. Again, I'm not chafing at the increase, but if we can get a sense of the breakdown and what percentage of that increase is going to NGOs—

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Pardon me, Stockwell. You have given the page numbers, but the corresponding pages in French are not numbered the same way. I find it difficult to follow. Is there any way that we can... I do not want to take away from your time.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** That is fine. I am referring to Vote 10, table 3.

[English]

How much of that would be going to NGOs, as opposed to large multilateral organizations? Once funding goes into those large multilaterals, we have difficulty tracking it, and Canada doesn't get the attention that it should.

On page 94, and that would be table six, there's an increase in federal forecast revenue over 2004-2005. It shows planned revenue, and there's no federal forecast revenue on your shared services line from the Department of Foreign Affairs; it's zero. Then it leaps to \$6.1 million. Again, if we could have a sense of that increase.... Does that show that you are respecting Parliament's decision to keep the two departments together? Because it's quite a jump from zero to \$6 million in terms of shared revenue. Again, I recognize you may not have that at your fingertips; in writing would be fine.

On the Iranian question, Mr. Minister—

• (0930)

**The Chair:** On the Iranian question.... Okay, go ahead.

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** —certainly we share your distress. I have to say we have had this level of distress from the beginning of the Kazemi case. I realize you weren't minister then. I still stick to our thesis that the government's response back at the beginning was too weak, and a stronger response, more like today's, may have mitigated how Iran has flagrantly abused not just Ms. Kazemi, but also in fact Canada's position on this.

We would have liked to have seen withdrawal of our ambassador. It just goes to show there's a corollary that says, first of all, never trust another government that doesn't trust its own people, and any government, if they have a chance, will treat our people the way it treats their people. The Iranian record is horrendous enough that we should have known they would try to completely go around anything that looked democratic or anything that followed due process. We would still like to see our ambassador withdrawn from there, but we do appreciate the steps that have been taken.

My last question is a request to get specifics from you on how specifically you're planning reform at the UN in terms of the organizations and the regional voting patterns that consistently are controlled by non-democratic regimes and tyrannies. Democratic impulse at the United Nations is always suffocated by these regional groupings. I think we've recognized that in the past; we talk about reform, but we haven't seen the specifics of how Canada would suggest these regional blocs be reformed so that non-democratic countries, which form the majority at the UN now, do not have sway. If we keep in mind Vaclav Havel, Czechoslovakia's courageous leader, here's where I get some concern about Canada following the EU tradition, as opposed to having our own tradition. He said:

"It is suicidal for the EU to draw on Europe's worst political traditions, the common denominator of which is the idea that evil must be appeased and that the best way to achieve peace is through indifference to the freedom of others. Just the opposite is true...."

I would like to hear something and see something that would suggest our government is more along the lines of what Vaclav Havel, the former leader of the Czech Republic, is saying about this past tradition of the EU.

Those are my questions, especially the political ones on reform at the UN. Can you comment on what specifics Canada has put forward?

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Okay.

[*English*]

Monsieur le ministre, I think you should start first with either the question about Iran or the question about UN reform, and we'll give time to Mrs. McCallion to be able to respond to three very specific questions concerning the budget.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Some of these answers will have to be given in writing, because we won't have every one of them at hand.

• (0935)

**Mr. Stockwell Day:** Yes, I appreciate that.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** On Iran, I don't think there's very much. I appreciate very much Mr. Day's point of view. We've discussed this in the past. I appreciate that today we'll be sending a clear message to Iran that we have been and continue to be very serious about the appeal that the family has been demanding.

I hope very much that the appeal court will very quickly reassemble. It's suspended, but for how long—24 hours, a week, a month? We don't know. But we've clearly indicated to them that we want it to be for the shortest possible time, as it is already late.

On United Nations reform, clearly that is an institution that has aged a great deal over the years. While it served our purpose very well in the post-war years, when there were 45 members, it just doesn't work at its now 190 members. It's an organization that just doesn't work any longer for the purposes for which it was created.

First of all, though, we were very pleased with the high-level panel that Kofi Annan appointed. A number of ideas that Canada had been promoting are reflected in both the high-level panel and Kofi Annan's own report. We have been insisting that UN reform goes way beyond the Security Council. As you know, in Canada we support option B of the Security Council, which is no new permanent members beyond the five present ones. It is a decision based on principle, not on rejection of any particular country. It's just that we don't believe any new veto, any new permanent seat, would bring any better transparency or any better efficiency to the Security Council.

But you are right that at the General Assembly, at ECOSOC, another idea we liked very much from Kofi Annan's report—not from the high-level panel, but from Kofi Annan's report—was the creation of a council of human rights, better than the present commission, where membership probably would be that of the whole assembly rather than the present way, with regional groupings. I participated in Geneva a couple of months ago, and the Commission on Human Rights very clearly is not functioning, just because of the very nature of the countries that get elected there; they're not great examples.

So we will be promoting substantial reform of ECOSOC, of the General Assembly workings, and hopefully that will break some of the regional grouping voting patterns, which are always so automatic that they have prevented the true kind of work and progress and dialogue that we want in the assembly.

These documents we can share. Our contributions are there. They target those very things.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

I would ask Mrs. McCallion to provide in writing the other answers, please.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I think there was something that you—

**The Chair:** No, the time is over. I'm being very strict this morning.

Madame Lalonde.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Minister, thank you for coming. I hope that you will come back on Thursday to speak more specifically about Haiti. We had asked that the minister come to discuss Haiti. You went to Cayenne, and we wanted to have a report.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** If I may, Ms. Lalonde, I would like to point out that I am chairing the annual ministerial Conference of the Human Security Network on Thursday. I will be hosting 25 to 30 ministers from the entire world who have come to talk about human security.

I would be surprised if I were able to come on Thursday. However, I would be pleased to come back another time.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I noted that in my agenda, with a question mark. I am not making that up. At any rate, I do not want to lose my time on that issue.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** This year, I am chairing the Seventh Ministerial Conference of the Human Security Network which was established by Canada a few years ago. There will be a lot of visitors in town.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I am just starting the 10 minutes that I have been allotted.

**The Chair:** Minister, I think that you had better come back and see us.

Go ahead, Ms. Lalonde.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I think there are some important issues here.

Your priority is to carry out our foreign policy and to co-ordinate international relations.

However, when I read the whole text—right up to the budget,—it seems to me that co-ordination is an extremely important aspect. This only increases my concerns about the separation of the Department of International Trade and the Department of Foreign Affairs.

The bill establishing the Department of International Trade provides that this Department is responsible for establishing relations with other countries. I find that very strange. Will the Department of Foreign Affairs retain general responsibility for relations between Canada and other countries? Under these circumstances, how can you ensure that policy will be co-ordinated and followed by everyone. I am thinking about policies on human rights, anti-poverty initiatives, on conflicts, on the United Nations—in other words, all aspects of Canadian policy? There is nothing more dangerous than sending out conflicting messages. We discussed the issue of the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea.

Ethiopia said it would comply with the decision made by the Boundary Commission, but once the decision was made, Ethiopia rejected it. And yet Ethiopia gets the most international aid funding from Canada. How are we to interpret that?

So co-ordination is extremely important.

In addition, I feel uncomfortable about the role of parliamentarians, and there was no reference to that. You talked about consulting everyone, but you mentioned the parliamentary committee only once.

You know that some parties, including my own, are very interested in the Haitian issue. We intervened forcefully, and this was important for Canada. You went to Haiti twice, did you not? Since this happened during a break week, only liberal colleagues

went. We must participate more in policy development, the committee's role must be enhanced and we must be involved in these visits as well. We are talking about foreign affairs, and the Bloc Québécois, like all parties, has always wanted the best possible form of policy, because it is the only foreign policy there is in Quebec.

I now have some more specific questions about Haiti.

You say that Haiti is the country in this hemisphere that gets the most financial support. From what I have read, our aid was limited to emergency assistance for Gonaives. What Haiti needs are projects that create jobs and help establish a justice system. Sometimes, this may mean establishing a police force from scratch. We have already provided aid, but at the moment, conditions are favourable, because the current administration will not be in place long, and it wants to assure a smooth transition. We can do more. If there is a special responsibility we can do more. Had we not decided not to scatter our efforts around among 150 countries that are requiring so many reports that money more or less well spent, but rather to target certain countries? Haiti is not one of these 25 countries. You will tell me that this is the responsibility of the Minister of International Co-Operation. I disagree, I think this is more a matter of foreign policy: what can we do for Haiti, a country located in our hemisphere?

In all this overview and its strategic enforcement, in your vision of the world—a more secure world, a world where conflicts are controlled by reducing their number—anti-poverty activities are mentioned only in reference to the fact that you, with others, want to achieve the Millennium goals. You say you will look at how you can go about achieving them. And yet, given the wealth and financial well-being that Canada is always bragging about, it could play a more important role.

● (0940)

In my opinion, Canada is discrediting itself by not taking a clear stand about reaching the Millennium goals by 2015.

I come now to the responsibility to protect. I have read a great deal on this subject, and I think this should come under the authority of the United Nations. Otherwise, it would be dangerous to create another type of colonialism. I think that is the way this is seen. This could, in fact, be used as a pretext by some countries, but it could also be a genuine reason. It is therefore very important that this come under the United Nations. In our opinion, international law is established by multilateralism. In the case of relations with other countries, we talk about internationalism, or plurilateral or bilateral relations.

I am pleased to see that you have taken a strong stand with respect to Iran. Nevertheless, I do think this position could have been taken earlier. I hope you will have the support of a number of other countries. We cannot allow this type of situation to continue.

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



The first issue you raised is of course fundamental. It has to do with the role of the Department of Foreign Affairs, which is evolving within the Canadian Government. You noted that fact and you are correct. I am familiar with your views regarding the two departments. As you know, we are going to be setting up a committee co-ordinated by Privy Council, so that we get good advice on this matter. Clearly, we did take into account the opinions expressed by members of Parliament in the House of Commons. The committee will therefore be advising us about the best way of proceeding, both as regards trade and as regards foreign policy.

However, let us be clear: the International Policy Statement gives Foreign Affairs Canada an integrating role with respect to the unique direction Canada should take in the world. At the moment, and without any trade consideration, about fifteen of our departments are very active internationally. They include CIDA and National Defence, of course, but they also include Environment Canada, Natural Resources Canada and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. When someone from the Department of National Resources speaks at a conference, it is essential that there be no contradiction with positions taken by Environment Canada.

I know I am going to surprise some by making the following comment, but I believe the role of Foreign Affairs is more and more focussed in Ottawa. It is practically equivalent to the role played by a central agency, or it should become this in the next few years, precisely so as to properly co-ordinate all these aspects, such as contributions from the provinces, which have some major responsibilities and are very affected by international issues in the context of globalization. I believe that this role of integration and co-ordination will be played increasingly by Foreign Affairs Canada. The International Policy Statement clearly establishes this leadership role. It is clear that if the Department of International Trade, Agriculture or Natural Resources have points of view, they will have to be incorporated into the Canadian approach, in order to maximize its impact. I believe it is very important to proceed in this way.

Let me now talk about the role of parliamentarians. I know that you and your party are very interested in Haiti. We spoke about the trip very late. The trip was organized rather quickly. A practice has been adopted in recent years. I have no objection to reviewing it at some point, but the fact remains that there is a cost issue. Because they have to be paired, liberal members have less opportunity to travel during ministerial visits than do other members. That means that when Parliament is sitting, I always travel with opposition colleagues. I am pleased to do that. For example, in the second week of February, we did some wonderful work in the Middle-East. Ms. McDonough was present as well.

During break weeks, the idea is to turn to liberal colleagues spontaneously, for practical and financial reasons, and to give all members of Parliament a chance to travel abroad. This was not a deliberate choice.

• (0945)

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** You were travelling as minister, nonetheless.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Yes. As I said, the idea is to ensure that all liberal members and opposition members have an opportunity to

get this international exposure. However, I would be prepared to examine this, and I do understand your point of view.

With respect to Haiti, our assistance goes beyond... Of course, there was a great deal of emergency assistance in the case of Gonaïves, but you were absolutely right when you said that Haiti must have projects now that show Haitians immediately that the transition process in which they are involved, is the right way to go. We have to give them some tangible signs of this. We have to improve their standard of living. We have already spent over \$90 million of the \$180 million we promised to provide.

When we were in Cayenne, the international community committed \$1.2 billion. There were 18 or 20 countries represented in Cayenne. We identified 380 specific projects, and one country responsible for each one, to ensure precisely that Haitians are encouraged to move through this transition period, to move toward democracy and to proceed with the next election.

For example, we have a highway intersection project to reduce congestion in southern Port-au-Prince. This project will create jobs and improve traffic flow in this area. I have supported the development of soccer fields. Young people in Haiti are disillusioned that have no place to play. You are right to say that everything needs to be done. I would say that of the 380 projects, many create jobs and improve the quality of life of Haitians to encourage them to be part of the transition process.

Haiti is not one of CIDA's 25 development partners, because it is in a special category. Essentially, our development partners are countries we consider sufficiently developed to become special partners. Haiti is in a category where countries receive a great deal more. It is in a category of fragile states. We hope Haiti will be able to become one of Canada's development partners. Once Haitians have gone through this transition period and are more involved in their country's future, Haiti will become a partner, in my opinion. This list of 25 countries is not final. We want some countries to no longer require development assistance and to be among our development partners.

We will never give up on Haiti. Our contribution there is significant, and we hope that at some point, this country will no longer be one of the fragile states and will become a development partner. Clearly, Haiti will always be one of our priorities. It is located in our own hemisphere, people there speak our language and a significant Haitian community lives in Montreal.

With respect to the other points you raised, yesterday we spoke about our efforts to combat poverty, and I will not repeat what I said then.

• (0950)

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I would like to ask a final brief question.

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC):** No. You had 14 minutes.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Oh, I'm sorry.

**The Chair:** I need the opposition.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Okay, I will conclude in 30 seconds.

[Translation]

I will not come back to the issue about giving 0.7 per cent of our GDP to overseas' development assistance, because we discussed that yesterday. I would just like to say that I agree with Ms. Lalonde about the importance of having very specific criteria with respect to the responsibility to protect. Canada is very supportive of this concept. However, we are very aware how sensitive it is. There is still a great deal of legal and conceptual work required before we implement this doctrine, which will replace to some extent the former sacrosanct concept of state sovereignty, which allowed states to do whatever they liked.

I think we are on the same wavelength. A great deal of more work must be done before we can really adopt this doctrine.

I apologize, but I think the point was important.

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

[English]

Mr. MacAulay.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.):** Thank you, Minister, and welcome.

First, I would like to ask you about an irritant in the renewal of passports. For example, when somebody has a passport for most of their life and some little thing is wrong, it can create a great problem. Somebody may have lived in this country for 40 or 50 years and had a passport, and then something, like wrong spelling, might cause a problem. Is there something in the department to make sure these kinds of irritants don't continue?

I'd also like you to comment on the L-20 and our attempt to be more responsive to countries in need. You could tie that in with the proposed peace-building commission we are supporting at the UN.

Also, there's some concern about the countries affected by the tsunami. Many billions of dollars were raised, and many people in the area seem not to have received the dollars that were so badly needed. I'd like you to give us an update on our government's efforts and what we as a government will continue to do to make sure the dollars reach the people who truly need them.

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

With respect to the passport, we've been updating it. We've been strengthening its security, working with the Auditor General. We're always working to have the highest standard and the best possible quality. I am sorry, but these mistakes of *orthographe* happen, of...

[Translation]

What is the word for "*orthographe*" in English?

[English]

**A voice:** Spelling.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Spelling.

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** Mr. Minister, what you might have is a wrong spelling; it might have been there for 20 or 25 years, and all of a sudden it's an issue, that's all. That's just as an example.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you for calling our attention to it.

We must be vigilant and try to give the best possible service to the citizens. You're quite right that service to citizens should be the first priority here rather than perfection in spelling. It probably affects a lot of my constituents because I have in my own constituency names where you never know whether they have one *n* or three *n*'s in a row. Anyway, we will continue to build on the quality check and the service to clients.

On L-20, we see it very much as a strengthening of the multilateral system. Prime Minister Martin has insisted a lot—and I've been saying it myself for some time too as we're on the same wavelength—Canadians love multilateralism. We're committed to multilateralism. At the same time, we must make sure it does not become an ideology, where we support multilateralism independently of its results. We see multilateralism as a process for the kinds of results we like, rather than as an end in itself. Multilateralism interests me more in the kind of result it allows us to have rather than as an end in itself.

We talked about United Nations reform. Prime Minister Martin led for years, as you know, the G-20 of finance ministers that dealt with financial crises around the world, there being the Asian crisis and the Mexican peso crisis. Mr. Martin played a very central role in that organization. The particular membership of the G-20, with a wider membership than the G-8, could actually arrive at results the G-8 or other institutions had not led.... What we are hoping is that at the meeting of the leaders of the G-20—it is, in my view, an idea whose time has come—we'll be able to deliver certain results, certain actions we're not able to do elsewhere.

Now, on assistance to tsunami countries, I've been following it very closely myself because I have an important Sri Lankan community in my own district. I have met with leaders from all sides in Sri Lanka, and at first we were preoccupied as to whether the Tamil part of the country would receive assistance. I spoke to the government in Sri Lanka, in Colombo, on December 27 and 28, just days after, and they gave me assurances that the humanitarian aid would reach those who needed it, independently of politics. Every indication I have had from Tamil leaders I've spoken to through families of constituents in my own district or in the Toronto community is that this has really been respected. We had given strong indications at the beginning that we would keep an eye on it, and I have received no indication that this has not been the case.

• (0955)

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:** That's it.

**The Chair:** Now we'll go to Ms. McDonough.

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

I'm trying to figure out how to ask the ten questions I want to ask in ten minutes, and it's an impossible thing. Then the minister hasn't any chance to answer.

First of all, I just want to note a concern about whether your enthusiasm for thinking continentally actually translates into deep integration à la Tom D'Aquino and the boys. This is a major concern.

Secondly, with respect to your pointing out the IPS as the first integrated framework designed to define and map Canada's role in the world, I have a major concern about the contradiction between that and the continuing ambiguity around the split of the foreign affairs and international trade wings of this department. I'm sure you've been apprised of the fact that Derek Burney appeared before this committee a week ago. Having been very involved in bringing about the marriage of the departments in the first place, he asserted that he thought it would be two years more of paralysis if this uncertainty continues and if in fact the government, in defiance of Parliament's directive, continues down the path of effectively operating separately.

On millennium development goals, you've talked about the fact that in the fall there will be high-level meetings at the UN to take stock of progress, yet when Jeffrey Sachs appeared before the committee a number of weeks ago he was absolutely devastating in his condemnation of Canada's failure to develop the timetables and targets to reach 0.7% ODA, because, he stressed, that was the absolute key to the millennium development goals, and anything less than that meant there wasn't a serious commitment. I want to ask you to address that. In fact, he said, it was downright arrogant and pretentious of Canada—I'm not sure those were his exact words, but that was certainly the message—to talk about wanting to provide leadership internationally and to then fail to deliver on our commitments to ODA.

With respect to Kazemi, we haven't time to talk about the details today, but I want to seek your assurances on my question placed on the order paper on April 11 asking for some really concrete indication of what Canada has actually done to try to resolve this, particularly in view of the fact that the department seems to have sat on the evidence of the Iranian emergency doctor for some time before showing any really robust response.

I think I'm at question number four.

On Darfur, I very much believe that the special advisory team that you put together is extremely important, but I want to absolutely understand that they're in a position to go further with commitments than what has been made. We all understand the desperate need for appropriate diplomacy through the AU, but more is needed, including armed personnel carriers on the ground, because if we're going to deliver on humanitarian aid, there have to be ways to deal with the safety and security concerns, just as one example.

With respect to Ethiopia and Eritrea, we haven't time to talk about it, but the committee would like an undertaking that the department is indeed going to act on our very specific resolution on Ethiopia and Eritrea that was adopted unanimously, I think, in the end. One concern that arises, given the desperate conditions in Eritrea, is that while international aid is certainly going to Ethiopia, it's not going to Eritrea, where it's even more desperately needed.

Finally, with respect to Haiti, the question is really what Canada is doing to ensure that the aid that is going there is actually achieving what is intended. As well, what are we doing to continue to try to demand accountability around the human rights atrocities and violations that continue to happen?

I already said finally, but on Kyoto, I'm worried that there is code language in here that really indicates Canada is still not strongly positioned to deliver on the objectives. We've now increased greenhouse gas emissions by 20% instead of reducing them by 20%, and it seems to me that our information on that indicates we're backing away from action on our Kyoto commitments.

Thank you.

● (1000)

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

Let me tell you my point of view on the thinking on continental, the way I see it as the foreign affairs minister and as one who has been trade minister for almost five years in this country. It has nothing to do with the sort of process the European countries have engaged in over the last 40 or 50 years with the Treaty of Rome and the European Union, as processes that call for a deeper integration between, now, 25 countries—starting first with six, then nine, then 15, and now 25.

The three countries could not, in my view, adopt the sorts of institutions that have been appropriate for Europeans, and certainly it has been working very well in the sense that there has been no war in Europe, as there used to be a war every generation. We must commend the Europeans for having engaged in that direction, and from an economic point of view it is paying benefits.

Now we are in a completely different situation. We have a situation here with a G-1 country, the United States, which is so vast and powerful that we couldn't think of a common dollar that would not be the American dollar. You'll never persuade the Americans to go with a euro-type of currency. It's impossible, and it is not desirable either, from my point of view. It is the same thing with the institutions. However, in my view, we must make sure that we are, from an economic point of view, more able to play on our respective strengths to make sure our North American economy is competitive given the new giants that are emerging on the horizon. We must make sure, with the emergence of China, India, and Brazil, that we as North Americans play on our respective advantages in a way that will allow us to meet that competition.

So it is not at all the kind of deeper integration process that some people wish for, but it is a way that will allow us to play on our respective advantages in a way that will make us more competitive meeting with the other challengers.

I have to go faster because I could probably do a half an hour on this.

On IPS and the ambiguity around the split of the departments, we will be having this group of advisers on it. It is always a challenge in any country to coordinate trade and foreign policy. I myself was a foreign policy adviser in Pierre Trudeau's Privy Council Office at the time we did the merge. So I have witnessed that. I was there between 1981 and 1984, at the very time we did that merge.

So I will be following that very closely myself. I do agree that it is imperative, as I was saying to Madame Lalonde a little earlier, that foreign affairs be the lead department for integrating the Canadian voice abroad.

Jeffrey Sachs and I had the opportunity to discuss yesterday.... Our commitment to the millennium objectives remains firm. We have not established a timetable at this time, but we remain committed to the millennium development objectives, and we will clarify over the next few years how we will get there. We will double that aid by 2010, from 2003.

We are doing lots of things beyond ODA. Much of the Darfur contribution announced by Prime Minister Martin last week is not ODA-able. We will not get any credit for it, yet if you want development, you need to stabilize the region.

Most of what we've done in Afghanistan is not ODA-able, because you've got to bring stability before you get there. A country like Canada needs to keep some flexibility in the kind of assistance it does.

On Kazemi, you will receive an answer very shortly to your question of April 18. I reviewed it yesterday. That's why I turn to my assistant here. It will be ready in the next few days. I reviewed the answer yesterday and it's quite good, and you will have that list of actions we have taken.

•(1005)

On Darfur, Ambassador Fowler and the two senators, Jaffer and Dallaire, have the mandate to advise our government on what to do, considering the evolution. The Prime Minister was clear that this is not the last thing Canada will be doing. We are doing this at this time. I had a solid conversation yesterday with the Secretary General of NATO, who told me that the timing of our announcement was good because it had already brought the catalytic leadership we are trying to provide. Other countries want to step up to the plate now. We support NATO's intervention. We support NATO's contribution and have helped NATO to develop the support within the NATO alliance for playing a bigger role.

More is needed, and more will eventually come down the line from Canada. But more will also come from other members of the international community, through NATO or in other ways. This is what we have to do to keep our eyes on the ball. Ambassador Fowler and his team will be advising us about the best contribution for Canada to make, as well as the best contribution that other countries could make. With Ethiopia and Eritrea, we have to be very vigilant about the aid getting there. In Haiti, the accountability is important at this stage. The projects are specific, clearly delineated.

As for Kyoto, we're committed to the targets and we want Canada to take a leadership role. My colleague Stéphane Dion, the Minister of Environment, is investing a lot on the COP 11 conference. It is beyond Kyoto; we are beginning to think about the next generation,

the next protocol that will succeed this one. Foreign Affairs Canada will be playing a major role. Minister Dion, the Minister of Environment, will be chairing the conference himself, *in cha' Allah*, in December. So we are committed beyond even the present marks that we want to respect.

•(1010)

**The Chair:** Mr. McTeague, please.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Scarborough East, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the Minister for being with us today. There are so many things to talk about. As you can see, the questions asked by colleagues on the committee are exhaustive, as is the report that has been tabled on the future of our foreign policy.

My colleagues on this side are very interested in multilateralism, and personally, I am very interested in consular services. I see that there has been a significant increase there. Last year, 180,000 people applied to our missions abroad. In light of the concerns about passports and the fact that we want to guarantee the greatest security possible for people, I think it is clear that these services will need a substantial increase, as it appears in the budget.

Can you tell us more about the existing services? Under what has been proposed here, do you plan to increase the consular services of your Department?

I also have a second question.

[*English*]

You have suggested an advisory blue ribbon panel of members to resolve this imbroglio over the trade department and foreign affairs. Have you given any thought to who that advisory council or panel would be?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you, Mr. McTeague.

First of all, I would like to thank you and congratulate you for your work on consular matters. You have been working on this for several years now, and we very much appreciate your work and your contribution to one of the very sensitive areas of Canadian foreign policy.

Globalization means that far more people are travelling—for business, for missions, for their education or for tourism. The number of consular cases has increased by 50 per cent in five years. Of course, that means that we have to increase our assistance quite significantly.

I would also add that we often find ourselves in unforeseen emergency situations, such as the Tsunami that happened in Thailand on December 26, 2004.

We are therefore going to set up a quick response consular team made up of people who are always on standby. Their names are on certain lists. They are very mobile and can travel quickly to the location where the emergency has occurred and where there are consular cases to be dealt with.

In addition, many Canadians have dual citizenships. You know better than I do that this creates some difficult situations and some very considerable challenges, particularly when people enter these countries using their other passport. A number of countries will not recognize Canadian citizenship if a different passport has been used.

In fact, this is printed in the Canadian passport. I would urge people to read it and to repeat it. We state very clearly on the back cover of the passport that people with dual citizenships must be very vigilant when they visit their country of origin. This country may impose certain national obligations on them, such as military service, for example. Very often, these are very delicate situations. I would urge people with dual citizenships to be extremely vigilant when they visit their other country and to bear in mind that some countries will not recognize their Canadian citizenship or their Canadian passport, particularly if they use the other passport on entry to the country.

I have some ideas about the people who should be on the advisory committee, but this will be the responsibility of Privy Council. The people at Privy Council will have to decide who will be on this committee that will advise the government about the future of the department or departments.

People in the machinery of government's section of the PCO will be making these choices. I hope I will be consulted, because I have some good ideas.

• (1015)

[English]

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Thank you, Minister. Thank you for those responses.

Minister, you and I, the Prime Minister, and others led a delegation to Libya to engage countries that are making a significant dramatic change in helping the world to become a more secure place. One of the items, apart from the human rights issues, that you and the Prime Minister and I broached with the leader in Libya was of course the role of the African Union in settlement of the peace process, both in terms of the southern conflict in Sudan, as well as Darfur. I'm wondering if you might be able to give us an idea of whether you feel that the talks that began this morning in Libya will be successful.

I know that some of our reporters over there are doing some work right now. I know one in particular, who I bumped into last week, had mentioned that there is cause for hope that may help us ultimately on Darfur.

This comes at a very critical time, certainly given the announcements by the Sudanese government as to whether or not it will accept Canadian troops, as well as recognition that much of the effort we have made to date may be better placed in our model on L-20, where we have troops who are at ready to engage and to help the situation.

Do you have any comments about the overall peace process in the initiative in Tripoli today?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you very much, Dan. I'm very interested in your question, and I will want to hear the answer from Mr. Ross Hynes, who is following that very closely for me. So I will

learn it at the same time as you, our expectations at the Tripoli meeting.

Mr. Ross Hynes.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** I'm glad he's here. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Hynes.

**Mr. Ross Hynes (Ambassador for Mine Action, Department of Foreign Affairs):** Mr. Chairman, just as I was leaving the office this morning we received a report from Libya that the Nigerian foreign minister has announced that the Abuja talks to settle the Darfur situation will resume on May 30 in Abuja. Canada, of course, has an embassy there, and we will be observing those talks. Ambassador Fowler and his advisory team will be actively promoting successful results there.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

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

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Thank you again, Mr. Minister, for coming. This may very well be your last visit to this committee as Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Trade; however—

**A voice:** He's back on Thursday.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** He's competing for the job.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Yes, of foreign affairs.

Mr. Minister, just before I came here this morning I had a delegation in from the committee for defence of human rights in Iran. So we welcome your announcement this morning; however, concerning the atrocities that are going on in Iran, a country we do some trade with, those who are aware of what's happening have called on Canada for some time to take a stronger step, perhaps in a multilateral way. But if other countries are not willing to step up, they were wondering what Canada would ever do.

You mentioned here today that Canadians love multilateralism. At the same time, they don't fall in love with this ideology that everything must be done in a multilateral way; yet quite often we see that's exactly what happens here in the country. That's why a lot of people get very frustrated with what they perceive as a lack of involvement of this government and willingness to step in, in cases or in times or places where there are human rights violations taking place.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs, when would you ever see our government in a unilateral way stepping in with some major moves that would show those countries...? We make announcements, yet we've waited for how long now? Because of the Iranian court again taking a recess on this issue, now we're going to make some announcement, but I think Canadians, especially those involved in it who have family, and others, just see a government that in some ways is perceived as giving a weak response. I guess, though, better weak—I mean late—than never.

Going to a question Mr. McTeague asked regarding the consular offices around the world, I wonder if you could give us a breakdown on whether this is simply increasing consular services. Is it a transfer of positions here in Ottawa? Is it just big government getting bigger, or is there a shift? We've had a centralization here in Ottawa for some time. I'm wondering if you can tell us: we know there is an increase in money allocated to consular services, but how many position increases will we see?

I have one other quick question. The Auditor General obviously found serious problems, and Mr. MacAulay brought this out, with Canadian passport systems. The United States now has moved to a system where they have demanded that all American citizens will have a passport before they move in and out of Canada. If this is a trend that is now going to, sooner or later.... We know we have to have more documentation even now for going to the United States. It hasn't come yet to having to have the passport, but if it does move to that, given the trouble in the passport department, how will we make sure Canadians are serviced as they travel and trade in the United States?

● (1020)

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Thank you very much, Mr. Sorenson. On the consular services and the breakdown, I will ask Madame McCallion to answer. I will answer the other two questions, and Madame McCallion will give you the breakdown on the consular services more precisely, as she is doing this research.

You're asking me a very theoretical question. I come from a city where the mayor of Montreal, Jean Drapeau, used to say that a politician should never answer a hypothetical question. So I find it extremely difficult, as the Minister of Foreign Affairs, to tell you when I will do something. Present me with a situation and I'll tell you, but it's very difficult to say.... To me, unilateral action, particularly if you talk about unilateral sanctions, is very rarely effective or efficient. And I wouldn't want us to do anything that is ineffective or inefficient.

It is too theoretical for me to tell you here is a situation where I could envisage it. It's a case-by-case thing, where we make our decisions.

We have obtained a lot of support from the international community on Iran. For a second year in a row at the United Nations they have had a condemnation of their human rights record. They don't take that lightly. We were very pleased to have international community support for that, and my view is that it's much better to be in company than to be on your own there.

I agree with the limits of multilateralism. We have to make it more effective, more efficient. We have to renew it, rejuvenate it, bring in criteria and all that, but we should, as much as possible, remain multilateral in our actions.

On the Auditor General and the passport, honestly, all of what is in the Auditor General's report has already been addressed. We've been working with the Auditor General's office for the past few months, and every one of her recommendations has either already been dealt with and integrated into our passport office or is on the verge of being dealt with in the next few weeks and months. She has said that she is satisfied with the collaboration she has received from

our passport office. So you can rest assured that every one of these elements has been dealt with in a very substantial way.

Madame McCallion.

**The Chair:** Ms. McCallion.

● (1025)

**Ms. Kathryn McCallion (Assistant Deputy Minister, Corporate Services, Department of Foreign Affairs):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We're reinvesting money from the department in consular services in the following ways. We're keeping money aside to expand the honorary consuls abroad. We are having an upgrade of what's known as the COSMOS system. This is our internal tracking of cases system. We are trying to put some money in infrastructure for a rapid reaction centre to respond to issues like the tsunami crisis and other major consular events around the world.

So it's a combination of investing in the existing and improving some of the services we have, and improving some of the publications, both online, to keep Canadian citizens informed of areas of the world they should not be travelling in, and other kinds of advisories.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** There are two things. Specifically, first of all, how much of an increase in positions is there?

**Ms. Kathryn McCallion:** At the moment there is no increase in positions abroad.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** But will there be when we start up these new consulates?

**Ms. Kathryn McCallion:** Yes.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** There will be no increase—

**Ms. Kathryn McCallion:** No, there will be at that point.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Okay. That's my question.

**Ms. Kathryn McCallion:** I'll have to get back to you on how many.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** What would you project, approximately? And we would wait for the exact—

**Ms. Kathryn McCallion:** For much of the consular services abroad that you're speaking about, those services are an increase in the locally engaged staff, and I'd have to get back to you in writing. I don't know what the production is.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Just one quick question, again to the minister. Very briefly, in the brief you brought here, you said, "As well, we continue to press for action by the United States on trade disputes, particularly beef".

Now, you know, we've been told—

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I added softwood to the text.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Yes, and "to ensure that the continental economic space works". You added that to the text. Okay.

But in speaking to the BSE issue and the closed border there, now we have R-CALF in the United States, which has now brought another injunction to the courts, to have the courts consider closing the border to boxed beef. They're taking all the old arguments and they're saying it's a food safety issue; we say it isn't a food safety issue.

What is your department...? We know Mr. Bush is onside with you, and this, that, and the other thing, but what can you do now, as this injunction is moved forward in the courts, with the same judge they had last time? What can you say to Canadians that would assure them that Canada is up to the challenge, that Canada is supporting the industry here? I'll tell you, we have an industry now that is in dire straits, and it's because of a lack of moving across the border and many perceive a lack of action on this government's part as well.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** If I can just add one little element on passports, I would like to reassure you that we also expect a vast increase in the number of passports we have to process every year. There are more and more Canadians who want and need passports, and I can assure you we are absolutely ready, technologically and staff-wise, to deal with that substantial increase in the number of passports per year.

On the BSE, it is really a question you should put to the Minister for International Trade. I don't feel comfortable answering a question on beef, as it is clearly his prerogative and responsibility to deal with the new injunction that was adopted there. We are working closely, on my side, with the American administration, as I said yesterday. We have done our very best, and the administration has really tried to be helpful. The problem, of course, is that the injunctions and the legal system they have step in all the time.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** So there's nothing the Department of Foreign Affairs can do to pressure the government? You'll do nothing in Foreign Affairs to pressure them?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I will discuss it with my colleague, the Minister for International Trade.

**The Chair:** The answer was given. It's for the other minister.

Monsieur Paquette.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Thank you.

I have three concerns. The first still has to do with splitting the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade into two departments. The two bills were defeated in the vote held in the House. I understand that a committee has been set up and that it will be making some suggestions to take Parliament's decision into account and at the same time to achieve the objectives regarding renewal. Is it possible to get some documentation on the initial project? What was the vision behind it? What was the government's intention in splitting the Department into two? We have had very little information. How much have we spent to date? Who has been moved? We need to know this so that once the committee makes its recommendation, we will be able to assess to what extent the government has taken Parliament's decision into account. We are really in the dark. I do not know whether it would be possible to send our clerk some materials so that we can get some idea where this was headed, how much it was supposed to cost and how much it has cost

to date. Once the consultation is completed, we will be able to assess whether Parliament's decision was actually taken into account.

My second concern has to do with the issue of visas for Chinese investors. I raise this with you because the Department of Foreign Affairs is supposed to play an integrating role. This is a major problem. There is a gentleman who is prepared to invest \$100 million in the Drummondville region and who has been waiting for his visa for six months. He does not even know where Drummondville is. He cannot see the land he is prepared to buy. Could we not find a different way of granting visas to investors and business people? They are not tourists and they are not immigrants. They simply want to come and see the place where they are going to make their investment. This is a serious problem for us and one I want to draw to your attention.

**My last concern is perhaps the most important one. Ms. Lalonde and I were rather surprised to see the following among your priorities:**

The Department will develop Canadian positions on cultural diversity to be presented to UNESCO (The UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizations) for possible adoption.

That is on page 23. We thought the Canadian positions were more advanced than that. This seems to come rather late given that in the current negotiations, our convention has already been discussed. Can you say a few words about this?

• (1030)

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** We would like to have an answer on this.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** With respect to your first concern, we will send you the documentation regarding the Orders in Council and so on. I may not have the figures. Contrary to what you said, the committee has not yet been set up. It will be.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** You said that it would be a committee of Privy Council, did you not?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Yes.

With respect to your third concern, between Heritage Canada and Foreign Affairs Canada, a great deal of work has been done. The government of Quebec is also making a very significant and impressive contribution.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Can you tell us what your positions are?

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** What is your position on the issues being discussed at UNESCO at the moment?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** It would be better for you to discuss this with Ms. Frulla. She has the lead role in this area.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** We are talking to the person who plays the integrating role.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** And he is very pleased to work with his colleague, Ms. Frulla. This is an issue I followed for years as Minister of International Trade. I work with the Coalition for Cultural Diversity in Montreal, so I am very familiar with these issues. However, if there are some more specific issues at the moment, I would prefer to leave this to Ms. Frulla, who is following them more closely. I do not think there is really a problem of substance here.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Yes, there is one with respect to the measures for implementing the convention.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Between the WTO and the... Yes, there is a problem there.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** A serious problem.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** We hope to get answers some day.

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

Mr. Bevilacqua.

[English]

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Vaughan, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** This time is for questions, not answers.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** You have been trying that for years.

[English]

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** Minister, I read your comments. I'm really interested in the issue related to North American economic space and the progress we will be making in that area. As well, when can Canadians and indeed North Americans expect truly a North American economic community? I'm not referring to the European model; I'm simply saying that many of the concerns we have as Canadians and as Americans have in large part been focused on the issue over the border. In your vision for North America, and I think you referred to it as the "North American community", do you see a seamless border any time soon?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** We discussed this earlier, prompted by a question by Madame McDonough. It depends very much on what you mean by a "community". In my view, when we look at the European community, the model that has been adopted there is not transferable to North America, simply because the sheer power of one of the three would make that approach not realistic. I don't think they themselves have much of an appetite to go in that direction.

However, given the rise of China, India, Brazil, it is imperative that we make sure the North American economic space remains competitive, and indeed, we must support the implementation of the new strategic partnership that President Fox, President Bush, and Prime Minister Martin signed last year. The plan is there. If you look at that partnership, the plan is there. It is well described. It is building on the experience of ten years of NAFTA, but the plan is there, and it's a pretty good, exhaustive plan with lots of measures dealing with security, border issues.... It is a very solid plan.

• (1035)

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua:** I know I'm only supposed to ask questions of you as a foreign affairs minister, but you were the international trade minister prior to this. I'm just wondering whether

in your mind we have as a nation maximized the benefits drawn from the free trade agreement related to productivity, innovation, and global competitiveness as an economic unit.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I've been supporting free trade.... I refused to run in 1988 because I was a supporter of the free trade agreement, so I've been committed to the principle of free trade in North America.

The major flaw of that trade agreement, and what is in my view the most costly element, is that we have not given up our national trade laws. In the United States, national trade laws are like a sacred cow. I'm not blaming the Mulroney government for having failed. It is something.... He tried very hard, he really tried, but Reagan could not deliver that in that agreement.

The most limiting factor of the trade agreement is really dispute settlement and resolution, which is not effective enough. I'm pleased that President Bush has acknowledged this on at least two occasions in the last few months: when he visited Ottawa, and again in Crawford at the meeting we had at the ranch, where he accepted to look into it. I'm glad that at the WTO for the first time the Americans have accepted looking into a dispute settlement mechanism and a dispute resolution mechanism. The reason is not that they've changed their minds. It is simply that other countries are beginning to do to them exactly the same kind of thing they've been doing to others. When they see India doing the same kind of thing they're doing to us and other countries, it brings some sense to them, and they're more open to do the resolutions.

Apart from that, I honestly think the trade agreement has been a very positive development. It has made our continent more productive and has been an essential part of our capacity to meet the challenges looming on the horizon.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll go now to Mr. Menzies, please.

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

This seems to be a habit. We've seen you two days in a row, and one more day this week. Is this what we call the consultative process? And I suppose if it is, I see that as a good thing.

Further along those lines, I think if we had consulted before the split of the departments maybe we wouldn't have burned up so much of the department's energies, and also the energies that we expended in the House.

In regard to this consultative committee—and I think this is a good thing, I'm just not sure the timing is appropriate—what will its mandate be, and when would we be likely to see this? That's one question.



Further to the comment earlier about tsunami aid being disorganized, I would like some comments about that. And whether it's denied here or not, we've seen reports.... In fact, I was in Chennai, India, about four weeks ago. I met with four NGOs, and not one of them had received one dollar of the matched money from Canada. In fact, some of them had to reapply a second time for their reconstruction projects, and that's not an effective use of our money. Canadians expected that money to be delivered, to be delivered efficiently and quickly, and that's certainly not the report I got from four NGOs that are on the ground and had programs in place.

I'd like to add—and Mr. Sorenson stole my question on the BSE—that I see a huge role for your department to play in issues such as this, whether it's the BSE, whether it's softwood, whether it's wheat, whatever it is. I think I would like to hear some more encouraging words from you that you are playing a role in this.

• (1040)

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Absolutely. Let me begin with this. The lead comes from my colleague, the Minister of International Trade, but we are doing a lot through all our consular services, through our embassy in Washington, through our ambassador. We are systematically raising these issues of BSE, softwood, and the litigation we're having.

So the Department of Foreign Affairs is fully engaged. In terms of new initiatives, I had heard the question as are you going to take new initiatives, and on that I have to discuss it following the second injunction that was adopted in the United States. But be assured that Foreign Affairs is doing everything it can.

On the tsunami assistance, you have to remember that India is a country that has said it did not want to receive any international aid. Of the countries affected at the time, India had very clearly said that it did not want to have any international assistance related to the tsunami. It's a choice they've made as a country. On the other four countries that have accepted international aid, I do believe that all of the matching dollar commitment to organizations that the government had made has been actually transferred, given to these NGOs. We will look into it to make sure.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** I was just going by these four NGOs.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Yes, but in India, you're right. It's simply that the program didn't apply to India, because they specifically said they did not want it. It is the government in Delhi that said they did not want to have any international assistance, that they could deal themselves with both the humanitarian needs and the reconstruction needs that India wasn't meeting following the tsunami.

On the split, Mr. Menzies, I'm afraid I do not have that mandate, and I do not have its timetable. It is a Privy Council Office and PMO.... Machinery of government is the prerogative of the Prime Minister. So we have to wait for the Prime Minister and the Privy Council people to give us the mandate and the timetable. I do not have it.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Merci.

Now we'll go for one last question, a very short question, because we have committee business also to deal with.

Ms. McDonough, please.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** I have a very short question. I hope the minister will have a chance to address it.

I happen to think that the fact that the commitment to ODA has not been kept continues to be the single most embarrassing thing about this government's performance in terms of foreign affairs and international development, the single biggest omission from the budget that is before us and from the IPS statement.

I'm wondering if the minister could give us some indication, given the fact that the official opposition for eight straight years has not been willing to commit to this unequivocally and help put pressure on the government, whether Belinda Stronach, now being appointed to the Liberal cabinet, who is the only Conservative member I'm aware of who has persistently stated her commitment to ODA.... Can the minister assure us that this will now help to move the government to a commitment to ODA?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Madam McDonough is—

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Is that why you're putting her in the cabinet? Because I know it's not for political reasons.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I have heard the excellent news that Madam Belinda Stronach had become a Liberal, but I heard it a few seconds ago.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** That is proof that there is really no difference between the Conservatives and the Liberals.

• (1045)

[English]

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** If I were a Bloc these days, I wouldn't speak about who really loves the Conservatives, because you really want the Conservative government more than—

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I am talking about a fact.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** You want a conservative government, but I do not.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** [Inaudible] ... from the Conservatives to the Liberals and from the Liberals to the Conservatives.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** We never said that, but you are proving us right.

[English]

**The Chair:** I have one final question before you leave, because we have committee business after. If you cannot provide the answer for me right now, I would like to get a written answer, please.

Minister, in your statement you referred to renewed public diplomacy funding. The international policy statement also speaks of a new diplomacy that will seek regular input from Canadian NGOs, labour unions, business groups, academics, and professional bodies.

At the same time, the Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development, which was created following the last foreign policy review in order to do public outreach, seems to have disappeared. At least there is no mention of it in the statement or in any of the estimates documents.

Could you, Mr. Minister, tell the committee if the centre is still active and give further details of how public outreach engaging Canadians and the expanded public diplomacy will take place?

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** The Centre...?

[Translation]

I am not sure I understood the question.

[English]

**The Chair:** The Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development.

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** The CRDC?

[Translation]

I do not know what you are referring to.

[English]

I'm sorry, I'm a bit absent-minded with.... There are all kinds of things.

The public diplomacy budget is going to receive \$8 million per year for the next five years, and that is something I'm very pleased with, because I believe public diplomacy is a very important partner.

**The Chair:** I would like it if you'd follow up with the blues, with the transcript, and give us a written answer, please—

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** I will ask my collaborator.

**The Chair:** —because the question is very clear.

[Translation]

Thank you, Minister, Ms. McCallion, Ms. Morin and Mr. Hynes.

[English]

**Hon. Pierre Pettigrew:** Merci.

Mr. Menzies said, like Madame Lalonde, that unfortunately I had the human—well, not unfortunately.... I'm delighted to be hosting and presiding over the human security meeting with about 25 foreign ministers in town on Thursday. I'm sorry if you thought I'd be here for a third time this week, but it will have to be the week after the break.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Monsieur le ministre.

Merci, all of you.

Now we will go to committee business.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Mr. Chair, are we in session?

**The Chair:** We're going on.

Order, please.

Monsieur Paquette, we're going to start.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Chair, given the testimony of the minister and the questions therein, I'd like to ask for consent to pass the main estimates.

**The Chair:** First of all, I'll call the votes on the credit on votes 1, 5, 10, and 40. Those are the four votes. All the other ones were accepted before.

[Translation]

I will call the vote on Votes 1, 5, 10 and 40. These are the votes of the Department of Foreign Affairs. If we do not pass them by May 31, they will be deemed adopted. That is just a technical detail.

[English]

Those voting in favour...

I'm sorry. I just called votes numbers 1, 5, 10, and 40. If they're not adopted or reported by May 31, they are deemed reported pursuant to Standing Order 81(4).

Go ahead, Mr. Menzies.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** Are we not waiting for answers to some of Mr. Day's questions that may be relevant to this?

**The Chair:** No, not for this. There were no questions relevant to the budget. The budget could be decreased, as it was once before, but we cannot increase any budget. It's just to get the implementation of the budget. You could have some answers back later, but that in itself is not going to change the budget.

I call the question.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE (FOREIGN AFFAIRS)

Department

Vote 1—Operating expenditures.....\$990,882,000

Vote 5—Capital expenditures.....\$104,992,000

Vote 10—Grants and contributions.....\$642,873,000

International Development Research Centre

Vote 40—Payments to the International Development Research Centre.....  
\$116,086,000

(Votes 1, 5, 10, and 40 agreed to on division)

• (1050)

**The Chair:** Shall I report them to the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** We will now have the presentation of the first report of the Subcommittee on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investments.

[English]

You have all received copies in your office. For people who don't have copies, we have some other copies.

I have one of the members of the subcommittee, Mr. Paquette. Do you want to move it?

Is there any discussion on this? We need to get someone on the subcommittee to move it.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** This report was adopted unanimously by the sub-committee.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** That was a report, as Mr. Paquette just said, that was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee, on chapter 19.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the report?"

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Shall I report to the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Hurry up and do it before an election is called!

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Maybe we have one more vote. Don't forget that.

We have a notice of motion from Mr. Stockwell Day. Mr. Day is not here at the moment. I might wait one minute, if he wants to be here.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** He has not changed his motion.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** No. Regarding the first motion, the one concerning the State of Israel, Mr. Day told me he doesn't want to pass it for the moment.

It was the second motion, concerning the Minister of Foreign Affairs obtaining from the United Nations a full report on the United Nations oil-for-food scandal investigation, and providing a copy of the same report to the committee in order to prove or disprove any implication of Canadians or Canadian companies. Mr. Day is not here to move it.

He needs to be here for us to pass it, but you can talk about it, Mr. Menzies.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** Can I move it on his behalf?

**The Chair:** No, it should be the member.

I just want to ask for clarification from the clerk.

Can somebody else...?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Andrew Bartholomew Chaplin):** Where things are under the control of the House leader, it would be allowed to be moved by another member. But where it's introduced by the member, it really belongs to the member and should only be moved by him.

**The Chair:** It should just be moved by the member. I'm sorry, those are the rules.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** That would obviate the second one, Mr. Chair. That would obviate the need to discuss the second one if the proposing member is not here.

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

I just want to point out that tomorrow we have a working lunch at noon. We have the Saudi Shura here. I think it's quite important. You received an invitation concerning this. I would like to have as many people as possible attending this lunch with the president of the Saudi Shura and his delegation. It will be in Room 257 of the East Block, the summit room.

Are there any opinions concerning Thursday? We're going to decide what to do on Thursday because the minister cannot attend. I'll try to get something—

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** Do we have other witnesses?

**The Chair:** Yes, we'll try. Maybe the Taiwan.... I'll try to do my best.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** It's certainly a pertinent issue.

**The Chair:** Yes, thank you.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Whenever you're ready, let's do Taiwan. We passed a motion.

**The Chair:** Yes, we passed the motion.

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.**