



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

FAAE • NUMBER 063 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, November 1, 2005

—
Chair

Mr. Bernard Patry

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

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

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Tuesday, November 1, 2005

•(0910)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.)): With your permission, we will start.

Thank you, and welcome to today's hearing of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

As you know, last April the government released its first international policy statement. The committee has been holding hearings on this statement since then, both in Ottawa and now across the country.

We have also opened an e-consultation on this subject, which you can find on our website. Once we have finished our hearings and the e-consultations, in December, we will prepare a report with recommendations for government policy that we hope to table early in the new year.

We are here in Toronto for two days. I just want to tell you that this evening we will have in this place a town hall meeting.

As witnesses this morning, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), we have, from the Canadian Coalition for Democracies, Mr. Stephen Posen, Mr. Alastair Gordon, and also Mr. Naresh Raghubeer.

Good morning.

Also, from the Formosan Association for Public Affairs of Canada, we have Mr. Harry Chen, who is president, and also Mr. Albert Lin.

Welcome, all of you.

We will start with Mr. Gordon, please.

Mr. Alastair Gordon (President, Canadian Coalition for Democracies): Thank you.

Good morning. On behalf of the Canadian Coalition for Democracies, I'd like to thank the Department of Foreign Affairs for this opportunity to appear before the standing committee.

In April 2005 the Canadian government released its international policy statement, or IPS, entitled *A Role of Pride and Influence in the World*. The IPS identifies the cornerstones of our foreign policy: diplomacy, defence, development, and commerce. But I would suggest there is another cornerstone: democracy.

The Chair: For translation you need to go a little bit slower. Keep going, but more slowly

Mr. Alastair Gordon: I am so enthusiastic!

If Canada wishes to diminish conflict and spread freedom and prosperity, there could be no better foreign policy than the uncompromising promotion and support of democracy around the world. True democracies almost never attack other democracies.

Imagine, for example, if the Middle East contained seven democracies rather than just one, Israel, we wouldn't need to discuss Canadian diplomacy, defence, development, and commerce in the region. True democracies would work out their differences and develop commercial ties, as they do today in Europe and North America, without the slaughter of innocents and without the chronic intervention of outsiders who struggle, as we do today, over why things go from bad to worse despite our best efforts.

For that reason, I would prefer to use my time before this forum looking specifically at Canadian foreign policy as it is practised today and to ask how we can adapt it to make Canada the foremost champion of democratic nations and movements around the globe—in other words, to truly have a role of pride and influence in the world.

Let me now jump into specific areas of foreign policy, in no particular order.

First is China and Taiwan. In 1968, when Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau announced that he would pursue diplomatic relations with Communist China, he made the following commitment: "Our aim will be to recognize the People's Republic of China...taking into account that there is a separate government in Taiwan."

Yet on his visit to China this year, Prime Minister Paul Martin signed an agreement on behalf of all Canadians that "...Taiwan is an inseparable part of Chinese territory. Canada reaffirms its adherence to a One China policy." So much for Pierre Trudeau's pledge to a nation that has become a modern prosperous democracy of 23 million people, a nation that has never been, not for a week or a day or even a minute, part of the People's Republic of China.

How could Canada's foreign policy honour Prime Minister Trudeau's pledge and stand for democracy over tyranny in the Far East? We could start by revoking our endorsement of the One China policy, an action comparable to China and the U.S. signing an agreement ending Canada's independence within North America.

We could allow elected representatives from Taiwan to visit Canada. We could modify our policy of offering preferential tariffs to a manufacturing giant like China, while charging full rate for Taiwanese imports.

And finally, Canada could end its approximately \$60 million per year in foreign aid to China, a country with the world's largest army, a GDP over \$7 trillion, and 700 missiles aimed at peaceful, democratic Taiwan.

This government has never, to my knowledge, explained to Canadians who it is that benefits from our China policy. With a balance of trade overwhelmingly in China's favour, it isn't Canadian workers. And it certainly isn't the advance of democracy and national sovereignty in the Far East.

Moving on to Sri Lanka, the Tamil Tigers, or LTTE, have been designated a terrorist organization by the United Kingdom, the United States, and India, and have been banned from the European Union. Yet the LTTE continues to enjoy legal status in Canada. Why?

In January, that question was put to Justice Minister Irwin Cotler, who said, "Toronto, I think, has the largest number of Tamils... outside of Sri Lanka, so we've got to be very careful just in terms of our own relationships."

Minister Cotler never explained why the number of Tamil voters in Toronto should influence whether it is right or wrong to bomb public markets, assassinate elected heads of state, and recruit child terrorists.

In February, Foreign Minister Pierre Pettigrew contradicted his justice minister, saying that most of the people we've been consulting, including the U.S. State Department, are demanding that we do not designate the LTTE as a terrorist organization at this time. This claim was dismissed by the U.S. State Department, who itself applied terrorist designation to the LTTE in 1997.

Prime Minister Paul Martin and several of his MPs have actually attended LTTE fundraising events, lending credibility to those responsible for unspeakable suffering in Sri Lanka.

Perhaps most damning of our foreign policy are the written words of the late Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka, Lakshman Kadirgamar, before he was assassinated in August, who said, "At one time it was reported that the LTTE raised approximately \$200,000 a month from the Tamil community in Canada" and "...the argument that banning the LTTE would hamper the peace process does not stand."

The late Minister Kadirgamar disagreed with both tenets of Canada's LTTE policy, confirming that Canada was a major financier of terrorism in Sri Lanka and dismissing the rationale that designating the LTTE as a terrorist organization would hamper the peace process.

• (0915)

As with Taiwan, the principles of democracy must dominate our foreign policy. We must stand against terrorist organizations regardless of the number of votes they claim to control in Canada.

Moving on now to the Middle East, we have one pluralist democracy under attack from several violent dysfunctional states and their terrorist proxies. Israel is not perfect, but if there were seven Israeli-style democracies in the Middle East, the problems of that region would demand about as much world attention as Scandinavia. Yet Canada has chosen overwhelmingly to demonize the only

democracy, while failing to apply the same standards to others in the region.

On the subject of anti-Israeli resolutions at the UN, Canada made an announcement in late 2004 that it would end its traditional reflexive support for Israel's adversaries. Not only has there been no meaningful change in Canada's voting record, but true balance would require that Canada vote no on every anti-Israel resolution. That may sound unbalanced in the opposite direction, but let me explain the logic. These resolutions have not been an even-handed mechanism of censure applied proportionately to the wrongdoing of states. Instead they are used almost exclusively against Israel, while infinitely worse regimes are spared criticism. If over time the application of these resolutions became even-handed, then Canada could vote according to the merits of the resolution. But until that day, Canada is participating in an undemocratic bullying farce that only strengthens the promoter of violence and makes a mockery of the UN.

Does Canada's foreign aid promote peace and democracy in the Middle East? Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas came to office promising to disarm Palestinian militants, to end incitement in schools and the media, and to end the glorification of suicide bombing. Prime Minister Martin promised another \$12.2 million in May of this year, based on those commitments.

Since receiving those tax dollars, President Abbas has reneged on all his commitments, specifically: one, in June Abbas' foreign minister publicly declared the PA will not disarm Hamas and other terrorist groups under his jurisdiction; two, Palestinian textbooks and PA-controlled media that deny the existence of Israel and preach destruction of the Zionist entity have not changed; and three, Abbas himself, speaking to a group of high school students and educators in Gaza, glorified suicide bombing when he declared, "What has been achieved here"—in Gaza—"is due to the martyrs."

What were the consequences of all this? In September, our Prime Minister awarded Abbas' bad faith with another \$24.5 million from Canadian taxpayers.

Does it help the cause of peace to fund a government whose constitutional charter calls for the genocidal destruction of another people? Article 9 of the Palestinian Charter still clearly states, "Armed struggle is the only way to liberate Palestine." And article 20 states that Jews do not constitute a single nation with an identity of its own. This is no guarded secret. The constitutional charter of the PA is proudly displayed on the PA website for our government and our Prime Minister to read.

The Department of Foreign Affairs has tried to make the case that the funds are for humanitarian projects such as roads. However, funding is fungible, and money that is not spent on a road will be spent on violence against innocent Israelis, as evidenced by the funds available for atrocities committed or apprehended daily. Until those moneys are being spent building a responsible democratic society, Canadian dollars should not be adding fuel to the fire.

Canada has poured one-third of a billion dollars into the Palestinian territories, and today there is more violence, more hatred, and more dependency than ever. When a medicine produces such deadly adverse effects with no demonstrable benefit, a competent doctor will consider a strategy other than continually increasing the dosage, as demanded by the patient and his friends.

I could go on all day, but let me end the Middle East section with Canada's decision to continue funding UNRWA at a level of \$10 million per year, even after evidence was presented, including videos and an admission by UNRWA's secretary general that Hamas members run its payroll. Hamas is illegal in Canada. If I were to write a cheque for \$10 million to a foreign organization that funneled some of those funds to Hamas, I'd go to jail. Why is it acceptable for our Ministry of Foreign Affairs to fund this organization? And what benefit can be shown? I've asked that question a number of times, and I've only ever been told, "The Israelis want us to do it". So does Tel Aviv set our foreign policy?

I would prefer to hear that Canada has some reasons of its own for funding UNRWA, and these reasons actually work towards peace and democracy.

• (0920)

Finally, on United Nations reform, Canada has rightly called for reform of the UN, a forum that has become dominated by non-democratic nations. Yet Canada joins with the Muslim nations in opposing India's entry as a permanent member of the Security Council, just as Canada joins with undemocratic China in opposing Taiwan's entry as a member of the General Assembly.

Could there be better role models for aspiring democracy than India, a nation with 23 official languages united under the world's largest democracy, and Taiwan, a nation that has moved on its own from civil war, through military dictatorship, to full parliamentary democracy? Why would Canada not want these democratic success stories to have a voice at the United Nations?

What explanation could there be for such a foreign policy? It is often speculated that foreign policy is shaped to appeal to domestic voting blocs that our government is convinced it will lose if it does not serve the interests of violent groups claiming to represent those blocs. To me, that sounds like the racism of low expectations, believing that because a voter shares the ethnicity of a terrorist organization, he or she must also share its brutality.

The other explanation I hear is that at the ministerial level there is a genuine desire for a more pro-democracy foreign policy but that we have an unaccountable civil service whose sympathies are, not to put too fine a point on it, Islamist and left-wing.

I think I speak for the majority when I say that the minister has the support of millions of Canadians for doing the right thing, regardless of political or staff pressures.

I would like to end with a plea to the Canadian government to measure every foreign policy initiative against its impact on promoting democracy. While diplomacy, defence, development, and commerce are vital cornerstones of our foreign policy, they will never bring peace in the absence of democracy. But history has proven, time and time again, that diplomacy, defence, development, and commerce will all emerge organically from the growth of democratic nations, and with them, peace.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Gordon.

Mr. Posen, does anyone from your group have something to add to Mr. Gordon's statements?

Mr. Stephen Posen (Canadian Coalition for Democracies): Yes, thank you.

I will cover some of the same ground in a different way from what Mr. Gordon did and make a couple of other points. I'll talk a little bit about the Middle East, a little bit about Iran, and I'll then talk about what I think are some guiding principles that ought to be superceded over what presently is, in my view, Canadian government policy.

I will go from my memory for some of the extracts from the IPS that Mr. Gordon referred to.

Support for Israel to live within secure and recognized borders has been at the core of Canada's Mideast policy since 1948. Canada recognizes Israel's right to exist, a right to assure its own security, to take proportionate measures in accordance with international law.

In my respectful view, this touches on what I consider to be the reviled policy of equivalency between the Israelis, on the one hand, and its adversaries on the other. Just to tell you a little bit or remind you, the whole of Israel is approximately the size of the strip of Highway 401 from Windsor to Toronto. Its population is approximately the population of the greater Toronto area. That's what Israel is. Its opponents have enormous territories, enormous resources, and enormous populations.

What is Israel to do? What is meant by "proportionate" and "in keeping with international law"? That's a very striking thought, because since 1948, since the inception of this state, it has been under attack by overwhelming odds. What are they to do to exist? At least they recognize that they are in a war, and they are doing what they have to do to exist. There has been no time in history when any government under attack, such as the Israelis have been, has been so restrained, and by any other means, as Israel has. They've been attempting to target their counterattacks. They have been doing every possible thing they could. So again, what is meant by "proportionate" and "in keeping with international law"?

Secondly, Canada supports the Palestinian right of self-determination through negotiations. Canada is committed to a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace and creation of an independent, democratic, and contiguous state for the Palestinians.

Number one, there is no such thing as a distinct Palestinian Arab group. Around 1919, when the Jews started to come and populate that area, there were some Jews and there were some Arabs—very few of both, because it was largely wasteland. As the Jews came, they developed the economy, and more Arabs came to get employment. What are the Palestinians? Israelis, with all due respect, are Palestinians. There's no such thing as Arab Palestinians.

Number two, the peace conference in Paris after World War I agreed, and there was an agreement between the Arabs and the Jews, that the territory east of the Jordan River would be for the Arabs and all the territory west of the Jordan River would be for the Jews. The Arabs and the Jews agreed on that, and that principle was going to be the agreement in Paris of 1919. It fell apart only because the French wanted a greater influence in the part of the territory east of the Jordan River. The result was that the entire deal fell apart.

Next, the Arabs were given half of the territory west of the Jordan River, more or less, in 1947; and by action, they turned it down. They tried to eliminate Israel from the face of the earth at that time. The Arabs have never accepted Israel's right to exist. As Mr. Gordon referred to, their charter documents don't acknowledge Israel's right to exist.

They have had the chance to have their own state, over and over again, from 1948 to 2000. In the words of Israel's first foreign minister, or early foreign minister, Aba Eban, the Arabs have never missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity.

All this is despite the fact that 93% of the territory of what became Israel in 1948 was purchased by private Jewish money, from the Turkish owners, I guess.

This is on page 3 of your policy statement: "Canada does not recognize permanent Israeli control over territories occupied.... The settlements also constitute a serious obstacle to achieving a comprehensive and just and lasting peace." With all due respect, that's absolute, abject, and utter nonsense, because the territories, so called, the Judea and Samaria territories, were, as I said, agreed by the Arabs after World War I to be Jewish. I'm not claiming that should be Israel proper ultimately in the case of a peace conference, but it's not occupied territories; it's disputed territories.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Arabs have been given that territory.... They were given the territory in 1948, and I don't mean given as a matter of largesse; they were given as part of a deal. Notwithstanding that, they tried to take more and were defeated. They tried to take more again, at different times, and finally, in 1967 the Israelis said "Enough of this; we have to secure our own security, so we will take over this territory until we can have a just peace."

It has been offered. It was offered as recently as the year 2000, when Yasser Arafat walked away without so much as a counter-offer.

• (0925)

It's not an obstacle for peace. It was offered, and they have shown they don't want the West Bank territories in exchange for peace. They want Israel. So how can the settlements be an obstacle for peace?

Now, the general purpose, the primary purpose of a government is to protect the security of its citizens. Canada has a failing grade, in

my respectful submission, in its primary obligation. It does not recognize that we—the democracies of the world—are in a war against those who wish to attack them. It does not recognize that Israel is on the front line of that war, and it is not doing anything effective to try to defend me and my children against the war that we are in, a war that is not being recognized. You can't fight the war if you don't recognize it, and there's no indication whatever coming from the policy statement or from the government that it recognizes that this war is being waged against us. It allows statements and occurrences in Canada without response.

I'll just give you two examples.

The notorious events at Concordia University a few years ago, which were on television and video, showed criminal activities. It was easy to see that there were criminal events taking place. I requested from my former schoolmate Paul Martin, from my member of Parliament Carolyn Bennett, and from my former schoolmate Bill Graham nothing other than a statement condemning what happened at Concordia. I'm still awaiting that statement.

Most recently, there have been uncitable comments from Moslem clerics saying that Israel and Jews are legitimate targets. Quite frankly, I don't understand why those warlike events are taking place without response. There's no apparent plan to prevent terrorist attacks in Canada. We are just plain lucky. If you think that trying to be all things to all people in the world is going to protect us, well, being all things to all people is being nothing to anybody. We can't make friends with everybody. We can't. It's impossible because we have opponents and we are a democracy and we believe—I believe—in the democratic rights and freedoms of individuals. The fact that it's happened elsewhere in the world, such as in Spain, Italy, the United States, Great Britain, and the like, doesn't mean we're so skilful. We just have been lucky and actions are not being taken to protect us.

Now let me spend just a moment—I'm sorry for the length of my comments—on Iran.

Iran is a belligerent nation and dangerous. There can be no doubt about that. They are developing nuclear power, contrary to international requirements. They have most recently announced as a policy from the president, in holding an anti-Zionist conference, that the Israeli government should be wiped off the face of the earth. Canada's response, while laudable as far as it goes, which is to condemn such statements, reminds me of an event that happened to a friend of mine a few years ago in London, England. He threatened a restaurant that failed to serve us at a quarter to ten at night, when their closing hour was ten o'clock. He said, "Tomorrow morning there will be an official protest on your manager's desk." Well, that was a real threat that brought a lot of covering by the waiter staff. The fact is, it doesn't mean a thing. Statements are very lovely. What are we going to do?

So I'm going to suggest what we might do.

Every decision to be made on Canada's foreign policy must be measured against Canadian values of individual democratic rights and freedoms. All actions must be taken in accordance with that. We must stop trying to placate or support countries that do not accord those democratic rights and freedoms.

Why are we taking a one-China policy? Why are we saying that China is only one country and therefore you, sir, in China dictate that we cannot have the leaders of the Taiwanese government come to visit Canada, because it will offend you? Why? So we can get more cheap goods from China and destroy our own jobs? What is the benefit of that type of policy? There is no benefit. So we must stop doing that.

As Iran moves closer to producing nuclear weapons with Pakistani technology, there is a genuine threat to world peace. What is Canada going to do about it? Are we going to make a statement that Iran said something bad about Israel, a fellow democracy, that they were going to wipe them off the face of the earth?

If Canada is to be true to its principles, we must suspend all diplomatic relations with Iran immediately. If Canada continues to trade with and deal with these people, it would be like having been in continuous diplomatic relations with Germany during World War II.

• (0930)

And secondly, Canada should do everything necessary to bring all criminals to account before the International Court of Justice. Abdul Qadeer Khan of Pakistan assisted in the proliferation of nuclear weapons by trading or giving knowledge to Iran and North Korea.

I think that, with all due respect, Canada should be taking the lead in pushing for these types of steps to try to change these dynamics as they presently exist. It should not just make statements but take action to support democratic rights and freedoms. If you just think "democracy" with every single decision, you will make the right decision. If you think "placating" and try to be all things to all people with every decision, which is what I perceive the statement intended to do, you will always make the wrong decision.

Thank you very much.

• (0935)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Posen.

Now we'll go with Mr. Chen.

Mr. Harry Chen (President, Formosan Association for Public Affairs (Canada)): Honourable Chair and members of the committee, my name is Harry Chen, president of the Formosan Association for Public Affairs, Canada. I also speak today with the support of the Taiwanese Canadian Association. We are delighted to have this opportunity to express our views on the implications of the government's recent international policy statement for Canada's relations with Taiwan.

To begin, as a Canadian citizen I can say we strongly support the IPS statement that "Canada's continued success depends on the joint pursuit of democracy, human rights and the rule of law". As Canadians of Taiwanese origin, we affirm that Taiwan is, like Canada, a sovereign democratic state that respects the fundamental rights and freedoms of its citizens. As such, the 23 million people of

Taiwan should have their right to decide the future of their island nation.

Today I want to argue that there are two implications of the international policy statement for our Canadian Taiwan policy. First, Canada's Taiwan policy should be made in Canada and not in China. Second, the Taiwan Affairs Act, Bill C-357, currently before the House expresses this spirit of the IPS in a way consistent with Canadian foreign policy towards Taiwan and thus should be passed.

First, Canada's Taiwan policy should be made in Canada not in China. In 1966 Paul Martin Senior, then Secretary of State for External Affairs of the Pearson government, told the UN General Assembly "Canada has never recommended a two-China policy. We have recommended a policy of 'One China, One Taiwan'".

On October 13, 1970, Canada recognized the People's Republic of China as the sole government of China, "taking note" of its claim that Taiwan is part of China, Mitchell Sharp, Secretary of State for External Affairs, told the House that "takes note" meant we "neither challenge nor endorse" China's position. This is our one-China policy, which holds that the status of Taiwan is an important international issue and Canada is open to any outcome that is keeping with our principles—that is, democracy, human rights, rule of law, and peaceful resolution of all international disputes.

China's one-China policy, however, is one China, no Taiwan. China's insistent claim that Taiwan is an internal issue for China is exactly a Chinese strategy to remove its aggression towards Taiwan from the rule of international law. Canada should make it very clear that our one-China policy does not accept this.

On his recent visit to Canada, PRC President Hu Jintao complained in a September 8 press conference that "There are some 'annoying noises' in Canada on the Taiwan issue in recent years. I want the Canadian government to deal with them properly, so that it won't harm the political foundation of Sino-Canada relations". More recently, Chinese Ambassador Lu, in a speech to the media, threatened consequences to Canada if you honourable members passed the Taiwan Affairs Act.

We are concerned that, in the eagerness to sell more donuts to China, someone in the government will abandon the principle of the international policy statement and allow Canada's Taiwan policy to be made in China. We appeal to this committee to make sure this does not happen.

Second, the international policy statement requires that the Taiwan Affairs Act be passed. In the policy statement Prime Minister Paul Martin has identified five responsibilities to push forward Canada's international agenda, beginning with the responsibility to protect. At the very minimum this will entail a requirement to protect the peaceful status quo in the Taiwan Strait. Currently Taiwan is facing a continuing threat from China with the apparent tacit approval of Canada and other western countries.

●(0940)

It cannot be in the interest of Canada for Asia's most vibrant democracy to be forcefully annexed by Asia's biggest dictatorships. Canada has the responsibility to prevent this military conflict from breaking out between China and her neighbour by actively supporting human rights and democracy and the rule of law in both China and Taiwan.

It must make a strong statement that unilateral change in status quo by China will not be accepted by the international community. The Taiwan Affairs Act proposes that Canada, among other things, conduct our foreign relations on the basis that peace and stability in east Asia are in the political, security, and economic interests of Canada in a measure of international concern, and consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means a threat to the peace and security of the Asia-Pacific region and of great concern to Canada.

This is exactly an expression of the responsibility to protect. This bill is in accordance with our made-in-Canada one-China policy and will give a firm principled foundation to our relationship with Taiwan, sparing Canada, Taiwan, and China from the vagaries of changing policy opinion and political or economic pressure.

In conclusion, then, we would like to reiterate that Canada's Taiwan policies must be made in Canada, not made in China. Passing the Taiwan Affairs Act, Bill C-357, is a logical implementation of the principle articulated in the international policy statement.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Do you have anything to add, Mr. Lin?

Mr. Albert Lin (Professor, Formosan Association for Public Affairs (Canada)): Yes, sir, if I may. Thank you.

I would like to give you a little bit more background leading into the new developments in diplomatic relations between the People's Republic of China and Canada.

Canada was involved as an active member of the allied powers in defending democracy against imperialism in those days. And when the war ended in 1945, as you are aware, Canada was one of the signatories to the San Francisco Peace Treaty, which became effective April 28, 1952. In its article 2(b), which related to Formosa and the Pescadores, as Taiwan was known in those days, it stipulates that Japan renounce all rights, title, and claim over Formosa and the Pescadores, a group of islands in the Taiwan Strait, without specifying the beneficiary.

The Canadian government was very much aware of this particular international nature of Taiwan. Therefore, in 1961 our deputy representative to the UN, Senator Alfred J. Brooks, said the following at this particular occasion of the 1074th plenary meeting of the 16th session of the UN General Assembly, where it was recorded and is on the record.

The Canadian position on the legal status of Taiwan has been firmly based on legal principles and moral consequence, as

witnessed by the Canadian delegation of the UN General Assembly, as I said. The quotation is the following:

Let me say plainly at the outset that the Canadian delegation is ready to consider carefully any proposal to settle equitably the question of Chinese representation. I stress the word "equitably". There are those who claim that wrong has been done to one of the parties concerned.

This is regarding the admission of China to the UN in those days.

They are entitled to that opinion, but I cannot believe that any delegation in this Assembly

—that is, the UN General Assembly—

would seriously seek to right what it considers to be one wrong by the creation of another.

If I may continue to quote:

It is the firm opinion of my delegation

—that is, the Canadian delegation—

that there must be preserved for the people of Formosa the right to self-determination, that is, the right to decide their own future. The right of all peoples to a voice in their own destinies is one that is fundamental to the purposes of the United Nations. Subject to due respect to that right in this matter before us, the Canadian delegation will, I repeat, give the most earnest attention to any proposals which may be advanced.

This has been the fundamental position of Canadian foreign policy regarding Taiwan, which was followed and continued and honoured by the Secretary of State, Paul Martin, Senior. He said the following, as recorded in the *Canadian Yearbook of International Law*:

We consider that the isolation of Communist China from a large part of normal international relations is dangerous. We are prepared to accept the reality of the victory in mainland China in 1949. ... We consider, however, that the effective political independence of Taiwan is a political reality too.

And that political reality continues even today, which is an effective and vibrant democracy.

●(0945)

As a democratic state, their people should have full rights. Therefore, I certainly appeal to honourable members of the committee and MPs to make sure that the Canadian policy is made in Canada, not elsewhere, and the Taiwan Affairs Act, Bill C-357, should be passed.

Thank you.

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

We are going to go to question and answer, but before that I'll ask Mr. Gordon a first question.

Mr. Gordon, in your statement, on the last page, you talk about United Nations reform. You say on the second line, "Yet Canada joins with the Muslim nations in opposing India's entry as a permanent member of the security Council". I want to understand where you found this, because my understanding regarding this is that Canada is not opposing it, there was no such.... India made the request to be a permanent member of the Security Council. So the same as Germany wants to be, Brazil wants to be, Japan wants to be, India wants to be on the Security Council. And they all have good reasons to be there.

But you understand that this final decision.... There are a lot of studies about this in the United Nations. We've been in committee in New York; we went with Madame Fréchette and we met with many people over there, and our understanding regarding this is that Canada doesn't oppose it. The fact is that if India requests a seat, Pakistan would like to get a seat also. If Germany wants a seat, Spain and Italy would oppose Germany being there. It's the same as Brazil. Mexico would oppose having Brazil over there. And it's the same for Japan: Russia and China will be opposed to Japan.

But you say that Canada joins with the Muslim nations in opposing India's entry. I don't know where you find this, and I'd like to get something more about this, about where you are taking it from.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: In the case of India, I think it is different from Spain, for example, just by virtue of its population.

The Chair: I understand why they want this, but you say Canada joins in opposing India.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Correct.

The Chair: I don't think Canada ever opposed anyone. There was never a vote on this. There was discussion about it. But you say—

• (0950)

Mr. Alastair Gordon: There was discussion about it—

The Chair: —Canada opposed India.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: If you look at Canada's statements, you will see they are in opposition to India becoming a permanent member of the Security Council. I can get those exact statements for you.

The Chair: Sure, I would like to see them.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Perhaps, Naresh, you've been more—

The Chair: Sure, that's why we are here, to get a debate.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer (Executive Director, Canadian Coalition for Democracies): In conversation with staff members at the Department of Foreign Affairs, we were informed that Canada will not—and I quote, “not”—support India's bid to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council. You are joining with Pakistan and with other Islamic nations who would oppose India's bid for that position. It is clearly a position we do not agree with. We think it is a betrayal of democratic values. It is a betrayal of the world's largest democracy, functional democracy, and it is a betrayal of our special relationship with India. We have great concerns with that.

We would urge members of this committee to certainly return back and urge the Canadian government to support India's bid for a permanent seat at the UN Security Council.

The Chair: But your quote, if I understand you properly.... You say that a staff member told you this; it was not the minister or the government officially who said that.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: He spoke on behalf of the minister, as your public relations officer.

The Chair: Is it a public officer? Is he from India—a desk officer from India?

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: No, it was not. It was your public relations officer, and I can get you the name.

I think the challenge for you, as members of Parliament—if you do support India's bid for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council—is to say so, because no one in the Canadian government has actually said they support India's bid for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. In fact, members of Parliament from the Liberal Party, the governing party of this country, and political staff and ministerial staff have indicated that Canada will not support India's bid.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roger Clavet (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Chair, I have a question to ask you about my parliamentary privileges.

The Chair: Monsieur Clavet.

Mr. Roger Clavet: Mr. Chair, you have just referred to a document that was submitted to you. I had no access to this document and I was wondering if it is my privilege, as a member, to have access to documents that were submitted.

The Chair: Yes, you're quite right.

Mr. Roger Clavet: Thank you

[*English*]

The Chair: Do you want to ask a question, Monsieur Clavet?

Go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roger Clavet: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My first question is addressed to all witnesses. Early in his presentation, Mr. Gordon talked a lot, as well as other witnesses, of the Canadian policy towards China and Taiwan.

Being the Asia-Pacific critic for the Bloc Québécois, this issue is very important to me. I would like to ask you the following question, instead of trying to answer it from this side. Let me first give you an overview of the situation. You will understand that Quebec considers very favourably the steps taken by Taiwan towards self-determination. It is easy to understand why we support someone who is taking the same steps as we are. However, no one should get ahead of a nation on the move. For example, Quebecers would not wish anyone to take them by the hand.

This leads me to Canada's one China policy and to the more recent Mr. Pettigrew's one Canada policy, which means that only Canada has the capacity to deal with international matters.

In view of Quebec's position, do you find it normal for Canada to be the only one to speak for its constituent parts on the international scene? Conversely, if you were in our place, how would you like this policy which was forcefully reaffirmed by Mr. Pettigrew? Do you think Canada can only speak in its own name as regards provinces, territories and so on?

[*English*]

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Good morning.

[*Translation*]

I am like Quebec

[English]

on this subject. I don't believe Canada speaks for me either on our attitude toward China and Taiwan. If any group of people within Canada goes through a democratic process and decides it no longer wants to be part of Canada—whether that is Quebec, Alberta, or anybody else who does not feel there's a case to be made for Canada any more—that is its right.

I think the situation of Canada believing it has a right to determine the fate of independent Taiwan would be like Ireland signing a treaty committing us to a one-Canada policy that would forever preclude the possibility of Quebec being an independent nation.

I'm with you 100%, Roger.

• (0955)

Mr. Roger Clavet: Does someone else want to comment?

The Chair: Mr. Chen.

Mr. Harry Chen: We have already affirmed that Taiwan is a sovereign democratic country. The people of Taiwan lived under fifty years of dictatorship, as you may know, and they have gone through an enormous struggle to get this far. Now it's a fully democratic state. So it is very unfair for a country like Canada or any other western country to say that Taiwan belongs to China. I don't think it is a fair statement to make.

[Translation]

Mr. Roger Clavet: I would like to hear Mr. Raghubeer's reaction. I will also take this opportunity to ask him a question about the permanent Security Council seats.

[English]

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Before I speak about permanent representation on the Security Council, I would like to comment on your previous statement about Quebec's representation with the democratic country of Taiwan.

I think Quebec should be encouraged to establish special trade relationships, as all provinces should. Should you have the authority to do so, we encourage Quebeckers—whether they are members from the Bloc Québécois, or Liberal members from Quebec—to visit Taiwan and work with them to support their democratic government. Then one day if Alberta or Ontario has the right to have political representation on foreign affairs, certainly the provinces should be able to do that. We encourage it as much as we can.

Can you please repeat your question about the Indian...?

[Translation]

Mr. Roger Clavet: About India's position and its potential election as a permanent member of the Security Council, which you favour, you seem to say that in its policy statement, Canada did not really have the courage of its convictions.

What would you have wished Canada to do, apart from unilaterally declaring its support? What would you have liked to see about India in the Canadian policy statement?

[English]

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Thank you.

Canada, as pertaining to India, should be much more courageous. We have better trading relationships and better diplomatic relationships with communist dictatorships. We give foreign aid to the communist dictatorship of China, but we do not support the democratic country of India, with over one billion people.

Our foreign policy should be clearly pro-India because India is a sister democracy. We should have a special or free trade zone with India—free trade agreements. We should have special relationships to protect India from cross-border terrorism from Pakistan. We should be clear. We should not meddle in India's domestic affairs, but we should work with India to help build that vibrant democracy and help India enter the world as a lead player.

We already know, Mr. Clavet, that India wishes to play a greater role in global peacekeeping efforts. India has offered foreign aid to Pakistan. India is ready to be a leader in the world, but Canada and our foreign policy have been anything but supportive of India's wishes to be a leader in the world.

[Translation]

Mr. Roger Clavet: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Clavet.

[English]

Mr. Lin.

Mr. Albert Lin: Canada's policy has definitely been consistent since 1970 that there is only one China, but that China doesn't include Taiwan, as Paul Martin Sr. said clearly. That was stated at the UN General Assembly in 1961 as well.

So the rights of the people of a democratic state.... As Harry said, Taiwan went through forty-some years of dictatorship, yet it is a vibrant democracy and they should enjoy that particular one. Of course the Canadian one-China policy should encourage human rights and democracy in China as well. That's another aspect of the one-China policy.

Thank you.

• (1000)

[Translation]

Mr. Roger Clavet: Thank you very much

The Chair: Thank you

Ms. Phinney.

[English]

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): First I'd like to thank you for being here today.

I'd like to just try to straighten up a little bit your last few comments. I got very confused: we're not supposed to interfere in India's domestic affairs, and we do support dictatorships, but we've never offered any aid to India. I think you really mean we're not supporting India on this one thing about its position in the United Nations. I don't think you're saying we've never offered aid to India. Am I correct in that?

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Yes, Canada has offered aid in the past, and India has been a recipient of aid. But it has been a recent policy of India to not accept foreign aid, and I wish China would follow that policy as well.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Okay. I just want to correct what you're saying. So as far as you're concerned, Canada is not supporting India's attempts to gain a different position at the United Nations right now, but we have offered aid to India. We have aided India in a lot of ways, whether it was for health matters, medical things, or whatever, but we have helped India over the years. You're not saying we've never helped India.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: That's right.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Okay. Thank you. I didn't quite understand all that.

In the last year or so we've experienced a large number of catastrophic events in the world. I'm just wondering if you think we should use the same criteria in offering aid to the people of those countries as we would for diplomatic relations.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: No, I think it's an entirely separate issue. If people are dying and suffering as a result of a natural catastrophe, our obligation is to the humanitarian dimension, regardless of the political dimension. But it is also an obligation on our part to ensure that the method of delivering the funding does not result in more death and suffering than we're preventing as a result of the humanitarian effort. That comes into play when we fund certain NGOs that have a history of funding violent entities with money we thought was aimed at humanitarian undertakings in the affected countries.

Ms. Beth Phinney: After the comment that we shouldn't be interfering with India's democratic process or their domestic policies, do you feel that in every country, if a group of people decided they didn't want to do what their country did, we should be aiding those people?

Mr. Alastair Gordon: I'm sorry—could you clarify that?

Ms. Beth Phinney: In any country in the world that's a democratic country, if a group of people in that country don't believe the same thing their democratic government believes, do you think we should be aiding those people who are not supporting their democratic government?

Mr. Alastair Gordon: I think it's a question of means. Certainly there are 50% of Americans who don't agree with their government, but they're not using terrorism; they're not slaughtering people; they're not beheading people; they're not recruiting child terrorists to advance their political goal.

I would say unequivocally that under no circumstances should we support people employing violent or terrorist means to achieve their political ends. My disagreement is not with the fact that they are not in sync with their government. My disagreement is that we fund their methods, which are the antithesis of democracy and humanity.

Ms. Beth Phinney: If this group of people were not using violence but were just not in favour of the democratic ideas of the present government, would you be supporting them, if they had some other idea and wanted to separate? If one of the states of the United States didn't like what was going on and said "we're going to

separate", would you be supporting them over the democratically elected government of the United States?

Mr. Alastair Gordon: I would remain absolutely and unequivocally neutral, because it's none of my business. That would be along the lines of my criticism of Canada for deciding it has a role to play in the self-determination of Taiwan.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Or of Quebec, in Canada?

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Well, no. I just want to say one thing about —

Ms. Beth Phinney: I think the implication earlier, and what we would be left with, was the idea that you would support any kind of idea from any part of any democratic country if they wanted to work towards separation.

• (1005)

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Absolutely.

I mean, for example—

Ms. Beth Phinney: Is the answer absolutely yes, or absolutely no?

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Absolutely yes. Czechoslovakia made the democratic decision to break up into the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and it was within the right of both of those new republics to do that.

I don't want Canada to break up, but if an overwhelming majority of Quebecers decide that Canada should break up, then it is not my right to use force of arms or other forms of coercion to keep them as part of Canada. We need to make the case positively for Quebec remaining in Canada, not with any kind of coercive methods, which I would not support.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Okay. What you said was similar to what you said before, but before you didn't say anything about using force. It was just a statement that you support anybody who wants to go in this direction, but you didn't talk about using force to stop them. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Ma'am, our grievance and what we are arguing is that Canada should do much more in supporting democratic movements within dictatorships, within tyrannies, within communist blocs, whether it's in Belarus or—

Ms. Beth Phinney: I just wanted to clarify that for your sake.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: But whether it's in Lebanon, where Canada has been anything but supportive of a democratic movement there.... We are in fact siding with the terrorists and the killers and the puppet masters from Syria, rather than supporting the democratic will of the people. I think all Canadians would want our government to support democracy and the democratic rights of people, rather than supporting tyrants.

Ms. Beth Phinney: I just wanted to be sure you were correctly reflected on the record.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: I want to give you an example of where the Liberal government did an excellent job in supporting emerging democracies. That was in our supervision of the Ukrainian elections and our refusal to accept the results of the first election, which were clearly tainted. If that model could be applied in the Middle East, in the Far East, and in countless other places where we choose, for some reason, not to apply it, I would have no complaints with Canadian foreign policy.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Thank you.

Mr. Stephen Posen: Can I just add one brief comment?

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Posen.

Mr. Stephen Posen: Just very briefly, I don't think it's a matter of foreign affairs that we discuss the situation of Quebec in Canada. I know we're doing it by analogy, but I think that is straying into a different area that we may not all be consistent in our views about. That's all I wanted to say at this moment.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. McDonough.

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

I have to say that all members of the committee are operating at a bit of a disadvantage this morning. Normally we're aware in advance who we'll be hearing from, and receive copies of the briefs, background information, résumés and information about the organizations. Ideally, we're then in a position to really think through some of the presentations.

You've now presented on a pretty broad range of things, so it's difficult to figure out where to dive in.

If I could just ask—though it's probably not the best use of the committee's time for us to spend a lot of time on this here this morning—if each of you could present a bit of background information, or direct us to a website or information on your respective organizations. I say this because our job as members is twofold, or maybe threefold: one is to hear the views of Canadians; another is to try to weigh the views in some way, to get some sense of how representative the views are of Canadians; and finally, to come together across political party lines, though we don't exactly share the same views on all issues, to arrive at as near a consensus as possible in putting forward a report to Parliament.

So I wonder if I could just ask very briefly—and then perhaps you could each provide some background information—for a little bit more about your respective organizations, whether you have boards of directors, what the size of your membership is, and if you can direct us to some more background information or supply us with some.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Probably the quickest way to find out about the Canadian Coalition for Democracies, other than speaking to our parole officers, is to go to canadiancoalition.com, our website.

In ten seconds, the Canadian Coalition for Democracies is a completely non-partisan, multi-faith, multi-ethnic, grassroots organization, whose uniting principle is democracy. That's why we don't simply have Jews supporting Israel, Lebanese supporting Lebanon, Coptic Christians supporting their constituency in Egypt, or Hindus supporting India. We basically have everybody who believes in

democracy speaking on behalf of the democracies that are under siege around the world, especially where those democracies are being harmed or are not helped by Canadian foreign policy.

So in a nutshell, that's what it is.

• (1010)

Ms. Alexa McDonough: Thank you.

Mr. Stephen Posen: If I may just add, I think it's also fair to say that we do have a board of directors, numbering 30, more or less, and a membership in the thousands. Our representative communities are Christian and Hindu, and we have Muslim representatives and the groups Mr. Gordon just referred to, representing communities whose members probably number in the millions. I don't know how many millions, because we've not counted, but the spokespeople from the communities represent a great, wide variety, and a large number of Canadians.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Chen, did you want to add something?

Mr. Harry Chen: I just want to give you some brief background on the FAPA, the Formosan Association for Public Affairs. It was established in 1990, and is not only of Taiwanese origin, but also has some other people who agree with our idea of promoting Taiwan-Canada relations. We are an umbrella organization for the Taiwanese Canadian community, or the Taiwanese immigrants here in Canada. Of course, people in this organization mostly speak for Taiwanese Canadian interests.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Beth Phinney: On that note, could we know where your funding comes from?

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Our funding? We are so far in the hole, you wouldn't believe it.

You are looking at the main source of funding. People around the table, each time we hit the wall, write cheques. That's where our funding comes from.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: And not one penny comes from the government.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Not a penny comes from the government, or from any other organization.

Mr. Stephen Posen: No, but the answer to your question is that we get funding from a wide variety of sources—

Ms. Beth Phinney: Organizations.

Mr. Stephen Posen: —in both small and large amounts. We operate on a fairly small budget, but our funding is coming from a number of different communities and a number of different people.

What Mr. Gordon is saying playfully is that it's mostly from around the table, but we do have large numbers of donors providing varying or differing amounts.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: We're independently poor.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Okay.

Mr. Chen.

The Chair: So you could be independent.

Mr. Harry Chen: To qualify also, the main funding is from the membership fee; it's \$20 a year. And then we have some people who donate. Taiwanese Canadians who agree with our goal and who want to help us donate \$100, \$200, that kind of thing.

We are a small and poor organization, but we want to do big things.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: May I just add one point? It is just to stress that we made a conscious decision not to be like other NGOs. The Canadian Coalition for Democracies wanted to be an organization that would be independent of government funding. We felt that having government funding would compromise our ability to provide an independent analysis of issues, and we would, down the road, become arms of the government or find ourselves advocating policies that the government would want us to if we were dependent on their funding.

We made a decision not to depend on the Canadian taxpayer to subsidize or to support our organization. We're appealing based on the merit of our case, the merit of supporting democracy, and so far Canadians have been generous.

The Chair: Thank you.

Next is Ms. Guergis.

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

Good morning. Thanks for being here.

Throughout your presentations, I think some of the words have actually even come out of my own mouth, in particular with respect to China. Usually I ask the question on why you think Paul Martin and the Liberals are continuing to give foreign aid to countries like China and to a corrupt regime such as Zimbabwe's. In fact, China gives foreign aid to Zimbabwe.

When you speak with Canadians on this, as I have many times, they are completely confused. They don't understand why. I'm wondering if you have some reasons as to why you think the government continues to do that. But before you answer, I want to go on a little bit about a couple of other things.

I want you to know that I fully support the Taiwan Affairs Act, my colleague Jim Abbott's private member's bill. It's my understanding that the committee is hoping to hear some legal advice on that private member's bill at some point. I look forward to hearing it, as I'm sure my colleagues do.

Since I became the international cooperation critic for the party, I've heard the minister say many times that countries following good governance, with a good human rights record, a good civil service, an independent judiciary—those sorts of things—are the countries that will qualify for foreign aid. Quite obviously, that is not the current situation. If you've had conversations with the minister and can share that information with us to see what some of her answers have been to you in the past, I'd appreciate it.

I have two other points here. One is a question specifically on human rights and the role they play in Canada's role in giving out development aid and Canada's decision to trade with countries. How important do you think that should be on the top of a list of

priorities? Should it tell us whether we should be trading or should be giving out our aid?

The second point is on the Tamil Tigers. I'd like one of you to comment on that for me. It seems that every major government, including the European Union, has listed them as terrorists, but in Canada we don't seem to do that. If you have some advice for me on that, I'd appreciate it.

•(1015)

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Helena, I think you asked the ultimate question: who benefits from Canada's China policy?

I cannot find a beneficiary I could talk about without being sued. What I mean is that it clearly isn't the Canadian economy. The balance of trade is overwhelmingly from China to Canada, so any threat to trade would not hurt Canada, it would hurt China. So it isn't trade, it isn't jobs, it isn't the economy. It certainly isn't the respect for sovereign nations, because Canada's foreign policy towards Tibet and Taiwan is completely dictated from Beijing, so it has nothing to do with sovereignty or an independent foreign policy. It certainly isn't respect for democracy, or we would not be trashing the rights of 23 million democratic Taiwanese.

What it comes down to is the big unanswered question: who is the beneficiary?

It is certainly not any broad group within Canada. The best that I've been informed is that a fairly small and select group of corporate interests happens to be very, very close to those who make our China policy, and they are the main beneficiaries. I have no evidence that is the case, but in the absence of evidence you tend to look for the most plausible explanation, and I've not found anything more plausible than that.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: I would like to respond to the question about foreign aid, and then I'll return to Mr. Gordon to comment on the LTTE.

With Canada's decision to designate a large percentage of our foreign aid to 25 underdeveloped countries, we have a bit of a concern with that, because unfortunately we are giving foreign aid right now, or we are designating those 25 countries. We assume they're going to be worthy recipients, but in a Freedom House survey of those 25 countries, 19 were undemocratic or faced major problems with corruption and the ways they spend their money.

I was born and raised in one of those countries—in Guyana in South America. I can suggest to you that while Guyana was not one of the worst of the 19, Guyana was actually one of the top six in that 25. Guyana is still a very undemocratic country—

The Chair: Did you say “Guyana” or “Ghana”?

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Guyana—British Guiana, formerly.

The Chair: British Guiana...you see, they're not a member of the 25 countries.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Yes, they are, unless you have changed that, but Guyana was—

The Chair: It's next to French Guiana, Cayenne.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: It is.

Ms. Helena Guergis: Yes, it's on the list.

The Chair: Good. Sorry.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Ghana is.

Ms. Helena Guergis: We just clarified it. It's right there—G-U-Y-A-N-A.

The Chair: We'll find out.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Ghana is in Africa.

I have done my research, trust me, as a native of that country.

Guyana, although it's receiving foreign aid, has a major problem with corruption and the way it spends our foreign aid. So I think if Canada actually really wants to promote a better living condition and end poverty, as it seems to be our goal, we have to be extremely vigilant in terms of giving aid to countries that have problems with corruption.

If Canada's foreign policy were to take the course of Norway, for example, Norway has been a strong advocate to ensure that corruption ends before the aid gets there. They have been leaders in Africa, specifically Kenya, to stamp out corruption. I think if Canada would implement a policy in which we did much more to end corruption before we gave aid or we set conditions on our aid, our aid would be much more effective and actually get to the people instead of to leaders who like to drive around in Mercedes-Benzes.

• (1020)

Ms. Helena Guergis: You said you had looked at the 25 and developed a.... Can I have that information where you've looked at the countries?

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Sure. I'll be happy to share it with you.

Ms. Helena Guergis: I'd appreciate it...with the committee, of course, and through the clerk.

I'll stop there and let you go ahead.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: I just wanted to give a glib short answer to one aspect of your question, which was what criteria ought to be used.

I want to come back to this. I think if we use democracies, individual rights and freedoms and liberties as the guiding light to all international decisions, we will always make the correct decision. And if we use trying to be friends with all kinds of people and trying to be everything to everybody as our guiding principle, which appears largely, or on occasions at least, to be the case, we will always in those circumstances make the wrong decision.

So that's my response to that aspect of your question.

Ms. Helena Guergis: Well, thank you. I agree with you.

Mr. Posen, I am coming to you next.

Many times in the past the government has insisted they don't give money government to government, and when I look on the website I can see government to government, and even in China it's ministry of something that is a partner. So I'm still a little bit confused about that, as I'm sure most Canadians are, when I constantly ask the question. Nonetheless, it doesn't really matter, because it is still the Canadian taxpayer dollar that goes to a corrupt regime.

So I'll just put that out there.

Mr. Stephen Posen: Maybe members of the committee would want to look into this. There is a troubling trend from the CIDA end in terms of where aid is given. We are now moving towards funding independent agencies in those countries that are outside of the reach of the Auditor General and our audits. We're moving towards that in Guyana. Guyana is actually a test case for that, where a former staff member from the CIDA office established an independent agency and is now heading the aid recipient group.

So I think there are certain areas this committee should look into, and be very wary that foreign aid is going to agencies that are outside of our arms and outside of the audit trail.

Ms. Helena Guergis: Okay.

Mr. Albert Lin: Foreign aid should be development-tied as well as democracy-tied, and we should look for partners with additional programs, such as programs of empowerment of the people through grassroots organizations, in such a way that people eventually will feel a full ownership of and sense of belonging to these Canadian development aid programs and will learn democratic means and ways as they improve the quality of their lives. This would be a long-lasting approach, rather than an approach of giving money here and there and of course ending up somewhere else, instead of benefiting the people.

The Chair: Thank you.

Do you have another question?

Ms. Helena Guergis: If I can, I—

The Chair: Go ahead, it should be no problem. We are in between.

Ms. Helena Guergis: I happened to send a little e-mail. I was just curious to see whether I could get the answer. It says here that the CPC—our party—will support India's joining the Security Council.

I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Okay, I'll just add—

Ms. Beth Phinney: What is that?

Ms. Helena Guergis: I said I had e-mailed my colleague asking whether the Conservatives would support India's joining the Security Council, and my answer back was yes.

The Chair: Fine.

I just have one comment concerning the 25 countries. We have been in 25 countries.... I don't want to defend CIDA; that's not my role as the chair. It is just that we find out that when the Prime Minister or anybody, such as the Minister of Foreign Affairs, travels—they travel everywhere in the world—they promise everything to every country. This is why we have diminished from so many countries to 25 and are trying to get into countries where there is some hope of helping. If you look at Africa, there are many countries in Africa.... If you ask me to give money to a democratic country in Africa, you are not going to find that many we could support in Africa. In the eastern bloc, the only country we are in at present is Ukraine, because we feel the Ukraine needs Canada for the moment. They need a lot.

I was in Ukraine three weeks ago. We met with the Prime Minister. They really need Canada there, and this is why we are present there. It is not easy, but the question is, if we don't want to give the money to the government.... We've tried to build relations with some NGOs there that our ambassador or people—I mean Canadian citizens—present would say were good NGOs. But if they say of an NGO that they're not that keen, we also have problems sometimes. There is not an easy solution.

My question is, how can we stop corruption in a country? We need to be present in a certain way to try to build up some good governance there.

•(1025)

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Just in response to that—"how could we stop corruption?"—you could stop corruption by stopping giving aid to those who are corrupt, by being vigilant in the audit trail, by tying our foreign aid to certain conditions in those countries. If you are giving foreign aid—let's say, as Norway has been doing in Kenya.... They have tied it to democratic reform, to implementation of the rule of law, to an effective and functional parliament.

Until we start doing that, until we start putting expectations on those governments who are recipients of Canadian taxpayer dollars, they will not have a reason to change. When you establish benchmarks or goals in foreign aid, you will get results. If you refuse to do that and simply hand out money, as we have been doing, you will continue to get the same bad results all the time.

The Chair: You talked about Kenya. By meeting with Mr. Wolfowitz two weeks ago.... He told us that in Kenya they have problems. Norway set some benchmarks, but Kenya is difficult. It is very difficult there to put benchmarks; there is not an easy solution.

We want to help by just letting you know about this.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: The objection should not be avoiding the difficult decisions. There are no easy solutions to getting aid directly to the people. But as long as we continue to give aid to those areas and regimes and people who are corrupt, we will not get the right results. We have to start making hard decisions, looking for the tougher choices and tougher roads, and we will get better results.

The Chair: Mr. Posen, and then Madame—

Mr. Stephen Posen: I would like, if I may, to take the opportunity

The Chair: We have five minutes left.

Mr. Stephen Posen: I would like to take the opportunity to ask the committee a question. On any criteria, could the committee please explain what is the benefit to Canada's providing funding aid to the Palestinian Authority, whose sponsor states are among the wealthiest countries in the world?

The Chair: Ms. Phinney? Do you have a question?

Ms. Helena Guergis: I'll pass that one to you.

Ms. Beth Phinney: No, you asked me if I had a question.

The Chair: No, no, no. Ms. Guergis, do you have a question?

Ms. Beth Phinney: I don't think we're here to answer questions. I think we're here to take information from you—

Mr. Stephen Posen: Okay.

Ms. Beth Phinney: —to the foreign affairs minister to help make policy. I don't think we're here for that.

Mr. Stephen Posen: The question, then, is rhetorical. But I think

Ms. Beth Phinney: Yes.

Mr. Stephen Posen: —it suggests its own answer.

Ms. Beth Phinney: All right.

I think CIDA is trying very hard and does lots of wonderful things, and it's like the situation with Norway: sometimes we go in with the idea we would like this and this to be going on, and it changes during the process of getting aid over there, etc. I'm not going to admit that everything that CIDA does is wrong, because I think that's incorrect. But I think you said that CIDA aid is going to an independent agency and that—

The Chair: In Guyana.

Ms. Beth Phinney: In Guyana. I am sorry. This was in alphabetical order, then all of a sudden at the end, after Zambia came Bolivia and Guyana. That's why I didn't see Guyana. It was after Z, and it shouldn't have been in that order. A weird alphabet from our research person....

Anyway, you mentioned that CIDA was setting up an independent agency, which they probably know the auditor would not be able to get at.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Well, no, CIDA is now giving aid to independent agencies or groups to administer the aid for that country.

Ms. Beth Phinney: You then said CIDA was setting up an independent agency.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: They're not directly setting it up. A former employee of CIDA, I was led to believe, left her work with CIDA to establish an independent organization or business, which is now the recipient organization of Canadian aid for that country.

Ms. Beth Phinney: That's something we should take back, to make sure that the auditor is able to audit any funds coming from CIDA.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: They should audit every penny that goes from CIDA.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Thank you. That's very good advice.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: May I make one very quick comment?

•(1030)

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: It's going to be very difficult to establish here general principles for giving from CIDA, but even in the absence of determining general principles, it's certainly easy to say that this year Paul Martin should not have sent another \$25.4 million to the Palestinians in light of their breaching every commitment that they made. That is only common sense. When you give money with the understanding that you will get something in return, when something in return doesn't happen, you don't continue to give money. So even in the absence of those general principles, those kinds of mistakes should be self-evident.

The Chair: Thank you.

Do you have one, Ms. Guergis?

Ms. Helena Guergis: Of course I do.

The Chair: Ms. Guergis.

Ms. Helena Guergis: We see the government is moving away from using the small non-governmental organizations and moving into the larger multilateral. Yet time and time again we've had evidence presented to us that the smaller NGOs are actually doing an excellent job and have a way around corruption, and that it's probably tried, tested, and true and the best delivery agent for our foreign aid, but for some reason we seem to be moving away from that.

Do you think that probably the government should go back to taking a look at the smaller non-governmental organizations, to avoid giving the money government to government, to corrupt regimes, if it has been proven, if there is evidence?

Mr. Stephen Posen: As we're short of time, I'll give a short answer. Yes, absolutely.

The Chair: Thank you.

I have one comment, Mr. Gordon. At the beginning, you quoted in your remarks Prime Minister Martin as reaffirming Canada's and China's policy and suggested this means that Canada accepts that Taiwan is part of China. Mr. Chen, on the other hand, said that

Canadian policy "has taken note of China's claims that Taiwan is part of China". My understanding is that the position of Canada is that it is up to them to decide. We're not going to decide for them, as you mentioned in the beginning.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: No. By signing the one-China policy, not only did Canada clearly undermine the independence of Taiwan—it certainly wasn't an affirmation of Taiwanese independence—but, in combination with the anti-secession law passed by Beijing, has essentially given international legitimacy to using force, to using arms to prevent Taiwan from continuing to enjoy its independence from the PRC, which has always been the case.

Mr. Naresh Raghubeer: Sir, to add to that, if there's any logic in our foreign policy pertaining to Taiwan, I have not seen it, because if you said that we do support an independent Taiwan, why then do we not allow democratic representatives from Taiwan to visit Canada?

I know this committee has taken that issue up before, yet we have not had a clear answer as to why we do not believe in letting democratic representatives from a fellow democracy visit Canada. It's absolutely absurd. They cannot even visit their relatives.

Mr. Alastair Gordon: Thank you very much.

The Chair: It was a pleasure.

We'll recess for a few minutes.

• (1033) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1057)

The Chair: Now we will resume.

We'll come back this afternoon at 1:45.

Mr. Roger Clavet: At 1:45?

The Chair: Yes, at 1:45, please.

Thank you.

This 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.