



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

---

FAAE • NUMBER 069 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Thursday, November 3, 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

Thursday, November 3, 2005

• (1410)

[Translation]

**The Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.)):** Welcome everyone.

Pursuant to Orders of the day, we are continuing our study of the International Policy Statement.

This afternoon, we have the pleasure of welcoming Ms. Carmen Ferland and Mr. Pierre Jasmin from the organization Artistes pour la Paix, as well as Ms. Dorothy Hénault and Ms. Sarah Humphrey, from Voisins et voisins du Mile-End pour la paix.

[English]

Welcome to the committee. I think we're late, but we have a good reason for being late this afternoon. It's the birthday of our vice-chair, and we're very pleased to say that.

However, don't be worried. We're supposed to sit from 1:45 to 2:45; instead, we'll sit from 2:15 to 3:15. We have the time, and we won't skip any of your time.

[Translation]

Ms. Ferland you have the floor.

**Mrs. Carmen Ferland (Artistes pour la Paix):** Ladies and gentlemen, you are members of a committee which Artistes pour la Paix considers very important to the cause of peace. Pierre Jasmin and myself will be sharing with you our thoughts of the last few days. Please forgive us for the off-the-cuff nature of our remarks; it is due to the short notice we received.

Last March, the government's response to the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade report was made public. Its title is the following: "Exploring Canada's relations with the countries of the Muslim world". It includes the following statement:

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin (As an Individual):** Western countries cannot continue to enjoy security here, while disregarding what is happening in the rest of the world. By contributing to improving governance and information elsewhere, we improve our chances of collective security in the long-term.

**Mrs. Carmen Ferland:** [Editor's note: *Inaudible*] its ethnocentric slant, it is a wonderful statement, except for the fact that the real statement contains the word prosperity or prosperous on three occasions, which weighs down both sentences and, according to us, takes away any positive effect brought about by our edited version.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Why would we object to prosperity? It seems to us that Canada must start helping developing countries by first calling into question what establishes our prosperity to their

detriment. Are our mining and oil companies exploiting Sudan, the Congo, Nigeria, the Philippines, Peru, Colombia and other third world countries for their good, or are they compromising their environment and security by sometimes being complicit in the massacre of civilians by regular military forces or by armed militia. These countries are far too poor to reject the call of some of our prosperous businessmen concerned with their well-being.

Are our armament companies supporting the cause of world peace by exporting to dictatorships? The Artistes pour la Paix were the first to denounce the Defence Industry Productivity Program, as of 1992. Didn't the DIPP offer grants to SNC, whose subsidiary in Le Gardeur exported landmines thanks to excess taxes collected for student summer jobs?

The Conservative government's policy under Brian Mulroney, Jean Charest and Lucien Bouchard—spokesperson for a clear-eyed vision of Quebec with Guy Saint-Pierre, former CEO of SNC-Lavalin—allocated \$280 million, in other words three times more public funds annually to promoting and exporting Canadian weapons than to arts production, promotion and world tours for the symphony orchestras, ballet, theatre and opera companies, exhibitions, museums, film projects, grants for artistic and literary projects under the Canadian Council for the Arts.

**Mrs. Carmen Ferland:** Let us now turn to political decisions in support of peace. It should be noted that in 1989, as a result of lobbying on the part of then President for Artistes pour la Paix, Antonine Maillet, against the proposed purchase of nuclear submarines at a cost of \$12 billion, Mr. Mulroney remembered he was Progressive-Conservative and wisely abandoned the project. However, when Pierre Jasmin, then Vice-President of Artistes pour la Paix returned from the shooting of a National Film Board film, in Moscow, he had charges levelled at him by the Minister of Defence at the time, Mr. Bill McKnight, who held him personally responsible for the imminent invasion of Canada by the U.S.S.R.; this was six months before the fall of the Berlin wall. It is a flagrant example of a Defence Department's policy analysis which is not vented by Foreign Affairs Canada nor developed jointly with the department.

This is why we are asking for a major change and for an increase in foreign affairs and international trade's budget to the detriment of the Department of National Defence's. Large numbers of hand-somely paid generals are still under no obligation to ask Foreign Affairs Canada what the real threats are to Canadian security. They therefore continue to waste billion of dollars on threats that ceased to exist 10 years ago.

We submit to you that training for military leaders in the field of international policy must be a priority. You could certainly count on support from your Governor General and Commander and Chief of the Armed Forces, Ms. Mich  lle Jean, whose concern for world peace is well-known.

•(1415)

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Canadian Liberal policy from 1993 until last year has thankfully followed a more logical course, marked by six constructive decisions:

The first was to cut the DIPP Program.

The second was to cancel the purchase of EH-101 helicopters equipped for nuclear submarine warfare called for under Ms. Kim Campbell. This was something that had been asked of her by then Security General of NATO, Mr. Claes, later imprisoned for having received bribes from Agusta, the company which manufactured these helicopters. Unfortunately, the Liberal government recently purchased some of these defective helicopters.

The third was to produce the Canada 21 Council report. The late Hon. G  rard Pelletier, an eminent member of Artistes pour la Paix sat on this Council, which called for a dramatic drop in military spending.

The fourth was to create a coalition of over 100 countries under Canada's world leadership, sadly without China and the United States, prohibiting landmines, 90 per cent of whose victims are civilians, specifically in Angola, Mozambique, Bosnia, Afghanistan and Cambodia.

The fifth was the refusal to back the United States in the Second Gulf War in Iraq, thanks in part to massive protests in Montreal which we actively instigated.

The sixth was the disbursement of \$1 billion to Russia for dismantling nuclear warheads on board of its nuclear submarines, intercontinental missiles and bombers, so as to preclude fissionable materials falling into terrorist hands.

Along with these six examples of enlightened policy, we should add a major development in Canadian diplomacy, lauded the world over. Two eminent Canadians, Louise Arbour and Philippe Kirsch, have been appointed to head international war crimes tribunals.

These models of success chart the way ahead for the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade which must denounce war-making policies and ensure collective security on a global scale, not based on the hypocritical concerns of businessmen relating to prosperity, but on principles of fairness, a respect for international law and genuine information efforts.

The department should, for instance, promote cultural and scientific university exchanges, it should also support journalists from programs such as Radio-Canada's *Zone libre* being sent abroad. As you know, *Zone libre* was the subject of scandalous cutbacks this year.

**Mrs. Carmen Ferland:** The current political context is cause for concern. Artistes pour la Paix decries the pervasive conservative world view, amongst the presidents of Iran, China, the United States

as well as Mr. Harper, for whom an increase in military expenditures would be a panacea.

Our neighbours have just approved \$440 billion per year in expenses for the Pentagon, and as a result, their citizens are increasingly the targets of world terrorism.

We believe that a possible rapprochement with the current American administration is incompatible with the cause of peace. With the complicit support of rich arms companies, oil, tobacco, patented pharmaceutical products and OMG company such as Monsanto, Mr. Bush's bellicose team has attacked Kyoto and all other international initiatives for peace, health or the environment, not to mention their shameful breach of NAFTA trade rulings.

On the domestic policy front, the minority liberal government should be commended for its social policy decisions, thanks to NDP initiatives. We congratulate the NDP for its concern for the poorest in society.

Since the 1984 to 1988 term of the first president of Artistes pour la Paix, the Honourable Jean-Louis Roux, our raison d'  tre has been and remains to work for peace and social justice, two things which go hand in hand in our opinion.

Sadly, we deplore the fact that this call from the Bloc Qu  b  cois to end the practice of tax loopholes and scandalous profits for banking, oil and multinational corporations involved in the flight of Canadian capital to tax heavens, this government has not mustered the political will to act.

Wouldn't this be an opportunity for the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade to take a courageous step?

We are referring here to Canadians' essential vigilance when it comes to the indecent squandering of tax revenue. This is a solution which doesn't seem to have been considered by our clear-eyed Quebeckers.

•(1420)

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** More so now than ever before, we believe in peace without weapons. Our foreign policy results over the last 18 months are hardly extraordinary, and before this committee, a committee which seeks to hear from Canadians as to the preferred course of action for a government, it behooves us to denounce the Liberal government's current approach. From the moment Prime Minister Paul Martin assumed office, not only had international aid not reached .7 per cent of Canadian gross domestic product, as called for by the United Nations and by Mr. Martin's friend Bono, or should we say our friend Bono, but in fact we are even further away from that goal. Instead, we have witnessed the largest increase in Canadian military spending since World War II, according to the Polaris Institute.

We are of the view that 13.5 billion additional dollars over five years and \$13 billion per year to defence, specifically for an offensive arsenal such as Oerlikon Contraves military vehicles amounts to the worst possible political decision. How can Canada, which only shares a land border with the United States justify the fact that it is one of the top 12 countries in the world in terms of military spending? This is why the Artistes pour la Paix sent out 56,000 postcards last weekend to condemn this policy which is disastrous for world peace. This is the first mail-out we have done since 1993, when we sent out 42,000 postcards against the EH-101 helicopters, a key issue of the 1993 election campaign which had wiped out all but two Conservative members of Parliament. This new expensive and massive mail-out for us was in our opinion necessary due to this new government's catastrophic military stance.

Support for war will not lead to peace. No one supports war. If it exists throughout the world, it is because it is a profitable enterprise for a handful of defence industry capitalists. But it tears billion of people's lives apart and leads to poverty and the inability for people to deal with famine, drinking water shortages, hurricanes, flooding, forest fires, earthquakes, tsunamis and pandemics.

The Department of Foreign Affairs should be a world leader in the conversion of national arm forces into humanitarian teams ready to come to the assistance of disaster victims. CARE Canada and Oxfam recently revealed that civilian teams cost ten times less than so-called armed forces humanitarian missions. One cannot easily carry stretchers and guns at the same time.

This Liberal government engaged in a military intervention against Afghanistan, a country where the Taliban had managed to come to power thanks to massive support from the CIA and American arms companies. Are Canadians not comprising their integrity by focusing on armed interventions? The Department of Foreign Affairs should be weary of forging alliances with governments steeped in strong military traditions. We are referring to China, Turkey, Indonesia, the United States and Burma.

In the field of foreign policy, it may be wiser at times to seek counsel from people representing non-military countries, not perverted by war-like nonsense, from the Vatican to the Dalai-Lama, from Costa Rica to Iceland, Iceland being a country which is a member of NATO but does not have an army.

Artistes pour la Paix believe that Canada should withdraw from NATO, which has lost its *raison d'être*, and we decry the worrisome and recent loss of independence of Canadian defence staff within NORAD, an organization which is increasingly controlled by the hawks in the Pentagon.

• (1425)

**Mrs. Carmen Ferland:** To be fair to the current government, it should be commended for its refusal to join Mr. Donald Rumsfeld's in the anti-missile defence shield project. Pugwash, a group which was founded in 1955 by Mr. Bertand Russell and Albert Einstein, believes that the anti-missile defence shield is an impediment to nuclear non-proliferation efforts, which we hope the current government will continue to support fully, in the tradition of Lester B. Pearson, Pierre-Elliott Trudeau and Jean Chrétien.

We believe it is reckless to want to sell CANDU reactors—another prosperity policy—to Indian, Pakistani, Chinese and Korean

governments. As a former member of the United Nations Security Council—a misnomer, given that its five members are the world largest arms exporters—Canada should find inspiration in Mr. Kofi Annan, the United Nations Secretary General's report entitled "The Responsibility to Protect" published in 2001.

It must be said that when the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy held office, he wanted that a plan be adopted to address issues as security and well-being such as conflicts prevention, peacebuilding and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Canada should also further support UNESCO peace efforts. We are very proud of the work accomplished by Mr. Pierre Curzi, President of the Union des artistes, who has built a common front in favour of a cultural exemption to deal with productive American market legislation.

Finally, we believe that it is self evident that Canadian diplomacy's best allies when it comes to peace, be it in the United States or Russia, in the North or in the South, are artists, from the Circle du Soleil, the Montreal Symphony Orchestra, the Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, our painters, sculptors holding exhibits the world over, our writers, storytellers, singers exporting art democratic values, our award-winning filmmakers at international festivals, our aboriginal artists, and the doctors, lawyers, reporters and clowns without borders.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Our heartfelt plea that prosperity not be included, that prosperity be given the status of a value worth defending, goes hand in hand with our plea that Foreign Affairs Canada choose instead to champion equitable and sustainable development. We also call upon the department to enforce its stringent policy against any form of racism or sexism. Finally, we urge the department to provide greater support to NGOs in their outstanding work, and to instigate a regular, but flexible, consultation forum with NGOs, a forum in which we would like to be included, in order to gain a better understanding of the challenges related to globalization and the new alter-globalization movement.

In conclusion, we are of the view that Canada's new International Policy Statement is indicative of the confusion and improvisation which had characterized the government over the past few months. We urge the government to instead return to non-trade-based diplomacy and peace missions free from military intervention, for this is how Canada's reputation was shaped, a reputation which has, lamentably, been at risk by the failures of recent months, such as the shameful sponsorship scandal.

Trust the Artistes pour la Paix who travel all over the world, and we are in a privileged position to warn you of the first indications of an unfavourable change in the way in which the world views Canada. This change is not irrevocable; it is not too late to show courage.

Lastly, we simply wish to point out that we are members of the Canadian Peace Alliance, who appeared before you earlier in the day and submitted a report to which we contributed.

•(1430)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms. Ferland and Mr. Jasmin.

Before handing the floor to our second group of witnesses, I would just like to point out that our committee recently adopted a report on the responsibility of mining companies operating abroad to respect human rights. While the committee may deem the government's response to be unsatisfactory, we, nonetheless, did the work incumbent upon us.

You also mentioned Mr. Koffi Annan's report entitled "The Responsibility to Protect ("R2P")", or, to give it its French title, "*La responsabilité de protéger*". Mr. Annan requested that this report be drafted in the aftermath of the war in Kosovo, to help countries determine if and when military intervention is the appropriate response. Canada championed this report. I say this so that you understand that we subscribe to what is said in the report, which was accepted at the last United Nations' meeting, thanks to Canada's determination to forge ahead on this matter.

I am now going to hand over to Ms. Hénault, who will tell us about Mile-End. Following her presentation, we will hear from Ms. Humphrey.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault (Voisins et voisins du Mile-End pour la paix):** Mile-End is a little corner on the Plateau Mont-Royal.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to appear before the committee and share our concerns with you. We are a neighbourhood group of some 50 ordinary Quebecers who have an interest in Canada's role in the quest for world peace. We first became involved in the peace movement at the time of the 250,000-person strong demonstration in Montreal against the war in Iraq. We remain concerned by the situation in Iraq.

[English]

We presented to our member of Parliament a petition of names gathered in the neighbourhood, urging Canada not to sign on to the U.S. missile defence system. We are pleased that Canada did not sign on officially, but we would urge you not to encourage our industries and our army to be so closely involved.

[Translation]

We are strongly opposed both to the concept and the process of deeper integration with the United States of America, a process which will result in our unilateral dependence on our neighbour and serious problems for Canadians. You have to look no further than to how the U.S. treated us over the matter of softwood lumber to see that our "partner" respects neither Canada nor its own promises.

[English]

The more we integrate into the U.S., the worse things are going to be for ordinary Canadians and the more Canada becomes a puppet for the U.S. Canada's sovereignty is essential to its ability to take a leadership role in creating positive alternatives to misguided American policies.

Why would we want to integrate with a country whose military and economic policies are leading it to ruin? Why integrate with a bully who is losing the respect of the international community, who

practises torture with impunity, a bully with neither ethics nor conscience, and, judging by Louisiana, an incompetent bully.

[Translation]

In the same way in which we foresaw with devastating accuracy the foolishness and tragedy which define the war in Iraq, we believe that Canada will not recover from the consequences of the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America, a partnership into which your government has already embarked upon the insistence of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives.

[English]

We believe NAFTA should be abrogated, especially because of chapter 11, which limits Canadian governments, whether they be federal, provincial, or municipal, in their ability to protect the environment for Canadian citizens. Your duty as the Canadian government is to protect the interests of Canadian citizens, not the interests of transnational corporations when their interests interfere with ours.

[Translation]

We call upon the government to work a lot harder in order to seek out alternative markets in Asia and Latin American in order to reduce our dependence on the United States.

[English]

Ninety-five percent of terrorism is carried out by people who are resisting occupation. Clearly there are more terrorists in the world since Iraq was set afire than there were before. Terrorism can only be fought by respect and social and economic justice, and any policies that racially stigmatize or remove civil rights are bound to increase terrorism.

Our imitations of American security practices—our security certificates in particular—are dangerous to Canadian lives in many ways. The more we tie in to U.S. policies, the more we will attract terrorists. And how does a democracy expect to protect its democratic freedoms by abrogating them? It is Alice in Wonderland logic.

•(1435)

[Translation]

If our goal is increased security, we should increase our international aid to 0.7 per cent of GDP. Any aid provided should not serve to shackle recipient countries, but should instead be genuine aid, allowing them to be master of their own destiny.

[English]

It is clear that the structural adjustment policies of the World Bank and the IMF have been major factors in the downward spiral of Africa and many other developing countries. Structural adjustment means privatizing all publicly owned services, such as water or hospitals, and making the user pay for education and health. Without the money to pay, they die in poverty and ignorance because of policies of the banks, over which we could have some influence. If Brian Mulroney could lead the embargo movement on South Africa that eventually defeated apartheid, surely the present government could have the courage to lead the charge against structural adjustment.

[Translation]

We deplore the fact that Canadian troops are supporting U.S. activity in Afghanistan. Our troops ought to be repatriated or sent to other countries as peacekeepers. Canada's International Policy Statement suggests that peacekeeping is no longer appropriate, and that the next generation of the Canadian Armed Forces ought to be modelled on its American counterpart.

[English]

Have you compared the role and the manner of the American troops in New Orleans with the style of the Canadian troops sent in to help a few years ago when Winnipeg was flooded? Canadian troops help; American troops terrorize. Is that what we want?

[Translation]

We are of the view that pre-emptive war, illegal invasions and chemical weapons, such as depleted uranium, are utterly heinous.

[English]

We are ashamed at the Canadians riding on the coattails of the Americans and the French and deposing Haiti's legally elected president, and then presiding over a rapidly deteriorating situation that has become a disaster. We are making the situation worse and wasting taxpayers' money that should be spent on helping the citizens of Haiti to climb out of poverty. Of course the situation is complex, but Canada should be able to help to negotiate real peace. Canadian troops should be a helping arm of diplomacy.

We were shocked to learn that the Canadian diplomatic delegations on a whole range of issues—poverty, environment, health, education, human rights, water, and food safety—are now dominated by officials who oppose any policy position that conflicts with Canadian trade and commercial liberalization. In particular, a recent Canadian plan to do the bidding of huge transnational companies pushing biotech terminator seeds, thereby cynically abandoning millions of peasant farmers around the world, is a case in point. Canadian efforts to get them approved by a UN committee have been described as sleazy and underhanded. Terminator technology has been called the most immoral agricultural application of genetic engineering so far. Surely Canadian diplomats can maintain some vestige of morality and aren't totally sold out to the highest bidder.

[Translation]

Stephen Lewis, UN special envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa, have qualified several of Canada's policies, including the provision of low-cost, generic HIV/AIDS drugs to Africa, as very useful, and we congratulate you on this decision. Our vision for Canada is as a moral country, which would not hesitate to help this world's least fortunate.

[English]

In his introduction to Canada's international policy statement, Prime Minister Martin says:

In a world of traditional and emerging giants, independent countries like Canada—countries with small populations—risk being swept aside, their influence diminished, their ability to compete hampered.

Canada has always been in a world of giants, yet since Lester B. Pearson we've had a shining place of influence, based on our sense

not only of our own interests, but on supporting the interests of international justice, seeking win-win solutions.

• (1440)

[Translation]

Noble values do exist in our world, values which cannot be bought, and which should never be compromised for financial gain. There is a crying need for active leadership on this front to combat the surge of greed, cynicism and despair. Canada could accept the responsibility of this noble role on the world stage.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Madam Hénault.

I would like to make two remarks. Firstly, the committee studied the matter of contributing 0.7 per cent of our GDP, and made unanimous recommendations to the government. Secondly, we have also studied and produced a report on NAFTA chapter 11. Mr. Paquette was one of the committee members at that time. Both of these reports are available on the committee's website.

We have studied these questions, and agree with you in much of what you say.

[English]

Mr. Sorenson, are you ready?

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC):** Sure.

**The Chair:** You have the first question.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** I thought Ms. Humphrey was going to present, but the two of you are together. Perfect.

Thank you for being here and for defending your perspective of Canada's role in the world. I have a couple of questions, but because it's a special day, I'll not defend some of what I'd call the rhetoric.

Do you have any concrete ways in which Canada can really make a difference to prevent some of the atrocities that we see taking place around the world, like Rwanda, Sudan, Kosovo, Darfur?

That would be my first question, and I'd like to come back on a supplementary, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Jasmin.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** I recently saw a film—I do not know whether you managed to catch it—called *Le Cauchemar de Darwin*,

[English]

*Darwin's Nightmare*, which was presented in our Ex-Centris cinema. It explained, in a gruesome way, the links between armament exportation from European and American countries and what's happening in Rwanda—in all those countries around Congo,

[Translation]

the Great Lakes region. Furthermore, it explained how it was all linked to the Lake Victoria environmental disaster,

[English]

where the European countries brought some of those big fat European fishes that ate all the small African fishes that are pivotal in saving the lake because they were eating the small organisms. This lake is now becoming a dead sea because of that policy.

Planes full of those big fat fish—for exportation, which is supposedly helping that country—are coming back from Russia after delivering fish for the best tables in Europe, and they are full of weapons that are sold on the black market and that are sold in order to really poison the whole situation in those countries. They are creating this havoc that you want to prevent, and that we want to prevent. This havoc is created by the countries that are also complicit in our armament industries.

This is why it's so important to be extremely careful in exportation of armament, for example. Again, it's wonderful to help those countries, but help doesn't compensate for the kind of nuisance that we've given to those countries by not opposing the exportation of Russian armaments because we want to be diplomatic on the international level.

This is so important. We expect that if you are members of this committee, it's because you probably have an interest in those affairs, and not because the president of your party has assigned you to the job. Each time that Canada wants to increase billions of dollars in the military budget, you should stand up and say, "Hey, there is an African child right now, in this present minute, dying from hunger. We cannot stand it. And we cannot stand that our government spend one more dime on armament before it settles at least this 0.7%, which is only the decent minimum set by the United Nations."

• (1445)

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** That's a real nice philosophical—

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** No, it's concrete: armament—exportation of armaments.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** That's right, but what I'm saying is that we have genocide happening now. You're saying, well, we have to rid the world of the weaponry and we won't have this. Okay, great, except that right now I'm dealing with a family that has brought people to Canada from the Congo. The six kids are here because their mom and dad were massacred with a machete.

We've always seen this; it's always been thus. I fully agree that weapons have caused the destruction to be much worse than what it is if you're hacking people with a machete. But what I'm saying very specifically is, in the position we are in right now, in Canada, how do

we solve problems like the Sudan? I don't mean, well, let's not get the weapons from Russia, etc.; they are there.

How can we make a difference? Because there are people dying now.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** I know. Again, it's by being very careful.

In Rwanda, for example, in the three years leading to this massacre, the ministry of defence increased their budget to an incredible level. It led to the downing of those planes. We don't know yet whether it was done by Belgian interests or by French interests or by American interests. Those planes that were downed with the President of Rwanda and Burundi started this massacre. To just say this was done with machetes and was not planned by the international sellers of armaments is ignoring all that came from this.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** It may be, but there are places where there is what we call in English "ethnic cleansing", where there are specific ethnic groups that go in and murder and kill simply because someone is from a different ethnic background. So it does not always go back to the fact that there is someone out there who wants to sell arms; it goes to the fact that some people are guilty only because of their ethnicity.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** I think you must also go back to political root of this. When Lumumba was killed in the Congo 30 years ago, it started this terrible upheaval. In Haiti it was the same way. It is not because those people are prone to interracial hatred; it is all because they were disorganized by powers who wanted to influence those countries and to take profits.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** But people are driven by bitterness and hatred.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** In some African countries, of course, the African countries' lines were not drawn by themselves, but by the colonializing countries, who put together different ethnic groups in countries. Perhaps if the Africans had drawn their own country lines they wouldn't have drawn them like that. They had gotten along for years until it became convenient for the former colonizers, who are no longer official colonizers, to go in and take over mines. Let's just think of Shell in Nigeria and the Ogoni people. The oil company was pitting those people against the people who were in the countryside and against the government, creating an ethnic situation where there was none before. That is the way the former colonial powers have acted, whether they're governments or transnational corporations—from Belgium, France, the United States, or wherever—which they're just as likely to be. They are pulling the strings to create chaos so they can control that oil field or that mine.

• (1450)

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Okay. Should Canadians—

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** I don't think, for instance, that the Canadian oil company that was in Sudan—

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Talisman.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** Talisman was in there for ages. We didn't see anything, and they were busy killing off the people in the south.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Talisman was?

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** No, they were giving the government the money to do it themselves.



**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Okay. Should we ban and not allow Canadian companies to be involved in any other countries?

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** I think we should regulate them.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Dictatorial countries, yes.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** They shouldn't be allowed in any dictatorial countries?

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** But they should be regulated.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carmen Ferland:** We must at all costs avoid exploiting ethnic conflict. Ethnic conflict is an internal problem, and we should try to understand its root causes, rather than exploiting the situation to provide one of the two warring clans with arms, in an effort to further our own interests. Self-interest is a motivating factor in all of this. Our intervention ought to focus on conflict resolution.

We have NGOs, and we have to trust the organizations which we

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Who is we? The Canadian government?

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carmen Ferland:** We have set up organizations, which operate in the field. I recall that NGOs sounded the alarm about the impending Rwandan tragedy almost a year and a half before it occurred. They knew what was happening because they were on the ground and sensed the burgeoning animosity. Yet it took us a year and a half to act.

This morning, I listen to what was said by Mr. Normand Beaudet from the Centre de ressources sur la non-violence. This is exactly the type of resources that we, as a Western country seeking to offer humanitarian aid, should provide. We ought to help these people and provide them with resources. You need to have workers in the field to help them understand what is happening.

**The Chair:** Ms. Humphrey.

[English]

**Mrs. Sarah Humphrey (As an Individual):** I think the answer lies with the United Nations.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Thank you.

**Mrs. Sarah Humphrey:** And it also lies in the fact of what we're saying and what was said by 250,000 people out on the streets of Montreal at minus 40 degrees, or whatever it was. We shouldn't be following the United States in their unilateral way of dealing with regime change or whatever pretext they want to use to invade a country. That's our fear: that the United States has abandoned the UN. They don't believe in it. They disregard it. Canada can play an excellent role in reinforcing the role of the UN.

Canada's decision not to join the U.S. in invading Iraq is best appreciated if we think, what if we had? What if we were in there now? It could easily have happened.

**The Chair:** Very quickly, please.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** I thank you. Really, when I ask that question—and I keep hearing about arms and everything else—I think your answer is a very concrete answer: the UN. The UN has a role.

That was going to segue into another question. What happens when the UN doesn't act? What reforms are needed at the UN to allow it to have the influence for peace that it should have?

We take little shots at the United States and the United Nations. The United States is the largest funder of the UN. Of the funding for the United Nations, 23% is from the United States, and 19% of the funding of the United Nations is from Japan. As you rightfully say, these two countries now are frustrated with the United Nations, to the level that—we were in Washington three weeks ago—one senator is willing to pull funding to the United Nations unless the UN falls in line with some of the things that the U.S. would have.

I'm looking for answers to whether or not Canada has a role. If Canada doesn't have a role, if we're going to wait for the United Nations.... We all have these little roles, in that we have influence in different countries. But if we also are putting a great deal of hope in the United Nations, if everyone agrees that the United Nations needs reform, if everyone agrees that the influence and the credibility of the United Nations is being hurt, and if everyone is opposed to the United States in the United Nations and they're the biggest funder, we have a major problem here, because we're looking to them first.

You brought up, Madame.... Oh, that's a different question for a different round.

● (1455)

[Translation]

**The Chair:** I just wanted to point out that nobody has answered Mr. Sorenson's first question. What should we be doing now? You spoke about Rwanda; however, what Canada has done since Rwanda and Kosovo is also a very important question. In the case of Kosovo, the United Nations did not want to intervene, the European Union was unable to intervene, and so the United States was asked to act. We asked that a coalition be formed, not for Iraq, we opposed the war in Iraq, but in order to have NATO intervene.

Canada responded to Kofi Annan's request that the question of the responsibility to protect be addressed. The responsibility to protect was approved in principle at the last United Nations summit of heads of state. This constitutes a significant change for us as parliamentarians. In our view, the decision to accept this principle, rather than simply considering state sovereignty to be sacrosanct, marks a significant step forward. We would like to know what you think should be done in a country like Sudan.

I went to Sudan and Darfur with the Prime Minister, and we met with the Sudanese President. What should we do? Should we intervene or not? An indirect genocide is unfolding in Darfur. As parliamentarians, what should we do? What suggestion should we make to our governments? We do not want a repeat of the Rwandan tragedy. This morning, we heard about what is happening in Burundi, and how it could escalate to Rwandan levels within five years. What should we do in terms of prevention? This is a question which is particularly important to us.

I am going to give the floor to Mr. Paquette.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** I am glad that we are having this debate.

I am going to ask you a question. Ms. Humphrey, you spoke about the importance of the United Nations and multilateralism. I agree with you that they are important. However, the members of the Security Council—France, the United Kingdom, etc.—have national interests and are major arms exporters. We were fortunate in that the Security Council did not approve US intervention in Iraq. Had it done so, driven by the national interests of member states, we would have found ourselves in a deeply troubling situation. That is why we believe it is important to reform the United Nations.

Had the Security Council approved US military intervention in Iraq on the grounds that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction—weapons which were never found, testament to just how well they were hidden—would Canada, in your view, be acting legitimately, were it to participate in the intervention? I put this question to you, because, as you know, this is the sort of question with which the Bloc Québécois is wrestling.

I am sure that this is a matter which all parties have debated extensively. We stated publicly our opposition to the war in Iraq, and fortunately, thanks to Russia and China, the Security Council did not approve military action. The war in Iraq was not sanctioned by the United Nations; if it had been, we would have found ourselves in an extremely sticky situation.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** There are two radically different schools of thought on UN reform. On the one hand, there are those who would like to see less votes being given to the heavyweights and more power being given to small and medium countries. The Security Council, and not the UN General Assembly, is where the real power lies. Some would like to see the United States granted more power. They want to reform the UN as their word is not always taken as law. There are two very different schools of thought, and Canada must decide which style of reform it supports. I remember that the US refused to pay its United Nations dues for many years on the grounds that the order to jump was not met with the request as to how high. Canada must decide how it wants the future UN to look, and must instruct its diplomats in such a way that it no longer be possible for the Security Council to legitimize an immoral and illegal war. That is the challenge that lies ahead. How can we build a United Nations that will not risk becoming a puppet used by the world's most powerful countries to further their own interests and build their own empires?

• (1500)

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** We would have more faith in a United Nations which included India, Brazil and South Africa, or indeed Nigeria, as the voices of Africa are not heard on this matter.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I would also like to come back to the matters that you raised as a source of frustration, a frustration which we share. Consultation was held on Canada's International Policy Statement. We raised the point that little attention was given to the role of parliamentarians and the civil society. I believe that it is only mentioned once, at the beginning of the statement. However, in the speech that he made at the launch of the International Policy Statement, Mr. Pettigrew said, and I quote:

In a globalized world, many of the most powerful forces are not exerted by countries at all, but by non-state trends playing out horizontally across national borders and vertically within the structures of societies.

This brings to mind the alterglobalization movement, the nuclear disarmament movement, indeed, the disarmament movement in general.

That is why the second major consideration of the IPS is that the cross-cutting global issues that matter more and more to Canadians' daily lives must become a main focus for our international policy.

Mr. Pettigrew is telling us that the concerns which are felt across the world, and which are shared by Canadians and Quebecers ought to be at the heart of Canada's International Policy Statement.

I believe that Canada's International Policy Statement reflects the concerns that you raised about NAFTA's chapter 11. As Mr. Patry said, both the House of Commons' Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, and the Subcommittee on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment have, on several occasions, asked the Canadian government to stop negotiating investment protection agreements under chapter 11. We know that negotiations are currently underway with four Central American countries: Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala. Disregarding the views of parliamentarians and a large part of the civil society, Canada is trying to impose chapter 11 content. We are seeing the same thing regarding the approach to Canada's trade interests.

My question is open to all of you. Do you feel that Canada's International Policy Statement reflects the concerns of Quebecers and Canadians? How can we ensure that Canada's International Policy Statement does reflect their concerns? What sort of mechanism would be required? It is not enough to have one round of consultations every 10 years, as is the case at the moment.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** We are neither a Canadian business, nor business leaders.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Oh, so you do not have special access to the Prime Minister's Office!

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** In our view, the conclusion of Mr. Pettigrew's speech is [*Editor's Note: Technical Problems*]. The problem is that civil society yields no power. The decision to group together international trade and foreign affairs in a single department constitutes a significant problem. It was a mistake from the beginning. In doing that, we sold out.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I do not fully agree with you.

**The Chair:** We will have a good discussion on that subject at another time.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** You realize that the government is now trying to split up the two departments.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** I hope so.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** If the Department of Foreign Affairs is split from the Department of International Trade, we fear that our international trade policy will be completely divorced from our foreign affairs policy. We hope that priority will be given to a foreign affairs approach, and that our trade policy will end up being a tool for our foreign affairs policy.

I respect your point of view, but we have already debated this over the last several months.

Ms. Hénault, what type of mechanism should be created to get the government to take your concerns more seriously? Neither you nor I feel that we count for very much.

• (1505)

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** I get the impression that we are not reading the same things. It's as if the people in power are just generally living on another planet. Whether it concerns the events in the United States or in Iraq, one of my sources of information is the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. It provides information and conducts very interesting research. But I have the impression that no one in government is listening. People in government take note of anything coming of the Fraser Institute, but from nowhere else. In terms of social justice, or in terms of other subjects which might have a positive impact on us and on others, it seems that government is in another space. I wish they would rely on more sources of information. I suspect that officials choose their sources of information very carefully.

I've known Ottawa since the 1970s. I was part of the National Film Board of Canada's Société nouvelle/Challenge for Change program. In my capacity as a filmmaker, I was a member of the interdepartmental committee. At that time, officials truly wanted to change the world. It was a time of hope. They wanted to try all kinds of new things and felt that it was worth listening to citizens. That was the spirit underlying our Société nouvelle/Challenge for Change program.

But I think that over the years, officials have been brainwashed by the Fraser Institute. Yet it is essential to rely on many sources of information and not to limit oneself to what comes out of that small clique. We also read the financial pages of newspapers, as well as the *CCPA Monitor*.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** There is no doubt that the action taken either by *Artistes pour la Paix*, or by your groups, is important and that more should be done. I clearly remember the demonstrations against the war in Iraq which took place in Montreal and in other Canadian cities, as well as throughout the world. They surely had an influence on Canada's decision not to get involved in the war. Letter-writing campaigns, such as the one launched by *Artistes pour la Paix*, often have a greater impact than one may suspect. It might be a good idea to think about having formal exchanges of views, because it is more difficult for your groups than for others to get the attention of the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Do you have any suggestions to make in that regard? We will surely propose to strengthen the role of our committee. I still don't know exactly how that will be achieved, but we will have to make sure that your contribution becomes more formal. If you have any ideas, please don't hesitate to send them to us. We will make recommendations to ensure that the International Policy Statement takes into account the ideas which have been put forward, such as the 0.07 per cent figure, and other things. So I am asking you to do this, since I want to be sure that we receive your ideas on paper.

**The Chair:** We will now give the floor to Ms. Phinney, but I would first like to say a few words to Mr. Jasmin. Even though I don't have anything to say about it, you mentioned the United Nations. You said that you would like the Security Council to have more members. You said that you would trust the Security Council more if, for instance, India, Nigeria or Brazil were on it too.

Can you please elaborate?

As for splitting up the Department of Foreign Affairs and the International Trade section, Parliament has already rejected this option, as has our committee. We fear that this might lead to policy being developed in different silos. In other words, the right hand would not know what the left hand is doing, when in fact it is very important, in our opinion, to know what the other side is doing. The split was rejected by Parliament, but, in fact, it is happening.

Of course, money makes the world go round. A lot more money will go into international trade than foreign affairs. Further, there is also the issue of the role of ambassadors. We are also worried by the fact that an order was issued decreeing that small arms represent a sale like any other, whereas before, the sale of small arms was subject to authorization from the Department of Foreign Affairs. We believe that international trade should lead to job creation and permit sales to other countries, but if there is no link with the Department of Foreign Affairs, the humanitarian aspect would fall by the wayside.

That's why I would like to know what you think. You criticized us and raised some legitimate points, which is the point of today's discussion, but we would also like to know what you think of significantly reforming the United Nations.

I will now give the floor to Ms. Phinney.

• (1510)

[*English*]

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Do you want me to suggest how to reform the United Nations?

**The Chair:** No.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Even I was surprised when Mr. Sorenson was talking about having to go into these countries ahead of time and when he was asking what we can do ahead of time to help in these areas, in these countries that are at risk. We have CIDA. If we took half the money we were putting into arms and gave it to CIDA, wouldn't we be able to do this work? I don't think Mr. Sorenson would say to give half of the money from arms to CIDA, but I think we have the organization there. We have NGOs across our country. We have lots of smart people who can go out into these countries and help to solve this problem.

I'm just not sure why many people have been for years trying to cut little bits off CIDA and cut CIDA back. I think we should be going the opposite way, giving a whole lot more money to CIDA. I don't know what you think about that.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** You belong to a government that voted for the biggest increase in defence funding in a period when defence is not against other countries, but against terrorists. I don't think you can fight exacto with nuclear submarines or with helicopters like the EH101. It's absurd to put this funding into those realms.

[*Translation*]

I understand very well, Mr. Patry.

**The Chair:** Fine.

[*English*]

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Of course I understand

[Translation]

that it's possible for civil society to influence international trade if both entities are together rather than apart. I understand your concern. The problem is that international trade is becoming increasingly important because market considerations are gaining the upper hand.

That's the main point. I said that I would like to see the word "prosperous" disappear, because it appears in every document, whereas that wasn't the case before.

I have personally returned to militant pacifism precisely because I am seeing our country turn its back on peaceful solutions when it gave an additional amount of \$13 billion to the Department of National Defence. I came to this movement because what is happening is a disaster. Our diplomacy is becoming increasingly focused on the market, whereas before, moral principles were more respected. This is causing me great concern because it is happening despite the fact that good things are happening in diplomacy, such as the appointment of two Canadians, Louise Arbour and Philippe Kirsch, to international tribunals.

These are things the Department of Foreign Affairs should be proud of. It should go forward and ask for more money to keep on moving in that direction. The problem is that it is going in the opposite direction. What I've said is a bit of a caricature, but it's like the relationship I had with Mr. Bill McKnight, the former Minister of National Defence. In 1989, he told me to my face that because of me, the Soviet Union would invade Canada. Further, he told me that the Department of National Defence was still conducting this type of analysis, because it did not have the same information which the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs had. As a result, the distance separating the Department of National Defence from the Department of Foreign Affairs is creating major resource allocation problems in our country, since last year, Mr. Martin decided to give an additional \$13 billion of Canadian taxpayers' money to National Defence.

It's a horrible aberration, since it will create even more problems. It will make the Department of National Defence even more dependent on weapons producers. It means that the Department of National Defence will take a more militaristic approach in Afghanistan, rather than a diplomatic one. We are contemplating all this with horror.

I therefore believe that the country is moving in the wrong direction. The reason we came this morning is because we believe that your committee will try to change all that. However, I think that your voice needs to be heard much more in the House of Commons, and that every time that \$13 billion are earmarked for weapons, you should stand up and say that at this very moment, an African is dying of hunger and that this cannot be tolerated. That is reality.

• (1515)

[English]

**The Chair:** Madame Phinney.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** How many people are in your organization?

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Right now, we have 250 members. We've always had between 200 and 1,200, so this is a low year and this is why we came back. We've come in to give more support to the organization.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** The reason I ask is that there are organizations that have appeared before us in the last few days that have millions across Canada.

The important time is before a budget or a budget statement, and before an election, not after and not even on election day, as far as I'm concerned. If every single person in Canada who feels like you do—and, I think, like I do—wrote an individual letter to the Prime Minister and one to the Minister of Finance and one to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, you'd make a big difference.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** I thank you.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** I'm very serious. It makes a difference. It's not a big thing and it's not going to make me.... That little letter comes in the mail, somebody has to open it, and they put it in a pile. The pile gets bigger and bigger, and then, gee, maybe we should put something else in our budget or maybe we should put something else in our policies. Think about it.

**Mrs. Dorothy Héault:** And they're harder to get rid of than an e-mail that you can delete.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Yes, don't e-mail them. Write a letter.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Jasmin, I agree to some extent with what you are saying, but not completely, because for each dollar spent on diplomacy or on development, be it for democracy or weapons, we spent \$4 on defence.

However, I disagree when you talk about the \$13 billion amount. As Parliamentarians, we need to ensure that our soldiers are safe. In fact, they were underpaid. Personally, as a human being, I thought it was important for them to have good quality of life. We want to send soldiers abroad on peacekeeping missions. We don't talk about war, but about peacekeeping. You are familiar with the state of the vehicles that they have. When they drove over a landmine, everything blew up. So we needed to make sure that our soldiers were safe.

The opposition capitalized on the fact that a helicopter crashed on a boat.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** The helicopters do not go up, and the submarines do not go down!

**The Chair:** I think that some money had to be spent.

As for the \$13 billion amount that you mentioned, I agree with you, it is probably too much. Except that it was necessary to increase the defence budget immediately for the international missions and to defend our country. That is one way of putting it.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Mr. Chairman, we are with you on that. Of course, we wanted to qualify...

**The Chair:** Of course. I am qualifying, but it is very important to me.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Perhaps it is because we are not before the defence committee that we did not provide you with greater detail. However, we agree that our soldiers needed to be paid more, especially the ones who are on peacekeeping missions, because it is very dangerous for them. We agree with you on that point.

**The Chair:** You know that we send them out on two or three missions. They come back mentally and physically exhausted.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Indeed.

We also agree with providing better care to veterans who are suffering not only in body but also in mind, we agree with all of the psychiatric care.

[English]

How these people were mistreated was appalling.

[Translation]

But that represents about one billion dollars out of a total of \$13 billion.

•(1520)

**The Chair:** Perhaps a little more.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** The problem is that there are no measures to accompany that. We are the country with the army that has the most generals. They earn about \$200,000 a year; they have a house, they travel on Challengers at will. There are so many of them that they are ineffective. They do not look into matters, and they are the ones who should be at the committee to understand the existing international security problems. That is in the letter.

**The Chair:** I have never sat on the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs, so I cannot comment.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** While I share what you said about the \$13 billion, there are in fact some items that are essential for an army on a peacekeeping mission, but there are also things that are not useful, like submarines, that I don't really believe in.

Have you already appeared before the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs?

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Of course. I had a discussion on CBC with a general from the Canadian forces and we talked specifically about the EH-101s.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** We do not think there is a defence approach. So if we give \$13 billion to National Defence without knowing what the army will do with it...

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** We were opposed to the EH-101s, especially since the army had just acquired helicopters manufactured in Mirabel that were much lighter and more appropriate for international peacekeeping missions. It had all been said.

In 1992, we had told Ms. Campbell that the EH-101s were designed for anti-nuclear submarine weaponry. The helicopters were supposed to be used against Russian nuclear subs. We predicted that the subs were going to rust out in Vladivostok and Odessa and that the EH-101s were not what the army needed at this point in time. Nevertheless, Ms. Kim Campbell was prepared to go ahead and spend \$6 billion. We all know what happened.

Canadians heard both sides of the argument. Mr. Chrétien wrote to us twice stating that he fully understood our criticism and that he fully endorsed it. It had become a major issue.

The current problem is that we can no longer turn anything into an issue, because all attention is focused on wealthy business people, and the Canadian government no longer listens to idealists.

**The Chair:** Before concluding, I would simply like to remind you, as well as other members of your organization, that we have...

[English]

—yes, I'll let you ask a question afterwards—

an e-consultation. It's quite important. You can go there. It's a question that we have asked of Canadians. The answer could be just in one field. It could be diplomacy, defence, or development. It would be very good if any one of you would like to look at it. Tell your friends and anybody else who wishes to answer back in the e-consultation. And if you have any specific recommendations, always feel free to send them to the clerk or the researcher.

Mr. Sorenson, you have the last question.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Just in passing, Madame Hénault mentioned the ministerial certificates. I was just wondering, have you done a bit of a study of the anti-terrorism legislation that we have?

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** I haven't done a profound study of it, but my hair stands on end partially because I think it's a callous imitation of the American way of going about doing things.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Actually, some of the parts of our anti-terrorism legislation are more wild than the American legislation.

You specifically mentioned the ministerial certificates—

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** That's right.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** —under which people can be held and the evidence can be given in secret, so that they don't even see the evidence against them and we can hold them without charge indefinitely. The States doesn't have it that bad.

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** There are people who are held over there and their lawyers don't even know why they're there.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** To me, there's absolutely no question that this is not the way you stop terrorism. It's a good way to pit people against each other within our country.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Are you opposed to a terrorism law?

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** I'm not opposed to arresting people who are planning or carrying out terrorism, but I'm not certain an extra law is needed, other than the laws we have against doing violent things. I certainly think the anti-terrorism law that we have is against everything we stand for as Canadians, in the permanent injustice that it sets out for people. I don't see how you can defend democracy by throwing it out the window. Human rights are human rights.

•(1525)

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Sometimes I don't like to disclose what other committees I sit on, but I'm the vice-chair of national security, and we're dealing with Bill C-36 right now. This is one of the most controversial parts of that bill, so it's always good to hear.

Most of the people who have come believe that we do need a terrorism law—not only the enforcement people, but everyone who says it's important in order to prevent the act—whereas in the Criminal Code you are more or less dealing with the criminal act after the fact. Under the Criminal Code, they don't have the ability to do the wiretaps and to do these things to prevent terrorism, so they see the need because of prevention.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** But I'm not sure you're preventing it when, by doing it to one innocent person over here, you may be instigating five people over there to get in on the terrorism thing because they get so angry at the injustice.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** One of the reasons for which they're being held is that we have a law right now whereby we can't extradite or deport people to a country where there may be torture. If there's any question about torture, we have to hold them, so you can't deport them—

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** But you can take them to a proper court instead of just holding them.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Yes, you can take them to a proper—

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** It's habeas corpus. The bases upon which our democracy is anchored are being just thrown away, and I assume it's under pressure from the United States. I just think we have to say we have our own way of doing it.

Actually, one of the things I'm saying is that a lot of the information, the collusion between our information services and the American information services, is probably giving a lot of disinformation to our guys. I have the impression that the whole information community in the States lives in never-never land or in a Hollywood movie.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** All we have, really, are about five cases in which these ministerial certificates have been issued over the last ten years. And they aren't necessarily good people. They aren't always, like you say, innocent people holding and drawing five more in. They very well may be guilty people who were indeed planning terrorist activities.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** But they can be brought to court.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** They are brought to—

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** Our police services aren't always competent. Think about the kind of fiasco in the Air India thing.

It would be really nice to have a competent police force that could come in and say they've gathered this proof and this guy's guilty, and for them to go through the court and have them take the consequences in the court. I have no problem with that. But it's partially because of the incompetence of our police forces that we're keeping them in limbo like that.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I hope that you are not counting [*Editor's Note: Technical Difficulties*] to return home.

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Maybe we're underfunding our police forces and maybe we're underfunding the resources given to our policemen.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** I don't know whether it's underfunding or training. I'm not sure it costs any more to train properly than it does to train—

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Do you know what? Just on that, Canada is viewed as having one of the best police forces in the world. In fact, what do we do? We send Canadian police to train the police in Haiti. We send Canadian police to train some of the police in Iraq, so that they can—

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** Jordan.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** Yes, and Jordan. So we're recognized as having the best police in the world, but it's still maybe not good enough.

**Mrs. Dorothy Hénault:** It depends on which police forces.

**Mr. Pierre Jasmin:** But they're mostly responsible for that billion-dollar fiasco in the weapons act here in Canada.

**The Chair:** Okay, we're going to close, but I just want to say that Bill C-36 is very difficult for members. It was very difficult when it was voted on in the House a few years back, and if it's back in front of the committee, it's just because we had a grandfather clause. That was the only way it would be accepted, at least by many MPs on the government side. We're not sure if it was good or not good, but for five years we accepted it and now it's under discussion.

Mr. Blair in England just withdrew his terrorism bill that would have increased, from thirty days to ninety days, the time of prevention, the time during which they could use it to hold people, and they have more problems than we are facing here right now. It was withdrawn because of a lot of pressure from his own party, and it's open for new consultations.

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

I want to thank you all for coming today. It was very interesting. We like to meet with all groups, including yours.

[*English*]

We're going to recess until the next witnesses arrive.

[*Translation*]

Since the witness scheduled for this afternoon is still not here, we will suspend our proceedings until 7 p.m.

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.**