



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

FAAE • NUMBER 070 • 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

•(1915)

[English]

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

We will continue the international policy statement study from the Foreign Affairs International Trade Committee.

This evening it's a town hall meeting, and we would like to have our witness identify herself, please.

Ms. Nadia Alexan (As an Individual): My name is Nadia Alexan.

The Chair: Do you represent yourself?

Ms. Nadia Alexan: I represent myself.

I'm going to speak from the heart, because I really hadn't time to prepare for this. My friend, Judy, told me about it last night at midnight, when I arrived at the John Sigler presentation, and I didn't have time to prepare. So I will speak from the heart and tell you what's on my mind.

As I was saying before, people are interested that maybe the problem doesn't concern you, but it's a problem of communication, primarily because we have one or two people in the country who own all the media outlets. Of course, they tell people what they want to tell them, sometimes not necessarily the truth.

In terms of Canada's foreign policy, the first thing I would like to talk about is our proximity to the United States. The problem we have these days is that we're following the United States blindly. The corporations have their lobbyists, and they're very, very loud, and all they're interested in is making money and profits, most of the time at the expense of human beings.

This will not go on for long, because all over the world there are resistance movements cropping up right now, and people are resisting and saying enough is enough, enough is enough.

Who is running the country? Is it Tom d'Aquino or is it our elected officials? Who is running the country? That is what I want to know.

For example, our policy toward Haiti. We scream about democracy and democracy, but when people democratically elect a person and the United States forcibly, through a *coup d'etat*, removes that person, we follow along with the United States policy. What kind of nonsense is this? It is madness, total madness. The way I see it, we have to be independent of United States policy, completely independent.

People cry wolf and say the end of the world will come and the sky is going to fall, there's going to be revenge and the United States is going to avenge itself on Canada. Nothing of the sort has happened. We have always had an independent policy in terms of trade and in terms of international relations and in terms of our relationship with the United States. We've always been independent.

Since when do we have to follow blindly the policies of the United States? The United States, in this day and age, is a rogue nation. It is discredited all over the world. The Americans themselves are going out and are afraid of saying they're Americans, so they are saying they are Canadians.

I was in Italy not too long ago, and people are ashamed; they are ashamed of what is happening in the United States and the way they're going about like a bully, bullying everybody into submission.

Our policy, for example, toward Haiti...the other thing is this policy of integration, we want to integrate our borders, we want to integrate our pharmaceuticals, we want to integrate our energy. This is suicidal. The more we approach and the more we harmonize our policies with those of the United States, the faster we go toward the road of suicide, because when we relinquish our sovereignty and give it to the United States, we are losing ourselves. We have no more decisions on what is happening to us.

To give you the example of the growth hormones, they are still given to cows in the United States, something that we have stopped, and beyond a shadow of a doubt, that is cancer causing and toxic.

We have to extricate ourselves from what the United States is doing.

In terms of trade policies, I think anyone who reads a book, anyone who can read, can see that trade is benefiting a few people. It's benefiting the people with millions of dollars. It's not benefiting the large majority of people in the world. It's not benefiting them at all. What we need to do is fair trade, not free trade. It's only free for those people who are making the rules, those people who are dictating the rules to other countries. It's free for them. It's not free for the large majority of farmers and for the thousands of people who are dying of hunger.

I really don't know how people can wake up in the morning, look themselves straight in the mirror, and accept that children are dying by the thousands every second of the day. And we sit back and we say, "It's not my problem".

I'm just rambling, but I'll be able to focus some more maybe a bit further. I want to make it very clear that our foreign policy should not follow that of the United States. We should stay clear away from United States policy if we care about the majority of Canadians and not just about the 10% at the top who are benefiting from this kind of integration.

They said our water is exempt, our energy is exempt. It's not on the table for negotiations. Tom d'Aquino wants it to be on the table, and John Manley wants it to be on the table.

The Washington consensus wants us to become subservient. Yesterday, John Sigler was saying, "We're going back to feudal times. Do you understand what's going on? We're going back to feudal times."

It's untenable. It's unbelievable, to accept that trade should take precedence over human beings and their livelihood, their well-being, their education, their energy, their water, and everything else. Water? Water? We are made of water. Water is not a luxury; it's a necessity. How can it be on the table for trade negotiations?

Anyway, I could go on, but I'm going to stop here because I'm getting more and more angry.

•(1920)

The Chair: Don't be too angry. It's not good.

Are there any questions?

I have one, if you—

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC): I'll say exactly the same thing I told you when you came in: thank you for coming. Obviously, you spoke from your heart. We hear this a lot, about people who come and they're frustrated, or concerned, or perhaps losing hope in the direction Canada's going in.

What do you see as the primary role of government in Canada?

Ms. Nadia Alexan: Regulation. If our government was not afraid of big business and if it really regulated them, we wouldn't be in the mess we're in.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Okay.

Ms. Nadia Alexan: Sir, the large majority of Canadians are paying 60% of their income in taxes. Big business, if they pay at all, are paying 4%. Then they get subsidies. Then they get tax loopholes. Then they get offshore havens to stack their money. For heaven's sake, what's the government for? Is the government here to protect me, or is it there to protect the 10% or 5% of rich people in this country?

Do you know what is happening? People are getting so frustrated, they are not voting any more. They're not voting. Only 62% of people are voting right now, and the numbers are dwindling and diminishing.

People are so fed up, they say, "What's the point?" The young people are saying, "If voting could change anything, it would be illegal". That's how cynical they have become.

The Chair: I just have one question....

I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: I asked the question, "What's the primary responsibility of government?", and you said, "Regulating". I would say the primary responsibility of government is to create an economy where Canadians can prosper in a safe country, enjoying the human rights and values that Canadians set as important.

Ms. Nadia Alexan: From what we see it's not happening. There's the Reaganite neo-liberal theory of trickling down, but it's not trickling down and it's not happening. A large majority of people have to work three jobs, or the husband and wife have to work at two jobs each, just to be able to make ends meet. Just look. I'm a teacher, and the pensions are so bad now that I have to go back and work twice a week just to be able to pay my bills—not for anything frivolous. They are cutting down on the pensions. How can a government allow a company to take subsidies from taxpayers' money and then say, "Oh, no, now we're going to Mexico"?

How can a government allow this to happen? How can you say they're doing it on their own, they're enterprising. They're not enterprising; they're doing it with our subsidies, with our money, with our taxpayers' money. That's how they're doing it.

•(1925)

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: If our primary goal is regulations, we wouldn't need a democracy to do that.

Ms. Nadia Alexan: Absolutely. It is a democracy, but a democracy means that one part of the people don't step over the other part. Right now everything is going to the corporations.

I don't know if you saw the show "Frankensteer" the other day on TV, on what they're doing to our meat. I said I'd never eat meat again after I saw that program.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Do you believe all that?

Ms. Nadia Alexan: It's disgusting. The government has to regulate. I forget the name of the packing industry. One single company has 80%...which means they're killing off all the small competition and merging into one humungous.... Of course, then what do they start doing? "We're not going to raise your salaries". I read in the newspaper those people who work in meat-packing companies don't even have time to go to the bathroom. The abuse has to....

This is where government comes in. Government has to regulate. You cannot take people's pensions, spend them on yourself and your company, and then say, "You people who have worked all your lives for a pension, now you're not entitled to one". What kind of nonsense is that?

Why don't we look toward the Scandinavian countries that have some form of prosperity, yes, but some form of prosperity for their people too. Look at the Scandinavian model.

Now when we see the international grading of countries, Canada is going down to the bottom and the Scandinavian countries are climbing up.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Can I jump in here?

Ms. Nadia Alexan: Sure.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: What parts of the Scandinavian model would you like us to take?

Ms. Nadia Alexan: Regulation.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Well, actually, some of the Scandinavian countries have different tiers of health care. They have the ability to have private health care.

Ms. Nadia Alexan: Let me tell you something. This is really the spin we get in North America because of those American companies that are pushing and pushing to take over our health care system.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: No, but there are only three countries: Korea, Canada, and Cuba—

Ms. Nadia Alexan: Let me finish. In France there is a two-tiered system, but the private system is very limited and small. It's only about 5% or 10% of the system. It is so regulated and the public system is so strong that this 10% doesn't overwhelm the public resources and take over.

We have to understand that within Europe there is a culture of sharing the resources and the system. It is different from being in North America, with the individualistic, barbarian culture of me, myself, and I, the overwhelming individualism, and the idea that there is no solidarity whatsoever in our culture.

Right now we have more private systems in our country than there are in France. In France it's 10%; over here we have 30% that is privatized.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Yes, so things like optometrists are private.

Ms. Nadia Alexan: In New Zealand they're private and it hasn't worked. They went back to the old system. In England they tried it. The railway system that used to work like clockwork is now.... Here it's the same thing because we privatized.

Look, the first and foremost *raison d'être* of a company is profit; it's not your well-being or mine. So if profits conflict with well-being, guess who's going to win? They'll cut corners from here and there. Don't renovate the infrastructure, don't maintain anything, just make profits—at the expense of whom?

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Thank you.

• (1930)

The Chair: Madame Alexan, thank you.

We have some other people. Can you come to the table now?

Are you together?

[*Translation*]

Cébert Hermann (Individual Presentation):

No, I am alone.

The Chair: Fine.

Cébert Hermann: I will be speaking French.

The Chair: That is no problem.

Could you tell us your name, please?

Cébert Hermann: My name is Cébert Hermann and I am a political science student at UQAM.

The Chair: Thank you.

Cébert Hermann: Canada's International Policy Statement signed by the Prime Minister and Minister Pettigrew attracted my attention and I have read it. I would like to take this opportunity today to state my views, given that my country of origin, Haiti, is

one of the places in the world where Canada intends to do certain things. I am quite flattered to be able to state my views and to share some of my thoughts about international relations and ways of resolving disputes throughout the world.

The comments I heard some people make today cause me to weep a little, because in my opinion they do not understand the current danger. Canada must affirm itself and must define its major orientation in order first to affirm itself, and next to come up with some solutions to problems facing certain countries in the south. That is the concept for some of my remarks.

I would like to start by making this point: Canada has imitated its powerful neighbour, the United States in almost all regards, except one. The United States is an imperialistic, conquering power with which Canada has developed a business relationship. Everything that happens in the United States is heard in Canada and we react right away. In financial affairs, every time the Americans dream about dropping their prime rate, Canada reacts the next morning. In other words, we listen to the United States very carefully on some matters, but there is one for which we do not do that. I will tell you what that is.

The cover page of Canada's International Policy Statement states the following: "A role of pride and influence in the world". I would like to emphasize that in my opinion, Europe stopped being an imperial power and has been overtaken by the former east bloc countries, which had socialist, community-focused programs—in other words socialist policies and economies. France, Germany, Italy to some extent and Belgium are no longer imperialist countries in my view, and this means that Europe—or the European Economic Community—is no longer an imperial power.

Benjamin Constant's theory is that in any given situation where everyone works together, there is some equality. The most powerful player, the United States at the moment, must affirm itself. The country that must assume responsibility for governing others plays this leadership role.

I come back to the point I made at the beginning. What Canada has not imitated about the United States is its desire for power.

• (1935)

Nietzsche talks about this theory. He says clearly that the superman reaches his peak and creates and invents things that become a new grammar, and this new grammar becomes the rule. Consequently, this superman sets the standards.

The grammar about which Nietzsche speaks is quite simply the financial, economic and military ability to dictate the rules of the game.

In order to compete with this great friend of ours, the United States, I think, contrary to what a number of speakers said today, that Canada must take on this desire for power, by defining its own rules, setting its own limits, and so on.

Earlier, Mr. Sorenson was speaking about the changes that must be made to the UN. However, we cannot change the UN if we do not have the financial ability to do so. As you said, some 23 per cent of its budget comes from the U.S. contribution, and 19 per cent from Japan, not to mention the sovereign powers that define and draw up an investment plan in this regard.

As a result, we can define the rules according to our ability to provide financial and other support to international bodies such as the European Union, which is a supraregional organization which is tending to become a political organization. Canada must respond to these needs.

I have not heard any proposals today, and that is what concerns me. So here is what I propose. First of all, we must redefine Canada's role in the world: Canada must decide to affirm itself in the world. If no country can play a leadership role in the world just by being fair to other countries, that is by taking into account the little countries in the south with very little voice, no country will do this in the interest of these countries. The fact is that Canada is recognized throughout the world as one of the countries that allow small countries to resist and to have access to certain opportunities.

Consequently, Canada's policy must be directed toward an exceptional affirmation. It must assume its role and create new institutions. As Nietzsche would say, the process of exceptional affirmation makes it possible to create new institutions. These new institutions are complex; as they are adapted to the needs, to the new realities and trends, institutions are created that are exactly in keeping with Canada's national needs.

I think Canada must redefine its international policy by affirming itself, by choosing to affirm itself in the world and to play its role beside the big players so as to redefine things.

Let me turn now to solutions for small southern countries, which include my native country.

I will not be flowery. I would rather go straight to the point.

I think that western civilization has created institutions in keeping with its reality and its needs, such as democracy, the free market, the free circulation of goods, services, people and so on.

Here is what I think must be done to help countries such as Haiti where living conditions are so difficult. The support that western capitalism has established is a patriation of social values. In other words, labour struggles have produced mechanisms that enable the individual to leave behind the family circle, and the constraints and fragility of families to bring him to a state of perfect freedom.

● (1940)

What I mean is that in the countries of the south, there are no means that allow an individual to become a consumer. When liberal, capitalist policies are proposed, these countries do not heed the call. What do we do then? An individual's transition from living in famine to self-affirmation must be supported, so that he can become self-sufficient. That is what the gauge should be.

According to CIDA, only 7¢ of each dollar of international aid is spent in southern countries. Eighty-seven per cent of monies given to southern countries returns to the donor country. Development must

take place at the local level. In order for that to happen, southern countries must be able to create transition mechanisms that allow for individuals to leave their families, on which they depend, and enter a society of production, consumption, and so on.

In the west, and in Canada in particular, I can decide to leave my family and live out my freedom, regardless of my family's intention to force me to stay. The "Tanguy" phenomenon, where a person lives at home until the age of 30, can be countered.

In the west, particularly in Canada, a person may benefit from social assistance and employment insurance. These are both mechanisms that allow an individual to break free from family constraints and become a consumer, in other words, someone who absorbs and assimilates liberal values. Everything I speak of today stems from my thesis entitled "Appropriation of liberal values by southern countries."

Financing this transition is something Canada can propose to the world. It can be done. Now, where do we get the money to do this? That is always the question being asked. Where do we get the money?

Western countries, including Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, and France do not have enough soldiers in their respective countries. We witnessed this during the Iraq war, where people, companies, and mercenary groups offered their services to the powers that wanted to invade Iraq.

Therefore, why not institutionalize these mercenary groups? To illustrate the best way of going about things, factoring in the problems, let us take Haiti as an example, my home country. In Haiti, people still draw upon the military tradition. They seek power, weapons, and believe that they are powerful. Yet, when they obtain weapons, they end up killing the population. As a consequence, they are opposed to rival groups—including popular organizations—and seek to destroy the country.

● (1945)

Canada could provide funding for training military personnel in this country. There could be an army of 50,000 to 100,000, but it would not be able to use weapons in Haiti. It would provide the services that a country such as Canada and the United States want to have. These powers could use this human resource to their advantage. In return, these countries would get some revenues.

Rather than giving Haiti the money directly—because we know that only seven per cent will be invested in the country, we could lend the money to Haiti, which would finance an army composed of its own people. We are on the brink of major change in this XXIst century. An army of between 50,000 and 100,000 could be created in countries such as Haiti.

So the money would be loaned, not given. It would not be a gift. That means that it could not become tainted.

Since there are no blacks in the American, Canadian, French, German, Italian or other armies, we could use this resource in certain conflicts throughout the world.

That is one suggestion.

So these soldiers could be trained in Haiti and given the power they require. However, this power must become a productive force, an agent of change. In Haiti itself, these people would be involved only in building bridges and highways. In addition, their services could be sold.

I am not being cynical! I am sorry, this is not cynicism, but rather political realism.

Given that fewer Canadians from ethnic communities decide to enrol in the Canadian army, we could use the services of these armies, in light of the current energy situation, and the fact that we are seeking new sources of energy.

As we know, western Africa has enough energy resources at the moment to meet certain needs. American companies such as Exxon/Esso and Shell are already in Africa doing some prospecting work and defining the possibilities.

Canada could turn towards this universe, because there will be conflicts. We must be realistic: There will be conflicts in the future.

If there are conflicts in these countries, the best way of dealing with money would be to have Canada buy military services from Haiti or other countries. I imagine this could be worldwide in scope.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind you that this week, the United Nations will be sending soldiers from Cameroon and other African countries to Haiti. These black soldiers will be in our country. That will help calm tensions.

We also forget that the people of Haiti revolted against the white man, the French man. The French man was a white man. Every time a white soldier arrives in Haiti, there is a reaction. Haitians object to the presence of whites. On a number of occasions since 1994 or after 2001, this has caused some unfortunate incidents.

Haitians tolerate tourists and others; they are very welcoming in fact. But when people come to us as colonists, there is a unified national response in opposition to these people.

● (1950)

In other words, the presence of Haitian soldiers in Africa or African soldiers in Haiti may have a calming effect. I will stop there. I think this could give rise to a debate.

Let us talk about security. I've heard many people asking questions about terrorism today. Let me say one thing at the outset. The theoretical model of intelligence services that made it possible to identify future terrorists is not in keeping with the new reality, with the new facts.

Terrorists are no longer only people from Afghanistan, Pakistan or elsewhere. Terrorists are already among us. They know the country and its structures well.

I apologize for making an aside, but I did have an opportunity to do an internship program in political science in Ontario. There I worked for the Department of Community Security and Correctional Services and for the Ontario Police College. I was able to make some suggestions, because I was a trainee. I saw that people did not understand the current issues surrounding terrorism. I will therefore make a suggestion to you. That is what I am here for. I do not want

to get into a discussion, because I am not skilled at rhetoric and I have not written anything.

Let us start by redefining the way in which terrorists are recruited. Terrorists are located in the west. They no longer have to get on a plane, they are already here. People in France found that out. I remember a discussion that I had with some friends. I was saying that soon there would be a war in France and that soon there would be a revolt. The communities that are not being integrated into French society are misunderstood, neglected and rejected and they end up paying the price and reacting.

In east Montreal at the moment there are groups that are clearly calling for a black revolution. This is a racist movement. Last Monday or Friday, certain events occurred in the eastern part of the city. Some whites hit some blacks with baseball bats. I think people will react and the blacks will decide to respond directly to this type of behaviour. I do not know, and I hope this does not happen.

My point is that to some extent we are involved in recruiting terrorists. Let me explain what I mean. Often an Arab or a black works in a manufacturing company. These are people with university degrees, skills, and so on. They have had to take many tests, and they are offered deplorable living conditions. Some manage to adapt and integrate. I know there is a theory which says that when immigrants arrive in a new country, they do not come to achieve that country's dream, but rather to achieve their own dream and to meet their own needs. They come to Canada because they have fled from natural disasters: poverty, civil war, political problems, and so on. They do not come to solve Canada's problems. They come here because they have determined rationally that they could achieve their dream here. That is why the American dream works.

● (1955)

Today, we have to define the Canadian dream. It must be a place where people can achieve their potential, work from what they know and enjoy prosperity.

Let me come back to the recruitment of terrorists. In my opinion, if there is no program to acknowledge the credentials obtained by immigrants in their country of origin when they arrive here, some of them could become terrorists. Why is that? Let us go through the process, without delving into too much detail.

Let us assume that someone comes here and is working in a manufacturing plant. One of the conditions the person had to meet in order to come here was to have a university degree and to speak French or English. So the person arrives here and is offered what? There is nothing to welcome such people here. Since there is nothing, the people decide to survive, and end up working in a manufacturing plant. They are not working with intellectuals, with people who have university degrees—I've travelled around Canada quite a bit, so I know whereof I speak—rather, they will be working with people who have a high school graduation at the most. These Canadians or Quebeckers, because they feel they are at home, tell these people that they are not superior to them, that they have nothing, and that they are merely claiming to have a degree even though they are working in a manufacturing plant. They tell these immigrants that they have only a high school certificate and all they know how to do is read and write, and they will ask what the immigrants are doing in that place. That is where the frustration starts.

Imagine these immigrants in a bar having a drink. If a white person is sitting beside one of them and decides that the immigrant smells bad, the frustration just continues.

Imagine what happens if this person tries to find a place to live. I'm talking about visible minorities—Arabs, Haitians, Africans, Latin-Americans and Asians. There is more frustration. Hatred develops. Immigrants start by hating their neighbour, then they hate their job, the boss, and other aspects of their world until they feel they have to act. This is what I call the process that leads to recruitment, something that requires these people to go somewhere.

Let us assume that these individuals are Muslims, and that there are groups in place to help them achieve what they want the most: obtain revenge on those who have hurt them. Let us assume as well that they have the financial resources required to do that. Subsequently, because they are drifting, they decide to attack the system. They no longer see the person beside them or the country in which they are living, all they see is the world system.

● (2000)

The Chair: We would like to hear your conclusions, please.

Cébert Hermann: I will conclude.

The Chair: We have a number of people here. Could you conclude your remarks, please?

Cébert Hermann: So to conclude, these people will find themselves beside someone who will be able to finance their activity. So they will be recruited and ready. These people will not have been recruited, they will have recruited themselves. We will have forced them to recruit themselves, and they will be able to act, explode, implode or even attempt suicide in order to put an end to the system. It is the symbolism of death. They commit suicide in the hope that the system itself will die following their death.

Because of the new international reality and the system being established—which is called "globalization", but which I call "the west expanding to the rest of the world"—more than ever, Canada must remain beside the country that has decided to be the biggest power, namely the United States, in order to meet the requests of small countries. If we leave the United States alone, it will not do much. It will continue to act like a giant, and no small power

anywhere will remind it that the small countries are at its side. The giant is not concerned about the small players beside it, but dwarfs are aware of those around them.

I hope all of this will be useful and will change the relationship. Canada must assume its place, because it represents the hope of countries in the south such as Haiti and the African countries. Canada must get involved. In order to do that, it must focus its international policy on other small countries through its commitments.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

I am now going to hand over to Ms. Maureen Adelman.

Maureen Adelman (Individual Presentation):

I would like to thank the committee for inviting me to speak this evening.

[*English*]

I would like to know what the government intends to do about their commitment to UN resolution 1325. That's the first thing.

The one very important point I would like to make is very simple: if we want to promote international peace and security, we need to increase our efforts at negotiation of peaceful settlements, elimination of production and the traffic of arms and weapons, and at finding humanitarian solutions in conflict situations. This means the abolition of war as a way of solving conflicts. I would like to know whether our government is committed to peace, to working for peace; whether our government is prepared to take the next 10 years to work for peace; whether our government will decide and show that they're serious and establish and fund a department of peace; and that this will be a commitment of our government.

I believe all Canadians want peace in the world; they're not interested in armed conflict any more. We have international organizations; we have the International Criminal Court; we have the United Nations. I would like to see stronger support of our government for any initiatives of the United Nations.

In this respect, we need to have women appear at all tables on resolution of conflict. It's women and children who are the innocent victims of war. It's women and children in Darfur, for example, who risk their lives every day just to get wood to cook their food, and this is multiplied throughout the world.

So what I have to say is very short. I would like to know whether the government is really concerned that they do something for peace in the world. This also includes working for the health of people throughout the world—working for vaccines for treatment of malaria, for example. This has been eradicated in some parts of the world, but now funding has been stopped, and I'd like to know what our government's position is, because this is a part of peace and security. This is the way to fight terrorism, by trying for equal opportunity for everyone in the world.

That really is all. I have much more here, and I would like to deposit this, and I'd like to know where. What is the e-mail address?

There are other people who didn't know about this public meeting, for some reason, and they're very anxious to send e-mails so that you would hear their input. I don't know; look how few people are here. It's unbelievable. Are you surprised? I would like to know.

You're not surprised? Why aren't you surprised?

● (2005)

The Chair: We don't know ourselves.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: I want to know why you're not surprised, because it's essential for us.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: We're a rich country.

The Chair: I fully agree with you. You're asking why we're not surprised? It's because there was not enough communication. We had the authorization to travel last Wednesday.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: Last Wednesday?

The Chair: That's when we had the authorization, and we sent e-mails, and that's why we came here to the UQAM, because it's central, and tomorrow morning we're still having people. It's the same with crisscrossing the country.

Now, we have an e-consultation; we have a website. We'll give you all the information about this. I sent myself, from my office, more than 800 e-notes, just to be sure that people will...answering back to see whether they cannot come to see us through... There's the e-consultation.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: Yes.

The Chair: We're meeting groups, national groups and local groups, and also person to person, as you're coming this evening.

But you asked me if we're surprised. Nothing will surprise politicians. We're politicians. In a certain sense, we would like to have more people. We worked yesterday from 9 o'clock in the morning until 10 p.m. That was our day yesterday.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: I see you working very hard.

The Chair: But you asked me if I'm surprised. No, because there is less and less of an indication from the Canadian population.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: I can't accept that.

The Chair: I mean there's less of an indication to come and visit us. But that's good, that's what we want, that's the idea of coming here. But you cannot always come.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: How did you notify us? That's what I want to know, because so many people knew nothing about it when I called them.

The Chair: The only way to notify people is to notify the association or the group. You belong to a group and there's notice through e-mail. That's the only way, otherwise people need to go to our website.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: But our government certainly knows that we exist, because we're certainly on lists with the government, so how is it that we're not notified?

The Chair: You have to make a distinction: it's not the government, it's the committee.

● (2010)

Ms. Maureen Adelman: It's the committee.

The Chair: It's a parliamentary committee, not the government.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: Oh, okay.

The Chair: We're all parliamentarians from three parties over here this evening, but it's not the government itself that's doing this; it's parliamentarians on their own.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: Okay, we need to furnish you with a list of the organizations that want to be notified in advance. I will get the website, but can I also have your cross-Canada schedule?

The Chair: Sure, that's no problem. Everything is public and on our website. If you have any written submissions, we would be very pleased to have them and to read them, and we'll be looking at them very carefully. That's the role of parliamentarians, but we're not the government.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: Okay. Very good then.

The Chair: That's okay. I just wanted you to understand the procedure. It's not easy all the time to understand it.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: Good.

I hope this continues next year, because when you come here to Montreal next year, I guarantee that this whole side will be filled.

The Chair: Good. I'm very pleased.

Thank you.

Ms. Maureen Adelman: Thank you very much.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: I would now ask Mr. Pierre Bricault to take the floor.

Mr. Pierre Bricault (Individual Presentation):

Good evening. I will not be so bold as to claim that I speak tonight on behalf of all Canadians; but, I am speaking on behalf of the five or six here with me this evening.

I will begin by discussing certain matters that I find troubling, such as the situation in Tibet and in Taiwan. These are delicate matters for Canada, as we are in the process of forging closer commercial ties with the world's largest market. Obviously, in light of our overdependence on the United States, Canadians would like to have access to an alternative market. Europe does business with Africa; this is perhaps a model to follow. Canada is seeking alternatives to the US market, and China fits the bill to a T. However, in going down this avenue, we are perhaps turning our backs on some of our fundamental values.

I closely follow the situation in Tibet, and have always been conscious of its predicament. As my interest in Tibet grew, I discovered, to my utter dismay, that it theoretically belongs to China. I am not quite sure at what point in history this became Tibet's destiny. We are told that when Mao invaded Tibet, he was acting legitimately. Personally, I continue to consider Tibet as a sovereign nation. We also know that Tibet regained its sovereignty around 1914, but only for a matter of a few years. I would like to see Tibet once again win back its sovereignty. I believe the Dalai Lama to be the spiritual and earthly leader of Tibet. I tread cautiously in saying so, as I realize that China is acutely sensitive to any interference on matters of its national sovereignty.

That being said, I believe that Tibetans are a sovereign people, who boast their own language and culture. I have seen the NFB's deeply moving film *Ce qu'il reste de nous* on many occasions. I am not somebody who usually watches films over and over again. The film portrays how China pilfers and squanders Tibet's resources, with no respect for Tibetans. Furthermore, China is seeking to inundate Tibet and its indigenous population with citizens of Chinese origin, such as the Han. To my mind, such a policy is tantamount to a creeping genocide.

Then there is the matter of Taiwan. I have a shortwave radio and, until very recently, I was able to receive Radio Taiwan International. Taiwan is an emerging democracy, and I am of the view that President Chen Shui-bian is running his country to the best of his abilities. I am aware that the Guomindang are supporting China. While this situation may be none of my business, it irks me greatly. I had the good fortune of travelling to Japan, as well as the People's Republic of China, where I was able to witness two extremes in the form of Shanghai and Kunming. I also visited a region at the foothills of Tibet, as well as Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan. My visit allowed me to develop an understanding of this region. I spent six months in Asia, and the time flew by. In that situation you do not really have time to analyze what is going on around you. You get swept along by your feelings.

To my mind, Taiwanese culture is undeniably Chinese culture, but Chinese culture which has developed its own, unique character. I was conscious of this difference when I was in Taiwan. I also had the opportunity to spend some time in the People's Republic of China, where the spectre of communism lives in the form of collectivism. There is a different energy in the two countries. Due to the influence of Catholic and Protestant missionaries, Taiwan opted for a different route, fusing traditional culture from before the communists came to power with many western influences. Oddly enough, even though Taiwan is really very Chinese in nature, I felt at home.

It would be regrettable to allow Taiwan to be swallowed up by this sprawling mass dominated by Beijing. I do not know whether you have been to China, but when I was there in 1995, there was only one time zone, the Beijing time zone. No matter where you find yourself in China, you are on Beijing time. In China, symbolism is not bound by reality. In Kunming, I saw several minority groups that had been assimilated, and who were unhappy to find themselves shackled to China. Mr. Deng Xiaoping said that the Chinese would not stand back and allow China to become the Balkans. However, it must be recognized that some minorities would like to have a little more of their own space. I do not know how that can be achieved. It

would be interesting to know what Canadians think of their country's relations with China.

I was disappointed to learn that Bombardier is contributing to the Tibetan genocide by building the infamous railway line, which will facilitate the exodus of the region's resources. I was also upset to learn that Nortel will be providing the telecommunication system for the trains. I know that Nortel has known troubled times, and needs money. One of my brothers had contracts with them. Apparently, Nortel has found itself stuck with huge quantities of low-quality products. It cannot find anybody to take them off its hands. What is hard to swallow is that, as a result, Nortel is jumping at any contract that comes its way.

When Mr. Martin met with the Dalai Lama, China made a sharp rebuttal, asking how the Canadian government would feel if China were to help Quebecers gain independence. In the weeks that followed, Nortel won a major contract worth hundreds of millions of dollars, as did Bombardier. In other words, although Hu Jintao's diplomatic approach is a far cry from aggressive, he nonetheless manages to force the hand of other nations. That brings me to the end of what I wanted to say about China.

Turning now to the United Nations, I would like to see it given more power. We are moving towards an increasingly integrated global village. The era of nation states, when nations lived in splendid isolation, is long gone. Increasingly, unelected individuals meet privately and make decisions on our behalf. This is both unfair and unacceptable. When somebody makes a decision on my behalf as to what economic policies should be followed, and when my Prime Minister goes one better by saying that the decision has been made and there remains nothing left to be said in the matter, I answer that, personally, I did not vote in favour of such things. One day, we will perhaps call upon the United Nations to play a stronger role in these matters of significant and international concern.

I attended one of the forums on UN reform organized by the Université du Québec. Those who work for the United Nations are currently telling us that chaos reigns. There is no doubt that the role of the United Nations should be strengthened and a way should be found for it to break free from American influence.

To this end, I proposed a tax of one cent per \$10 spent. Developing countries would pay virtually nothing, while developed countries, countries which have money, would automatically fill the coffers of the United Nations. We are not there yet, but perhaps Canada could promote the introduction of such a measure. We believe that the Tobin tax should be adopted, and that tax havens be somehow abolished. It would be a good idea for the United Nations to do this. It would provide them with another source of revenue. Why not?

Another matter of concern is the notion of Fortress America, an American theory that terrorists have infiltrated their country a bit like a virus. The theory postulates that we are all susceptible to becoming terrorists, and that the government must therefore keep a watchful eye on us all. This is going to lead to a virtually totalitarian society. It would be difficult to live in such a society. I know people who, like myself, will leave Canada. If I have the opportunity to do so, I will take what little talent I have elsewhere. I do not want to live in a country where I feel like I am in the People's Republic of China. When I was in the People's Republic of China, I was constantly under surveillance by either the Public Security Bureau, the PSB, or undercover agents. I was under surveillance, I was not just imagining it.

I remember going to the Bund, in Shanghai. There is a square called the Diamond, where you can get a shuttle to the Pudong New Area and the restaurant area. Two women came over to talk to me. They were ordinary Chinese women who waited tables. I was holding my little dictionary, and as soon as they began speaking to me, three others approached me and said "We are university students and we would like to practise our Chinese with you." This happened to me on several occasions. They all spoke impeccable English. But what happened was that the local Chinese, who only spoke Chinese, walked away, embarrassed. That was what happened with these two women, who were about 50 years old. They wanted to interact with a westerner. At the moment, China is a police state. Its citizens are tightly controlled. I do not want that to happen to Canada.

In the 1990s, when the Soviet Union collapsed, the CIA had to decide what to do with its personnel. They had been trained to fight the Soviets, but the Soviets were no more. This heralded the rise of a new concept concerning populist insurrections, and I have a number of books on the subject. The men and women of the CIA were trained to combat populist uprisings. They were taught leadership to enable them to control a given group. In order to be able to carry out surveillance during an insurrection, closed-circuit cameras were put up all over the place. I am talking about Omnitron cameras, they have an integrated, 360° rotating microphone and a zoom which allows those monitoring the camera to see what people are writing. At the moment, we are not far from a Big Brother situation. Some Canadian and US companies are helping China to monitor its citizens more effectively. There is a burgeoning trend which is healthy neither for us nor the rest of the planet. I can assure you that I do not want to see such things here in Canada. But, that is exactly where we are headed. The process is underway. I would like Canada, along with other countries, to adopt a more active stance. When I say that, I think, amongst others, of the space research body that we fund, although it is not very productive. If several bodies were to work together, as they did in the European Union with Airbus and Ariane, Canada could perhaps play a stronger role on the world stage. That is the Canada of my dreams.

In addition, I would like for us to one day stop thinking of English Canadians and French Canadians as polar opposites. As somebody with both English and French-language heritage, I deplore the fact that we fritter so much energy on this subject for nothing; this polarization saps our country. There's a real problem. I once spoke with a man from Newfoundland who told me that he was amazed by just how different the west of the city was. He told me that there were simply no francophones living there.

● (2020)

The Chair: That was in the west end of Montreal?

Mr. Pierre Bricault: Yes.

So this man had come here and he felt like a foreigner. I met him when there had been some major problems in Newfoundland, when a minister had tried to "break" the provincial public servants. He had tried to bring them into line by imposing some rather severe conditions on them. There was a strike, and ultimately, people went back to work.

The reason I raise this is that I am quite sensitive to what is going on in the province. There are some problems, such as declining production in the forestry and fishery sectors. The province must survive. I wholeheartedly approve of Canada's recent approach toward the weaker provinces. When an individual is handicapped, others help out. Ontario is strong—wonderful! The idea is not for everyone to be stupidly equal, with everyone having the same share.

What I am getting at is that some day I would like to see Canada solve this problem once and for all. We cannot force anglophones to take an interest in francophones. We have a dynamic culture that is appreciated even in France. We are the little North-American cousins. Our artists and filmmakers go to France and the United States. We had a unified Montreal, even though the Anglo-Saxons in the West Island, the people in Westmount, Pointe-Claire and other areas have separated quite recently. They decided to establish borders. This is unhealthy. We are part of the same group, and we have to think Canadian. That does not exist yet, and we are wasting energy on this.

It would be good if we had free trade in Canada. I do not understand why Mr. Charest is dreaming about having a fast train between New York and Quebec. I have nothing to do with the Americans! Why not have a fast train to Toronto? That is not such a dumb idea. Why is Mr. Charest selling electricity to the Americans, when the rest of the country needs it? What is the idea behind that? Why would I help my neighbour to the south who is so rich and powerful rather than helping the people in my own country? I do not understand. It is a strange way of looking at things. We are selling electricity and oil to the United States. And what about Canada? It takes what is left over. That is no good. In any case, that is a brief statement of my views.

I would also like us to open up our borders more. I have just read about what is going on in the Spanish territory in Morocco. There are Africans running into barbed-wire fences and being killed. They tried to use force to become part of the prosperous country, but they did not succeed. They died in the attempt. I think it is scandalous that such things are still happening in this world. Some people are still looking for a solution, but if they succeed, they will die. That is not right. I would like us to welcome more people here.

Are my comments too long?

● (2025)

The Chair: No, that is all right.

However, I do want people to understand that we are trying to find solutions in Canada, but also internationally. I understand that what happened in Melilla and Ceuta, the two Spanish enclaves on the Mediterranean Coast of Morocco, is terrible. I went there myself and I saw the barbed wire, and so on. It is very difficult for us as well.

We can make diplomatic recommendations about Canada's role over there, but our committee cannot get involved in the affairs of other nations. Nevertheless, I can assure you that we are looking at this very closely, because we are familiar with the situation.

Mr. Pierre Bricault: Actually, perhaps we should be increasing the number of people in Canada. At the moment, there are many Chinese people arriving. For a number of reasons, Canada is more accepting of people from China. This is a right. It would be a good thing if we were to accept people from all parts of the world, in order to retain a better balance. In addition, this would increase our domestic market, which would make it much more dynamic and would create a critical mass. We would achieve a critical mass in terms of population, and that would enable us to function much more effectively. In addition, we must not forget all the wealth of knowledge people bring.

Yesterday, I attended a lecture by Jean Ziegler. It was touching. There are 100,000 people dying of hunger every day.

The Chair: Ms. Alexan told us about that.

Mr. Pierre Bricault: We are wasting our wealth in this world. I see people like Mr. Pratte or Mr. Piché, who write in *La Presse* or elsewhere, and who defend the Chicago school vision, which is one of hard-line neo-liberalism. That is destructive to people, to the planet and in every other way.

Could Canada's so-called strategic natural resources be protected? I do not understand why gold mines are owned by private, foreign interests. And I do not understand why oil, which is going to become more and more strategic, is owned by foreign interests. The United States have a strategic resource category and it is untouchable. This is how they were able to turn down an oil company. They said it was a strategic resource. Why does Canada not do the same?

At the moment, Canada is selling raw materials cheaply. And what happens? We buy value-added products for high prices and say that we are getting a good deal. Are you so sure of that? The Americans are in the process of buying up all of Canada. They own everything! Go to any supermarket, pick up your favourite product and look at the back of the package. You will find the words "Made in USA" on almost every product. Almost all prosperous Canadian companies are bought up by Americans.

Recently, Sears reported that its revenues had dropped. That is unfortunate. What did Sears do? They quickly reported a two-billion-dollar dividend. To whom was it paid? [*Editor's Note: Technical Difficulty*] Two billion dollars left the country and went to the United States. That is not a good thing.

• (2030)

The Chair: I would like to thank you, Mr. Bricault.

I would just like to tell you that I was the chairman of the committee when the Dalai-Lama came to Ottawa. He appeared before the committee for two hours. We had a very good, interesting discussion with him.

I would like to thank you for your comments on Tibet, Taiwan, the United Nations, equality and so on. We have recorded all your remarks and will listen to them again and read everything you told us. Thank you once again for coming in as a responsible citizen.

[*English*]

Are there any other comments?

[*Translation*]

Thank you very much for coming.

[*English*]

You came today. Ms. Berlyn, you're always welcome.

Ms. Judith Berlyn (Individual Presentation): Thank you very much.

I'm Judith Berlyn. I'm here as a member of the steering committee of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. This is a subject I only touched on earlier. I was hoping for questions; I didn't get them, so I would now like to deal with it a little more fully. I won't be long.

Can I divide myself in two? I'd like to be personal for a minute, with just me as a Canadian citizen and this document. I went home and I spent another hour and a half with it while I sent my husband out to get some takeout food so I didn't have to cook.

I have the new policy. As I told you before, I've read the overview and the defence *cahiers*, and I went back over my marginal notes. I know Mr. Sorenson thinks I'm negative, but what I noticed most about that document was what is not in it, some things that are very important to me. There is this great lack of definitions, I find. Terms are used that can be defined in various ways, and the definitions are not given in many cases.

I don't know if I'm going to have time to go through it almost page by page and send you a written set of comments, but I'm going to try. When is the deadline for the written submissions?

The Chair: I'm sure you get another month.

A voice: I think we're going to extend it.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: It would be good. I would urge you to extend this process.

• (2035)

The Chair: If you could submit it by the first week of December, that would still be good—just to let you know.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: Yes, and there are holidays, so I could even work on it over Christmas, probably, because you're going to give these people some holidays.

There is very little mention—just one little place, I think—of the fact that we live in a world where 20% of the population of the planet as a whole is using 80% of the resources, and this gap between rich and poor is growing. They do mention the gap in one place that I found. This is an untenable situation. Certain things are not at all mentioned.

Maybe it's not the opinion of the government, but it has been mentioned here that we live in a world of one superpower, a very unipolar world. That's an unhealthy situation. Canada should see itself as needing to be part of creating a counterweight to that and work with other countries to make sure there is some better balance of things, to my mind.

Many people have mentioned that it's too close to Canadian policy. What I notice is that not only do we not attempt to distance ourselves from the United States...although when the election comes we'll hear all about our independent foreign policy, because it's almost a mantra, but we don't have one, and you're hearing over and over again that Canadians really do want one.

Not only does it not make a distance, but it actually states in many places that we want to be more integrated, particularly in military matters, to be more closely associated with the U.S. militarism.

I have written here, "Defence, page 12". I don't know what it says. But one definition I want to bring to your attention, because it is really alarming to me, is that the phrase "global engagement" is used in the conclusion of the overview. That would be page 30 of the overview. It says:

This International Policy Statement establishes the principles and priorities that will guide the next generation of Canadian global engagement.

This set off alarm bells in my mind, because I remember very well that on the United States space command website there used be lots, more on the long range plan. But in this document, called *Vision for 2020*, which has alarmed many of us for years, they do see fit to define global engagement. It's the first time I learned the phrase: "Global Engagement is the application of precision force from, to, and through space." That's their definition of global engagement. We don't say we have another definition.

The Chair: I just want to point out that I want you to speak, but... I'll give you an example. When the United States goes to Iraq against Iraq, they call it "freedom of Iraq". I disagree with the terminology the United States uses for Iraq. That means I can disagree with the United States' terminology for us as Canadians.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: I hope we disagree—

The Chair: That's what I mean. I don't want to make comparisons with the United States on this issue.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: I think we should define our terms.

The Chair: Sure. On that I agree. On the definition, I fully agree, but I don't want to say, because the United States has a definition, that's the definition we're looking at.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: Okay.

To be more precise about the nuclear stuff, again, what's lacking in here is that there is no statement that nuclear disarmament is an international requirement. It's an international treaty obligation for Canada to do its utmost. That is not mentioned.

That's a fact; this is opinion. Opinion is, but I think it's a fact, that the only way to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—in particular, nuclear weapons—is to eliminate them from the planet. That's really the only way to prevent, because as long as they're around and as long as powerful countries say they need them, other countries are going to want to have them and we're

going to have a proliferation problem. So if we want to deal with proliferation, we have to achieve disarmament.

I did mention earlier about NATO's policy really violating the treaty. That is international law. That's not mentioned in there. NATO's policy on nuclear weapons isn't mentioned at all, and there is certainly no challenging the continuing existence of these horrible weapons.

As to what we would like, do you want a concrete suggestion?

A voice: Sure.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: Let the Government of Canada come out clearly and unequivocally in favour of a total ban on nuclear weapons, a worldwide ban. Nuclear weapons are the only weapons of mass destruction that are not banned by international agreement.

Chemical weapons are banned. Biological weapon are banned. Dumdum bullets are banned. You can't use dumdum bullets legally.

So let Canada be in favour of a ban. It won't declare that. We don't say it. We never have, and we refuse to. We had an opportunity at the non-proliferation treaty conference in New York last May, at the UN.

A very good working paper was circulating at that conference. I have copies of it to give to you, but I want to find the title. It was a very practical document drawn up by the same lawyers who worked on the World Court projects to get the International Court of Justice to pronounce. It's called "Follow-up to the International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons: Legal, technical and political elements required for the establishment and maintenance of a nuclear weapons free world".

This was a month-long conference that I came home from after just four days. I was so excited when I found this that I put a copy of it into the hands of the top elected official in the department within a week of coming home, asking for the government to consider it. Someone was going to get back to me. They didn't. I phoned back and so on. Finally, on the last day of the conference, May 27, I got a call saying the government would consider it. Of course, it was too late. The opportunity had gone by because this was a working document for the conference.

However, another opportunity will be coming the government's way. There are many people, NGOs, and other governments around the world wanting Canada to do some kind of new Ottawa process with respect to nuclear weapons, the kind of thing we did...

We talked earlier today about the problems at the UN, the roadblocks, and the vetos on the Security Council. There are ways to stickhandle things through the UN system, and that's what we did with anti-personnel land mines, very cleverly. If we use the General Assembly more, where there's no veto, that's one way of trying to handle things.

In this case, the request will be for Canada to host an international conference of countries that want to consider precisely this: the legal, technical, and political elements required. That's very practical stuff, and I hope the government will agree to host such a conference.

• (2040)

The Chair: Do you have a copy of your—

Ms. Judith Berlyn: This is the paper that died at the end of the—

The Chair: We would like—

Ms. Judith Berlyn: I'm sure you'll be getting it before you're finished your whole process.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: So there are just a couple of concrete things we could do about really helping to get rid of nuclear weapons, which are still an enormous threat—enormous—unless you believe in fail-safe technology. I've been surrounded by a husband who is an engineer and a father who was an engineer, although he's now dead. The engineers in my life don't think there's any such thing as fail-safe technology. When I asked my husband if he was concerned about nuclear weapons, he said, "Of course, I am, because I'm an engineer and I know there's no such thing as fail-safe technology."

When we have the accident with nuclear weapons, which is inevitable sooner or later—we're just very lucky that we've been living with them for 55 years now. With the business of making them, storing them, transporting them, and all this, inevitably there will be a horrendous accident that will be like no other accident or natural disaster we have ever seen, other than Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Actually, no, it will be much worse because these are much bigger bombs than the ones that were actually used.

We have to get serious about getting rid of them, and Canada could do a lot more. Please.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: Thank you.

The Chair: Are there any other witnesses?

Thank you very much.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Could you give me one minute?

The Chair: I'll give you thirty seconds. You're young, you can run. I'm not running any more.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: Don't let the bureaucrats make policy. That's what happens. They really do want to limit their counterparts.

A voice: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Come on up. Don't feel like you have to have a formal presentation. We want to hear from young and old.

The Chair: Can you give your name, please.

[*Translation*]

Jonathan Bujault (Individual Presentation):

My name is Jonathan Bugeau. It is spelled Bugeau, not Bujault.

The Chair: That is why I asked the question.

You have the floor.

[*English*]

Jonathan Bujault: I'm going to speak very briefly.

One of our broader foreign policy visions that Foreign Affairs has outlined is that of human security, which is a mix between promoting individual human security throughout the world and economic development. The two are inseparable; if you don't have one, you can't have the other.

Part of our commitment towards human security is going to take more concrete steps. Right now, it's a great catchphrase. We've got some agreements with Denmark. I think in the past, before we even came out with our official human security policy, we did take steps to create international pillars to promote this. Examples would be the creation of the International Criminal Court and the Ottawa convention on banning land mines.

I think it's going to be necessary to create another pillar in international law that will be able to empower groups and countries like Canada to better engage themselves, both in aspects of the security and the economic development aspect of human security. I think that would be the creation of a convention regulating the global trade in small arms and light weapons. Right now, at best, the international community has a few patchwork protocols, declarations, and some minor resolutions, but nothing solid.

I know that the disarmament committee, right now I think, is closing up their negotiations of the tracking protocol they're creating. There's the UN firearms protocol, but aside from that, there's no universal standard on the trade in small arms and light weapons, which is one of the more volatile weapons systems in the world. Unlike weapons of mass destruction, small arms and light weapons, daily, kill more people than weapons of mass destruction have in the last 50 years or so.

A previous witness raised a very important point, that one of the things Canada has added to diplomacy in the post-cold war world is that we're at the forefront of multi-track diplomacy and the empowerment of civil society, and international civil society, in the creation of international law and norms. That was witnessed both in the formation of the ICC and the negotiation process in Ottawa for the land mine convention.

I think such diplomatic tracks could be very useful, not only for contentious issues like nuclear weapons, but also contentious issues like small arms and light weapons, which we all know the P-5 has major interests in. They are the largest dealers in small arms and light weapons.

That would be something that would also help us domestically. With the number of Canadians killed with firearms in this country, I think half of those firearms are illegally smuggled from the U.S.

Like I said, it's an issue that touches home as much as it touches our commitments abroad to security, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and economic development. It's something I believe the Canadian government should begin exploring as an avenue for the future.

• (2045)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Jonathan.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Thank you very much.

First of all, this is not an observation or a negative against anyone else, but it's good to have young people come out to this.

I noticed you guys were sitting up there the whole evening.

Jonathan Bujault: We were fashionably late, but....

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Yes, fashionably late....

You know, we have a great country; it can be a lot better. It's good to see young people who care, who take an interest, and who are willing to come to a boring old political meeting to tell us what they believe.

I hope you always stand up for what you believe and try to make the country better.

Jonathan Bujault: Thank you very much.

I think you said it best, that it's a wonderful place we live in.

The fact that we as citizens of this country have the opportunity to come here...we are in essence democratizing the process, not only of our domestic policy and legislation, but our foreign affairs. It's a democratization of foreign policy. In a way, it's a reflection of the creation of an international global civil society, if you will.

As much as we are Canadians, we also share global values with people around the world from many different backgrounds. These values come together. We hold a common concerted vision of a world that is less ridden with despotism and war and genocide and human rights violations. By working with other global community members, Canada can help promote these values by using international legal institutions and our soft power of influence, which we have a lot of in the world.

The Chair: On the point you have made about human security, the Liu Centre at the University of British Columbia just published its first annual human rights report, which is an overview of human security around the globe modelled a little bit on the human development report.

I wanted to let you know that some universities are looking at it—
[Translation]

Jonathan Bujault:

That was established by the University of British Columbia.

The Chair: I think you are very interested in this subject. It would be a good idea to try to find this report, because it is in keeping with the remarks you just made.

Jonathan Bujault: Do you know the exact title of the document?

The Chair: My researcher will give you that. I mention this because you are interested in the subject and the fact that other academics in the country are also interested in it may be helpful to you in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Bugeau.

• (2050)

Jonathan Bujault: Thank you.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Are you a student here?

Jonathan Bujault: I'm a student at Concordia University.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Concordia?

Jonathan Bujault: Yes, but I do some work with the Liberal Party with regard to foreign affairs and stuff like that.

Ms. Beth Phinney: [Editor's Note: Inaudible]

Jonathan Bujault: My friend, Mr. Van Gelder...he has disappeared.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Oh, he's over there now.

Jonathan Bujault: I found out about this only an hour before it started, so I didn't really have time to prepare.

The Chair: We're very pleased that you came.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: On behalf of the Conservative Party, I won't hold it against you that you're helping out the Liberals, but thank you for—

Jonathan Bujault: But we're all here, doing the committee together, isn't that right?

Ms. Judith Berlyn: I will give you.... You asked for this, and it would be good if it were floating around somewhere besides the one place. Do you want another copy?

[Translation]

The Chair: I do not understand.

[English]

Ms. Judith Berlyn: The third D. Did you say we have three Ds?

The Chair: Yes.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: It shouldn't be defence; it should be disarmament. Development—

The Chair: Then it's five Ds. We heard them as five Ds. There are three plus disarmament and democracy. We have five Ds now.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: Oh, I see. Are you hearing that a lot? Well, I wouldn't put defence. I don't think defence, as we define it, has much to do with our security.

The Chair: But it was for the study, like a statement of—

Ms. Judith Berlyn: Oh, I forgot to say too that we need a minister of peace and disarmament, like they have in New Zealand. The Minister for Disarmament. I learned that at the UN too.

The Chair: It's a free zone, New Zealand.

Ms. Judith Berlyn: The Lester B. Pearson is a big building; they can have three ministers in there.

The Chair: Angela, are you going to speak? Okay, fine.

Monsieur Bricault, oui.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Bricault: Thank you very much, Mr. Patry.

There is something that concerns me. At the moment, there is an experiment underway with Mr. Chavez in South America. I am not that familiar with the situation, but I have read various books on torture in Brazil, Argentina and elsewhere. Some quite monstrous things happened at the time of the great American plan to resist any possible communist insurrection. I heard what our Ambassador to the UN, Allan Rock, had to say about this. He seemed in strong disagreement with the Bolivarian experiment.

The Chair: What experiment are you referring to?

Mr. Pierre Bricault: I am referring to the Bolivarian experiment.

The Chair: What is that?

Mr. Pierre Bricault: Mr. Chavez is talking about a Bolivarian revolution.

In addition, Telesur is coming. I was touched by one thing. Mr. Chavez was one of the soldiers responsible for repression when the population revolted, following the demands of the IMF and the World Bank. At one point, the people made some noise, and the armed forces were sent in to get the people under control. However, at one point, Mr. Chavez—

The Chair: Are you talking about Venezuela or Bolivia?

Mr. Pierre Bricault: I am talking about Venezuela.

The Chair: Fine.

Mr. Pierre Bricault: At one point, Mr. Chavez realized that things were making no sense, because his fellow citizens were entitled to say that they were under too much pressure from the IMF and the World Bank. That is when Mr. Chavez got involved in politics. When there is abuse somewhere, other abuse happens at some point.

I recently found out that Venezuela is just as rich as Canada in all respects, including natural resources. Ninety per cent of Venezuelans are poor, and of them, 60 per cent are extremely poor. As Mr. Chavez said, this must stop; the wealth must be redistributed. Mr. Trudeau was of the same view. Yes, some people can be richer than others, that will always be the case. However, the tremendous discrepancies that exist in South America are simply too much!

I will conclude by saying that I do not agree with Mr. Rock, with all due respect. His position is much more important than mine, and he certainly has more experience than an average person like myself. However, we must redistribute the wealth, and live and let live throughout the world. That is a Canadian point of view: To live and let live. This approach works well for us, while in the United States, there is so much crime that prisons are exploding. They build more and they are always overflowing. They kills inmates, and there are still too many of them.

That is the type of society the Americans have chosen, and that is their right. Our choice is to have a society that redistributes wealth,

and that makes our society much more peaceful. There are fewer social explosions. We are not perfect, no human being can claim to be perfect. However, our society says:

● (2055)

[*English*]

“I don't want to be an American.”

[*Translation*]

Regardless of what people may think.

[*English*]

“I don't want to be an American.”

[*Translation*]

Efforts are being made to achieve a very strong integration of the continent.

[*English*]

“I don't want to be an American.”

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you.

At the moment, Venezuela is an oil-exporting country, like Canada, to some extent. Seven per cent of its production is exported to the United States. The United States cannot do much. They created, not

At the moment, 14,000 Cuban doctors and 6,000 nurses are working in Venezuela, in villages throughout the country, to improve social conditions, health care, education, and so on. With its oil, Venezuela also helps small countries a great deal. However, is that a good or a bad thing? It is up to them to decide that, not us.

Thank you very much in any case. Thank you for your comments this evening. We will resume our work tomorrow.

The meeting is adjourned.

[*English*]

the food for oil program, but the social for oil program.

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.