



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

---

FAAE • NUMBER 010 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Thursday, April 15, 2010**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Dean Allison**



## Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

Thursday, April 15, 2010

•(1110)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC)):** Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), we are studying the situation at Rights and Democracy, the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development.

We're just going to wait a few seconds to allow the cameras to exit the room, and then we will begin with opening comments, Mr. Latulippe.

Just before we get started, I want to recognize Madame Lalonde. She has her hand up.

Yes, madame.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce a motion. It is related to this subject, and I would like us to take at least 15 minutes at the end of the meeting to examine it.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay, most definitely. We'll get a couple of rounds in on this. We'll set some time aside at the end.

Mr. Latulippe, thank you for being here today. We welcome you. What we'll do is we'll start with your opening comments, sir. Then we'll move around the room for a couple rounds of questions and answers.

Mr. Latulippe, the floor is yours, sir. You have 10 minutes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe (President, Rights & Democracy):** Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I am pleased to be asked to testify before the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development.

For a number of years, I have worked in many countries around the world providing technical assistance to parliamentary committees of emerging democracies. Today I do not intend to renounce the work I have done overseas for many years. I was selected as president of Rights and Democracy following a public call for applications at the end of an open and transparent selection process. I believe I have the necessary experience to hold this position.

[English]

I worked for 19 years in international development, including more than seven years for the National Democratic Institute. NDI is, of course, an American institution led by former U.S. Secretary of

State Madeleine Albright. It has a mandate similar to the mandate of Rights and Democracy, with a budget of more than \$100 million; I would say it's \$120 million. I occupied senior positions in North Africa and in Haiti. Overall I have worked in 14 countries for NDI, including seven where Rights and Democracy has programs.

[Translation]

I was also Quebec's delegate general to Mexico and Brussels. I know the machinery of government and international diplomacy. I am trilingual, a lawyer by training, and I know the law.

My work in the field has also been a humanly enriching life experience. I have experienced the oppressive surveillance of security services in certain African countries by contacting journalists and dissidents courageously exercising their freedom of expression. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, I prepared party leaders and organized a public debate with them on the future of their country in an area that had been devastated by civil war.

In Baghdad, I witnessed a terrorist act when a hotel exploded before my eyes. I was there to provide assistance in designing the structure of the Iraqi parliament.

On January 12 of this year, I was in Port-au-Prince during the earthquake. I subsequently delayed taking up my position at Rights and Democracy in order to return to Haiti for a number of weeks. I had a moral obligation to go and put in place an aid program for our employees and to redirect our programs, particularly to support the civil society associations supporting women who had been abused in the camps for earthquake victims.

I have been in my position for a number of days now, and I have already met with certain employees and the union. I have also started to meet with employees one by one.

[English]

I am convinced that they have the best interests of the organization at heart. I personally witnessed the professionalism of their work on the ground when I was with NDI, whether it was in Morocco, Mauritania, or Haiti. My conversations with the staff have demonstrated to me that Rights and Democracy has developed some innovative niches of expertise, for example in supporting independent media and citizen journalism in Burma, Zimbabwe, and Egypt.

I have also met many members of the board of directors, who play an essential role in setting the policy direction of their organization and in the oversight of Rights and Democracy. I am convinced that they are dedicated to the mandate of Rights and Democracy.

•(1115)

[Translation]

I have not yet completed my due diligence work. I have been there for barely 15 days. I would nevertheless like to give you some personal reflections on my vision and some of the principles that should frame our actions.

Rights and Democracy belongs to a class of federal institutions called shared governance corporations. The centre is an agency that is publicly accountable for its activities to Parliament and the government and that, at the same time, enjoys considerable independence from the federal government in conducting its activities and carrying out its mission under its constituent act. It is not an NGO.

[English]

The enabling legislation for the centre obliges the board of directors to have knowledge of Canadian foreign policy. The activities of the centre must conform to the major principles of Canadian foreign policy and the objectives of our program of aid and development. That was the declaration of the minister at the time when he tabled Bill C-147. Program activities and funding of the centre must not come into contradiction with Canadian foreign policy, no matter which party is in power. Foreign policy is the prerogative of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister; the programs of Rights and Democracy are the prerogative of Rights and Democracy. Its programs should give effect to the rights and freedoms enshrined in the International Bill of Rights.

[Translation]

As is clearly stated in its constituent act, the centre's mission is to initiate, encourage and support cooperation between Canada and other countries in the promotion, development and strengthening of democratic and human rights institutions and programs that give effect to the rights and freedoms enshrined in the International Bill of Human Rights. The act states that the major object of the centre is to help reduce the wide gap that sometimes exists between the formal adherence of states to international human rights agreements and the actual human rights practices of those states. My experience has shown me that it is, in particular, through programs in the field, designed to address identified problems in a strategic manner that development assistance can be most effective.

The international community, in particular through the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action have made aid effectiveness and evaluation of the aid results a priority objective. It is also a priority for CIDA. In short, decisions on the centre's programs, activities and grants must aim to achieve measurable results, in accordance with best practices, for the improvement of democratic practices and human rights in selected countries.

[English]

Allow me to repeat that in English to give it the clarity and emphasis it deserves. Going forward, all decisions on programs, activities, and funding must be based on measurable results reflecting best practices for improving democratic principles of human rights in respective countries.

[Translation]

I also believe that Rights and Democracy's programming must respect the balance between democratic development and human rights. However, democratic development and human rights are intimately connected. The strengthening of democratic institutions is an essential factor in improving the human rights practices of states. Greater emphasis will have to be placed on the development and reinforcement of institutions and democratic processes.

•(1120)

[English]

The mission of the centre is extensive. The strategic plan of 2010-2015, approved by the board and developed by the staff through a consultative process, is very ambitious. However, the resources of the centre are limited. We will need to diversify our funding in order to achieve a growth of our financial means. Our core funding from the Government of Canada is \$9.2 million. The funding per project, such as those in Afghanistan and Haiti, is around \$3 million per year. This year our growth should mainly come from developing more projects, not through core funding. Rights and Democracy is also a charitable organization. Last year we raised only \$17,000 from private sources. We can, and we must, do better.

[Translation]

I must admit I have taken up my position at a time when the organization is going through a major governance problem. Under the Parliament of Canada Act, your act, the board of directors must set direction and orientations. The employees and I, as president, must work to implement programming consistent with that direction. That must be clear for everyone.

I am also aware that the management of resources and labour relations is a major challenge. This issue is moreover central to the dispute. Rights and Democracy cannot achieve its objectives and effectively implement its five-year plan unless coherence is restored to the institution and the working atmosphere is improved. I will need positive cooperation from everybody in order to achieve that.

The priority must be to restore coherence in this organization. We can very well wonder how long taxpayers will agree to pay for an organization that is tearing itself apart in public, here in Canada, whereas it should be focusing its efforts on promoting democratic values around the world.

That said, what is done is done. I'm not going to rewrite history. We must now, all of us together, turn the page and build a better future. I am convinced this is possible, if we all focus on the promotion and defence of the universal values that are central to Rights and Democracy's mandate, values that are shared by all Canadians and historically by all our governments, regardless of political party.

Thank you very much. I am prepared to answer all your questions.

[English]

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

We're going to start with Mr. Rae.

You have seven minutes, sir, from questions to answers.

[Translation]

**Hon. Bob Rae (Toronto Centre, Lib.):** Thank you very much, Mr. Latulippe.

I would like to give you a chance to respond to a few comments on your career. You have submitted a summary of your work, but you didn't mention your career as cabinet minister under Mr. Bourassa. I saw some articles, when you left Mr. Bourassa's cabinet, referring to the circumstances in which you left government. Can you explain the circumstances in which you left Mr. Bourassa's cabinet?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** That was 23 years ago, Mr. Rae. I am prepared to tell you that, 23 years ago, when there was a dispute over two contracts that I had awarded, a parliamentary committee on financial commitments proved that those contracts had indeed been awarded in accordance with the law.

Now I should tell you this. I was subsequently appointed by four cabinets consisting of ministers of different political parties to very high level positions in the Quebec public service, which, in my mind, is a token of recognition that I subsequently received.

In the past 23 years, Mr. Rae, I have worked overseas. In the past 23 years, I have worked in 19 countries. In the past 23 years, I have promoted... I have worked in countries ranging from Mauritania to Georgia. I was in Georgia after the Rose Revolution to assist Georgian parliamentarians in doing what you are doing today, asking questions, conducting investigations. I was in Mauritania after the coup d'état to put in place—

• (1125)

[English]

**Hon. Bob Rae:** Mr. Chairman, I only have seven minutes to ask particular questions of our guest. I'm not trying to be difficult, and I'm not usually—I think my colleagues will know—aggressive in questioning.

I'm trying to give you a chance to answer particular questions because they've been raised by others.

In addition to working for the Liberal government, you carried on as a delegate general for the government of the Parti québécois. Is that also correct, Monsieur Latulippe?

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I was never a member of either the Parti québécois—

**Hon. Bob Rae:** That wasn't the question. I didn't ask that question.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'm going to answer you very readily: I am not a sovereigntist.

**Hon. Bob Rae:** That's not the question I asked you.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'm going to answer you very readily: I am not a sovereigntist. In 1995, I took part, like many Quebecers

who are here today and who are members of all kinds of political parties, like yours... I was in favour of change. I took part in a public debate, a democratic process. In a number of countries where I worked, that kind of democratic process would not even be legal.

**Hon. Bob Rae:** I entirely understand. I was there too—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Let me finish. That experience enabled me to go to other countries. In the Congo, for example, in a region dealing with civil war, I led the leaders of the Congolese political parties to debate the future of their country.

**Hon. Bob Rae:** Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a witness so disinclined to simply answer very specific questions. He's delivering a speech on all the countries he has visited. I've visited a lot of countries too, but I would very much like him to answer my questions.

I have seven minutes, Mr. Latulippe, and I insist you answer my question and that you avoid giving me a travelogue, a summary of your activities. That will not do.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'm prepared to answer your questions, but—

**Hon. Bob Rae:** What was your role in the Canadian Alliance in Mr. Day's time? Were you in Quebec then? Were you overseas? Weren't you involved in Quebec politics within the Canadian Alliance?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I was indeed a Canadian Alliance candidate, as you were a Liberal Party candidate and as others were Bloc québécois candidates. I believe I took part in a normal democratic process. That's precisely the mandate of Rights and Democracy.

**Hon. Bob Rae:** But why didn't you mention your candidacy, your political experience in the biography you presented to us?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** That's very easy, Mr.—

**Hon. Bob Rae:** My name is Mr. Rae.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** That's very easy, Mr. Rae.

[English]

It was my professional resumé. When I applied for NDI, too, I didn't mention that, because they wanted to know my competency in international development. That's the position for which I applied. I was not applying to be a candidate for a political party.

[Translation]

**Hon. Bob Rae:** I believe the question of the independence of the mandate, which will be debated by my colleague Mr. Patry, is important. You talked about turning the page, but before turning it, we have to look at it. We have heard about some really very disturbing things, not on a previous board of directors, but on the board that is currently in office. There's the matter of contracts, activities of the board of directors.

Have you had the opportunity in the past few days to look at the testimony of those who have come here to tell us some very disturbing things about contracts awarded by the board of directors, the very one that gave you your job?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** What do you want to know about those contracts?

**Hon. Bob Rae:** I want to know, for example, how much Mr. Gauthier was paid during the period when he was both chair and member of the board of directors.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I have various pieces of information on the contracts. I don't have them all because I have just taken up my position, but I can give you some. For example, if you wish, I can give you some information on Mr. Gauthier's trip to China. That came out yesterday or the day before.

• (1130)

**Hon. Bob Rae:** Yes?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Mr. Gauthier went to China. He was head of the delegation and replaced the president. I asked some questions. The fees he requested are those normally requested by people who belong to other boards of directors in Canada. What he billed covered seven travel days, three preparation days and one day for the report and briefing. This is customary procedure in the case of members of boards of directors. I made that check. I don't have the total amount that he was paid, but I'll be pleased to submit that information to the committee in the next few days. The fact remains that I have just taken up my position. I only started gathering this information yesterday.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you. That's all the time we have.

I'm going to move to Madame Lalonde, please.

You have seven minutes.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Mr. Latulippe.

When you came back from Haiti, you said you could see no other way than to put Haiti under trusteeship. That's a surprising comment from someone who was subsequently appointed president of Rights and Democracy. One wonders how you'll be able to present yourself as someone who provides assistance for the democratic development of countries. Do you stand by that statement?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Madame, the interpretation made of my statement appeared on *L'actualité's* website.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** It's also in *Le Devoir*.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I came back from Haiti and I made a lot of statements. I also worked in Haiti and I'm going to explain the briefings that I gave. I've always maintained the same—

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** The question I'm asking you is simple. Do you stand by that statement?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I have always held the same position, Madame.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** So you stand by that statement.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** No, I have always held the same position. We need a new governance model in order to be able to rebuild that country. This new—

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Is it—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Let me finish.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** You said we need a new governance model. I understood.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, but let me finish. I have always said what the new governance model should entail. I said that the Government of Haiti was fragile and needed the international community to take part in that reconstruction. I also said that we had to expand it as much as possible so that all the country's bone and sinew were involved.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** But—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Let me finish, because I think that—

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Pardon me, but I understood very clearly what you meant. I want to know whether you changed that position after seeing that the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, your employer at the time, was so displeased that the president of the NDI wrote a letter to President Préval to apologize for what you said. I have to read it in English because the letter is in English. I quote:

[English]

To be certain, the views attributed to Mr. Latulippe and expressed in this article in no way represents the opinions of NDI. We ask that you accept the Institute's and Mr. Latulippe's regrets for the misimpressions left by this unfortunate article.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** You forgot to say that he also wrote that my remarks had been distorted because—

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** He said it was probably because you were

[English]

in a “highly emotional context”.

[Translation]

I think it's worthwhile to read the letter.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Absolutely, but I was asked to give briefings to the National Security Council for NDI on the issue of governance in the context of the reconstruction.

• (1135)

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Well, I only have seven minutes and we've already taken a number—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, but you're not letting me say that I went from Hillary Clinton's office to the American think tanks, to the Congressional and Senate committees, to the National Security Council—

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Fine, then—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** —and everywhere I maintained that a new governance model was needed. You know, the existing governance model—

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Please, Mr. Chairman, I have questions to ask, and his presentation is finished.

[English]

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Go ahead.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** One question is a major concern for me. You said—it was reported that you said—in English, once again:

[English]

that Rights and Democracy “can be fixed internally by concentrating on programs and leaving policy to the Department of Foreign Affairs”.

[Translation]

However, yesterday we heard two former presidents of Rights and Democracy speak passionately. They contended precisely the contrary, stating that the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development Act is such that it sets development aid as an objective, but in an entirely impartial manner without any partisanship. Its purpose is not to develop Canada's position nor that of the United States or Israel. That's what they told us.

In view of what you said, how do you distinguish yourself from other organizations, CIDA or the Department of Foreign Affairs? Rights and Democracy loses its uniqueness in light of what you said.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Absolutely not; on the contrary. There is no contradiction between the mandate of Rights and Democracy being to give effect to the International Charter of Human Rights and Canada's foreign policy being the business of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Let me give you an example of rights and democracy that concerns Rights and Democracy. In Burma, we work with citizen journalists—underground journalists—to ensure that we can track all the human rights problems within Burma. We do that, whereas the Department of Foreign Affairs can't do it. So it's through our programming that we are able to distinguish ourselves.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Fine, the idea is to go against the policies of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, if necessary.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'll give you an example.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Yes or no?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Can I give you an example?

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I'm asking you: yes or no?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Rights and Democracy's programming is the programming of Rights and Democracy.

I'll give you an example. When I was in Mauritania, the American government, at the time of the first coup d'état, publicly spoke out—

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Mr. Latulippe, we don't need to know what you think—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes you do.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** It's one thing to say that the field of foreign affairs belongs to Canada and that one must comply with it. It's quite another to hear Mr. Broadbent and Warren Allmand say that it is the obligation of the president and of the Centre to be independent, not to engage in Canadian, American or Israeli politics. I repeat that.

[English]

**The Chair:** That's all the time we have in this round. We're going to move it back over.

Mr. Abbott, you have seven minutes, please.

**Hon. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, CPC):** Good. Thank you.

I want to thank you for coming to speak to us today, Mr. Latulippe. You've just recently stepped into this, and quite literally into a hurricane, as you've already found out in this committee so far today.

I must say I was very disappointed with Mr. Rae. I don't recall that anything he did in his tenure as the NDP Premier of Ontario was necessarily relevant to the time at which he was asked by the Government of Canada to do certain work for them. I don't think what happened in your history as the Premier—of about exactly the same period as his tenure—has anything to do with what we're talking about here today.

As I say, I'm very disappointed with Mr. Rae.

**Hon. Bob Rae:** I'll appreciate that in the next election.

**Hon. Jim Abbott:** I appreciate your commitment to both international human rights and to the democratic process.

**Hon. Bob Rae:** I'll be a little surprised if that's what happens in the next election—

● (1140)

**Hon. Jim Abbott:** I understand there's a little chattering going on in the background there. I don't know what it is all about, but that's all right.

I really respect the CV you have brought to this job. I know it is going to be very challenging. One of the difficulties, too, because this has turned into such a partisan exercise, is that this has turned into a he-said-she-said kind of tattletaling on both sides and an awful lot of partisan grandstanding. I'm anticipating that, with your background, you'll be able to bring a little bit of civility to this process.

So what are your first steps? How are you going to go about getting this ship, these sails, going in the right direction, getting the rudder on the right track? What are you going to do?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** As a first thing, my priority is to bring cohesion within the organization and with the board.

I have already started to talk and meet with, one by one, every employee of this organization. I want to understand their needs. I want to have them as allies. The employees are the organization. They are important for this organization, and they will help me bring cohesion.

I also have met most of the members of the board, and I think I can work with the members of the board, based on the following principles. First, we need transparency, transparency from my part and transparency from the other part. I think communication is important, not communication only when there are meetings of the board, but communication on a constant basis.

I think there is one way, when there is unity in this organization, a unity with the staff and the board, and it's that the staff has developed a strategic plan for 2010-2015. The strategic plan has also been approved by the board. This is a base upon which I will build the future of this organization.

**Hon. Jim Abbott:** Good.

Mr. Lunney has some questions.

**Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I also want to express my appreciation for your being here today. As Mr. Abbott said, you stepped into a bit of a hurricane. We would certainly appreciate the experience that you bring to this file.

With regard to the inquisition from Madame Lalonde over there, I think, as politicians—and we know you had a career in politics as well—we've all had the experience of being misquoted. Regrettably, the more you are involved in discussing anything, the vulnerability of being misquoted certainly appears.

You've told us that you wanted to implement a results-based culture at Rights and Democracy. That's something I'd like to expand on. I just wondered if you could elaborate on how you hope to achieve this goal. Would the fundamental mandate of Rights and Democracy have to change in order for it to successfully shift to a results-based mandate?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** You know, one thing I'm bringing to this organization is that I am the first president who has a career in international development. In my career in international development, results-based is what we call aid effectiveness. Aid effectiveness means that you need to focus your program on where you can do better on the ground.

This needs skills. It needs qualifications. I have done that in many countries of the world. I think even within Rights and Democracy this is already growing. I will bring my experience to Rights and Democracy to improve the aid effectiveness, which in fact is one of the most important issues of development.

**Mr. James Lunney:** I certainly appreciate that answer, as we all want to make sure that the dollars that we put into difficult circumstances are actually getting results and not being diverted to ineffective uses.

Another thing you mentioned that I want to follow up on is something that was news to me, actually. I noticed you mentioned that in terms of funding, Rights and Democracy has about \$9.2 million in core and about \$3 million in additional funding through Foreign Affairs, CIDA, and so on to implement programs currently.

Something that was unknown to me was it is a charitable organization in Canada. If I've got the figure right, there were about \$17,000 in donations last year. I know that Canadians are actually very generous, as was demonstrated through the recent situation in Haiti. You certainly have a lot of experience on the ground there. Do you have a plan to diversify the source of your funding in order to expand the range of options, services, and programs administered through Rights and Democracy?

• (1145)

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I think we can raise more funds from private sources. I will tell you, I think Canadians are ready to put their money where they have their values. We can raise more private funds if we focus on specific causes.

I will give you an example. After the earthquake in Haiti, I'm absolutely convinced that Rights and Democracy could have raised a lot of funds to direct toward specific causes like the cause of the women who are victims of violence in the camps. I've seen it myself

in the camps of those who have been displaced. This is an example of the causes where we can raise more funds.

In Burma or in Zimbabwe, we have developed a niche, the democratic voice of journalism. We can bring out of those countries that are closed the problem of human rights with the bloggers, with citizen journalists. I think we can raise private money for that.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Lunney. We'll have to come back in the second round.

For the last question in the first round, Mr. Dewar, sir, seven minutes.

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to our guest for appearing.

Mr. Latulippe, I understand that you've only been at the helm for a little while. But in that time, I understand from your previous answers that you've had some time to look at the affairs, financially, of the institute. I've been asking questions of the board members. One was Mr. Gauthier, who was the acting president prior to your taking over.

We're still waiting from Mr. Gauthier—I believe, Chair, we haven't received it yet—the contracts that he tendered and entered into with legal firms, communication firms, private investigative firms, and the auditing firm.

I'm wondering if you could share information with this committee. I'll start with legal bills. Do you have any idea, at this point, the sum of the legal bills that Mr. Gauthier entered into?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, I will give that to you. I have a legal bill from Ogilvy Renault for \$37,392.80.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** For what period of time was that?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I don't have that here. I can provide it...

Oh, yes, I have it; it's until March 31, the end of the fiscal year.

We're still in discussion about the amount of money with Borden Ladner Gervais, but I will give you more or less the amount.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Just so people know, that's another legal firm.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, that's another legal firm.

It would be around \$200,000, maybe a little more, maybe a little less.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** It's \$200,000. Over what period of time was that work?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** It's exactly the same period of time, until March 31.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** When was that contract entered into? Was it when Mr. Gauthier took over as the acting president?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, that was it exactly. I don't exactly know the date.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** So for about 60 days, it was \$200,000?



**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'm not sure exactly. I can provide it to you.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** So it's \$200,000 to date.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, more or less, because, as I told you, I didn't complete the negotiations, the discussions with them.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Okay.

Are there any other bills from legal firms that you're aware of?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I saw that there might be one more, but I'm not aware of any others.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** You've been more forthcoming than he was, because he couldn't even give me a ballpark figure. I appreciate that.

What about Prima Communication?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** For Prima Communication, I think it's a little less than \$10,000, or it's around \$10,000.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** That contract has been ended now?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** There was some for the hearings. I don't think it's ended now, just as the other ones are not necessarily ending. There will still be some—

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** So they were hired to do work for them.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I can tell you that the cost has been substantially reduced since I've been there, but I'm just telling you the cost. I'm not there to judge the reason.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** No, I'm just asking questions on fact.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, on facts; that's it. There were urgencies.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Just to be clear here, Prima Communication is still on contract with Rights and Democracy as far as you know?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** There's the last contract that is still there. But as you know, my daughter is here today.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Right. But I'm asking that because my understanding, from what you're saying, is that Prima Communication was hired to help the board at the last hearings, for instance.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Well, I don't have information about Prima Communication because I took the information more about the other firms. Personally I can supply that to you without any problem in the future. I don't have the exact...and so I prefer to take some time to give it to you.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** That would be helpful.

Do we have any idea how much the bill from the private investigative firm SIRCO is for?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, their bill is \$66,261.

• (1150)

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Does Rights and Democracy still have a contract going with them?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I met SIRCO and Deloitte, and I asked for reports.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** So it's \$66,000 to date with SIRCO.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** It's always until March 31.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Okay, but was that the final sum as far as we know?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I think so. I'm not sure. I met with them, and I said I wanted a report.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** What does SIRCO do? What were they doing for Rights and Democracy, as far as you can tell?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I cannot enter into the details. I will tell you that what they did was related to the firing of the three directors. So this is something that will be useful, that will be used in court, because those issues are actually in front of the court or the arbitration court.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Well, we know what the board did. Now we know how much it cost.

How much has been spent on the auditing firm Deloitte and Touche to date?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** The cost from the auditing firm is \$68,000. As a matter of fact, I'm looking forward to the report of Deloitte and Touche, because I think this is a very important report that will be able to clear the air, give us the situation, and bring change if there has to be change within the organization. I'm really looking forward to this report. I met with them, and I asked them to accelerate their report as much as possible. They told me that they are going to do so.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** So their file is still active, their contract is still active, and they haven't finished their work yet?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** No, because I already asked them for the report.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** You already mentioned Mr. Gauthier's honorarium. There was something that came out the other day, which surprised many of us. One of the board members was hired to be a consultant to, I believe, Mr. Gauthier. I'm wondering if you knew anything about that. There were suggestions that the contract would have been...I don't know for how much, but are you aware of any board members being paid on contract to help Mr. Gauthier do his work and, if so, who that was?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Mr. Dewar, like you, this is something I have just learned at the hearing. You will notice that I am trying to act as fast as possible and to be as transparent as I can.

I have tried to find the information, and first, there was no contract with Mr. Navarro-Genie. Second, I understand it's the practice that on these boards you can have an advisor who is a member of the board. That's not only within Rights and Democracy but the whole system. He was hired and paid with the tariff that is applicable to the board members, \$325 a day, and he received \$2,925.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** So for the record, Mr. Navarro-Genie received that amount—over \$2,000—to provide his advice to Mr. Gauthier's office?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I was not there for the details, but I understand, Mr. Dewar—I more than understand—that this was a practice before Mr. Payam Akhavan was there, and before that. It was there during other presidencies, not only the presidency—

**The Chair:** Thank you. That's all the time we have.

We're going to move to five-minute rounds.

Mr. Van Kesteren, sir.

**Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Essex, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Latulippe, for appearing before us.

I would echo what my colleagues have said; you have certainly stepped into a tempest. But I really believe you have the qualifications to straighten this out and to once again restore what we've come to expect.

Had you been here last Tuesday and watched the proceedings, it got pretty hot. I think it's probably safe to say that both witnesses were pretty steamed, especially toward the end.

It was interesting; as we listened and tried to uncover this, there was a theme that seemed to keep coming up, over and over. I think Mr. Abbott really hit the nail on the head when he said this is all about Israel. Mr. Allmand replied—the time was up, but it's on the blues—and he said yes. I thought how unfortunate; we had the opportunity....

I sense that you're very passionate about exporting our values and democracy. I'm the same way. Probably most people here feel the same way. When we get the opportunity, for instance, to visit another country, especially those countries that are struggling democracies, we make every effort to encourage them.

I had that opportunity in February. I went to Turkey. Looking at a country like Turkey, what a golden opportunity we have to take a stable democracy that's still fledgling and has some issues and to influence that region where we have seen so much turmoil. I'm puzzled when I see that opportunity missed.

I wonder, sir, do you share that? Do you have any ideas or possible plans for that region and maybe working to possibly solve some of those problems we have been struggling with for generations?

• (1155)

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I think Rights and Democracy could do a lot more, especially if we could raise more funding. One of my objectives is to diversify funding. This would help the autonomy of the organization.

In my former career I worked with funds from Norway. Through project funding we can have funds, not only from CIDA...we can have funds from Norway, the Netherlands, from everywhere. Then we could do a lot better.

We can also do a lot better in developing some specific niches in democratic development. In the 14 emerging democracies where I have worked, there is always one very important issue. There is a huge gap between the citizens and their members of Parliament and their political parties. This is part of the core issue they are facing.

I think we can develop a niche in trying to close the gap. We have the skills. For example, we can be leaders in developing the base skills across the world; we can be leaders in developing technology to help political parties reach out to their citizens. That's part of my plan.

**Mr. Dave Van Kesteren:** You're getting me all excited, because I feel the same way, and I think this is wonderful.

What I'm reading from you is that rather than a confrontational state, which has been the case many times in the past, you'd like to see this organization move forward. I always wonder, too, we need a better coalition between those organizations such as your own that are involved in those types of strategies. One of the areas you want to take us down is possibly using parliamentarians to....

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'm looking forward to working more closely with your committee. I believe that from the bottom of my heart, and it's what I've done across the world, making closer the relationship between organizations like ours and committees like yours. You can even help us raise private funds, or you can help us in countries where we're working. That's one of my objectives.

**The Chair:** That's all the time we have, so I'll have to come back when we have the chance in another round.

I'm going to move back over to Dr. Patry, sir.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, madame and Mr. Latulippe.

We have five minutes. I'm going to ask you some questions and I would like you to give me succinct answers, please, Mr. Latulippe.

You told one of the newspapers in the capital here in Ottawa the following:

• (1200)

[*English*]

There is no role for Rights and Democracy to enter into debates about foreign policy. We have to work within the framework of government foreign policy....

[*Translation*]

You aren't unaware that it was Parliament, not the government, that gave Rights and Democracy its mandate. What does the independence of Rights and Democracy mean for you now if the agency has to work within the framework of Canadian foreign policy? That's my first question, and I would like you to give me an answer, please.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Rights and Democracy is independent with regard to all the programming it must carry out. It is not required to work in countries where the government has priority interests. It works where there are human rights violations, where emerging democracies can be established. It is independent in those respects. Rights and Democracy is not the Department of Foreign Affairs. It does not establish Canada's foreign policy.

**Mr. Bernard Patry:** Thank you, sir. If I correctly understand what you've just told me, if there was a conflict between the mandate of Rights and Democracy and Canada's foreign policy, it's the mandate of Rights and Democracy that would take precedence.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I don't see any conflict. The mandate of Rights and Democracy is to reduce the gap between international agreements on charters of human rights and freedoms signed by the countries and the practices of those countries. The values of charters of human rights and freedoms do not contradict those of Canada's foreign policy and never will. This is based on our Canadian values and that's why Rights and Democracy is able to work around the world.

**Mr. Bernard Patry:** Thank you.

Mr. Latulippe, you aren't unaware that the international human rights community does not support your appointment. That has been made public. The opposition parties don't support it either.

Can you explain to me what moral authority you will have if you take up this position without the support of the majority of parliamentarians in this government or of the international human rights community?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** First, you are talking about the international human rights community, but I can give you the example of the letters I've received from a number of important persons who support my candidacy. The selection process to which I was subjected is that provided by the act, and in the context of that process, I was selected based on my experience and qualifications.

Concerning the point you raised, I would like to emphasize that, to date, very few of those persons have discussed my experience. I also think I can ensure that Rights and Democracy pushes its mandate beyond everything that has previously been done because I am the first president who has had a career in international development. That's what we talk about at Rights and Democracy.

**Mr. Bernard Patry:** I wouldn't want to contradict you, but I believe the person who preceded you, Mr. Beauregard, was also well known. He did a remarkable job internationally. He worked in Africa, as you did as well. You may not be the first, but I want to point out the work that Mr. Beauregard also did.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's fine.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I must say that, since I have been in the position, the people I have met, everywhere and at all levels, respect Mr. Beauregard.

[English]

**Mr. Bernard Patry:** That's fine, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We're going to move back over to Mr. Lunney, sir, for five minutes.

**Mr. James Lunney:** With all due respect to my colleague opposite, I don't know where he would come from to say that all the international community—I don't know what evidence you have for that, or how you can support such a statement—does not support the candidacy of Gérard Latulippe. You may have some people saying that, but we could provide a whole lot of people internationally who would support the candidacy. We don't look to international agencies in our selection of candidates. That would not be normal protocol. I'm sure the member would understand that.

With all due respect, I wanted to come back to something you mentioned that caught my attention, about access to parliamentarians

from many parts of the country. It certainly has been my experience, when I've had visitors from other countries, that they just can't believe that we walk around as members of Parliament. That's true for all of us in this room. We have such an open democracy here that we can debate with people and we walk around without armed guards, with some exceptions for senior ministers. But for most of the members of Parliament, we do have such access to people. That's certainly something that many countries do not enjoy. So I applaud you; you've got some strategies to help encourage more openness. It's a big job in many countries where people to do not have that experience.

Let me just pick up on a couple of countries that I'm concerned about. In recent months we've heard troubling evidence of human rights abuses in Venezuela, Cuba, and Iran, for example, amongst others. Can you tell the committee if Rights and Democracy has any projects under way currently, or is planning to instill in the future, to address human rights abuses in countries such as the ones I've mentioned?

● (1205)

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** The strategic plan that was approved for the next five years provides that we will consider new countries. Personally, I have an interest in the Americas, and I believe we must do more work there. The allegations we heard about what's going on, whether it be in Venezuela, Iran or Cuba... These are countries where we could do good work, particularly with the specialized expertise we have developed.

Moreover, in the next few weeks, I'll be getting ready to discuss this with my staff. I'm at the point where I'm going to get into programming. The ideas you raise are excellent.

[English]

**Mr. James Lunney:** Thank you.

I don't know if this question was partly asked before, but I'm wondering about a long-range perspective for Rights and Democracy. What are some of the projects already under way that you're hoping to follow up on, for example? Are there others that you may have in mind in the long range on the international scene?

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'll give you two examples. We have two projects that are extremely promising. In Afghanistan, we are assisting in the implementation of a new family code. I have always made the rights of women one of my priorities over all those years. This work in Afghanistan is very innovative because it concerns a progressive code that must be pursued.

In Haiti, we have a multi-million dollar program involving women's participation and the reinforcement of political parties. I believe we have to have more of these kinds of projects in other countries. It takes a lot of time, consistency and effort to make changes in institutions. This means that you have to be able to raise funding from various sources, and quite considerable amounts. That's what I want to do. I also want to use our core funding to raise additional funds for project funding. That's how we'll ensure that Rights and Democracy has an even greater impact in the field.

In my opinion, the most important thing is to change the situation on the ground, whether it be the rights of women, victims in the prisons, or freedom of expression. It's on the ground that we can make a change. That's what I want to do with Rights and Democracy.

[English]

**Mr. James Lunney:** As a follow-up, I'd like to say that at the beginning I think you were rather modest in describing your own experience over the past 23 years internationally. In responding to Mr. Rae, you started to go in that direction, but sort of got cut off a little bit, I might say.

I notice that you had experience in countries such as Jordan, Libya, Iraq, Georgia—I think you touched on some of the difficult situations there—Mauritania, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, and other countries like Egypt and Burkina Faso. I'd just like to give you an opportunity to mention if there's something in your career that stands out as particularly helpful to you from that international experience that you hope to bring to Rights and Democracy.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Thank you.

You know, I was given the mandate to lead the first mission from an organization in Libya. I was in Libya in order to assess the political situation and where we could work in order to improve human rights in Libya. I led this mission for NDI.

I organized the first international observation mission ever in Morocco for the 2007 election.

Mr. Dewar was there, he was on the steering committee. He knows that the results of this mission have put forward and have led Morocco into the future in the matter of democratic development. He was there.

This was very important, and I was the one in charge of the organization of this mission.

• (1210)

**The Chair:** That's all the time we have for you, Mr. Lunney.

I just want to do a poll of the members here. I'm going to go back to Madame Deschamps next, and then I want to know if there are any other questions.

Mr. Valeriote, you want one question? Okay.

What about this side here? Could we come back? Okay.

Here's what we will do. We'll move to Madame Deschamps, we'll go to Mr. Valeriote, and then we'll finish with one quick question from Mr. Dewar.

It's more than a quick one?

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Yes.

**The Chair:** All right.

Let's go ahead and start with Madame Deschamps.

[Translation]

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** I'm going to hand over to Ms. Lalonde.

[English]

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

Five minutes, Madame Lalonde.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Thank you, Mr. Latulippe, for all the information you've given us on what you intend to do.

I would like you to share with us what you intend to do about cooperation with the new Centre for Advancing Democracy. That centre—and this is one of the government's well-known projects—must help the political parties in emerging developing countries. It is intended to be non-partisan.

In your examples, you talked about the aid you could grant for political parties. How would Rights and Democracy, under your control, and the new centre for the advancement of democracy share the responsibilities?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I am not familiar with the situation of that new centre. I don't even know whether it will exist. I don't know whether there will be a bill. It's not up to me to comment on that centre.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Has anyone spoken to you about it?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I know that you have all—

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** No, that's not what I'm asking.

When we met you, had—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** No, not at all.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** When we met you before you became president of Rights and Democracy, had anyone talked to you about that centre, which will be called upon to share democratic development tasks with you?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I was given a mandate. I was told that taxpayers' money would have to be used to ensure that Rights and Democracy's missions in the field have the greatest impact.

[English]

I will repeat: they gave me the mandate so that taxpayers' money would be used within the mission of Rights and Democracy so that it has more impact on the ground to help human rights development and democratic development. That's what I was hired for. That's what the questions were asked of me—nothing else.

So you're in a better position to answer that question than I am.

[Translation]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** So no one talked to you about that. That surprises me.

You say that taxpayers' money should be used to ensure that Rights and Democracy's missions in the field have greater impact. To say that, you must also have conducted an evaluation and considered that what was previously done can be considerably improved. However, as you know, in the area of democratic development, it can be difficult to establish an evaluation method, for reasons you have no doubt experienced.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Indeed, I would have to provide technical details, which I could share with you in another context or place.

However, there are project evaluation techniques. Those techniques—I'm obliged to use technical terms—are quantitative and qualitative in nature. I have used both those techniques and that will require staff training. That will require work on my part to ensure that evaluation, using the appropriate techniques, becomes a concern for the president's office. The president's office will have to concern itself with project evaluation techniques. That's what I'm going to do because I'm familiar with them.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Mr. Latulippe, you are not unaware that this evaluation is hard to do because democracy itself is a subject that is not easy to evaluate. Some in Canada may currently feel that democracy is weakening because the government lacks transparency—I'll say only that. So saying that it has to be more effective doesn't suit me. In fact, it can trouble me because that would mean that the hardest missions that Rights and Democracy has undertaken in a number of countries would be abandoned in favour of missions that would make it easier to raise funding among the Canadian public.

• (1215)

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I can assure you of the contrary, madame. Moreover, I would refer you to a number of books by Tom Carruthers, who is the world expert in this matter.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** We've read him.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** He is the world expert in this area, from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Mr. Carruthers says a number of things.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Yes, indeed, he talks about that. If you read his books, you'll understand the techniques I want to apply.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Oh, but that troubles me even more.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** No, that shouldn't trouble you because these techniques have been applied in the programs we have in Afghanistan and Haiti: CIDA applies them. And we've had positive evaluations of the work that Rights and Democracy has done in Afghanistan and Haiti. CIDA says it's very positive. If I were you, that wouldn't trouble me; on the contrary, it would encourage me.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madame Lalonde.

We'll go back to Mr. Abbott for five minutes.

**Hon. Jim Abbott:** Thank you very much for your continuing testimony.

I would like to bring up the elephant in the room that nobody ever wants to talk about, and that's Israel. From the response that I had from the former presidents at the meeting on Tuesday, as Mr. Van Kesteren mentioned, it seemed to me they were of the opinion, I am of the opinion, that this whole issue seems to focus around the attitude that the Government of Canada has toward the only democracy in that region. I would like to give you an opportunity to just express....

You know, I'm taking a look at your CV. I see Jordan, I see Libya, I see Iraq, I see Egypt—all countries that you don't exactly have warm fuzzies about or send Christmas cards to. Well, of course, you wouldn't send a Christmas card to Israel, but you understand what I'm saying; they're not really on this....

Help us to understand where you would be coming from on that very vexatious, complex issue.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I can tell you something: I'm not here to interpret or to discuss Canadian foreign policy; I'm here in fact to develop support for human rights and democracy. I am not here to change an organization in an ideological way. Nobody from the government, nobody from the board, has even asked me anything in terms of changing this organization ideologically.

You know, we are working across the world, and at this point we don't really have any programs in Israel or in Gaza. We don't have any programs in this region. We are working across the world. In fact, I see the vision of Rights and Democracy not in terms of the conflicts of Israel and Palestine, but I see it as an opportunity to develop Canadian values across the world.

Let me tell you something. I've been working for a U.S. organization. In fact, it's the NGO of the Democratic Party. Everywhere that I've been, people have asked me, "Are you a Canadian?" It was opening doors for me. Because I was a Canadian, I had access to a level of leadership to which others did not have access, and people were asking me why I wasn't working for Canada. There are a lot of people within the NDI who are in the same situation. Your friend Les Campbell is in the same situation.

In fact, that's an opportunity for us to develop that across the world. The world believes in our values. We should all be on the same page, because we can make this a leader across the world. We should all work together. Help me to give Rights and Democracy a bright future and to promote Canadian values across the world. Please help me do that.

**Hon. Jim Abbott:** Good. Thank you.

I have one quick technical question. There was a movement afoot during the more troublesome times historically with Rights and Democracy to do amendments on clauses, certainly on clause 19 of the bylaw, which has to do with the mandate relative to the executive performance review committee.

I don't think there were any movements afoot to do an amendment, but I would like your comment on how acceptable you find clause 20 as provided in the act: that the president is the chief executive officer of the centre and shall supervise and direct the work of the centre in accordance with the policies established by the board. In other words, there is a pecking order established here.

So it's really two questions. Number one, are you comfortable with the bylaws as they are written with respect to executive performance review committee? Number two, are you comfortable with the fact that the policies for Rights and Democracy will be established by the board?

• (1220)

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Mr. Chairman, absolutely.

**Hon. Jim Abbott:** Okay, thank you.

**The Chair:** Now we're going to move back over to Mr. Valeriote.

Welcome, sir, to the committee.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.):** Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Latulippe, for appearing before us today. I appreciate it.

You mentioned earlier that the board did not speak to you about your ideology, and I'd suggest to you that sometimes the direction from which a person is coming indicates the direction in which they're going and maybe there was no need for them to ask you about your ideology.

But having said that, you did talk about moving forward. Certainly, when one is moving forward, you sometimes have to disavow certain actions that pre-existed your entry to the organization.

One of those actions was a gag order that was issued by Aurel Braun, the chairman of Rights and Democracy. I'd ask you if you're aware of that gag order. It is a matter of public record. It was discussed in a Canadian Press article of March 30.

Do you condone that action, an issuing of a gag order by a board member to staff?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I am telling you that I'm taking Rights and Democracy, and I will not remake the past history of Rights and Democracy. What I can tell you is that, for example, some inquiries are in process. I am looking forward to those inquiries.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** Yes. Okay. I'm speaking to you about the gag order. Have you repealed that gag order seeking to silence the staff of the organization? Have you repealed that gag order?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I will tell you something. I have—

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** I just want to know if you've repealed the gag order.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Look, let me tell you something. I think the staff has done something wrong in asking.... That's the first time in my life that I've seen staff asking for the resignation of a board. I think this was wrong by the staff.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** Did you repeal the gag order?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'm—

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** Did you repeal the gag order?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Look, I'm telling you that....

What do you mean by the gag order?

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** The gag order: telling them not to speak out about the organization. There was a gag order. A copy of it was given to Minister Cannon. Did you repeal it? You're talking about moving forward. I want to know if you've liberated the staff.

Do you believe in free speech?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Absolutely. Do you know that the staff is meeting with me twice a week? Do you know that I'm meeting with the staff all the time?

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** And did you—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** No, no, no—

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:**—tell them they don't need to worry about the gag order, that it's repealed?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I told them that they can talk to me about everything.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** Can they talk to anyone else?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** They can talk to whoever they want. The staff actually is able to talk and to have their opinions.

And let me tell you—

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** Okay. So—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** No, no, this is important.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:**—does that statement officially constitute you repealing that gag order?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Don't put your words in my mouth. What I'm telling you is that I'm in a constant relationship with the staff.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** Okay. That's fine.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** No, no, no, I'm telling you that the staff has the right; personally, my way to manage an organization is to let the staff discuss even my ideas.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** Okay, Mr. Latulippe—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'm open to that.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:**—you're taking up my time here to ask you questions.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I may be, but I'm sorry, I need to answer your question.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** I have another question. Mr. Lunney said he was not aware of any other organization that had questioned your moral authority. I'm surprised that Mr. Lunney would say that, being a permanent member of this committee, because the International Federation for Human Rights, representing 155 human rights groups worldwide, called on the government to reconsider their decision to appoint you as the agency's new president.

In fact they said—I'm following up on Dr. Patry's question—that you don't have the moral authority because of your statements that Muslim immigrants risked undermining the cohesion of Quebec society, your opposition to same-sex marriage, and your support for the death penalty.

I would like to know if your views on those matters have changed, because those opinions are not consistent, and can't be reconciled, with Canadian policy on multiculturalism, same-sex marriage, and capital punishment. Have your views changed?

● (1225)

**The Chair:** Mr. Latulippe, you have 45 seconds.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Look, I've worked for the democratic party organization. I've worked with people on the left. Audrey McLaughlin was the director of my political parties program. I worked with people on the right. I worked with Islamist parties. I was accepted everywhere. I worked with right-wing parties and left-wing parties around the world.

[*English*]

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** Have your views changed? It's a simple question.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I'm not here, as a representative of Rights and Democracy, to discuss or debate my personal ideas, regardless of what they are. I have an obligation to—

[*English*]

**Mr. Francis Valeriote:** I'm sorry, Mr. Latulippe, but do you think your personal views, as expressed, are—

**The Chair:** That's all the time we have.

Mr. Dewar, we're going to wrap it up with you. We have to finish at about half past, so you have four or five minutes.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Five, please. Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Latulippe, I want to go back to the money. Maybe it's my Scottish roots. I've calculated, so far, from what you have told me, that it is \$381,000; we know that this bill is essentially for the work of Monsieur Gauthier and that it was directed, I think, through Mr. Braun. I guess what I'd like from you is that when you get those contracts, you give them to this committee, because we haven't been able to get them from the people who entered into them. I understand that none of these contracts were tendered, which I find astonishing. You know, how did BLG get their contract without competition?

I wish you to report to this committee, for obvious reasons, not only how much was paid out but how these contracts were entered into and tendered. I would appreciate that information, as soon as you get it, along with the amount of the honorariums paid, because I still find it disturbing.

I'll be frank, I don't care what other boards do. I want to know why this board was paying one of its board members money to advise that interim president. I would like to know, at the end of the day, what the amount of money was—you said \$3,200, I think—and what other honorariums there were.

I'm just asking; if you could provide that, that would be great.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** I can answer you immediately on the matter of the calls—

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Well, you've given me all the numbers already, so I'm just asking, requesting, that when you get more, please send it in. Okay? Is that a fair request?

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Okay. That's a fair deal.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** At the end of the day, I can say this: Mr. Latulippe, we have a problem. We have a board that went and fired three of its managers. According to most people we talked to, these were people who had been dedicated to this institute. You've told us that you have confidence in the people you talked to at the institute. You believe in their dedication. We have a chair and a former acting president who went off on a spending binge to go after people, in my opinion, hiring PR firms, hiring private investigation firms, hiring law firms, hiring whomever they could find, it seems. That's no way to run an institute with transparency. I have to say that this has got to stop.

Not only that—I'll come to a question here—you've noted the exemplary work the institute has done in Afghanistan. But here's the

problem, Mr. Latulippe: the woman who heads the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission was on the board of Rights and Democracy. As you know, she quit. Why? It was because of meddling. So you have a problem. We have a problem.

In my opinion—you might wish to respond to this—the solution to this problem is that we need a new board. If you're going to actually be successful, and you believe in—I trust what you say—the people who work for the institute....

I don't have any confidence in the board. I have no confidence that this chasm between the two, after the spending that's been engaged in, after the trust that has been broken, after a woman who we depend on, who has the Order of Canada.... You know that, right, that Ms. Samar has the Order of Canada, along with Nelson Mandela? She quit the board because of meddling, because of these board members.

I believe the solution, if you're going to be successful, is to replace the board.

● (1230)

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Mr. Dewar, I'm not responsible for appointments to the board, but I can tell you something: personally, I'm convinced that I can work with this board.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** But the staff can't. That's your problem, Mr. Latulippe.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** You know, there is a human dimension to this problem.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Yes, there certainly is—

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** No, no, no, let me answer.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** —and there's a human solution: to fire the board who is responsible for, really, taking an organization—we all agree it was working well, from the reports that we've had here—and basically sinking it.

**Mr. Gérard Latulippe:** Mr. Dewar, I'm convinced that if you give it time, we will be able to close the gap and to bring closer the board and the staff toward the future and toward specifically the realization of our strategic plan. They both agree on the substance. On the substance, we are all on the same line.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Yes, but Mr. Latulippe—

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. That's all the time we have.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** —if they don't agree on where to go with the substance, we're sunk.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Mr. Dewar.

We're going to wrap it up now.

Mr. Latulippe, thank you very much for taking the time to be here today.

I'm going to suspend the meeting for a couple of minutes so that you are able to clear the room. Then we'll come back with committee business.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- (1235)

**The Chair:** Members, there are only a couple of things that we need to address today. Madame Lalonde has a motion before us. We'll talk about that in one second. The other thing we need to do is discuss what we're going to be doing next week in terms of future business.

We'll start with Madame Lalonde's motion, because that will probably tie in to what we're looking at doing over the next few meetings. Then we can have some discussion.

Madame Lalonde, please read the motion. Then we can have some discussion.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Mr. Chairman, in view of the evidence we have heard in the past few weeks and of the answer the Minister of Foreign Affairs gave a number of us when we asked questions on Rights and Democracy, that we should invite members and make recommendations, I move the following:

That the Foreign Affairs and International Development Committee prepare a report with recommendations concerning the situation at the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development (Rights and Democracy), after hearing from all pertinent witnesses, and that this report be presented in the House.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'll start taking names to talk to this motion.

Mr. Dewar.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Chair, I support the motion, and I would hope that the government would help us get there and that we don't get into any filibustering. I say that very sincerely. In light of what we heard in the House yesterday and previously, the minister himself has asked us to do that. If you look at what our role is here, it's to have oversight to this institute. That's embedded in the mandate of the institute.

Hopefully, Chair, this is something we would do as quickly as possible and we work together on. We might disagree on what some of those recommendations might be, but that's fine. Let's put our best ideas down, let's get this done, and let's get it sent to the House as soon as possible.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I have Mr. Lunney, Mr. Obhrai, and Dr. Patry.

Mr. Lunney.

**Mr. James Lunney:** With all due respect, we have a situation here that has been rather acrimonious, to say the least, at times. There are certainly differences of opinion.

We have a lot of important work we're trying to get to at committee. I for one was looking forward to having a discussion on important affairs regarding the Arctic.

We need to discuss how many meetings we want to have to prepare such a report. I suspect it may not be as easy as Mr. Dewar would like. If he wants to write the report himself, he may have his opportunity.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** On a point of order, I'd said that the committee—

**Mr. James Lunney:** Frankly, Mr. Dewar, I have the floor. I have to listen to you, as painful as that is for me sometimes.

We have important work on the Arctic that I was hoping we'd get to. The G8 summit is coming. We have the issue of maternal and child health. We wanted to have some hearing time on that.

If the committee wants to spend the next however much time of our tenure discussing the report, which in Mr. Dewar's imagination will be one meeting, it certainly doesn't work in my mind. If that's the way you want to go, I want to be on the record from my perspective that we're committing an awful lot of time on this matter that should be directed to other issues, as far as I'm concerned.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Obhrai, and then Dr. Patry.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As you know, as the Minister of Foreign Affairs has stated and as you have stated, we really don't have an issue if the committee wants to study this. I don't mean "study"; I mean we can do a report and put forward recommendations. I don't think it's going to be an issue. This was a question we asked well before we started the hearing. At that time, it was stated that we didn't want to, but if the committee so desired, we could do it.

The question I have will be very blunt. I do not agree with Mr. Dewar that it's going to be one meeting for the report. I can tell you that. I know Mr. Dewar and I've worked with him for many years. He tends to bring in things that will automatically extend everything, because he will of course have his NDP agenda.

We don't have a problem, but I think we should discuss the issue of how many days of hearings we're going to have. My recommendation is that we have four days for the hearings. If we finish early, that's fine. If we don't finish early, then we may need more time.

But I can tell you here that if you think we're going to do this report with a rubber stamp, that's not going to be...a problem. However, there is no difficulty on our part to write a report and send forward recommendations.

- (1240)

**The Chair:** Dr. Patry.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Patry:** I don't want to repeat everything that's been said.



However, as Ms. Lalonde said, Mr. Cannon said, in an answer in the House of Commons during question period, that he was anxiously awaiting the recommendations of our Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. Mr. Cannon himself said that. The Conservative government is waiting for answers and recommendations on the operation of Rights and Democracy.

I think we have to go ahead. We'll have to determine the number of meetings that will be necessary, probably a maximum of two or three. We can set dates. The steering committee can look at that, Mr. Chairman. We will look at it with you, and we will determine the amount of time we have to take to develop those recommendations.

Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** I've listened to everybody. Here's what I'm going to suggest. I'm going to suggest that when we meet on Tuesday, we give some drafting instructions to our researchers. There should be some communication about that in terms of what we hope to accomplish with the report.

I'm going to suggest that we have a steering committee on the following Thursday for at least an hour to discuss some of the future business that we need to determine. It will also give the researchers a chance to work on the draft and on the report, which we can look at on the following Tuesday. We can determine with the steering committee, before we come back to the full committee, the number of meetings and what the schedule is going to look like. It's going to take a few meetings to have the report drafted and to have some discussion on what it will finally look like.

I think we're pretty much on the same page. My suggestion once again would be to give directions in terms of drafting to the researchers on Tuesday.

I'm not going to be here. Dr. Patry, you're going to sit in the chair. I'm at the millennium summit for the morning. I'll be back in the afternoon.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** You're giving instructions on this for Tuesday, which means Tuesday is open. Mr. Rae put forward a motion to study the situation in Ethiopia with the forthcoming election. We feel it is a very important issue. With the approval of the committee on Tuesday, we can start a hearing on the Ethiopian issue.

**Mr. Bernard Patry:** We have Bill C-300 also. We cannot start everything.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** Well, you other guys, I'm here to say we feel the motion from your foreign affairs critic on Ethiopia is quite an important issue that needs to be discussed because the elections are coming up in Ethiopia. We can start looking at the government coming and making a presentation on Tuesday.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Madame Deschamps.

[Translation]

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** I listened to Mr. Obhrai's concerns. I have a concern with regard to the agenda that we've already

established, which includes, in particular, Ms. Oda's appearance. I don't know whether a date has been set for the Minister for International Cooperation.

[English]

**The Chair:** No, we don't. We tried three times to have a steering committee meeting over the last break. None of those dates worked, which is why I'm proposing we have one next Thursday so we can get this started.

I'm still going to suggest we meet on Tuesday to give directions to the researchers to start putting something together, that we have a steering committee the first hour on Thursday, and then we come back to the full committee on Thursday with what that would look like over the next little while.

Paul.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** I agree with that, and we should put off the Ethiopian item until we have a chance at the steering committee to deal with that.

Finally, if we're wrapping up, has this motion been passed?

**The Chair:** No, I'll have the formal vote in one second.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Okay, thank you.

**The Chair:** Does that make some sense, and we'll give directions to the researchers?

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** Will that be for two hours?

**The Chair:** No, it probably won't take you two hours, but I'll leave that up to you guys. It may be an hour. It may be a shorter meeting.

And then I suggest we have the steering committee for the first hour on Thursday and then have the full committee to talk about Ethiopia, G20, and all these things that haven't been addressed.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** I'm fine with that.

**The Chair:** Is that okay?

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Do we have a consensus?

**An hon. member:** Yes.

**The Chair:** All right, we'll go with that, then.

If there's nothing else, I'll adjourn the meeting.

● (1245)

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Can we pass the motion?

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll do this formally, then.

All those in favour of the motion? Any opposed?

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Thanks.

The meeting is adjourned.





**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,  
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*  
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

### **SPEAKER'S PERMISSION**

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and  
Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943  
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the  
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

### **PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT**

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les  
Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5  
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943  
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à  
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>