



Defining the National Interest: New Directions for Canadian Foreign Policy 4-5 November 2004

Conference Report

Report Prepared By

Rachel Lea Heide
Pre-Doctoral Fellow
CSDS
Carleton University, Ottawa

Trista Grant
Research Assistant
CSDS
Carleton University, Ottawa

Christopher Ankersen
Post-Doctoral Fellow
CSDS
Carleton University, Ottawa

Dorothée Roy
Graduate Student/Research Assistant
Institut québécois des hautes études internationales
Université Laval, Quebec City

Julie Boileau
Graduate Student/Research Assistant
Institut québécois des hautes études internationales
Université Laval, Quebec City

© 2005 Centre for Security and Defence Studies
Carleton University



Table of Contents

Part A:

The Impetus Behind the Report <i>Visions of Canadian Foreign Policy</i> and the Innovative Research Group Inc.'s Survey	3
---	---

Part B:

Agenda of Conference on <i>Defining the National Interest: New Directions for Canadian Foreign Policy</i> , Held at the Lord Elgin Hotel 4-5 November 2004	5
--	---

Part C:

Session Summaries	
Grand Keynote Address	7
Panel 1: Framing Canada's National Interests: The Fundamental Principles	9
Panel 2: Economic Interests and Public Policy	12
Panel 3: Canada's Role in the World: The View from Civil Society	15
Panel 4: Canadian Public Opinion and Foreign Policy	18
Syndicate Meeting Reports	21
Plenary Session	29

Part D:

About the Hosts	
Centre for Security and Defence Studies (CSDS)	32
Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI).....	32
Queen's Centre for International Relations (QCIR)	33
L'Institut québécois des hautes études internationales (IQHEI).....	33
Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars	34
The Dominion Institute	34

Part E:

Panelist Biographies	35
----------------------------	----

Part A

The Impetus Behind the Report *Visions of Canadian Foreign Policy* and the Innovative Research Group Inc.'s Survey

Between Thursday 21 October and Thursday 28 October 2004, the Innovative Research Group Inc., a Toronto-based research firm, conducted a survey of 500 randomly selected Canadians. The survey, which was commissioned by the Dominion Institute of Canada and the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, has a margin of error of +/- 4.38%, 19 times out of 20. A preliminary report was prepared for use at the conference *Defining the National Interest: New Directions for Canadian Foreign Policy*. The final report will be available at the Innovative Research Group Inc.'s website <http://innovativeresearch.ca>.

The Canadian government is in the midst of the first major policy review of the new millennium. The purpose of this study was to provide a benchmark of Canadians' level of engagement and basic orientations toward foreign policy, as well as to explore the Canadian public's reaction to a number of competing visions for Canada's foreign policy future and foreign policy choices.

The survey covers seven major topics:

- Public Engagement: The survey explored Canadians' expressed interest in international events, their knowledge of basic foreign policy facts, and their sense of whether world events make a difference in their lives and whether or not foreign policy is best left to the experts.
- The Context: Surveyors asked Canadians their views on Canada's past role in world affairs, whether Canada is getting stronger or weaker in terms of making a difference, and it briefly explored the implications of the HMCS Chicoutimi fire.
- General Foreign Policy Orientations: Surveyors asked Canadians whether it is better for Canada to play an active part in the world or not; it also explored attitudes towards the United States, promoting Canadian values, the impact of our changing demographics, and whether power still comes from the barrel of a gun.
- Visions of the Future: Drawing from the summary of visions of Jennifer Welsh's book *Canada at Home in the World*, the survey tested Canadians' reactions to six competing visions for Canadian foreign policy.
- Threats: Drawing upon the quadrennial studies of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, surveyors asked Canadians to rate their degree of concern regarding seven potential international threats.
- Willingness to Use Force: Again, drawing upon the quadrennial studies of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, the survey tested where Canadians really stand in their willingness to use the military as a foreign policy tool and compared those results to findings from six other advanced industrial economies.
- Choices: Finally, the survey looked at four key foreign policy choices drawn from diplomacy, development, and defence.

Surveyors found a country deeply interested in foreign policy, watching the Chicoutimi story closely, but with limited knowledge in key foreign policy facts. Canadians are strongly oriented toward taking an active role on the world stage. It is a country that firmly believes it has played a major role in the significant world events of the past seventy-five years. While there is no consensus among the general public on whether Canada is becoming stronger or weaker internationally, those who are most concerned are worried that Canada is losing ground in terms of its influence.

While Canadians are still more likely to believe the United States is a force for good rather than a force for evil, there is a Canadian consensus that the United States is acting like a rogue nation, rushing into conflicts without first working with friends and allies to find other solutions. A bare majority of Canadians (51%) also do not trust the United States to treat Canadian concerns fairly.

Canadians are not convinced of the appropriateness of promoting Canadian values abroad. While a narrow majority of 55% agrees that Canada should promote our aboriginal policies as a model for the world, four out of five Canadians agree it is wrong for any country, even Canada, to push its values on other countries. Canadians are divided over whether power today still comes from the barrel of a gun, but they agree narrowly that the increasing number of Asians in our country should result in Canada paying more attention to Asian countries.

Fear of potential epidemics like SARS and AIDS is Canada's top concern from a list of seven international threats. Global warming and international terrorism joined potential epidemics on the list of threats that most Canadians ranked as being of critical concern. Four other potential threats – globalization, Islamic fundamentalism, immigrants and refugees, and United States aggression toward Canada – were rated as critical threats by less than 30% of Canadians.

Canadians are willing to commit Canadian troops in a wide array of scenarios, even when there is a chance some members of the military may be killed and no Canadian lives or direct interests are at risk. The only scenario the survey tested where Canadians showed any significant reluctance to commit troops was to secure the supply of oil, and even in that case, 47% of Canadians were prepared to commit Canadian troops.

Moreover, despite the stereotypes of the pacifist Canadian public and the belligerent Americans, Canadians are very similar to Americans in their willingness to commit the military. It appears the main difference between Americans and Canadians when it comes to committing troops is not Canadian commitment but Canadian capability.

When it comes to choices in foreign aid and diplomacy, Canadians show a willingness to focus foreign aid on fewer countries to create a bigger impact, but they are reluctant to shift resources away from the United Nations to focus on important countries or to alternative regional multi-lateral organizations.

Looking to the future, the survey uncovers a mixed story. Canadians strongly embrace both the interests-based approach of foreign policy for trade relations and the values-based approach of soft power. However, whether the government adopts an interests-based approach or a values-based approach, Canadians do not appear to be prepared to sacrifice domestic priorities for the greater international good.

Part B

Agenda of Conference on *Defining the National Interest: New Directions for Canadian Foreign Policy* 4-5 November 2004

Thursday 4 November 2004

9:00-9:15 a.m. – Welcome Addresses

- Dane Rowlands (Associate Director NPSIA, Carleton University)
- Katherine Graham (Dean of Public Affairs and Management, Carleton University)

9:15-9:45 a.m. – Grand Keynote Address

Canada and the International Policy Review: Identifying Canada's Fundamental National Interests

- The Honourable Barbara J. McDougall (Advisor, Aird & Berlis LLP)

9:45-10:45 a.m. – Panel 1

“Framing Canada's National Interests: The Fundamental Principles”

Chair – David Bercuson (Director CDFAI)

- Norman Hillmer (Professor CSDS, Carleton University)
- Norman Michaud (École nationale d'administration publique)
- John Higginbotham (VP Research and University Relations, Canada School of Public Service)

11:15-12:30 p.m. – Panel 2

“Economic Interests and Public Policy”

Chair – Kim Nossal (Head of Political Studies, Queen's University)

- Thomas d'Aquino (President and Chief Executive, Canadian Council of Chief Executives)
- Louis Bélanger (Director, Institut québécois des hautes études internationales, Université Laval)
- Mary Pat Mackinnon (Director, Public Involvement Network, Canadian Policy Research Network)

1:30-3:00 p.m. – Panel 3

“Canada's Role in the World: The World from Civil Society”

Chair – David Carment (Director CSDS, Carleton University)

- David Lord (Coordinator, Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee)
- Betty Plewes (Consultant, Former CEO of Canadian Council for International Cooperation)
- David Malone (Former President of the International Peace Academy)

3:30-5:00 p.m. – Panel 4

“Canadian Public Opinion and Foreign Policy”

Chair – Jean-Sébastien Rioux (Canada Research Chair in International Security, Université Laval)

- Rudyard Griffiths (Executive Director of the Dominion Institute)
- Chris Waddell (Associate Professor School of Journalism, Carleton University)
- Michael Pearson (Coordinator International Policy Review, Office of the Minister of Foreign Affairs)
- Greg Lyle (Innovative Research Group Inc.)

Friday 5 November 2004

9:00-9:30 a.m. – Opening Session

Welcome Back – David Carment (CSDS, Carleton University)

Plenary Recap – David Biette (Canada Institute, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars)

Procedural Instructions – Jean-Sébastien Rioux (Université Laval)

10:30-11:30 a.m. – Syndicate Meetings

- The Fundamentals
- Economic National Interests
- Role of Civil Society
- Public Opinion and Foreign Policy

11:30-12:30 p.m. – Final Plenary Session

- David Bercuson (Director CDFAI)
- Kim Nossal (Political Studies, Queen's University)
- David Carment (CSDS, Carleton University)
- Jean-Sébastien Rioux (Université Laval)

Part C

Grand Keynote Address

“Canada and the International Policy Review:

Identifying Canada’s Fundamental National Interests”

By The Honourable Barbara J. McDougall (Advisor, Aird & Berlis LLP)

Mrs McDougall’s opening remarks noted the national effort among major centres of study to grapple with the challenge of defining the national interest. She was glad to see that “interests” and not “values” were being assessed, as this would lead to a more hard-nosed approach. In reviewing the October 2003 conference notes, she identified three key observations which she believes all still hold true: that the world has changed drastically but Canada has lagged behind; that limited influence and heavy interest in trade makes the United States Canada’s most important imperative; and that decision-making power is in the hands of too few people. The call for a foreign policy review finally has been answered, and now there is a need for defence and security reviews as well.

Mrs McDougall put forth three factors that should frame discussions about Canada’s future role in the world. The first factor is Canada’s changing demographic profile. Today’s multi-ethnic population bears little resemblance to the French Canadian and “WASP” populations that existed in Canada at the time of the Statute of Westminster. Canadians now come from all over the world, and the North Atlantic emotional links have been diffused. An examination of the trans-Atlantic alliance is overdue. A generation of Canadians have grown up without attachment to a Canada that has significant military power, and Canadians under the age of forty likely have as much in common with people around the world as they do with Canadians over forty. This “globalized generation” sees the world in new ways: computers are their friends, and cell phones are a necessity. They may not use the word “globalization,” but the issues they care about are global ones: water, pollution, and nuclear waste, for example. This list does not include the Canadian military. As Canadians think more and more about global issues, they think less and less about foreign policy. This should be met with an attempt to produce a coherent Canadian approach.

The second factor that will form Canada’s strategic direction in the future is the importance of an emerging China. It has always been a sleeping giant, but China is now ready to play a role in the world and use its status as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council to its advantage. It is a nuclear power and a member of the World Trade Organization. China has an acute understanding of economic power over military might. China’s new interest in Canada confounds Canada, in light of its past dealings with the country. In the wake of Tiananmen Square, Mrs McDougall formed a policy of shunning China, as did other “do-gooder” countries. Canada retained mild sanctions longer than others, but Canadian companies still operated. Given China’s progress (for example China’s taking over Canadian assets), a position of not dealing with China due to its poor human rights record is untenable. China’s size and rise is an important factor for Canada.

The third factor Mrs McDougall discussed was the United States. For Canada, it is the first concern due to its size and proximity and trade and security issues. Mrs McDougall feels that it is encouraging that Canada has a prime minister who is willing to give this vital relationship the attention it deserves, seeing as she believes that running the United States file is a 24 hour-a-day, 365 day-a-year job. It is important to note that China is creeping up on Canada in United States trade. The outcome of the most recent American election is important: George W. Bush is who matters to Canadians now, despite Canadian support for John Kerry. Canadians have to “get over it” and deal with the bilateral relationship. Its relationship with the United States takes Canada from being an outsider and can help with other relationships – for example those with China, Japan, and Latin America. Foreign policy realignment is required in terms of global positioning: the United States is the only superpower in the world, and acts like one under Bush. Canada must recognize this and stop sniping from the sidelines. Canada can play an important role as a mediator between the United States and Europe, but it must have good relations with both in order to do so. Canada should improve its relationship with the United States, speak out when it matters, and strengthen its capacity to do so.

Mrs McDougall concluded that Canadians like foreign policy reviews, not foreign policy action. She called for improved diplomatic presence in the United States, for more attention for military affairs, intelligence, and security matters, and for more co-operation overall. This applies to Europe as well as the United States – Canada needs to reevaluate its relationships and strengthen its capacities in the world. A focus on the United States does not overshadow the need to pay attention to other countries. A challenge exists in education in keeping up with research and development, funding health care, attracting professionals, and making and distributing movies. In the international arena it is difficult not to get rolled over by the elephant. Mrs McDougall is dubious about the new structure because decision-making is in fact more concentrated than before. The United States file has been moved into the Prime Minister’s Office. She suggests that, instead of re-jigging structures of departments, those departments need to work more closely together, particularly with defence. Partners are more important in light of America’s determination to play “strong man,” and Mrs. McDougall would like to see a country that considers all the players that have a role in its foreign policy.

Panel 1: Framing Canada's National Interests: The Fundamental Principles

Chair – David Bercuson (Director CDFAI)

- Norman Hillmer (Professor CSDS, Carleton University)
- Norman Michaud (École nationale d'administration publique)
- John Higginbotham (VP Research and University Relations, Canada School of Public Service)

The speakers of the first panel reflected upon Canada's foreign policy pursuits in the past, the challenges facing foreign policy makers today, and the difficult choices that will have to be made in the near future. Dr Norman Hillmer opened the session by divulging the secret life of Canadian foreign policy. Canada has always pursued its national interests relentlessly, but the country – politicians and voters alike – has been reluctant to admit this. Maintaining alliances with Great Britain and the United States are in Canada's national interests, but few are willing to admit how much these alignments matter in the final analysis. Instead, Canadians and their leaders are happiest hiding behind the mask of independence and activist internationalism, for this obscures the core interests of the country – interests which foreign policy has always advanced, just secretly.

The first mask Dr Hillmer uncovered was the rhetoric of Liberal nationalism, spoken by Wilfrid Laurier and William Lyon Mackenzie King from 1887 to 1948. These prime ministers crusaded to preserve national unity and advance Canadian autonomy in international affairs, even if this jeopardized the Dominion's position in the British Empire. Actually, Dr Hillmer argued, this legacy is really a sham. Liberal leaders were very much aware that Canada's interests did lie in the Anglo-alliance: Canada's foreign policy always stood with Great Britain – quietly in peacetime and more openly in times of war.

The second mask Dr Hillmer exposed was Canada's Cold War internationalism. During this time, Canada seemed to take more pride in activism than alliances; the country happily joined countless international organizations, and Canadians had a sense of superiority since they were able to share a continent and live in harmony with their neighbour. In reality, Dr Hillmer argued, Canada's economic and strategic interests were tied to the United States. Nonetheless, because of the safety provided by Canada's alliance with its southern neighbour, Canada had the liberty to construct rhetoric about good works and nation building.

Dr Hillmer then addressed the mask of late-1990s' Axworthyism. The populist philosophy projected an agenda of worthy humanitarian campaigns: a human security agenda, the creation of an international criminal court, the pursuit of treaties against land mines, the denouncement of child soldiers. Canada's real foreign policy agenda, Dr Hillmer pointed out, was the prime minister's Team Canada trade missions in pursuit of 'anything for a buck.' Most 'bucks' lay south of the 49th parallel; hence, Canada's foreign policy clearly had a north-south focus.

The most recent mask Canada has been wearing is the idea that, after 11 September 2001, and especially after the United States invaded Iraq, Canadian and American opinions have been diverging. Canada refused to go to war in Iraq, and the Liberal government has vocally disapproved of the United States' right wing administration. Actually, Dr Hillmer argued, opinions have not diverged as much as people would like to believe: Canada joined the campaign against terrorism in

Afghanistan, and Canada is serving its alliance with the United States in places other than Iraq.

Lately, the impression is being left that Canada's policies do not reflect its national interests. This is yet another diverting mask. Eighty-five percent of the country's foreign policies are in relation with its southern neighbour. Canadians know where their foreign policy interests lie; Canada will advance its national interests. The country simply does not admit to doing this.

Nelson Michaud reflected on the many values that serve as a base to Canada's foreign policy: multiculturalism, conciliation, peace, security, honest-brokerism. Despite these worthy values that Canadians would like to project internationally, the country's foreign policy makers still must confront the challenges that exist in the creation of effective policy.

The first challenge is to acknowledge the benefits of adaptation; it is not always necessary to start again at zero. Solid foundations can easily accommodate change. Dr Michaud then emphasized how the country needs to prioritize its policies and objectives. One single country cannot do everything. Canada's third challenge is to evaluate multi-lateralism: is this always the most beneficial policy? Dr Michaud suggested that there are advantages to bilateralism, especially seeing as the United States prefers to be a bilateral actor.

Cultivating and maintaining Canadian-American relations is another delicate balancing act for Canada. The country clearly wants differentiation between the two nations' policies, but on the other hand, Canada must not turn its back on Washington in its attempt to declare Canadian autonomy. The political culture of Canada's government and the various departments involved in forming foreign policy is another challenge. There is a very present danger that the values imbued in this political culture will inhibit flexibility in the nation's foreign policy. Dr Michaud also argued that there must be more acceptance of the role of other government departments, outside Foreign Affairs, in the setting of foreign policy. There are also new actors on the world stage that must be included in the cultivation of international relations.

Canadian policy makers must define Canada's national interests as a global actor. Canada must also be cognizant of the changing face of global actors – China and Africa are just two examples of regions that cannot be ignored for the traditional western players. Canadian sovereignty is an ever-present challenge; policy makers not only need to decide how sovereignty will be defined, but then they must provide the tools to protect this sovereignty. The final challenge Dr Michaud raised was the relationship of foreign policy with the country's civil society. Public opinion and social culture have an important role to play since there is an undeniable influence of Canadian social values in the formation of foreign policy.

In closing, Dr Michaud delineated three elements that are imperative for the country's foreign policy. There needs to be a clear doctrine where the nation's interests are articulated explicitly. There also needs to be resources; for defence, development, and diplomacy, equipment, human resources, and money must be provided. The country also needs international influence, and this can only be possible if Canada has a clearly articulated doctrine and the resources to impact the international scene.

John Higginbotham spoke about the pragmatic and values-based nature of Canada's foreign policy. Canadians have an inclination to do foreign policy since there

is a sense of responsibility amongst the nation's citizens. There is also a sense of building something special in Canada – tolerance, immigration, multiculturalism, a charter of rights and freedoms. Canadians want these elements reflected in international policies abroad.

Mr Higginbotham also pointed out that Canada does have national interests as well when it comes to foreign policy. These interests are peculiar to the nation's geography, population, and history. Since 11 September 2001, security has been a major concern of both Canada and the United States. Arctic sovereignty has always been a worry for Canada's leaders, more so now with the impact of global warming. Maintaining national unity has been a challenge for political parties throughout Canada's history. With so much trade between Canada and the United States, it is clearly in the country's economic interest to maintain an open trade system with its southern neighbour.

Despite being pragmatic and values-based at the same time, Canada's foreign policy has been incremental and fragmented. All too often, the nation's policy has been responsive to crises and events. Some very useful policies have come out of reacting to emergencies. There is now Canadian and American cooperation on bilateral preparedness in connection to security issues (take for example Canada's new department for security and emergency preparedness). Nonetheless, national interests are hard to define in the heat of the moment. For this reason, foreign policy reviews can be very useful; with some thoughtful planning, consultation, and consideration, national interests are revealed and advanced.

With the changing world situation, Mr Higginbotham emphasized the obvious: there will be some difficult choices facing Canadian policy makers in the near future. Where will Canada focus its international aid? What interests and what values will be prioritized? What commitment is the nation willing to make to which alliance? What will four more years of a strong Bush Government in the United States mean for Canada? Will Canada increase its international roles? Will the resources – human, material, and monetary – be available for defence, development, and diplomacy? In setting policy for the next decade and beyond, Mr Higginbotham reminded his listeners of the value of integrating the views from the various foreign affairs players (CIDA, the Department of National Defence, and the Department of Foreign Affairs). He also advised that the government recognize the important national role other departments – and even provinces – can play in establishing and carrying out the country's foreign policy. Everyone has a stake in the part Canada plays on the world stage.

Panel 2: Economic Interests and Public Policy

Chair – Kim Nossal (Head of Political Studies, Queen’s University)

- Thomas d’Aquino (President and Chief Executive, Canadian Council of Chief Executives)
- Louis Bélanger (Director, Institut québécois des hautes études internationales, Université Laval)
- Mary Pat Mackinnon (Director, Public Involvement Network, Canadian Policy Research Network)

According to Tom Aquino, foreign policy is an extension of national personality, and business often relies on what others think of Canada as a country. He, for one, does not accept that Canada cannot make a difference on the world stage. A good foreign policy, therefore, is needed. Dr d’Aquino defines a good foreign policy as one where Canada is intelligent and influential, has a strong economic base at home, and is able to provide itself and others with ‘good governance.’ In economic terms, business is not only concerned with growth as a national priority, but increasingly with equitably distributed economic benefit.

In the period 1945-1960, Canada had influence – the nation mattered, according to Dr Aquino. This is due largely to the fact that Canada could pay for things like defence and infrastructure. By the 1980s and 1990s, because of mismanagement, Dr d’Aquino believes Canada ‘hit rock bottom’ in terms of foreign influence. However, improvements in recent years, in terms of debt reduction and fiscal reform, have meant that Canada has enjoyed the best growth and the best job creation in the G7, and, as a result of the strong economy, Canada is beginning to be listened to again.

Canada has the means to influence the global scene in seven major areas. The first of these is in economic multi-lateralism. Building on Canada’s solid track record in this area, both as architects and players, Canada has an opportunity to further develop existing institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), and perhaps to enhance emergent ones, such as the G20. The second area, according to Dr Aquino, is intelligent regionalism. Rather than seeing regionalism and multi-lateralism as incompatible, Dr Aquino believes, led by the example of the European Union (EU), that they are complementary. Therefore, Canada should look to strengthen its ties with the EU, perhaps exploring the idea of a North Atlantic Free Trade Area. Furthermore, Canada needs to develop a strategy for engaging with North Asia and its key economies such as China, Japan, and South Korea. Finally, Latin America, in Dr d’Aquino’s words, is a “mess not to be ignored.” The asymmetries that exist within the region’s economies are not conducive to the successful establishment of a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). There is a role for Canada to play in developing the region further.

Dr Aquino then discussed intelligent development policies. Development matters to both foreign policy and business. Canada needs to concentrate its efforts to take advantage of its greatest strengths, which might not be money but rather capacity building, especially in the area of governance. Another area that needs consideration is the fact that business carries Canadian values abroad. Contrary to the anti-globalization protest movement, business does promote good values. Transnational companies, including Canadian ones, bring money and human rights practices to other countries around the world. Therefore, business is part of the wider foreign policy team.

Another area in which Canada must become more involved is North American policy. Canada must get on board with the North American Security and Prosperity Initiative because in terms of North America, security is indispensable and non-negotiable. A

European model is not possible for North America, and it should be remembered by Canadians that threats have the potential to flow both ways across the border: for instance, there are 10-12 million people living in the US without identification who could pose a threat to the safety and security of Canadians.

Foreign Policy must become a reflection of Canada's national vision. Canadians need a vigorous, non-apologetic vision, one that is then resourced correctly, even if this means making difficult budgetary decisions. International Trade must work together with Foreign Affairs, CIDA, and the nation's many cultural assets. Canadians are not hewers of wood and drawers of water, but writers, actors, and artists. Finally, there can be no effective foreign policy without a credible defence capability. One need only look to Australia, not only for an example of a well integrated security policy, but to the fact that John Howard, because of his clear and well communicated policies, was supported and eventually re-elected on a platform of strong defence and foreign policy.

In Louis Bélanger's paper, he argued that, in addition to the traditional instruments of foreign policy, Canadian commercial policy has undergone a radical transformation and needs to become a public policy field as well – one just as important as health or environmental policy. This reality needs to be recognized, according to Dr Bélanger. He believes that it is impossible to have a good foreign policy without a good commercial policy and vice versa. Accordingly, then, it was a bad idea to separate the departments of International Trade and Foreign Affairs. These aspects of Canada's policy need to be thought of, and articulated in, an integrated fashion.

Dr Bélanger argued that NAFTA was a watershed in terms of Canadian trade, but it has not received the kind of attention that it deserves. Canada has virtually ignored Mexico politically, which is hard to understand, given that the country is a trade partner of some importance. Dr Bélanger concluded his remarks with three observations. Canada needs to get its relations with the United States right so that the country can get its other relationships right as well. There is currently no coordination between the plethora of federal and provincial agencies dealing with the United States; this deficiency must be addressed. Nonetheless, it is difficult to get other unfinished business done without Canadian commercial policy being fixed first.

Mary Pat Mackinnon began her remarks by highlighting that she was providing a citizen's perspective (rather than as a representative of one or more civil society organizations) on Canadian foreign policy. She regards public policy as both an art and a science, and at its heart, it was about choices – choices that need to rest on a foundation of legitimacy. What is needed, therefore, is more (and better) deliberative dialogue to plumb public judgment.

Ms Mackinnon's remarks revolved around four main points. Firstly, Canada has come along way since the 1989 Free Trade election. Canadians are confident in their country's productivity and believe that this productivity is due in no small part to Canada's social programs. Canadians see business, not government, as the engine of economic growth and as the main source of job creation. Secondly, Canadian economic policy and practice are characterized by both pragmatism and principle. Economic development to most Canadians is seen as a means and not an end. Values matter – both Canadian values and those of the countries in which Canada invested and to which Canada has given aid.

Ms Mackinnon then spoke about how definitions matter. Citizens have holistic, integrated ideas about economic interests, rather than narrow, facile ones that are sometimes included in economic models. Intangibles such as social values and civil society are not always accounted for in the market. What Canadians want, rather than a pure free market, is a shared community, where citizens themselves are involved in governance. This means there is a need to spend time defining economic issues and governance challenges. When one speaks of good governance, one means transparency, and since decisions always involve trade-offs, one cannot afford to rely solely on 'experts.' If Canada want to be a 'model power', as styled by Jennifer Welsh, then the government needs to give people a greater say and needs to understand what citizens mean by such terms as democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, in terms of economic foreign policy.

Panel 3: Canada's Role in the World: The World from Civil Society

Chair – David Carment (Director CSDS, Carleton University)

- David Lord (Coordinator, Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee)
- Betty Plewes (Consultant, Former CEO of Canadian Council for International Cooperation)
- David Malone (Former President of the International Peace Academy)

David Lord explained that the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee (CPCC) is a network of approximately forty organizations whose members include those concerned with development and relief, human rights organizations, aid organizations, conflict resolution agencies, and many individual peacebuilding technical professionals. Members of the CPCC have come together to work for more effective Canadian participation in peacebuilding, an activity its members believe to be integral to foreign policy. Many of its member organizations are dependent on CIDA and the Department of Foreign Affairs for funding.

The CPCC has been gathering input for the foreign policy review process and is keenly interested in the outcome of the international policy review. The main foreign policy issues that have been identified for this group include Canada's role in hot spots in terms of the nature of involvement, levels of resources and long-term commitment; why and how decisions are taken in government to prioritize some crises over others; how to keep longer-standing areas of Canadian engagement firmly on the political and public agenda; the blurring of the lines in conflict zones between humanitarian workers and the military; how Canada and other international governmental and non-governmental actors can work together in conflict prevention; and how transitions from violent conflict to peace to sustainable development are handled.

Civil society plays roles in responding to violent conflict that include providing information and analysis, policy development, strategy design, and programme implementation. The CPCC aims to create a consultative process through effective partnerships with governments, regional organizations and parts of the United Nations government. It wants to raise awareness of the role of civil society and urge these bodies to include civil society in their strategies for promoting security and responding to conflict through the establishment of formal deliberative and consultative mechanisms and agreed implementation strategies.

If NGOs involved in peacebuilding activities were setting foreign policy priorities, the following areas would receive considerable support: developing Canadian and international capacities to prevent violent conflict; more effective responses to current "hot" crises; and a dedicated humanitarian, developmental and institution-building capacity to bridge the post-conflict transition from violence to sustained development.

Mr Lord would like to add "three C's" (coherence, coordination, and consultation) to the establishment of principles and mechanisms that will ensure that the '3 Ds + sometimes T' (diplomacy, development and defence, and sometimes trade) and other areas of Canadian interest will be systematically taken into account when international policy initiatives are planned and implemented. There is a need for greater policy coherence despite resistance from different parts of the government bureaucracy to perceived infringements on their autonomy. The impact of conflict prevention strategy is reduced due to lack of coordination; for this reason, there is a need for joint development

strategies and coordinated development assistance and peacebuilding activities. To become more effective at multidimensional peacebuilding and heighten its impact, Canada needs to develop coherent and coordinated responses based on a consultative process that draws in more talent and resources. The bar must be raised through the formulation of an overarching strategic framework for peacebuilding activities, so that key conflict prevention actors operate in isolation no longer and coordinate activities across sectors, and the available pool of Canadian expertise will be substantially enlarged. This requires sustained investment in long-term capacity building within government and NGOs.

A strategic framework for Canadian peacebuilding could include a statement of Canadian values and objectives; a set of general guidelines for developing focused, context-driven peacebuilding responses; principles for collaboration between government departments and Canadian non-governmental actors; mechanisms for bilateral, multilateral and multi-sectoral cooperation in peacebuilding between Canada and others; and a long-term financial commitment on the part of government that is supplementary to existing development assistance commitments. According to Mr Lord, to do this requires strategic vision, long-term perspectives and commitments, dedicated resources and better collaboration within government and between government and civil society organizations.

Betty Plewes began her comments by pointing out that there is no single view from civil society. There is a need to update the image of international relations as a game played by states because it is in fact a much more disaggregated activity. Foreign policy is a reflection of who Canada is as a nation, and this is changing; the country is held together by shared values, not shared roots. Canadians are no longer satisfied to leave policy and decision-making to “experts”; they want a broader discussion. Ms Plewes believes that promoting interests (economic, foreign policy) can be consistent with the promotion of values (democracy).

Canadian prosperity and security are closely linked with global peace and security. Canada must address global poverty because poverty promotes instability. Canadians want global poverty addressed; in fact, many think the nation does this now. One of the tools Canada has at its disposal for this purpose is development assistance. Canada recommitted itself through United Nations Millennium Goals, but Canadians must now make sure that trade foreign policies have a positive or neutral impact on poor nations. CIDA should have the lead role in coordinating development assistance effort, if it is given a mandate and the leadership to do so. There is a need to strengthen civil society participation in Canada and recipient nations. Ms Plewes argued that this endeavour needs an overarching policy framework to guide CIDA in development assistance, peacebuilding, and humanitarian aid. There needs to be public engagement, and NGOs should support constructive citizen participation through a strong coherent domestic program to engage the public. In particular, two key sectors need to be engaged: youth and ethno-racial communities. The role of Diaspora communities and links around the world have not been fully exploited. Ms Plewes concluded with the observation that Canada is a work in progress.

According to David Malone, in peacebuilding, the issue of attention span is of particular importance because peacebuilding is a project of time (often taking place over decades) and is undermined by a lack of media attention. Media attention displaces

existing and continuing problems too fast, and there is a question of sustainability. In discussing peacebuilding, Dr Malone highlighted the fact that money tends to follow media coverage, and NGOs stampede toward the funding. It is important not to be sentimental about NGOs since, although they are driven by high ideals, NGOs have to be self-interested in order to do good. The key issue is that of peacebuilding and attention span – how to create it? The United Nations Security Council, specialized agencies, and NGOs must be pressed to stay interested in the problems themselves, as structural change, in and of itself, is not a solution. In regard to the interaction of NGOs and military actors, it is not possible to develop a schema that will fit every situation and all activities, as the roles of the military and NGOs change over time.

The role of regional organizations can be further explored – for example, the International Peace Academy worked with Organization of African Unity/African Union (OAU/AU). A syndrome is present in the attitudes and dealings of NGOs with regional organizations: there is an initial burst of enthusiasm, a period of falling out of love, then abandonment. Donors can be finicky and would rather criticize than help regional organizations. This syndrome is apparent in what happened with the OAU, and is happening to the AU. Canada needs to be helpful wherever or whenever it can. An example is that Canada is providing airlift capability for a year in Sudan to the AU. Dr Malone sees this as significant, as support is not just taking the form of capacity-building at headquarters. There is a simplistic, media-driven approach to humanitarian crises, but there are other crises worse than those that receive the attention.

What Canada needs to do most is make some choices. Given its limited resources, even with growth in CIDA, strategic choices make sense, as does CIDA's focus on concentration of effort. An example of the wisdom of strategic choices can be seen in the case of Norway. According to Dr Malone, the Norwegian government has been successful in peacemaking, and the reasons seem to be that it has lots of money, but also has made very strategic choices: it chose three projects on which to focus in the long-term (Middle East, Sri Lanka, Haiti). Canada has to focus on some things and say 'no' to others. NGOs and politicians are not good at this, but the approach needs to be taken seriously. Individuals can learn by participation, and one way to do this is to keep the early years of careers in NGOs focused on issues, not policy or structure.

Panel 4: Canadian Public Opinion and Foreign Policy

Chair – Jean-Sébastien Rioux (Canada Research Chair in International Security, Université Laval)

- Greg Lyle (Innovative Research Group Inc.)
- Rudyard Griffiths (Executive Director of the Dominion Institute)
- Chris Waddell (Associate Professor School of Journalism, Carleton University)
- Michael Pearson (Coordinator International Policy Review, Office of the Minister of Foreign Affairs)

A public opinion survey (Visions of Canadian Foreign Policy) was conducted especially for the conference using a random sample of 500 Canadians from across the country. The results are accurate $\pm 4.38\%$, 19 times out of 20, and form the backdrop for the panel discussions on the issue of public opinion. Generally speaking, it seems that Canadians agree that Canada should have an active role in the international arena, but they differ greatly on what that role should be, where Canada should act, and what Canada's priorities might be. (The full report can be obtained on the internet at: http://www.cdfai.org/PDF/DCI_CDFAI_report_formatted_V5.pdf)

Greg Lyle, one of the survey's authors, drew attention to the key findings from the survey. Firstly, the level of public engagement in Canada appears high, but the level of knowledge or understanding of foreign issues is another matter. In fact, the opinions of those who are well informed on foreign issues differ greatly from those who know very little. Secondly, Mr Lyle found that Canadians seem evenly split over the issue of 'soft' versus 'hard' power approaches in foreign affairs. The level of support for sending Canadian troops overseas was unusually high, including in cases where they might be at risk.

The survey, according to Rudyard Griffiths, is full of 'good news' for those interested in foreign affairs: Canadians' level of interest in foreign affairs (which has always been the 'poor cousin' in terms of public policy) is at an unprecedented level. Events like 9/11, the Iraq War, and the disaster involving the HMCS Chicoutimi have helped to bring this about. Furthermore, Canadians appear to be saying that foreign policy is about more than just Canada/United States relations. Mr Griffiths believes that there is a public expectation that Canadian foreign policy should have multiple priorities.

However, Mr Griffiths cautions, one must be careful not to become too carried away. The results of this poll are not going to lead to a groundswell change in government priorities. Indeed, there is much in this survey that is alarming:

- 25% of Canadians are isolationists
- 25% of Canadians believe that what goes on in the world has no impact on their lives
- 44% of Canadians are comfortable with the status quo
- 81% of Canadians are unwilling to sacrifice what the country has at home in order to rebuild Canada's reputation abroad.

Consequently, there is a "philosophical discomfort" between home and abroad. Canadians desire things like universal healthcare at home but are not willing to help others outside their borders.

Mr Griffiths concluded with four observations about the survey's results. The Canadian public believes that foreign policy is too complicated to be handled by the public and would rather hand over responsibility for its formulation to the politicians and bureaucrats. In Canada, foreign policy is articulated by one person: the Prime Minister,

which is unlike other sectors of public policy. Canada lacks the civil society capacity, like that which exists in the United States or the United Kingdom (i.e. think-tanks). NGOs tend to be 'single issue shops' which do not consider foreign policy 'in the round.'

Chris Waddell shared the findings of some research that looked at that the way in which issues of national security are dealt with by political parties in Canada and by the Canadian media. While national security dominated the American presidential election, this was certainly not the case in Canada. Dr Waddell looked at the platforms of the Canadian political parties and analyzed the amount of national security related material within them. In a 53 page document by the Liberal Party, there was only one paragraph on national security. The Conservative Party's 44 page document had 4.5 paragraphs while the NDP's 66 page document had two pages.

In a similar fashion, Dr Waddell looked at newspaper coverage during the election and found that of 1334 articles within the *National Post*, *Globe and Mail*, and the *Toronto Star* (combined, during the election campaign), very few dealt with national security matters: national security garnered zero articles; there were four articles on defence, three on Canada and Iraq, and thirteen on foreign policy issues. Columnists and op-ed writers, too, avoided the issue, with only two columns appearing on foreign policy (none on national security) and one op-ed piece on national security (none on foreign policy). In sum, then, Canadians' lack of understanding of foreign issues is hardly unexpected when the major political parties do not address the issues intelligibly and when the media does not bring it up in a meaningful way.

Michael Pearson claimed that from his perspective "no one seems to care what the public thinks." Public opinion itself is problematic and divided; the media is interested only in sound-bites, and he feels that the pundits who do address the issue are not objective. While public opinion may not be important, according to Pearson, "perceptions of public attitude or mood are important." The issue of Canadian policy towards involvement in the Iraq War, for instance, is not so much one of what was decided, but the process of what was reached and communicated. On some issues there appears to be a convergence of views: the world is a rougher place, and Canada needs to spend more.

Mr Pearson pointed out three on which Canadians should focus. Firstly, Canada currently spends only 3% of the world's total Official Development Assistance (ODA) but spreads it across 155 countries. The country needs to concentrate its efforts to be more effective. Secondly, Canada is not a miser in terms of global defence spending. While the nation spends only 1-1.1% of GDP on defence, Canada is the 20th largest spender in the world (in absolute terms) and 6th largest in NATO. The real question is not whether Canada should spend more on defence, but how Canada can spend it more effectively. Thirdly. Within the G-8, Canada has the lowest number of diplomats. In order to be effective abroad, the country needs more "suits on the ground."

According to Mr Pearson, Canada needs to undertake four initiatives in order to maximise its foreign policy impact:

1. Spend smarter: concentrate, rather than penny-pocket, resources. This will entail making choices about the range of roles played and where they are played;
2. Play to the nation's strengths: one such area might be in the area of 'good governance';
3. Question the utility of an integrated approach (3D + T): is such a plan possible?

4. Create a real partnership with Canadians: not more consultation, but more engagement.

In conclusion, Mr Pearson indicated that Canada needs to adopt five key roles abroad. Canada needs to be a catalyst (like the way the country helped the African Union build capacity for Darfur). The nation also needs to be a key player (for example, Canada is the biggest donor to some World Health Organization programs). Canada should be an agent of change (like in advocating The Responsibility to Protect, United Nations Reform, and L20). Canada can be a valued partner (the 'smart borders' approach with the United States is such an example), and this country could aim to be someone who takes care of business (sample business needing attention – improving trade policy).

Concurrent Syndicate 1: The Fundamentals

Chair – David Bercuson (Director CDFAI)

Having identified Canada's fundamental relationship to be with the United States, the syndicate considered what the aim of diplomacy with the US should be, whether bilateral or international. Primary concerns were that Canada maintain secure borders and ensure continuous traffic for trade. It was argued that a broader view of fundamental Canadian interests was necessary and that a longer term view, and consideration of the impact that the world has on Canada over long term, was the best approach. The topic of the United States was central to the debate, and there was some disagreement over the placement of the United States in the consideration of national interest. The syndicate members considered that it is important, to any extent possible, to ensure the health and vitality of the economy, and to ensure access to energy and information, as they are both critical and since information drives the economy. The group pondered whether the United States would be a fundamental interest if Canada did not share a border and have it as its largest trading partner. As important as the United States is to Canada, it was important to the syndicate members that the United States not be its *only* focus. There is the rest of the world to consider, and Canada has interests other than its southern neighbour.

Consideration of what exactly Canadians want to preserve and promote was central to the syndicate's debate. Canadians want to preserve good governance, which comprises human rights and freedom of movement, goods, people and ideas into and out of Canada. Ultimately the most fundamental concern is here at home - how to sustain the system and quality of life. There should be some importance placed on knowing more about other peoples, societies, and cultures. The most important factor, however, is preserving one's own government's way of doing things. It is a fundamental interest to have diversity and a pluralistic society, and this is one of the fundamentals that foreign policy should serve. Canada has been nurtured by a system in development since the Second World War, and this same system has been nurtured by its Allies – the central idea was that the world would fix itself through creation of international organizations, and that this liberal internationalism would bring about a new global regime. Sustaining this system is a Canadian interest, as it maintains systems that allow global trade.

The syndicate members spent a great deal of time attempting to agree on a master list of 'fundamentals,' but they had difficulty defining what exactly qualifies as a 'fundamental.' Proposed inclusions for this list were 'prosperity' and 'security', but debate ensued over how to achieve these objectives. This raised the questions of what qualifies as a fundamental interest and whether the group is discussing 'what' or 'how.' A particularly thorny issue was that of national interest, as it was given a place of priority in the list of 'fundamentals' by some, and seen as a sub-topic that fell under a fundamental like 'good governance' by others. The role of national unity brought up the issue of the ability of a country to act as a unitary body, both internally and on the international stage. It was finally agreed that the first fundamental, before Canada's role in world, is the situation at home, and this leads to an examination of core values.

It was agreed that, in foreign policy, Canada needs to operate through bilateral and multilateral forums, but the difficulty was in determining what Canada wanted heard in these arenas. Is it more important that Canada proclaims that it has a Charter of

Rights, or is it more important to create a country that is strong in human rights and trade? How does one get the world to play ball so that Canada can strengthen what it has? Canadians do not understand the link between standards of living and international trade, and this link needs to be clarified.

It was argued that Canadians need to articulate objectives. Is it a fundamental principle of Canadian foreign policy that defending human rights abroad serves Canadian interests? Something can be a value and an interest (philanthropy + 5%). The syndicate agreed that it is okay if one serves national interests by doing good since a society that is open will be open to trade with Canada. A rules-based system grounded in liberal democracy, with universal human rights, is a fundamental; it is “good” *and* in the country’s interests. It is necessary to defend national sovereignty and Canada’s borders, and also to promote arms control and create a safer world. It is in Canada’s interest to promote respect for international law in general. In Canadian foreign policy, is there room for helping others for its own sake, or only when it serves Canada’s foreign policy interests? There is danger in altruism, in that donors can fall into the trap of it not mattering what is done or how money is spent, as long as it does “good.” Self-interest creates attention and careful devotion of resources.

The maintenance of traditional alliances has been sustained (i.e. Canada’s North Atlantic orientation) but has fallen down in last few years. With a lack of alliances, Canada is adrift. Alliances are seen as a tactic to achieve interests, rather than fundamentals in and of themselves. Traditional alliances are interest and value-based and form a consensus-building system. For example, NATO is an instrument of foreign policy, but also an alliance of like-minded nations that are in fundamental agreement on human rights. For a small country like Canada, security is found in multi-lateralism, and achieved through necessary alliances. Canada should have ‘power multiplier’ alliances, with nations that have shared democratic, capitalistic ideals. There are one of two ways to maintain global stability: balance of power or hegemony. Today, the world faces hegemony and a Europe on the rise that is attempting to create a balance of power. In this context, where do Canadian interests lie? The syndicate believes that a country should put itself in alliances that will serve its largest needs, such as defending national sovereignty, rule of law, and trade. Multi-lateralism is a tactic that serves a rules-based international system by consensus, which contains enough flexibility to deal with rule breakers.

In the end, the original fundamental, “preserving and advancing the United States” was displaced by “preserving and advancing the society that Canada has” as the overarching objective. This includes a high standard of living, rule of law, etc., and is essentially what Canada is and who Canadians are. What policies do Canadians want their government to pursue to achieve this aim? These policies should embrace liberal internationalism, free access to goods and services, and address the three pillars of Canadian foreign policy: Security, Prosperity, and Canadian Values.

The overarching task that the syndicate set for itself was an attempt to identify fundamentals, and at the end of debate they developed a “matrix” of fundamentals. There was significant debate over what was a fundamental and what should be listed under each fundamental, but in the end Security, Prosperity, International Governance, and Good Domestic Governance made the list; Trade, National Unity, Human Rights were taken

off this list. The tactics and instruments listed under each fundamental overlap. The matrix developed by the syndicate is below.

Fundamentals

▪*Security*: protect borders → political and economic; alliances/multilateral organizations; liberal democracy; liberal internationalized trade systems; energy; defence of national sovereignty; environmental protection;

▪Instruments: security/armed forces with expeditionary capabilities within alliances, and capability to lead international forces, multi-tasking/purpose capability; intelligence; foreign service; resources; stabilization;

▪*Prosperity*: alliances/multilateral organizations; liberal democracy; environmental protection

▪Instruments: United States/open borders; promote WTO, NAFTA; competitive foreign investment climate; aid and trade promotion capabilities;

▪*Good International Governance*: alliances/multilateral organizations; liberal democracy

▪Instruments: foreign service; United Nations reform; North-South dialogue; conflict prevention; non-proliferation

▪*Good Domestic Governance*: liberal democracy promotion; national unity/diversity; broader and longer-term view regarding foreign policy

▪Instruments: more parliamentary oversight/control; accountability; more resources.

Concurrent Syndicate 2: Economic National Interests

Chair – Kim Nossal (Political Studies, Queen's University)

Participants in the syndicate discussion aimed to identify some of the economic national interests that Canada's foreign policy should pursue and promote. The dialogue focused on four main themes: trade relations with the United States, expansion into international markets, encouragement needed for business expansion, and the need of a strategic plan within the government.

Statistics show that the United States is clearly Canada's most important trading partner: 38% of Canada's GDP is generated by American trade; 88% of this country's exports go to its southern neighbour. For these reasons, some syndicate members argued that the Canadian government needs to try to better influence the American administration. Some felt that trade relations with the United States should be the country's first priority.

In discussing Canadian-American trade relations, the syndicate raised the issue of the impact of specific trade disputes (such as BSE and softwood lumber) on trade relations as a whole. There was a strong consensus that the entire relationship should not be defined by the problems within a handful of industries. It was argued that excessive energy should not be spent on one small issue: disagreement over a \$10 billion-a-year industry is clearly not worth threatening \$1 billion of trade that crosses the border daily. Syndicate members felt it might be wiser for the Canadian government to claim defeat in the dispute and compensate a specific industry as a strategic decision to protect the Canadian-American trade relationship as a whole.

Because of the large volume of trade between the two continental neighbours, the syndicate discussed the need to protect the economy against unforeseen events. If a terrorist attack on Canada occurred, flow across the border would undoubtedly be affected by American security measures. This pitfall can clearly be foreseen: the Canadian government needs to devise ways to prevent this potential cessation of flow of trade and traffic across the border in the case of an emergency. If an attack ever did occur and no safeguards were in place, the future political climate between Canada and the United States would be predictably problematic.

While some syndicate members believed that trade made Canadian-American relations of utmost important to foreign policy, other members wondered if perhaps too much concentration was being placed on one partner. They questioned the meaning and consequences of deepening the relationship with the southern neighbour. Are Canadians prepared to consider tax harmonization, a customs union, shared drug certification, or even a common market? How close do Canadians really want to get with the United States? Perhaps this exclusively regional focus should consider the true effects of globalization on Canada's economy. China and India, for instance, are large regions and large markets badly in need of resources. Some syndicate members argued that it is in Canada's national interest to develop a capacity to react and respond to these markets.

The public opinion poll conducted for the conference showed that twenty-five percent of Canadians see globalization as a threat. The syndicate felt that the government needs to consider an appropriate response to this finding. The government has been echoing and perpetuating this fear instead of articulating a sound, fact-based doctrine that

defends globalization, shows the ethics of it, and convinces skeptical Canadians of the economic benefits of this phenomenon.

The calls for Canada to increase its international trade and focus on more regions than just North America raised the issue as to why businesses and industries were reluctant to expand their trade relations. It was pointed out to the syndicate that the risk-reward ratio for businesses in Canada is such that companies are not encouraged to pursue international trade values. Because businesses are not put on a competitive footing, they concentrate on home or American markets; the high risks prevent engaging other countries. Canadian businesses are not in a position to compete internationally if other countries will subsidize materials to lower bid estimates while Canada does not. The Canadian tax structure also hurts businesses' competitive edge. Foreign companies have an advantage inside and outside Canada. Until the government levels the playing field, Canadian industries are at a disadvantage both here and abroad.

Because Canada's definition of research and development is so narrow, Canadian firms are not competitive in this area either. Canada's \$18 billion annual expenditures on research and development are no match for the \$500 billion spent each year in the United States. Government rules stop research and development in this country, and businesses would like for Canadians to be put on equal footing in this area. Little research is conducted in Canada because it is not economical to do it; if the situation were improved, firms in Canada would take on more research and development.

Syndicate members also discussed how the government needs to be more of a facilitator. The government has not worked close enough with businesses to develop trade and policy strategies. Instead of helping companies, the government has been making decisions without knowing the basic facts. Hence, the syndicate called for a more effective relationship between government and business, where the government and its policy decisions could benefit from businesses' expertise. It was also recommended that the government pursue and encourage relationships other than just between Ottawa and Washington. Relationships between Canadian and American provinces and states, and business associations, should be cultivated as well.

The syndicate agreed that it was clearly in Canada's national interest for the government to have a strategic foreign policy. Unfortunately, this strategy is non-existent. Whereas other countries devote a great deal of energy on lobbying, the efforts of Canada's Foreign Affairs department and the country's presence in other state capitals pales in comparison. Syndicate members advised that the Canadian government needs to improve its lobbying techniques in the United States since trade across the 49th parallel is so important to the Canadian economy.

The syndicate also discussed the role of government in negotiating trade agreements. Unfortunately, Canada seems unable to close deals and bring them to fruition. The problem is that the Canadian government wants a perfect and long-term agreement on the table before it is willing to sign. Syndicate members stressed that there will never be the perfect agreement; the government must accept this and be willing to compromise. The government must also come to realize that a signed contract is a license to negotiation revisions.

The syndicate wanted to see more energy and resources put into developing and carrying out a trade policy strategy. They wanted to see short-term reactionary solutions replaced with prime-ministerial attention and inter-departmental coordination and

cooperation. Foreign policy and international trade relations should not be conducted in stealth, but rather with clear doctrine, strategic goals, expert advice, and transparency. Unfortunately, some recent re-organizations by the government will further hamper all of these needs. The December 2003 decision to split International Trade and Foreign Affairs into two separate departments, and moving Canadian-American relations into the Privy Council Office, threatens coordination. Instead, the opposite move – integration for the sake of efficiency and clear strategies – is in Canada's national interest. To where Canada needs to move is easily defined; the government now needs to find the will power and leadership to move in that direction.

Concurrent Syndicate 3: Role of Civil Society

Chair – David Carment (CSDS, Carleton University)

The meeting on the Role of Civil Society was attended by representatives from different NGOs, governmental organisations and Centers of studies; among these, CUSO, CCIC, CSDS and CPCC attended.

The first debate encompassed defining the main differences between the notion of values and interests based decisions. Some representatives did not deem there to be a clear separation between the two concepts, while most could agreed on the necessity of developing a strategic vision that permits the enhancement of values and interests based on common objectives. Moreover, the notion of poverty reduction as a key concept for the allocation of Canadian international aid was in opposition to the notion of strategic interests. After a heated debate, a consensus was finally reach on the fact that alleviation of poverty by Canadian organizations abroad is fundamental in obtaining Canada's long term strategic interests.

The question of policy coherence was also stated as a prime area of concern. Clearly, everyone agreed on the inevitability of developing a cohesive approach in which different departments work together instead of fuelling a competitive approach. Representatives promoted the idea of social responsibility in the framing of policy, and everyone was pleased by the 3D approach.

Concerning Canada's interest viewed from the civil society point of view, representatives discussed the role of changing demographics and how this affects the Canadian perception of foreign policy. Prior to these changes, the general attitude toward foreign policy was centred around the English-French dichotomy. Nowadays, the current situation of growing immigration has resulted in the shifting of this dichotomy toward redefining Canada's foreign policy, in order to become more responsive to the desire of these growing communities. The syndicate also looked at how Canada can best use the strength of these communities to attain its development goals abroad. In many cases, these diasporas can be better suited to providing aid approaches and implementation in their country of origin than programs set up by Canadian government agencies.

Finally, everyone agreed on the need to establish aid priorities based on sectors of expertise and areas of interest. Furthermore, participants came to a consensus concerning the fact that Canadian interests abroad were scattered and that Canada should focus on the aid initiatives that it does best in specifically targeted countries.

Concurrent Syndicate 4: Public Opinion and Foreign Policy

Chair – Jean-Sébastien Rioux (Université Laval)

One discussant stated that in terms of foreign policy there is a need to communicate complicated policies in straightforward, simple ways to the public. However, according to the discussant, this task is made difficult owing to a national mythology (e.g./ an attachment to peacekeeping, an overly optimistic vision of Canada's impact on the world stage, etc.) that exists.

This led another participant to argue that there are competing visions for Canada in the world, and since foreign policy is laden with 'meaning', it is difficult to analyse objectively. Essentially, the debate revolves around 'values' rather than 'interests,' and since Canada does not have a coherent national identity or image, it is difficult to project one internationally.

Attention then focused on the poll itself which provided the answers to questions such as "how much does 'conventional wisdom' shape responses to polls?" and "are we seeing authentic value change in Canadians or media agenda setting? Knowledge of the issues is the biggest differentiator in terms of responses to the poll. Essentially, the people who know about foreign affairs 'are different' from the rest of Canadians. There is a difference between Quebec and the rest of Canada (but the starkest difference is between Alberta and the rest of Canada!). Age, too, makes a significant difference: older Canadians tend to echo American attitudes more. Those under age 55 are more concerned with global warming. Those under 35 are far more anti-American than those over 35. Those aged 35-55 tend to be more conservative. Responses tend to be more 'feelings/values' based because people are able to articulate those, while 'interests' tend to be more fact based, and people feel they are unequipped to deal with them.

Some discussants raised the point that the idea of 'public opinion' is misleading since there are so many different aspects of it: mass opinion, elite opinion, that of those interested or informed, etc. Student participants in the session stated that they understand where the 'anti' sentiment comes from in their generation: throughout high school and university they are asked 'what are you against' in the pursuit of thinking critically. They are not often presented with positive images or asked 'what are you for'.

The syndicate then tackled the question 'what can be done?' The first subsequent question was to ask how relevant public opinion/polling is to political decision-making. A former political aide stated that foreign policy is not 'on the radar' for most MPs, unless there is an ethnic or interest group connection. This is partly because MPs themselves have little to do with foreign policy. It is centrally decided and executively driven. The political machine hates foreign policy because it is too complicated and 'too hot'. For this reason, the survey was regarded by some in the group as very important: it will confirm the political beliefs that people feel foreign policy is complex and that there are 'no votes' in foreign policy. Hence, unless there is a spectacularly embarrassing event, foreign policy is still a dead issue politically.

Final Plenary Session

- David Bercuson (Director CDFAI)
- Kim Nossal (Political Studies, Queen's University)
- David Carment (CSDS, Carleton University)
- Jean-Sébastien Rioux (Université Laval)

In the final session, the syndicate moderators each presented a brief synopsis of the concurrent breakaway groups' discussions, conclusions, and recommendations.

The group that focused on the fundamentals of Canadian foreign policy considered the question "what is the most important thing Canadians ought to care about, and how do Canadians achieve this objective?" The syndicate came to the consensus that any policy should both aim to preserve and advance Canada, both now and in the future. Prosperity and an environment for international trade were of great importance to this group. Promoting prosperity for the nation meant being part of international alliances, maintaining open borders with the United States, being a member of the World Trade Organization, and articulating an aid policy that was both philanthropic and that also promoted the country's self interests.

Supporting the spread of liberal democracies was also seen by the group as a means of achieving Canadian prosperity. Additionally, such democracies would be created through trade, not by use of guns. Other necessary measures for the prosperity of Canada included trade liberalization, protection of the environment, and a balanced flow of energy. Another important concern for Canadian foreign policy was security. The syndicate felt that the borders must be protected from those with ill intent. Any security alliances formed would have to be conducive to Canadian interests. The creation of more liberal democracies would also help the security environment because there would be more countries interested in making the world free and secure.

International governance was another interest identified by the syndicate. It was recommended that Canada join alliances, promote the non-proliferation of weapons, create a more effective foreign service, and pursue reforms to the United Nations' General Assembly and Security Council. At the home-front, the syndicate felt that national sovereignty needed to be a priority. In connection with this, Canada should expand its foreign service, have an expeditionary capability, and aim for leadership roles in coalition operations.

Concerning domestic governance, national unity is clearly a concern for any government. The syndicate also recommended that the government articulate a long-term view of the country's place in the world instead of merely reacting to the latest crisis. The syndicate members wanted to see more parliamentary oversight and greater accountability. These were the fundamentals of a foreign policy in Canada's national interest.

The second syndicate discussed the economic national interests of Canada. The group members considered these to be good relations with the United States and access to American markets and decision makers. A number of challenges are appearing on the horizon: exchange rates, foreign ownership, foreign investments, new economic actors and powers, sovereignty concerns, and economic sovereignty.

Syndicate members felt that the Canadian government needs to show clear leadership and move forward in a strategic fashion. The prime minister's action and

energy are needed on such issues as economic integration with the United States. The government also needs to foresee the long-term consequences of not making long-term decisions. It is important to defend the liberalization of the global economy, but the government has failed to articulate this defence to Canadians. Syndicate members agreed that Canadian firms need to be put on a level playing field both inside and outside Canada. Tax incentives would be one way of improving Canadian business' competitiveness; harmonization with certain American economic policies would also have its benefits.

The syndicate also considered the problematic mechanisms in place to address the economic interests of Canada. On 12 December 2003, Foreign Affairs and International Trade were separated into two departments. Consequently, the capacity to engage in strategic decision-making has been highly fragmented. Although it cannot be denied that Canada's economic health and performance over the past decade has been fairly good, the country needs to be prepared for unforeseen crises, needs to define its national economic interests clearly, and needs to proceed in a strategic fashion toward achieving these objectives.

The third syndicate discussed the role of civil society in the formation of foreign policy. The question 'should foreign policy be based on Canadian values or national interests' was raised with the response being that insisting on a dichotomy between values and interests is not fair. Must there be a choice between values and security and trade? Indeed, eighty percent of Canada's interests with the United States are defined in terms of trade and security; nonetheless, twenty percent is free to articulate values.

The choices Canadians do have to make will be on deciding which countries and regions matter most to Canada and why. Sub-Saharan Africa is of concern, but it has no bearing on the security of Canada. This region matters to Canada for reasons that appeal to values. Increasingly harder choices face policy makers in the 21st century. If two countries are failing, and Canada only has the resources to help one state, which will it choose and why – the small, harmless democracy or the large, security threat?

The syndicate noted that popular influence in Canada's foreign policy is increasing, but the group members also questioned the wisdom of this new trend. Certain demographic sectors unfairly have more influence over foreign policy than other groups of society. Certainly, the government should strive to find a common set of values across all groups. The fact that finding the perfect compromise may not be possible should not mean that an attempt is not even made.

The syndicate advised that a new era of cooperation is upon the nation; both government and non-governmental organizations need to be willing to work together to further their objectives. Non-governmental organizations, typically focused on humanitarian programs, are realizing that they need greater security; hence, they clearly have an interest in foreign policy and the security that Canada's armed forces can provide. Helping these organizations means that the government has been able to have a hand in humanitarian efforts simply by striking a partnership with those already on the ground. This kind of a policy is clearly beneficial to all parties, but it needs to be clearly thought out. Unfortunately, the syndicate members were not optimistic of the likelihood that Canada will develop a more coherent and strategic policy. They would like to be proven wrong.

The final syndicate focused on the role public opinion might have in the formation of foreign policy. One question the group pondered was how does a government divine foreign policy and national interests from a public opinion poll reflecting the views of Canadians over a one-week period? Although this question may be difficult to answer, the syndicate was able to discern many characteristics about the Canadian voter from the survey.

The poll did show that the level of a person's knowledge determines the consistency with which a person holds an opinion and views foreign policy and society. Age, education, and region of residence effected differences in public opinion. The poll also showed that Canadians discuss foreign policy in a values-based language. Consequently, the syndicate members drew the conclusion that policy makers need to move beyond the idea that foreign policy is too complex for the average Canadian to comprehend. Instead, leaders need to improve their leadership, adjust their message, and draw Canadians into the policy-making process. The challenge is how to link public opinion and the foreign policy machinery.

The syndicate drew three other conclusions from their discussion of the survey's findings. Firstly, Canada's foreign policy has been too abstract and lacking in concrete doctrine and direction. It is a reactive policy, only being clearly formed when an immediate threat forces the hand of the government. Syndicate members believe that foreign policy needs to be treated as a long-term investment. Focus on foreign policy should not happen only when there is a threat.

Secondly, the syndicate called for leadership. The government must be able to define its role and link foreign policy with people's values. Abstract diplomacy needs to be made relevant to the voters' real, daily lives. The interests of the public need to be integrated into policy making.

Thirdly, syndicate members called for policy makers to look past the youth dichotomy. Polls may show a difference of opinion between Canadian youths and other age sectors. Nonetheless, the youth of today will become the next generation of policy makers. Hence, these people need to be engaged in policy making; they too have a vested interest in shaping the country in which they live.

Part D

About the Centre for Security and Defence Studies (CSDS)

The CSDS at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA), Carleton University, is internationally recognized for its advanced research; conference, workshop, and guest lecture programs; graduate and undergraduate education; and public outreach programs on security and defence issues in the Ottawa community and across Canada. The CSDS has three principal and inter-related missions:

- to enhance interdisciplinary graduate and undergraduate teaching at Carleton University in the fields of international conflict analysis and defence and security studies;
- to promote research and publications by faculty, graduate students, and outside specialists in these fields, with emphasis on policy and security issues for Canada; and
- to support outreach activities with the Parliament of Canada, government departments and agencies, school boards, the media, NGOs, and international organizations through training programmes, professional conferences, and public discourse on international security and defence issues.

CSDS programs and activities embrace faculty from several disciplinary and interdisciplinary departments and schools at Carleton University, most notably NPSIA, the Department of Political Science, and the Department of History.

The work of the CSDS is structured around four distinct interdisciplinary modules: Force and Statecraft; Partnering, Peacekeeping, and Peacebuilding; Military and Society; and Intelligence and Policy. These modules serve to integrate research, teaching, and outreach activities around particular security and defence-related themes.

The CSDS at NPSIA is a member of the Security and Defence Forum (SDF) programme of the Department of National Defence. The SDF programme is designed to assist and support teaching and research in the fields of international security, conflict, and defence at selected Canadian universities.

About the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI)

The CDFAI is a non-profit, independent, non-partisan, research institute with an emphasis on Canadian Foreign Policy, Defence Policy, and National Security. The CDFAI's mission is dedicated to enhancing Canada's role in the world by helping to stimulate awareness and debate amongst Canadians about the nation's defence and foreign policies and the instruments that serve them.

The Institute provides Canadians with factual and comprehensive policy analysis to promote their understanding of Canada's foreign policy and the state of Canada's military preparedness and national security by developing and sponsoring authoritative research and education programs. The Institute studies these areas through a full range of national and international applications with an emphasis on their economic, political, and social impact on individual Canadians

The CDFAI will fulfill its mission by

- contributing, as permitted, to the public discussion of government policy in the areas of foreign affairs and national security as well as institutional preparedness to support current policies;
- supporting the development of Canadian expertise by funding research as well as professional and student conferences in relevant areas;
- establishing linkages with international organizations, government, and the private sector; and
- providing opportunities for the exchange of national and international study.

The CDFAI is a federally registered non-profit organization with charitable status. It is funded by public donations and the private sector. As well, CDFAI seeks support on a project basis from the appropriate government departments.

Primary funding sources are Canadian corporations and the private citizens with an interest in the CDFAI's research areas. These sources share the belief that an informed electorate will in turn produce an informed polity. Dissemination of information will lead to the drafting, implementation, and support of innovative and comprehensive Canadian policy in the areas of foreign affairs, defence, and security.

About Queen's Centre for International Relations (QCIR)

The QCIR was established in 1975 as an interdisciplinary research institution at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, with a mandate to conduct research and writing in strategic studies and other aspects of international relations. It draws on the expertise and energies of Queen's faculty members, most notably from the Department of Political Studies and the School of Policy Studies. As well, it has well-established links with the Royal Military College, also in Kingston.

The QCIR has been engaged in recent years in research on Canadian and international security policy (including foreign and defence policy), European security and transatlantic relations, hemispheric security, and post-Soviet foreign and defence policies. Publications from the Centre continue to reflect these research areas.

About L'Institut québécois des hautes études internationales (IQHEI)

L'IQHEI fut créé en juin 1994. Son champ d'action est organisé autour trois axes: les relations internationales, le développement international et les affaires internationales. Avec la création de l'Institut, l'Université Laval innovait en dotant le Québec du premier institut francophone d'études supérieures et de recherche en relations internationales en Amérique du Nord. L'Institut exerce aussi ses activités en publication et en animation. L'Institut offre un programme d'études de deuxième cycle en relations internationales (MA) et des programmes d'études associés en gestion de la défense, gestion internationale, en journalisme international et en droit international et transnational.

About the Canada Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

The Canada Institute proudly marked its second anniversary in the fall of 2003. The Canada Institute was founded to explore current and emerging US-Canada issues, to highlight the importance of the US-Canada relationship – especially in Washington, and to increase knowledge about Canada among US policymakers.

Canada's profile among Americans remains much smaller than it should be in spite of the enormous trading relationship between the two countries. The Canada Institute – in the Wilson Center's tradition of providing a nonpartisan forum to encourage dialogue on the issues of the day – attempts to raise that profile by presenting an array of programs and publications to look at Canadian foreign policy and bilateral Canada-US relations, trade policy, and contentious trade issues, Canadian values and identity, and regional issues. The Canada Institute does not have a policy or research agenda and, as part of the Wilson Center, aims to provide a link between the world of ideas and the world of policy, with positive as well as critical views of issues.

About the Dominion Institute

The Dominion Institute was established in 1997 by a group of young people concerned about the erosion of a common memory in Canada. In the space of seven short years, the Dominion Institute has had a far-reaching impact on Canadians' perceptions of their history and shared citizenship, through groundbreaking public opinion research, high-profile internet, education and television programming, book publications, and meaningful curriculum reform.

Part E

Panelist Biographies

Louis Bélanger, Ph.D.

Louis Bélanger est directeur de l'Institut québécois des hautes études internationales (HEI) de l'Université Laval et Professeur agrégé au Département de science politique de la même université. Ses recherches courantes portent sur les négociations et le design institutionnel des accords internationaux, principalement dans le domaine commercial (ALÉNA et ZLÉA), mais aussi dans ceux de la culture et de la sécurité. Sa plus récente publication est «Vers une communauté nord-américaine ? Asymétrie et institutions communes au sein de l'ALÉNA » (dans M. Azuelos, M. E. Cosio-Zavala et J.-M. Lacroix (dir.), *Intégration dans les Amériques : Dix ans d'ALENA*, Paris, Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2004). Il a publié en 1999, avec Gordon Mace, *The Americas in Transition: The Contours of Regionalism* et on retrouve ses articles dans plusieurs revues, dont la *Revue canadienne de science politique*, le *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, *Études internationales*, la *American Review of Canadian Studies*, *Political Psychology*, le *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, et la *Revue internationale d'études canadiennes*. Louis Bélanger a été Président fondateur de la section canadienne de l' International Studies Association (ISA).

David Bercuson, Ph.D

Since January 1997, David Bercuson has been the Director of the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies at the University of Calgary and is also the Vice President of the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute. He has published in academic and popular publications on a wide range of topics specializing in modern Canadian politics, Canadian defence and foreign policy, and Canadian military history. He has written, coauthored, or edited over 30 popular and academic books and does regular commentary for television and radio. He has written for the *Globe and Mail*, the *Toronto Star*, the *Calgary Herald*, the *National Post* and other newspapers. In 1988, Bercuson was elected to the Royal Society of Canada and in May 1989, he was appointed Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies at The University of Calgary. In 1997 he was appointed Special Advisor to the Minister of National Defence on the Future of the Canadian Forces. He was and a member of the Minister of National Defence's Monitoring Committee from 1997 to 2003. His newest book, co-authored with Holger Herwig, *A Christmas in Washington: Churchill, Roosevelt and the making of the Grand Alliance* will be published in the fall of 2005.

David Biette

David Biette is the Director of the Canada Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington. Prior to joining the Woodrow Wilson Center he was the Executive Director of the Association for Canadian Studies in the United States (ACSUS) (1992-2001); Political/Economic Officer, Canadian Consulate General, New York City (1986-92); lecturer in French, Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies (1985-86); teacher, Blair Academy (New Jersey) and Université de Clermont-Ferrand (France). He holds an M.A. International Relations from John

Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies and a Certificate of Merit, International Council for Canadian Studies (2002).

David Carment, Ph.D.

David Carment is currently the Director of the Centre for Security and Defence at Carleton University. For 2000-2001 he was a Fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, JFK School of Government, Harvard and was affiliated with the WDF Program on Intrastate Conflict, Conflict Prevention, and Conflict Resolution. He is also an Associate Professor of International Affairs at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University, Ottawa. He teaches courses in bargaining and negotiation, conflict analysis, mediation, international organization, development theory, Canadian foreign policy, and international relations theory. His research interests fall into the categories of conflict prevention, conflict resolution, ethnic conflict, peacekeeping, internet technology, and Canadian foreign affairs.

Thomas d'Aquino, B.A., LL.B., LL.M., LL.D.

Thomas d'Aquino is President and Chief Executive of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives (CCCE), an organization composed of 150 chief executives of major enterprises in Canada. The Council is the senior voice of Canadian business on public policy issues in Canada, the United States and internationally. A non-partisan and not-for-profit organization, member companies administer more than \$2.3 trillion in assets and have annual revenues of close to \$600 billion. He has served as a Special Assistant to the Prime Minister of Canada and as the founder and chief executive of Intercounsel Limited, a firm specializing in the execution of domestic and international business transactions and in the mentoring of chief executives on public policy strategies.

Anne-Marie Gingras, Ph.D.

Anne-Marie Gingras est professeure titulaire au département de science politique de l'Université Laval et directrice de la revue *Politique et Sociétés*. Son champ d'intérêt principal est la communication politique (médias, opinion publique, régulation nationale et transnationale en communication, communication des personnages politiques, économie politique des communications, etc.). Elle a publié *Médias et démocratie. Le grand malentendu* (1999) et a dirigé *La communication politique: état des savoirs, enjeux et perspectives* (2003) et *Démocratie et réseaux de communication* (1999). Elle a publié dans *Hermès*, *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, *Politique et Sociétés*, *Canadian Journal of Communication* et *Communication* et a écrit plusieurs chapitres de livre sur les médias et le gouvernement électronique. Elle mène présentement des travaux sur le gouvernement et la démocratie électroniques et sur les représentations sociales de la démocratie lors des élections et des négociations commerciales sur la scène internationale; ce sont les représentations sociales dans les médias et celles des acteurs ayant accès à l'espace public qui sont étudiées.

Rudyard Griffiths

Rudyard Griffiths is the founder and the executive director of the Dominion Institute - a national charity dedicated to the promotion of history and citizenship. Under Rudyard's leadership, the Dominion Institute has grown into a national organization with a full-time staff of ten and 1,800 volunteers across Canada. The Dominion Institute's principal

activities are operating free educational programs for teachers and community groups, producing television documentaries, publishing books and organizing large-scale public dialogue campaigns on public policy issues. Rudyard is also an advisor to the Woodrow Wilson Center, assisting in the development of a new institute on Canada-US relations. He writes for the *Globe and Mail*, *CanWest* newspapers and *Maclean's* on Canadian history, Canada-US relations, public opinion polling and Canadian politics. He has edited two books on Canadian democracy and politics.

John Higginbotham

John Higginbotham is Vice-President, Research and University Relations, at the Canada School of Public Service (formerly the Canadian Centre for Management Development) the Government of Canada's management development, training and research centre. He recently served as Senior Visiting Fellow, International, at CCMD where he worked on the issue of Canada in the New North America. Prior to that he was Assistant Deputy Minister, Policy, Communications and Culture, in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, after six years as Minister (Political / Trans-boundary) at the Canadian Embassy in Washington. He also held a succession of posts in Beijing and Hong Kong including Commissioner for Canada in Hong Kong.

Norman Hillmer, Ph.D.

Norman Hillmer is currently a Professor of History at Carleton University. Prior to joining Carleton, he was a visiting professor of Modern Commonwealth History at Leeds University and also worked as a historian for the Department of National Defence. His current research includes *A History of Canadian Peacekeeping, 1949-1999*, *The Anglo-Canadian "Alliance," 1919-1939: Great Britain and the Birth of Canadian Foreign Policy*, *Canadian Military Policy in the Second World War*, *National Leadership, Elections and Political Style in Canada* and *The 1935 Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement*. He has written and edited numerous books and articles including *Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World to the 1990s*, *Prime Ministers: Rating Canada's Leaders* and *Canada Among Nations*.

David Lord

Since January 2002, David Lord has been the Coordinator of the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee, a network of civil society organizations and individuals engaged in peacebuilding activities. Immediately prior to joining the CPCC, he was the regional representative for the Carter Center in East Africa as part of the team supporting the implementation of the Nairobi agreement between the governments of Uganda and Sudan. From 1994-1999 he was co-director of UK-based Conciliation Resources which he co-founded and where he was responsible for the development of CR's community-based peacebuilding programs in Sierra Leone and Liberia, as well as the organization's Africa media and conflict programming. Previously, he was working as director of research at International Alert, in London, as advisor to the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans' Affairs in the Canadian House of Commons and as a print journalist in Ottawa and his native Montreal.

Mary Pat MacKinnon

Mary Pat MacKinnon assumed leadership of the Public Involvement Network in 2002, where she directs the Network's citizen engagement policy research projects, initiatives and activities including the long-term management of nuclear waste and the Ontario budget strategy. Mary Pat came to CPRN from the Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA) and the Credit Union Central of Canada (CUCC), where she was the Director of Government Affairs and Public Policy. Prior to her work with the co-operative sector she was a Social and Economic Policy Consultant with the Ottawa Social Planning Council, a Planner at the Department of Development, Nova Scotia Government, an Urban Analyst with the former Federal Ministry of State for Urban Affairs, and a Research Associate to the Pepin-Robarts Task Force on National Unity.

David Malone, Ph.D.

David Malone was appointed Assistant Deputy Minister (Africa and Middle East) in Canada's department of Foreign Affairs in September 2004. From 1998 to 2004, he was President of the International Peace Academy, an independent research and policy development institution in New York. A career Canadian Foreign Service officer and occasional scholar, he was successively, over the period 1994-98, Director General of the Policy, International Organizations and Global Issues Bureaus of the Canadian Foreign and Trade Ministry. During this period he also acquired a D.Phil. from Oxford University with a thesis on decision-making in the UN Security Council. From 1992 to 1994, he was Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations, where he chaired the negotiations of the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (the Committee of 34) and the UN General Assembly consultations on peacekeeping issues. From 1990 to 1992, he represented Canada on the UN's Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and related bodies.

The Honourable Barbara J. McDougall, P.C., O.C., C.F.A., L.L.D

Mrs. McDougall is an advisor at Aird & Berlis, counseling clients on matters of international business development, corporate governance and government relations. Barbara McDougall was a Member of Parliament for nine years and held several cabinet posts, including: Finance (Minister of State), Privatization, Employment and Immigration, and finally External Affairs. She is a graduate of the University of Toronto, a Chartered Financial Analyst and has an honorary doctorate from St. Lawrence University. She is now a Senior Resident at Massey College, University of Toronto. She recently completed a term as the Canadian representative on the International Advisory Board for the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. She is also a director of the Institute for Research on Public Policy in Montreal. Recently she completed a five-year term as President of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. Mrs. McDougall is an Officer of the Order of Canada.

Nelson Michaud, Ph.D.

Nelson Michaud est professeur agrégé de science politique et de relations internationales et directeur associé du Groupe d'études, de recherche et de formation internationales (GERFI) à l'École nationale d'administration publique. Il est également chercheur-membre de l'Institut québécois des Hautes études internationales, chercheur associé au Centre d'études inter-américaines et Research Fellow au Centre for foreign policy studies

(Dalhousie University). Il a enseigné aux Universités Laval et Dalhousie et comme professeur invité au Collège militaire royal du Canada. Au fil des années, il a été récipiendaire de bourses de recherche du Conseil de recherche en sciences humaines du Canada (CRSH), du Fonds pour la formation des chercheurs et l'aide à la recherche (FCAR), Fonds québécois de recherche sur la société et la culture (FQRSC). Il a reçu, en 2004 le *Prix d'excellence en recherche* de son institution et *Le Journal économique* l'a reconnu, en 2003, parmi les 100 chercheurs émérites dans les régions de Québec et Chaudière-Appalaches. Ses intérêts de recherche portent sur les processus de prise de décision particulièrement en matière de politique étrangère, la dynamique de politique bureaucratique, les relations internationales des entités fédérées, les médias et la politique étrangère et les institutions politico-administratives.

Kim Nossal, Ph.D.

Kim Nossal was appointed Professor and Head of the Department of Political Studies at Queen's University. Prior to joining Queen's, he was professor and chair of the Department of Political Science at McMaster University. His research interests include Canadian foreign and defence policy, Australian foreign policy, and the international relations of non-central governments. He also looks at the privatization of security, including prisons, in Australia and Canada. His recent work includes co-editing (with Nelson Michaud), *Diplomatic Departures: The Conservative Era in Canadian Foreign Policy, 1984-93* and *The Patterns of World Politics*.

Michael Pearson

Michael Pearson has been associated with international affairs, Canadian foreign policy and the federal Liberal Party for over 20 years. Since graduating with a master's degree in international affairs from the Norman Paterson School at Carleton University, he has worked as an advisor to four foreign ministers, supported Liberal parliamentarians in their roles as opposition critics for foreign, defence and aid policy and provided foreign policy advice to the Paul Martin leadership campaign. He has also taught international relations at the MA level, written articles on Canadian foreign policy and served as a board member of the North-South Institute, a development research NGO based in Ottawa. He has worked in the government relations profession and run his own policy consulting business, supporting private and government clients including industry associations and various federal departments.

Betty Plewes

Betty Plewes has worked most of her career in the voluntary sector. After working as a cooperant in several African countries, she worked in a variety of senior management positions for CUSO a Canadian international development organization which supports programs in Asia, Africa and Latin America. From 1992 -2000 she was President and CEO of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation a coalition of 100 Canadian organizations engaged in international cooperation. She was one of the founding members of the Voluntary Sector Roundtable, an unincorporated group of national organizations and coalitions that came together in 1995 to strengthen the voice of Canada's charitable, voluntary sector. Currently she works as a consultant with a variety of organizations in the voluntary sector on such issues as governance in the voluntary sector, capacity building, and voluntary sector management. She is currently working

with the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation helping them develop a program on the theme of *Canada and the World*.

Jean-Sébastien Rioux, Ph.D.

Jean-Sébastien Rioux est titulaire de la Chaire de recherche du Canada en sécurité internationale et professeur adjoint au Département de science politique de l'Université Laval depuis juin 2001, et *Fellow* de la *Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute* (CDFAI). Ses intérêts de recherche portent sur l'analyse des conflits armés; sur les interventions des tierces parties dans les conflits ainsi que sur l'analyse de la gestion des conflits et les politiques de maintien de la paix. Il a fait des études sur le terrain en Bosnie-Herzégovine et en Afghanistan, ainsi que dans plusieurs pays d'Afrique. Il participe depuis 2003 au Projet de développement des capacités en maintien de la paix et sécurité en Afrique (PDCMPS) du Centre Pearson pour le maintien de la paix en enseignant des cours à l'École de maintien de la paix à Koulikoro, au Mali. Les résultats de ses recherches ont été publiés dans plusieurs revues scientifiques telles que *International Politics*, *Political Research Quarterly*, la *Revue canadienne de science politique* et *Études Internationales*. Il est auteur et/ou éditeur de deux livres et de plusieurs chapitres d'ouvrages collectifs sur les questions de politique étrangère et de l'analyse des conflits.

Christopher Waddell, Ph.D.

Christopher Waddell is an associate professor and holds the Carty Chair in Business and Financial Journalism at Carleton University's School of Journalism and Communication. He joined the university faculty in July 2001 after spending 10 years at CBC Television News. He held a number of positions including Parliamentary Bureau Chief and Executive Producer News Specials for CBC News. Before joining the CBC, he spent 12 years working in the newspaper industry, writing for the *Financial Post* and the *Globe and Mail*, working his way up to National Editor responsible for domestic news coverage and The *Globe's* involvement in public opinion polling with CBC Television News. In his journalism career, programs for which he was responsible have won six Gemini Awards. He is also a two-time winner of the National Newspaper Award for business reporting.