



CANADIAN GLOBAL AFFAIRS INSTITUTE
INSTITUT CANADIEN DES AFFAIRES MONDIALES

What Role for Canada on the Global Stage?

by Lance Hadley, Queena Li & Kiernan McClelland

May 14, 2019

CONFERENCE REPORT

What Role for Canada on the Global Stage?

by

Lance Hadley, Queena Li & Kiernan McClelland
May 14, 2019



CANADIAN GLOBAL AFFAIRS INSTITUTE
INSTITUT CANADIEN DES AFFAIRES MONDIALES

Prepared for the Canadian Global Affairs Institute
1600, 530 – 8th Avenue S.W., Calgary, AB T2P 3S8
www.cgai.ca

©2017 Canadian Global Affairs Institute
ISBN: 978-1-927573-XX-X



Panel 1: The Plight of the Rohingya: Forgotten People?

Hon. Bob Rae (Advisory Council Member, CGAI) moderated by Sarah Goldfeder (Principal, Earnscliffe; Fellow, CGAI)

Where do things stand today?

- **Hon. Bob Rae:** Firstly, like all crises, the world is coming to the situation in Myanmar during the third act of the play. Myanmar has been in conflict since the 1930s and going back long before then. We need to understand that Myanmar was a theatre of enormous violence and deprivation during the Second World War. The presence and departure of the British left huge challenges, deep wounds, and longstanding traumas. The conflict between the government and the Rohingya is only one of many unresolved conflicts, which have been ongoing since independence. Even the slogan, ‘Burma for the Burmese,’ has a dual meaning. For the British, the phrase invokes national liberation, but for minority groups that make up 35 - 40% of population, it means ‘Burma for the majority.’
- Secondly, we need to understand the Rohingya refugee crisis in the context of a much larger global refugee crisis. Within these multitudes of crises, the Canadian government has a common fear that doing ‘too much’ for one situation will mean doing less for others. Communiques, press releases, and the passing of resolutions in international forums have not resolved the crisis. Displacement and creation of slums continue. The reality is very tough and responding will not be a ‘feel good’ discussion.
- A final factor is that we live in a world without adult supervision. The assumed agreement on how issues will be resolved, and which global leaders can be counted on to get us there, are gone.

There has been a global movement to push Myanmar towards democratization over the last 10 years, but the military still manage so many key Burmese institutions. The Myanmar government’s categorization of peoples has been unparalleled. The consequences have not been limited to the Myanmar-Bangladesh border, with Christian refugees have also fleeing to Thailand. How do these factors play into the discussion? Is there a way for middle power countries like Canada to help create inclusive societies where all peoples have formal status?

- **Hon. Bob Rae:** Firstly, the statement that Myanmar is a democracy in transition is a hope and wish. The reality is that it is unclear what Myanmar is transitioning into. Promoting democracy alone is unlikely to persuade Myanmar’s military to stop their actions. Canada has not had an embassy in Yangon since Myanmar’s independence. Canada is not a major trade or investment partner of Myanmar.
- It was announced this morning that Myanmar will be buying a lot of electricity from China. We know that deals with China come with some political influence. How much leverage does Canada have with China and India in order to play a greater role with



Myanmar? China and India will look at Canada and say Myanmar is not our neighbourhood. Canada needs to recognise the depth of challenge and work with likeminded countries to determine how best to respond, but also realise that a political crisis is at that heart of the humanitarian crisis that Myanmar faces.

- Lastly, we all suffer from a collective attention deficit disorder. We often only pay attention when crises are in the news. Governments looking to provide quick responses and capture headlines become seized of these matters and appoint special envoys. We must recognise that crises are not short-term and require sustained engagement. Canada has been coasting for a long time because we relied on US to call on us, and we did join albeit on a lesser scale. That is not happening anymore. If Canada is going to be all in, we need to discuss how to be prepared; to join up policies internally and internationally. We are not doing enough on aid, security, and diplomacy.

There has been huge investment in the Trade Commissioner Service and Canada's global trade footprint. We know trade creates networks that, ideally, create a more stable environment. With countries like Myanmar and China, where we see targeting of religious and ethnic minorities. There is some level of traction that China has on trade that Canada won't have – how to successfully compartmentalize relationship with a country that raises human rights concerns, but is an important trade partner – which we know helps to create more stable environments?

- **Hon. Bob Rae:** Their needs to be a coherent approach to allow us to not be afraid of talking about human rights – to understand that doing so will subject us to scrutiny and questioning from others—but also engages in trade, humanitarian and development assistance. First, you can't discretely compartmentalise these things. Even though we merged CIDA with Foreign affairs, we haven't really merged them in terms of how people think. Aid, diplomacy, trade, security are not worlds unto themselves. Secondly, we need a serious approach to big countries where we have profound disagreements (China, Russia, Saudi Arabia), and decide how we are to respond that doesn't see concerning human rights violations as one-off situations. We need to develop a more mature approach that is not just reactionary – that doesn't just respond to tweets. The assumption was, that opening up of Myanmar to the internet would create pluralism, engagement, and the internet would become a place for discovery—but instead it's racist, dangerous place, which is a powerful fact of our lives that we haven't figured out how to respond to. Serious foreign policy is not based on acting on impulses.

What is social media's place in Sri Lanka, and Burma; these are countries that have leapfrogged traditional modes of communication to cell phones, access to social media have inflamed divisions, but also showed to us and provided visibility for our understanding. None of this is new, but how does this new awareness translate to policymaking for us?

- **Hon. Bob Rae:** Still 7000 Rohingya without freedom of movement, living in blackout conditions, dependent on food aid. They're stuck, and we don't know much about this vulnerable population. Speaking to aid workers in IDP/refugee camps, they don't know



what will happen – are things getting better or worse? Then, in Bangladesh, which has accepted one million people in three weeks, and the camp is a massive instant slum with horrendous social conditions, facing rainy cyclone season. The real issue is education, which is exemplified by the fact that we can't get a serious schooling network established in Bangladesh. Bangladesh has explicitly stated – in conference in Dhaka— that it's not going to establish permanent schooling in refugee camp when we want the camp to go away; won't make the conditions better because then they'll attract more refugees. This links to concerns about radicalization and security in these camps; a danger when there are no schools that provide anything beyond rote learning. Experience of Palestinian refugees is that short-term can become the medium-term, which can become the long-term and then generations – 70 years have passed, and these villages are being created, and we can no longer discuss how to go forward from that point. If we don't find greater capacity for political innovation, that's what's going to happen with the Myanmar situation.

I'm picturing what the Canadian people would say if we heard that we'll be expecting one million refugees in a month?

- **Hon. Bob Rae:** That happened with the Irish refugees to Canada (Toronto), which we did but not without its own conflicts. We can't blame Bangladesh for not wanting this to be a permanent situation, but also that as long as people are there, we need to provide opportunities for education and safe work.

Panel 2: Managing Uncle Sam

Meredith Lilly (Associate Professor, Carleton University; Fellow, CGAI), Hon. John Manley (Advisory Council Chair, CGAI), John Parisella (Senior Advisor, National Public Relations) moderated by Colin Robertson (Vice President, CGAI)

- **Meredith Lilly:** If Sheer is voted in, he may have a certain capacity to communicate with Trump better than Trudeau. Will have opportunities which aren't connect to politics in recent years. Will have to turn inroads into policy decisions. Will inherent files (the "status quo") that Canada has recent pursued with the U.S. Opportunity to join NORAD and BMD, in addition to demonstrating areas of common goals. Mexico is the fastest growing Mexican economy; Canada should therefore be building bilateral relationship with the Mexican Government.
- **John Parisella:** The provinces don't operate at the same level. The President is focused on proactive, economic diplomacy (focusing on trade). For Canada, can't take a back seat. They need to engage actively. At the provincial level, this is transpiring faster than the federal level (ex. Quebec and energy policy). The opinions of an American President



have more of a sway in Quebec electorate. As such, there needs to be considerable work at the Federal level to allow this dialogue.

- **Hon. John Manley:** The lesson that Canadians need to learn is a) America First is not going away and b) America First is bad for Canada, and c) the leverage we had from the Mulroney Government with NAFTA is no longer a leverage. We are in a different phase of Canadian-American politics. We are dealing with a much bigger partner.

Panel 3: An Energy Superpower? Or Hamstrung by Social License and Provincial Bickering?

Jack Mintz (President's Fellow, University of Calgary; Advisory Council Member, CGAI), Brad Wall (Senior Advisor, Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP; Advisory Council Member, CGAI), Monica Gattinger (Director, University of Ottawa's Institute for Science, Society and Policy; Fellow, CGAI) moderated by Jeffrey Simpson (Advisory Council Member, CGAI)

Is climate change real and what should we do?

- **Monica Gattinger:** Yes. And we should make climate change policy as if energy policy matters. How can we make climate change policy that also considers energy? It's not just environmental, it's also security.
- **Jack Mintz:** When I do read the IPCC report - what is a bit more difficult to do is predict exactly what the impact will be. Probabilities are still not promising for the climate.

Jack Mintz, you once argued for a price on carbon. Do you still stand by that?

- **Jack Mintz:** I would still argue that the best way of controlling emission is to have a single uniform price for carbon. Issues that make it difficult: 1. When you're trying to control a price, that's not the same as controlling a quantity. If you have a target, pricing is not a way to do that. 2. If you do have carbon regulations and trading emissions, you're still trying to lower quantities. That is the same as pricing, which is no way to affect target.
- **Brad Wall:** Yes. Pricing is myopic. We've been having this debate on a carbon tax. But Canada plays a minuscule part of global emissions. Pricing isn't going to help the planet. How Canada could help the planet better is by inventing technologies that can be exported that works. In a world that's still building coal, Canada has a chance to focus on 2nd generation climate tech. If we had a man-moon mission for getting to that technology, we would do more for the climate overall. We have a chance to lead and it will take public investment.



Monica Gattinger, it sounds like you're talking about balance. When you look at the difficulties in getting energy products built. Especially in linear projects, like pipelines. What gives you confidence, that we can break through the log-jam?

- **Monica Gattinger:** It's been a slow-motion train wreck on energy. There's a lot of mistrust on our institutions from environmental groups to institutions, such as policy-makers, regulators etc. To my mind there are 3 key areas that are frankly obstacles, but I hope optimism. 1. Increasing polarization that make it very difficult to develop policy.

Can you see ways of unblocking the polarization and institutional obstacles?

- **Jack Mintz:** The Harper government did make many pipelines. There's a paper called Climate Wires, and he traced through lobby foundations the environmental associations to stop pipelines in Canada. Even though clipper and a whole bunch of projects got through, it was the start of Keystone XL that started the process of legal changes. I don't have an answer for how you get around it. There's a different view amongst Canadians that has to do with resource development. The majority is that responsible resource development is appropriate. I think it's based on markets in the future. 1st is plastics. 2nd is bunker fuel and aviation. 3rd is long haul transport. 4th is electric cars and light trucks. If you assume that we cannot solve this. Even if the demand for oil drops, you still need to replace reserves to keep oil production going. Even if you do go to a lower carbon society, we're still going to need oil. If you look at the oil sands today, the amount of GHG emission will be lower than what we import. We can have responsible resource development, but if we're completely blocked, what kind of resource market do we have in Canada. If we cannot produce and sell oil and gas, that's the sort of thing that creates existential issues.

In British Columbia, their governments consider opposing resource development and consider it an existential issue?

- **Jack Mintz:** I'm surprised to hear that. Vancouver has a shortage of oil and imports much of its oil from Washington. So, if you just shut down BC resource development. What does that mean, we just pull it from Washington? We need to sustainably develop it at home.
- **Brad Wall:** We know everything we need to know regarding environmental impact. Which has concerned business, which has been lost to other oil firms abroad. Talking about new regulatory regimes, only increases that uncertainty and is more damaging.

For the first time, we're seeing indigenous chiefs, who were frightened, but now see the destitution in their communities. What is their role?



- **Monica Gattinger:** I completely agree, Indigenous movements and their mobilization give me enormous optimism. What BC indigenous groups are looking to do, is looking to build their capacity to engage the industry.
- **Jack Mintz:** Agree with Monica. There's quite participation from indigenous participation in industry projects. They're looking to get more. However, who has the right to say no? Companies choose who gets to participate. Indigenous groups may be included, but they don't have power. We need to work out something, with first nations, there are the rights of the first nations benefit and get to be included, but those that say no seem to have an overwhelming political power.
- **Brad Wall:** Support for getting the Kinder Morgan pipeline done. There has been interest in getting first nation support. But we have governments that are making commercial policies. On commercial terms, first nations should be included in development.

We've heard this word banded about... can you define social license?

- **Brad Wall:** I look at the energy sector and the direct and indirect employment. I look at how it transforms quality of life. I look at how their responsible compared to other nations. They have paid their social license. Yes, they should do more.
- **Monica Gattinger:** The terminology that should be used is public trust. It's easy. It's governments that permit projects. In an industrialized democracy, we need to keep power with the people, not corporations. Who decides our public institutions.

Panel 4: An Agri-Food Superpower?

Murad Al-Katib (President & CEO, AGT Foods & Ingredients), Kim McConnell (Board Member, Canadian Centre for Food Integrity) moderated by Janice MacKinnon (Advisory Council Member, CGAI)

One of the most valuable assets a country can have is the capacity to produce safe, reliable food to feed the growing global population. Canada has an abundance of arable land, a reputation for providing healthy, reliable food, major employer, and major part of our economy – but you seldom hear about agriculture. I'm hoping we can discuss: what is agri-food? Do we have agri-food in Canada? What are Canada's assets and challenges? What are we not making the most of and what needs to change to get the most out of our potential?

- **Murad Al-Katib:** The agriculture sector was designated as a priority sector for Canadian government to launch a bold pilot. Some view this as a century of agriculture. Seldom recognised as an economic driver, but looking at fundamentals, we see two major trends: first, population growth – 10 billion by 2050. This is a major opportunity and challenge. To quantify-- In next 40 years, we need to provide the same quantity of food that we produced in last 10,000 years. Water and land are scarce resources in the world, and



water use/conservation and soil management and management of agriculture production, including post-production and food waste. If we don't do this, we won't be able to meet targets of fundamental food security - a building block of civil obedience and institutions of peace and security in the world. The recognition of difficulties in sector: potentially the most political business in the world—balancing farm lobbies, tariffs aimed at boosting prices for local producers. Let's take stock of assets: land, water, research institution plugged into commercialisation, large farm base – these are all advantages. Could not scale technology on one-acre farm. Tens of millions of dollars enterprise. \$33 trillion middle class spending in Asia – linking the protein highway to silk road in Asia will lead to changing prosperity for Canadians. Set real, tangible targets to increase exports value from 45 billion to 85 billion. Through AI, satellite imaging, data analytics, agriculture 2.0 is going to be exciting. When I left government as minister, my twins are going to graduate high school this year. They are instant gratification consumers who grew up with a cell phone with their hands, that provides great economic prosperity rather just being a commodity-based economy.

- **Kim McConnell:** It's agreed that agriculture is an industry of growth, innovation and political security in various areas. We produce what people want and protein, as Murad mentioned, is high on demand list. Canada produces the best protein in the world bar none, including plant-based protein, lentils and peas. We have opportunity to go considerably further. By the same token, there are questions about whether we have an agri-food industry. The hyphen in agri-food is a mountain; agriculture industry and food industry don't always talk to each other. Opportunity comes from when the mountain becomes a bridge, and this is what Canadians want. Canadians want to know how food is produced and processed. My father farmed for 42 years. Most food companies change their menu more often in a year than my father did in 42 years. Don't say farmers don't want to change – they do – but they need to understand the value proposition for change. Having trust in consumer is very important, which is area of advantage for Canada. Canada produces safe and affordable products that is supported by system for building public trust. The process of building public trust is simple in theory: pillar 1 is 'do the right thing,' which means putting the industry, e.g. beef, around the table and they say they know what the right things are and continue to champion. We need regulatory arms to be nimble and they play an important role as third-party certification. Pillar 2 we need to communicate transparency. Canada is bringing a whole of food system where we are not just selling a safe, nutritious, affordable product, but selling a domestically and internationally a product that is a step above. We have the opportunity to truly be an agri-food superpower.
- **Murad Al-Katib:** We have the foundation to a build a new agricultural economy. Other countries are going to have difficulties reacting to dynamic change, especially in the fussy consumer. Regulatory systems are important, but we today are facing a regulatory burden that is choking the sector. We need to balance between regulation and public trust and public safety. Need to modernise Canada Agriculture Grain act. We need to be a part of global value chains; count on government when we need them but not a burden.



What would be a country that is comparable and what does their regulatory burden look like?

- **Murad Al-Katib:** Hyper regulators like Australia. US is one step below, but Canada seems to have more of a regulatory silo approach where agencies are not aligned. We need economic concept of regulation to be the paramount consideration. Statistics don't lie – we are 36th in regulatory competitiveness. If we are to capture the opportunities, we need massive change.
- **Kim McConnell:** Three things to I would do to enhance the industry: (1) appoint Murad and his team to implement his report's recommendations, one of which is regarding regulation. I'm tired of seeing wonderful reports sit on shelves. Second, structural and strategic change in regulation. We are behind in a lot of ways. Example of Beyond Meats plant-based protein: they are bleeding ink, IPO the other day that made mega billions. They are utilising tech to the fullest, new investors, new thinking, new speed to go about doing this, and great bankers – an infusion of cash. Let's pause and look at other sectors of Canadian agriculture – hundreds of associations. Where is the youth? The diversity? We need that infusion to see real opportunity and change. Thirdly, I want to see an ambassador of agri-food, who would be a champion to advance/promote industry within Canada and internationally; liaison with health, trade, etc.; and serve a role in bringing in the brightest in the agriculture industry. Ambassador needs to utilise Canadian university system – look at thousands of foreign students who go back to their countries and can be ambassadors for Canada/its agri-food system.

Following up on point that agri-food doesn't really exist, are there other mountains that prevent agri-food from developing?

- **Murad Al-Katib:** We are fundamentally suffering now and that will continue. Our India/china foreign policies will impact our agriculture sector. Open access through bilateral trade are paramount to success; if we don't get relevant in foreign policy/trade circles, we are not going to realise potential, capital will flow south. Domestic agriculture protection is not new to this US presidency; and in India is not going to go away. And there is too much reliance on multilateral solutions that haven't done well for us.

What else would you do if you were prime minister to get regulatory agencies talking to each other?

- **Murad Al-Katib:** It's not just about eliminating regulations – getting rid of two regulations and replacing with 1 bad one is not better. If you want health care and education, we need an economy. With a change in my back-yard mentality, we're not going to have food for our children and grand children.

Why is the agriculture sector rarely mentioned as a major economic driver? How did we get here?



- **Kim McConnell:** The agricultural industry is relatively humble – we’re not very good at telling our stories and bragging. But we are also quite competitive. WE need to be better communicators and stronger promoters of each other. Secondly, many Canadians look at agriculture industry through historical lens – mom and pop and apple pie rather than the technology. Get on a tractor and out to barns today, it’s phenomenal experience in terms of advanced monitoring and robotics systems. Not an image that many people have. I was in Loblaws the other day, and the 3000 people who were there probably none of them have connection to the farm.
- **Murad Al-Katib:** We’ve had scale-up problems in agriculture in the past; no national champions. Do we want to be dinner or dining? We need to scale up. Lacking that scale, we are not so high in mind, but I think that is changing and going to change.

Panel 5: Canada’s Bid for the United Nations Security Council: Should we or Shouldn’t We?

Ian Brodie (Program Director, CGAI), Kate White (President & CEO, United Nations Association in Canada) moderated by Christopher Waddell (Professor, Carleton University; Advisory Council Member, CGAI)

For some context, we have history of being on the UNSC. Our competitors are Ireland and Norway.

- **Kate White:** Franklin D. Roosevelt urged activists to push him to do the right thing: “You’ve convinced me; now go out and make me do it.” Profound economic change and rise of extremism, climate change and geopolitical shift that Canada finds itself in. This is about Canada’s master brand and place in the world. Despite criticism UNSC receives, this is the most important board room table in the world. For Canada, the key definitive reason to be at the table is trade. With trade is trust, and especially financing for development. Underlying trade is always trusting relationships and rule of law. Underlying geopolitics writ large. Canada’s experience provides the world confidence that sitting with the P5 is not our first rodeo. Canada is showcasing how an equitable world should be, where gender equality is assumed. With refugees and immigrants, we get innovation; we are exploring opportunities and practices. We have much to bring to the world if we hold that seat.
- **Ian Brodie:** Canada is a valued member of almost every multilateral organisation on the planet. Every organisation I’ve dealt with has not only valued Canada’s membership but has demanded more of it. Our financial contributions aren’t always on time but always generous. Our technical know-how contribution is in constant demand everywhere. And because there is constant demand, we have to be clear about our commitments. To spend two years on the UNSC, security council campaign push is an expensive endeavour; it requires PM’s time and ministers. It’s not a moral beauty contest; not about values



compared to other countries. Trying to accumulate votes amongst UN is club of dictators and despots; existing estimates are likely low estimates. We are in a low point of ODA under this Trudeau government; FIAP is not that well-funded—to take that pot of money and spread it as thinly as possible; to buy as many votes as possible is undoing 10 years of Canada's development and diplomatic engagement. No question there are advantages to being on the UNSC, but the reality is that it's not possible to win without US support. If the US are unsure whether they want Irish or Norwegians filling the spot, the burden on us becomes exponentially higher. Less about pursuing Canadian interests and instead getting about accumulating votes. Canada's position in the UN has shifted considerably in last 20 years, especially after consolidations of EU policy, we're not in the in-crowd. The cost does not grow commensurately with the achievement.

- **Katie White:** When it comes to EU, we are still a likeminded country and EU members still see Canada's assets. Telling the story of what Canada must give and how we're doing that is a unique opportunity. In terms of despots and dictators club, I don't want to talk only to likeminded white hats. We need that table. It is a seat kept warm for us that we should be sitting at.
- **Ian Brodie:** We are member of UNGA by right, but I don't think Canada has itself recognised that UNGA has had resurgence in impact in last four years; wrapping up MDGS; putting SDGs in place. Discussions about migration have led to Global Compact. UNGA will be the place where discussions about Global Compact take place, as well as dozens of other less high-profile issues. While nothing important may have happened at UNGA 10-15 years ago more valid, and so we have to be on UNSC, this is less true today.

Would it have been better, given difficulty of dealing with US, to punt the bid for the seat to 2020? What will Canada do if it gets the seat? A UNSC needs constant envoy that, given current political circumstances, may not possible.

- **Kate White:** The Prime Minister had an uprush of support and decided to seize the moment. UNA Canada felt that changed and that is part of the rationale.
- **Ian Brodie:** Prime Minister's storyline is as good as any; it fits with mandate of UN/UNSC, and it fills a hole that UNSC is otherwise short on. For the majority of countries looking for a narrative of what Canada would do it is clear. There are countries that are concerned about individual concessions, others may be attracted to invest but that is not typically the case.

Does losing twice make it more difficult to win at third time?



- **Ian Brodie:** Not sure there is precedent for such a thing. If we were to try that, it means Canada needs to sit back and think what that campaign would look like. Western Europe would also look at that and say, what are you trying to achieve?
- **Kate White:** I don't agree with your analysis. It's a long campaign. At this moment, Canada's chances are really good. It's not unusual that campaign would be against friendlies. If we were running against dictator or despot, they may be able to gather votes too. Not the complete story; in the end it is a private vote and we have 102 colleagues in the field.

After the 2010 loss, and with lots of recriminations, it was an uncomfortable moment for government. If we lose this time, it'll be a bipartisan failure of two parties. Trudeau is Mr. Global citizen, so if we are repudiated this time, what does this say about our place in the world, our foreign policy, and sense of the ourselves?

- **Ian Brodie:** Part of the worry of 2010 campaign was that we were coming off a high from multilateral engagement that had nothing to do with UN; it had to do with financial institutions and G20. The campaign had been dedicating attention/efforts to other parts of the multilateral system; success that had nothing to do with UN during context of major financial crisis. This time, what's going on in Western Europe and that they can't agree whether we should be one of the nominated two. If western Europe is now a bloc, and Africa is a bloc, what bloc are we in?
- **Kate White:** The EU is a not a bloc in terms of votes or engagement. It was unhelpful for Ignatieff to say Canada doesn't deserve a seat so shortly before the vote. My belief is that we have a strong chance now. We're a trading nation and we have to keep working on bilateral relationships, and any PR rep will tell you that you see trade change based on who you sit beside in UNGA. Being at the UNSC table is an opportunity now – the more we do and act as advocates for Canada's place all over the world in multilateral organisations, such as NATO, the better the opportunities for Canada.

Luncheon Keynote: Jacob Poushter (Associate Director, Pew Research Center)

International Opinion of Canada around the World

- 2018 survey was done in 26 countries. Face to face and television. 31 languages. Nationally representative of the population.

Views of the US and Confidence in the US President



- Generally, there is not a lot of confidence in Trump. Only 25% Canadians trust that Trump will do the right thing. More positive views come from Israel, Philippines. In Mexico only 6% have positive views of Trump.
- This wasn't always the case. In Canada Confidence in Obama was very high 83% vs 25% now. This also reflects favourability of the US.
- Conservative followers in Canada are more likely to have a favourable view of the United States and confidence in Trump and president.
- In Canada with other leaders, lack of confidence in Trump, Putin, and Jinping. But Macron and Merkel are more favourable.
- Beyond just US image, there is also criticism of US Soft power. Only 37% of Canadians say US respects the personal freedoms of its own people. More people say American soft power is lower than it was.

International Threats

- Around the world, most countries said climate change was the top international threat. The second was ISIS and extremism/terrorism. In US cyber attacks was the top threat.
- In Canada, climate change is the top threat for 2/3rds of Canada. Then cyber attacks, then ISIS. US Power influence was also selected by 48% compared to China which was lower. In 2013 half as many people said US was a threat to Canada.

Cyber attacks

- 53% Canadians said that Canada was prepared to handle a cyber attack, higher than others. Targets include sensitive security information, public services, elections.

Balance of Power and Views of China (note that this is 2017 data)

- Before recent events, we had been seeing a favourable decline from 53% in 2009 to 42% in 2017.
- Canadians viewed the issues with China as a human rights issue (62%), rather than an economic issue (38%).
- When asked if Canadians think China (relative to Russia etc.) is playing the most important in the world.
- Canadians say that China is the top economic power, more so after 2008. This is contrast to other countries.
- When ask to compare US or China as the world leading power. 71% of Canadians prefer US.

Canadian and American Views of Trade, The Future of Work and Migration

- Canadian views of trade. Canadians are not as convinced that trade creates better wages or makes a difference for prices. Canadians are enthusiastic about trade, but don't feel one way or the other about effects of trade.



- In the US: republicans are supportive of tariffs, democrats are not.
- 84% of Canadians say that the jobs done by humans will be done by robots.
- Canadians and Americans feel the same about immigration, but much more positively than Europe.
- But Canadians support bringing in highly skilled immigrants, rather than lowly skilled. Canadians also support more refugees.

American Views of Canada

- American feels the warmest to Canada compared to others.
- Americans feel that Canada is about the 3rd most important partner for US. Republicans are less likely to say that Canada is an important foreign policy.

Panel 6: Coping with China's New Stance: Middle Power in a Time of Renewed Great Power Competition

Stewart Beck (President & CEO, Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada), Graham Shantz (President, Canada-China Business Council), Rob Wright (Advisory Council Member, CGAI) moderated by Sarah Goldfeder (Principal, Earncliffe; Fellow, CGAI)

Assumptions in the title to be addressed. Are we seeing evidence of a new stance from China, especially as it relates to Canada?

- **Rob Wright:** Yes, China has changed. China has worked hard to establish a constructive relationship, but in the last couple of years, we have seen Chinese leadership take a new stance, as evidenced by position in the South China Sea, etc. They are less willing to listen to middle powers; during my time at least, China sought out our views and advice.

Is this directly related to Huawei incident?

- **Rob Wright:** No, but it is a clear reflection. Canada has been caught up in problems between China and the US.
- **Stewart Beck:** China has always had to endure Norman Bethune legacy as reflection of positive Chinese attitudes towards Canada. During that era (1999-2003), Canadian bureaucrats had better access than US counterpart (which did not necessarily translate to business). In 2006, the Conservative government took a hard stance, and China didn't understand why Canada was breaking with history. This made the leadership question Canada's friendship over last 10-15 years. Recently, Canada's empty well of good will was reflected in targeting canola exports: Richardson's was targeted (Jim Carr's riding), which wasn't translated into economic value, but was useful/had influence in conversations with Chinese leadership. Shows Canada and China are no longer friends.



To what extent is there movement in China's own eyes from "more in common with middle powers" to its destiny with more aligned with larger powers?

- **Stewart Beck:** Economic success and leverage is based on size of their own economy and middle class and success of the political party in terms of bringing people out of poverty, and there is belief that the leadership doesn't need help. Canada still has these missionary attitudes towards China/India, but they've moved past that and we need to treat them as more than equals.
- **Graham Shantz:** For Canada, part of the answer to your question is the growth of the global middle class. What do about it – not to stop it from growing; but to take advantage of it. Canada can take advantage of it provincially, e.g. through attractiveness international education institutions; 29% of international students come from China. China makes up \$4-5 billion of that income, largest than any single export. Tourism is another example; 9% of Spain's GDP; only 2% of Canada's GDP. Getting Asia's new economic realities is quite important.

China is 2nd largest economy; military resources are growing, though not engaged the way US are in operations around the world, but ready to show willingness/awareness of engagement globally. How does Canada and other Asian country neighbours deal with being squeezed between giants and potential trade war?

- **Rob Wright:** China has changed. Our relative influence with China has decreased. We cannot expect influence we've had in the past, but there are efforts we can do, like working with partners in the Pacific. Japan, for example, is the 3rd largest economy in the world. The more we do with Japan, the more China will take interest in what we're doing in the region. We have to be realistic of institutional change like closer economic cooperation – and ground has shifted significantly in the last year. With arbitrary detention of Canadian citizens, terminating exports of certain products, and a refusal to meet indicates we can't count on China the way we have in the past. Strength is integrity, commitment to rule of law, and strong partnerships not just in Asia pacific, but also decades of work in other institutions – WTO, NATO and elsewhere. Can't be naïve about what's happening, and we can't expect to achieve our objectives this way through bilateral relation.

There's a sense that Canada has to compartmentalise its policies; for instance, we need sensitivity on some issues to advance trade. We are at risk of creating an environment where we've compartmentalized relationships with China so that trade is on one track, and other issues like rule of law and human rights on another track.

- **Rob Wright:** We have to pursue issues on all fronts. If we're not engaging with China, then our prospects and relevance is diminished. My view is to do as much as we can on economic, trade, investment and human rights fronts, but we don't have to be naïve about



what we can achieve. Definitely don't do tit for tat; it penalises Canada more than China. The US is deep in a trade war with China and there is no need for Canada to jump in.

- **Stewart Beck:** When I arrived in Shanghai, China had 1.4% of Chinese import market (Australia 2.5-2.6%). A decade later, we had 1.3% (Australia over 5%). Only 1% of Canadian students who go abroad go to Asia. Asia is going to be driver of global economic growth over next 20 years. Are we prepared for that reality? This means being prepared with China via embassies, consulates, etc., but are we prepared as a population? If you live in China and meet with the people, you meet young bilingual Chinese students and see brands like Gucci. The average Chinese citizen is not the political leadership. A Canadian curriculum in a city no one in this room has heard of serving a population of 33 million.
- **Graham Shantz:** Though, much trumpeted by the US presidency, a deal for US agricultural exporters will not be beneficial to Canada. China plays the full spectrum of areas and interests. We should be using the bilateral instrumentation that we do have to carry on conversations important to Canadian government: annual leaders dialogue (met in 2018 not sure will meet in 2019); senior economic/finance dialogue (met in 2018 not sure will meet in 2019); national security and rule of law dialogue (met in 2018 not sure will meet in 2019). These things matter because this is how the Chinese system works. Traditional diplomacy matters; what you say; how you say it; who said it; knowing what your objectives are matters. Very different bilateral relationship than Canada is used to, but it matters.

How do we get back in the room to have bilateral dialogues in the next scheduled window that we can have them? Is it the importance of having a politically appointed ambassadors in China? I'm hearing there's a need for engagement in a forum where both sides understand goals and how to move forward, but how do we get there from here?

- **Rob Wright:** The G20 meeting is in a month in Osaka and Japan provides good opportunity for PM to meet with Xi Jinping. I know we've tried to engage in recent months but have been unable to do so. Should continue in a reasonable way. Charges d'affaires doing an excellent job but I agree that China will agree to sit down with a new envoy. But putting new person in the job doesn't mean renewed discussion unless they have a mandate and China agrees to sit down with new envoy. This is unlikely to happen but doesn't mean won't happen.
- **Stewart Beck:** Whomever gets sent will be under the microscope. Why risk it at this point and time.

Is there an issue of rank? Dealing with Charges d'affaires different than Ambassador?

- **Rob Wright:** Not sure it matters. During difficult time in our relationship it past, there may be ups and downs, but over time China has great respect for Canada and its relationship, and so it will be back on track. My sense is Chinese leadership looks at



current situation this way, but it will take more time. Skepticism of Canadians has increased considerably.

- **Graham Shantz:** Traditional modes of diplomacy are important. We are opening chapter in Halifax later this month. Two aspects are important for China-Canada relationship: one is immigration, especially STEM graduates in China. Technology in the future will be coming from China. Investment is huge issue; paying for our pension funds retirement means investing not only in US but also Asia.

Panel 7: Defending the Dominion against Bots, Trolls, Terrorists and Other Threats

VAdm (Retd) Bruce Donaldson (Advisory Council Member, CGAI), Richard Fadden (Advisory Council Member, CGAI), Janis Sarts (Director, NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence), Elinor Sloan (Professor, Carleton University; Fellow, CGAI) moderated by Dave Perry (Vice President, CGAI)

What does the return of great power competition mean for Canada?

- **Elinor Sloan:** It's important for Canada in terms of security and defence. Canada is playing a big role in Europe. In the future, we need the surveillance to have control of arctic waters and in Asia with need allies through US, increasing with Japan. Next government will have to focus on naval capabilities; ship building capabilities; ensure ship and coast guard needed. WE also need to focus on more supply ships or submarines, playing both areas in arctic and Asia pacific, leaving aside Europe where we already play a big role. There is a defence procurement system in place but in my view, it has not gone far enough. We need a champion in charge of shipbuilding because it so important to all these areas, perhaps in form of Deputy Minister to ensure ships are produced in expeditious way. In summary, great power tension is one of the most important things for Canada in immediate future. In a maritime environment, we need to focus on shipbuilding and new ways of ensuring shipbuilding program proceeds expeditiously.

One of the ways we employ maritime forces is through cooperation with US, I'm not sure how well understood that relationship is, and given the rising unpopularity of US, what is the importance of resetting the relationship with US from a defence point of view?

- **Bruce Donaldson:** We have seen time and again, when things go bad, Canadians stand up for Americans for whole bunch of reasons. Canadians recognise that shared interest and has invested heavily as country and people in that close relationship. It underpins a defence relationship which transcends even refusal to participate in Iraq invasion, star wars, etc. That underlying basis has a number of different instruments for close defence cooperation, which allows us to share info, work cooperatively, it encourages military interoperability, security interoperability; and it supports mechanisms for joint command



and control of force. We are still the only nation that the US will accept to be in command of their forces operational. Having said that, there are tough times ahead. The next government has some difficult questions: on which some of the assumptions of a historically based defence policy and approach may be a challenge, e.g. expectations of consultation/ability to predict where the lines will be for military engagement. Would we be prepared to support an invasion of Iran? Would we be prepared to accept pre-emptive strike or limited nuclear exchange? It has always been discussed notionally but I'm concerned that we don't know where the lines are anymore. What does 5g infrastructure mean for the five eyes community going forward in terms of cybersecurity, intelligence? Difficult questions mean we need to rethink assumptions that we based policy and approaches on. How much is enough? As a country, how much investment in commitment, money, capability, and relationships is enough? It's not a top of mind issue domestically among Canadians, and don't think we have the answer.

What will be the key national security concerns more broadly, including cyberterrorism for the new government in Canada?

- **Richard Fadden:** The first is a meta-threat (threat about other threats); that Canada has had a selective worldview of what has been going on globally. E.g. tens and millions of dollars in IP that China is stealing from Canada, how China uses its diaspora in Canada. We need to maintain dialogue with China, but it is not strategic to not look at the totality of what the relationship implies. Canada needs realistic assessment of Russia, which is developing an aggressive stance on variety of threats (not necessarily as much as China but still able to poke and prod). Easy for Canada to not pay attention to bots and terrorists because we don't feel very threatened; unrealistic view especially when we live in world without borders, especially on cyber side. I cannot think of a single case in terrorism without international component. In the past, one state used to spy on another state, now it's state-state; corporations; terrorist groups; criminal groups. There is no focal point for dealing with cyberterrorism and issue is going to get worse before getting better. To say nothing about how much we say privacy is important, not doing anything to address privacy threats from private sector. Put this all together and there needs to be a realistic view of the world and our place in it. We are less influential in the world, but influence won't help us if we aren't understanding the whole context.
- **Janis Sarts:** We think it is still, but it's rough waters, and they're not going to calm down. Key thing is that we have to understand and see what is required based on challenges of the past to get prepared for the next thing that's going to happen. I point to interventions that we're not prepared for, e.g. Russia's hybrid strategy in which conflict is permanent state and moves between various levels of intensity; embracing new tools. What are the new tools? what are the new vulnerabilities? In addition to cyber – one doesn't need to hack anything if you scrape open source data to influence behaviours? We scraped open source data about participants in military exercise and were able to affect behaviours of participants. We made soldiers leave their positions! Are prepared



for these kinds of things? Do we know where the data of our society are? Bad actors at any given time have these datasets. Are we prepared? Our most likely challengers are investigating these capabilities. I'm worried about how we are currently developing model of taking big data applying surveillance technologies and targeting individuals, how does that translate in the 5g world? Data from smartphones, medical devices will be very interesting to anyone who wants to affect behaviour. We should still build the ships and have full scale military operations, but there are new emerging risks that affect command and control; elections; political decision-making, which are also in the line of fire. Need to develop more comprehensive security and defence solutions for these emerging threats

Has 5G been tipping discussion into meaningful action?

- **Richard Fadden:** It has definitely raised awareness; public and private sector and close allies have been focused on it. Looking at various sectors of economy, financial and nuclear is in decent shape, but telecommunications not in great shape. The US national security community considers Huawei a risk, and given Canada interoperability with US, we are saying to the US that we don't care about their national security. Government has been given a couple hundred million dollars to make things better, but the threat is so massive that we haven't spent enough time, money, or effort. Belief among politicians is that there are no votes in national security true today. We are going to be too slow to deal with them; change is evergreen; always changing faster than we can keep up.

There is a perception that there have been difficulties in getting enabling capabilities, in part because lack of internal champions, but are we making the right types of investments within the overall basket?

- **Bruce Donaldson:** We've started to. It's good to rethink the full spectrum of capability necessary to have effective/deployable force. How big, often, how many at the same time – it's important to determine strength of enablement. But it's still predicated on the presumption that we rarely deploy quickly on our own in something to protect our national interest; I'm not sure how valid that still is. It glosses over more expensive enablers unrelated to the tactical side of operations; but related to the operational strategic side. No effective communications in the artic because it's too expensive; only serving military purpose and so no one else wants to take ownership; defence has taken some ownership; but it's crazy to believe you can do anything without a system of communications. The North Warning System is well past due in terms of modernization and equipment; and the area of enablement is not sexy. It's expensive but it would go long way to assuring the US that we are taking steps to ensure our mutual security. Plus, if look at capabilities in space surveillance, awareness within space/maritime approaches on all threat posts, we could invest a lot more, and further investment likely to bear even more fruit.



When you gauge your students' awareness, do you get the impression the government(s) is doing enough to address this?

- **Elinor Sloan:** Peacekeeping used to be of greater interest; but now there is much more interest in intelligence and great powers and terrorism. There is a big change in the new generation of students – they are not so interested in regions of the world, Africa, Asia Pacific, etc., but they're more interested in how the regions connect. Multilateral institutions and human rights across the board; international security; how countries relate globally through United Nations etc.

What's happening to close gaps between what alliances are doing and threats?

- **Janis Sarts:** There is a gap and we have to talk about cognitive warfare which now targets/hacks the thinking of large populations. By very nature of how we are, we never try to look in this area. We need to think of how to protect; we need to think of how to act immediately in next 3-4 years or will be a very dire situation.

Panel 8: Ambassadors Forum: How do we Sustain the Rules-Based International System and Meet the Populist Challenge?

H.E. Susan le Jeune d'Allegeerschecque (UK), H.E. Natasha Smith (Australia), H.E. Vikas Swarup (India), H.E. Peteris Ustubs (European Union) moderated by Barbara Martin (Professor, Queen's University; Fellow, CGAI)

Can you unpack what the populist challenge is? Peteris, from your perspective what is fueling the widespread dissatisfaction with ruling government?

- **H.E. Peteris Ustubs:** On populism. We need to look where it comes from, it's not coming from just one year. If we look back to 2000, which is linked to China's accession to the WTO. This led to the adoption of many new industrial policies. People are thinking they are losing their jobs to cheaper country. Also, from 2008, people first start to deal with financial issues and people start to look for someone to blame. In Europe, financially, people think there are immigrants looking for MY social benefits and MY job. Having said that, populism is not only a populism in Europe, we see the same populist movements in Asia, Latin America. Therefore, there may be a false idea that populism is a silent minority. In fact, in Europe it is a loud majority. We see many European countries with strong populist movements. We have the EU elections this month, and many say that the populists will do well, let's see. There is a direct impact on the general electorate. These parties and movements are triggering anti-government sentiment which is crowding out moderates. More people are leaning to the far-left and far-right.



Natasha, if you could introduce the international rule-based order, which has raised many people out of poverty. But what about expectations that ALL would do well. How are expectations breaking down in the Asia-Pacific region?

- **H.E. Natasha Smith:** I think that it's not quite breaking down, it's evolving. A lot of the power-shifts, demographic shifts, and technology shifts are also happening in the Indo-Pacific region. This is especially challenging when they work against the rules-based order which has spurred economic growth. It's not about stopping it, it's about working in coalitions and working so that the rights of individual rights are respected, that we have the flow of goods and services and ideas. I'd want to draw attention to alternative rules-based order beyond UN etc. ASEAN and CTPPP for instance. MICTA for instance. If we're going to find solutions, we have to look outside traditional boxes. If you look at the drivers it's about the pace of change. The challenge is bringing the conversation down so that the average person can understand it. It's about ensuring that people understand the system works for them.

Vikas, can you talk about whether the UN is still effective and what we may need to do legitimize the UN?

- **H.E. Vikas Swarup:** the UN used to be an organ for diplomacy. Now it is a forum for public democracy. It used to be a technocratic organization with expertise on disasters, international law, etc. Note that this was before 2015. The UN was designed to function of great power cooperation, not great power rivalry. Even if you look at UNSC, where is it on ISIS, and DPRK. Usually it's ineffective because of vetoing. The UN is reverting to what it was during the era of the Cold War. The UN is not the global body that we all used to think it was. Especially if we look at UNSC, it is not the force it used to be.

Susan, The US has been a cornerstone of the international rules-based order. Some politicians are using the populist agenda for gaining support in their country. UN is under fire precisely at a time when we need it most. What are the risks on multilateralism from populism?

- **H.E. Susan le Jeune d'Allegerschecque:** The biggest risk is complacency. Things like freedom of speech, especially for journalists. Equality for women and minorities are being threatened. Complacency is what we all need to fight against. The second risk is small chips away at these institutions and what they stand for. We need to be vigilant about small tweaks about minor things, which ultimately cut into our democracy. Right at the heart of these issues is the threat to our own democracies. Now that we all talk about election interference as if it is normal. That is terrifying. The people we have always worked with, are not always going to be the people we work with in the future. The JCPOA is a great example of that. The final thing I would say are the success. It's true that the Syrian crisis is still the worst. But just this last week we have seen progress on Yemen. Our press our politicians need to spend more time on the giving the institutions credit that are doing a good job AND then reform them.



The alliance for multilateralism, do you see this as an effort to bind the non-great powers?

- **H.E. Natasha Smith:** I think it's a great idea, but I don't think we need more institutions.
- **H.E. Vikas Swarup:** The G20 is a good alternative for this. It was very effective, and it can work here too.

The EU needed two wars to come together. How is the EU responding to these internal pressures on the union and the resistance of Brussels control?

- **H.E. Peteris Ustubs:** We know well you will win the hearts of the people if they don't know the enemy and you can construct a bogeyman. We have to learn how the EU works and explain what the good things that the EU has done. That is not an easy dialogue. The outside world thinks that the EU is adopting thousands of regulations and so on. In fact, the number of legislations adopted has been reduced, and regulations have been abandoned. But this might be difficult to explain to the people. There is so much good happening, and we as institution are not always explaining well.

Susan, are there any quick lessons from Brexit that you can offer?

- **H.E. Susan le Jeune d'Allegeerschecque:** At first, populism was a large part of the decision that was made (Brexit). There was a sense that globalization had not come for them, that it was making rich people even richer. Political class in the UK was dangerously isolated from real people. The decision to hold the referendum was ill-informed with people who would vote. The best politicians are still those who knock on doors. 3rd education. People were woefully ill-informed about what the EU had done for the UK. UK politicians were quick to point to the EU for issues without accepting their own responsibility. Finally, the British press did not help to frame the issue. Lastly, a referendum with a Yes/No answer is very risky.

Vikas, with your experience in India, can you talk about how populism is there?

- **H.E. Vikas Swarup:** Elections are very important, because the poor votes. Middle class will not often show up to vote. It is the poor who votes. There cannot be any government that is not responsive to the poor. Even now there are 73 million Indians living in extreme poverty. But the good thing is that because of the affirmative programs we are undertaking 43 people are coming out of poverty every minute!
- **H.E. Natasha Smith:** In Australia, 16 million are also voting. It is a right and responsibility. It's compulsory. We see this in immigrant communities, how much they value voting. But I want to bring it back to explaining the importance of the concept. It's important to bring the importance of the message back to something people understand. If we look at the SDGs, it's a similar problem, explaining it in a way that people understand.



Panel 9: Responsible Neighbours: Lessons from the Lima Group

Allan Culham (Senior Advisor for Venezuela, Global Affairs Canada), H.E. Alejandro Marisio (Chile), H.E. Roberto Rodriguez (Peru) moderated by Patricia Fortier (Fellow, CGAI)

- **H.E. Roberto Rodriguez:** When we talk of Venezuela we talk about the absence of human rights and law. As responsible neighbours, there is a necessity to support the situation in Venezuela. Supports supporting the rule of law and trying to convince the current regime to have a peaceful transfer. Don't recognize the current administration based on the international precedent set by international law. Proposes a peaceful transition. Part of a package that Venezuela must accept is related to political prisoners (a commitment that the Lima Group remains focused).
- **H.E. Alejandro Marisio:** Chile has been trying to contribute to the resolution of the political crisis in Venezuela. Alongside regional partners and international partners. Chile has decided to be a part of determining a political way forward because Venezuela is a country not a region (has influenced the region, because of migrants and economics). Chile has been monitoring the situation. The international committee as the responsibility to broker a peaceful solution. Any deal must be negotiated. Chile sees international contributions as including to seek convergence on allow a democratic transition.
- **Allan Culham:** As one country, there is little Canada can do. Together, multiple countries should work together for a defined purpose (this is what the Lima group is). The construct of the Lima group is unique and opens the way for future diplomacy in the future (specialized groups coming together). Purpose of the group is to pressure and isolate the regime. Is no longer a local issue. It has become an international issue and an affront to Canadian values and what we stand for. It is a crime against humanity. A military government is in charge with a high level of criminality.

Panel 10: Foreign Policy Priorities for the Next Government

Ian Brodie (Program Director, CGAI), Peter Donolo (Vice Chair, Hill+Knowlton Strategies Canada; Fellow, CGAI), Roland Paris (Professor, University of Ottawa), Peter Van Praagh (President, Halifax International Security Forum) moderated by Maureen Boyd (Director, Carleton Initiative for Parliamentary and Diplomatic Engagement; Fellow, CGAI)

What priorities haven't gotten done by the current government? And what should some priorities be for the future government, whether Conservative or Liberal?

- **Roland Paris:** There have been huge changes in the international environment. Many of the assumptions that have underpinned the design and execution of Canadian foreign policy for decades are in question. How should Canada be managing in a messier and



meaner world? This is going to take time to navigate and figure out how to manage in this new environment. I don't think political parties are that well placed to engage in that kind of reflection. I don't think we can leave this task solely to our public service, so organizations like CGAI have a lot of work to do over the coming months and years. Guiding that reflection should be a clarity on what the goals of our foreign policy are and what is especially important for our foreign policy. How do we use our foreign policy to improve the wellbeing of Canadians? There are 4 areas I would highlight: insuring we have good construct relations with the US; expanding Canadian trade and trade opportunities; assuring our security and contributing to our allies/allied efforts; doing what we can to sustain the liberal world international order. These should also be the priorities for the next government.

Ian Brodie, from your perspective, what do you think the priorities should be for the next government, particularly if it is Conservative?

- **Ian Brodie:** The framework of the debate in Ottawa is not out of align with the challenges that we have. In Canada-U.S. relations, I think we can manage having a protectionist Republican administration and protectionist Democrats in the House, we've seen this before. What's changed? Well, we are now in a world where the Americans no longer have our back. And they are doing just fine – U.S. economy has done the best it has in a generation.

Peter Van Praagh, you've been looking at foreign policy from a big picture geo-political focus, what should Canadians priorities be from your perspective?

- **Peter Van Praagh:** We need to understand the truth about this country, our size, who we are, our history and where we are in the world. And understand that the number one foreign policy priority for any Prime Minister is to have a good solid working relationship with the President of the United States. PM Trudeau should not be blamed for not as close relationship with the current President, but the burden still falls with the Prime Minister of Canada.

Peter Donolo, how does the government ensure that its foreign policy priorities are not only successful but be perceived to be successful?

- **Peter Donolo:** The problem with Canadian governments generically, is that they focus too much on communications and they are obsessed with symbols, appearances. Communications in government terms is like the soundtrack to a movie, it should heighten the experience, but you shouldn't be conscious that you're listening to it. That's what communications ought to be in government, not drive government decision-making. Now, we have governments that get elected but continue to campaign. This diminishes our position abroad. The role of Canada is we get invited into rooms that the Americans don't get invited to and then we run and tell the Americans what happened. And that was



why we were invited. But that is not the case now. In this new reality, what Canadians will be looking for a government that puts Canada first, Canadians first and Canadian interests first.

- **Peter Van Praagh:** Our other interests should not be at the expense of our close-ness to the United States.

Why is that Canada is giving away its brand of excellence and not promoting Canadian organizations abroad?

- **Roland Paris:** In the democracy promotion space, there just isn't many Canadian organizations or Canadian equivalents to the National Democratic Institute. Canada has a particular advantage being useful and the advantage is that Canada has the ability to mobilize a broad range of international actors towards specific common goals. In the past, is the to be able to leverage the resources we have to get resources from elsewhere to then mobilize coalitions. We could be doing a lot more of that to sustain pieces of the liberal international order. Other middle powers have said we all could do more to backfill where the U.S. is pulling back. There is a lot of talk but yet to be any concerted action and division of labour amongst those countries. That should be a priority for the next government.
- **Peter Donolo:** One of the most useful tools we have is our governance model and practical governance. Helping people developing the institutions they need and eliminating corruption.
- **Ian Brodie:** On democracy, we have been downplaying the importance of the democratic stream to try to incorporate China into an international rules-based order. We are renewed in a philosophical competition with China and Russia who are trying to consistently undermine the support for open democratic societies and free market economies. One of the challenges for the next government is to try to contain Chinese philosophical influence in our higher education institutions.
- **Peter Van Praagh:** Canada creates internationalist individuals. Canada has the best foreign service in the world. In international organizations, there most effective senior officials and people on the ground are Canadians. And we need to figure out a way to harness that in a Canadian institution. This is something major parties should be thinking about where Canadians can add value.



S tart text here

▶ **About the Author**

Text here...

► **Canadian Global Affairs Institute**

The Canadian Global Affairs Institute focuses on the entire range of Canada's international relations in all its forms including (in partnership with the University of Calgary's School of Public Policy), trade investment and international capacity building. Successor to the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI, which was established in 2001), the Institute works to inform Canadians about the importance of having a respected and influential voice in those parts of the globe where Canada has significant interests due to trade and investment, origins of Canada's population, geographic security (and especially security of North America in conjunction with the United States), social development, or the peace and freedom of allied nations. The Institute aims to demonstrate to Canadians the importance of comprehensive foreign, defence and trade policies which both express our values and represent our interests.

The Institute was created to bridge the gap between what Canadians need to know about Canadian international activities and what they do know. Historically Canadians have tended to look abroad out of a search for markets because Canada depends heavily on foreign trade. In the modern post-Cold War world, however, global security and stability have become the bedrocks of global commerce and the free movement of people, goods and ideas across international boundaries. Canada has striven to open the world since the 1930s and was a driving factor behind the adoption of the main structures which underpin globalization such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and emerging free trade networks connecting dozens of international economies. The Canadian Global Affairs Institute recognizes Canada's contribution to a globalized world and aims to inform Canadians about Canada's role in that process and the connection between globalization and security.

In all its activities the Institute is a charitable, non-partisan, non-advocacy organization that provides a platform for a variety of viewpoints. It is supported financially by the contributions of individuals, foundations, and corporations. Conclusions or opinions expressed in Institute publications and programs are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of Institute staff, fellows, directors, advisors or any individuals or organizations that provide financial support to the Institute.