CANADIAN GLOBAL AFFAIRS INSTITUTE
INSTITUT CANADIEN DES AFFAIRES MONDIALES

After the War: What Kind of World for Canada?

by Claire Wähler

July 2022

CONFERENCE REPORT

AFTER THE WAR: WHAT KIND OF WORLD FOR CANADA?

by Claire Wählen

July 2022

CANADIAN GLOBAL AFFAIRS INSTITUTE
INSTITUT CANADIEN DES AFFAIRES MONDIALES

Prepared for the Canadian Global Affairs Institute
1800, 150 – 9th Avenue S.W., Calgary, AB T2P 3H9
www.cgai.ca

Keynote Address – Minister of National Defence, the Hon. Anita Anand

Three major points of discussion: Supporting Ukraine via supplies and NATO; NORAD modernization; and updating the defence review.

Operation UNIFIER is an example of Canada's long standing support for Ukraine, training local forces; Canada has since supplied Ukrainian forces with pistols, sniper rifles, anti-tank weapons, grenades, and military drone cameras, as several examples; Canada has further invested an additional $500 million in military aid. Canada is united with allies, including with NATO. Training is ongoing. Canada's military contribution to NATO has been increased by 460 personnel, including an artillery battery and the HMCS Halifax, as well as a 120 person contingent to Poland to assist with incoming Ukranians displaced by war.

NORAD modernization has four components, discussed in a recent meeting with US Def. Sec. Lloyd Austin: enhanced situational awareness via new warning systems; improved command and control; increased capabilities to deter and defeat, including increased infrastructure spending; more research and development. This will take up a sizable portion of the $6 billion earmarked in the 2022 Budget for defence priorities. Arctic Ministers of Defence have been invited to come to Canada this summer for an arctic security dialogue.

Defence spending and policy update: investments made since 2017's release of Strong, Secure and Engaged policy have begun bearing fruit. New arctic and offshore patrol ships are in the water. We are finalising the procurement of 88 new F-35 fighter jets and investing in 15 new surface combatants for the navy. Canada will be updating its defence policy to better reflect the current defence and security climate. SSE remains the foundation upon which a review will explore how Canada can better prepare for threats, including hypersonics and cyber attacks to the re-emergence of great power competition, bolstering both continental and international defences. Culture change is also key to development and assuring protection for Canada.

Specific requests from Ukraine: precision cameras for drones, made in Canada - turn around a contract within 3-4 days and to Ukraine within a week; "immediately affixed to drones and used in combat" - also have a contract for maintenance of cameras/drones?

Arctic offshore ships in the water; 88 new feature fight jets, F-35s important for interoperability with US.

Panel 1 – What are the surveys saying about how Canadians see the global condition and what they want out of it?

David Coletto – CEO and founding partner, Abacus Data and Advisory Council member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Frank Graves – Founder, EKOS Research Associates Inc. and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Moderator: Kathleen Monk – President, Monk + Associates and Advisory Council member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

David Coletto:

There are millions of people in this survey who have literally no idea what is happening in the world. Three things to take from this: 1- Canadians think the world is less safe than it was 10 years ago; 2- Canadians are conflicted on what kind of foreign policy they want; 3 - Not a big partisan split on foreign policy (i.e., what we want, how to get there). Data below was collected last week, including approx. 1500 Canadians, online. Several highlights include:

- Canadians mostly agree globalisation has a positive impact on Canada; are pro-free trade.
- 67% feel world is less safe than 10 years ago.
- 58% believe world is headed on the wrong track.
- Threats to Canada with consistent high percentage of concern by Canadians include climate change; Russian aggression had polled rather low months ago but charts quite high now amid the war in Ukraine.
- Politics is not driving our thoughts on foreign policy.
- No consensus on source of Canadian pride - highest is promoting democracy at 28%, lowest was military.
- Defence preparedness; half say unprepared, one third say prepared, rest show no clear understanding.
- Almost half of Canadians believe democracy is retreating and declining; 34% really don't know.
- Only 24% think a democratic decline will impact their lives.

This data really points to the fact that Canadians don't have guideposts on how to think about foreign policy on our role in the world.

Frank Graves:

Tremendous rise up for faith in government during the pandemic. Polarisation re-expressed itself post-pandemic, arrayed around pandemic issues - foreign policy and defence are among the few immune topics. Polarisation of partisanship splits the view of whether the country is going in the right or wrong direction; the traditional left/right spectrum is being replaced by an 'ordered open dimension', stark divisions on issues like immigration. Intense polarisation is so blown out of proportion on one side that it seems as if split evenly but its not; abortion is one example.

- Among those who expect a return to normal, the overwhelming outlook - 77% - is towards a more open society, rather than a more ordered one.
- Public priorities: health care is number one issue in the country, housing affordability and inflation are penultimate - important links to social class and age (under 50s).
- Climate change/climate emergency deeply polarised on whether its overblown (1:3) or a deeply threatening problem (1:6).
- Stress has been about double than the usual for the past two years - pandemic stress starts to drop but war stress spikes.
- 76% Canadians are pro-choice on abortion; not likely to have a big debate despite the actions in the US.
- On Immigration: lowest scores ever of Canadians who think there are too many immigrants.
- 1 in 3 people have someone in their life they don't speak to anymore because of pandemic politics.

Connected disinformation between anti-vax and pro-Russian believers. Deep polarisation paradoxically misses the point that we are moving towards a more open society. Disinformed people are not listening to mainstream information sources. This is an existential threat to democracy and we don't even have a basic idea of how to respond to it yet.

Panel 2 – After the War: What Kind of World for Canada?

The Hon. Peter MacKay – Senior Adviser, Deloitte and Advisory Council member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Dr. Roland Paris – Professor, University of Ottawa and Director, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs

The Hon. John Manley – Senior Business Advisor, Bennett Jones LLP. and Chair, Advisory Council, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Moderator: Dr. Meredith Lilly – Associate Professor and Simon Reisman Chair in International Economic Policy, Carleton University and Advisory Council member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

The Hon. Peter MacKay:

Our response to Putin's aggression in 2014 wasn't strong enough and goes back well beyond that, as far back as Bucharest in 2008 in discussions around NATO expansion. The training is something Canada can be proud of and still shows fruit today. Losing Crimea via annexation was a huge psychological blow to the Ukrainian people; it hardened them. They understand Putin was capable of doing what he is today in a way the West had completely missed. We saw it in Afghanistan: Canadians are today seeing the world in a personal way, the role we play in the world, how we prevent and shape future conflict. The Arctic is enormously vulnerable because of climate change and Russia (they're the neighbour we don't see and don't acknowledge enough).

Dr. Roland Paris:

What we've done well so far has been extraordinary: this level of unity and resolve was entirely unpredictable. Canadians have woken up to the changed world. This is one of those world-shaking moments: look at Germany, investing €100 billion euros in defence, breaking with decades of tradition or policy by sending lethal arms to Ukraine. Something dramatic has shifted. Putin now sees the prospect of defeat. We're operating as if we know what his red lines are but we'll only be right until we're wrong. We need to sustain this level of resolve and unity and provide Ukraine what it needs for defence, but we also need to avoid hubris. We shouldn't discuss 'weakening Russia' or 'removing Putin from office'; this isn't helpful. Russia will be weakened already: its army has been mauled, its economy will shrink by 8.5 per cent this year and inflation is expected to be 21%. NATO is more united and expanding. Russia has done more to develop Ukrainian nationhood in three months than practically any event in the history of Ukraine. But saying all of this out loud feeds Putin's narrative of NATO attacking Russia.

The Hon. John Manley:

Inflation writ large is over the top of everything. Wage inflation, supply chain disruptions, rising costs. Some of this is pandemic related, some of it is Russia related more recently. Something fundamental has changed. Finding and retaining talent, working in a world with unreliable Chinese supply chains are foundational threats. With Russia, we have threats to food security, energy, minerals. As Canadians, we see there is some room for Canada to step forward on these issues, having all of these resources to some degree. Canada should look at this in part as an opportunity but also as something of an obligation. Europe has taken courageous decisions on energy - we should not politicise energy. Food shortages are deeply concerning, in particular grains and fertiliser. Devastating famine in Africa and elsewhere as a result of the war is a real threat.

The Hon. Peter MacKay:

World order is changing at an accelerated pace and unintended consequences are everywhere. Opportunities do not mean optimistic: the world does need more food, does need more water, does need more energy. Leadership on these issues can help us to change the world, for example, to policies that are more climate smart, such as phasing out coal in India. We had a military before we had a country. We need to be considering public opinion in decision making but we need to be careful; if we keep describing our military as a brothel of white supremacists then yeah, public support for the military will go down, not that this is to say that we don't need culture change too. We can't let public opinion degenerate our institutions.

Dr. Roland Paris:

I think we are heading for a long period of confrontation with Russia, we see the drawing of clear lines in Europe. I don't see most of these sanctions going away even if there was a negotiated settlement in Ukraine, of which there is no appetite or capacity right now. Whatever happens, we need to prepare ourselves more. The resolve and unity we've seen among partners needs to be sustained and it will be challenging; US midterms will increase Republican presence in Congress, which will keep the Trump conversation going for another two more years; Putin will almost certainly be looking for cracks to exploit in these relationships.

There are lots of other issues we need to be focusing on, other crises and long-term issues; food prices, which were last this high before and causing the Arab spring. Rise of China, as a challenger to the rules based order, will be the medium - long term challenge that persists. Russia is more day-to-day, China is forever. Cold war with Russia could not be replicated with China; a much more complicated relationship, we're far more intertwined. We need to define where we are going to focus our effort; happy to see a refresh on the defence policy, needs the chapeau of 'what's Canada going to do', how will they prioritise efforts going forward.

The Hon. John Manley:

MACUSA will not last as long as NAFTA; Mexico isn't clear in direction, Trump arrested the efforts to increase Mexico's integration and undoing Bush's efforts, and Trumpism hasn't gone away. There's a realistic possibility of his return or the advance of a Trump-like candidate, so we are more alone than we have ever been in our history. We were with the UK or the US for decades but now we're solo: what are our domestic interests, advantages? We cannot continue to rely on the US - we need to do as much as we can while we can. We must be careful with creating a list of things Canada must be able to produce on its own; calls back to Trump not wanting to ship PPE to Canada; domestic supply is a mess. Afghanistan was remarkably long and couldn't be sustained; there will be a time when leaders in the West are going to say we need to accommodate Russia because it's not going anywhere. Long term, Russia will always be there, so we need to keep that in mind: consistency and endurance are not major strengths. We need to look at our own security needs, look at the Arctic - it's a matter of our crucial natural resources to which we are entitled in and under the northern waters; we aren't equipped or capable to protect those interests, because we've never perceived a risk.

The Hon. Peter MacKay:

We have a perpetual election cycle now and that has an impact on spending and infrastructure planning. The problem for national defence isn't announcing money, but to force feed it into the department to use, especially if it's not off the shelf. Regarding Ukraine, we're not going to be fighting a war with tanks on our continent anytime soon so we should send those to Ukraine; we need to get planes over there, even if it means taking them apart to ship them; cyber, insidious and below the surface; space, weaponizing space and looking at debris; all of these are areas of security where Canada can play niche roles. That's hard to break down for the public though, so there's always a challenge.

The Hon. John Manley:

We've got a lot of strengths; on a global scale we're one of the most educated populations in the world, overlaid with a wealth of natural resources; we're well positioned to prosper.

Panel 3 – Doctored Democracy: Can we keep our liberties and beat back the autocrats? How do we counter disinformation and ensure cybersecurity?

Farhaan Ladhani – Co-founder and CEO, Digital Public Square

Marcus Kolga – Founder and Director, DisinfoWatch

Peter Donolo – Vice Chair, Hill + Knowlton Strategies and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Luiza Ch. Savage – Executive Editor for Growth, POLITICO and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Moderator: Chris Waddell – Professor Emeritus, Carleton University and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Farhaan Ladhani:

Mis/Dis/Mal-information isn't new but there's a new scale, velocity and something else called augmented engagement. On scale and velocity, FDA is now saying misinformation has a negative impact on life expectancy in the US - to scale that is enormous, on velocity its expiring human lives. Thinking about it like a health issue, we have lots of institutions that systematically address health that can scale up, this will bring about thinking about novel approaches and engagement. On augmenting engagement, let's look at vaccine hesitancy because it has direct correlation to disinformation, low trust in institutions, as well as a relationship to violent extremism. This matters in terms of thinking of solutions, because disinformation comes back to clusters of beliefs and augmented engagement. Misinformation, disinformation, malinformation are not the same things. Two principled roadblocks to engaging in a meaningful way: design content that makes them think about revising concepts (this is very hard) because of negative emotions (anger); second is biased reasoning, the belief that they already know what's what - so capacity to engage is reduced.

Marcus Kolga:

Putin intends to stay in office until at least 2035, so we have a long time to deal with him and his information warfare. Pandemic saw Russian propaganda against vaccine uptake; many of us anticipated this exploitation of the crisis to further polarise us. Russian state media supported the trucker protest, aimed to legitimise the issues they push; RT promoting overthrowing the Canadian government. This was the same gamebook for January 6 protests in the United States, amplifying fringe narratives and giving a platform to radicalized elements within it to delegitimize those conspiracies they were promoting. Example of this was people actively encouraging police to 'turn over to the other side' and calling for a violent overthrow of the Canadian government.

Anti-vaccine groups were immediately available to support Russian propaganda during the first hours of the Ukraine incursion, pushing unvarnished posts about denazification within the first few hours. They post it among their usual content of anti-vaccination tweets and normalise it. There's a growing recognition of the threats this poses to us as sovereign nations. Canada should go on the offensive against authoritarian regimes, in Russ/China, and in other languages.

Luiza Ch. Savage:

Needed to make an appealing product - Ottawa Playbook, POLITICO - what makes it successful is the touching of a happy place in your brain, makes you feel smart, helpful, as part of a community. People are willing to accept some information they might otherwise not because it is put forward by their community. In terms of media product, there's supply and demand: on supply, whether it's coming from Russia, basement dwellers, activists or whatever there are three main ways to see change: 1 - government regulation (EU trying this); 2 - industry norms, such as on social media platforms on certain topics like child pornography; 3 - stakeholder capitalism, are corps there for shareholders? Or some greater cause for being? Demand side: we see this breakdown of trust in institutions, social cohesion. Every single institution in a democracy can no longer take for granted that the public trusts it, respects its authority. Whether you're media, public health, university, govt department - proactive measures to re-establish and nurture the trust with the public is necessary. Engaged, transparent, accountable.

Peter Donolo:

Historic perspective that the house isn't as on fire as we tend to hear; there's a lot of smoke and problems but this isn't the end of the world. Ukraine isn't the end of the golden age, ignoring the history of proxy wars, from ravaging South America and Africa to Vietnam and the Middle East being destabilised: we forget that stuff. Just like we forget disinformation isn't new, we've just amped it up to eleven. Turbocharging misinformation is at a spike but not a novelty. Google and Facebook vacuum up 80-90% of ad revenue in Canada, which starves real news media from the ad revenue they need to support newsrooms. The government has legislation to try and rebalance this; in terms of EU approach vs. Canada, just look at the algorithms to see how this is being used/abused, with people claiming to be neutral sources of information but that use algorithms to find audiences and amp up their aggression. Public opinion support is only so valuable as you remember that the public doesn't know much.

Farhaan Ladhani:

The stereotypes of who is misinformed is itself wrong, it's more broad than most people would think and impacts more people than you're envisioning - and it happens at both ends of the spectrum, bubbles need to be popped.

Marcus Kolga:

It's hard to argue with anyone who thinks the world is flat - they live in an alternative universe with different facts. Russian efforts polarize by pulling at both extremes, left and right, not just focusing on one side.

Luiza Ch. Savage:

By lumping "those people" who fall prey to disinformation into a bucket, we fall into the danger of making people 'other' and adding to the polarisation.

Peter Donolo:

Civics education needs an update; how we judge information on the internet is a different set of tools; needs to be adapted, changed - needs to make kids critical consumers of the internet.

Panel 4 – New Alliances, New Institutions? How do we make rules-based multilateralism work for democracies?

The Rt. Hon. Joe Clark – former Prime Minister of Canada,

Meredith Preston McGhie – Secretary General, Global Centre for Pluralism

The Hon. Bob Rae – Canadian Ambassador and Permanent Representative, United Nations

Moderator: Maureen Boyd – Chair, Parliamentary Centre and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

The Rt. Hon. Joe Clark:

Multilateralism has to become more effective. We've been a leader historically but we've let that slip in the face of trade and security. Serious multilateralism is an urgent international requirement and a genuine Canadian capacity - more so than that of almost any other nation. We are domestically and historically a multilateral nation. Our federation is inherently multilateralist. When we try, we agree on inclusive and respective common ground. We're increasingly multicultural, and also cohesive. Our history is as a colony, not as a colonist. We were highly creative multilateralists - from our diplomats work on multilateral treaties including in developing the law of the sea, to CETA's incredible role in international development, even to Lloyd

Axeworthy's successful initiatives on convening power to drive the ICC and responsibility to protect. World-wide policy preoccupation with trade policy and security had nudged our focus for multilateralism aside but it is more relevant today than it has been in a long time. Real engagement can make a real difference. This was once our signature for a very good reason and it needs to be again.

Meredith Preston McGhie:

One of the things we're up against is populist rhetoric and it has the threat of sounding more simple than it is - it's hard to get into the nuance and really achieve change. We need to be more muscular in how we approach pluralism, multilateralism - not be afraid but strategic and lean in. More inclusive alliance of counties we could be working with. The fact that we're struggling with reconciliation makes us a more authentic partner with nations and partners, because we're putting the work in. We could be this trusted partner who marshals this consensus going forward.

The Hon. Bob Rae:

History doesn't repeat itself but sometimes it stutters - we have to be aware of the fact that the fate of the League of Nations is not impossible for the United Nations as we see it now, but the UN itself has become a very complex thing. It has many institutions, beyond the courts, security, accountability, development, etc. On Ukraine: the UN has responded incredibly effectively to humanitarian crises, it has not reacted well to the political issue, because of the Security Council. Often as the case is the member states interested in doing something have other ways to get together and achieve change - the UN is not the only multilateral institution. Wherever there's a void in whatever we do, whether it's peacekeeping or whatever, China will step in. Russians are really good at tearing things down, breaking things up, ending things. So when we discuss engagement, it's a constantly moving kaleidoscope, it's a question of how effectively we can do it; more persistent, patient and present than alternatives or else we lose out. Thinking about alliances and institutions in new ways; what are the range of countries that have something in common with us; the like minded is not a static thing, it varies; we have to be nimble in building these relationships because there are no perfect matches. You have to have capable, assured diplomacy - figuring out how to maintain a level of engagement and ability to talk and engage, not because they could change their minds but because you need to know what's on your enemy's mind. Don't close embassies, don't end talks - you need to keep dialogue open. I fear that we think there are easy wins, low-hanging fruit but we're a G7 nation, we have no reason not to have a good diplomatic representation.

The Rt. Hon. Joe Clark

I don't want to give up on our institutions but we have a capacity for engagement that allows us to draw together people from diverse poles to create consensus is an indication of the kinds of things Canada can do if we look forward; we don't get a lot of credit for this but there was a need and we have a capacity to lead and draw others in. Should we be selective in doing these sorts of engagements? Yes but we really should keep the net wide. I think this is on the edge of being a real obligation for Canada.

Meredith Preston McGhie:

We need to learn really clear eyed lessons on why institutions are not doing what we want them to do; for example ICC's approaches have not brought us to where we need to be, from a lack of accountability for example. An anti-corruption court will face a lot of the same problems that we are not addressing with the ICC.

The Hon. Bob Rae:

Institutions have a better sense of corrupt money, where it is, etc. Do we need a new institution to look at corrupt money? Maybe. Canada is one vice-president on Assembly of State Parties to the ICC - it's still a newish institution and there are a lot of abstaining countries to ICC Rome Treaty; we've created an architecture that is neither complete nor perfect but is ongoing. I do think Liberal democracy is under threat; our generally common sense arguments are not accepted globally; we need to understand the bad actors better. NATO has become almost exclusively a military alliance.

The Rt. Hon. Joe Clark:

Part of our capacity is to coalesce others who are not as democratic as we are, some of it is simple fraternity like Francophonie, Commonwealth, etc. We have to be a lowercase a activist country with a role of coalition building with a purpose; not a lot of countries are good at it but we have a good track record, it should be a central aspect of our approach; we tend to get preoccupied by the headline issues of the day but we do our best work on the issues not in the news.

Meredith Preston McGhie:

One of the things where Canada excels abroad is not exporting a form of democracy but working with people at different levels of democracy to explore the issues and fundamentals; education is key for promotion of democracy, resisting autocracy, etc. in the forms of civics, critical thinking, facilitating dialogue in schools, become more positively disposed towards democracy.

The Hon. Bob Rae:

I think we could do a better job of really championing the institutions that have built up in the country over the few years who do a lot with the little they have; a lot of partners like Norway and Sweden who pump a lot of money into their orgs. Alternatively in the US the libertarians do a lot of the same. Republicans and Democrats don't agree on very much but they do agree on properly funding institutions.

Panel 5 – Why can't we get our natural resources to market? How can we get it done?

Claire Citeau – Executive Director, Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Fawn Jackson – Director of Government and International Relations, Canadian Cattlemen's Association and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Susannah Pierce – President and Country Chair and General Manager Renewables and Energy Solutions, Shell Canada and Advisory Council Member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Dr. Janice MacKinnon – Fellow, Royal Society of Canada and Advisory Council Member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Moderator: Jeffrey Simpson – Award-winning writer and Advisory Council member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Claire Citeau:

Non-trade barriers is the one issue companies bring up consistently - it used to be getting products to market, now it's 'now what?' Example: Mandatory Country of Origin Labelling, which discriminates against Durum Wheat. Canada grain used to be a major part of Italian pasta but the mandatory country of origin labelling, which also runs counter to EU law, is unfairly discriminating against Canada. This started when CETA was implemented and was renewed at the start of covid.

Susannah Pierce:

For us it's regulatory uncertainty. Goal posts keep moving. Rules change as you go and there isn't a lot of clarity for making investments. Even against the decarbonization of the energy system, this is the number one problem that doesn't get a lot of attention from policy makers or regulators across the country. The EU has laid out new and clear conditions for one year approvals that are quite good. The problem is both the complexity of large projects and a lack of clarity on the steps;

there's front end loading of societal and Indigenous support right up front, which is not itself a bad thing. We've had successful projects that met with local and Indigenous leaders based on a well selected site and we came together to make it work, but that isn't always the case despite best efforts. The challenge is that there's still a lot of discretion on what is considered sufficient. There also isn't enough by way of timestamps and clarity on consistency. Nothing stops a legal challenge at any point but not all stand. They aren't all very long challenges, but it varies so much.

Fawn Jackson:

The challenge for us is what are the factors we could control within Canada; combination of labour and investment is 'recognition' of what the industry can supply for environment, trade, global food security and how do we make sure we have the tools in place to do that? Market access might not be something we have perfect control of and we have less control now than we had ten years ago and it will only get bumpier ahead but let's make sure we have the people to work on farms, in the market access secretariat, the investment in risk management projects so that if something happens in global markets or as a result of climate change that we are ready. Government free trade agreements have allowed us to increase our value from last year almost 40% over the previous year, and we've been hitting records over the past few years. I would add we can't lose sight of driving that forward, because our trade report has some exciting numbers like markets in South Korea are 300% up, while others are down 100% - for example, we are no longer shipping to the UK, to China anymore, because of these market barriers that come in place - so we must keep an eye on diversification, both with usual suspects and long time allies.

Claire Citeau:

Global agrifood trade has allowed us to make the most of a number of free trade agreements and as a result global agrifood trade has tripled. But if you look at the non-tariff barriers, they have also tripled over the past 20 years. Look at the number of notifications of technical barriers to trade, SPS measures at the WTO. There's a number and there's a cost that comes with it. In general the cost of a nontariff barrier is equivalent to 20-30 percent when shipping to Asia, it can increase to 40% when shipping to Europe. So we have in a way replaced tariffs, eliminated, with non-tariff barriers. The importance we place on food safety, preparation, etc. means a greater number with more complex regulatory requirements are put on food products we trade. Number of regulatory requirements, i.e. sanitary, have gone through the roof - often they are intended to be legitimate in protecting the animal health in the country, but the second category of non-tariff barriers that we experience are the results of domestic pressures, motivated by several political groups in different countries but have no basis in science. Those come up on very short notice and are very trade distorting.

Dr. Janice MacKinnon:

Our principal problem with getting our resources to market is federal regulations without collaboration with the provinces that have control over resources, which has two effects: the sheer number of them (process, red tape, screening). We have a cumbersome, bureaucratic process that takes too long - timeliness is huge. Investors in Canada have walked away from projects because they can't wait any longer or have another court case; example of BC with liquified natural gas, which is close to the Pacific, had investors lined up, year after year the process went on and investors left; Americans and Australians have taken those markets we were courting. Secondly the federal government comes in with reduction numbers that aren't developed with industry or the province (ie. Alberta) instead of working together to determine a realistic target and presenting it to the province, Ottawa ships numbers without context.

Fawn Jackson:

There are certainly a lot of regulations. Food security is an area where Canada is a superpower, as one of only a few countries that are a global net food exporter. Twelve percent of the world's traded calories come from the Black Sea region and last year for the first time we saw a significant increase in food insecurity. Beef additives will cut methane emissions by like 70-90% and Europe okayed it but genetically modified food is always a question; genetically modified food is the only way we can keep up with global food trajectories. It's a challenge because in comparison to 2018, we will need to increase our food production in 2050 by 56%. Developing nations are especially impacted in that they have lower tech uptake, climate change high impacts, etc. Global food prices are the highest they've ever been as of February.

Susannah Pierce:

Regulatory certainty makes it hard to sell Canada to Shell Intl. Number one question we get is 'how certain are you that carbon pricing will persist?' As a global country we provide about 5% of the world's energy, ish. Cost certainty is a Canadian problem insofar as experiences of labour productivity, labour availability, cost certainty, are our major problems. Frankly in Canada we don't have a good reputation for delivering projects on time and on budget, a lot to do with the human capital issue. A third issue is the scale of our market; Canada is a great country for export projects, which is why LNG is so attractive for us - especially now.

Claire Citeau:

We don't have one country that we don't have SPF issues with. It's constant, growing and increasing well over 400 now. Covid made it worse, the war in Ukraine makes it worse also; price of fuel impacts costs, its top of mind right now with uncertainty. Canada can help fill the gap caused by the war in Ukraine, weather/labour/investment dependent. At best, it could be a 6-10% increase to address the grain gap caused by Russia.

Dr. Janice MacKinnon:

An aspect of the role of Indigenous people in resource development that is important is the kinds of jobs development makes. One of the reasons Canada has not seen a hollowing out of the middle class is because of well paid, good benefit resource jobs in rural and remote parts of Canada with few other opportunities, with Indigenous people benefiting largely. Points to minority of Indigenous activists using Duty to Consult to try and kill projects in court projects - government needs to define it better, protect against abuses, support legitimate concerns.

Panel 6 – Can Canada make a difference? Or do we just take what comes?

Kerry Buck – retired career diplomat and Senior Fellow, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa

Peter van Praagh – Founding President, Halifax International Security Forum

Ben Rowswell – President and Research Director, Canadian International Council

Moderator: Richard Fadden – former National Security Advisor to the Prime Minister and Advisory Council member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Ben Rowswell:

Canada can make a difference - we've had it very, very good. High prosperity and security, not an accident that the international order reflects our interests because we made meaningful contributions to shaping it. In the 1930's we had none of the attributes that informed our influence in the 40s: leadership, public support, resources, community of nations that's larger than ourselves. The 1930's had poor foreign policy leadership in the government; very low public opinion of foreign engagement remembering the losses of war time; no resources in the aftermath of the great recession; our identity group was the British Empire - not fun times. We radically changed the identity group we belonged to - the creation of NATO challenged our concept of who

we were, led to the development of this idea of the West, wherein we partnered with our former enemies to create a new identity that has lasted us to date.

Move to today: up to the audience to decide for themselves if this government is serious about foreign policy. Significant change in everyday citizen support for Canadian activity in foreign policy, not in terms of wanting 'more Canada' but in seeing the world is in need and asking what is our government doing? In terms of resources we are at historically low levels of investment which will bite us in the ass. Lastly identity group: the West has been successful and united in the face of the Ukraine war but this is a conflict about the international rule globally so this could really challenge the international rules-based order, meaning it will likely be reimagined - will not be totally inclusive what with China and Russia in the world.

Kerry Buck:

Should Canada lead is an odd question and I blame Lester Pearson and his Nobel Peace Prize. Since Suez, we've looked for where we should lead but it's an ungrounded question. We can rely on the US umbrella, which goes beyond security. As such foreign policy has been downgraded to a hobby and it's growing thin so there's some cognitive dissonance. The end result has been an underdevelopment in the people, policies and assets that we need. Light motif of outraged umbrage. Foreign policy initiatives have been largely reactive and operational responses to crises - it's good to take in more refugees but it's not something that contributes to the maintenance of the rules based international order or build the international system that gives us a seat, a voice and a veto. It's transactional and largely bilateral. We have a legacy that resonates internationally, we have good people and have had some good ideas but not many. We can go back to leading.

Disagree that we have no Canadian foreign policy - we just don't write it down. We have not had a comprehensive, articulated foreign policy in 17 years. Give us a foreign policy review. Past reviews have not changed much, had little impact, were not comprehensive, etc. There's a case for a review now though: we've been engaging in tactics when we need a strategy. We live in a radically changed international environment: not just Ukraine but the pandemic, China, all countries turning inward on every front. Any review has to start with a hard analysis of our interests - most have started with values but it's a profoundly false distinction between the two, go hard on both and they become the same thing. Strong Secure and Engaged was very well done. We need a more bloodthirsty focused analysis of what we contribute and when, gap analysis and division of labour. My list of priorities, geography aside: multilateralism as an end of itself, climate, arctic, digital/cyber, civilian/military, trade diversification, democratic resilience. The point is to come up with a list and then deploy our people and assets. How do we lead? Sometimes it's the Pearsonian style - he knew the people, the UNGA, had style and he could leverage that well. Leading from the side is the other way to go - diplomacy is the art of letting others have your way. We need to invest and lead from the side. Professional diplomacy really matters.

Peter van Praagh:

Been bringing democracies together for 15 years for the Halifax Security Forum and people ask how do you do it without China? Or Russia? He replies, how can you have one with them? Now more than ever democracies working together is important. The urgency the world is calling for isn't enough; the world has changed. We're on the same level of 9/11, Pearl Harbour; there has been an attack on us and how we live in the world. It's not the same as an attack somewhere else in the world, this is a member of the UNSC no longer being a responsible actor and this is the most significant international event in our day. The UNSC is finished. Where is the security? Victory in Ukraine can only be victory, because of what's at stake. Disinformation, Trump, all the threats. The world needs to work together to make sure Putin doesn't succeed in Ukraine; everything else is an abstraction. China is also part of our agenda because they're part of the problem. Everything is at stake if Putin succeeds at all.

Ben Rowswell:

I believe there is a moment of accountability coming because there are more failures than successes coming in world affairs, wherein a government can fall. I suspect a moment like that is coming for either this or the next government. A major foreign policy failure will be what spurs the needed change - it will be a reckoning.

Kerry Buck:

Our foreign policy has been largely reactive for decades but we've been ahead of the curve on Ukraine, not just security with training but building their governance, media, etc. We can't take credit but we can take pride in contributing. Economic security, defence security. So if you take that positive lesson learned in, you can come very quickly to the determination that a whole of government approach is needed. Take the positive examples and determine you need a framework to get results that make sense.

Peter van Praagh:

We need to tap on our strengths - we had success in Ukraine because there is a large diaspora of Ukranians in Canada. It's one of our strengths that we have large populations from around the world in our nation. The West is a beautiful idea whose time has come. There are western countries that really believe that the West is a thing - it's not a thing. Democracy is a thing, human rights are a thing. Canada can, because of our body politik, bring the democracies that aren't on board with Ukraine to heel. Whenever anything has happened in the world, we'd wait to see what the US did and then react to their reaction instead of to the thing itself. Not just Trump but the failure in Iraq, disappointment in Obama - I do think Canada should have its own thoughts instead

of watching and waiting to see what the US does. Spend time and resources, sending Ministers and PMs to places to build out relationships. It can't just be lipservice and ideas - there needs to be real resources.

Kerry Buck:

Abroad: define your interests and then show up. Our activity in Asia is led by FOMO, including AUKUS… but we can't articulate why we want that. We need to articulate and show up. At home: international literacy has been tanking, a trend in the public service as a whole, moving away from knowledge and moving toward general managerial competence. They don't have networks, they don't have decades of experience; we're paying the price for that lack of knowledge now. There's less advice where you want to see a bigger picture for the government, fewer ideas being shared, no policy rich conversation. It hits us on the foreign policy front more than most.

Ben Rowswell:

On hard power/soft power, we need both. They feed each other. On resources, we've done well with the peace dividend but it's over, it has to be over. The only reason we've made the investments of the 40-50s last is because we've enjoyed relative peace. We won't hit the 9% GDP for military funding of yesteryear but we can't stay where we are either.

Peter van Praagh:

We haven't convinced ourselves that we can have our own sovereign foreign policy, we think we are feeding into UK/US policy. It's time for Canada to play in the world, show up, compete and contribute.

Panel 7 – Canada and the US: How do we make it work better?

Gary Doer – Senior Advisor, Dentons LLP. and Advisory Council Member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

David MacNaughton – Canadian President, Palantir Technologies and Advisory Council Member, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

The Hon. Frank MacKenna – executive, TD Bank Group, member, TD Securities

John Parisella – Senior Advisor, Business Outreach, NATIONAL and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Moderator Sarah Goldfeder – Government Relations expert, General Motors and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

David MacNaughton:

For many Canadians the Trump years were frightening and unpredictable and now we get this new guy Joe Biden who will fix everything but not so much. Goes back to Obama; he was interested in legacy issues in his last year in office and that did not mean lumber, but rather TPP. He didn't want any extraneous issues which could push fence sitters away: softwood would do that. Most of Canada's interests were trade, the US mostly had nothing to do with Canada at all. On the high interest issues, the US didn't really care to prioritize Canadian opinions. The relationship now is as close as and as difficult as it has ever been.

Gary Doer:

You can usually fix a lot of things before it hits the leader's desk if you have a good relationship with your ambassador partner. Sometimes as ambassador, you advocate for your country and sometimes you're convincing your country when there's no value gained. The conditions on which people are governing are more important than the partisan issues. Both Conservatives and Democrats were addressing the economic struggles [of the Harper/Obama era]. Bailouts were happening, people were losing value on their property and everyone was angry - being a Canadian ambassador, I could boast about Canadian institutions which protected people. It clouded issues we were working on but we had successes. Worked on climate discussions. A lot of anger goes into US presidential elections, both for Dems under Bernie and Reps under Trump.

The Hon. Frank MacKenna:

We didn't join Iraq and Obama was fair about it but Rumsfeld was frigid, Dick Cheney was frosty. Things improved over time by focusing on mutual interests, consistency. Public diplomacy was hugely effective at this time in showcasing Canada's role in Afghanistan. Also the original free trade agreement with the US was not done out of love but in interest in the energy security relationship. F-35's were one of the biggest purchases we've ever made but little attention was paid to it. Modernization and digitalization of NORAD is one where we have to be in lockstep, hypersonic missiles, arctic, etc. all need to be in tandem. We can characterise the relationship in terms of mutually advantageous gains. NYT commented that Canada provides a lot of the goods that will see absences in light of Russian war on Ukraine, it would be countries like Canada who stand up to fill those gaps from Russia and Ukraine exports.

John Parisella:

In the first six or seven months of the Biden administration the polls were on his side; vaccine numbers were up, passed a bill for a relief package; things turned after Afghanistan. Inflation went up, poll numbers went down. Traditionally first term presidents face something of a referendum and lose seats but there's definitely a movement towards losing the House and maybe the Senate in coming months. Judge Alito's draft killing Roe. v Wade could have a very polarising impact on voter turnout and results; inflation and the economy are still considered bigger issues still but there are likely to be impacts at the ballot box. Biden has gotten good points for his successful management of partners over Ukraine. He will likely pass his massive spending bill shortly. Softwood, the border, are all still issues but we work on them as a team.

Gary Doer:

I think it's really wrong that we're discussing climate and energy as two polarized opposites. I believe we should have a four-point plan on climate and energy on efficiency, renewables, best practices and security. It's insane we have a situation where the US goes to Venezuela for oil because it's fast/cheap when Canada can do it better but we're not technically doing it quickly. [Parisella and Mackenna concur]

The Hon. Frank MacKenna:

We need to be nimble in reacting to American division. This is a very fractured country. This is the largest commercial relationship in the world. Diplomats need to be very agile, including with interest groups. Who will be more protectionist, Democrats or Republicans?

David MacNaughton:

I was astounded by the level of expertise when dealing with trade policy so despite the move to generalists, we have had some really qualified diplomats. I think a recession is coming; will it be deep and long or a shallow recession? Protectionism is coming. I think we have a significant role coming in our hemisphere to help handle China and Russia.

Panel 8 – Canada and the Indo-Pacific: We want to be a player so what do we have to do? And what do we want?

Jonathan Fried – Senior Advisor, Bennett Jones and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Trevor Kennedy – Vice President, Trade and International Policy, Business Council of Canada

VAdm (ret'd) Darren Hawco – Executive Advisor, Deloitte and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

Moderator: Deanna Horton – Senior Fellow, Munk School of Global Affairs and Fellow, Canadian Global Affairs Institute

VAdm (ret'd) Darren Hawco:

In terms of defence and military issues in the region, I think there's competing interests; spending and capability trajectory for the region will be notable and will set conditions for potential conflict; and finally potential flashpoints. Some considerations: the South China seas, Chinese passports (because of Taiwan), Taiwan's independence, Russia/Japanese islands disputes, Korean war, and India/Pakistan tensions. From a military capability point of view, investment in the region is notable. We're used to hearing 2% but only Japan doesn't have that trajectory, but they're making signals for change, otherwise mostly everyone is investing the same. China of course is making extraordinary investments, towards a world class military by 2049 'to defeat a strong adversary' is a clear indicator of what's to come. The significant number of attack submarines China and others in the region present destabilizing investments. Chinese anti-satellite tests, development of super/hyper sonic weapon systems are examples of a military developing capabilities for regional conflict and for what purpose. And then there's the nuclear tripolar world we will find ourselves living in as China invests in scores of new nuclear silos and increases its nuclear abilities.

Jonathan Fried:

In Min. Joly's remarks to the region recently she lays out quite explicitly her thinking on Canada's approach to the Indo-Pacific. We've heard throughout the day about combining values and interests: this is a region with so many countries at so many levels of development with so much

inequality both within and between countries. We have a values based interest in promoting sustainable development in this region. That makes them potentially more stable and reliable partners for us in economic terms; it gives us potentially better customers in the region. We're told to expect by the end of the decade that 60 percent of the world's middle class will be in the Indo-Pacific - that matters. Secondly, however inadequate it may be, Canada has been, is and will continue to be present in the Indo-Pacific. We're a founding member of APEC and CPTPP. So we're building on a not terrible track record. Relationships and presence matters at senior levels, which must be sustained and meaningful as opposed to case-by-case needs. Going back to Joly's remarks, things have to change both qualitatively and quantitatively. Qualitatively in terms of the sustainable engagement; quantitatively in terms of better allocation of bodies, development assistance monies, etc. to contribute to the region's development, and working with the diaspora populations here. Our favourite partners vary; on climate change it might be different than who we might turn to on security intelligence, and vice versa. Trade and investment has several dynamics to consider, including TPP, Canada-ASEAN, Canada - Indonesia bilateral discussions. To be clear, Canada's policy includes China.

Trevor Kennedy:

Canada is an Indo-Pacific country so it's important that we have a serious plan to engage with the region. We're not starting from scratch, we have previously stated initiatives and trade agreements. Quite a lot of active trade policy is underway which is positive. We also don't want to miss out on emerging frameworks - the regional economic comprehensive partnership currently does not include Canada but the economic projections show there is a cost for not including Canada in that framework, trade diversion effect is something like $800 million. There's also the US-Indo-Pacific economic framework which we're also not a part of. Japan and South Korea are very important partners for Canada; emerging markets that we should do more with, including Indonesia in particular; India is also important to keep in mind. On China and risk analysis, we don't expect companies to leave anymore; we expect there to be an 'and', so which markets to go to in addition and there again India is an important market. Lots of competition in these markets for example from the UK and Australia.

VAdm (ret'd) Darren Hawco:

Canada taking on leadership of deputy commander of the Korean peninsula UN force was good. The participation of Canadian persons of leadership, capacities and capabilities is enormously valuable politically for Washington. The recognition of the risks for those sorts of activities, that kind of support to a rules based international order which is recognized in our defence policy as one of the cornerstones of our international interests base. The ability and willingness to do those kinds of things is very significant and is where Canada should be looking to add value. It's not something the US can't itself do but the US can't be someone else; having like-minded nations

putting themselves forward for these initiatives represents a real and meaningful opportunity to demonstrate value.

Jonathan Fried:

Let me note that this region has never been characterised by a unified set of intergovernmental institutions. With Europe there's EU+NATO but in Asia/Southeast Asia/Central Asia it's a patchwork of differing forums with overlapping membership. Shanghai, ASEAN, ASEAN+, so there's no cohesion. With the Quad, let's watch because with India's stance on Russia there's troubles. Canada's view isn't 'oh no, we need to catch up and join' but rather look at their agenda and see where we can compliment, reinforce. Critical materials and minerals were cited and thus with the region, we can see areas for collectively lowering our dependence. Belt and Road is not the best recipe for sustainable development: China's practices have imposed greater debt, some corruption, and other problems. In the G7 we've collectively committed to Build Back Better in the region; also patchwork, not going to be a single G7 fund but plans to collaborate and pool resources.

Trevor Kennedy:

There are a lot of Indo-Pacific strategies in the world now; the EU's is the only one that lists Canada as a partner and part of the region. US, Australia, Japanese strategies do not consider Canada a part of the Indo-Pacific and there's obviously a concern there because we are part of the region but our partners don't think of us as such. Releasing a strategy would help, making it clear that Canada does care for the region, have plans for the region and has resources for the region. This links directly to our US policy in the sense that there's bipartisan agreement that China is a problem in the US even to different degrees; in either case, Canada doesn't want to duplicate a US-China strategy but rather to make our own, one with eyes wide open. But we need the US to keep us in mind as they develop their strategy in the region.

Jonathan Fried:

Russia Ukraine war obviously has major ripple effects: Russia is a member of APEC. China has been trying to walk a very fine needle, wanting to protect Western customers but are otherwise happy with disruption and staying onside with Russia. They may see some opportunities with the exit of some 500 western firms from Russia right now. We'll see how Biden frames things with ASEAN because to some extent America might want to turn up the toughness in holding China back from tilting more towards Russian sympathies. It's a very fluid situation now. On education, Canada's international education strategy recognizes the value of bringing in talented foreign students and right now boasts more Vietnamese students in Canada than those from France but we don't do a good job of sending students out to these foreign regions. It could start earlier with

better foreign language proficiency in secondary school and before. It needs to be better valued in the public service.

VAdm (ret'd) Darren Hawco:

One needs to see a more substantively enforced public service from which we can deploy foreign service officers to regions and problems - without the many hands it will not be light work and we will not be nimble. We need to reinvest in this first. We need an articulation of objection from officials in the region with a better sense of time and scale. One of the factors which has challenged a modern foreign policy review is our approach to situationally specific policies of the day or period; the complexities of that make it hard to be coherent. We need to make hard choices for priorities.

Trevor Kennedy:

On the private sector side, we hear this all the time that we need to develop talent and improve on the long-term prospects. During this pandemic, we've lost two or three years worth of students opportunities to study in Asia. We risk falling behind even further unless we address this gap, make up lost ground, but it's a real challenge.

About the Author

*Claire Wähle*n *is a researcher and analyst working on NATO and deterrence policy, pursuing her master's with King's College London. She was formerly a Program Director with the NATO Association of Canada, and has worked with the United Nations in Rwanda, Project Ploughshares and as a national security reporter with* iPolitics.

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, or collaborate with, the Institute.