



2019 TRUDEAU REPORT CARD

C+

CFPJ

iAffairs 

 **NPSIA**

The Norman Paterson School
of International Affairs

Carleton University

CONTENTS

2019 REPORT CARD	03
PAST REPORT CARDS	04
INTRODUCTION	05
EVALUTATION CRITERIA	07
DIPLOMACY	08
DEFENCE	19
SECURITY	25
TRADE	33
ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE	38
DEVELOPMENT	45
IMMIGRATION & REFUGEES	53
CONTRIBUTORS	58
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	59
LIST OF ACRONYMS	60
CONTACT	61

2019 REPORT CARD

C+	FINAL GRADE
C-	DIPLOMACY
C+	DEFENCE
B	SECURITY
C+	TRADE
B-	ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE
B-	DEVELOPMENT
B-	IMMIGRATION & REFUGEES

PAST REPORT CARDS

	2016	2017	2018
FINAL GRADES	B ₋	B ₋	B ₋
DIPLOMACY	B ₋	B ₋	B/B ₋
DEFENCE	B	C	C
SECURITY	B ₋	B ₊	B ₋
TRADE	B ₊	B ₊	B ₋
ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE	B ₊	B ₋	B ₊
DEVELOPMENT	A ₋	B	C
IMMIGRATION & REFUGEES	B ₊	B ₊	A ₋

INTRODUCTION

Canada's more aggressive and conservative diplomacy is best exemplified by Chrystia Freeland's appointment as Foreign Minister. Under her tutelage Canada's foreign policy no longer conveys a clear commitment to multilateralism nor for that matter quiet, constructive diplomacy. It has become instead a series of ad hoc efforts to publicly isolate, chastise and bandwagon against those states caught up in America's geopolitical struggles. In many ways, Canada is more in lock step with Trump's security agenda than the Liberal government would like voters to believe.

Even so and despite a major defence review, the Trudeau government has shown a unwillingness to make Canadian defence a priority. Canada's air force is aging and the navy faces challenges on a number of fronts. Indeed on the defence file the biggest issue has been disciplining whistle-blowing Admiral Mark Norman who sounded the alarm over Liberal political interference within the procurement process. While some might consider the Liberal's approach to peacekeeping as innovative the government has yet to organize its priorities to ensure that its defence promises are kept.

If top bureaucrat Michael Wernick's alarmist comments are taken at face value, Canada is less secure today than it was four years ago. The world has fundamentally changed and the Liberals find themselves adrift without a plan for steering us to safety. While the government has found small victories in bringing light to clandestine activity, reforming our intelligence community, and preparing for the future of cyber security, the Liberals have failed the larger tests. Our Arctic remains unattended to, foreign fighters are returning home without consequence, and now we find ourselves in the middle of a geopolitical battle between China and the United States with no exit strategy.

While the government managed to avoid fumbling the three trade agreements it inherited, the process was certainly messy. The USMCA took the spotlight, supplying year-long high drama and reflecting ill-considered strategies. Throughout this process, the government's actions for the most part fuelled the fires of the unpredictable

American administration, leading to harmful implications on the Canadian economy which could have been avoided. Additionally, with the end of Trudeau's term approaching, and the unfolding corruption affairs, the government is yet to live up to its rhetoric on progressiveness and diversification.

With respect to foreign aid, the Trudeau government considers itself progressive. Yet, despite its ambitious goals, the feminist international assistance policy (FIAP) remains underfunded without clearly identified priorities. In year over year comparisons, the launching of FIAP suggests that the Trudeau government is delivering more of the same, just under a new title and brand. This marketing ploy may work to galvanize Trudeau's domestic base but it will not deliver the real change that the Trudeau government promised.

The heady days of the Paris Climate Agreement where Trudeau hoped to become a global leader are long gone, suggesting a reversal of fortune on the environment and climate change files. His government has purchased a pipeline, faces provincial resistance to implementation of a nation-wide carbon tax and has learned the hard way that reconciling the environment and the economy is a tall order. In trying to appease everyone, prioritizing short term gains may eclipse the long term change this government promised.

On immigration and refugees, ongoing controversy generated from recurring irregular border crossings reflects the government's failure to disarm public fear and maintain public confidence in the immigration system. These weaknesses in public policy stand in contrast to the Liberal's performance on the global stage where the government continues to position itself as a vocal proponent of a revamped global refugee regime.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The grades assigned for the Report Card serve as an assessment of the Trudeau government's foreign policy performance. While it is largely based on the year since the last Report Card, there will certainly be a degree of overlap with previous Report Cards as the country heads into an election. We have provided letter grades for the following areas: diplomacy, defence, security, trade, environment and climate change, development and immigration and refugees. Each category is weighted equally to generate the final grade, which serves as an average of our seven categories. In assigning grades for each section, three factors were considered, with their respective weighting in brackets:

Rhetoric vs. Reality (30%): By identifying key promises made during the 2015 campaign, outlined in ministerial mandate letters and in the two years since their election, the grading process evaluates the degree to which the government has made progress on these commitments.

Overall Performance (60%): The grade reflects an evaluation from our policy experts on the effectiveness of the government's policies, actions and commitments in each area.

Openness, Transparency and Accountability (10%): The Trudeau government campaigned heavily on distinguishing itself from the previous government in this regard. The grade assigned considers the degree to which the government's actions have reflected this rhetoric.

The objective of the Report Card is to engage the public in the discussion of Canadian foreign policy. Despite improving in some areas and regressing in others, this year's grade of C+ is lower than last year's. We will leave it to our readers to discuss whether or not this evaluation is justified.

DIPLMACY

C-

MAKING A DIFFERENCE IN THE WORLD?

Today, Canadian voters are increasingly skeptical of Justin Trudeau's claim that he and his party have brought Canada back, let alone are making a difference. Indeed, the "liberal values" of which Justin Trudeau drew on to differentiate his party from Stephen Harper's Conservatives have now been all but displaced by a more hardnosed conservative agenda that continues on where Stephen Harper left off.

The 2015 election platform, upon which the Liberals staked their political future drew from a number of well-worn and clichéd maxims defining Canada's place in the world: its commitment to multilateralism, its respect for human rights, its long-standing support for the rule of law and its position in the world as a middle power with influence and pride of place.

Yet, in power, many of these left-of-centre "values" have been abandoned or severely watered down. Moves intended to appeal to right-of-centre voters include increased security spending, troop contributions to NATO, taking on Russia, Iran and Venezuela and the pursuit of free trade deals, especially the single-minded focus on renegotiating NAFTA.

DIPLOMACY

THE NEW DIPLOMACY

Canada's aggressive and conservative diplomacy is best exemplified by Chrystia Freeland's appointment as Foreign Minister. Under her tutelage Canada's foreign policy no longer conveys a clear commitment to multilateralism, nor for that matter quiet constructive diplomacy. It has become instead a series of ad hoc efforts to publicly isolate, chastise and bandwagon against those states caught up in America's geopolitical struggles. In many ways, Canada is more in lock step with Trump's security agenda than the Liberal government would like voters to believe.

Consider that all those countries that have bowed to US pressure on Huawei's purported security risks are highly dependent on the US including, Australia, New Zealand plus a few others such as Poland. Germany provides a contrasting case. Remember it was Germany that Freeland looked to for support when Canada was confronted by Saudi Arabia after her disastrous tweet. While Germany has since then made a commitment to cease arms sales to Saudi Arabia, Freeland has moved in

the opposite direction seemingly blind to her government's contradictory policies.

Further Germany remains unconvinced of US security claims regarding Huawei and is holding steady. Even Canada's telecoms have said they would like to continue working with Huawei. Still, US pressure is immense. The US threatening sanctions on Germany for upholding its commitment to build the Nordstream II pipeline is but one of several important examples of Trump's commitment to "make America great again" even if that means alienating key allies in the process. Is there any reason to believe that Canada would be treated differently under similar circumstances?

If the positive, progressive message Trudeau continues to trumpet has been replaced by far more hawkish actions by Chrystia Freeland, it is not without its enablers in Ottawa and elsewhere. Moving beyond the selfies and "virtue signalling" that have become the bedrock of the Liberal party platform, the government's use of social media has a more menacing purpose. For example, GAC's

DIPLOMACY

“direct diplomacy” with Iran, Venezuela and Russia, among others is designed to bypass governments in an effort to shift public opinion and undermine confidence in foreign government leadership. Closer to home the right-of-centre MacDonald-Laurier Institute, whose director spoke of ousting former Foreign Minister Stephane Dion from office, chose Freeland as their policy maker of the year in late 2018.

For her efforts, Freeland received tributes from US-based think tanks whose opinions on China, Iran and Russia are unambiguously hostile. This kind of grooming is troubling given that American elites don't seem to appreciate the fact that Canada is a sovereign nation with interests distinct from their own. Yet efforts to exercise that sovereignty are undermined by the fact Freeland has only limited access to Russia due to her persona non grata status. She has also failed to re-engage Iran by not reopening Canada's Embassy there.

If Venezuela, China, Syria, Russia, Iran and North Korea are at the top of the Canadian diplomatic agenda that is largely because of their importance not only to the White House, but to both the Democratic and Republican parties and the Senate and the Congress. Indeed, the January 2019 Ottawa meeting on Venezuela proved to be less about diplomacy or even collective security but as a way to soft pedal regime change. That summit, involving members of the Lima Group, conveyed the illusion of distance between Canada and the more belligerent US-agenda.

A former Canadian diplomat, who at one time was denied accreditation to Caracas, went so far as to publicly rebuke the US approach to Venezuela claiming that Canada's agenda was undermined by the Trump administration's bellicose and divisive tone. Yet China and Russia were not part of the Ottawa summit even though they are key to the conversation. Countries with close ties to Canada, despite their dubious human rights records, Honduras for example, were invited with their voices heard and opinions counted.

DIPLOMACY

When the Canadian government organised a Ministerial summit on North Korea in early 2018 neither China nor Russia were part of that discussion, though they both share a border with North Korea. At the G20 meeting in late 2018, it was Foreign Minister Freeland who took the initiative of publicly condemning Russia for its ongoing involvement in the Ukraine conflict. The Liberals who are now preparing to ship sniper rifles to Ukraine, show no interest in bringing the conflict to an end through mediation and remain apparently indifferent to increasing corruption, war profiteering and worrisome minority rights violations.

MULTILATERALISM IF NECESSARY BUT NOT NECESSARILY MULTILATERALISM

In contrast, the level of effort in reinvigorating multilateralism has waned considerably under Minister Freeland. Despite efforts to conjoin Canada's peacekeeping efforts in

Mali with a seat on the UN Security Council, Canadian forces will be replaced by Romania as the Canadian contribution winds down. The Liberals cannot point to a clear, or for that matter decisive, outcome where our mission made a difference in Mali. Indeed the situation there has deteriorated significantly in the last six months as it has in Haiti where Canada is drawing down its aid programme.

More tellingly, when Trudeau declined an invitation to speak to the 73rd session of the UN General Assembly in late 2018, that honour passed on to Foreign Minister Freeland. After agreeing to speak, Freeland then shifted her schedule and pulled out completely. This is a far cry from the time in 2017 when Trudeau was the great American hope. A New York Times op. ed. then declared Canada as the de facto "leader of the free world".

Nowhere better is the decline in Canadian influence on full display than the recently completed free trade negotiations with the United States and Mexico. President Donald

DIPLOMACY

Trump got the better of the USMCA deal and yet arranged it so all three countries could proclaim success. Indeed, the substance of the agreement indicates that both Canada and Mexico made a number of significant concessions to the United States.

Very early on in the negotiations, Trump made clear his intent to bring investment back to the U.S. and, in the end, managed to do exactly that. Some may call that behaviour bullying, while others may interpret it as part of Donald Trump's "America first" strategy. Certainly with respect to the now all important clause regarding future Canadian trade negotiations with China, it would seem that the United States has imposed on its North American partners a degree of veto power that heretofore did not exist.

For Canada, the alternative to accepting these terms was rather bleak; namely no deal at all. Canada had to fight very hard to maintain the status quo in a very difficult three-way negotiation. There was limited success, for example, in engaging the US on Canada's

progressive trade agenda, labour mobility and big pharma. More importantly Trump's all important tariffs on aluminum and steel remain, a bargaining chip the US holds in reserve for future negotiations.

WHY DOES ALL THIS MATTER?

First, in a world beset by geopolitical struggles, the implication of Canada taking sides is clear. We see this on display in the Middle East where the Syrian war was prolonged and deadly because Canada, like the French, British and Americans supported rebel forces in the early stages of the conflict in order to destabilise the country and topple Assad.

In its unrelenting confrontation with China, the US has shown that it sees that country as a clear rival to American hegemony; an idea that resonates within Congress and among voters of different political stripes. Reality is more complex. Global problems including climate change, energy policy, the future of

DIPLOMACY

Africa's weak states (where China's presence is growing), pivotal states (such as Pakistan where China's influence is also growing) or humanitarian crises in the Middle East cannot be properly solved without constructive engagement.

Finding consensus is essentially how Canada has managed to navigate a turbulent world. Consensus creates a more predictable international environment for the less powerful. This is not news, but it is surprising that the Trudeau government is ill prepared to meet the challenge. Neither the G7 nor the G20 are proving to be effective at coordinating global policy and the Liberals have failed to utilise the capacities of either of these organisations to their full advantage.

The breakdown of international order has been assigned to Donald Trump as promulgator, but in reality predates his arrival by decades. To be sure "the America first" view of the world did not begin with Trump (consider the Buy America Act and America's unilateral invasion of Iraq for

example) but due to his more transparent and less conventional communication style the American agenda is now obvious and transparent.

To motivate America's allies President Obama used soothing words and highly charged rhetoric referencing the rule of law and appeals to a higher moral authority. In turn, America's allies for the most part turned a blind eye to, or openly supported an increase in drones targeting ordinary citizens, America's refusal to shut down GITMO, the destruction of Libya or covert support for rebels in Syria in order to topple Assad.

Indeed Canada proved all too grateful to have been given the lead in our efforts to remove Qaddafi from power. Even if those efforts resulted in the destruction of one state and the collapse of at least one other (Mali). Today we are picking up the pieces throughout the Western Sahel and North Africa.

Obama succeeded because he was able to convince his allies that these things were not just of interest to the US but in their interests

DIPLOMACY

too. They were, as many Canadians believed at the time, the right thing to do, even if those claims have not withstood the test of time.

On the surface at least it appears the Trump administration is pursuing a different path. Not one of isolation or even consensus but of consequences. In reality, though the language and the rhetoric may be different, the outcome is much the same. Even though linkage politics and transactional negotiation are the order of the day, countries like Canada remain stuck in the middle. Unable to chart a course without facing consequences in the pursuit of self interest.

Second, the Trudeau government was elected on the rhetoric of making the world a better place and remains ill-equipped to deal with more pressing and worsening trends. It is not helpful that the Liberals are being increasingly criticized for their perceived ability to speak out of both sides of their mouth. Defending gender equality and human rights on the one hand, and selling weapons to Saudi Arabia on the other; building (and buying) pipelines

on the one hand, while defending indigenous empowerment and autonomy on the other; pursuing free trade with China on the one hand while undermining that relationship by confronting Huawei on the basis of US pressure on the other, claiming open transparent and accountable government on the one hand while seeking a backdoor (and potentially unethical) solution to SNC-Lavalin's ailing fortunes on the other.

Few remember that democracy reform was high on the Liberal Party agenda before it came to power. That initiative was completely abandoned within one year of the Liberal mandate. More troubling are the resignations of Liberal MPs Scot Brison, Judy Wilson-Raybould, and Jane Philpott in the wake of two major foreign policy corruption scandals. Canadian patience is wearing thin. For example, while the public has shown an overwhelming desire to curb military equipment sales to Saudi Arabia following the murder of the journalist Jamal Khashoggi Minister Freeland is reluctant at best to consider this option.

DIPLOMACY

Third, the Liberals clearly have no plan B to achieve their stated goal of making Canada relevant again. Given that China is the focal point of US hostility, Canada has not dealt very well with that shift in strategic orientation. The repeated call for trade diversification, for example is often made but rarely heeded, and little thought is given to developing alternative economic or political agendas and strategies that lessen Canada's trade and dependence on economic powers that subject Canada to their political agendas. If anything, Canada is now more tightly bound to the North American continent even as the Liberals express (publicly at least) a desire to weaken these ties.

The upshot is that the institutions in which Canada and its allies have invested significant capital, such as trade, political, and security organisations, have been tested and stretched to the limit. The G7 is divided, the WTO is not working, and NATO is fragmenting. The European Union, for example, faces challenges from within as its member states confront a changing political landscape in the

United Kingdom, a European state desperate to break free of the shared values that made a peaceful continent possible.

THE WAY FORWARD?

Despite repeated claims that Canada is a fully engaged multilateral player in diplomacy and trade, the recent record is rather weak. If Canada has become economically strong, it is largely due to the success of the US market and the expansion of Canada's resource and manufacturing sectors in which our trading relationship with the US is dominant.

However, if Canada has fallen behind in market competitiveness, it is largely because our multilateral engagement has mostly focused on the dominance of an established power and the institutions it upholds rather than those institutions that are not dominated by an established power. Canada's relative economic and political decline globally might explain why traditional middle powers seek to preserve the status quo and why leaders seek to convince audiences abroad and at home of their importance.

DIPLOMACY

Indeed, since the end of the Cold War, Canada's commitment to and involvement in multilateralism and international institutions have shifted due to changes in the global economy. But the Liberals now need to realise, the multilateralism that Canada helped develop and which was initially beneficial for Canada as a middle power works differently. The knee jerk response is to close ranks, circle the wagons and seek out like minded democratic states to confront illiberalism and democratic backsliding. These are all potentially helpful but they also carry unintended consequences.

If Canada's economic fortunes are to rebound we must build ties with emerging markets that are now Canada's chief economic competitors. This means, in essence, that Canada must engage states with different value systems. It means that if the Trudeau government is serious about reducing Canada's export dependence on the U.S. market, it is far more important that the Liberals focus on improving our global competitiveness.

Yet Justin Trudeau and Chrystia Freeland have not figured out how to make the much needed and difficult compromises necessary in simultaneously shaping a new international order and making Canada a competitive player in a shifting global economy. Nowhere is this better illustrated than our continued confrontations with Russia and China and their allies even though we know this opposition is ultimately counterproductive.

Open conflict is costly for one thing, it also diverts us away from those things that really matter such as national unity, a competitive and productive economy and building a viable trading system that does not subject us to the political vagaries of a dominant power. Unfortunately, short-sighted and domestically driven political pandering, has trumped long term strategic interests.

The consequences of continued pandering are clear. Popular pressure for economic and political change was the hallmark of the Trudeau government's rise to power. Transparency, open debates on public policy,

DIPLOMACY

and evidence-based policymaking all figured prominently in how this government would conduct its foreign policy.

The reality is concerning. Rather than being a vehicle for positive transformation, the social media that the Liberals are so keen to exploit is slowly lowering the deference, respect and trust Canadians have towards their leaders.

Justin Trudeau's star clearly is in decline.

Lowered deference has been a key factor in the rise of populism and disenchantment with established parties and leaders in the USA, who are seen by many as corrupt enablers of a rigged system.

It is only a matter of time before the same corrosive effects become part of the Canadian political scene. Corruption, and the popular perception of the corruption of leaders whether framed in terms of favoritism, privilege, or back room dealings all contribute to this decline. As a result, the Liberals have found it increasingly difficult to engage effectively and honestly in global affairs as reality catches up to their rhetoric.

Looking ahead, one unheeded aspect of corruption in Canadian politics is the deepening centralisation of power at the federal level. Considering that Canada's foreign policy budgets are largely discretionary and vast, there is cause for concern. Not only does centralisation privilege unelected political appointments from the Prime Minister's Office, it closes it at the same time to public oversight and accountability. The deepening influence of political machinery on public life is troubling. For example, political parties now rely extensively on political appointments rather than career bureaucrats to develop and implement foreign policy. The role of political staff and advisers is not to serve the public interest or to sustain the public service. It is a political staffer's job to help re-elect the ruling party into power. Whether working as senior advisers, speechwriters or communications specialists their role in shaping Canada's foreign policy has only expanded with time.

This is corrosive behaviour because political staffers are neither elected nor accountable.

DIPLOMACY

They pay no price for being wrong. Couple that with reduced access to information, foreign policies pushed through without proper and full debate and the deployment of Canadian forces on missions that Canadians don't understand, and the promise of more accountable, open government seems uncertain.

It is important to recognize that corruption is a symptom of poor governance. Further, there is little governments can do to immunize society from systemic corruption when political parties themselves are seen to be corrupted.

A case in point is the Afghan detainee scandal, which forced the previous government of Stephen Harper to call an election in the face of a non-confidence motion regarding the Conservative government's unwillingness to make public, the facts around the case. The details of that scandal are still not fully understood by the public. But it is believed that Canadian forces were implicated in handing Taliban fighters over to Afghan

forces, who then tortured them (a war crime). One can only ask, who among the Canadian personnel on post in Kabul were aware that detainee torture occurred regularly?

This is but one example that speaks to the need for improved parliamentary oversight, public debate and political accountability. When it comes to foreign policy, Canada could do worse than having a parliament that is accountable, transparent, and above all, well informed.



DEFENCE

C+

A NEW APPROACH TO PEACEKEEPING

Canada's foreign security policy has always been guided by four priorities: the defence of Canada, the defence of North America, the defence of our allies, and support for our alliances. During the 2015 federal election, then Liberal Party leader Justin Trudeau promised voters that Canada would return to its age-old practice of participating in international peacekeeping missions. Canada was finally back. The Trudeau government, we were told, would re-assign Canada's armed forces to new missions around the globe in a sustained and committed effort to rebuild the United Nations' peacekeeping operations and strengthen multilateralism.

Four years later it appears that what this government promised would only be a fleeting return to Canadian peacekeeping. To their credit, the development and application of Smart Pledges have focused on shrinking the capability gap and training requirements needed for each mission. These pledges are supposed to maximize the effect of Canada's contribution on peacekeeping operations. However, while Trudeau's Liberals have taken an innovative approach to maximizing our contributions, our engagements around the world fail to fit into any sort of broad, cohesive, long-term strategy.

Our presence in Iraq for example, intended to train and equip the Iraqi and Kurd security forces to withstand the resurgence of the Islamic State, lacks clarity and direction. True to his word, Prime Minister

DEFENCE

Trudeau withdrew Canadian fighter jets from their role in the mission early in February, 2016. At the time, the Prime Minister assured Canadians that Canadian forces were no longer in harm's way. Unfortunately, since 2015, there have been at least three reported occasions where Canadian soldiers have found themselves trapped in firefights with Islamic State fighters. Mr. Trudeau's obfuscation of Canada's role in the Middle East is deeply concerning. Similarly, in 2018, Minister of Defence Harjit Sajjan announced that they would be extending Canada's mission in Iraq until Fall 2019, though he failed to provide any indication of what we, or our allies, would be doing after that.

Operation REASSURANCE in Latvia is part of NATO's larger, enhanced forward presence in Eastern Europe to reinforce collective defence and demonstrate the strength of Allied sovereignty. Of all Canada's ongoing missions, it is the largest; a battle group of 835 CAF personnel from all three branches of the military running training exercises, and NATO-specific tasks. Though Canada's

mere presence there is important, it is unclear how substantial Canada's contribution to the larger mission is. This is a cause of concern as discontent among Latvia's Russian-speaking diaspora is growing. Ethnic tensions only make Canada's job more difficult. Indeed, through the militarization of the Baltic region, and Russia's counter measures, tensions continue to escalate.

Canada's mission in Mali has been owned exclusively by the Trudeau government. Despite calls from the UN and the French, who are leading the mission, the Trudeau government has announced that at the end of the year Canada will be winding down and exiting Mali. Canada's role has focused on medical evacuations and logistical and technical support. At most, we have deployed 250 personnel and eight helicopters to support the UN deployment there. The Romanians have stepped up to fill in after Canada has left. Our decision to withdraw not only directly compromises our credibility in the eyes of our allies, during a campaign for a UN Security Council seat no less, it helps

DEFENCE

undermine the promise of a return to Canadian peacekeeping made by Trudeau during his first campaign. Our withdrawal also comes at a time when the situation in Mali is deteriorating.

It appears as though while Trudeau's Canada may be present, it certainly is not back.

While the Liberal government has agreed to participate in peacekeeping and security operations, it appears as though they have done so reluctantly and haphazardly. On those missions where Canada's presence has an outsized influence, such as Mali, the Liberal government appears indifferent to the needs of Canada's allies. Most worryingly, our contributions overseas take place with little regard to how they serve broader Canadian strategic interests. This is mostly because the current government has yet to make clear what those interests are.

BUCK PASSING ON PROCUREMENT

Defence procurement has become a perilous subject that has plagued successive

governments, stretching back to the Sea King helicopter debacle during the 1980s. A combination of risk-aversion and political interference has distorted the procurement process, crippled the capacity of our armed forces to engage on missions, and damaged Canadian credibility in the eyes of our allies. While this government has shown some degree of improvement from previous governments in terms of project progress, they are not without their failures.

The defining procurement failure of the last four years has been the acquisition of a next generation fighter jet. Going back to the 2015 federal election, the Trudeau government made a promise during the campaign that his government would abandon the Conservative pledge to purchase the much hyped F-35 Lightning II fighter jet, the newest fifth generation fighter jet developed by Lockheed Martin. Instead the Liberals would be conducting, in their words, a transparent and fair competition to replace Canada's aging fleet of CF-18 Hornets, first flown in 1978. At the time, they argued that the price-tag and extravagant

DEFENCE

technological features exceeded Canadian needs and that Canada's air force would be equally well-served with a lower-cost alternative. Whether or not their assessment of the F-35 was accurate, their promise to equip our air force with a new plane worthy of serving our troops has been nothing short of calamitous.

Originally, the Trudeau government planned to purchase 18 of the less-expensive F-18 Super Hornets, manufactured by U.S. aerospace giant Boeing. However, in 2017, Boeing filed an anti-dumping suit with the U.S. Department of Commerce accusing Canada's Bombardier of receiving unfair subsidies for their C-series passenger aircraft. In retaliation, the Trump administration introduced a 300 per cent tariff against Bombardier's aircrafts sold in the U.S., all but ending Bombardier's sales to U.S. airlines and ending Bombardier's long running reputation as an economically viable Canadian company. In response, the Trudeau government announced they would be cancelling their \$5 billion agreement with Boeing to supply the F-18 Super Hornet.

Having written off the F-35 contract during the 2015 campaign and after cancelling the F-18 Super Hornet contract after the Canada-U.S. trade dispute, the Trudeau government was left with no fighter jet to purchase.

Instead, in 2018 they announced they had set aside \$500 million to purchase 25 used F-18 Hornets from the Australian government as an interim fighter jet. As it now appears, the total cost the Minister of Defence shared with Canadians was far from accurate. The Parliamentary Budget Officer recently stated the total cost for acquisition of the interim jets will top \$1 billion.

The situation regarding the Liberal treatment of Canada's navy is equally disappointing. Despite its incessant promises to operate with transparency and openness, the Trudeau government has found itself entangled in a criminal investigation involving former Vice-Chief of the Defence Staff, Admiral Mark Norman. Norman was first removed from his post as Commander of the Navy and Vice Chief of the Defence Staff in January, 2017 by General Jonathan Vance over allegations that

DEFENCE

Norman had leaked sensitive information to reporters and Quebec-based shipbuilding giant, Davie Shipbuilding, as part of a \$700 million contract to refit a civilian vessel into a support ship for the Navy. As the case dragged on, it became clear that Norman was simply responding to purported political meddling on the part of Trudeau's cabinet. While the previous Harper government had reached an agreement with Davie to deliver on the project, shortly after the 2015 election, Nova Scotia-based Irving shipbuilding ostensibly approached the new Cabinet and asked them to reconsider the deal with Davie. The Trudeau government ultimately abandoned its effort to delay and review the Davie shipbuilding contract. As the Norman case has dragged on, the situation for the Trudeau government has worsened given the abrupt resignation of Scott Brison who, as Treasury Board President, oversaw the procurement process. It has become clear that this government was interested in transparency, only insofar as it earned them praise.

STRONG, SECURE AND (DIS) ENGAGED?

In June, 2017, the Trudeau government released its defence policy, Strong, Secure and Engaged, an upgrade to the 2008 Canada First Defence Strategy introduced by the Harper Government. Strong, Secure and Engaged sought to better position our armed forces to meet the complex challenges faced today and to prepare for the future of warfare and security. The document was intended to be comprehensive and forward-thinking and, given the geopolitical agendas of the major powers, timely. In it were numerous promises and policies to grow the size of our armed forces, invest heavily in assets and technology, and secure our core strategic interests. The majority of pledges focused on revitalizing equipment and infrastructure which included a comprehensive budgetary plan to chart defence spending over the next decade.

While visionary, this government has struggled in its implementation ("deliverology" as the Trudeau government is fond of calling

DEFENCE

it). Ensuring the successful implementation of a new policy framework is an ambitious task, but critical if it is to be impactful. While spending has kept up with targets, there has been virtually no movement on the range of procurement issues the policy paper identifies as priorities. Reporting on procurement progress has been even more depressing. Canadians have not yet seen a larger implementation plan from this government detailing how they plan on acting on their promises.

FIGHTING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE

The issue of foreign interference in elections is an entirely contemporaneous security issue even if it does strike some as alarmist in tone. It first rose to prominence during the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election but has since become a risk for open democracies around the world. For the first time since 2001, CSIS Director David Vigneault downgraded the threat of terrorism to national security

and instead, elevated foreign interference and cyber-attacks as the most pressing security concerns.

Bill C-76, the *Elections Modernization Act*, has been a strong, legislative step to prevent and deter foreign interference in our electoral process. The Bill includes a number of laudable provisions that force the identification of advertisers paying for advertising on social media and prevent foreign spending on third-party advertising. The Bill also restores voting rights to expatriates who have lived abroad for more than five years, a positive step in strengthening our democracy.

Bill C-76, supported by new powers given to our intelligence agencies in Bill C-59 to deter interference, are positive steps to defend democratic institutions against possible interference from foreign agents. The Trudeau government has brought a new level of transparency and accountability to our electoral system and for its actions, deserves credit.



SECURITY

B

KEEPING OUR ARCTIC STRONG AND FREE

In a major shift from their predecessors, the Trudeau government has all but abandoned the Canadian Arctic in their strategic policy. From 2007 to 2015, the Harper government published Canada's Northern Strategy which outlined a broad regional strategy for economic development and security, to stake out and enforce Canada's claim to sovereignty in the Arctic region. Early on in their mandate, the Trudeau government announced they would be doing away with the Harper-era strategy and foreign policy approach to the Arctic and would instead be introducing a new policy framework to guide government decision making that prioritized economic and social development and reconciliation with Inuit and Indigenous peoples. Though consultations finished in 2017, the government has yet to put forth their own strategy for the Arctic, including what are our core objectives in the regions, what will be required to secure them, and the means to do so.

The timing of this failure is worrisome. The government's pivot away from the Arctic has occurred as China and Russia have expanded their physical presence in the region and made clear their intentions to influence regional politics. As the polar ice sheets continue to

SECURITY

melt and access to deep-sea resources and international shipping routes become exposed, it is unclear how this government will proceed. Not only do we lack the military capacity to enforce our claim to sovereignty and the regional economic strength to underpin our claim, the Trudeau government lacks the plan to ensure Canada's Arctic remains strong, free, and under our control.

SECURITY IN THE DIGITAL AGE

The Trudeau government has taken large steps in seeking to modernize Canada's critical infrastructure, including expanding the role for Canada's digital government – online spaces to house crucial data and information and provide Canadian's with core government services. During this time, Canadians' reliance on digital services has grown which has intensified the risks Canadian's face online. In their latest report, the Canadian Centre for Cyber Security has warned that the largest online threat facing Canadians is cybercrime, including fraud,

identity theft, and extortion.

True to their promise, the Trudeau government has established the Canadian Centre for Cyber Security, a subgroup of the CSE. This new centre will centralize Canada's cyber innovation and collaboration and coordinate action between government and private organizations.

The creation of the Centre is a positive step in the right direction. As cyber threats continue to evolve, especially as quantum computing balloons in importance, it will be all the more important that the government is able to approach this nexus of security threats in a coordinated and organized fashion.

DANCING WITH THE DRAGON

No issue is arguably more emblematic of the treacherous geopolitical landscape Canada must now navigate than Canada's relationship with China over Huawei. Canada, and several Canadians, have found themselves embroiled in a geopolitical turf war between the U.S.

SECURITY

and Chinese governments over the former's arrest and criminal case against Huawei Technologies. The reversal in policy is stark. Within a matter of months, Canada went from actively exploring a free-trade deal with the Chinese to being accused of 'white supremacy' by the Chinese Ambassador. The relationship has seen a complete diplomatic meltdown with Minister Freeland uncertain on what the government's next steps should be. In fact, after the departure of Canada's Ambassador, it does not appear as though there is a plan in sight of how to repair the relationship, let alone rescue the Canadians held in detention. The Trudeau government has offered no reassurances it will be able to utilize back-channels with Beijing and Washington D.C. to effectively diffuse the crisis and see the detained Canadians are set free.

Canada's interaction with Huawei is about much more than national security. There are undoubtedly security concerns associated with their participation in developing Canada's 5G telecommunications network.

However, those in favour of cutting ties with Huawei argue that the greater threat is to economic security, and the risks Canada would be exposing our domestic industry to, if a Beijing-backed firm dominated the market. Perhaps the greatest risk which has not been squarely addressed is how Canada can develop a lasting and mutually beneficial relationship with China, our second largest trading partner, when our closest ally, the US, has effectively used the Liberal government as leverage in their own trade war with China.

It is entirely unsustainable for Canadian security if we are expected to 1) tolerate the US' classification of Canada as a threat to national security to legally apply tariffs to our exports; 2) act as a political agent on their behalf in geopolitical skirmishes; 3) operate under their security umbrella amid their increasingly illiberal and isolationist policies; and 4) attempt to grow our economy while losing access to the largest economic market on earth, in China.

There is no better example of a failure in leadership than a government that does

SECURITY

not act in a country's sovereign interests. As such the Trudeau government has yet to make clear how they plan on navigating a world increasingly divided along geopolitical fault lines. If the US continues to engage in protectionism and isolationism, and our access to the world's largest market has been cut off, both Canadian security and industry are at risk.

ACTING ON NATIONAL SECURITY

During the 2015 federal election, then Liberal Party-leader Justin Trudeau criticized Bill C-51, the *Anti-Terrorism Act, 2015*, and the Harper government for providing sweeping new powers to Canada's intelligence agencies that would infringe on Canadian civil liberties. If elected, Trudeau promised that he would pass an expansive national security bill that would address many of the concerns raised by voters during the election, while balancing the demands for public safety. True to his promise, in 2017 Prime Minister Trudeau and

Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Ralph Goodale, introduced Bill C-59, the *National Security Act*.

Bill C-59 has become the government's signature national security policy and represents one of the most drastic steps taken by any Canadian government in decades to reform and empower Canada's intelligence agencies. The Act, which passed its third reading in the House of Commons in June, 2018, has remained stuck in Senate proceedings since. It remains to be seen whether or not the Government will be able to pass the bill in advance of the 2019 federal election.

Within the Act are three separate acts: The *National Security and Intelligence Review Agency Act* (NSIRA Act); The *Intelligence Commissioner Act* (IC Act); and The *Canadian Security Establishment Act* (CSE Act).

The NSIRA Act and the IC Act established new provisions to review and monitor intelligence operations and activities. These include creating a new Intelligence

SECURITY

Commissioner to be filled by a former judge that is responsible for reviewing and authorizing the activities of Canada's two main intelligence agencies, CSIS and the CSE. This new office is a positive step forwards in bringing transparency and accountability to Canada's national security activity.

The CSE Act drastically expands the capabilities of Canada's foreign signals intelligence agency. Most notably, it gives the organization licence to conduct both defensive and active cyber operations, which would allow them to attack foreign cyber assets that threatened the security of Canada.

This legislative accomplishment, if passed, will prove crucial to modernizing Canada's intelligence functions and ensuring Canadian critical infrastructure remains secure. True to their promise, the Trudeau government has succeeded in bringing greater transparency and oversight to Canada's national security activities.

UNCLOAKING INTELLIGENCE

Included in the mandate letter to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, the Honourable Ralph Goodale, Prime Minister Trudeau requested the Minister establish a Committee of Parliamentarians who would review the policies, conduct, and operations of Canada's intelligence agencies to prevent any gross breaches of trust and accountability.

Prior to the establishment of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians (NSICOP), Canada was the only member of the Five Eyes intelligence network without some level of public oversight of its national security actors. The decision to establish the committee came after a series of scandals involving Canadian intelligence agencies including the Omar Khadr case, the Afghan detainee scandal, and previously, the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Certain Activities of the RCMP. Though not a standing committee of Parliament

SECURITY

– which would provide the group with legislative authority – the decision to bring a select group of experienced Parliamentarians together to review our national security policies and priorities was a large step in the right direction.

Though not long after the Committee was conceived, it became embroiled in the Clement-sexting scandal. The former President of the Treasury Board who now served as a Conservative member of the committee had risked compromising the information he had been entrusted to protect. While his actions were a serious cause for concern and illustrated many of the concerns the intelligence community raised prior to the committee's conception, the whole affair should and was best taken as a growing opportunity for the body.

The Trudeau government deserves credit for keeping to their promises to establish greater oversight and review of Canada's intelligence operations. Included in this was the need to stand by the good this committee has provided in the wake of the scandal and

take greater precautions in the vetting and monitoring of member's personal activity. While the government has said little in the wake of the incident, Canadian's deserve to know who is in charge of ensuring the protection of Canada's intelligence and hold those individuals to the highest degree of integrity.

RETURNING FOREIGN FIGHTERS

The Trudeau government, like many Western governments, has struggled to effectively respond to the return of foreign fighters who have left to join the Islamic State. As the group has lost territory and its administrative capacity is reduced, many of the individuals who left for Iraq and Syria have begun to return home. Contrary to much of the hype around this problem, Canada's share of foreign fighters is relatively small. Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Ralph Goodale has indicated that approximately 250 Canadians have left

SECURITY

to join the extremist group. Of those, 190 are still abroad, either fighting or dead, while 60 have returned home. There has not been, as some have suggested, a recent surge of foreign fighters returning.

The challenge this government is facing, as most Western governments are, is what to do with these returning fighters. In most cases, there is insufficient evidence to charge them with crimes conducted overseas and bring them through the Canadian judicial system for punishment. The absence of adequate reporting in the combat zones and the use of pseudonyms for fighters means that evidence and records of activity are spotty. Canadian prosecutors are seldom able to meet the burden of proof in a criminal trial. However, these individuals are still radicalized and pose a significant public safety concern.

During the 2015 federal election, then Liberal Party leader Justin Trudeau won praise from many in his party by refuting Prime Minister Harper's suggestion to revoke the citizenship of foreign fighters, prohibiting them from

ever returning home. However, the Prime Minister has yet to offer a legitimate policy of how to deal with them. In his defence, his options are limited. However, he has a duty to public safety to ensure that those who would otherwise cause harm to the public are dealt with and restrained accordingly.

This government has begun seeking Peace Bonds which allow authorities greater freedom in monitoring and surveiling foreign fighters. In some cases, these allow them to force suspected foreign fighters to wear tracking devices, and in others, to entirely suspend their access to the internet or technological devices.

However, based on his comments during the 2015 campaign, the Trudeau government has avoided any speculation of implementing a neutrality law as some of our allies have, which would essentially criminalize the act of leaving Canada to join any foreign fighting force. In a society as pluralistic as Canada's, implementing a neutrality law would be a step

SECURITY

in the right direction. It would force those that come here to honestly and faithfully pledge their allegiance to Crown and country.

Most problematically, this government has offered few details publicly about how they are managing this crisis. Only recently have details been released by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness as to the extent of the problem. While the details of ongoing operations may be withheld, this government ought to clearly explain its approach to public safety in light of the security concerns posed by foreign fighters.

COUNTERING EXTREMISM

Over the past four years, the threats this government has faced have evolved substantially. Terrorism and radical Islamic extremism is not the issue it once was, and is certainly not the issue many portray it to be. In November, 2018 CSIS Director David David Vigneault downgraded the threat of terrorism for national security, though he indicated that

it still remains the primary threat to public safety.

Trudeau's approach to combating extremism, unlike his predecessor which famously produced the 'Barbaric Cultural Practices Hotline', was going to be to adopt a community-based approach to combatting extremism. Such a strategy would involve identifying vulnerable individuals susceptible to radicalization and intervening early on. Four years later, though not perfect, the results of their strategy have more or less matched their promises. The Office of Community Outreach and Counter-radicalization Coordinator has been established, and the government has supported academic research on the subject including the University of Waterloo's Canadian Network for Research on Terrorism, Security and Society.



TRADE

C+

A PERIOD OF HIGH DRAMA

This year was heavily focused on the NAFTA renegotiations. The final agreement landed where most experts anticipated it to land. It was predicted from the outset that Canada would have to make concessions on dairy, follow the US lead on rules of origin for automobiles, and make changes to our de minimis threshold for duty free shipping. No progress was made on government procurement, labour mobility or free entry, nor were there any meaningful deliverables for the progressive trade agenda, besides the non-binding add-on references to indigenous peoples. These were all promises the government failed to deliver, and in that respect, what the Canadian government actually achieved was fairly minimal. Though the trilateral NAFTA talks would have been difficult for any government, especially when President Trump's temperament is added to the equation, Minister Freeland undeniably played a weak hand. The public sympathy and uncertainty generated by the talks contributed to the temptation for Canada to settle, while Lighthizer's team delivered a 'wonderful deal' to President Trump.

Yet the pace at which Canada negotiated has raised eyebrows. On a number of occasions, the negotiators on the Canadian side worked very slowly, pushing the deal into the summer. Canada also attempted to double-cross Mexico and conclude an agreement with the US, but was unsuccessful. Following this backstab play, and with Mexico rushing to conclude an agreement, US and Mexican negotiators shook hands over the summer,

TRADE

giving Minister Freeland the cold shoulder. It should have been anticipated a year before that the electoral calendar was going to determine much about the schedule of the negotiations for Mexico. As a result of being left out, Canada was placed in a very difficult and inferior negotiating position when ultimately allowed back in.

It is rather unlikely that Canada could have gotten a better deal, but the poor treatment it received from Donald Trump in the form of rhetoric and tariffs on steel and aluminum could have been avoided. The anti-Canadian bias, new level of bullying and comments about Trudeau crept into Trump's speeches during the summer, and surely heightened tensions following the Prime Minister's actions at the G7 summit. It is possible that had Minister Freeland worked more quickly and avoided the six-month delay, much of the negative treatment Canada received could have been avoided. It didn't help that Freeland publicly negotiated and went after Trump in her speeches, rather than attempting to deescalate the arising tensions. The political drama was unnecessary, and the fallout cost

Canada a productive relationship with the current US administration.

CHINA-US TRADE WAR

Everything has changed on the China front as a result of the Huawei saga and the rising political tension with the Middle Kingdom. Bilateral relations with China are in a very rocky place, with Canada being wedged in the middle of a China-US trade war in a way that places Canada in a vulnerable position. The Trudeau government had ambitiously hoped to launch free trade negotiations with China, but it is quite unlikely that there is any prospect of moving forward with this now. A free trade agreement with China is off the table for the rest of the government's mandate, notwithstanding the USMCA 'China clause'. This potentially also applies to a future government, seeing that President Xi's increasing absolutism has shifted the thinking around whether Canada even wants an agreement with China. All that aside, with Beijing being Ottawa's second largest trading partner, Canadian industry has already felt the

TRADE

blow of this fallout, in the form of heightened quality checks, such as those experienced by Canadian canola exporters, and threats of further repercussions.

How did Canada end up in this position? Trudeau might have fancied staying neutral, but under the pressure of increased tariffs from the US, and Canada's dependence on its North American partner, Canada had to pick a side. The so-called national security tariffs were purportedly introduced to target Chinese trade and as part of the "America First" agenda. Yet Canada's 'ally' and neighbor did not exempt it from these tariffs, despite the Trudeau government's continuing exhibition of its devotion. Once the tariffs were introduced, Canada had no choice but to proportionately retaliate. Canada's imposed tariffs undeniably carried ulterior motives by including items such as whisky, chocolate and ketchup, all obvious slaps on republican leadership. What is most absurd is that in practice, the US tariffs which were supposedly targeting Chinese trade, have in fact unfairly favoured Chinese steel, with higher exclusion rates from tariffs than

other countries, including Canada – a stark 35 percent as opposed to 2 percent. Freeland did not succeed in lifting these tariffs as part of the USMCA talks, and efforts to reach a settlement continue.

On a similar note, the introduction of Article 23 on "non-market" economies, better known as the China clause, raised many concerns about putting talks with China on hold at the time it was announced. But so much has occurred now to damage relations between Canada and China that it is the least of Canada's problems at this point, especially with China's prolonged and unnecessary detention of Canadian citizens. Experts have also emphasized not to look at this clause as an episodic case, but as a reflection of the US approach to this geopolitical problem which will define this century. It represents a new template text and position for US negotiations with future trade partners – making countries pick sides and undermining alliances if necessary. That being said, the Liberals adherence to a rules-based international order and sunny ways in the face of these superpower rivalries such as launching WTO complaints or

TRADE

waving the rule of law banner to justify Meng's politically-charged arrest, is unlikely to yield the desired results when dealing with rule breakers.

BEYOND THE NORTH AMERICAN CORNER

With the perpetual uncertainty generated by Canada's overreliance on a state making itself "great again", the need to diversify and seek paths to economic growth beyond the U.S. is more relevant today than ever. The government successfully closed three important deals it inherited, the CPTPP, CETA and USMCA, which cover most of our current commerce in the world. The next steps for the Liberals, and governments to come, is to strengthen and implement these agreements and to work on increasing Canadian trade with these jurisdictions, rather than signing new FTAs with other parts of the world that offer marginal returns. In the process of breaking this overwhelming dependence on the US, the challenge lies in maintaining a balance between diversifying

and simultaneously not provoking our biggest trading partner. Minister Freeland and her Department can start by more actively promoting the benefits of CETA to industry and the Canadian public.

FAUX PROGRESSIVENESS

The Liberals continue to pursue the path of rhetorically changing the nature of trade agreements. The government is yet to put some meat and substance to this amorphous concept. The Trudeau government has pursued a progressive trade agenda through airy preambles and a largely rhetoric-based agenda rather than employing a meaningful policy-based agenda. This is observed with the Chile trade agreement and its symbolic non-binding gender chapter, and in the USMCA where most of the language around indigenous issues was also non-binding. Pushing this agenda too far almost cost Minister Freeland the CPTPP: resulting in no more than a name change, and handicapping

TRADE

the prospect of a deal with China. We are left with the question of whether this is a government that prioritizes domestic politics over trade policy, when it matters most, or this is a government that is oriented towards scoring domestic points by being progressive at the expense of efficiently advancing trade policy in ways that would benefit Canadian trade interests.

As a part of a larger effort to establish Canada's global footprint it may be laudable to push for Canadian values globally. However, the effectiveness of pursuing this through trade agreements even if non-binding, is to a large degree contingent on what Canada's partners are up for. Trade policy is not the most appropriate avenue for this kind of "trial ballooning." Furthermore, the Trudeau government has also shaken the public's confidence in the ingenuousness of adopting progressiveness due to the lack of uniformity in its implementation. Consider the stark contrast of pushing for labour and gender rights on the one hand while simultaneously selling arms to Saudi Arabia on the other.



ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE

B-

“WE’RE HERE TO HELP”

“Canada is back my friends and we’re here to help.” These were Prime Minister Justin Trudeau’s words to the international audience at the Paris Climate Conference back in 2015, a clear statement of his intent to deliver on a campaign promise to demonstrate that, in contrast to his predecessor, Stephen Harper, the economy and the environment could go hand-in-hand and that Canada could become a world leader in this mission.

Trudeau’s ambitious environment campaign was most prominent in Paris in 2015 when he committed to cutting Canada’s emissions by 15% of its 2005 levels by 2020 and 30% by 2030. While this GHG reduction target had been originally set by Harper’s government, Trudeau’s tone suggested more optimism for Canada’s climate-friendly policies. Trudeau also promised that Canada would commit \$2.65 billion towards emission reduction projects in developing countries. These promises told the world that the Trudeau government was prepared to be an international climate leader. But, in the past four years Trudeau has learned that managing environmental and economic priorities, being both climate friendly and pro-pipeline, is an impossible standard that he has set for himself by trying to appeal to the principal federal

ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE

divide. Trudeau's attempt to gain favor from all parties through irreconcilable environmental and economic priorities, represents a failure in leadership.

CARBON TAX CHALLENGES

With the creation of a carbon pricing benchmark and the introduction of a federal carbon pricing back stop to be applied for jurisdictions that do not meet the benchmark, Trudeau kept his 2015 campaign promise. Most economists agree that this is the most cost-efficient and practical way to achieve emission reductions by incentivising people to find alternatives to greenhouse emissions. However, despite early hopes, the tax has received a lot of push back from four provinces (Manitoba, Ontario, Saskatchewan and New Brunswick) who refuse to implement their own carbon tax. In addition, both the Saskatchewan premier (Scott Moe) and Ontario Premier (Doug Ford) have decided to take the federal government to court over

its constitutional right to impose carbon tax on provinces. Alberta agreed to the carbon tax so long as Trudeau made sure the Trans-Mountain pipeline deal was followed through. These challenges arose in spite of the Carbon Tax pricing scheme being based off of extensive consultations with provinces and territories, and consultations with Indigenous people. At the First Minister's Meeting to address the push-back, Trudeau was unable to contain the provincial unrest, an indication of a lack of leadership from the Trudeau government to fulfill his carbon pricing plan effectively. However, there still are significant issues with the carbon tax policy that need to be addressed.

Firstly, the output-based pricing system, which is the carbon tax on industries, was less onerous than originally prescribed. In fact, for the four industries that face "high" competitive risks, that is, the producers of cement, iron and steel, lime and nitrogen fertilizers, emissions would have to reach 90% of their specific industry before they were penalized. This appears to be an

ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE

accommodation to address economic issues related to industry competitiveness. In other words, Trudeau's policy on carbon tax seems to be following some of the Harper-pathology: only engage in environmental policies that still make you likeable by the energy sector and remain economically competitive.

There appears to be a similar 'preferential treatment' at work in the carbon taxing system. One of the main criticisms that has arisen over the past few months is that gas will have a much stricter limit applied to it than coal, despite it being a much cleaner fuel. According to economist Blake Shaffer, the cleanest coal plants will only pay the equivalent of \$1 per tonne while gas will be taxed at \$20 per tonne. Environment Minister Catherine McKenna has defended this strategy by explaining that the commitment to ban coal generating stations by 2030 has made high taxes on coal less necessary. However, once again, the Trudeau government appears to be dropping the ball and lacks leadership in its commitment to phase out fossil fuel subsidies. After all, what is a tax reduction if not an industry subsidy?

The Trudeau government's industrial carbon tax system is trying to lessen the impact on certain industries so that they are not put at a disadvantage given the current U.S. context and other competing markets. However by trying to not impact these industries production costs, premiers have used this as an explanation for how the Trudeau government is acknowledging that certain industries would be hurt by the tax.

JUSTIN TRUDEAU BUYS A PIPELINE

On the subject of pipelines, Trudeau's government fell short of its environmental promises. Trudeau made the politically convenient decision to remain supportive of Canadian oil going to market. But buying a pipeline seems to go above and beyond support for the oil sector. According to Minister McKenna, the Trudeau government's goal is to provide a "modern environmental regulatory system that protects the environment, supports reconciliation with Indigenous people and attracts investment." However, if Canada

ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE

continues to increase its pipeline capacity and help fund the oil industry in Alberta, it will be impossible to meet its Paris targets.

There has been a lot of controversy in the past few years targeted at Trudeau over his commitment to environmental issues, especially when it comes to pipelines. In fact, Trudeau's energy policies are nearly identical to Stephen Harper's. The difference is that Harper was more upfront about his desire to invest in fossil fuels rather than investing in climate change. This past summer, the Trudeau government purchased the Kinder-Morgan Pipeline for \$4.5 billion dollars and received insurmountable criticism for this action, especially from environmentalists and Indigenous people who protested the pipeline on the basis of the potential environmental degradation to the land. However, buying out the pipeline was both an economic and political calculation. Economically, measures needed to be taken to respond to the effect of low oil and gas prices on the western economy. Politically, Trudeau's government sought to appease Albertans, given that many

jobs were on the line. Many see the pipeline controversy as the Liberals' failure to fulfill its commitments to environmental action and Indigenous rights. Canadian emissions will certainly be increased as a result of the pipeline. In addition, the neglect of the rights of First Nations when pushing for the pipeline project through Squamish territory and B.C.'s concerns over the effect that the diluted bitumen will have on the oceans have raised serious concerns about Trudeau's commitment as a 'climate leader'.

CLEAN TECHNOLOGY AND CLIMATE FINANCE

In promising to be a climate leader for Canada and to the world at the Paris Climate Change Conference, the Trudeau government committed to investing in clean tech and climate finance. Indeed, Canada has made significant contributions to this sector. In 2017, Canada invested \$2.7B (USD) in climate finance and clean tech. This was considered a watershed moment for the clean technology

ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE

in Canada. According to the Global Cleantech Innovation Index, Canada ranked 4th in 2017 (compared to 7th in 2014) amongst 40 countries based on an average between inputs to cleantech innovation and outputs of cleantech innovation. Ahead of Canada were Denmark, Finland and Sweden. While this is a laudable achievement, the reality, is that Canada's investments in climate finance fall behind other countries when looking at investments in renewable power and fuels, such as wind and solar energy. By 2017, China had invested \$126.1B in this industry. The U.S. had invested \$40.5B. Canada has only invested \$2.7B, falling behind Japan, India, Germany, Australia, UK and Brazil.

While the Trudeau government has stepped up investments in clean technology, there is still more room to grow. At the same time, Canada needs to rely less on non-renewable energy and develop its infrastructure and research into resources such as solar energy which will make us more competitive in the long run against other countries.

G7 PLASTIC CHARTER

In 2015, the Trudeau government promised to re-commit and achieve the goals of the 2010 International Convention on Biodiversity and Aichi Biodiversity Targets for protecting freshwater, marine, and coastal habitats. The G7 Oceans Plastic Charter was an important step for the Canadian government to show its commitment to reducing plastic both at home and around the world. However, the Ocean Plastics Charter put forward by the Canadian government was non-binding and both the United States and Japan did not sign, diluting the effectiveness of the charter.

Since the G7 Meeting, the Trudeau government has placed a domestic ban on microbeads, the microplastics used in toiletries. In terms of international initiatives, Canada has made several significant commitments, including an investment of \$100M in a marine litter mitigation fund that will prevent plastic from entering the oceans, address plastic waste on shorelines, and better manage existing plastic resources.

ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE

At home, Canada has committed \$1.5B towards a national Oceans Protections Plan, working with Indigenous Peoples and coastal communities to support these ecosystems and protect endangered species. However, aside from these financial commitments, the Canadian government has failed to produce any sort of plan for how they will achieve Minister McKenna's stated goal of zero use of plastics by 2040. A ban on single use plastic products in government may be a good start but it is only a first step. For someone who prides himself on his commitment to the environment Trudeau's achievements in the fight against plastics fall far well short of expectation.

TRUDEAU, TRUMP AND CLIMATE CHANGE: SUNNY WAYS OR COLD SHOULDER?

Canada's relationship to the United States has historically remained key to their environmental policies. While the Trudeau

government wants Canada to be seen as a climate leader in the world and reduce its greenhouse gas emissions, the country still remains reliant on resource development, especially oil and gas, with the U.S. being their main trading partner. This means that there has been an emphasis on the Canadian end to conduct their climate policies in such a way that would not be economically disadvantageous, especially in relation to the United States.

All of Trudeau's progress in the areas of carbon taxes, management of pipelines, investment in clean tech and climate finance as well as the G7 Plastics Charter has been made in spite of the unforeseen and unexpected push back from the 'Trump Effect'. With President Donald Trump calling global warming a hoax, pulling the United States out of the Paris Climate Agreement, and pursuing radical environmental deregulation, Canada's environmental agenda has been challenged and the provinces have been emboldened as they push-back climate-

ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE

friendly initiatives in Canada, namely the carbon tax.

Whereas pre-Trump, Canada worked in partnership with the U.S. to develop North American wide climate action policies, Trudeau has been forced to seek some unlikely but alternative partnerships and connections, including with China and Mexico. As Trudeau continues to govern under the shadow of Trump's anti-environment policies, these new alliances will play an important role in establishing Canada as a climate leader and Trudeau's diplomatic skills and commitment to the environment will continue to be challenged.

UNLIKELY TO MEET OUR PARIS COMMITMENTS

Canada is still struggling to find its voice and influence when it comes to maintaining its reputation as a 'climate leader.' So far, it has made progress but is still lagging behind most countries. Trudeau continues

to portray himself as an international leader on climate change, however his rhetoric and commitments at the international level have not translated successfully into effective domestic implementation due to provincial resistance, policy weaknesses, lack of concrete implementation plans and competitive domestic economic and political priorities. As a result, environmentalists have claimed not only that we will not meet our 2020 goals, but that our 2030 goals are unlikely to be met largely because of our reliance on the oil industry. The balancing act that the Trudeau government has taken on, that is, tying climate friendly initiatives with investment in pipelines has been a failure. What has emerged is consistent with the image that Trudeau conveyed in 2015, a prime minister trying to please all parties involved, but in 2019 he appears to be failing many in some way.



DEVELOPMENT

B-

IS CANADA REALLY BACK?

Trudeau campaigned on the promise that he would restore Canadian leadership in the world by re-engaging with the UN and other multilateral institutions. This was in juxtaposition to the Harper Conservative agenda, which allowed Canada to become more insular. The enthusiasm from the Trudeau government to feminize its foreign policy and commit to human rights and gender equality was seen as a welcome shift from the Harper government. This emphasis was made evident from the Feminist International Assistance Policy (FIAP) that Trudeau launched in June 2017. The following summer, while hosting the G7 summit Trudeau proposed the Charlevoix Commitment on Equality and Economic Growth, which emphasized the importance of education and gender equality. The Trudeau government's campaign for a seat at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to promote Canadian values on the international arena also gave a sense to both Canadians and the world, that Canada was back at the table and ready to bring about real change.

This progressive demeanour has not, however, been matched with substantive changes in policy. The OECD Report stated that Canada's foreign aid under Trudeau has been disappointing. It has fallen behind previous Liberal and Conservative government's spending and international benchmarks. The Commitment to Development Index, which evaluates OECD countries' development policies has

DEVELOPMENT

downgraded Canada's performance from 14th place in 2015 to 17th place out of 27 countries in 2018, behind countries with their own economic challenges such as Spain and Italy. While the Trudeau government has progressed its agenda, and met its promises, it appears that things are operating more or less the same, just under a new title or brand. The limited funding for Trudeau's development portfolio suggests that his government is more concerned with its appearance than the substance of its policies.

Despite the lack of funding or policy innovation, the Trudeau government has met most of the objectives that it set for itself back in 2015: They have almost met the Sub-Saharan Africa orientation in development (48%, with the target being 50%), they implemented a feminist international assistance policy and created a financial development institution. They also maintained their promise to be open and transparent by consulting a diversity of experts before creating their feminist international assistance policy and in publishing their international

assistance and spending on a bi-annual basis. That being said, the consultations did not change their orientation to development which highlights the distinction between consultation and engagement. Furthermore, this government appears sensitive to criticism which impacts its ability to maintain openness and accountability.

FEMINIST INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE POLICY (FIAP): A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

The Feminist International Assistance Policy reflects the Trudeau government brand of a feminist approach to governance. The government's foreign aid spending towards least developed countries and prioritizing sub-Saharan Africa has largely been met. The FIAP policy also provides support to women's rights to reproductive choices. This policy was a step further from Harper's maternal and reproductive health initiative which

DEVELOPMENT

did not support abortion related-services. It also showed the Trudeau government taking a progressive step away from the current American stance on reproductive health. While the Feminist International Assistance Policy is a step in the right direction, there is still much room for improvement especially in showing results for dollars spent

Criticisms of the FIAP are threefold. Firstly, the FIAP policy is too broad. While there exists only one core area, gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls, almost every development project can be considered to have a gendered dynamic. This means that the gender mandate may not have as much of a meaningful impact as promised, especially because it is not a radical departure from what we had before. Women empowerment and gender equality have been highly prioritized on the Canadian aid agenda since the 1980s. The greater gender focus is welcome, and if the FIAP's ambitious targets are met, Canada can emerge as a global leader alongside Sweden for their gender-focused aid. But insufficient and unfocused

spending on aid threatens the very success of the FIAP agenda.

The increase in spending of \$2 billion over the next five years in development funding is a positive shift in development aid. However, this amount will only contribute to an 11% increase in aid funding over the next five years. This falls short of the recommended 0.7% of Official Development Assistance (ODA) spending recommended by the United Nations. To date, Trudeau's government contributes only 0.26% of its GNI towards humanitarian assistance, falling below Harper's average ODA spending (0.30%).

Quality of aid is just as important as quantity. Currently, Canadian aid is spread far too thin, resulting in a less meaningful impact on the ground. Rather than focusing on which countries needed aid, the Trudeau government ended up prioritizing missions with a gender component. Other countries, such as Sweden, have applied a gender-based aid framework to region -focused aid programs, allowing them to generate greater impacts.

DEVELOPMENT

Finally, there exists no clear evaluation framework for the FIAP policy available to the public. This means that Canadians and international observers cannot accurately assess how effective the policy is in practice. This can be seen as a gap in transparency and accountability for the very development projects that Trudeau has campaigned on.

It is too soon to judge how effective FIAP will be as a vehicle for Canadian foreign policy. However, it appears that the feminist international assistance policy is another example of Trudeau promoting a policy intended to galvanize his domestic base and motivated by electoral considerations rather than to promote meaningful change.

FINDEV: CATCHY NAME, BUT NOTHING TO BOAST ABOUT — YET

Canada opened its Development Finance Institute (DFI) in January 2018, now known by its abbreviation, FinDev Canada. The purpose

of the organization is to help create jobs, promote women's economic empowerment and contribute to a cleaner and greener environment in least developed countries. FinDev's first project included US\$10 million towards a Kenyan company that uses batteries to generate power for homes that lack a connection to electrical grids. The second project was a US\$20 million investment in Climate Invest One's (CIO) Construction Equity Fund to support the shifts towards renewable energy in emerging markets. These projects complement Canada's development portfolio with its commitment to sustainable initiatives. The FinDev institution also helps Canada support the 2030 Sustainable Development goals which sees innovative financing as a necessary tool to reducing extreme poverty. Still, it is too soon to praise Canada's DFI. The performance of this institution has yet to produce many tangible results.

Canada was the last G7 country to create a DFI. While it deserves credit for its implementation, the projected investment

DEVELOPMENT

into FinDev is only \$300 million over the next five years. To have much of an impact in this sector, the projected \$300 million should be increased on an annual basis to catch-up to the other G7 members. Moreover, the Trudeau government cannot take much credit for its creation, as the Harper government's 2015 budget had already allocated the funds for this purpose. Trudeau just used the blueprint to move forward.

Another criticism for Canada's DFI is the Trudeau government's focus on branding. The Liberal government spent \$500 000 on outside advisers (Cossette Communications Inc.) to come up with a logo, name, and branding for a new agency that promises to alleviate poverty in developing countries. This shocking revelation seems to highlight one of the principal problems with the Trudeau government: are they more concerned with appearance or results?

HUMAN RIGHTS: CANADA AN UNLIKELY LEADER FOR AN INTERNATIONAL RULE- BASED ORDER

Canada's approach to advancing human rights is to represent Canadians as champions of inclusive and accountable governance, peaceful pluralism, respect for diversity, and human rights including the rights for women and refugees. This kind of rhetoric is iterated in the Liberal government's bid for a United Nations Security Council (UNSC). However, the Canadian government has neither an agenda nor a clear vision as to why it deserves a seat at the table. Instead, the discussion seems to be quite circular: we deserve a seat at the table because we are Canada-what does Canada do at the table? Project Canadian values. This rhetoric for human rights and promoting Canadian values abroad should be brought into question. While Canada touts its feminist international policy at conferences

DEVELOPMENT

and at home, its ‘under the radar’ arms deals with Saudi Arabia, which is known for its atrocious human rights record deserves attention because it is a measure of where our priorities lie. Specifically, for the Trudeau government, it would appear that economic prosperity in trade takes precedence over maintaining and projecting our “Canadian values”.

While the Trudeau government maintained an economic agenda, Canada’s overt criticism to the Saudi Arabian government seemed to serve his own political agenda and domestic base. This became evident beginning in August when Chrystia Freeland, Minister of Foreign Affairs, denounced Saudi Arabia’s actions towards the imprisoned human rights activist Samar Badawi over twitter. Trudeau’s government also placed sanctions on seventeen Saudi nationals in November that were linked to the killing of journalist Jamal Khashoggi under the Magnitsky Act. Most of the people were already doing jail time so the sanctions were largely symbolic and had no real effect or influence.

These actions taken by the Trudeau government appear to be bold in order to show that Canada stands up against countries that commit human rights abuses. Yet there is a clear mismatch between Canada’s outward stance on Saudi Arabia and its economic transactions with the country. Trudeau has still upheld his \$15 billion dollar arms deal for light armoured vehicles to the Saudis. In fact, Trudeau only started to consider backing out of the arms deal in December once a financial report released in December proved that the Saudi Arabia government had fallen short on payments by \$1.8B. To date, no final decision has been taken. While Trudeau stresses the importance of human rights on one hand, the arms deal with Saudi Arabia leaves him and Chrystia Freeland open to accusations of hypocrisy.

Canada’s stance on Venezuela since Juan Guaido proclaimed himself interim president has also been problematic. While Canada jumped on the bandwagon after President Trump recognized Juan Guaido’s presidency, Canada’s policy towards Venezuela

DEVELOPMENT

deserves further reflection. Venezuela's formal President Nicolas Maduro has led a controversial regime, furthering his country into a deep and devastating economic crisis. But, Chrystia Freeland's remarks that she wants the Venezuelan president to be deposed by the military and install the unelected self-proclaimed Juan Guaido, shows how the Trudeau government appears to push their human rights agenda too far. The contribution to humanitarian aid in the country should also be questioned. Trudeau has stated that Canada will provide \$53 million in aid for Venezuelan humanitarian groups, not governments. However, humanitarian aid in Venezuela is currently being used as a political tool by Guaido to gain support and legitimacy by Venezuelans since Maduro has blocked some humanitarian aid from entering the country. For this reason, the International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC) has stated that they refuse to operate in the country. It begs the question, if the ICRC is not willing to operate, why should the Canadian government?

Canada's position regarding Venezuela on the surface seems to play out as part of its act to fulfill its role as an international leader. But while the Trudeau government argues that it supports an international rule-based order, its failure to support international institutions and legislation over the years, namely the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine and the International Criminal Court tell a different story. Since becoming Canada's foreign minister, Minister Freeland has mostly ignored the role of the ICC. However, Freeland's decision to follow the response of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Paraguay and Peru and refer to the situation in Venezuela to the ICC is in striking contrast to her previous actions. Freeland is weaponizing the ICC. This is why the Trudeau government's position on Venezuela should be considered "unusually harsh". There have been many flawed elections within South America such as the recent Brazilian and Honduras elections, and Canada did not speak out against these governments. So, why now? Minister Freeland appears to be responding to the

DEVELOPMENT

lead of other countries. Moreover, by joining the Lima Group's support in regime change in Venezuela and sending aid which would support an unelected president, Trudeau is looking to solidify his role as an international leader. More cynically perhaps Canada's position towards Venezuela represents yet another instrument for the Liberals to gain a seat on the United Nations Security Council.

Canada's biggest problem with trying to be a leader in a rules-based order is that the Trudeau government is seen as failing to maintain these same standards back home. When the SNC-Lavalin's corruption scandal made headlines, revealing that the company had paid out \$48 million in bribes to Libyan officials between 2001-2011, it appeared that the Trudeau government wanted to brush the controversy aside. The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) reportedly tried to pressure then attorney-general Jody Wilson-Raybould to enter into a remediation agreement with SNC-Lavalin. The disregard for Jody Wilson-Raybould's judicial opinion,

Canada's first indigenous attorney general, has led to questions about the Trudeau government's dedication to the promotion of gender equality and Indigenous rights. The claims of political interference by the Trudeau government reinforces the view that his government is not bound by the same rules of law that Trudeau expects from other countries. It has furthered the perception that corporate offenders can get away with committing serious crimes. This is not the first time the Trudeau government has been under investigation by the Ethics Commissioner.



IMMIGRATION & REFUGEES

B-

STOKING MIGRATION FEARS

The influx of irregular border crossers continued to rise this year, and so have public discourse and import. On the one hand, the Trudeau government should be commended for its response in balancing between two very different views on the Safe Third Country Agreement (STCA); demands to ‘close the loophole’ and outlaw any asylum claimants from the US, and calls for the complete suspension of the STCA, questioning whether the US can be considered a ‘safe third country’ at all. The Trudeau Government managed these conflicting calls by upholding Canada’s legal and moral obligations to allow individuals claiming asylum to have a fair hearing.

IMMIGRATION & REFUGEES

While practically and programmatically, the government has done an acceptable job at responding, they haven't done a good enough job of explaining what they are doing, and why they are doing it. The Liberals have allowed the Canada-US border issue to develop into a very volatile political issue due to an outrageous lack of communication and coordination.

This is exemplified in the way the government has responded to provincial governments that raised concerns (such as the Ford government in Ontario). The Liberal response was not aimed at addressing legitimate concerns of the governments, but rather deflected all concerns by pointing fingers and labelling governments as racist, exclusionary and a disgrace to Canadian values. This attitude along with the divisive comments has only antagonized those who don't share Liberal political ideologies. Concerns from major host cities such as Montreal and Toronto about the mounting costs of refugees and the strain of refugees on public housing and social services reflects a complete lack of coordination in all

levels of government.

The failures in communication are mounting. The failure by Minister Hussen to clearly communicate to the Canadian public what's happening in Roxham Road (a favored border crossing in Quebec) and Emerson, Manitoba (another border crossing) is a case in point. Trudeau's own town hall comments have further managed to blur the line between refugees and asylum seekers in public discourse.

These lapses reveal a very large weakness within the Liberal government in building and sustaining the consensus and support necessary to see difficult policies through to fruition. By taking a moral high ground, the Trudeau government has yet to demonstrate true leadership on immigration. The Liberals have allowed a policy problem, key to realising Canada's future prosperity, to become an issue of politics. As a result, immigration has become a deeply divisive political issue and will be a subject of much debate in the upcoming elections.

IMMIGRATION & REFUGEES

The concern is not with immigration numbers, but with the government's ability to project the public's opinion and manage these flows in a financially responsible way. Irregular border crossings have come to a halt during these vicious winter months, following several cases of frostbite. Yet another run at the border is expected in the coming months. All eyes are focused on how the Liberal government will respond.

THE GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES

There is genuine discord between the Trudeau government's performance abroad and what it has accomplished domestically. Globally, the Liberals have shown leadership in a difficult time to support the work of the global refugee regime. 2018 was a critical year to develop and deliver a new Global Compact on Refugees, that was ultimately accepted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 17, 2018 despite the United States voting against it. With the absence

of US support, The United Nations High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR) did not have its traditional hegemon to call on, given that it is the biggest donor to UNHCR and was the largest resettlement agency. Canada played an important role through this difficult process as a bridge builder in terms of facilitating dialogue between refugee hosting states and donor states and by bringing the global South into the conversation. Canada also played an important role in bringing along some of its likeminded partners; European states and Australia who faced domestic opposition to developing a new global agreement.

Canada is now the largest refugee resettlement country in the world, following the US reduction in the number of refugees it resettles (Germany has taken in far more in absolute terms), and is also one of the top ten donors to the UNHCR, though this is not unprecedented for Canada. Excluding the one-time donation of \$100 million in 2016, the Liberal government's contributions to the UNHCR are not far from Canada's average

IMMIGRATION & REFUGEES

donations under the Harper government which maintained an annual contribution of approximately \$70 million, compared to the \$72 million pledged last year. The Liberal government has also demonstrated leadership in the way it is raising awareness of complex situations like the Rohingya in Bangladesh or the Syrians in Jordan or Lebanon, and on its leadership on G7 commitments. Globally Canada is fully engaged in the rhetoric of making a difference.

MESSY PROCESSES

Yet Canada's moral authority is in a large measure derived from what it is doing at home. Real care and attention must be directed to ensure there is strong cross-party support for Canada to maintain the current refugee levels Canada has. There is looming crisis which must be attended to. With a backlog of over 60,000 asylum seekers, it has become apparent that our system is not equipped to process unanticipated and very large influxes. This has left hundreds on the

welfare rolls until their status is determined. Other things being equal, the RCMP, the Canada Border Services Agency, and the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada are simply doing their jobs. Individuals who cross the border are apprehended, taken into custody, documented if their identity can be verified, and then appear at their hearing.

Results have been delivered and boxes have been ticked, but have the processes been inclusive, transparent and value based, as promised in the Liberal mandate? The government delivered on the letter of its commitments, but not on the spirit of their promises. The sudden relaunch of the lottery system for family reunifications in January 2019 for example is a case of a process that is neither transparent nor open. The preferential treatment in the fast-track asylum process of the Saudi teenager Rahaf al-Qunun, is another example of opacity and virtue signalling.

Photo ops and masking intrinsically diplomatic maneuvers as humanitarian initiatives all contribute to a loss of faith in the

IMMIGRATION & REFUGEES

government's commitment to accountability.

The way in which the Liberals continue to use the resettlement program and its humanitarian assistance program as part of larger diplomatic efforts in the Middle East is a case in point.

The quality of good governance is not judged solely on its efficiency. It is also to be judged on maintaining openness and transparency of those policies which generate public confidence. The government has lived up to its commitment to some of its promises. However, these promises have been delivered in what many describe as a "deliverology" way, or rather in the government's words, on data driven results-based management. The government's own online report card extolling Liberal party virtues but none of its vices is an example of this.

CONTRIBUTORS

DAVID CARMENT

David Carment is a Professor of International Affairs at Carleton University. He is also the Editor of the Canadian Foreign Policy Journal (CFPJ) and a Fellow of the Canadian Global Affairs Institute.

BRANDON JAMIESON

Brandon Jamieson is an M.A. candidate at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, studying Security and Defence Policy. He received his B.A. (Honours) in Political Studies from Queen's University. His primary areas of interest are in national and international security, foreign policy, and emerging security threats. You can contact Brandon at brandon.jamieson@carleton.ca.

FATIMAH ELFEITORI

Fatimah Elfeitori is an M.A. candidate at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, specializing in Humanitarian Assistance and Project Management and obtained her Bachelor of Laws (LL.B) from the University of London. Her research interests lie in global migration, fragile states, transitional justice and international law. You can contact Fatimah at fatimahelfeitori@gmail.com.

EMILY ROBERTSON

Emily Robertson is an M.A. candidate at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, in Project Management for Humanitarian Assistance. She received her Honours B.A. in Political Science from Queen's University in 2018. Emily's research interests include Canadian foreign policy as it relates to development and humanitarian assistance, gender in international relations, and drug policies and crime rates in Latin America. You can contact Emily at emilyrobertson3@email.carleton.ca.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Aniket Bhushan
Dane Rowlands
Howard Duncan
Meredith Lilly
James Milner
Stephanie Carvin
Philippe Lagasse
Aniket Bhushan
Valerie Percival
Yiagadeesen Samy
Inger Weibust
Nic Rivers
Alex S. Wilner

CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY JOURNAL

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PLATFORM

CENTRE FOR TRADE POLICY AND LAW

IAFFAIRS CANADA

NORMAN PATERSON SCHOOL OF
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

RIDEAU INSTITUTE

GRAPHIC AND LAYOUT DESIGN BY: LANCE HADLEY

LIST OF ACRONYMS

- CBSA** - Canadian Border Services Agency
- CETA** - Comprehensive Economic Trade Agreement
- CIO** - Climate Invest One
- CPTPP** - Comprehensive and Progressive Free Trade Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership
- CSE Act** - The Canadian Security Establishment Act
- CSE** - Communications Security Establishment
- CSIS** - Canadian Security Intelligence Service
- DFI** - Development Finance Institute
- FIAP** - Feminist International Assistance Policy
- FTAs** - Free Trade Agreements
- FinDev Canada** - Financial Development Canada
- GAC** - Global Affairs Canada
- GHG** - Greenhouse gases
- ICA** - The Intelligence Commissioner Act
- ICRC** - International Committee for the Red Cross
- NAFTA** - North American Free Trade Agreement
- NATO** - North Atlantic Treaty Organization
- NSICOP** - National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians
- NSIRA Act** - The National Security and Intelligence Review Agency Act
- OECD** - Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
- PMO** - Prime Minister's Office
- RCMP** - Royal Canadian Mounted Police
- STCA** - Safe Third Country Agreement
- UNHCR** - United Nations High Commission on Refugees
- UNSC** - United Nations Security Council
- USMCA** - United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement
- WTO** - World Trade Organization

CONTACT

CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY
JOURNAL (CFPJ)
CFPJ@CARLETON.CA

IAFFAIRS
ADMIN@IAFFAIRSCANADA.COM

NORMAN PATERSON SCHOOL
OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
5306 RICHCRAFT HALL BUILDING
CARLETON UNIVERSITY
1125 COLONEL BY DRIVE,
OTTAWA, ON K1S 5B6
CANADA

(613) 520 6655

CFPJ

iAffairs 



**The Norman Paterson School
of International Affairs**

Carleton University

© ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
MARCH 2018