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Welcome

Dear Participants:

It is our pleasure to welcome you to this remarkable experiment in Canadian democracy: Foreign Policy By Canadians. We are thrilled that you have joined us to be one of roughly 400 Canadians scientifically selected to represent the entire country on March 13 and 14, 2021. Over these two days, you will join your fellow Canadians in discussing issues on foreign policy and hear from experts in global public health, security, prosperity and human dignity who will answer your questions.

We call this type of gathering a “deliberative poll.” You have already answered survey questions related to foreign policy issues. During the weekend, you will discuss your views with other Canadians who also have been randomly selected to represent the whole country. To help prepare you to discuss the issues, we have produced this briefing book with the help of subject-matter experts. The book contains a background analysis and competing arguments ‘for’ and ‘against’ different policy proposals that each propose actions Canada could take on the international stage to advance the interests of our citizens: your health, your security, your prosperity and your dignity. Each section of this briefing book brings together different points of view, benefiting from the input of diverse experts, ranging in different perspectives and political views.

We recognize this is a thorough document and we have tried to make it as useful as possible. We hope you will read the competing arguments in the boxes before your group deliberations on the issues and you can also make reference to them during the group discussions. To maximize your participation, we recommend that you read the issue summaries prior to March 13 and we hope you will read the entire document.

We would also like to take this time to thank Global Affairs Canada as this project would not have been possible without their support.

Thank you for giving your time to participate in this unique dialogue. We thank you deeply for the commitment you are expressing to our democracy.

Julia Anderson     Ben Rowswell
CEO, CanWaCH     President, CIC
More than ever before, our lives as Canadians are shaped by what happens outside Canada: from the food on our tables, to the jobs we may hold, to the technology that connects us to our loved ones and that keeps us informed. And now, with a pandemic turning our lives upside down, our very health is influenced by international affairs.

In a democracy, citizens must have a say in the decisions that affect their lives. Increasingly, decisions that affect our lives are impacted by developments and decisions beyond our borders. The lives of everyday Canadians are shaped by the way Canada engages in the world.

At the same time that our interdependence with other countries has grown, the world has become a more divided place. The past few years have seen an increase in competition between countries, as the alliances and institutions that unite us grow weaker. Just as we now rely more on decisions made at the international level to instill some stability in our lives, those decisions have become more and more difficult to make.

How should Canada work with other countries to improve our lives? You, like all citizens, have an essential role to play in answering this question. Foreign policy shapes your life. This exercise is an opportunity to learn what Canada’s foreign policy should be, in the view of the people most affected – Canadians themselves.
People and goods travel around the world faster than ever before. This means that your health is affected by the health of people in other countries, and their health is affected by yours. Over the last several years, there have been infectious illnesses that have spread quickly around the world, such as SARS in 2003, H1N1 in 2009 or MERS in 2012. The current COVID-19 pandemic is one of the largest and most dangerous outbreaks we have seen in recent years.

Within 12 months, COVID-19 reached the shores of every continent on Earth. By the end of March 2021, there will likely be more than 1 million confirmed COVID-19 cases in Canada, and more than 2.5 million people have died globally, including over 20,000 Canadians. The Canadian government has committed to vaccinating everyone in Canada who wants a vaccine by the end of 2021. Public health measures such as handwashing, mask-wearing, physical distancing, and restricted travel remain critical in preventing the spread of the virus.

Given how widespread COVID-19 is, it is very possible that you or someone you know has been directly affected. As well, the pandemic has had major negative effects on our economy, jobs, and relationships. Public health crises like COVID-19 put a big strain on our health systems and have been shown to make social inequalities even worse. This means that the most vulnerable people in our neighbourhoods - such as people who are elderly, frontline workers, immigrants, and those who have no shelter – feel the negative effects the hardest.
PREVENTING THE SPREAD OF COVID-19

The Issue

In early 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) asked countries to take action to end the outbreak. In response, almost every country in the world has put in place restrictions on international travel over the past year. These typically include refusing to allow visitors from other countries to enter, particularly visitors from countries which are believed to have high numbers of COVID-19 cases.

Canada is no exception. Every Canadian province/territory has enforced some form of restriction on movement. As well, the Canadian government has taken increasingly strong measures to restrict international travel, including but not limited to:

- Refusing most foreign travellers, with some exceptions;
- Requiring all travellers to provide proof of a negative COVID-19 test taken before they leave their home country;
- Requiring travellers to take a COVID-19 test when they arrive in Canada, and to isolate themselves until their test results come back negative; and,
- Enforcing serious penalties for travellers who do not follow these policies.

In 2020, Canada joined many countries in recognizing that vaccines should be affordable and available to everyone, everywhere. By 2021, however, several countries have already purchased more than 50% of the world's vaccines, and Canada has reserved more than four times what it needs to vaccinate our entire population, making us the largest purchaser of COVID-19 vaccines in the world. At the same time, most countries in Asia, Africa, and South America may have to wait until 2024 before vaccines are available.
## Proposal 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should maintain high restrictions on international travel from high-risk countries until the majority of Canadians have been vaccinated.</td>
<td>Every day, we learn more about the virus, how it spreads, and how it affects our communities. We must protect Canadians, especially because we share borders with the world’s hardest hit country, the US. At least three new strains of the virus have been found in three different continents. These new strains have also been found in Canada. Canada should protect Canadians by taking all measures to prevent the virus from entering Canada via international travel.</td>
<td>Travel restrictions have increased hostility against certain racialized groups over the past year. Some experts think we should focus on prevention measures that are known to work, such as physical distancing and testing before travelling. Given that there are alternative measures, and since more dangerous strains of the virus are already spreading in the country, Canada does not need to keep travel bans in place. Keeping strict travel restrictions in place until all Canadians have been vaccinated means waiting, at the very least, until the end of 2021 before travel to and from Canada is possible. This will put hundreds of thousands of Canadian jobs in travel and tourism at risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canada should contribute COVID-19 vaccines to poor nations at the same time as we distribute them at home.

**Canada has purchased more than enough vaccines for our entire population, but vaccines are arriving over time (not all at once), and are distributed in different ways across provinces and cities. Canada should keep all their vaccines until all Canadians have been vaccinated before promising vaccines to other countries.**

The pandemic is not over until it is over everywhere. The rise of variants has demonstrated that Canadians will not be safe until the majority of the world is vaccinated. Widespread global vaccination will slow the spread of the virus and reduce dangerous mutations.

Even if Canada manages to vaccinate its entire population, Canadians and Canadian businesses will not return to their normal activities until travel and trade reopen around the world too. The global economy stands to lose as much $9 trillion USD if we fail to end this health crisis quickly for all countries in the world.

Canadian foreign policy has recognized that a safe, secure and healthy world is good for Canadians. One major threat to a safe, secure and healthy planet is poverty. In addition to being a health risk, the COVID-19 pandemic threatens to push more people around the world into extreme poverty. Through the provision of vaccines and aid to poor nations, Canada can help stop the spread of COVID-19 and its impacts, such as extreme poverty.

We do not know enough about the long-term immunity of COVID-19 vaccines (i.e.: how long it protects individuals against the virus). It is possible that Canadians will need additional doses of the vaccine in the future. We also need to better understand how effective the vaccines are at preventing infection. Until we have this figured out, holding on to our stockpile of vaccines may be the smartest course of action.
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR BETTER PREPARATION

The Issue

Although scientists repeatedly warned of a potential “global health emergency”, the world was unprepared when COVID-19 emerged. Responding to the pandemic has cost the world trillions of dollars, whereas a strong health crisis preparedness plan would have cost only a fraction of this amount.

We know that new diseases will emerge in the future and many think Canada should waste no time in preparing for another global health emergency. As the experiences in some countries have shown, the best way to overcome a pandemic is to act early.

Canada has invested in early warning systems before. Between 2009 and 2019, the Global Public Health Intelligence Network (GPHIN) issued more than 1,500 alerts on potential outbreaks from around the world to Canadian and international public health leaders in an effort to keep Canadians and the world safe. However, the Canadian government scaled back this system in mid-2019.

Another way to prevent the next global health crisis is to make sure that the international organizations that are supposed to coordinate the global response are better prepared. Canada works with the World Health Organization (WHO) to quickly respond to health crises. However, the work of the WHO goes beyond preparing for the next major outbreak. The WHO also promotes the health and wellbeing of people all over the world so that they can lead healthy lives. Despite criticisms over its handling of COVID-19, the WHO has also achieved great success, such as the worldwide elimination of smallpox more than 40 years ago.

Canada pays annual dues in order to participate in the work of the WHO. Dues are calculated every two years based on a country’s wealth and population. In 2020-2021, Canada’s dues are just under $30 million USD. For comparison, Germany pays about $65 million USD, China $129 million USD, and the US over $230 million USD. Canada and 193 other member countries also usually donate additional funds that are used for specific regions or issues that are important priorities for them. Some experts say that these donated funds actually limit the WHO’s ability to react quickly to urgent health issues that, while important, are not as popular among donors.

In addition, nearly all countries in the world have agreed to work together with the WHO to fight the international spread of disease under the International Health Regulations. However, the regulations have been criticized over the past year for failing to address the COVID-19 pandemic. Under the current regulations, the WHO must wait for an official invitation from the affected country before it can carry out an independent investigation. One suggestion has been to give the WHO the right to investigate outbreaks the moment they are detected, even if the WHO has not been invited, and even if the affected country has not confirmed any outbreaks.
## INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR BETTER PREPARATION

### Proposals 3, 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSALS</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should reinstate the Global Public Health Information Network and protect its international warning system from future cutbacks.</td>
<td>Countries are often reluctant to say that they have an outbreak because other countries around the world react in fear, and this may affect their economic interests. If Canada had its own early warning system in place in 2020, we may have been better prepared and saved more lives in Canada and globally. The US is looking to develop a similar tool, which demonstrates that these types of alerts are valued, and also means that Canada has an opportunity to partner with our closest neighbour.</td>
<td>The world does not depend only on Canada to issue alerts of global disease threats. The WHO has offices around the world that are supposed to monitor these threats, and we would be better off strengthening existing international tools. There are also publicly available systems that report on disease outbreaks, and private Canadian companies that offer tailored services. Canada needs to stay flexible enough to reallocate funding to domestic public health priorities as they come up, both during and beyond the pandemic. Canada should support the WHO’s outbreak alert system, rather than create its own system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada should respond positively to the international effort to build up global health infrastructure through increased mandatory contributions for the World Health Organization.</td>
<td>The WHO needs steady and flexible funding to lead bold campaigns, such as promoting universal health care, and to address crises like pandemics as they emerge. In addition, if we let the bulk of WHO’s funding come from a very small number of donors, we run the risk of letting the WHO become politically dependent on these donors. For the sake of the WHO’s independence and better performance, it is better to increase required contributions from all countries. By becoming a more active contributor to the WHO, Canada can send a clear signal to its allies that it is ready to cooperate, negotiate, and help advance shared priorities in global health.</td>
<td>The decision to increase required financial contributions to the WHO ultimately depends on the agreement of all 194 member countries, many of whom are still struggling with the economic impact of the pandemic. Canada’s support for the proposal may have a minor impact, if at all, on influencing support for this proposal at the international level. Voluntary funding allows Canada to provide what it can when it can, shape the global health priorities of WHO, and track how its funds are being spent. This allows Canada to report back to Canadians, country partners, and other stakeholders on how it is contributing to health development globally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>ARGUMENTS FOR</td>
<td>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada should push to legally authorize the WHO to inspect countries independently when an outbreak is suspected.</td>
<td>Many countries believe that if China had disclosed possible COVID-19 cases sooner, far more deaths could have been prevented around the world. It is time to consider giving more powers to the WHO to investigate cases of unknown diseases before they reach pandemic levels. As we have seen with COVID-19, there are several ways in which the WHO may get information about possible new outbreaks, including whistleblowers residing in the affected country, observations from neighbouring countries, and private companies. If we change international law, the WHO could be authorized to investigate outbreaks anywhere in the world based on these reports.</td>
<td>Some countries – especially those with authoritarian governments – are likely to strongly oppose the proposal. Other countries that place high emphasis on independence may similarly view this as giving the WHO too much power. Ultimately, more than two thirds of every country in the world would have to agree to the proposal for it to become official international law – and it is unclear that there is enough political will at the moment. Canada should avoid creating tensions between ourselves and powerful countries like China, with whom relations have already been difficult in recent months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Issue

Politics and global health are connected, and due to COVID-19, health has become the most important foreign policy issue of the year. Beyond COVID-19, however, there are medium- and long-term threats to global health that affect not only Canadians but people around the world, making the case for Canada to work with the international community.

In 2019, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria were still among the biggest killers of adults in low-income countries. At the same time, non-communicable diseases like heart disease and cancer are among the leading causes of death globally. Though science has given us tools to tackle some of these health challenges, death rates continue to increase, not only here in Canada but in low and middle income countries where little attention is given to these diseases. This is just one of many new and emerging dangers. To give one example, some illnesses have evolved to outlast every drug we have to fight them. An estimated 700,000 lives are lost globally each year to infections caused by these sorts of drug-resistant illnesses. Without making significant changes, drug-resistant illnesses may kill as many as 10 million people annually by 2050. This makes drug resistance one of the biggest global health challenges of our time.

Some feel that global partnership is necessary to save the planet from these dangers and focusing on the health risks that Canada shares with the world is fundamental if Canada aims to achieve health, prosperity and security for all Canadians. While many countries, such as Norway, Germany, and Switzerland, have national global health strategies, global health has not been the focus of Canada's foreign policy agenda.

A national global health strategy could ensure that our foreign policies and programming are coordinated and clearly aligned with global health interests around the world. To give you one recent example, over the past several months, Canada's Minister of International Development has been criticized for assuring Canada's support for global vaccine equity, while at the same time, Canada's international trade diplomats have continued to protect international trade rules that allow private control over vaccine production and distribution. A national global health strategy could ensure Canada's foreign affairs is informed by the global health impacts of their work.

Implementation of a strategy could be overseen by an appointed expert in global health, such as an Ambassador for Global Health, an approach being utilized in countries such as Norway. In addition to making sure that Canada's national global health strategy is being put into action, the Ambassador could be responsible for Canada's contributions to international meetings, like the G7 and the World Health Assembly, where important decisions are made that affect the health of Canadians and the world. The Ambassador could lead Canada's efforts to strengthen global health institutions like the WHO and build meaningful partnerships with other countries for greater global impact on health.
Official development assistance (ODA) refers to the funds that Canada and other high-income countries give to low- and middle-income countries in order to help them improve things like their health care and education and to lift people out of poverty. The federal government department of Global Affairs Canada is responsible for making sure that Canada achieves its international development goals. Global Affairs Canada is guided by Canada’s Feminist International Assistance Policy, which aims to eliminate poverty, ensure peace and prosperity, and promote gender equality.

Canada has established an international reputation for investing in the most often ignored areas of global health, which overwhelmingly affect women and girls. With countries like the US having pulled back from promoting women and children’s health over the past four years, Canada has an opportunity to become a global champion in women and children’s health in the years ahead.

To support ODA investment, in the 1960s, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson developed an international benchmark for high income countries to donate 0.7% of their gross national income to aid. However, we have consistently fallen below this target in recent times. In 2018-2019, Canada gave less than 0.3% of its gross national income (the lowest amount seen since 2012) in ODA. Our aid contribution also falls well below the average of contributions made by 34 middle- and high-income donor countries. For instance, countries like Sweden and Norway consistently contribute 1.0% of their gross national income to international assistance.
## IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF GLOBAL PUBLIC HEALTH

### Proposal 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should establish a National Strategy on Global Health, led by a Global Health Ambassador.</td>
<td>A <a href="#">national global health strategy</a> would ensure that Canada's foreign policies and programming are consistent across all government departments and would help to ensure they are aligned with Canada's global health priorities. It's important that Canada be part of international discussions that shape how prepared the world will be for future global health challenges. A national global health strategy led by a trusted and skilled global health expert would ensure that Canada's vision and opinions are represented in important current and future international decisions, such as how to strengthen the WHO.</td>
<td>A national strategy creates a new layer of bureaucracy and may not guarantee buy-in from branches of government, particularly those whose objectives may sometimes conflict with global health priorities. Some other departments, such as Health Canada or the Public Health Agency of Canada, may consider this to be something that should be their responsibility. This could lead to unclear leadership and accountability for government decision-making and judgment, especially in times of crisis. To be truly impactful, a national global health strategy would have to integrate domestic health priorities. However, these typically fall under the jurisdiction of provinces and territories. The federal government may be seen as interfering with the health agendas of provinces and territories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>ARGUMENTS FOR</td>
<td>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada should take a leadership role in global health by building on our track record in women and children's health.</td>
<td>It is better to have a major impact in one area of international aid, rather than to provide small amounts of aid to many areas. Canada has already done a lot of work for women and children's health around the world. Our existing partners, especially those that are community-based, need reliable funding to ensure long-term impact. Canada should continue this work and establish a clear role as champion, expert, and reliable ally. Women and children are hit hardest by crisis, poverty and inequality, yet they are pillars of strength and stability in society. For example, by one estimate, investments in gender equality would add $12 trillion dollars to the global economy by 2025. Investing in the health and rights of women will be the surest way of guaranteeing global recovery from the pandemic.</td>
<td>Canada's ODA should take into consideration other leading causes of death around the world. With non-communicable diseases like heart disease and cancer receiving little to no attention in low- and middle-income countries, Canada should consider addressing these issues. Canada needs to invest in urgent priorities, such as building resilient health systems in the aftermath of COVID-19 and be open to changing directions quickly if needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Issue

Key concerns worrying Canadians like public health, climate change, inequality and economic stability are all global issues that require global solutions. COVID-19 provides an example of how our health here in Canada is tied to the health of people around the world. Even if Canadians are all vaccinated, we would continue to be threatened by new variants of the virus until COVID-19 is eliminated everywhere.

Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) is one tool Canada has in its toolbox to address global issues and help make the world a safer, more secure and prosperous place. ODA refers to the funds that Canada and other high-income countries give to low- and middle-income countries in order to help them improve outcomes in health care and education, and to lift them out of poverty. The international development goals to which the government applies ODA are laid out in the Feminist International Assistance Policy, and these include the elimination of poverty, promoting peace and prosperity, and gender equality.

In the 1960s, on the advice of Canada’s former Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson, the international community adopted a benchmark for high income countries to donate 0.7 percent of their gross national income to aid. Canada has never met this target. In the 2018-2019 fiscal year, Canada gave a little over 6 billion USD in aid – amounting to less than 0.3 percent of our gross national income, the lowest amount seen since 2012. Canada’s aid contribution also falls well below the average of contributions made by 34 middle- and high-income donor countries.

Opponents of increased spending often argue that ODA is not fit-for-purpose in the current global climate. Some argue that to lift poor countries out of poverty, the government should focus more on growing the global economy through trade. Others believe Canada should focus more exclusively on issues here in Canada.

The question is how much international assistance funding is the right amount? How far should Canada go in supporting solutions to crises around the world?
# THE PRICE OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION: SPENDING IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

## Proposal 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should support global goals like global health by bringing ODA levels up to the average of other G7 nations.</td>
<td>Some people estimate that emerging economies will need at least $2.5 trillion USD to recover from the pandemic. Canada's ODA contribution will come at a time when aid from other countries may decrease, meaning it will fill an important gap and increase Canada's leadership on the world stage. In the longer term, efforts to address global health will need to also address the significant lack of &quot;stuff, space, staff and systems&quot; experienced by many countries in the world, especially those in the global south. In the past, these same shortages have contributed to the spread of diseases like Ebola and, if left unaddressed, they could make us more vulnerable to the next global pandemic too. But ODA isn't just to mitigate public health crises. It also strengthens global value-chains and markets, prevents and ends conflict, and fosters innovation that benefits everyone. There is a clear return on investment for international assistance. For example, Canada has contributed over $1.5 billion in development assistance to Vietnam since 1990. Over those 30 years, Vietnam has grown into a lower-middle-income country with a large international trade portfolio that includes Canada. Our two-way trade with Vietnam rose from $50 million in 1993 to $6.5 billion in 2018 - up 130 times. Now every two years, Canada makes as much in sales to Vietnam as it provided in 25 years of ODA.</td>
<td>Canada has increased its debt during the pandemic. For the foreseeable future, Canada must focus on encouraging our own national economic recovery and growth. The pandemic has negatively impacted the most vulnerable people in Canada, some of whom are living in poor conditions. It is too early to begin making commitments to increase ODA, particularly since inequalities are also increasing in our own neighbourhoods. Canada must ‘put on its own mask’ before it can protect other countries. Official development assistance is an outdated tool to lift countries out of poverty. The Canadian government should place more focus on trade agreements that allow poor countries to develop on their own terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Should Canada Engage in the World to Protect the Health of Canadians?
How Should Canada Engage in the World to Protect the Security of Canadians?

COVID-19 is the latest of a range of threats to Canadians that originate beyond our borders. There is no shortage of other threats. Finding the right path to achieve both national and international objectives, in a fast-changing and potentially dangerous world, is complex. Adding to the complexity is the need to ensure that while pursuing effective security for Canadians, we do not undermine any of the core foundations of our democracy.

National security is about preventing harm, above all to Canadians, but also to our fellow global citizens. It is also about doing no unnecessary harm to our rights.
FOREIGN INTERFERENCE THREATS TO OUR ELECTIONS

The Issue

In early 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) asked countries to take action to end interference by foreign states and their proxies in democratic elections has been on the rise since 2016 when Russian state-backed entities attempted to interfere in the US Presidential election, and it is now a global problem. Such foreign interference threatens the very foundation of our democratic practices by manipulating and corrupting political campaigning, distorting public debates, and attempting to suppress the right of all citizens to vote. Investigations into foreign interference show that it is enabled by cyber tools, and is often conducted in a sophisticated and hidden manner. No democracy is immune from this threat.

The evidence to date suggests that foreign interference in election processes in democracies will be a persistent problem. A core feature of such interference is that its objectives are two-fold: a) to influence election decisions and b) to undermine faith in democracy itself. In seeking to undermine faith in democracy it can be used as a weapon to target racial minorities, stir up racial hatred and polarize societies.

Proposal 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should deploy strong laws against foreign interference in our elections.</td>
<td>We must uphold our democratic practices, especially around free and fair elections. Canada must have the capacity to impose serious legal penalties against any foreign interference in our elections, including against Canadians who facilitate it. Only through the use of strong legal powers will foreign interference in future elections be deterred. Only strong action against foreign election interference will sustain Canada’s global reputation as a democracy.</td>
<td>Introducing legal penalties in an election setting will do more harm than good. Among the unintended consequences are: such powers could be misused for political gain; accusations could fuel more bitter partisan politics; individual reputations could be smeared; and, communities could be racially targeted. Better to rely on Canadians’ resilience and good judgement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CYBER THREATS TO OUR ECONOMIC SECURITY AND PROSPERITY

## The Issue

Canadians are among the most digitally connected peoples in the world. Our advanced economy depends on digital tools to innovate, conduct research, bring products to market, manage supply chains and conduct global trade. Individual Canadians need to be digitally secure against intrusions that could threaten their privacy and their livelihoods. Governments at all levels in Canada depend on digital processes to execute policies on behalf of Canadians. Governments and large private sector organizations, such as our major banks, hold large quantities of private data that must be secured. Malicious cyber activity, including by foreign states, poses the greatest threat to Canadian national security, according to the director of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

Cyber threats touch all Canadians. They also impact Canada’s foreign policy since Canada is part of a global system that must address cyber threats, and must demonstrate, especially to its allies, its ability to be cyber secure and, therefore, a trusted partner.

## Proposal 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should improve our capabilities to respond to online threats targeting our economic prosperity.</td>
<td>Efforts by foreign adversaries using espionage and cyber hacking to steal government and private company data and secrets harm Canadians’ individual and collective economic security. Cyber attacks cannot be met by defence alone. The Canadian government should use new legal powers and capabilities to stop cyber attacks and cyber theft at their source by “hacking back” to stop the bleeding away of our knowledge and innovation base.</td>
<td>Canada must not contribute to a cyber arms race by playing a dangerous escalatory game in international cyber space. Canada should instead pursue a foreign policy that seeks to establish international laws and norms to constrain cyber aggression of all forms. Cyber security must remain a game of lawful defence in which all Canadians have a responsibility for maintaining cyber “hygiene” with good cyber practices, in which private corporations exercise a responsibility to protect the integrity of the digital information they hold, and in which the federal government limits its specific role to defending the information it holds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAFEGUARDING THE CANADIAN ARCTIC

The Issue

Canada is an Arctic nation. The Arctic region is undergoing tremendous change, warming at three times the global average. The environment, wildlife, and livelihoods of Canada's Arctic Indigenous peoples are all under threat.

The Arctic has long been a zone of international cooperation. However, climate change impacts, expanded resource accessibility, and military modernization by some states with long term strategic interests in the region, such as Russia and China, challenge the maintenance of international stability in the Arctic and Canada's security.

Canada needs a clear security policy for the Arctic, as well as a clear foreign policy that addresses Arctic issues. This issue goes to the heart of protecting our country's interests, maintaining international peace and cooperation, dealing with climate change impacts and protecting our fellow citizens who inhabit the region.

The Canadian government should expand our military and coast guard operations and increase our security and defence focus on Arctic military capabilities. We must have early warning about threats by potentially hostile state actors, including through the expanded use of Canadian owned and operated satellite monitoring of the region.

Our best security partner to support our interests in the Arctic region is the United States, with whom we should maintain a close working relationship. We must work with the United States to modernize the NORAD continental defence agreement, and pay our fair share of the costs of upgrading our early warning systems and northern defence capabilities.

We also have to protect the region from outside economic forces. Foreign investment in the Arctic should be closely scrutinized on security grounds. Foreign state-owned companies should not be allowed to engage in takeovers of Arctic resource companies or related infrastructure.

The Indigenous peoples of Canada's Arctic region face enormous challenges, which have been amplified by climate change impacts. Their economic security and food security are at risk. The Canadian government should make its priority in the Arctic protecting the livelihood of the indigenous population.

The future of the indigenous peoples of Canada's Arctic is dependent on new economic opportunities as well as protection of traditional ways of living. Development of the economic resources of the Arctic region requires an ability to attract foreign investment. Canada should remain open to the economic benefits of foreign investment. Decisions on economic development should be made primarily by the people and governments of Canada's north.
In the context of the real, local needs of Canada's Arctic peoples, attention must not be diverted by exaggerated and hypothetical global security threats. Canada should continue to enhance its support of the long-established system for international and peaceful cooperation in the Arctic, exemplified by the Arctic Council. We must work with all Arctic states, including Russia, and others with proclaimed strategic interests in the Arctic, such as China.

**Proposals 3, 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSALS</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Canada should strengthen its ability to maintain its sovereignty and safeguard its territorial control in the Arctic in the face of threats by states with long-term strategic interests in the region. | Canada must have an ability to defend its interests in the Arctic region. More military and coast guard resources for the Arctic are needed. To protect the Arctic requires a Canadian ability to continuously monitor all air and sea military traffic in the region. Canada's sovereignty and control over northern development could be threatened by foreign investment in such key sectors as mining, port operations, airfield maintenance and telecommunications. | Canada does not have the financial resources to greatly expand its military and coast guard capabilities in the Arctic at the expense of other missions. The threat of strategic competition and military action in the Arctic region is hypothetical and does not warrant major investments in response. | }

| Canada's main focus in the Arctic region should be on enhanced human security. Canada should focus on improving economic and food security in the Arctic region for its Indigenous population. | Climate change has brought existential threats to the way of the life of Canada's indigenous peoples in the North. Helping them meet these challenges is Canada's first priority. Sustainable development in the Arctic is crucial for economic and human security. | Human and economic security for the indigenous populations of Canada’s Arctic depends on the maintenance of Canadian sovereignty, which must be the first priority. We don't have to choose one over the other. Canada must make long term investments in military and coast guard capabilities to defend its Arctic sovereignty as a first priority. |}

How Should Canada Engage in the World to Protect the Security of Canadians?
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THE EXISTENTIAL THREAT OF CLIMATE CHANGE

The Issue

The Arctic is far from the only part of Canada experiencing climate change – Canadians everywhere face the threat of dramatic, disruptive and permanent alteration to the ecosystems in which we live.

Most states have joined the 2015 Paris Agreement on Climate Change, including the US which has now rejoined. In keeping with the commitments reached in Paris, many states have set new limits on harmful emissions and are finding new economic pathways to lessen dependence on fossil fuels.

Climate change poses global security challenges, including around resource scarcity and resource conflicts, political and societal destabilisation, economic challenges, and forced migrations.

Climate change also has regional and local security impacts. These impacts are most visible to Canadians in terms of severe weather events, ravaging cycles of forest fires, degradation of critical infrastructure, lowered agricultural productivity, and requirements for emergency response.

Our built environment is often not designed to deal with such threats and may even contribute to them. Climate activism as a political cause is on the rise, particularly energized by young people, and may lead to a divisive politics.

The accelerating impacts of climate change on our security both at home and abroad require effective policy responses.
# The Existential Threat of Climate Change

## Proposal 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should create new domestic emergency response capabilities to deal with climate change as a major national security threat.</td>
<td>A major new danger to Canada and Canadians now comes from the impacts of climate change, which threatens our security at home through extreme weather events and their costs, and global security generally. We are fast moving past an age when states and their militaries, or even non-state actors like international terrorist groups, pose the greatest threat to our national security. Dealing with the security impacts of climate change at home should be a new policy priority. We need a new climate emergency response force—a hybrid of the military, firefighters, police and the Red Cross. We need more spending to aid recovery from extreme weather events, create more resilient communities and infrastructure, and foster greater public understanding of the threat.</td>
<td>The best response to the threat of climate change impacts is for Canada to invest urgently at home in economic transition to a green economy, not to sink major resources into trying to fight every climate emergency reactively and in quasi-military fashion. Canada must also, as a wealthy, industrialized country, lend its support to less developed countries in the “global south”, to assist them in dealing with the ravages of climate change on their societies and economies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Humans have been adept at developing weapons of tremendous potential destructive power. The more destructive such weapons have become, the more effort has been devoted to trying to find ways to prevent and prohibit their use. These efforts have never been completely successful but are ongoing.

Weapons of mass destruction are generally grouped into three categories: Nuclear (and radiological), biological and chemical. Of the three types, nuclear weapons are the most recent, dating from the first use of the atom bomb against Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War Two. Canada helped develop the atom bomb as part of the US-led Manhattan project. We subsequently decided to rid our military arsenal of nuclear weapons.

Canada’s history, our technological and scientific capabilities, and our long-established policy against the use of all forms of weapons of mass destruction establishes Canada’s role as a potentially powerful actor in trying to stop their use and spread.

Canada can contribute to international efforts against weapons of mass destruction in all forms. Yet we can make a special contribution with regard to chemical weapons prevention amid their rising use as weapons of assassination. Recent examples of this include the attempted murder in 2018 of former Russian intelligence officer, Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia, and the use of air-dropped chemical bombs by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad in Syria.
The Issue

The modern system of international relations emerged over four centuries ago based on concepts of state sovereignty, rules for the conduct of international relations, and efforts to prevent destruction of the system through catastrophic wars between major powers. Since then, the highest levels of violence in world history have occurred when the rules of the international system are abandoned and its efforts at stability overturned. The previous such period occurred in the early twentieth century when the breakdown in international order produced two world wars.

We are currently living through a new period of global instability and change in which the existing foundations and rules of international relations appear to be threatened. These changes pose major security risks for Canada and Canadians.

While the future is inherently difficult to predict, it is possible to identify five major factors at play, all of which impact on Canada:

1. The rise of China.
2. Continuing disengagement by the United States from global leadership as it tries to heal its domestic wounds.
3. Growing instability in the Middle East as Saudi Arabia and Iran conduct a series of devastating proxy wars.
4. The increasing pace of technological change, especially around cyber power and artificial intelligence, and its destabilising effects.
5. Weakening respect for international laws and norms, especially by authoritarian and populist regimes; ongoing weakness on the part of international organizations.

To achieve security, Canada must find a policy that supports international order and peace and enhances national security in the face of such changes.
## Proposal 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should help build an alliance of liberal democracies to defend the international rules-based order in the face of challenges from China and Russia.</td>
<td>Authoritarian powers like China and Russia increasingly challenge established norms of international behaviour such as peaceful cooperation between states, collective security delivered through the United Nations, respect for international law and the principles of sovereignty. A divide-and-conquer approach by such authoritarian states must be met by a renewed sense of commitment to democracy and its global spread. This cannot be achieved by any single state such as Canada, but can be better managed by a global coalition of democracies with shared values who can muster sufficient power to deter and stop international rules-breakers and benders through moral suasion, political appeals against authoritarian rulers, and even sanctions.</td>
<td>A coalition of democracies provides no feasible solution to international disorder. It would require leadership by the most powerful states, which could bend others like Canada to their will and policy objectives. It would privilege a western system of government over not just authoritarian regimes but many hybrid political systems that have emerged in the developing world or in post-conflict situations. A coalition of democracies invites a divided global order and a potential return to the circumstances of Cold War confrontation and spheres of influence. Rather than mending the international system and sustaining a rules-based order it will lead to its further fracture. Canada should instead continue to work through multilateral organizations, with special emphasis on increasing the effectiveness of the G20 group of nations and the UN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PRICE OF SECURITY

The Issue

The Canadian government does not have a “security budget.” It has sectoral budgets for many different government activities, including, for example, defence and foreign policy. It does not even calculate or publish a unified security budget, elements of which are shrouded in secrecy. This makes it difficult for Canadians to know how much money is being spent on security overall or whether that spending accords with Government promises or Canadians’ wishes. The Auditor General has uncovered serious problems with security spending in the past, particularly with regard to difficulties in tracing expenditures and relating them to policy promises.

If Canadians are in the dark about our security spending, so are our allies. It is important for Canada that our allies know that we are devoting required resources against security threats.

Without a dedicated security budget, it is hard to create a coherent security policy and hard to either increase spending where needed or defend spending against cuts when such cuts, particularly those generally targeted at deficit reduction across government, might be unwise and leave us vulnerable.

Canada faces concerted pressure from our military allies to devote more funding to defence.

Among our security agencies, we know that the RCMP is perennially under-funded and unable to properly cope with the wide range of threats that it is responsible for as a national security police force. Other elements of our security apparatus face steep costs in trying to stay abreast of technological developments.
## Proposal 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should create a well-funded security budget, one that is transparent to the Canadian public.</td>
<td>In the threat environment we face, where old distinctions between peace and war no longer hold, Canada must pay more for its security. New security spending requirements include increased defence spending, increased spending on intelligence, increased spending on cyber capabilities, and increased spending on law enforcement. Security “on the cheap” is no longer feasible and we cannot rely on others to protect us. Security budgets must be defined and made public, so that security spending can be debated by Canadians. Canada has a history of achieving security on the cheap, by depending on allies such as the UK and the United States for a security “blanket”, and keeping our security budgets low in time of peace. This cannot continue.</td>
<td>The COVID-19 crisis has upended our economy and fundamentally changed our calculations about the path to sustained prosperity. The costs of a necessary transition to a green economy will also be very high. National security is important, but without economic prosperity it is meaningless. Economic prosperity pays for security spending, never vice-versa. Canada must have a smart security budget that is restricted, proportional and measured against the greatest needs, rather than the whole range of real and feared threats. Security spending will never be available to meet all needs. A fixed budget does not accord with economic reality for Canada. The priorities of current security spending need to be upended, with more money spent on understanding threats, and proportionally less on the hard power capabilities to meet them all. The government should explain the broad nature of its security spending and targets, but a detailed budget would give away too many secrets of our capabilities and operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Should Canada Engage in the World to Enhance the Prosperity of Canadians?

Trade has always played a key role in Canada’s economic success, from the days of the fur trade and cod fishing, to the rise of agriculture and forestry and, more recently, energy production and car manufacturing.

Today the US is our most important trading partner. With about US$718.4 billion worth of goods and services exchanged in 2019, Canada and the US have the world’s biggest trading relationship. While Canada has other important trade partners, none comes close to the size and importance of our relationship with the US. The list below shows the 10 top countries for our exports in 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>US Dollar Value of Imports</th>
<th>Percent of Canadian Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 US</td>
<td>US$336.8 billion</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 China</td>
<td>US$17.5 billion</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 United Kingdom</td>
<td>$14.9 billion</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Japan</td>
<td>$9.4 billion</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mexico</td>
<td>$5.5 billion</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Germany</td>
<td>$4.7 billion</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 South Korea</td>
<td>$4.1 billion</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Netherlands</td>
<td>$3.9 billion</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 India</td>
<td>$3.6 billion</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hong Kong</td>
<td>$3 billion</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After three decades of growing globalization and free trade, the world is starting to see a backlash. Trade brings constant change as economic opportunities shift. Over the last few decades, large numbers of factories have closed, and many manufacturing jobs have moved abroad. While there has been a steady creation of new jobs, these have not always helped the same workers who lost their manufacturing jobs. Many workers have found themselves unemployed or taking lower-wage jobs. In response to this concern, the idea of protectionism has emerged. People in favour of protectionism call for tariffs and trade restrictions to support industries that employ many Canadians.
Many economists disagree with this approach. Protectionism, they say, can help some groups but only at higher costs to others. In the end, people pay more for foreign goods because of the tariff, and they also pay more for domestic goods because domestic producers often raise prices due to higher operating costs or when they no longer have to compete with international companies. As well, in response to Canadian tariffs on their products, other countries might respond with their own tariffs, which can shut down trade and slow growth.

Today, we are seeing that some countries are organizing together into large agreements (called ‘blocs’). For example, China has an ambitious US$1 trillion program to build ports, roads, railways, and airports, as well as power plants and telecommunications networks that connect Asia with Africa and Europe. There are mixed opinions on this. On one hand, some fear that Canada might be excluded from a new trade bloc led by China, and there are concerns about our future access to key markets. Similarly, there are concerns that China might use its economic power to advance its political priorities, and that being part of such an alliance could be worse than being left out.

Canada’s history shows that economic growth, good jobs, and prosperity depend on our ability to get our natural resources, agricultural products, manufactured goods, and services to markets beyond our borders - but which goods and services should we sell to which markets? How do we balance our economic interests with other national objectives? How can we share the benefits of growth, and prepare ourselves for an uncertain future?
### Proposal 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada should focus on deepening access to the US market through</strong></td>
<td>North America is our natural advantage. The US is the biggest market in the world and being next door makes it easy to trade with them. Our two economies are already very connected but Canada cannot afford to see these ties erode. We should focus on further integrating the two economies, as well as with Mexico. Specifically, this should include plans to make it easier for people to work across borders. We should also work together to make sure that we have the same quality standards to make it easier to sell items in both countries.</td>
<td>Canada already has trade agreements with other countries. It should build on these to create better access to other markets and diversify our partnerships so we are not entirely reliant on the US. Asia has a huge population and the economies of many countries in Asia are growing rapidly. In future, these countries could become major markets for our goods and services. We should be focused on developing strong trade relationships with these countries. Further integration could limit Canada’s independence. The Canadian and the US economies are already highly integrated, and more integration would likely require Canada to change some of our existing laws and policies that protect the health and safety of Canadians, the environment and our culture, in order to align with the US.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE TRANSITION TO RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Issue

Canada has an abundance of energy resources, including crude oil, coal, nuclear energy, renewable energy, and natural gas. We are the world's sixth largest energy producer, the fourth largest net exporter, and the eighth largest consumer. The energy sector is one of the country's most important employers, responsible for some 832,000 jobs across Canada.

Gas and oil are by far Canada's biggest energy export, accounting for about $122 billion of our total energy exports in 2019. Ninety-six percent of this trade is with the US. However, the industry is facing serious challenges, including an international oil price war, a pandemic that slashed fuel demand, concerns over global warming, and pressures for new energy sources.

Of course, fossil fuels accelerate climate change, a growing risk to the security of Canadians. Continued reliance on oil and gas threatens Canada's ability to achieve the Paris climate goals, to bring global warming under control and to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050.

Proposal 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In preparing for the economy of tomorrow, Canada should partner with the oil and gas industry to help it finance and lead the transition to a clean energy future.</td>
<td>To be an energy leader in the future, Canada must invest in sustainable energy sources today. Our government does not have the money or the expertise to do this, while the oil and gas industry is already a leader in clean technology. To succeed, we will need the resources and knowledge of the oil and gas industry. Demand for oil and gas is still growing. According to the International Energy Agency, global demand for natural gas will increase by 29% by 2040, and global demand for oil will increase by 7%. If Canada doesn't supply these markets, someone else will.</td>
<td>International investors see oil and gas as increasingly risky and expensive. One example of this is the cancellation of the Keystone XL pipeline. Turning to the oil and gas industry to pay for Canada's transition to clean energy will only slow progress. Clean energy is already a growing industry. In 2018, environmental and clean technology accounted for 3.2% of Canada's GDP, and 1.7% of jobs. The US is preparing for a very large investment in clean technologies, as are other countries like China and India. As the world's fourth largest producer of hydroelectricity, Canada is already a leader in clean energy. Our governments should be investing lots of money in this transition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADAPTING TO THE DIGITAL ECONOMY

The Issue

The digital economy is the result of an explosion of new services based on digital platforms and the internet, from financial consulting to marketing to online shopping. These services are part of a new global market in which free trade is focused on services and the flow of data, rather than the production and distribution of goods.

In the digital economy, data – much of it personal – is generated by all kinds of routine activities, such as credit card purchases, cell phone location, medical tests and prescriptions, browsing history, and social media activity. Companies such as Google, Apple, Facebook, and Amazon have amassed vast stores of data through their interaction with clients. This data is a highly valuable resource that can be used for an endless number of purposes, from marketing and economic forecasting to election planning and commercial research and development.

These companies have become de facto monopolies in the digital economy with extraordinary control over how the new resource – data – is created, gathered, and used. There is growing concern that the lack of regulation around them concentrates power and influence in their hands, and puts individual privacy and freedoms at risk.

The objectives of promoting a strong digital sector in Canada’s economy and in regulating digital companies to protect the personal data of Canadians may be in tension with one another.
# ADAPTING TO THE DIGITAL ECONOMY

## Proposal 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the global economy becomes increasingly digital, Canada needs a vibrant, innovative digital sector. Rather than restraining or limiting these companies, we should embrace digital innovation as a primary source of economic growth.</td>
<td>Canada already risks falling behind as the world economy goes digital. We rank behind many other developed economies in innovation. The COVID-19 pandemic shows how important technology is to our lifestyles. Technology has allowed lots of people to work from home, allowed students to continue their classes while schools are closed, and helped people to stay in touch with loved ones and entertain themselves while staying at home. Many of Canada’s high-paying jobs are in services. Rather than limiting the ability of these companies to develop, we should be making every effort to help them grow.</td>
<td>Personal data can be used to influence public behaviour. Online companies use personal data to understand, predict, and change people’s behavior without people even being aware. Social media websites like Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and Twitter are places where hate speech, bad information, and conspiracy theories can easily spread. However, these companies don’t want to change their business models. Without competitors or laws to control them, they have no reason to change harmful behaviours, and users have no other place to go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHARING THE BENEFITS OF GROWTH

The Issue

Free market policies have been guiding Canada’s economic policies for decades. Economists argue that free trade leads to international investment and economic growth, and that “a rising tide lifts all boats”. Nevertheless, not all benefit from the economic growth that occurs.

On one hand, the freer movement of goods, capital and people has created new wealth which has also reduced poverty and improved living standards in many countries.

On the other hand, economic inequality has reached levels not seen in almost a century. The benefits of economic growth have not been shared fairly among citizens, and that too much money is going into too few hands.

Many feel that the current model of globalization needs reform and/or that national governments should play a more active role in promoting greater overall equality. One way to address inequality is for governments to support initiatives that create a fairer sharing of the benefits.

Some initiatives are more controversial than others. Calls for more debt forgiveness, a global wealth tax, or trade practices with special opportunities for disadvantaged populations or sectors have been met with considerable resistance. Programs that provide education, training, and employment support, on the other hand, are widely seen as positive. They make a critical contribution to both equality and wealth creation.

Proposal 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should focus on training and employment support programs to reduce inequality and ensure that people benefit equally from economic growth.</td>
<td>We need to make sure that Canadians have the skills they need to be competitive in today’s economy. To do this, we must have programs in place to train them, and ensure that they are healthy and able to access jobs. High quality training is important if you want to improve people's incomes. Jobs with higher education and training requirements often pay more.</td>
<td>Economic inequality is deep-seated, and effective solutions require more than new education and training programs. More ambitious policies such as income redistribution and a guaranteed basic income would have greater impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOVERING FROM THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE PANDEMIC

The Issue

Due to COVID-19, the Canadian government had to put in place lots of stimulus programs to keep the economy going while Canadians were told to stay home. As a result, Canada has the highest budget deficit in its history, which can create long-term risks for our economy.

During COVID-19, almost all Canadians experienced a sudden change to how they access food. For the most vulnerable people, this was particularly difficult. Millions of Canadians have been pushed into food insecurity, which can put our health and prosperity at risk.

Canada’s first-ever Food Policy was created in June 2019 to make Canada’s food system healthier, and to support farmers, producers, and food businesses within our borders. It calls on the government and people to work together to make the food system stronger and more coordinated. The Policy has four Action Areas, one of which is to support food security in Northern and Indigenous communities.

Should economic growth resume and stay strong for years, it may be possible for Canada to manage our very high debt-to-income ratio. However, Canada could be vulnerable to other economic problems if it continues to carry so much debt.
## RECOVERING FROM THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE PANDEMIC

**Proposal 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Canadian Food Policy should include <em>Food Security for Canadians</em> as a key Action Area.</td>
<td>Today, one million Canadian households can't access healthy food. Simultaneously, about one-third (1/3) of food produced in Canada is wasted. Food insecurity is a complex challenge that needs creative solutions and dedicated efforts.</td>
<td>Domestic and international goals should be separate. Canada's <em>Food Policy</em> was created to strengthen the food system within our borders. Our domestic and international objectives on food are different and should be kept separate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada's Food Policy calls on the government and stakeholders to work together to make Canada's food system stronger. This is important for reducing food insecurity for all Canadians, but it doesn't address international food insecurity.</td>
<td>Although Canadians import 30% of their food, much of this – US$24 billion in 2019 – comes from the US and includes processed foods and produce. Canada's access to this market is already secure and needs no additional government management or involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada imports 30% of its food. Ensuring food security for all Canadians requires a strong international focus. Specifically, Canada should think about how to lower our dependence on imported food (i.e.: buy local). We should also make sure that we can still get the food we need if there is a global disaster (like a pandemic) and we can no longer easily access items.</td>
<td>Interfering in food import markets to reduce food insecurity (such as by promoting “buy local” movements), will change market behaviour and could undermine Canada's agricultural sector. It may also anger our trade partners, like the US. Food is a critical part of the North American free trade system. Businesses and consumers should be left to buy and sell as they currently do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposal 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should focus on paying down the large deficit we have accumulated during the pandemic before trying to have greater international influence.</td>
<td>The pandemic has significantly increased government spending. Our government cannot afford more spending on international programs. Once the COVID-19 crisis has passed, our first priority should be to bring deficits and debt under control. Governments have a poor track record when it comes to creating wealth. Prosperity comes from economic growth and job creation, and that task should be left to the private sector. Governments should support private sector investments, rather than lead investments.</td>
<td>Governments have a critical role in promoting prosperity. Businesses are focused on making a profit, rather than promoting security, public health, or human dignity. However, investments that create wealth and jobs are often deeply affected by how they impact on these other areas. Canada has a key role to play in helping Canadian businesses get this right. This ranges from providing the information that businesses need to make good decisions, to creating the policies and building the relationships that support long term investments. Trade missions, for example, allow Canada to develop new trade relationships and agreements. Investments in global training and education strengthen global markets. Initiatives like these make a critical contribution to wealth- and job-creation. We are living through a period of remarkable change at the global level. Canadian businesses should benefit from emerging trends (such as clean energy), but they need support from the government to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Should Canada Engage in the World to Uphold Human Dignity?

Of course, as Canadians we seek more than to be healthy, secure and prosperous. In our communities and in our society we seek to live in dignity. However, you may not be able to realize your rights or live in dignity because of your income level, race, gender, or other reasons. Whether you are able to access a full range of rights and dignities will likely depend on what you look like, where you live, how much money you have, and how much people like you hold power and make decisions in your communities.

You enjoy rights and dignities thanks to the hard work throughout history by groups of people to realize them. Some Canadian examples include: women’s suffrage, the black civil rights movement, the French language rights movement, the establishment of the Canadian Bill of Rights, the push for medicare, and ongoing Indigenous reconciliation.

You share this history with people around the world, who have fought for and are still struggling to realize their own rights and dignities, including the movement to end slavery, the civil rights movement, or the campaign to end apartheid in South Africa.

For decades, Canada has included a focus on some form of human dignity as part of its foreign policy. Sometimes there has been a focus on one particular issue, like opposing landmines in order to protect people’s safety. At other times, it has been driven by a broader set of values, like ensuring human rights for all.

For some Canadians, there is a moral case for human dignity in foreign policy because we are all human and have the right to a dignified life. Others think it is strategic for Canada to promote human dignity because it aligns with our values and interests as a country. Canada is a democracy with a Charter of Rights and Freedoms. They believe that it is in Canada’s interests to support these values in other countries as well as at home. In addition, some people make a more self-interested case for human dignity because safe, stable countries that respect human rights are good for the world in general. They cite evidence that promoting human dignity contributes to other goals, like reducing conflict, war, and inequality; supporting healthy, educated populations; and growing economies fairly. This benefits everyone, no matter where they live.

Canadians who support human dignity in foreign policy agree that we should promote Canada’s strategic interests, and assert that these interests include human dignity. They think we must push back against undemocratic regimes that threaten the safety and security of not just their own people, but of all citizens around the world. They also argue we can’t separate dignity from other aspects of foreign policy, like trade.
On the other hand, in an increasingly complicated world, some Canadians believe that, rather than human dignity, Canada's strategic interest lies in tackling big global threats, like cyber threats, and preventing other countries from obtaining nuclear weapons. They also support a robust trade agenda to advance Canadian economic interests and connect Canadian commerce to global markets. They believe that we must remain focused on the difficult security issues of our time, grow our economy, and ensure Canada's unique interests are represented in global spaces. They also argue that Canada has tried to 'promote values' overseas many times in the past, and it has been ineffective or even backfired. Others say that Canada has its own domestic human dignity challenges, and is in no place to lecture others. Other countries do not need to be told what values they should hold. They want to trade and advance their own interests, and it is not our place to push them on rights and empowerment.
DIGNITY AND FOREIGN POLICY

The Issue

Imagine we agree human dignity should be a key part of Canada's foreign policy. What exactly would that look like and how would we carry it out? What are the trade-offs for advancing human dignity compared to other issues?

Canada has a range of tools to advance any foreign policy objective. These include:

- Trade relationships: conducting trade or withdrawing trade, sanctions
- Diplomacy: influencing decisions, policy and behaviours of other countries through discussion, dialogue and negotiation
- Defence and military force: providing protection through military power
- Intelligence and security services: gathering, sharing, and using information we've gathered
- Foreign aid: making financial contributions to help other countries achieve goals

Some Canadians maintain that the rights and dignity for women and girls is a key remaining area to improve human dignity. They see women's equality as a proxy for overall human dignity. In other words, we can use women's rights as an indicator of how fair a country may be. When countries do not uphold human rights, women are often the first group to be oppressed. They argue that when women realize their rights and achieve equality, everyone benefits.

Some feel that a foreign policy rooted in feminism and gender equality is a new, powerful way of achieving Canada's longstanding commitment to advancing human rights in foreign policy. Mexico and Sweden have a feminist foreign policy, for example. A feminist foreign policy makes sure human dignity is at the heart of all ways that Canada deals with the world. It ties together all the tools Canada has in a coherent strategy, and makes human dignity an equally important goal alongside trade, the economy and security.
## DIGNITY AND FOREIGN POLICY

### Proposals 1, 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSALS</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should implement a Feminist Foreign Policy to put human dignity at the centre in all Canadian foreign policy considerations, including diplomacy, funding, military, and intelligence matters.</td>
<td>Using women and girls as a proxy for human dignity overall is a useful way to measure progress. The health and rights of women and girls are indicative of a country’s overall progress. We must make human dignity an equally important issue alongside trade and security. Putting human rights in a policy makes it clear that this is a Canadian priority. We cannot separate human dignity from other areas of foreign policy, so a feminist foreign policy will ensure that our values and policies are aligned, and help us show up with one voice that reflects a full range of Canadian interests.</td>
<td>A feminist foreign policy is too difficult to achieve in practice. Sometimes, governments need to make tough foreign policy decisions, and a policy would eliminate the flexibility required to make the right decisions in different contexts. We would have to apply a feminist foreign policy equally to all our international relationships. This could potentially impact how we deal with other countries with whom we want to trade, but who have poor track records in regard to human rights. A feminist foreign policy does not allow governments to respond to emerging trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada should make our advocacy of rights abroad more credible and effective by linking it to securing the same rights for Canadians at home.</td>
<td>It gives Canada moral standing to criticize the human rights records of other countries if we can show we’re making progress ourselves. Connecting domestic and international struggles for dignity helps Canadians understand foreign policy and why it matters.</td>
<td>Foreign policy is different to domestic policy. We can’t compare ourselves to countries with which we don’t have a lot in common. We can improve human dignity around the world without directly linking it to what we do at home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDRESSING ROOT CAUSES OF INDIGNITY

The Issue

Ensuring human dignity can be complicated because dignity cuts across so many areas of life. Each area impacts the other, because we do not live our life in silos. As a result, it can be hard to make progress overall by addressing just one aspect.

Many experts identify one way to improve human dignity overall - addressing underlying systems of power, including belief systems. Belief systems that benefit some people and uphold their rights, but exclude and marginalize other people, can lead to human rights abuses. These systems - like our political systems, our healthcare systems and our education systems - tend to be built by people with power, and they often benefit majority populations.

Systems are upheld by underlying beliefs about the people with less power. Often, these people are seen as less important and less valued. For example, there are pervasive beliefs as to why political parties don't run female candidates, why some men feel it is acceptable to hit women, and why people of different religions are persecuted. Changing these beliefs is critical to improving human dignity.

Proposal 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should address root causes of indignity and human rights violations in other countries, thereby helping local people to make their political, education, health and justice systems more equal and inclusive.</td>
<td>Providing direct services to help people may not address the underlying causes of their problems. To really improve human dignity, we need to support local people in improving systems and changing beliefs. Addressing root causes creates long-lasting change and improves life for everyone, not just the people who receive services. It is in everyone's interests to uphold human rights, and human rights are universal - they do not vary based on culture or context. It is not culturally insensitive to insist everyone has the right to healthcare, or to be treated equally by the law.</td>
<td>It is not Canada's place to interfere in how other countries organize themselves. We are not perfect, and we shouldn't tell other countries how to behave. Every country has its own history, culture and religion. Canada shouldn't impose its own values on other countries. Changing countries' systems is a job for people inside that country, if they decide to do so. It is too difficult for an outside country to improve the systems of another country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposals 4, 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should direct funding towards improving dignity and rights through local community organizations, rather than through national governments or big charities.</td>
<td>Women’s organizations receive less than 1% of all funding to developing countries, for example, yet they are critical for addressing root causes, and creating solutions that work in local communities. Local people know their communities best, and helping them improve systems and address their own country’s issues is the best approach.</td>
<td>It is difficult to get funding to small, local groups. Canada has tried before and hasn’t found good ways that are quick and meet our needs too. Big charities often have better capacity, staffing and skills to do the work. Canada should encourage governments to improve rights and dignity themselves, because that’s most appropriate, and how lasting change happens. We should work directly with governments, and not try to work around them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada should help countries prioritize diverse leadership and representation in systems like politics, law, health, and economics, to reflect the needs and perspectives of everyone.</td>
<td>When the people who run systems like schools, hospitals, and parliaments are not representative of their communities, they are less likely to consider the rights and dignity of everyone in their communities. Men are still overwhelmingly represented in decision-making positions (such as government) worldwide. More equal representation would lead to better decision-making that considers everyone’s needs.</td>
<td>People in other countries don’t want us to help improve their systems. They want safety, access to healthcare and education, and good jobs. Canada should focus on the basics, and let other country governments decide who they want to lead their schools, parliaments and police.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGIES FOR PROMOTING HUMAN DIGNITY WORLDWIDE

The Issue

Some Canadians suggest that funding to local groups through foreign aid is the best way to improve human dignity. They argue that this is one way to ensure that vulnerable people directly receive assistance in a timely way. Others say this is an outdated or ineffective method. They point to the crucial role of trade and economic growth, and cite evidence that when countries get richer, they are able to provide basic services to their people. Trade also brings countries into dialogue with others, and encourages them to follow international rules, including human rights rules.

However, the trade agreements that Canada signs with other countries can affect human dignity. For example, women are more likely to work in low-paid, service sector jobs that don't benefit as much from trade. They are more likely to be harmed by trade deals that don't consider their rights. Some people feel we need to make sure our trade deals aren't harming human rights.

Canadian companies must abide by the environmental and human rights standards of the countries in which they operate abroad. Sometimes these standards are higher than they are in Canada. On the occasions when local standards are lower than Canada's, many companies voluntarily choose to respect the higher standards that apply at home. Those that do not sometimes implicate Canada the controversies that surround their actions, whether these involve environmental damage or exploitative labour practices.
## Strategies for Promoting Human Dignity Worldwide

### Proposals 6, 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposals</strong></th>
<th><strong>Arguments For</strong></th>
<th><strong>Arguments Against</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should adopt a policy of prioritizing trade agreements with democratic countries that respect human rights and dignity. We should review our trade agreements with countries that become less democratic, or violate human rights.</td>
<td>If we are serious about human rights, we need to show it with more than just words. We should not trade with countries that violate their citizens’ rights. We must balance our trade priorities with our human rights obligations. Canadians strongly support a principled foreign policy, and Canada can set a standard for other countries. It is the right thing to do.</td>
<td>We should pursue human rights but only where this doesn't directly contradict other objectives Canada has, like trade. Every country has human rights challenges, including Canada, so we don't have the credibility to try to influence other countries. It would be too costly to Canadian businesses and the economy to refuse to trade with countries, even those countries that do not uphold human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that Canadian companies operating overseas abide by strong human rights and environmental standards. The voluntary standards that some Canadian companies adopt to this end should be made mandatory for all Canadian firms no matter where they operate.</td>
<td>Holding Canadian companies to a higher standard than their competitors should send a signal of the importance that Canada attaches to environmental protection and to human rights issues. Maintaining consistent standards for Canadian companies no matter where they operate around the world would reduce the negative impact on Canada’s reputation when a labour dispute or environmental spill abroad is linked to companies registered in Canada.</td>
<td>Subjecting companies operating overseas to Canadian law would set a precedent for the extraterritorial application of one country’s laws inside the jurisdiction of another. It’s not for Canada to dictate how companies must behave overseas. Other governments can choose how they want companies operating in their countries to act. It would affect the growth and success of Canadian companies if they were constrained by rules on how they operate overseas that don't apply to their competitors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How Should Canada Engage in the World to Uphold Human Dignity?*
THE PRICE OF INFLUENCE: EXPANDING CANADIAN DIPLOMACY

The Issue

The proposals outlined above outline a large number of changes that Canadians would like to see implemented in other countries. Each of those countries has its own culture and society, to say nothing of its own government with objectives of their own. For Canada to exercise the influence we seek requires an understanding of how each of these countries operates, who the key decision-makers are, and the relationships we can leverage to accomplish change.

That is the task of diplomacy. Canada operates embassies in most major countries so that our diplomats can acquire the deep knowledge and develop the extensive networks that allow our country to influence the decisions of others.

But Canada's diplomatic presence is modest by the standards of other middle powers, let alone our partners in the G7. There are dozens of countries in the world in which we have no diplomats at all. In many, our embassies are small and stretched very thin. Decades of budget cutting has relocated resources from embassies abroad, which tend to be expensive, to civil servants in Ottawa where costs are lower. As a result, Canada has one of the most unbalanced foreign services in the world, with the vast majority of diplomats based at headquarters.

Proposal 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS FOR</th>
<th>ARGUMENTS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada should increase the number, size, and resources of embassies around the world to better advance Canadian national interests in our interaction with other countries.</td>
<td>Having more skilled diplomats on the ground in countries helps us better understand the local culture and context. This puts Canada in a better position to advance its priorities. Diplomacy is a relatively inexpensive yet powerful tool in our foreign policy toolkit. It costs relatively little, and has the potential for a big impact.</td>
<td>In a time of historic budget deficits after COVID spending, Canada can't afford to devote resources to influencing other countries, we must pay down our deficit instead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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