

Speaking Notes for

**David Pratt, M.P.
Nepean-Carleton**

**Chair
Standing Committee on National
Defence & Veterans Affairs**

The Conference of Defence Associations

**Ottawa, Ontario
February 26, 2003**

Please Check Against Delivery

Ladies, Gentlemen & Distinguished Panellists –

Let me begin by saying what a pleasure it is to be invited to this annual seminar once again. Let me also extend my congratulations to the CDA for the work it does in bringing defence and security issues to the people of Canada. This seminar affords me the opportunity to renew acquaintances and more importantly listen and learn from people who have in large measure devoted their professional lives and working careers to matters of defence and security. I am not saying that as a politician trying to butter you up, but I do hope that it has that effect.

I have been asked to speak to the issue of sovereignty, homeland and continental defence. The topic is an interesting and a very relevant one. For Canadians, who are notoriously skittish about sovereignty issues, effective homeland and continental security measures in my view are absolutely critical in terms of safeguarding Canadian sovereignty. The more I think about these three issues the more I have come to believe that they are inseparable.

Before we talk about the issues of sovereignty, homeland and continental defence, on a broader scale, I think we have to ask ourselves precisely what it is we are protecting. The simple answer to that is “We are protecting a way of life in Canada and on the North American continent.”

The depth and breadth of the social, political and economic relationship between Canada and the United States has no equal on the planet. But how do we explain the deep connections we have with our American friends? How do we explain the cross border social, family and employment links? How do we explain the very strong political relationship as allies during war and peace? How do we explain the hundreds of bilateral agreements and treaties covering virtually every

aspect of our relationship or the economic dimension of our ties which see over a billion dollars of trade per day cross our borders?

I believe it can be explained by one thing – values – shared values that we have developed over almost 200 years of peaceful co-existence. These values include: respect for the rule of law, democracy and human rights. While we inherited these values from the English and French political traditions of the 18th century, and while they are not exclusively shared with our American friends, it is probably safe to say that Canada, the United States and Great Britain tend to express and give life to these values in similar ways.

For instance, I would venture to say that these values drive some of the common objectives we have with the United States such as the promotion of prosperity and employment globally as well as the need to protect our security within a stable international framework. What unites us in common cause is far, far more important than that which divides us. And while Canada and some Canadians wrestle with our relationship with the United States, I believe that most Canadians accept the wisdom offered by former Prime Minister Lester Pearson when he stated in his memoirs:

“One principle [of our relationship] is that we should exhibit a sympathetic understanding of the heavy burden of international responsibility borne by the United States, not of her own imperial choosing but caused in part by the unavoidable withdrawal of other states from certain of these responsibilities. . . .Above all, as American difficulties increase, we should resist any temptation to become smug and superior: ‘You are bigger but we are better.’ Our own experience, as we wrestle with our own problems, gives us no ground for any such conviction.”

Getting back, however, to the immediate topic at hand, sovereignty, homeland and continental security, it is in my view critical to examine it on the basis of our current defence policy. While we would all agree that this policy is in need of a review, the three basic pillars: the defence of Canada and the aid to the civil power, the defence of North America in cooperation with the United States and contributions to international security, are in my view unlikely to change in any significant way. With the new threat of cell-based, international terrorism, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the defence of Canada has become much more complex. In fact, post September 11, we saw elements of all three parts of our defence policy in action. We saw the Canadian Forces involved in assisting civilian authorities with stranded airline passengers. We saw the Canadian Forces involved in NORAD operations in defence of North America. Our Forces were also involved in NATO AWACS operations in the United States and of course through Operation Apollo our land, sea and air Forces saw action in the Afghanistan conflict.

As the Afghanistan operation clearly showed, protecting North American security in 21st century means dealing with the threats before they reach our shores. As soon as Mohammed Atta and his band of suicidal extremists took control of those planes, it was too late. Ensuring that global terrorism does not have a home base from which to attack the North American homeland or that of our European allies may mean that we will be called upon to protect North American security on the mountains and plains of dusty Afghanistan or other places which it would be unwise for me to speculate on at this point. So, rooting out terrorism may indeed require us to conduct

operations similar to the destruction of Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Future operations in the war against terrorism will likely involve the use of our land, sea and air forces again. However, as I think we can all appreciate, other tools will also be necessary – tools like intelligence, financial tracking, transportation security, border security, immigration, emergency preparedness as well as other legislative means.

If anyone ever thought that we could compartmentalize the three components of our defence policy, that suggestion has, in my view, absolutely nothing to do with the reality we face today. Preserving the physical security of Canadians from the threat of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction means putting in place the measures, both military and non military, to protect people and property within Canada. It also clearly means working with the Americans as continental partners. We do North American security because it is in our interests to do so. They do North American security because it is in their interests to do so. We all know quite well that if we don't approach this task as a proportionate partnership, then we will indeed have problems with our sovereignty.

The challenge for Canada today is to ensure that we do in fact play a proportionate role in the defence of Canada, the security of North America and indeed our contributions to international peace and security. Understanding the trauma that was wrought on the American psyche on September 11, one of the critical dynamics at play is to assure the Americans that their northern border is not a problem. For both Canada and the United States, it is a strategic imperative that our common border remains open to the traffic of people and goods.

Not only is it critical to deal with the myriad of issues attached to the border, I believe it is also important that we engage actively in the debate on a new national security strategy for Canada similar to that outlined by Brigadier General Mcnamara and Ann Fitz-Gerald in a paper that they did for the Institute for Research on Public Policy entitled "A National Security Framework for Canada." Once we have had the debate and made the decisions then I believe we can do the restructuring and make the investments required to add value to our security relationship with the United States. But at least one thing in my mind is perfectly clear: Doing the bare minimum simply won't cut it anymore.

I think it is safe to say that the "doing the bare minimum approach" which has characterized the relationship over a quite a long period of time began to change in the first budget after 9-11. It certainly didn't change from a defence standpoint because we didn't get the money we were looking for in the November 2001 budget. But we did get a significant investment of \$7.7 billion dollars over five years to enhance security, emergency preparedness and border infrastructure. Last week's budget added a considerable sum to the base – again not as much as some would like, but it was substantial.

Now that more resources have been injected into defence and security, and awaiting as we are a foreign and defence policy review, perhaps it is time to engage in the debate over a national security strategy and what that might encompass. One thing that has concerned me about our approach to national security is that it has been rather haphazard and ad hoc over the years. And indeed when we look at the progress the Americans have made on the subject of homeland

security, I believe we need to do some more thinking on these issues. And indeed, I think it is also time to ask ourselves whether we are organized in such a manner that promotes efficiency, effectiveness and the required levels of coordination and cooperation between agencies.

Lets take intelligence as an example. Although we have no specific foreign intelligence agency, we do have some foreign intelligence capability within DFAIT. We have our signals intelligence resident within DND along with military intelligence. We have domestic security intelligence under the Solicitor General along with the criminal intelligence component offered by the RCMP. While I have become convinced that we need a foreign intelligence agency for Canada and I will be introducing a private members bill to that effect in the near future, I also believe we have to look at some serious restructuring which would place intelligence (with the notable exception of military intelligence) and homeland security under the responsibility of the Solicitor General. In my view, we have to look at getting back to the basics as far as DND's role, which in my view could also perhaps mean transferring OCIEP to the Sol-Gen as well. As General Fitch has said, leave homeland security and intelligence to civilian authorities and give DND the responsibility for homeland defence.

Before I close I would like to update you on the efforts of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs to come to grips with these and other issues. Earlier this month we began a study of Canada – U.S. defence relations.

The committee's study of the current status and future direction of Canada-U.S. defence cooperation will highlight the importance of cooperation for North American security while identifying the difficult decisions Canada may soon have to make on some issues.

SCONDVA's study will address issues such as: (1) the implications of Northern Command to Canada; (2) the future of NORAD; (3) ballistic missile defence; (4) the impact of a transformation of the U.S. military on interoperability between Canadian and U.S. forces; (5) the relationship between defence industries in both countries; (6) the changing relationship with NATO; (7) cooperation with the rest of the Americas; (8) the future of Canada-U.S. defence arrangements; and (9) the role of Parliament in this relationship.

So far our study has been tremendously interesting and we certainly look forward to visiting the United States later in the spring to speak to Congressional representatives, Pentagon officials, the Homeland Security Department and research think tanks. The study is expected to be completed by May or June, however, the release of the committee's report may not occur until the fall of 2003.

Let me close by once again thanking the CDA for inviting me here today and I look forward to the discussion.