

**“THE DEFENCE OF CANADA:
Who Cares?”**

DELIVERY TEXT

**Conference of Defence Associations Institute
Graduate Student Seminar
October 31, 2008**

**Mel Cappe
President, Institute for Research on Public Policy**



CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

1. Introduction

- Start with my **bona fides**
 - This is to tell you a bit about me, but more to show how **I am an example** of the indifference towards the fundamental role of the state
 - As my mother knows, I am a **charlatan**
 - My first **exposure** to the military was like many, the war stories of my **father**.
 - He used to tell the story of
 - being at University of Toronto in Pharmacy as a **student during the war** and
 - in **Royal Officer Training Program** and then,
 - in **uniform**, going down to the **docks** in harbour in Toronto
 - with his parents in **tears** on the dock waving goodbye
 - as he boarded a **ship** to go to Niagara-on-the-Lake.
 - But I too **lost family** in the war
 - Old enough to remember **post Korea**
 - 1975 in TBS evaluated the **value of sovereignty** in the cost/benefit analysis of the LRPA Aurora.
 - Early '90s Deputy Secretary Treasury Board Secretariat working on the **budgets of DND**
 - Cutting, and working with CDS and DMND
 - Can only cut where you spend

- Mid '90s DM Environment
 - Environmental enforcement
 - Environmental encouragement
- Then DM HRSDC skills and EI etc
- I was **in the Cabinet room** during
 - **Oka and the Ice Storm,**
 - the **bombing of Kosovo** and
 - Why is Kosovo on every Cabinet agenda?
 - Because Canadians are in harms way.
 - the **event and aftermath of 9/11**
- '99 to '02 Clerk
 - With DM dealing with CDSs and with Ministers
 - **9/11** and its **aftermath**
 - MND and CDS in Bulgaria
 - **VCDS** and I closing airspace and tracking flights
 - KAL aircraft diverted by American fighters to **Whitehorse**
 - Called the Commissioner of the **RCMP**: Tell your men in Whitehorse to saddle up and go to the airport and intercept a suspicious KAL aircraft
 - But there was an ERT there and they responded beautifully
 - PM etc
- '02 through '06 **High Commissioner to the UK** and had my **own one-star** and three four ringers and ...

- Made improving the bilateral military and intelligence relationship my first **priority** for my Performance Assessment.
- Took delivery of and return of **Chicoutimi** after the fire
- Largest UK military training facility in the world is **Suffield Alberta**
- Member of Board of **CDAI**
- **IRPP** does research on Security and Democracy
 - Non-profit, non-partisan Think Tank
 - **Independence** protected by an endowment fund and a distinguished **Board of Directors**
 - Including **two former Foreign Ministers**, Barbara Macdougall and John Manley, from two different parties, and two former Deputy Prime Ministers Manley and Anne McLellan, and Ann Fitzgerald of Cranbrooke and the UK Staff College at Shrivenham, and on my Research Committee sits Joel Sokolsky, Principal of RMC.
 - Mostly **anti-terrorism**
 - Paper on civil-military relations
- Throughout my career, I have been **offended by the indifference of Canadians** to their military and to their defence
 - **Simplistic** and **inexplicable indifference**
 - **Anecdotes**

- When they sent a **naval TaskForce** to the Arabian Sea in 2001-2 someone asked if they sent the **Evinrude dealer** with them.
 - When **Mel Lastman**, Mayor of Toronto inappropriately called on the military to help him in a snowstorm, and the APCs rolled out in Toronto, my cousin said: **“We have tanks??”**
 - When **then Col. Hillyer** led the Canadian Forces into Ottawa after the **IceStorm** of 1998 he didn’t have a **map of Ottawa**.
 - Military/Afghanistan never significant issues.
- So, I ask
 - What **kind of country** goes for **137 years** without a National Security Policy?
 - We have had Defence Policies, to which I shall return, but not a NSP until 2004
 - **Why** are Canadians indifferent?
 - Do we **pay a price** for this indifference?
 - What can or **should we do** to avoid this?
- Start off by acknowledging that in some ways you are the **wrong audience**
 - You obviously care or you wouldn’t be doing papers on defence
 - But in some ways you are the soon to be **influential opinion leaders** who can make a difference.

2. Canadians do not appreciate the Defence of Canada.

- In preparation for this presentation I reviewed all the **statements of Defence Policy** since the war, and as much of the **survey data** on public sentiment regarding Defence as I could.
 - The fact that there is **not much survey data** on defence matters **prior** to 9/11 and Afghanistan is telling

- Survey data
 - Post 2001: There is a lot on **public support** for action supporting the US after 9/11
 - 73% supported Canada going in with the US to combat terrorism after the attacks on the WTC
 - Even if it meant increasing the likelihood of attack in Canada
 - 74% approved Chrétien's handling of response to the attacks
 - An astounding 21% thought the world was heading towards nuclear war
 - Majority of **Québecers** were prepared to join the US but only at 59%
 - And down to 31% if it put Canadians in harm's way.
 - And liked even more than ROC how Chrétien handled it at 76%

- These numbers started to drop off and then bounce up after the Oct 7 bombing of Afghanistan and then down again afterwards
 - 84% supported government after the attacks in Afghanistan
 - Québec is always lower, but still high at 78%
- There is a lot on public reaction to Afghanistan.
 - Canadian support for the war hovered around 50% through 2006
 - With a gap of on average 15% or so for Québec
 - Then the numbers go south after 2007—and I don't mean to Kandahar
- In the **May 2005 Policy Options** you will find a fascinating series of articles on defence issues
 - Including an article on maritime security by a member of the Research Committee of IRPP and the Principal of RMC Joel Sokolsky
 - Including an article by Pierre Martin on whether Québec public opinion nixed BMD
- Have a look at **Wikipedia** re article on “Canada’s role in the invasion of Afghanistan” and there is a subsection with all the polling results of Strategic Counsel, Ipsos-Reid, Leger, Decima and Angus Reid.
- However, there is little on the public support for defence over the earlier years.
- And it turns out we don't even **ask** the question about public sentiment towards the broader question about their feeling of “**security**”.

- A fair bit on reaction to **Ballistic Missile Defence**
 - By the early 2000's the sentiment of our defence being left to the Americans is still there.
 - So, the threat of Missiles means we don't have to do anything.
 - When the threat was bombers we had a role to play
 - In 2005, when Paul Martin had his finger in the wind, over 50% of Canadians were against Canada joining in BMD
 - Some were quite rational and thoughtful
 - Others were defensive, leaving it to the Americans.
- While I am quoting statistics to you: **Just remember**, that according to a StatCan survey published in the **New Yorker**, 73% of statistics are wrong 41% of the time.
- There is much in the **literature** on the **adaptive responses** of policy to public opinion.
 - But it all depends on that opinion being reflected in the minds of MPs and/or being reflected in reliable and consistent opinion polling.
 - Moreover, there is actually very little on the **adaptive response of public opinion** to coherent, consistent and focused leadership by politicians on public opinion.
 - ie what is the effect on public opinion of real leadership?
 - Moreover, public opinion and attitudes to governments in Canada is particularly complex due to the **federal** structure of the country.

- Canadians still blame their federal MP when their garbage is not picked up
- Canadians have long been **ambivalent** about our relationship with the **US**
 - Lester Pearson in 1951 as Secretary of State for External Affairs at the height of the Korean war and in the post war environment said that it was “not very comfortable to be in the middle these days”
- For a **long time** Canadians did not appreciate the importance of the defence of Canada
- Canadians now **increasingly appreciate** the need for the defence of Canada
 - And you can see it in the **current government’s** pursuit of a more muscular defence policy
- Lots of reasons why: Let’s look at what I have called the **five “periods of insecurity”**
 - With a view to explore **why** we have been insensitive to the actual threats and chosen to largely deny the reality of the Defence of Canada

3. Five periods of insecurity.

- **Too close** to the recent periods to have historical perspective
 - **Mao and Nixon:** Nixon trying to bond with Mao says, we are both nations born in revolution. What do you think of the American revolution of 1776? Mao looks up and brushes his chin and says inscrutably, it is too early to tell.
 - See **David Charters'** of UNB paper published yesterday by IRPP entitled: "The (Un)Peaceable Kingdom"
 - It chronicles the history of terrorism in Canada starting with WmLyonMackenzie through Armenian Terrorists, the FLQ, Rexam, Air India and on to 9/11.
 - It points out that Canada has **not been immune** from Terrorism, as we like to think, both **home grown** and **foreign**
 - And that the **time to prepare** the force, legislative and administrative infrastructure to deal with terrorism is now, not after the event.

1. **Three periods of peace**

1. **Cooling War:** 1945 to 1964
2. **Cold War:** 1964 to early 1970's
3. **Sleepy Time:** 1971 to 2000
 - Andrew Cohen's book: "While Canada Slept"

2. Two periods of conflict

4. **Age of Terror**: 2000 to 2005

5. **Afghanistan**: 2005 to present

- So let me briefly go through the **history of defence policy papers** since the war and try to see some of these changes
 - **1964 Hellyer**
 - **Less than 20 years** after the war.
 - Same as the time from Perestroika to now.
 - But went for almost 20 years without a statement of defence policy
 - It was obvious
 - There was a threats-to-**North America** focus rather than threats to Canada
 - It used **quaint terminology**:
 - “national survival” ,
 - sino-soviet quarrel,
 - “national tasks” ,
 - group of experienced men
 - Premise: if you prepare for deployment **abroad**, and are **mobile** and **combat capable**, then you will naturally be ready for the need in Canada
 - **Bombers** mean Canada actually faced a threat, even if it is only because of **geography** and **proximity** to the US.
 - Defence of Canada is **Job 4**

- and only is concerned with “**protection and surveillance of our territory**, our airspace and our coastal waters, which comes after
- preserve the peace supporting **collective defence**, deter military aggression, support to foreign policy including participation in international bodies.
- “National measures” were like an afterthought
- “It is for the **foreseeable future, impossible to conceive** of any **external threat** to Canada which is not also a **threat to NA** as a whole.” P13
- Most of what the paper did was elaborate what we were **NOT going to do**.
 - Nuclear, interamerican defence, SEATO etc.
- **1971: Macdonald** (former Chair of IRPP)
 - Change in **technology**, pace of arms control discussions, and increasing **scepticism of the traditional role of the armed forces**.
 - Getting **further away from the war** and not seeing new threats apart from the **Soviet Union**.
 - **North** starts to show up as a **sovereignty** mission as well as an environmental one
 - Environment Canada was created in 1972

- Threat to society posed by “**violent revolutionaries**” ... more **euphemisms** ... “**the recent crisis**”.
 - “**internal security**” is euphemism for threats to **domestic stability**
 - “Will see established order increasingly challenged by **organized violence**”
 - Nevertheless, **bold** statement: “**A catastrophic war between the super powers constitutes the only major military threat to Canada**”.
 - **Breeds apathy**
 - The **greatest threat to Canada** today is the **increasing apathy** of the public. And the real problem is that **nobody cares** about the increasing apathy.
- Starting to see “**niche**” **conversation** developing ... “**Chemical and Biological capacity**”. Not because we saw this as a threat, but because we had the capacity.
- The **inability to affect** the defence of Canada became a **rationale for decline** in the defence capability
 - **1987 Beattie:**
 - All of a sudden **Canada** enters the equation
 - **SearchAndRescue** becomes a focus
 - **Globalization** first enters the discussion.
 - Canada’s **role in the interconnected world** is now a challenge

- Section on **Armed Forces and Society**: P81 discusses the decline in public support for arms.
 - “Despite justifiable pride in past military accomplishments, Canadians find the prospect of war ever more abhorrent, a feeling that has been reinforced by the losses suffered in two world wars and the Korean conflict. The advent of nuclear weapons has only added to the concern with which they view the possibility that Canada could again be caught up in a major armed struggle. Canadian security policy and the roles of the Forces must be widely and well understood, if the Forces are to enjoy the support they require.”
 - **Attempt** to identify the problem and to **lead**.
 - So, you want to hear “**quaint**”:
 - To deal with the growing antipathy to the military, the Dept sets up a National Defence **Speakers Bureau**.
 - “ $\frac{3}{4}$ of military occupations are now **open to women**.”
- **1992: Masse**
 - First reference to **WMD**
 - **AsiaPacific** first reference since the War
 - In true **Tory** form,

- **Defence of Sovereignty is Job 1**
- **JTF2** from the SERT RCMP
- But still dealing with **states**
- And **threats** are now **social policy**
 - Illegal migration
 - Illegal drugs
 - Fishing
- **1994: Collenette**
 - First time: **links from conflicts abroad to domestic threats** although still weak
 - Move to **constabulary** role:
 - **End of History:**
 - Need to **justify** a standing force
 - Gone from “First” defence of Canada to “**First and Foremost**” the defence of Canada
 - First reference to **failed and failing states**
 - But still violence based on **state on state** actions
 - Must **convince Canadians** that this is important: “Canada’s defence policy must reflect the world as it is rather than the world as we would like it to be” ... end of Chapt 1.
 - This passes for **leadership**
 - Need to **build public consensus**
 - **Public consultations**
 - **Parliamentary hearings** etc
 - Mention of **terrorist** threat
 - The **Este** and the Spanish fishing fleet makes the new missions real
 - Fishing is important for security

- **2004 National Security Policy: Martin**
 - First National **Security** Policy ... remarkably
 - Good, for the first time
 - My visit with Rob Wright, National Security Advisor to **Eliza** Manningham-Buller (Bullingham-Manner) with the new NSP
 - We are all proud.
 - She says, not very good really.
 - But it's our first ever!
- **2005: Graham**
 - Evolution to **Defence of Canada** as first priority
 - Role of **personality** and **leadership** ... Rick Hillier
 - “Values and interests” becomes “**interests and values**”
 - Security in Canada ultimately begins with **stability abroad** ...
 - **lose focus**
 - This is the first comprehensive **functional** articulation of what a defence of Canada means.
 - Reference to **failed states** “**providing a haven for those who would attack us directly**”.

- **2007: McKay**
 - Title: **Canada First Defence Strategy**
 - **Modern threats**
 - Climate change
 - Severe weather etc
 - First clarity of missions and priorities by comparisons to functions in '05

4. What have we learned:

- Reviewed the **8 statements of policy** on national defence or security
- Learned a lot
 - The policy **evolved** but stayed essentially the **same**
 - i. Differences are very subtle
 - The Defence of Canada has become **more explicit** over time
 - Governments have tended, until recently to **follow** rather than lead
 - Having a **clear enemy** with plans and capability during the Cold War gave focus
 - ii. Clarity removed ambivalence
 - iii. After the Cold War, we thought we could have the luxury of ambivalence
 - **Futility** of dealing with the threats makes Canadians apathetic
 - iv. Growth of **nuclear holocaust** makes us feel like there's not much we can do
 - The **effectiveness of delivery mechanisms** of threats alters our interest in helping in the defence of Canada and North America
 - v. **Bombers** are threats to us before they are threats to the US
 - vi. **ICBMs** are threats to the US and only fly over us

1. Whether in the 1970s or in the 2000s
 2. **BMD** was presaged in the 1964 Policy document, and comes back throughout
 - a. and it is a grand mystery as to how it became a Paul Martin “No” by 2005.
- The **retrenchment to North America** has meant an expeditionary military force in search of a mission
 3. It should not be surprising that only in the last four years have we created CEFCOM and CanadaCom.
 - vii. Concomitant development of a realization that the world is a nasty place.
 - We have gone from our traditional emphasis on **multilateral** action through **bilateral** and North American action to a greater reliance on **ourselves** in the standing up of **Canada Command**
 1. Would have been unheard of fifteen years ago
 2. We would have seen it as looking for a mission in the post-cold war world.
 - a. In fact, we did.
 3. In fact, our reliance on a **modest role** to be played in an alliance, like **NATO**, actually **detracts** from the public’s sense of **urgency** and **importance** in the Defence of Canada
 - viii. Remarkably, it was **only in 1959** that the DND was first assigned a role in “**national survival**”.
 1. This is all about the **maturing of Canada** as a nation

- a. 1867 and subsequent provincial accessions
 - b. 1934 and institutions of the Dominion
 - c. Second World War and the 10 days of September 1939 before we declared war
 - d. The third largest navy in the world
 - e. Peacekeeping
 - f. NORAD/NATO
 - g. National Survival
- Throughout all the early statements of defence policy, the emphasis on “**collective security**” meant the **political discourse** was all around whether we should **play our part** or just **be a free rider**.
 - 2. Our **friends are too polite** to hold the mirror up to us and we get away with leaving the table just before the cheque comes. (Manley)
 - There has been an increasing role of **municipalities and provinces**
 - ix. Not just in **Aid to the Civil Power**
 - x. But also in defining threats
 - xi. National survival and **Continuity of Government**
 - xii. **Response to emergencies** generally
 - 1. First responders are local
 - xiii. And in implicating themselves in **other federal powers** like trade and commerce which have implications for our defence posture and how our allies view us.

1. Environment and protectionism for instance

xiv. The move from the War Measures Act to the Emergencies Act was **more than** just for the purpose of **compliance with the Charter** and the reaction to the abuses of 1970

- What would the Defence White paper of **2017** look like?
 - 10 years is not that long in the history of evolution of our defence thinking
 - YOU, as interested observers and scholars, will have to construct that policy

5. Who Cares?

- Role of **Québec**
 - Always been **different**
 - Always more **antipathy** to military matters
 - Rather **schizophrenic**
 - **Chicoutimi** heartland of separatist sentiment
 - **Bagotville**: proud of our boys and girls.
 - Further **schizophrenia**
 - **Free trade** openness and confidence
 - Military inward lookingness
 - Fear of reaction
- Role of **media**
 - Being **analytic**
 - Probing
 - Making **international comparisons**
 - Not being sensational and thus dismissable
 - Beat reporters?
 - Feature writers
- Nature of the **threats**
 - People
 - Non state actors
 - Asymmetric
 - Groups
 - Infrastructure
 - Ambassador bridge
 - Electrical installations etc

- Nature of the **enemies**
 - **less than asymmetric**
 - non-state
 - among us
 - Khawaja
 - indeterminable
 - **Interstate** conflict
 - Pakistan/India
 - **intrastate** conflicts
 - Nigeria, Iraq, India, Pakistan
 - **terrorism,**
 - **state-sponsored** terrorism and radicals
 - Iran/NorthKorea
 - Islamists
 - Recent pipeline terrorists
 - All of these have **implications** for Canada
 - At minimum, domestic expat communities affecting domestic Canadian policy
 - Threats to Canada directly: terrorism
- Nature of **Allies**
 - During the First and Second Wars
 - UK and US
 - Defence of North America
 - US
 - Europe
 - NATO
 - World
 - UN

- Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, Peacebuilding
 - At home ... Ourselves
- Role of **Politicians**
 - **Responding to** the domestic entreaties of **expat** communities
 - Evacuation of **Lebanon**
 - **Pushing back** on the domestic entreaties of expat communities
 - Paul Martin and the **Tamil** Community in Toronto
 - Keeping Canadians **aware without unnecessarily scaring them**
 - Yet in **Crime and Punishment**, we have failed
 - The government **scares without evidence**
 - In terrorism, we **have evidence** and we **fail to sensitize the public to it**
 - Should we admit **secret intercept intel** to court cases?
 - Helps make it real
 - Risks exposing sources and methods
 - Risks scaring the public
 - Does the Government **follow** the public or have a responsibility for **leading** and developing the constituency for the defence of Canada?
 - Role of **Colin Kenny's Committee**.
 - He may be difficult, but performs a valuable service.

- Someone should **upbraid me** for missing the North American **Security and Prosperity Partnership** with Mexico and the US under **NAFTA**.
 - But our approach there has always been to encourage the US to **see Mexico as a threat** & Canada as an ally.
 - Not easy to do.
 - Chicago vs Arizona or Texas might help.
- **Parliament:** Government and Parliament have different roles

6. Conclusion:

- The Defence of Canada is partly a question of **ambition**
 - What kind of **country** do we want to be?
 - What **role** do we want to play in the world?
 - As HC in the **UK**, it used to really be like pulling nose hairs when Jack Straw the Foreign Secretary would take me aside and say, “We really need Canada to come through for us. We need you to deliver the Caribbean countries in the UNGA.”
 - If that is the **reach** to which we **aspire**, then we have been successful.
- The conviction of **Khawaja** and the treatment of the Toronto 11/17 will help make it real.
- Canadians have been **insensitive** to if not ignorant of the threats we face
- **Political leadership** is sometimes responding to this naiveté by grabbing Canadians by the lapels and shaking them back and forth.
- Canadians have **taken for granted** the defence of Canada
 - When I was DM of Environment and we misforecasted a tornado in Aylmer and lots of damage done, I realized that I the measure of my success was delivering service of a quality that would be taken for granted.
 - The mistakes were headlines. The successes no one noticed.

- However, I am strongly of the view that Cappe's principle of wanting to be taken for granted should not apply to the Defence of Canada
- The **media, politicians and academics** have a role to play in influencing Canadians' perceptions of the Defence of Canada
- So, The Defence of Canada: Who Cares? **Me!** I care.
- We **all** have to ensure that Canadians have a realistic sense of the role of the military and of the threats we all face and how to stand up to them.