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Foreword

Welcome to the beautiful city of Québec, host of the 127th Assembly and related meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

For the first time in more than 25 years, and the fourth time in our history, Canada has been granted the privilege of hosting this world-class international assembly of parliamentarians.

This year, 2012, marks the centenary of the Canadian Group’s affiliation with the IPU. This commemorative book chronicles Canada’s long history with the Union and showcases key areas in which Canadian parliamentarians have taken an active role in IPU initiatives.

The IPU – as the world organization of parliaments – has a major role to play in raising awareness and ensuring action on issues of shared concern on the world stage. As the world’s oldest and largest parliamentary association, the Union brings together parliamentarians from more than 160 national parliaments. Its mandate includes, but is not limited to, working for peace and cooperation among peoples of the world.

The IPU also works in close cooperation with the United Nations and holds observer status at the UN. Through this partnership, IPU members undertake much-needed work to help establish democratic parliaments, prevent conflict, restore peace and advance reconciliation.

These activities, in my view, are the IPU’s greatest contribution to world peace and parliamentary democracy. For example, in collaboration with its partners, the IPU has helped to develop and deliver learning programs for parliaments in political transition or in post-conflict situations. The Union has also had an active role in strengthening the institutional capacities of parliaments in numerous contexts, most recently in Liberia, Sierra Leone and South Sudan.

Developing nations of the world regularly call upon the IPU and its experts for guidance to help restore the rule of law and establish a democratic parliamentary system that is representative, transparent, accountable, accessible and effective.

It is widely recognized that parliamentary associations provide venues for promoting dialogue, particularly when conflict is transnational. The IPU is uniquely qualified for this purpose because its members have been mandated to represent the people, and speak on their behalf.

This is part of the genius of the IPU. It provides conflicting parties with tangible opportunities for parliamentary dialogue and diplomacy in contexts that ensure that the voices of all affected peoples are heard.

As we come together in Québec city, I am confident that we will continue our work to promote democracy, human rights and good governance – three intrinsic principal interests of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

On behalf of my colleagues in the Parliament of Canada and my fellow Canadian citizens, I hope you will enjoy this book and will take full advantage of the 127th IPU Assembly to exchange perspectives and experiences with your parliamentary colleagues from around the world.

Hon. Donald H. Oliver, Q.C. LL.D
Speaker pro tempore of the Senate of Canada
President of the Canadian Group of the IPU
We are honored to welcome you to the city of Québec, Canada for the 127th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. This book commemorates the Parliament of Canada’s longstanding and close working relationship with the IPU.

Founded in 1889 by a handful of European parliamentarians, the IPU has a rich history that predates the League of Nations and the United Nations. It now works closely with more than 160 national parliaments from all regions of the world.

The IPU’s mission and vision espouse inclusivity and understanding. Through its activities the Union brings together parliamentarians from the full range of political perspectives to engage in dialogue and debate, with the goal of reaching common positions on matters of shared concern where action is required.

As early as 1900, Canada was sending parliamentarians to IPU meetings. Senator Raoul Dandurand, who served as Speaker of the Senate of Canada from 1905 through 1909, championed Canada’s early IPU involvement. He believed strongly in the value of inter-parliamentary relations, and over the course of 40 years helped to promote and build upon the founding principles of the IPU as an agent of cooperation and a defender of peace.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of Canada’s admission in 1912 to membership in the IPU. As the IPU has refined its goals and objectives over the years, the important role that Speakers of parliaments play in the sphere of parliamentary diplomacy has come to the fore.

In 2000, the IPU organized the first Conference of Presiding Officers of National Parliaments. Its final declaration expressed strong support for international cooperation and a commitment to work more closely with the UN system and other major international negotiating bodies through the IPU.

Speakers from around the world assembled to take stock of the IPU’s status during both the Second and Third World Conference of Speakers, held in 2005 and 2010 respectively, with a view to reaffirming the lead role parliaments can play to bridge the democracy gap and to secure democratic accountability for the common good.

We commend the IPU for taking the initiative to create tangible contexts through which the global community of presiding officers may assemble. The bi-annual IPU assembly, typically attended by more than 75 Speakers and Deputy Speakers, is a case in point and the 127th Assembly in Québec city provides a unique opportunity to build upon the valued relationships we have with our international counterparts.

The following pages present a compelling history of Canada’s involvement with, and commitment to, the IPU. This account underscores the IPU’s intrinsic value as the world organization of parliaments, a forum where member parliaments may freely debate and interact with their peers to enhance decision-making processes in the fulfillment of their parliamentary duties.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella
Speaker of the Senate of Canada

Hon. Andrew Scheer
Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada
This year the Inter-Parliamentary Group of Canada celebrates its 100th anniversary. Canada can be very proud of its long and prestigious history with the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Throughout the past one hundred years, the Canadian IPU Group has made an outstanding contribution to the work of this venerable institution.

Members of the Canadian Parliament have sat on every single body of the organization over the years. Nine members have served on the Executive Committee. Senator Raoul Dandurand became Canada’s first Executive Committee member in 1924 and today the Canadian Group’s President, Senator Donald H. Oliver, occupies a seat on this important IPU body.

In October this year, parliamentarians from around the world are gathering in the city of Québec for the 127th IPU Assembly. The organization is returning to a city that IPU delegates first visited back in 1925. It was in that year that the United States of America and Canada jointly hosted the 23rd IPU Conference. The summary record of that Conference recounts that “This was followed by the charming stages of a rapid journey in Canada. On October 11th in Hamilton, the 12th in Toronto, the 13th in Ottawa, the 14th in Montreal, the 15th in Quebec, the delegates were received and feted by the local authorities with indescribable munificence and cordiality.”

The summary record also reveals that the parliamentarians present held a lengthy debate on the problem of national minorities. And that same subject will permeate our Special Debate that will take place in Québec city this October under the banner of Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world.

Forty-one parliaments, represented by 290 delegates, took part in the Conference in 1925. That must have represented quite an organizational challenge for the hosts in those days. The membership of the IPU has quadrupled since then and this year Canada will be playing host to around 1,500 delegates. I have absolutely no doubt that our hosts will rise to the occasion just as their illustrious predecessors did 87 years ago. Indeed, this is the fourth time in the history of the IPU that Canada has staged this major parliamentary event.

What could be more appropriate for the Canadian IPU Group than to mark its 100th anniversary by hosting an Assembly that will bring together parliamentarians from around the world and for them to debate issues relating to citizenship, identity and diversity?

After all, cultural diversity is the cornerstone of Canadian society. Canada is a country with a hugely diverse population. Its 32 million inhabitants reflect a cultural, ethnic and linguistic makeup found nowhere else on earth. It has a history of nation building that thrives on diversity while promoting equality, integration and mutually respectful acceptance of others. How fitting, then, that Canada should host this debate at the IPU, itself a hugely diverse organization that promotes solutions to common problems through dialogue based on respect and a shared recognition of all forms of diversity.

Hon. Abdelwahad Radi
President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union
Celebrating a Century of Canada–IPU Collaboration
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Introduction and Acknowledgments

This book has been commissioned by the Canadian Group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union to commemorate its 100th year of official affiliation with the IPU and to celebrate the holding of the Union’s 127th Assembly in the city of Québec in October 2012. This anniversary is a proud occasion for Canadian parliamentarians. As the following pages confirm, they have created over the years an active and strong IPU Group that has shown sustained dedication to worldwide democracy through parliamentary diplomacy.

When I set out to write this book, I was surprised to discover how little published material was available on the history of the Canadian Group, even though Canada’s first participation in IPU assemblies dates back to 1900. I hope that this book will provide a valuable historical record of Canadian parliamentarians’ involvement in the IPU’s activities.

The following pages do not pretend to provide an exhaustive study of the activities of the Canadian Group. The main focus of Part 1 is the Group’s participation in IPU assemblies over the years. Part 2 highlights some of the key themes addressed by the Group in IPU assemblies. Part 3 presents all presidents of the Group, with their photographs. Part 4 lists Canadian delegates to IPU assemblies since 1900.

This book could not have been written without the help of others. I wish first to express my gratitude for the support I received from the Hon. Donald H. Oliver, Speaker pro tempore of the Senate and President of the Canadian IPU Group. Senator Oliver was the first person with whom I met to obtain guidance on the project. He suggested names of people to be interviewed and helped identify public policy issues important to the Canadian Group.

I would also like to express very special thanks to the following persons who kindly agreed to be interviewed: the Hon. Salma Ataullahjan, Senator; the Hon. Sharon Carstairs, P.C., former Senator; Marlene Catterall, former MP; the Hon. Gerald J. Comeau, Senator; the Hon. Dennis Dawson, Senator; the Hon. Joan Fraser, Senator; Benno Friesen, former MP; Roger Hill, former Advisor to the Canadian Group; the Hon. Marcel Prud’homme, P.C., former MP and former Senator; and the Hon. Paddy Torsney, P.C., former MP. Their collective memory helped in identifying the major public policy areas presented in Part 2, as well as in tracing particular events and anecdotes presented throughout this book. The full transcripts of these interviews are available on the website of the Canadian IPU Group. I encourage all readers to review the transcripts, which reflect the interviewees’ dedication and valuable contributions to the IPU, as well as their strong attachment to this organization.

I am also greatly indebted to the Union’s headquarters for giving full and free access to their archives and library. Several IPU staff members were very helpful in explaining how to use their archives and collections, collating some statistics and searching for images. Thanks are also due to Gary Levy, Editor of the Canadian Parliamentary Review, who provided guidance in searching through historical material and archives, as well as to Barbara Reynolds, former Advisor to the Canadian Group, who devoted countless hours to helping me search through the debates and journals of the Senate and the House of Commons for the period 1898–1960. She also reviewed and commented on the first version of the book and provided photographs.
The project’s coordination from idea to this final product was overseen by the current Senior Advisor to the Canadian Group, Joseph Jackson. It was both an honour and a challenge to write this book, and I want to thank him for assigning this important task to me.

The Library of Parliament provided funds for the book’s production, as well as for travel to and accommodation in Geneva. I want to thank several colleagues from the Library who contributed to the project:

From the Parliamentary Information and Research Service: Jean-Denis Fréchette, Acting Director General, reviewed and approved the various parts of the text. Other colleagues assisted in the drafting, peer review, archival research, internal quality assurance, and planning of various meetings: Kathleen Cauley, Frédéric Forge, Marie-France Gareau, Hélène McLean, Marcus Pistor and Nataly Quesnel.

From the Information and Document Resource Service: Janet Brooks, Marc Lapointe and Denise Ledoux were responsible for obtaining the photographs of the presidents of the Canadian IPU Group in appropriate formats for reproduction purposes, along with copyright authorizations and credits. They were assisted in this work by Kerry Barrow from the House of Commons’ Curatorial Services.

From Publishing, Editing and Creative Services: Brenda Laporte, Manager, was responsible for all steps in the production/publishing process. Michel Corriveau oversaw the editing of the French and English texts. Marc Foley and his team – Cheryl Deblette and Stéphanie Routheir – created the book’s design and layout.

Special thanks also go to colleagues from the International and Inter-Parliamentary Affairs Directorate who provided access to their archives. The Directorate also contributed funds for this book’s production.

Please note that, with a few exceptions, the persons named in the book are all current or former Canadian parliamentarians. Their designation as “Senator” or “MP” in this book reflects their role at the time referred to in the text.

Odette Madore
Manager, Special Projects
Library of Parliament
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Through its assemblies, the IPU facilitates parliamentary dialogue and cooperation. It defends democracy. It promotes human rights. It works in support of gender equality and the participation of women, minorities and indigenous peoples in political and public life. — Senator Donald H. Oliver, 2011

The IPU is the first and largest international organization of parliamentarians of sovereign states. It is also unique; it provides a forum for dialogue and diplomacy among legislators from diverse parliaments and all continents. Its members may represent radically different political and economic regimes, but in the Union’s assemblies and meetings they can exchange views and make personal contacts in an atmosphere of freedom and confidence. These exchanges help to cast new light on issues, enhance understanding, and move discussions towards a solution.

From a modest beginning of nine members in 1889, the IPU currently numbers 162 parliaments, as well as 10 associate members. Its original goal – to promote peace and international arbitration – has broadened over the years; it now addresses a wide range of public policy issues that can be resolved only through united international action.

Between 1889 and 1966, the Union usually held one conference each year. In 1967, it began to meet twice each year: its various study committees held preliminary meetings in the spring to debate topics to be considered at a full-scale conference in the fall. Since 1984, the Union has held two conferences each year, which since 2003 have been called assemblies.

Canada attended an IPU conference for the first time in 1900; it formally joined the Union in 1912. In 2012, the Canadian IPU Group celebrates a century of accomplishments. The following pages highlight the milestones and key players in Canada’s involvement during those years.

1888

Twenty-five French and nine British parliamentarians attended a meeting in Paris organized by two individuals dedicated to promoting peace and international arbitration: William Randal Cremer (Great Britain) and Frédéric Passy (France). Five resolutions were adopted, including one calling for a conference to be held the following year with legislators from other interested parliaments.

1889-1899

The 1st Inter-Parliamentary Conference was launched in 1889 (Paris), and paved the way for the formal foundation of the IPU. Ninety-five legislators attended, representing nine different parliaments. The principle of regular conferences was established and, between 1890 and 1899, eight other inter-parliamentary meetings were hosted by the various parliaments represented at the conference.
I want to pay homage to one of the best men that I have had the advantage of meeting in my life ... . His name was William Randal Cremer. ... In 1887, he obtained the signatures of 234 members of the British House of Commons to an address to His Majesty the King and the President of the United States in favour of international arbitration. He himself crossed to Washington with some colleagues of his, and presented that petition to the President of the United States. In 1888, he had the idea that something should be done to bring the parliamentarians together, to have them commingle and know each other better, and thus help to maintain peace, and he crossed over to Paris in that year with a dozen members of the British Parliament to meet as many members of the French Assembly. There the Inter-Parliamentary Union for Peace was founded. The object of that association was to create a universal sentiment in favour of international arbitration and a limitation of armaments. — Senator Raoul Dandurand, 1922

1900
Senator Raoul Dandurand represented the Government of Canada at the World Exhibition in Paris. While there, he attended the 10th IPU Conference, accompanied by Senator William Hales Hingston. They participated as observers and did not take part in the formal discussions. The conference attracted 273 legislators from 19 parliaments, and Senator Dandurand’s memoirs note that “very fine speeches were made.”

1901-1904
No conferences were held in 1901 and 1902, and Canada was not represented at the 1903 and 1904 conferences. Its lack of representation at that time and at various points in the future was due to several factors, notably: distance (most international conferences were held overseas); lack of personal funds (delegates had to pay all expenses themselves); and timing (Parliament was often in session when conferences were taking place).

1905-1907
In 1905, Senator Dandurand, then Speaker of the Senate, founded the first Canadian IPU Group, with a total of 131 members from both the Senate and the House of Commons. He was elected President of the Group. Canada did not, however, participate in the conference held that year. In 1906, Lord Weardale, President of the British IPU Group, invited Canada to attend the 14th Conference to be held in London in July; Senator Dandurand participated, along with Senator James Domville. In his memoirs, Senator Dandurand noted that he was welcomed at the conference by Lord Weardale himself. A total of 23 parliaments were represented by 615 legislators.

No conference took place in 1907. In March of that year, Senator Dandurand invited members of both houses to attend a meeting to discuss the idea of reconstituting the Canadian IPU Group:

Dear Sir,

The members of both houses are asked to meet on Thursday, 21 March, at 11:00 a.m. to discuss the advisability of forming a Canadian Group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

The main purpose of this association is to further the principle of arbitration in the settlement of all international disputes.

Nearly all of the world’s parliaments have a large number of members who have joined the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Sincerely,
Raoul Dandurand, Speaker of the Senate
1908–1911

The Canadian IPU Group was reconstituted in 1908, and numbered 193 parliamentarians; Senator Dandurand was again elected its President. That same year Richard Eickhoff, President of the German IPU Group, invited Canada to attend the 15th Conference to be held in Berlin in September. Senator Dandurand was the only Canadian delegate at the conference, which brought together 600 legislators from 18 parliaments.

Later that year, Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier informed the House of Commons that the British IPU Group had proposed that the Union’s next conference should be held in Canada. He then tabled the following motion, which was seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, Robert Laird Borden, and was adopted:

That the Inter-Parliamentary Union of Peace, which is striving to establish better relations between nations by furthering the principle of arbitration in the settlement of all international disputes, be invited to hold its annual meeting in the capital of the Dominion in August, 1909.

The invitation was initially accepted by the Inter-Parliamentary Council; however, the Council had to reconsider its decision because, at the time, the IPU’s statutes did not provide for independent representation for British Dominions. No conference was held in 1909. No Canadians participated in the 16th Conference held in Brussels in 1910, and there was no conference in 1911.

1912

Again in 1912, following the opening of a new Parliament, Senator Dandurand wrote to parliamentarians, calling the Canadian IPU Group together and inviting the new members of both houses to join. The meeting took place in March, and a Group totalling 166 members was formed (72 senators and 94 MPs). It was agreed that Canada would begin making an annual financial contribution to the Union, amounting to $200.

The IPU Executive Committee was advised of the reconstitution of the Canadian Group in April. At the 17th Conference held in Geneva in September, a resolution was adopted providing for independent Dominion membership, and the Secretary General of the IPU reported Canada’s formal affiliation with the Union. Senator Dandurand was present at that conference, along with 156 other delegates, representing 18 parliaments. As a member of the IPU, Canada was entitled to two representatives on the Inter-Parliamentary Council; Senator Dandurand and George Halsey Perley, MP, were nominated.

1913

The Canadian IPU Group met in February. Senator Dandurand presented a brief summary of the discussions held at the Geneva Conference. The Group then debated whether Canada should invite the Union to hold a session in Canada in connection with the conference scheduled for Washington in 1915. It was agreed that Senator Dandurand would discuss this opportunity with the federal government.
In June, Prime Minister Borden informed Senator Dandurand that the Government of Canada would be pleased to welcome the Union in 1915 and was prepared to pay for transport and accommodation for all delegates:

*It is understood that the American delegates will extend an invitation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union to visit this continent in 1915. The Government of Canada considers that such a visit would be of the highest importance and that it ought to include this Dominion. The Government is informed that arrangements have been made by which the Government of the United States will pay the railway fares of the delegates across the continent. The Government of Canada will be prepared to seek Parliament's approval for an appropriation of a sufficient amount to defray the expenses of the delegates through Canada as suggested in your letter.*

Also in June, Senator Dandurand informed Christian Lange, Secretary General of the IPU, that not many Canadian delegates would be able to attend the upcoming 18th Conference in The Hague:

“I do not know how many Canadians will be able to go to The Hague for 3 September. The session was long and few members will have the time to travel to Europe this summer.” Senator Dandurand and Herbert Brown Ames, MP, attended the conference, which brought together 296 delegates from 19 parliaments. Both Senator Dandurand and Mr. Ames took part in the meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Council.

**1914–1921**

The invitation to hold part of the 1915 Conference in Ottawa, although accepted by the IPU, was cancelled due to the outbreak of the First World War. Naturally, no conferences or meetings of the Council or Executive Committee were possible during this period. However, the Canadian IPU Group was one of 22 national groups that remained in existence during the war years, and it continued to pay its annual financial contribution of $200. In 1917, Senator Frédéric Liguori Béique succeeded Senator Dandurand as President, and in 1920 he in turn was succeeded by George William Allan, MP.

In 1919, Canada was one of 10 parliaments that took part in the meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Council in Geneva. As it was the Council’s first meeting since 1914, its initial action was to approve the minutes of the meeting held five years earlier. Following a break of eight years, the 19th IPU Conference was held in 1921 in Stockholm, but Canada was not represented.

**1922–1924**

In 1922, Senator Charles-Philippe Beaubien was elected President of the Canadian Group. He attended the 20th Conference held in Vienna that year, along with senators Dandurand and George Eulas Foster; in all, there were 316 delegates from 26 parliaments. Senator Foster was appointed Vice-President of the conference and made the first important Canadian speech at an IPU conference, addressing economic and financial questions. Following his return to the Senate, he reported on the discussions held in Vienna; he also invited parliamentarians of both houses to attend the 21st Conference to be held in Copenhagen in 1923. No Canadian delegates were present, however.
In 1923, the Canadian Group elected a new President, Rodolphe Lemieux, then Speaker of the House of Commons. He was succeeded in 1924 by Senator Napoléon-Antoine Belcourt, a former Speaker of the House of Commons, who held this position until 1930.

In 1924, Senator Dandurand attended the 22nd Conference, which was divided between Bern and Geneva. There, he was the first Canadian to be elected a member of the IPU Executive Committee – a position he held until 1930, carrying out its duties with dedication and enthusiasm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924–1930</td>
<td>Senator Raoul Dandurand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965–1969</td>
<td>Senator Jean-Marie Dessureault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978–1979</td>
<td>Cyril Lloyd Francis, MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979–1980</td>
<td>Senator Gildas L. Molgat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985–1989</td>
<td>Benno Friesen, MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–2002</td>
<td>Senator Sheila Finestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–present</td>
<td>Senator Donald H. Oliver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine Canadians have served as members of the IPU Executive Committee.

Sources: Statutes of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the IPU website.

**THE IPU: STRUCTURE AND WORK**

**Membership and Geopolitical Groups**

The Union’s membership is drawn from members of national parliaments. Most IPU members belong to one or more of the six geopolitical groups that operate within the Union’s structure: African, Arab, Asia-Pacific, Eurasian, Latin American, and the Twelve Plus. Each group decides on its own working methods within the IPU. They meet to discuss and, as much as possible, agree on a common approach to matters on the assembly’s agenda, although the groups cannot compel their members to vote in a particular way.

**Assembly (formerly Conference)**

The Union holds two assemblies per year. IPU members designate those parliamentarians who will attend as delegates. Each assembly is assisted in its work by standing committees, whose number and terms of reference are determined by the Governing Council. IPU members have two delegates (one representative and one substitute) on each standing committee.

**Agenda of the Assembly**

The assembly’s agenda includes a general debate with an overall theme, and one topic for each standing committee. One emergency item may be added to the agenda; the item must relate to a major event of international concern on which the IPU considers it necessary to express its opinion. It is selected by the IPU members through a process of proposals and voting. The agenda may also include a panel discussion on a specific topic of general interest.
1925

In April, Philippe Roy, Commissioner General for Canada in France, attended a meeting of the Executive Committee as a replacement for Senator Dandurand. On behalf of Canada’s government and Parliament, he invited the Union to hold a plenary session in Ottawa, following the conference planned for Washington in October 1925. The telegram of invitation signed by Lt.-Col. Thomas Vien, MP and Secretary of the Canadian Group, read:

*Canadian Group invites delegates 23rd Conference to visit Canada and hold meeting in Ottawa. Group will pay for hotels and transportation. Commissioner Philippe Roy asked to represent us 30 April. Letter follows. Vien.*

The Committee accepted the invitation. Mr. Vien also wrote to U.S. Senator William B. McKinley, President of the American IPU Group, to say that the Canadian Group would welcome delegates at Niagara Falls and take them on a tour of some major Canadian cities.
Once Canada’s invitation had been accepted, a committee headed by Senator Belcourt was established to oversee Canadian arrangements for the 23rd Conference. In addition to the government’s planned contribution of $10,000, Canadian delegates to the conference were asked to make a personal contribution of 40 Swiss francs, or about $7.75 at the time.

At the beginning of the Washington–Ottawa Conference, controversy arose out of the U.S. government’s refusal to allow a communist British MP to enter the country. A lively debate ensued in the Inter-Parliamentary Council, as many members felt that an important point of principle was at stake: namely, could a host parliament or government discriminate against individual delegates wishing to attend an IPU conference?

In Ottawa, Senator Belcourt presided over the conference with U.S. Senator McKinley as Vice-President. Both Sir Robert Borden and Senator Beaubien acted temporarily as presidents. Two sessions were held in the House of Commons: one on “The fight against dangerous drugs,” which ended with the matter being sent back to committee; and the other on “The problem of national minorities,” which resulted in the adoption of a resolution. The newspaper *Le Droit* reported that: “Yesterday, during its 23rd Conference ..., the Inter-Parliamentary Union voted unanimously to recognize the principle of minority rights.”

James Douglas noted: “An odd attendee at the 23rd Conference was Newfoundland with a delegation of seven members of its Parliament. The presence of this Newfoundland delegation brought up the position of provincial or State Parliaments within a nation, although in 1925 Newfoundland itself had Dominion status, that is to say, independence but without responsibility for defence and international affairs.”

A total of 41 parliaments were represented by 290 delegates. Canada welcomed the delegates at Niagara Falls and gave them a five-day tour by train of Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montréal and the city of Québec.

1926

No conference was held this year. However, the IPU Executive Committee met in March. At that meeting, Senator Dandurand indicated that members of the Canadian Group were required to sign a declaration stating their adhesion to the statutes of the Union.
1927

Senators Dandurand and Belcourt attended the 24th Conference, which took place in Paris and brought together some 400 delegates from 34 parliaments. Senator Dandurand opened the general debate on the first day. During the debate, Senator Belcourt talked about the current conditions of parliamentary government; he urged the need for a thorough study of its shortcomings and failures, as well as the need for improvement. Following his recommendation, it was decided unanimously to make this a principal question for discussion and action at the next conference, and the item was placed on the agenda.

1928

The Canadian Group met in April, and decided to set the annual membership contribution at $5.

The 25th Conference in Berlin was attended by five Canadians: senators Dandurand, Belcourt and Beaubien, as well as Murray MacLaren, MP, and Justice Charles Wilson, a former MP attending as an observer. A total of 475 delegates from 38 parliaments were present. Senator Belcourt tabled a report on the conference in the Senate in June 1929. He urged other senators to join the Canadian Group, stating that “all parliamentarians are eligible, and upon becoming members are entitled to receive the publications of the Union, including the full and complete annual report of the proceedings of its Conference, and are thus afforded very valuable information not easily obtained elsewhere.” He noted that the first item on the agenda of the conference – parliamentary evolution – had been placed on the order paper following his urgent request at the 1927 Conference.

In August, Senator Dandurand attended an IPU Executive Committee meeting, where he recommended that Justice Charles Wilson be accepted as a member of the Canadian Group; he explained that Justice Wilson was more readily able than current MPs to travel to overseas conferences. The names of two other former legislators in two other member parliaments were also proposed. The Executive Committee endorsed them as members of those groups.
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1929–1930

No conference was held in 1929, but the Canadian Group met in April. Senator Dandurand pointed out that the Group had paid less than the expected contribution of about $600 to the Union for the past few years, and that the Union’s revenues were insufficient to support its work. It was resolved:

“That the Canadian Group agrees to increase its annual contribution from $400 to $600 and to pay the arrears, amounting to $400, or $200 for each of the years 1927 and 1928. And that the Government of Canada be approached with the view to increase its annual grant.”

In 1930, the Canadian Group elected a new President, Murray MacLaren, MP. At the 26th Conference held in London that year, Canada was represented by Justice Wilson alone, as a general election was to be held soon after the conference. Only 32 parliaments were represented, and 439 delegates participated. James Douglas noted: “At the beginning of the 1930s, the Union was faced with the thorny problem of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany; this was the first time that a deep political division between members divided the Union.”

Financial Contribution

The IPU is financed mainly by its members out of public funds. Each member’s annual contribution is based on a scale established by the Governing Council. The Union’s proposed budget for 2012 totals 13.7 million Swiss francs (about $14.8 million).

When it became formally affiliated in 1912, the Canadian IPU Group began paying an annual contribution amounting to $200. In 1924, the contribution was increased to $400. In 1925, Canada contributed an additional $11,450 to cover the cost of IPU delegates attending the conference held in Ottawa. In 1932, the annual contribution was further increased to $600. The Canadian Group ceased temporarily to be an active member of the IPU in 1935, but resumed the payment of its contribution when it rejoined the Union in 1960.

Today, Canada’s Parliament is the sixth-largest funder of the IPU, contributing 383,402 Swiss francs in 2012 (about $415,387).

Canada has contributed additional funding to the IPU through the Canadian International Development Agency. In 2007–2010, $669,600 was provided to support a project to assist parliaments in reconciliation efforts. In 2008–2010, some $1.2 million was provided to the IPU’s program on gender equality and on the representation of minorities and Aboriginal peoples in parliaments.
1931

Arthur Beauchesne, Clerk of the House of Commons and Secretary of the Canadian IPU Group, organized a meeting of the Group in July, and Senator Beaubien was elected President for a second time. He held this position until 1938.

In 1931, Michael Luchkovich, MP, attended the 27th Conference held in Bucharest, which brought together 145 delegates from 20 parliaments. Reporting on his participation, Mr. Luchkovich stated:

_The great value of such conferences lies not only in the opportunity given to discuss pressing and vital world problems but also in enabling delegates from various parts of the world to intermingle and learn more about each other. In view, therefore, of the ever-increasing inter-dependence of nations there cannot be too many conferences such as has been described in the above report. Canada would be well advised to send her full quota of delegates to the next conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union._

1932–1936

Justice Wilson attended the 28th Conference held in Geneva in 1932, and also the 31st Conference held in Brussels in 1935. Later that year, however, following a general election, the Canadian Group was not reconstituted. The Secretary of the Canadian Group told the IPU headquarters that he hoped the Group would be reconstituted following the general election.

1937

Senator Dandurand took part in the 33rd Conference held in Paris. The President of the conference, Mario Roustan, of France, announced:

_Dear colleagues, a colleague just arrived to whom I wish to express my sympathy, respect and friendship. He is one of our most loved and respected senior members, Mr. Dandurand. He came to shake my hand, recalling that he had attended a meeting here in 1900. Nearly forty years ago! Forty years of service! Fortunately, the Inter-Parliamentary Union has not lowered the retirement age and Mr. Dandurand continues to serve the IPU with all his might. I offer him my warmest thanks._

_None of us has forgotten how he welcomed the Inter-Parliamentary Union to Canada in 1925, and I add to this memory the assurance of our respectful and affectionate friendship._

Senator Dandurand replied:

_Mr. President, I am very grateful for the warm welcome you have given me. Unfortunately, my health prevented me from attending this meeting earlier. However, I did want to make an appearance. I have been following the debate since the start of the conference, and I want to congratulate you and the other delegates on the large amount of important work that has been presented and the conclusions you have drawn._

He was warmly applauded by the delegates.

Later that year, Mr. Beauchesne informed Léopold Boissier, IPU Secretary General, that he could no longer serve as Secretary of the Canadian Group and that Paul Martin Sr., MP, had agreed to act on a temporary basis as Honorary Secretary.
1938

The Canadian Group met in June. Its President, Senator Beaubien, explained that the Group had not been active for some time for two main reasons. First, Parliament was no longer providing an annual grant to the Group, and members were not paying membership fees. Second, parliamentarians were increasingly involved in new parliamentary associations, which left less time for participation in IPU activities. The President further stressed:

*There can be no question of the desirability of having a Canadian Branch of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and because of this fact a real effort has to be made to vitalize Canadian interest and participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union.*

The minutes of the meeting record that Senator Dandurand also spoke:

*The Honourable Senator Dandurand asked leave to address the Assembly and spoke in eulogistic manner of the merits of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. He was supported in this sentiment of approval by other members who spoke or gave expression of approval.*

The Group then decided to reconstitute its Executive Committee as follows: Hugh Alexander Stewart, MP, was elected President, replacing Senator Beaubien who declined to be re-elected; Senator David Ovide L’Espérance, Vice-President; Paul Martin, Honorary Secretary. The minutes further state:

*The Honorary Secretary, Mr. Martin, explained that there were no funds available for use of the Canadian Branch of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and suggested that there should be a subscription fee, which met with unanimous approval. It was tentatively agreed that there should be a subscription fee of $5.00 and the Honorary Secretary was instructed to canvass members of the House of Commons and Senate in this connection. Most of those in attendance at the meeting promptly made their subscription available at once to the Honorary Secretary.*

Although the Group was revitalized, no Canadian delegates attended the 34th Conference in The Hague.

1939-1946

Canada was not represented at the 35th Conference in Oslo in 1939. The Second World War broke out in September 1939 and, as a result, no conferences were held between 1940 and 1946. However, the Inter-Parliamentary Council met in 1940 and again in 1945, and inter-parliamentary activities were maintained through correspondence. This was not an easy task. For example, IPU Secretary General Léopold Boissier wrote in 1941 to Hugh Alexander Stewart, who had been elected President of the Canadian Group in 1938. Paul Martin wrote back, indicating that Mr. Stewart was no longer an MP and adding:

*It has been very difficult because of the emergency of war to carry on in respect of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. However I do circulate your circulars, and I will do all I can at this end. You will appreciate at the present time, in view of the disturbed condition of things, it is not possible to be as active, but I will keep the matter alive for future use.*
1947-1953

The Canadian Group did not succeed in reconstituting itself during this period. However, the IPU Secretary General continued to correspond with the Secretary of the Group and with the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Commons, stressing that the Union’s members would welcome Canada’s renewed participation in IPU activities.

1954

André de Blonay, the new IPU Secretary General, reported that Canada sent to the 43rd Conference in Vienna “one of its most eminent members,” Louis-Philippe Picard, MP and Chair of the House of Commons Committee on Foreign Affairs. He further noted that Mr. Picard followed the debates very regularly (as an observer), “thus indicating the interest with which the IPU’s work is viewed in Ottawa.”

1955-1957

Like his predecessor, Mr. de Blonay made a point of writing to various Canadian parliamentarians, including the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Speaker of the House of Commons, and other MPs and senators, inviting Canada to rejoin the Union.

1958

In July the Speaker of the Senate, Mark Robert Drouin, announced that “the Government of Canada in its good judgment has decided to send two observers to the IPU Conference at Rio de Janeiro.” The two parliamentarians – Senator Jean-Marie Dessureault and Ernest James Broome, MP – attended the 47th Conference. Upon their return, Mr. Broome submitted a report; it was tabled in the House by the Speaker of the time, Roland Michener. The report stated that the two parliamentarians “attended as observers” and that their participation was “on an unofficial basis.” It recommended that a Canadian Group be formed and that a small official delegation attend the next conference, and added that parliamentarians from many countries strongly encouraged Canada to rejoin the IPU to help counterbalance the Soviet Bloc:

> At the very beginning of the Conference the Soviet Bloc tried to upset the prepared Agenda and to introduce the subject of troop movements into Lebanon and Jordan by the U.S. and the U.K. They were not successful in this attempt but were only defeated by a relatively narrow margin. We also understood that some two years ago the Soviet Bloc came close to taking over control of the Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

> For this and other reasons the Canadian observers were under pressure from the U.S., the U.K., the Australian, the French and other Western delegations to make a strong report to Parliament that Canada join the Inter-Parliamentary Union and so add our weight of support to the Western viewpoint.
Later that year, the Speaker of the U.K. House of Lords, Lord Kilmuir, wrote to Senate Speaker Drouin, who replied in November:

_I agree entirely with your suggestion that the Parliament of Canada consider reviving our National Group and be present with a delegation at Warsaw and you may rest assured that upon the return of our Prime Minister from his world tour and that of the Honourable Roland Michener, the Speaker of the House of Commons, who is actually in Rome, I will discuss this matter with them at the very first opportunity._

**1959**

Like his colleague in the House of Lords, Speaker William Morrison of the U.K. House of Commons wrote in January to his Canadian counterpart, Roland Michener, inviting Canada to attend the Warsaw Conference. In his response in May, Speaker Michener stated:

_In the interval since your letter of January 27th, about the Inter-Parliamentary Union, I have hoped for a decision and for funds which would enable Canada to apply for membership and send a delegation to the Annual Conference in Warsaw. However, it appears now that we shall not be able to take part this year ... . I am still hopeful that we shall make a different decision for the future, but must now report to you with regret that we shall not be able to join your delegation at Warsaw._

**1960**

In August, Alcide Paquette, Clerk Assistant of the Senate and Executive Secretary of the Canadian IPU Group, informed the IPU Secretary General that a Canadian Group had been formed (comprising 86 members, with Mr. Broome as President) and asked for a formal renewal of membership. He also mentioned Canada’s intention to participate in the next conference, to be held in Tokyo. The Canadian Group was admitted by decision of the Inter-Parliamentary Council in Tokyo in September, and Canada has been a very active member of the Union ever since.

The Canadian delegation to the 49th Conference was composed of nine parliamentarians. The report, prepared by B. A. Keith of the Canadian Embassy, stated:

_As a first item of business, the President of the Council, Professor Giuseppe Codacci-Pisanelli (Italy), welcomed the admission of the Canadian delegation, and said it brought to fifty the number of parliamentary groups represented. Replying to the President’s words of welcome, Senator G. S. Thorvaldson, Chairman of the Canadian delegation, expressed great satisfaction at the fact that Canada had once again joined such an important organization. He observed that Canadians are well aware of the Union’s long and useful history and of the part which it had played over the years in helping to build friendship, amity and understanding among the nations._

Senator Gunnar Solmundur Thorvaldson made similar comments in the Senate, adding: “Canada received suitable acknowledgement of its readmission into the organization.” Senators Dessureault and Arthur Wentworth Roebuck also made statements on their participation in the 49th Conference.
1961–1964

Canada sent a delegation to all IPU conferences during this period. In 1962, Senator Thorvaldson told the Senate that the Canadian Group, with the approval of the Government of Canada, had invited the Union to hold a conference in Canada in the fall of 1965. The invitation had initially been extended under the previous government, with the approval of the then Prime Minister, John G. Diefenbaker. It was confirmed by the new Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson, who promised his full support, as did the then Secretary of State for External Affairs, Paul Martin Sr.

In the 1963 general election, the President of the Canadian Group, Mr. Broome, was defeated. Senator Dessureault was elected President in July 1963. Later that year, Senator Dessureault confirmed in the Senate that the 54th Conference would be held in Ottawa in 1965.

In 1964, Ian G. Imrie, Coordinating Secretary for Parliamentary Associations, accompanied the Canadian delegation to the 53rd Conference held in Copenhagen and drafted a report summarizing his observations for use in planning the 54th Conference.

One sometimes hears the question asked, and I must say that I asked it of myself: What is the benefit of an international parliamentary union? I wondered just what was the use or purpose of this union. To me, it seemed to be more or less a United Nations without real force or effect. My first impression was that it was a sort of glorified debating society which had no real executive purpose. However, I soon learned differently, and I came away from the conference with the feeling that this organization can and does have an effective place in the affairs of the world. Its greatest function is that it provides an important forum for peace-loving forces of all nations in the struggle for peace. This was emphasized time and time again, and one could sense it as the days went by. — Senator Alfred Johnson Brooks, 1963

1965

To assist in preparations for the 54th Conference, a Parliamentary Relations Secretariat was established as part of the Canadian Parliament; it would later become International and Interparliamentary Affairs. A commemorative stamp was issued for the occasion.
Sixty-one parliaments were represented at the conference, which included 446 delegates, 117 advisors and secretaries, and 160 accompanying persons, as well as eight international, intergovernmental or inter-parliamentary organizations. The inaugural ceremony took place in the Chamber of the House of Commons, in the presence of the Governor General of Canada, Georges P. Vanier. Speaker Alan Macnaughton said that it was a historic moment in the life of the Parliament of Canada, as it was the first time that the Chamber had been the scene of an international meeting of such magnitude. Prime Minister Pearson recalled that it was the second time that Canada had had the honour of welcoming parliamentarians of the world. Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, also addressed the conference. He spoke about some of the fundamental problems of world affairs at the time, and the role that the United Nations could play. He then paid tribute to the work of the IPU: “The two ideals of democratic participation in policy making and of peace in international relations are being pursued by the Inter-Parliamentary Union on a scale which is bound to assure lasting results.”

James Douglas remarked that a notable break with tradition occurred (and it was to be followed by others) when the conference adopted, by 565 votes to 10 with 99 abstentions, a resolution entitled “The Problem of Apartheid in the Light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the United Nations Charter.” The text strongly condemned “the policy of apartheid prevailing in the Republic of South Africa.” Not only was the Parliament of South Africa not an IPU member, but more importantly the Union had previously abstained from intervening in internal affairs and had turned down motions concerned with conditions of specific countries.

The conference excursion took delegates to Montréal, where they saw preparations for Expo 67 and were later honoured at a dinner hosted by that city.

Senator Dessureault was elected to the IPU Executive Committee in 1965 and remained in that position until 1969. (He was the second Canadian to hold this position, the first being Senator Dandurand.)

1966-1984

The Canadian IPU Group remained active during this period. Nine different parliamentarians served as President of the Group, and large delegations were sent to all conferences. More importantly, these years were marked by Canadian delegates’ increasing participation in the general debates as well as in standing committees. They submitted memoranda, presented draft resolutions and amendments, and spoke on a wide range of topics. They also undertook key functions. For example, four Canadians were at different times elected members of the IPU Executive Committee. Many others assisted the chairpersons on the Inter-Parliamentary Council. Several served as presidents of standing committees and as rapporteurs. Canadian delegates also addressed a wide range of topics through their memoranda and draft resolutions, including: aid to developing countries, the role of parliamentary committees, disarmament, the environment, the violation of parliamentarians’ human rights, women parliamentarians’ participation in the IPU, and international drug trafficking.
In 1975, Canada took the important step of joining the Twelve Plus Group. The origins of the Group, which was created in 1974, were rooted in the tensions and confrontations of the Cold War. Known initially as the Nine Plus Group, the organization took its name from the then nine members of the European Community (EC). As membership in the EC grew, its name became the Ten Plus Group in 1981 and the Twelve Plus Group in 1986. It was then decided to keep the name “Twelve Plus” even if further countries were to join the EC (now known as the European Union). The term “Plus” was intended to avoid a strict demarcation of the Group. It currently has 46 members.

The Twelve Plus Group

is an association of like-minded countries who have enough interests in common to see merit in a coordinated approach before and during IPU conferences. They discuss the conference agenda, review proposals, address the various issues raised and find common ground. The Group does not act as a bloc, but when there is unanimity on a position all representatives are expected to adhere to it.

During this period, conferences were usually a productive and rewarding experience for Canadian delegates. At times, however, they were discouraged by lack of progress or by a highly political and divisive atmosphere. For example, the Canadian Group’s report on the spring meetings in 1975 (Colombo) stated:

The 1975 Spring Meetings were basically very discouraging to the Canadian delegation, almost all of whose members were at their first IPU meetings. In general, the study committees worked on topics which were not conducive to very much forward movement in this forum, while the Council was disorganized and disorderly and proceeded, in disregard of the rules, to take important decisions designed to further political causes favoured by the majority. The most important case was the invitation to the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.) to participate as an observer in London in September. A number of delegations, including Canada’s, pointed out that the majority had the authority and right to change the rules in order to make this representation possible.

Similarly, the Canadian Group’s report on the 68th Conference in 1981 (Havana) remarked on the polarizing effect of the 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and indicated that the number of countries seeking closer ties with either the “East” or “West” appeared to be on the rise. The report further noted:

In addition, the increasing number and bitterness of bilateral disputes are affecting the international atmosphere. While Western democracies look at Union meetings as gatherings of parliamentarians, the East bloc and most Third World delegates view them as diplomatic fora where their governments’ positions are promoted. Delegations representing Western Parliaments are divided amongst parties and viewpoints (which is reflected by their voting) while most others present unified positions with carefully worked out game plans.

The same report stated:

It is traditional for the Head of State to address the conference during the inaugural ceremony and normally these speeches outline the host country’s international stance emphasizing subjects before the conference where greater understanding and consensus can be furthered. Most Canadian delegates found President Castro’s speech to be aggressive and confrontational taking close to two hours instead of the usual twenty minutes.
The diplomatic representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and China felt obliged to walk out during the speech as their respective countries were attacked. …

The immediate result was the redrafting of remarks by a number of delegates scheduled to speak during the first plenary and who felt compelled to react to President Castro’s discourse. A mood of confrontation was set resulting in more energy and effort being spent on preventing the hardening of extreme positions both among and within delegations than on the substantive issues themselves.

In 1976, the Speaker of the Newfoundland Legislative Assembly wrote to the President of the Canadian IPU Group asking that consideration be given to including provincial parliamentarians in the Canadian Group and on delegations, “as Canada is a federal and not a unitary state.” In his reply, the President of the Group explained that the statutes of the IPU do not permit such an arrangement. According to one article of the statutes, “in a Federal State, a National Group can only be established within a Federal Parliament”; another article states that only “members of the National Parliament of their country” are entitled to become members of a National Group.

Another interesting historical note relates to the Canadian Group’s efforts in 1978 and again in 1981 to invite the Union to hold a conference in Ottawa. Those efforts were unsuccessful, for three reasons: the high cost to Canada of hosting the event; the lack of suitable facilities in Ottawa; and uncertainty as to whether it was Canada’s turn to extend an invitation. In early 1983, however, both the Senate and the House of Commons confirmed funds to host the IPU conference in Ottawa in 1985. The new Ottawa Congress Centre, scheduled to open in 1984, would provide a suitable venue. At the Seoul Conference in October 1983, the President of the Canadian Group, Marcel Prud’homme, MP, conveyed Canada’s invitation to host the 74th Conference.

1985

Canada hosted the 74th Conference in September 1985 at the Ottawa Congress Centre. There were a total of 741 registered delegates, including 459 legislators representing 94 parliaments, 16 intergovernmental and international organizations and 40 observers. An elaborate program was drawn up, including an inaugural ceremony at the National Arts Centre on 2 September (in the presence of the Governor General, Jeanne Sauvé), and a gala evening on 4 September that featured some of Canada’s leading performers and was broadcast nationwide on CBC/Radio-Canada. A special meeting commemorated the 40th anniversary of the United Nations. Receptions were hosted by the Speakers of the houses of Parliament, national delegations and others. As well, the program included visits to key Canadian scientific, medical, cultural, agricultural and international development institutions in the Ottawa region. A commemorative stamp for the conference was publicly unveiled during a ceremony hosted by the Chairman of Canada Post.
The Canadian Group submitted three memoranda. The first dealt with International Youth Year and the Rights of Youth; the second concerned international drug trafficking – an item that had been placed on the agenda as a result of Canadian efforts; and the third, decolonization. The Group also presented draft resolutions on these three issues.

During the plenary session, Allan Lawrence, MP, spoke authoritatively on drug trafficking and the international drug trade. He was appointed rapporteur of the Committee on Parliamentary, Juridical and Human Rights Questions, and the resolution drafted by the committee was adopted without a vote. Howard McCurdy, MP, spoke on issues affecting young people. Mary Collins, MP, spoke on decolonization and chaired the committee working on that problem. Marcel Prud’homme, MP, presided over the Committee on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament. Senator Peter Bosa delivered a speech on international peace and disarmament during the debate on the general world situation. At the end of the conference, Benno Friesen, MP, was elected to the IPU Executive Committee and became the sixth Canadian to hold this position.

1986–2011
During this period, six parliamentarians, including two women, were elected President of the Canadian IPU Group (see Part 3 of this book for a list of all presidents and their photos). In addition, three Canadian parliamentarians – senators Finestone, Fraser and Oliver – were members of the IPU Executive Committee.

Canada continued to send large and very active delegations to all IPU conferences. Canadian delegates addressed a wide range of important issues, including gender equality, the environment, representative democracy, decolonization, relations with the United Nations, reform of the IPU, the health of the elderly, maternal and child health, human rights, landmines, diversity, the Middle East situation, and peacekeepers.

As in the past, delegates received input from many Canadian sources to assist with drafting memoranda and resolutions to be presented at the conferences. Federal departments and agencies, non-government organizations and experts provided pre-conference briefings, and the Library of Parliament prepared background documents. During the conferences, Canadian embassy officials in the host country provided regular briefings and support.

Following each conference, the Canadian Group prepared a report that was tabled in both houses of Parliament. In the Senate, one or more senators would speak on the subject matter. The President of the Group would also write to relevant ministers, departments, and chairpersons of parliamentary committees, enclosing a copy of the conference resolutions and asking for comments.

Since the middle of the 1980s, Canadian delegates have taken the opportunity of being in various IPU host countries to visit development projects funded by the Canadian International Development Agency. These site visits have included a wide range of undertakings such as rural development programs, health clinics, educational centres and shelters. Findings of the site visits are always included in the Group’s reports.

Those of you who have been a rapporteur know that it means being in an enclosure for about 48 hours and barely seeing the light of day as you try to meld together the resolutions that come from various countries. — Sheila Finestone, MP, 1996
The last 25 years of Canada’s IPU involvement have included important achievements and notable delegates. Some of these are highlighted below.

Canada’s longest-serving delegate, Marcel Prud’homme, attended 25 conferences. Mr. Prud’homme is both a former MP and a former senator, and his interests, knowledge and dedication equipped him to play important roles, in particular as President and rapporteur of the Committee on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament. On stepping down as President of that committee in 1987, he was asked to discuss his experience during the annual meeting of the Canadian Group. He recounted:

I was first elected Chairman of the Political Committee in Geneva in April 1984 and was the only candidate from the western countries. My primary challenge was to show balance because very frequently around the table one would have Israel, Syria, the Soviet Union, the United States and the Palestine Liberation Organization. The meetings of the committee were often long and painful marathons. The topics dealt with by the Political Committee included the Middle East, a recurring theme; Central America; disarmament and international terrorism. The quiet role of Canada in finding solutions to problems, sometimes working with other countries, added to our prestige and our reputation as being reasonable human beings. I want to remind those attending that delegates from Canada to Union Conferences are Canadians first.

In 1989 (London), Canada made a major contribution to the Union’s Centennial: to celebrate the event, the Speaker of the House of Commons authorized Philip Laundy, Clerk Assistant, to prepare a book, Parliaments in the Modern World, for general readership.

In 1993, Ottawa hosted the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on North-South Dialogue for Global Prosperity. Forty-three parliaments were represented by 164 delegates; observers from 13 international organizations and other bodies also attended. The inaugural ceremony was held at the Museum of Civilization and the working sessions took place at the Conference Centre. The conference was presided over by Dr. Bruce Halliday, MP, and focused on three themes: trade and development, financial resources and Third World debt. A comprehensive final document set out the world parliamentary community’s vision of the future basis for international economic relations; it stressed the principle of partnership and put people at the centre of sustainable development.

In 1994 (Copenhagen), Senator Peter Bosa was elected chairperson of the Twelve Plus Group; he was the first Canadian to hold that position. That year, he presented the History of the Twelve Plus Group, a document prepared by the Canadian Group to commemorate the 20th anniversary of Twelve Plus. Senator Bosa was declared chairperson of the Group again in 1995.

It should be noted that, even when their governments are at odds, parliamentarians can meet at IPU assemblies and discuss issues of common concern. This was the case in 1995 during the 93rd Conference (Madrid). At the time, Canada and Spain were involved in a major fishing dispute.
Senator Bosa and the leader of the Spanish delegation, Miguel Angel Martinez, were nonetheless able to work together to co-sponsor a resolution on the need to conserve fish stocks, which was one of the main topics on the agenda of the 1996 Conference (Istanbul). There, Peter Adams, MP, was selected to be a member of the drafting committee dealing with the conservation of world fish stocks; he was later appointed rapporteur. The final resolution, which was substantially based on the joint Canadian-Spanish draft resolution, was passed almost unanimously – an achievement made possible because the Canadian Group received significant support from Spain’s delegation.

In 1997 (Cairo), the Canadian Group applied for membership in the Asia-Pacific Group. Both Senator Bosa and Marlene Catterall, MP, spoke in support of the application to members of the latter Group, noting that Canada was very much engaged in the Asia Pacific Region and had strong links to Asia dating back more than a century. They also pointed out that Canada was an early member of APEC (Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation, comprising 18 member countries), recognizing that a liberalized trading system in the Asia Pacific Region could benefit all countries. In 1998 (Windhoek), the Asia-Pacific Group welcomed Canada as its newest member. Ten years later, Senator Oliver was the first Canadian to be appointed chairperson of the Group; he chaired the meetings at the 118th Assembly in Cape Town and the 119th Assembly in Geneva. Senator Oliver also chaired a working group that reviewed the working methods of the Asia-Pacific Group in 2008 in Ottawa.

In 1998 (Windhoek), a Canadian – Claude DesRosiers, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario – was one of three candidates for the position of IPU Secretary General.

In 2003 (Geneva), the Governing Council approved a proposal made by Senator Oliver to establish a foundation that would mobilize external funding sources to support IPU activities that promote democracy. Senator Oliver served as president of the foundation until 2007.

In 2005 (Geneva), Paddy Torsney, MP, was elected chairperson of the Twelve Plus Group, but after losing her seat in the 2006 federal election, she was unable to fulfill her mandate. The Canadian secretariat maintained responsibility for the finances and administration of the Group until a new chair was elected at the 2006 Assembly (Nairobi). In the interim, the Canadian Group, with Senator Joan Fraser as acting chairperson, hosted a Steering Committee meeting of the Twelve Plus Group in Ottawa.

In 2008 (Geneva), the IPU jointly hosted a one-day conference on the theme “Informing Democracy,” in collaboration with the Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments, and the International
Celebrating a Century of Canada–IPU Collaboration

Federation of Library Associations and Institutions’ Library and Research Services for Parliaments Section. The program was developed in partnership with Canada’s Library of Parliament and a member of the Canadian Group, Senator Dennis Dawson, who also served as a panellist. Participants agreed that parliamentarians are struggling to extract useful and reliable knowledge and information from a growing range of sources, which is making it more difficult for them to perform their duties effectively. As a result, they rely increasingly on library and research services to provide timely and accessible information – a trend that, in turn, is placing pressure on parliamentary information providers to adapt their methods and practices to meet clients’ needs. A follow-up joint meeting on the theme of parliamentary communication and representation, and the role of social media, is planned for the 127th Assembly.

In 2011 (Bern), Senator Oliver and the Canadian delegation hosted a reception to promote the 127th Assembly, which will be held in the city of Québec in October 2012. “Speaking on behalf of the Canadian Group,” said Senator Oliver, “we feel tremendously honoured that Canada was selected to host this major event. It will build on our history of active participation in the IPU’s work.”

A Century of Collaboration

Since 1900, Canada has had an increasingly strong voice within the IPU. Between 1900 (Paris) and 2012 (Kampala), a total of 356 Canadian parliamentarians – including 51 women – have attended IPU assemblies. (See Part 4 of this book for a complete list of Canadian delegates from both the Senate and the House of Commons.) Many have participated several times and some have held senior positions in the IPU, entailing additional responsibilities during and between assemblies.

AGENDA ITEMS AT IPU ASSEMBLIES HOSTED BY CANADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Pan-American Union</td>
<td>• The United Nations, instrument of international cooperation for peace and disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The development of international law</td>
<td>• New prospects for international economic relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The codification of international law</td>
<td>• Means of strengthening the effectiveness of parliamentary institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Declaration of the rights and duties of nations</td>
<td>• The demographic problem and the forthcoming United Nations Conference on World Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The criminality of war of aggression</td>
<td>• Relations between the Inter-Parliamentary Union and UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• European customs union</td>
<td>• The use of television and other modern technical media for the education of children and adults in a spirit of international peace and friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The problem of national minorities</td>
<td>• The problem of apartheid in the light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The fight against dangerous drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The reduction of armaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The parliamentary system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout those years, engaged and active Canadian delegates to IPU assemblies and meetings have striven to ensure that Canadian values, interests and perspectives are well represented in debates and resolutions. Canadians are highly respected by their IPU colleagues and are regularly asked to serve on committees and working groups. They are often considered as problem solvers. Marlene Catterall, a former MP, explained it this way:

_What generally has made us effective internationally also applies at the IPU: I think Canadian delegations always have a huge amount of respectability and respect; Canadians are nice and people know that. We are just there to find solutions; we are not there to exert power. When something big comes up and there seems to be no way to agree, other delegates would ask the Canadians to look at it to find a solution, a compromise. We are seen as problem solvers and moderate and having the ability to bring people together. … Finding a common ground and building consensus is something people respect Canada for. We don’t always succeed but they always trust us to try!_

As these words suggest, Canadian IPU delegates have effectively used parliamentary diplomacy to advance causes that are important both to Canada and to the international community. Some of those causes already had broad support; others were – and still are – contentious. However, as is clear from the list of items on the agenda of the four assemblies held in Canada (below), Canadian delegates and their IPU colleagues have never avoided discussions of complex and controversial issues.

The Canadian Group’s involvement in IPU activities has been so long and so wide-ranging that it would be difficult to provide an overall summary. Accordingly, Part 2 of this book highlights only some of the major areas in which Canada has played a key role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1985</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• International Youth Year</td>
<td>• Plenary debate on citizenship, identity, and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rights of youth</td>
<td>• Enforcing the responsibility to protect: the role of parliament in safeguarding civilians’ lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Illicit international drug trafficking</td>
<td>• Fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decolonization</td>
<td>• The use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foreign debt in developing countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Key Themes Addressed in IPU Assemblies
Peace and Security

Since its inception, the Inter-Parliamentary Union has studied all questions to which the solution may help maintain peace among nations. It will continue to bring together all peace-loving parliamentarians, and to cooperate in shaping a society in which the “final argument” of nations will be solely that of justice. — Senator Raoul Dandurand, 1927

Known in its early days as the “Inter-Parliamentary Conference for Peace and Arbitration,” the IPU has traditionally focused not only on broad questions of peace and security, but also on specific conflicts and threats. This is perhaps why Canadian parliamentarians have always seen the Union as a key forum for international political dialogue and cooperation. Their long-standing involvement in IPU debates and studies on these topics has consistently reflected a deep commitment to the human rights and democratic values so central to the Canadian society they represent.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union has recognized the necessity of stimulating debate on international peace and cooperation in parliaments and beyond them in wide public circles before governments reach their decisions. The drive to achieve collective security through permanent international institutions, which has characterized the best in political thought in this century, has been closely linked to the desire to widen the basis of public interest in public policy. — Paul Martin Sr., Secretary of State for External Affairs, 1965

Peacekeeping

In light of Canada’s important role in the establishment of the first United Nations (UN) peacekeeping force in 1956 and in many later operations, it is not surprising that Canadian IPU delegates have often taken a stand on peacekeeping and peace-building initiatives and related issues. As Beryl Gaffney, MP, said in 1997 (Seoul): “Successive Canadian governments have consistently regarded peacekeeping as one of the most important mechanisms for dealing with world crises.” In 1998 (Windhoek), Marlene Catterall, MP, explained that, over time, Canadian

Canada has a very small population and we have attempted to exercise our limited influence in the world as peacemakers, peacekeepers and peace brokers. We use our democratic institutions and our Charter of Rights and Freedoms to demonstrate to the world our view that, for instance, respect of human rights is a prerequisite for peace within individual states and even more importantly that a parliament consisting of representatives freely and fairly elected is the best guarantee of human dignity and the prosperity of citizens. — Senator Donald H. Oliver, 2000
Interventions and contributions reflected the changing international security environment, which was characterized by a decline in the number of wars between states and an increase in intra-state conflicts, often with significant civilian casualties. She noted that, since the 1990s, this had led to a growing focus on what came to be known as human security as opposed to national security. Correspondingly, the focus of IPU discussions had shifted from peacekeeping, as a means of separating warring armies, to peace-building which had to put in place the minimum conditions under which a country could be governed peacefully and ensure the security of its citizens.

Terrorism

International terrorism has been another major topic of debate at the IPU, and one that Canadian delegates have often addressed. For example, in 1978 (Lisbon), Senator Joan Neiman asked fellow delegates to urge their parliaments and governments to accede to and ratify all existing conventions and agreements dealing with international terrorism; and she called on the IPU to develop definitions and formulate agreements that could serve as models for governments preparing legislation in this area. On behalf of the Canadian delegation, she submitted a draft resolution establishing basic criteria for the definition of international terrorism.

Over the years, Canadian IPU delegates have supported several resolutions condemning international terrorism and calling upon all states to adopt appropriate measures to tackle this problem and its social, political and economic causes, while respecting human rights and the rule of law. The September 2001 attacks on the United States brought renewed urgency to efforts to address the threat of international terrorism. As Paddy Torsney, MP, told the assembly in 2003 (Chile), “On 9-11 as the IPU was meeting in Ouagadougou, cold-blooded killers struck a blow at the values and beliefs of free and civilized people everywhere. The event occurred in New York and Washington, but it is clear – the world was attacked. Terrorism is a global threat.”

Similarly, Larry Miller, MP, argued in 2008 (Cape Town) that terrorism erodes democracy and human rights and that all countries must do their part to fight it.

If we are to make and keep peace in countries that are victims of conflicts, not only military security but also human security must be guaranteed. That is where peace-building comes in: a series of measures to strengthen and solidify peace by building a sustainable infrastructure for human security. The purpose of peace-building is to create the basic conditions in which a country can take charge of its future, and in which social, political and economic development becomes possible. — Raymonde Folco, MP, 1998
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At successive assemblies, Canadian delegates have promoted disarmament as a key step towards achieving lasting peace. In particular, during the 1990s they won a reputation among their IPU colleagues as persistent champions of a global ban on anti-personnel mines (landmines).

Advocating for a Ban

In 1995 (Madrid), the entire Canadian delegation voted to select a Belgian proposal on banning landmines as a supplementary item. Although it was not the selected item, the issue was considered at a standing committee and the resulting resolution called for a universal ban on anti-personnel mines. At the following assembly (Bucharest), Senator Peter Bosa spoke in favour of a complete ban on landmines during the general debate.

In 1996 (Istanbul), Beryl Gaffney, MP, and Senator Bosa again raised the issue and urged IPU members to support a global ban on anti-personnel mines. At the following assembly (Beijing), Senator Bosa spoke on the resolution item on landmines, co-sponsored by Canada and Germany. The Canadian Group’s report noted its efforts to gain support for the resolution: it had prepared copies of the draft resolution in English, French, Spanish and Arabic and had sent letters requesting support to the leaders of the other geopolitical groups, as well as to all ambassadors in Canada seeking the support of other national IPU groups. The assembly adopted the resolution.

In 1997, Canada and 121 other countries signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction, known as the Ottawa Convention. The signing of this treaty was an important step, but states also had to ratify it in order to bring it into effect in their country. During IPU assemblies, the Canadian Group used various opportunities, both formal and informal, to lobby for ratification.

You may recall that I urged delegates to work with their respective governments to adopt stricter laws about the use of anti-personnel mines and to support clearance programs. The issue of anti-personnel mines and the incredible damage inflicted by them is so great that I have chosen to speak once more about this major international problem. ... There are now over 110 million anti-personnel mines deployed throughout 69 countries – most of them in the developing world. An additional 100 million land mines remain in national stockpiles. There are now at least 250,000 land mine-disabled people in the world. ... More than 90 percent of land mine victims are civilians, many of whom are children. — Senator Peter Bosa, 1996

Anti-Personnel Mines

Anti-personnel mines are perhaps the most indiscriminate and inhumane class of weaponry ever deployed. They cannot distinguish between the footstep of a soldier and that of a child. Millions of these indiscriminate killers lie strewn across more than 70 countries, adversely affecting the daily lives of civilian populations in every region of the world. They hinder economic development and poison otherwise fertile soil by making land inaccessible to farmers and crop growers. They make post-war reconstruction particularly difficult, as they remain hidden in the ground long after the wars for which they were originally planted have ended. — Senator Sheila Finestone, 2001
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Promoting Ratification

In 1998 (Windhoek), the Canadian Group encouraged countries to ratify the convention. In some instances, parliamentarians were unclear about the differences between signature and ratification, or about the ratification procedures. In others, a parliament had passed the required legislation but had not deposited the treaty documents with the United Nations. Canadian delegates met with several IPU colleagues to explain the procedures and provide material on the ratification process.

The Canadian delegation also took opportunities afforded by subsequent IPU assemblies – in 1999 (Brussels and Berlin), 2001 (Havana), and 2003 (Santiago and Geneva) – to host meetings and other gatherings to promote awareness of the Ottawa Convention among parliamentarians and encourage its ratification.

We were preparing for our next conference in Windhoek when Minister Axworthy reminded us that some countries had not ratified the landmines treaty. He asked us to talk with parliamentarians of these countries to see what could be done. Many of them from developing countries and countries involved in war did not know that their parliament had to ratify it to have the treaty come into effect. This work helped in increasing the ratification of this international treaty. ... Ministers should more often use this opportunity and recognize what can be done by the IPU. — Marlene Catterall, former MP, 2012

In 2000, the IPU assembly met in Amman. At the time, Jordan was the only country in the Middle East that had both signed and ratified the Ottawa Convention. The Canadian delegates travelled to a de-mining site in southwest Jordan, where they presented the Jordanian Royal Corps of Engineers with equipment provided by the Government of Canada to assist in the removal of landmines.
The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

It is our responsibility as parliamentarians who have the luxury of a parliament which allows us to speak where we are free of harassment, where we are free from unfair prosecution, where we are certainly free from murder; then, we have the responsibility to other parliamentarians in other countries of the world to protect their interests, because if a parliamentarian does not have human rights, then the citizens of that country definitely don’t have human rights. — Sharon Carstairs, former Senator, 2012

The IPU does important work in defending the human rights of parliamentarians. Canada has been a key player in this field. In 1974 (Tokyo) during a debate on “The Problem of Torture in the World,” Robert Gordon Lee Fairweather, MP, stressed that parliamentarians were being jailed in many countries because of their political beliefs; some were tortured while in detention. He also spoke about the denial of parliamentarians’ rights to exercise their parliamentary mandate, which he referred to as “a little-recognized form of torture,” adding: “This is a form of life sentence outside of jail.” The resolution adopted by the assembly called on the IPU to explore the possibility of setting up a procedure for examining and following up on communications concerning these human rights matters.

The Canadian Group undertook to develop such a procedure. In 1975, while in London, Robert Douglas George Stanbury, MP, visited the Secretary of Amnesty International to discuss practical ways of bringing this about. Later that year (Madrid), after extensive consultations, Senator Joan Neiman put forward a draft resolution by the assembly called on the IPU to explore the possibility of setting up a procedure for examining and following up on communications concerning these human rights matters. A revised Canadian text was adopted, which led to the establishment of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians.

Membership

The committee consists of five permanent and five substitute members from the different geopolitical groups represented in the Union. They are elected by the Governing Council for a five-year term. Elected members must have a strong background in human rights. Substitute members must be present at all meetings and must have a detailed knowledge of the cases before the committee, to ensure a smooth transition if they are required to replace a permanent member. Each appointment is personal and cannot be transferred to another delegate from the same national group.

Three Canadians have served on the committee. Senator Neiman was elected substitute member (1979), permanent member (1983), President (1990 and 1992) and Vice-President (1991). Irwin Cotler, MP, was elected substitute member in 2002. Senator Sharon Carstairs was elected substitute member (2004), permanent member (2006–2011) and President (2007–2011).

Senator Carstairs at the press conference following public release of the report of the Committee, 2010 (Geneva)
© Corbis / Photographer: Salvatore Di Nolfi
Procedure

The committee examines a case after receiving a formal complaint from what it deems to be a qualified source. It then prepares a summary of the allegations and sends it to the authorities of the country concerned so they can present their position. A summary of their observations is relayed to the complainant.

The committee meets four times a year. It conducts hearings, reviews the information received, deliberates on the cases and adopts decisions in camera. This ensures both the independence and the discretion of its activities.

When a case is complex, or there is limited information on file, or there is slow or no progress due to a lack of official cooperation, the committee carries out an on-site mission, with the consent of the country’s authorities. Direct contacts and personal interaction often help in achieving a satisfactory settlement. If the committee feels that further progress is impossible, it makes its reports public by submitting them to the Governing Council.

Committee members devote a large amount of time to this task. They must read and review complex and extensive material prior to each meeting, and the on-site visits require careful planning and preparation. Their work is also emotionally draining, as they learn about the violations and abuse suffered by their counterparts in many parts of the world.

Since its creation in 1978, the committee has investigated more than 1,600 cases in some 100 countries. In 2011 alone, it reviewed 83 cases (43 confidential, 40 public) affecting 389 parliamentarians from 41 countries.

A total of 910 alleged violations against these 389 parliamentarians were recorded. The allegations included violations affecting their life, integrity and liberty, as well as the exercise of their parliamentary mandate.

Moral Authority and Parliamentary Solidarity

The committee has no legal authority with respect to the cases it investigates; it depends on the power of persuasion and moral authority. Parliamentary solidarity also plays an important role in securing successful settlement of cases. In 1990 (Nicosia), Senator Neiman reminded the assembly that IPU members can make an important contribution by putting pressure on the authorities of countries against which a complaint has been made. In her view, two of the most effective actions are: contacting the ambassadors of the countries in question, either by letter or in person; and asking our Minister of Foreign Affairs to relay concerns through Canadian ambassadors accredited to those countries. These two actions have been a standard practice for the Canadian Group.

Senator Neiman, who was instrumental in the establishment of this Committee over a decade ago, devotes considerable time and energy to this cause – attending meetings during the two statutory conferences, travelling to Geneva for two other meetings at the Union Headquarters and visiting foreign countries to investigate at first hand some of the cases under consideration. It is an extremely time-consuming, but vitally important task.

— Senator Nathan Nurgitz, 1989
Women Parliamentarians and Gender Partnership

Through the years, the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians became a much fuller dialogue with a deeper level of discussion. The attendance became bigger and the debate got more open and interesting. The Coordinating Committee provided an important opportunity to reflect on the issues that were discussed at the main plenary from a woman’s perspective and from our perspective as women parliamentarians from around the world. — Paddy Torsney, former MP, 2012

Canadian women parliamentarians have been actively involved in IPU activities since the mid-1970s, and many have held senior IPU positions. Canadian parliamentarians – both men and women – have always encouraged the active participation of women delegates in IPU assemblies and the Union’s main bodies.

The Meeting of Women Parliamentarians and its Coordinating Committee

Between 1978 and 1984, women parliamentarians attending IPU assemblies met informally. In 1985 (Lomé), they decided to meet more formally, and later that year in Ottawa, Suzanne Fortin-Duplessis, MP, organized and chaired the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians. There it was decided that the women delegates would meet formally prior to the opening session to discuss matters of mutual interest as well as ways of increasing the participation of women within the Union and its various activities.

In 1988 (Sofia), on behalf of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians, the Canadian Group recommended that the IPU amend its statutes to ensure that at least two elected members of its Executive Committee were women.

The amendment was adopted.

In 1990 (Nicosia), Sheila Finestone, MP, was a force behind the creation of the Coordinating Committee of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians; its goal is to provide continuity and to facilitate the planning and organization of the women’s meetings. In 1998 (Moscow), the IPU gave official status to the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians and its Coordinating Committee, and new provisions were adopted whereby the person elected President of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians becomes an ex officio member of the Executive Committee.

Over the years, Canadian women parliamentarians have held various positions on the Coordinating Committee. For example, Sheila Finestone served as President (1991) and was both Vice-President and a geopolitical representative of the Twelve Plus Group (1996–1999). Similarly, Senator Joan Fraser was President and a geopolitical representative of the Twelve Plus Group (2004–2006). For their part, Paddy Torsney, MP (1994–1995) and Edna Anderson, MP (1992–1993) served as geopolitical representatives of the Twelve Plus Group. By virtue of being members of the IPU Executive Committee, both senators Finestone...

It took 98 years before one woman was elected on the Executive Committee. The group of women parliamentarians are simply asking for minimal representation to ensure that women are guaranteed a voice on the Executive Committee. Through time, mechanisms have been found to ensure adequate representation for different groups, be they ethnic, religious or representatives of economic interests. This is affirmative action and it is done to counter discrimination. ... I call on all delegates to support this amendment so that women parliamentarians have their rightful and complete place. — Senator Nathan Nurgitz, 1988
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(1999–2001) and Fraser (2002–2003) served as ex officio members of the Coordinating Committee. Many other Canadian women parliamentarians also served in other capacities during IPU assemblies.

Canadian women parliamentarians first participated in an IPU delegation in 1965 (Ottawa); on this occasion, three Canadian delegates – one senator and two MPs – were women. In total, 51 Canadian women have been IPU delegates. Of the 73 assemblies held between 1965 and 2012, 60 Canadian delegations have included women.

Gender Partnership Group

In 1997 (New Delhi), the Gender Partnership Group was established as a sub-committee of the IPU Executive Committee. Made up of four members (two men and two women), it monitors the composition of delegations to IPU assemblies, reviews the participation of women in all IPU activities and examines the gender composition of member parliaments. Senator Donald H. Oliver is currently a member of the Group and two other Canadians have served in this capacity: senators Finestone (2001–2002) and Fraser (2002–2003 and 2004–2006).

The work of the Gender Partnership Group has led to a series of amendments to the Union’s statutes which provide strong incentives to members to ensure that their delegations include both women and men. In 2012 (Kampala), Senator Oliver reported some of the Group’s findings. He indicated that women represented 28.2% of the total number of delegates to that assembly. Fifteen delegations had no women members; four of them were sanctioned for having no women delegates for the third time in a row. Senator Oliver also pointed out that, over the past 12 years, scarcely any women have been standing committee chairs. “Colleagues,” he declared, “it is clear that we can do better.”

In 2012 (city of Québec), the Gender Partnership Group will be holding a special plenary session to develop and release a plan of action to foster gender-sensitive parliaments. The session aims to provide a platform for parliamentarians to discuss what constitutes gender-sensitive parliaments and to identify objectives and concrete strategies for achieving such institutions.

Much of the Union’s work concerned human rights and, in many cases, it aimed to advance the rights of women. We have made great progress. This has shown that women, especially those without a strong voice in their own country, are not alone. Women have won key positions; this is one of the Union’s notable achievements.

— Senator Gerald J. Comeau, 2012

During its annual meeting in December 1987, the Canadian IPU Group proceeded to the election of its Executive Committee. Following the election of the Chair and Treasurer, the Group then turned to the two positions of Vice-Chair. Marcel Prud’homme, MP, declined his nomination, stating it was important for Canada to show an example in electing women to its Executive Committee. Sheila Finestone, being the only candidate, was declared elected.
The Health and Well-Being of Women and Children

It must be understood that the rights of women and children are an inalienable, integral and indivisible part of universal human rights. Who would deny we have a responsibility to nurture, protect and develop the world’s children? — Sue Barnes, MP, 1996

Canadian delegates have often used IPU assemblies to address questions related to the health and well-being of women and children, and to remind IPU colleagues of their role in raising awareness about relevant international conventions and treaties and in ensuring that signatories comply with their obligations.

The Human Rights of Women and Children

In 1989 (Budapest), the Canadian delegation submitted a memorandum and a draft resolution on the protection of the rights of children. Margaret Anne Mitchell, MP, served as chairperson and rapporteur of the drafting committee that studied this subject. She stated that Canada called on all nations to take the necessary steps to sign and ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The resolution was adopted unanimously by the assembly.

In 1990 (Punta del Este), the Canadian and Pakistan groups co-sponsored a resolution calling on IPU members to press their governments to implement the commitments agreed to in the Declaration and Plan of Action of the World Summit for Children. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

In 1991 (Pyongyang), the Canadian delegation submitted a memorandum and a draft resolution on violence against women and children. The Canadian text served as the basis for the resolution, which was adopted by consensus. It called on parliaments to enact and governments to enforce legislation prohibiting all forms of violence against children and women and to monitor their application on a regular basis.

In 1996 (Beijing), Canada submitted a memorandum and a draft resolution on promoting greater respect for human rights in general and in particular for those of women and children. Sue Barnes, MP, spoke on this topic: “Women’s rights are human rights. Canada’s commitment to equality for women is rooted in the belief that equal rights for women are an essential component of progress on overall human rights and democratic development.” Some key elements of the Canadian text – references to national human rights institutions, domestic violence, development assistance and the role of non-governmental organizations – were included in the final resolution.

In 1997 (Cairo), Maurice Dumas, MP, spoke about violence against children and emphasized Canada’s strong commitment to protecting and promoting the rights of children, who are the most innocent and vulnerable among us. He reminded his IPU colleagues that there were many international agreements on protection for children.

In 2004 (Mexico City), Senator Marcel Prud’homme spoke during a meeting of the Committee on Peace and International Security:

People everywhere aspire to the same things, including a better life for their children. The IPU should consider encouraging an exchange of women parliamentarians from Israel and Palestine so as to permit them to see how their respective families live, both in Israel and on the Palestinian side. Women, more than men, would no doubt be prone to understand the problems faced by the other side. Reconciliation requires forgiveness for the evils of the past.
In 2006 (Nairobi), Senator Raynell Andreychuk spoke about violence against women in situations of conflict. She noted that IPU members can play a role in raising awareness about the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000), and ensuring that signatories comply with their obligations.

**Maternal and Child Health**

In 2010 (Bangkok), Senator Wilbert Keon spoke on the role of parliaments in achieving Millennium Development Goals 4 and 5 relating to child survival and maternal health. He noted that Canada was determined to raise awareness of maternal and child health as one of the key challenges in the field of security and development. He also indicated that few issues were more important, as the United Nations had recognized.

In 2011 (Panama), Senator Salma Ataullahjan was appointed as one of three co-rapporteurs to a standing committee that examined maternal and child health. Their report evaluated progress towards achieving Millennium Development Goals 4 and 5, described key challenges, and summarized relevant international human rights frameworks. In 2012 (Kampala), Senator Ataullahjan drew the committee’s attention to Paragraph 27 of the draft resolution it had submitted, noting that it “requests the IPU to develop an accountability mechanism to monitor the progress of Member Parliaments in implementing the resolution between the date of its adoption and 2015. For the co-rapporteurs, this is a crucial paragraph. We cannot simply make commitments and then move on to other issues at future assemblies.” The final resolution was adopted unanimously by the assembly.

My colleague Senator Ataullahjan worked tirelessly for many months to develop a report and draft resolution for the IPU’s Third Standing Committee in collaboration with her co-rapporteurs from Uganda and India. The final resolution ... provides a robust, ambitious and comprehensive framework for parliamentary action on maternal and child health. — Senator Donald H. Oliver, 2012

Senator Salma Ataullahjan and Paula Turyahikayo of Uganda, Co-Rapporteurs, 2012 (Kampala) *Courtesy of Senator Ataullahjan*
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Diversity and Representative Democracy

For parliamentary democracies to remain relevant, the various groups in society must be equitably defended and represented within them. We must strive for truly inclusive parliaments and greater civic engagement so that all members of society have an equal opportunity to participate in the political decision-making process, regardless of their background or identity.

— Senator Donald H. Oliver, 2011

In 2012 (city of Québec), the IPU will hold a special debate on the theme of citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity. This topic was chosen by the Canadian IPU Group in light of Canada’s long history of promoting diversity and equality. Canadian delegates at successive IPU assemblies have spoken about diversity as a source of strength and stability and have vigorously advocated for representative democracy.

Strength and Stability

In 1992 (Yaoundé), Canada submitted both a memorandum and a draft resolution on the functioning of democracy and the expression of ethnic diversity as a means of ensuring stability. The memorandum states that a democracy that allows for the peaceful expression of ethnic diversity encourages all citizens, regardless of ethnic origins, to develop their skills and become active members of society. This not only builds greater political and social stability; it also improves the prospects for economic development. Similarly, in 2000 (Amman), the Canadian Group submitted both a memorandum and a draft resolution that stressed that diversity is a source of strength and culture.

In 2009 (Addis Ababa), Senator Donald H. Oliver emphasized that diversity was an important topic for debate because, in light of the global financial crisis, countries could not afford to have people not contributing to the economy because of their religion, gender or skin colour. He noted that diverse and inclusive societies attracted the best talents, and that countries that were tolerant would be the most successful in the years to come.

Representation

Over the years, Canadian IPU delegates have spoken strongly for the protection of minorities and representative democracy. In a speech prepared for the 1925 Conference (Ottawa), Senator Napoléon-Antoine Belcourt praised the principles of the Magna Carta as “essential … [for] general application throughout the whole civilized world” and fundamental to the protection of minorities.

In 1992 (Stockholm), Senator Peter Bosa stressed that the test of democracy was the way in which a country treated its minorities. That same year in Yaoundé, Kenneth David Atkinson, MP, said during the plenary debate: “True democracy … recognizes the universal and

In any discussion of culture, it is important to use a broad-based notion that encompasses language, human rights, human expression, ideas, values, histories, tradition and religion as expressed through a wide range of creative means including literature, film, visual arts, music and dance. Furthermore, the creative spirit is nourished by the interaction of people of different cultural, linguistic, racial, religious and national heritages. Thus, the diversity of mankind can be a source of strength rather than a cause for division. — Karen Redman, MP, 2000
equal application of the law and the existence of basic human rights which take precedence over the interests of the state. In this way, discrimination against women, disabled persons, minority races and ethnic groups is held in check.” For her part, Marlene Catterall, MP, stated in 1997 (Cairo) that “parliament must be relevant by ensuring equality of representation of all people. The representation of women is very important both by itself and because it reflects the representation of other minorities.”

Senator Oliver has been a long-time advocate for representative democracy. In 2006 (Nairobi), he noted a growing trend towards democracy, as evidenced among nations of diverse cultures and histories. He added, however, that there was a danger of taking it for granted. It was thus necessary to promote it both in transition countries and also where it was already well established. In Kampala (2012), the Senator spoke, during the general debate, about Canada’s pluralistic and multicultural society and stressed that parliamentarians must strive to represent all citizens in all their diversity.

Voter Participation

In 1928 (Berlin), Senator Belcourt stated that governments cannot effectively meet the needs and aspirations of a democratic society unless there is strong participation by a well-informed electorate. He noted that only “fifty per cent of the electors in democratic countries take the trouble to cast a vote in parliamentary elections. … [T]he electorate has been given the privilege to vote without acquiring a sufficient appreciation of the importance of the vote, and of the duty to exercise it, and in consequence is incapable of making a judicious choice of representatives.”

More recently, Canadian delegates have pointed out that parliaments must represent all age groups and that greater efforts must be made to reach young people. For example, in 2010 (Bangkok), Senator Dennis Dawson said that Canada prided itself on being an historic pillar of participatory democracy, but it was nonetheless facing a decline in voter participation in all elections, particularly among first-time voters, whose disaffection perhaps stemmed from lack of interest or lack of time. The end result was that the electoral machine focused on communicating with the older generation of more reliable voters through such traditional methods as television and newspapers, as opposed to the Internet and its more youth-oriented social networking sites. Senator Dawson also noted that few countries encouraged Internet voting, yet it was associated with the wider participation of young people in the democratic process. The use of new media to boost voter participation was therefore a challenge that governments must actively address.
Reform of the IPU

The IPU is a very large organization; not surprisingly, at times its size can make it bureaucratic and cumbersome. Despite this, it has shown flexibility over the years in adapting to evolving world circumstances and the changing needs of its growing membership. Major reforms have addressed areas such as the functioning of its assembly and committees, its budget and governance, and its future role as the world organization of parliaments. As described below, the Canadian IPU Group has taken an active part in many of these reform efforts.

Financial Governance and Accountability

In 1994 (Paris), during the meeting of the Twelve Plus Group, Senator Peter Bosa drew attention to the IPU’s growing operating costs. In particular, he noted many double-digit increases in some expenditure categories over the previous four years, even though inflation rates in Switzerland—where the Union’s Secretariat is located—had been quite low. The Group asked him to relay these concerns in a letter to the IPU President. The letter urged the President “to direct the Secretariat to put an immediate freeze on its current expenditures and to review every aspect of its financial operations with a view to proposing a plan of action to achieve savings and restraints.”

In 1997 (Cairo), Canada and other delegations expressed concern about a proposed increase in membership fees. Again, Senator Bosa stressed the need to reduce costs, asked for a re-examination of the Union’s budget, and proposed a motion to design a budget “to live within our means.”

In 1998 (Moscow), Canada raised questions about the decision-making process regarding construction of new headquarters for the IPU Secretariat in Geneva: members were not given sufficient time to reflect on the project and consult national groups. Later that year (Windhoek), Senator Gerald J. Comeau noted that the Canadian Group had previously requested a breakdown of assembly costs in order to shed some light on the Union’s finances. To date, however, it had not received the necessary comparative data, and this made it difficult for the Group’s members to take an immediate position on the construction project under discussion. Senator Comeau emphasized that the Canadian delegates needed to have adequate information to justify a request to their Parliament for a contribution to the project.

More recently, Senator Donald H. Oliver was appointed internal auditor for the IPU’s 2006 financial statements. In 2007 (Nusa Dua, Bali), he presented a report prepared in collaboration with Mr. A. Quawas from Jordan. The report expressed satisfaction with the IPU’s financial performance in 2006 and with the presentation of its financial statements. To improve financial governance, the authors recommended that the financial regulations be amended to limit transfers between budget headings, suggested that new reporting standards be adopted for staff benefits, established a deadline for publishing an internal finance manual, and encouraged the Governing Council to consider appointing a salaried internal auditor.

The IPU should seize the opportunity of the forthcoming review to reorganize itself. It should never lose sight of the original aim of discussion in pursuit of peace. — Senator Nathan Nurgitz, 1991
Since 2010, Senator Oliver in his capacity as a member of the IPU Executive Committee has had an active role in ensuring the Union’s longer-term financial stability. A notable outcome of his efforts was the creation in 2011 of a Subcommittee on Finance of the IPU Executive Committee with a mandate to review the IPU’s budget and expenditures with the aim of identifying savings and efficiencies. The subcommittee’s work in 2012 prompted a 10% reduction in members’ contributions to the IPU.

Gender-Neutral Language and Gender Indicators

In 1994 (Paris), the Union decided to review the terminology of its statutes and rules to ensure gender-neutral language. The Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians proposed that this task be undertaken by a small working group with representatives from four national groups, including Canada. The working group was chaired by Senator Lise Bacon and included Sue Barnes, MP, and Pierrette Ringuette, MP. Canadian IPU members were well placed to take a leading role in this work because it is standard practice in Canada to ensure that statutes, regulations and government documents use gender-neutral language. Handbooks and guidelines produced by Status of Women Canada and the Canadian Department of Justice were used to determine appropriate terminology. The assembly accepted the amendments of the working group in 1996 (Istanbul).

In 2004 (Geneva), in her capacity as a member of the IPU Executive Committee, Senator Joan Fraser proposed the analysis of the Union’s budget from a gender perspective. In 2005 (Manila), she pushed via the Gender Partnership Group for the inclusion of specific gender indicators in the IPU’s budget. Later that year in Geneva, the Secretary General made a commitment to expand and develop additional gender indicators for all IPU programs.

Membership

Early in 2000, the Union proposed that its members be “national parliaments” rather than “national groups.” The proposal was “designed to reflect more adequately the existing institutional link between the national parliaments of sovereign States and the IPU as their world organization.” Canada objected to the proposal because it would have forced the Canadian Group – and several others, for similar reasons – to withdraw from the IPU solely because Canada’s parliamentary system does not allow Parliament to join associations or groups. Due in large part to the Canadian Group’s insistence on the need to preserve the rights of existing national groups to remain IPU members, a proviso to that effect was agreed upon in 2001 (Havana).

In 1994 (Copenhagen), the Canadian IPU Group successfully introduced the term “les droits de la personne” as the French translation of “human rights”; this term had been used in Canada for many years. The Union was the first international forum to use gender-neutral language in this way, and the event was regarded as an important milestone by the Canadian Group.

This particular example shows how the IPU reform process – if left unchecked – could affect the full participation of the world’s parliaments in IPU activities. And this is why I encourage you to pay close attention to the question of IPU reform. — Senator Sheila Finestone, 2001

Mission and Vision

The IPU Strategy 2012–2017, adopted by the Governing Council in 2011 (Bern), places considerable emphasis on values and ideals such as those that Canada has actively promoted at the IPU ever since Canadian parliamentarians first began attending its meetings in 1900. It is a testament to the hard work and dedication of these individuals that the IPU is now well positioned and better equipped to address the challenges of today’s rapidly changing geopolitical environment.
The IPU and the United Nations

After much work the IPU was ... given a form of recognition as the parliamentary parallel organization of the UN. The problem is that simultaneously there was and still is a group of people who thought that the IPU was a complete waste of time and what the United Nations needed was a much more closely affiliated group of parliamentarians and so the IPU spent a lot of time working to reaffirm its own status. — Senator Joan Fraser, 2012

The IPU is the parliamentary parallel organization of the UN and has had a cooperation agreement with the UN since 1996. In 2002, the UN General Assembly granted permanent observer status to the IPU, along with the right to circulate its official documents. This status, which brings a parliamentary dimension to the UN’s work, was achieved through some 30 years of efforts by the IPU – efforts that were strongly supported by the Canadian Group.

The Cooperation Agreement

Recognition of the IPU by the UN was first proposed by a British delegate in 1946 (Copenhagen). The matter was referred to a sub-committee, which decided to request consultative status with the UN’s Economic and Social Council; this was granted in 1947.

In 1982 (Rome), Gérald Laniel, MP, presented an amendment submitted by Canada that “[called] on Parliaments and the Inter-Parliamentary Union to search for appropriate means of strengthening the participation of parliamentarians in the work of the United Nations.”

In 1983 (Seoul), Senator Peter Bosa was rapporteur for a committee that dealt with a resolution on ways to strengthen the UN. The concern was raised that the IPU’s consultative status with the UN had proved inadequate. The resolution adopted in the final plenary, without a vote, called on the UN to grant “appropriate status” to the Union.

In 1992 (Stockholm), Edna Anderson, MP, was rapporteur of a drafting committee that dealt with the relationship between the IPU and the UN. The drafting committee used the Canadian text submitted on this topic as the basis of a resolution – adopted unanimously in the final plenary – that called on the IPU to seek observer status with the UN General Assembly.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union has been an excellent advocate for the United Nations. Canada was very pleased to co-sponsor the resolution on cooperation between the UN and the IPU, and we expect to join the consensus when the item is placed before the General Assembly. — André Ouellet, Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1995

In 1995 (Madrid), the IPU adopted a resolution calling once again for stronger cooperation between the IPU and the UN. National groups were urged to approach their foreign affairs ministers to seek support for this initiative. Upon returning to Canada, the Chair of the Canadian Group wrote to the Hon. André Ouellet, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, and received his support.

This seems to be a legitimate objective for the Union in view of its representative nature. Parliamentarians should also be associated with both the Regular Sessions and Special Sessions of the United Nations so as to increase the influence of national parliaments over the activities of this organization. — Gérald Laniel, MP, 1982
In 1996, the IPU and the UN signed a cooperation agreement. Subsequently, the IPU established formal cooperative arrangements with several UN bodies, such as UNESCO, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and the United Nations Development Programme.

In 2000 (in both Amman and Jakarta), several delegations – including Canada – again expressed concern that the IPU did not have speaking rights at the UN General Assembly, and pressed for further action on this issue. In 2002 (Marrakech), Senator Joan Fraser briefed the Twelve Plus Group on the IPU Executive Committee’s work to reintroduce a draft resolution requesting observer status with the UN General Assembly. She encouraged delegates to lobby their respective governments and UN ambassadors. The President of the Canadian Group, Paddy Torsney, MP, wrote to the Hon. Bill Graham, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, to request the Canadian government’s support for the draft resolution. The UN General Assembly granted the IPU permanent observer status in 2002.

Permanent Observer Status

Since 2002, cooperation has strengthened between the two organizations. Of particular interest is the IPU-UN Parliamentary Hearing held annually at the UN headquarters, which strives to enhance the role of parliamentarians in global governance. Members of the Canadian Group have been active participants in these hearings and have served as panellists on several occasions. Canadian delegates have also participated regularly and actively since 2005 in sessions of the UN Commission on the Status of Women.

In 2007 (Nusa Dua, Bali), the IPU established a Committee on United Nations Affairs to review and report regularly on progress in IPU-UN cooperation. The Committee has set up an Advisory Group to support its work; Senator Dennis Dawson was elected as one of its members in 2012.

During the 2010 IPU-UN Parliamentary Hearing, Canadian delegates worked with legislators from 11 other parliaments to draft a resolution seeking a closer relationship between the two organizations on both the political and operational levels. The resolution, which called on the UN to put this item on the agenda of its General Assembly, was adopted by the UN General Assembly in May 2012. It sets a course for greater engagement between the UN, the IPU and its members in the areas of peace, democracy, human rights and development.

The IPU’s celebration of the 40th anniversary of the United Nations during the 74th Assembly in Ottawa in 1985 was a unique occasion, being the first time an IPU session had been interrupted to celebrate a special event.
The IPU and the European Parliament have jointly held sessions of the Parliamentary Conference on the World Trade Organization (WTO) since 2003. Canadian parliamentarians have been involved in the event from the start, both as members of the steering committee and as Conference participants.

Origins and Objective

At the fourth WTO Ministerial Conference held in Doha (Qatar) in 2001, a small group of parliamentarians adopted a declaration calling on the WTO to demonstrate greater transparency by involving more parliamentarians in its activities. A steering committee was established, and met twice in 2002 to organize the first Parliamentary Conference on the WTO.

The Conference’s objective is to strengthen democracy at the international level by bringing a parliamentary dimension to multilateral cooperation on trade issues. It enables parliamentarians with an interest in trade issues to meet with senior WTO officials and negotiators, and offers a forum for presentations, debate and discussion on the progress of negotiations. Parliamentarians have the opportunity to learn more about current WTO activities such as dispute resolution, and about such issues as building trade capacity and the role of trade in the global economy. At the same time, they can express the views of their constituents and their government to the WTO.

Conference Activities

Six sessions of the Parliamentary Conference took place between 2003 and 2008, two of which were held at the same time as the fifth and sixth WTO ministerial conferences. Since 2008 and the slowdown in the Doha Round of trade negotiations, only one Conference session has been held, in 2011.

As an extension of the Parliamentary Conference, the IPU and the European Parliament hold parliamentary panel discussions during the WTO Public Forum, an annual event that provides a platform for various representatives of civil society to discuss new developments in world trade and suggest ways to enhance the multilateral trade system. These panel discussions are open to the public and are generally very popular, as they offer lively evidence of how parliaments connect governments and citizens.

Canada’s Participation

Canada has a seat on the Parliamentary Conference steering committee, which is made up of delegates from 22 countries and representatives of the European Parliament. The steering committee is responsible for all issues related to organizing the Conference. It receives information and updates from senior WTO officials and drafts the final declarations at the end of the annual sessions.

Since 2003, the steering committee meetings have been attended regularly by Paddy Torsney, MP, (until 2006) and Senator Donald H. Oliver. Senator Oliver has been the co-chair since March 2011. Senator Mac Harb and Ted Menzies, MP, have also attended several meetings.

Canadian delegates have made a significant contribution to the committee. For example, Senator Oliver obtained members’ support for instituting regular updates to WTO negotiators on the committee’s views and discussions.
For parliamentarians to be more effective in addressing trade issues, certain mechanisms need to be institutionalized so that the stages of trade negotiation are matched by parliamentary debates and committees. In certain instances, legislation is required to enact trade arrangements. This provides parliamentarians with direct democratic input. That said, input is at times muted if ratification is required to avoid the loss of credibility internationally. For this reason, it is particularly important that committee activities and parliamentary debates are undertaken with foresight and on an ongoing basis. — Senator Grant Mitchell, 2005

At the 2005 Parliamentary Conference in Hong Kong, Senator Grant Mitchell was one of five panellists discussing best practices for parliamentary monitoring of trade negotiations and policies. He outlined Canada’s experience and suggested ways to increase understanding of trade policies, including through public consultations by parliamentary committees and making negotiators accountable to parliament. He also stressed the IPU’s role in helping parliamentarians to democratize trade negotiations.

Canadian parliamentarians often take part in the panel discussions held during the Conference. In Brussels in 2004, for example, Ms. Torsney gave a presentation on trade in services from a developmental perspective, showing that improving market access for service providers can be an important lever for economic growth. She also emphasized that parliamentarians have a role in moving negotiations forward, particularly by promoting awareness of the issues at stake in the Doha Round.

These updates take the form of brief declarations made at the end of each meeting.

For the first time in its eight-year history, the Parliamentary Conference is holding its session on the premises of the WTO. … For parliamentarians, … this is a long-awaited and politically symbolic step along the way to endowing the WTO with a meaningful parliamentary dimension. By playing host to a meeting of legislators specializing in international trade, the WTO has shown its willingness to enhance its transparency and open itself to a greater degree of democratic oversight and accountability. — Senator Donald H. Oliver, 2011

At the 2006 Parliamentary Conference in Geneva, Senator Oliver tabled and discussed a working paper on regionalism and multilateralism in trade policies. He highlighted the advantages of each approach and noted that it is in Canada’s best interest to support multilateralism. He added that Canada would be well advised to pursue trade liberalization at every level, given the slow pace of WTO negotiations.

Senator Oliver chaired the 2011 Parliamentary Conference, which was held on the premises of the WTO for the first time. During steering committee discussions, senators Oliver and Harb played an important role in developing a consensus that led to the final declaration issued at the conclusion of the Conference.

At the 2011 Parliamentary Conference in Hong Kong, Senator Oliver tabled and discussed a working paper on regionalism and multilateralism in trade policies. He highlighted the advantages of each approach and noted that it is in Canada’s best interest to support multilateralism. He added that Canada would be well advised to pursue trade liberalization at every level, given the slow pace of WTO negotiations.
The Canadian IPU Group has always taken a strong stand on the need to promote sustainable development. Several issues have been addressed over the years under this broad topic. Two are briefly presented below: the environment and fish stocks.

**Environment**

The Canadian Group participated in the first worldwide Inter-Parliamentary Conference on the Environment in 1984 (Nairobi). On that occasion, Charles L. Caccia, MP, was appointed to a committee mandated with reviewing progress made in implementing the conference’s recommendations.

In 1987 (Managua), Canada and the delegations of Czechoslovakia and Mexico jointly presented a draft resolution urging IPU members to draw their parliaments’ and governments’ attention to the conclusions and recommendations of the 1984 Conference, to promote their implementation, and to inform the Union of the steps taken.

In 1988 (Guatemala), Mr. Caccia was elected rapporteur on the topic of the environment. He drew attention to the growth of the world’s population, noting that it was concentrated in developing countries where many industries were highly polluting and heavily reliant on environmental resources, and where there was less capacity to minimize their damaging side-effects. The draft text he presented was approved unanimously by the drafting committee, adopted unanimously with a few amendments in the full committee and then adopted unanimously by the plenary. The resolution called on governments to cooperate in identifying and resolving international environmental problems.

In 1990, the Union established a Committee on Environment (which became the Committee on Sustainable Development in 1995). Its mandate was to study parliaments’ actions in relation to environmental matters and sustainable development, and to advise on the Union’s policy and action on North-South dialogue and development. Mr. Caccia was nominated to the committee in 1996 (Beijing) and elected as its Vice-President in 1997 (Cairo).

In 1992, a Canadian delegation participated in the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Environment and Development held in Brasilia. In drafting the recommendations, the Canadian delegation was successful in introducing the concept of environmental impact assessments and in emphasizing the role of women in environment and development.

Solutions to climate and sustainable development issues are now more urgent than ever. In your parliaments, you can play valuable roles ... Why, you may ask, why should parliamentarians be motivated to take strong political action? Because parliamentarians are present and future leaders. ... Here in Yaoundé, this IPU convention offers parliamentarians concerned with the present and future well-being of humanity on this planet, a unique opportunity for political action.

— Charles L. Caccia, MP, 1992

In 1992 (Yaoundé), Canada submitted both a memorandum and a draft resolution on the topic of environment and development. Mr. Caccia was the Canadian Group’s representative on the drafting committee.

In 1994 (Paris), Canada submitted both a memorandum and a draft resolution on the topic of waste management for a healthy...
The Canadian delegation believes that all nations now know that what some only suspected in 1982 is a reality. Without proper resources management, wild fish stocks will disappear. Resources management in this context means responsible national actions and responsible international action. No one nation can resolve this problem on its own. — Peter Adams, MP, 1996

Fish Stocks

During his years with the Canadian IPU Group, Senator Gerald J. Comeau often spoke about important trends in fish stocks, both as a global issue and as an indicator of long-term sustainability. In 1997 (Seoul), he reminded delegates that “the social, economic and political repercussions of resource depletion are easy to understand.” In 1997 (Cairo), he spoke in the general debate on the bilateral dispute over the Pacific Salmon Treaty:

I would like to draw the attention of fellow parliamentarians to the need to protect trans-boundary fish stocks for present and future generations. Fishing fleets now have at their disposal technologies that make possible rates of exploitation such as the world has never seen. Competition to harvest stocks that migrate beyond national boundaries has depleted many species of fish.

In 1998 (Windhoek), he reminded the assembly that the UN had declared 1998 the International Year of the Ocean and commented: “While we often speak of ‘oceans,’ all nations share only one global common ocean whose waters are interconnected. We all have a stake in protecting it.”

Resource management of fish stocks has been an issue of concern for the whole Canadian delegation. For example, in 1996 (Istanbul), Canada submitted both a memorandum and a draft resolution on fish stocks. The text that the assembly adopted by consensus contained the priorities identified by the Canadian Group.
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Canadian Delegates to IPU Assemblies
From the Senate, the Honourable:

Olson, Horace Andrew, P.C. (19772); Ottenheimer, Gerald R. (19942); Pearson, Arthur Maurice (1970); Perrault, Raymond J., P.C. (19911, 19982); Petten, William J. (19761, 19772); Phillips, Orville H. (19872); Prud’homme, Marcel, P.C. (19972, 19982, 20001, 20011, 2002, 20041); Quart, Josie Alice (1965); Rivest, Jean-Claude (20001); Robichaud, Louis, P.C. (1974); Roebuck, Arthur Wentworth (1960); Rousseau, Yvette Boucher (19801, 19811, 19822); Rowe, Frederick William (1972, 19832); Spivak, Mira (19942); Stambaugh, Weasley (1961); Stratton, Terrance (19992, 20001); Taylor, Nicholas (19982, 20001); Taylor, William H. (1965); Theriault, Norbert (19832, 19882); Thorvaldson, Gunnar Solmundur (1960, 1961, 1962, 1965, 1967); Tkachuk, Earl Wallace (1970); Vien, Thomas, P.C. (1965); Walker, David James, P.C. (1966); Willoughby, Wellington Bartley (1925).

From the House of Commons:

Adams, Peter, P.C. (19962); Aiken, Gordon (1968, 1971, 1972); Allison, Dean (20082); Allmand, William Warren, P.C. (1970, 19872, 19942); Ames, Herbert Brown (1913); Anderson, David, P.C. (1969); Anderson, Edna (19912, 19922, 19932); Anderson, Hugh (19772); Andre, Harvie, P.C. (1973); Anguish, Douglas Keith (19832, 19842); Appollini, Ursula (19782, 19832); Armstrong, Scott (20112, 20122); Asselin, Gérard (19972); Asselin, Joseph Patrick Tobin (1965); Atkinson, Kenneth David (19912, 19922); Augustine, Jean, P.C. (20012); Baker, Walter, P.C. (19772); Balfour, James (19742); Barnes, Sue, P.C. (19942, 19952, 19962, 20012); Barrington, Merrill Edwin (1961); Baskin, James William (1960); Batten, Herman Maxwell (1961, 1965, 1966, 1967); Beaudoin, Léonel (1969); Beaumier, Colleen (19981); Bechard, Albert (1965); Begin, Monique, P.C. (19752); Bellemare, Eugène (19952, 2002); Benjamin, Leslie Gordon (19922, 19932); Bergeron, Stéphane (20042); Bezan, James (20122); Blackburn, Derek Nigel Ernest (19792); Blaieickie, William Alexander, P.C. (19802);

Blenkarn, Don (19902); Blouin, Anne (19882); Blouin, Gustave (1968, 1974); Bonsant, France (20032, 20082, 20092); Bonwick, Paul, P.C. (19982); Boulanger, Samuel (1961); Bourgeois, Diane (20012); Brightwell, A. H. Harry (19882, 19892); Brison, Scott, P.C. (19982, 2002); Broome, Ernest James (1958, 1960, 1961); Brown, Patrick (20072); Brunsden, Edwin William (1961); Bujold, Joseph Roger Rémi, P.C. (19802, 19812, 19832); Caceia, Charles L., P.C. (19762, 19802, 19882, 19922); Cafix, Norman Augustine, P.C. (1971); Calkins, Blaine (20012, 20092); Cameron, Colin (1963, 1964, 1965, 1967); Caouette, David Réal (1966); Caron, Alexis Pierre (1960, 1963, 1965); Caron, Yves (19772); Casey, William D. (20032); Catterall, Marlene (19972, 19982, 19992, 20002); Chamberlain, Brenda, P.C. (19952); Chapdelaine, Gérard (1964); Charlton, Chris (20112, 20122); Chartrand, Gilbert (19832); Chatterton, George Louis (1963); Chretien, Joseph Jacques Jean, P.C. (1965); Clancy, Mary (19932); Clermont, Gaston (1971); Coates, Robert Carman, P.C. (1965, 1967); Cohen, Elizabeth Shaughnessy
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1977); Matthews, Walter Franklyn (1960); McCleave, Robert Jardine (1961, 1969); McCurdy, Howard (1985², 1986³, 1991, 1993); McDonough, Alexa (2008³); McGuire, Joe, P.C. (1994¹); McKenzie, Dan (1988³); Ménard, Serge (2007³); Menzies, Ted, P.C. (2007³); Miller, Larry (2005², 2008³); Mitchell, Margaret Anne (1982¹, 1989¹, 1992³); Monteith, Waldo J., P.C. (1966); Muir, Robert (1969, 1978³); Mullally, John (1965); Murphy, Brian (2009³); Nasserden, Edward (1966); Neil, Douglas (1976⁵, 1980², 1983³); Nesbitt, Wallace (1970); Nicholson, Aideen (1975¹,²); Nixon, George (1965); Nowlan, Patrick (1979², 1980²³); O'Brien, Patrick (1994¹); Ogle, Robert (1980³); Orlikow, David (1970, 1978³, 1982³); O'Sullivan, Sean (1974); Otto, Steven (1971); Ouellet, André, P.C. (1969); Paproski, Steve, P.C. (1977); Paradis, Denis, P.C. (1999); Paré, Philippe (1994); Patry, Bernard (1994); Penner, Keith (1970, 1973, 1978); Peric, Janko (1996); Peters, William Arnold (1961, 1974); Philbrook, Frank (1976); Phinney, Beth (2001); Picard, Louis-Philippe (1954); Pickard, Jerry, P.C. (1996); Pigeon, Louis-Joseph (1960, 1961, 1963); Pilon, Bernard F.H. (1965, 1966); Prud'homme, Marcel, P.C. (1981¹², 1982¹², 1983¹², 1984¹², 1985¹², 1986¹², 1987¹, 1989¹², 1990¹, 1991¹, 1992²); Rae, Bob, P.C. (2010); Redman, Karen, P.C. (2000); Redway, Alan (1993); Regan, Gerard, P.C. (1965); Reid, John, P.C. (1969, 1970, 1971³); Reimer, John (1989³); Richard, Jean (1965); Rideout, Margaret (1965); Riis, Neil (1998³); Ringuette, Pierrette (1995³); Robinson, Kenneth (1980¹); Robinson, Sven (1999², 2001³, 2003³); Robitaille, Jean-Marc (1989³, 1990³, 1991¹); Roche, Douglas (1976³); Rock, Raymond (1964, 1965); Rodriguez, John (1975¹, 1976⁵, 1990³); Rondeau, Gilbert (1970); Roy, Jean-Yves (2001³); Rowe, Frederick William (1975³); Rowland, Douglas (1971); Roy, Jean (1974, 1976³); Saltman, Max (1971, 1975³, 1979³); Savoie, Denise (2009³); Schellenberger, Stan (1975³); Schroder, James (1980³); Shepherd, Alex (1999³, 2003³); Silva, Mario (2007³, 2009³); Smith, David, P.C. (1981³); Southam, Richard R. (1972); Stanbury, Robert Douglas George, P.C. (1975³, 1976³, 1977³); Stanfield, Robert, P.C. (1976³); Stewart, Craig (1978³); Stoffer, Peter (1998³); Thorkelson, Scott (1991¹); Torsney, Paddy, P.C. (1994¹, 1998³, 1999³, 2001³, 2002, 2003³, 2004³, 2005³); Tremblay, Marcel (1987³); Valade, Georges (1968); Van de Walle, Walter (1993³); Vellacott, Maurice (2003³, 2005³, 2009³); Vincent, Robert (2010³); Waddell, Ian (1981³, 1983³); Waddell, John (1965); Wahn, Ian (1965); Waslyelia-Leis, Judy (2005³); Wells, Derek (1995³); Whelan, Eugene, P.C. (1963, 1965, 1968); White, Brian (1990³); White, Robert Smeaton (1925); Wilbee, Stanley (1990³); Wilson, Charles (1928, 1930, 1932, 1935); Wilson, Geoff (1985³); Winkler, Eric (1964, 1965); Wood, Bob (2001³); Woodlains, Eldon (1964, 1968, 1977³); Young, Roger (1977³).

1. Spring meetings or assemblies.
2. Fall meetings or assemblies.
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