

# “Now More Than Ever: The Case for Canada Advancing Democracy and Human Rights Abroad”

Thomas S. Axworthy

Presentation to the House of Commons:  
Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

February 7, 2019

## **Introduction**

Democracy and human rights are intrinsic to Canada's identity and traditions. They are among the values we hold most dear. Much of the world's population, however – nearly 40 per cent according to Freedom House – does not enjoy these liberties. Worse, the trends are all going in the wrong direction: For 13 straight years there has been a decline in the number of countries improving their democratic status. And, as the wave of democratization rolls back in many countries, there is an ebb tide in established democracies as populist nationalism ignores established norms. Thus “Democracy in Retreat” is the title and overall theme of the 2019 annual report of Freedom House.<sup>1</sup>

Retreating democracy in much of the world is not only a moral outrage that should concern freedom loving men and women everywhere, but it is a serious danger too. Weakened democracy leads to instability and instability can lead to conflict and violence. The authoritarian regime in Syria so denied basic human rights and opportunities to its people that civil war broke out in 2011, killing hundreds of thousands of people and forcing 5.6 million people to flee. That exodus in turn has roiled the politics of Europe. Similarly, the political violence and process and persecution practiced by the Maduro government in Venezuela has forced three million Venezuelans, nearly ten per cent of the country, to flee, causing a refugee crisis in Colombia. Preventing a crisis is always better than managing a crisis and the relatively modest amounts spent on assisting on good governance, the role of law, pluralism and constitutional reform are true value for money propositions if they can prevent a state meltdown.

Canadian members of parliament have been alert, both to the moral and security dimension of an active Canadian role in promoting democracy, and human rights abroad. It was a Joint House of Commons and Senate committee in 1986 that recommended the creation of an agency for human rights and democratic assistance.<sup>2</sup> It was the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development in 2007 that issued a landmark report “Advancing Canada's Role in International Support for Democratic Development” that argued for a new direction and new instruments to increase Canada's role in helping emerging democracies.<sup>3</sup>

Today, more than a decade later, my argument is that the priorities of the 2007 report make even more sense today than they did a decade ago. Democratization has stalled, and authoritarian countries are increasing in influence. With Europe convulsed by populist politics and the United States retreating from the global order it largely created, the global community of democratic activists need a new champion. Canada should take up this challenge and Parliament can lead in making this happen.

## **The Democratic Retreat**

Thomas Carothers, the dean of scholars writing on democratic development, has recently written that “authoritarianism appears to be gaining a global surge of self-confidence.”<sup>4</sup> The President of Freedom House, Michael J. Abramowitz, concurs: “Political rights and civil liberties around the world,” he writes, “deteriorated to their lowest level in more than a decade.”<sup>5</sup> According to the index of Freedom House, there has been decline in political and civil rights for an alarming 13 consecutive years from 2005 to 2018. In 2019, for example, Hungary's status declined from free to partly free due to sustained attacks on the country's democratic institutions by the governing Fidesz party.<sup>6</sup> In 2018, Freedom House reports there were declines in democracy of 35 per cent in Turkey, 30 per cent in the Central African Republic and 23 per cent in Venezuela.<sup>7</sup> In 2018, Freedom House estimated that 39 per cent of the world's population was free, 37 per cent not free and 37 per cent partly free.<sup>8</sup>

So, what has caused this reversal? The first point to recognise is that it takes time to develop a culture of liberty. Athens invented direct democracy in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, but it only lasted until 322 BC; not quite two-hundred years. In Great Britain, Magna Carta and its shining principle that law also applied to the King occurred in 1215; the first parliament was in 1265; the Glorious Revolution, which established parliamentary supremacy for good, occurred in 1688-89; the Reform Act in 1832, extended the suffrage so that by 1837 all male households regardless of value were enfranchised and in 1918 women were finally allowed to vote for the first time. Britain's democratic development took nearly 700 years! The story of democratic government is one of creation, rollback, advance and finally (and hopefully) maturation.

The same is happening today: There was a democratic wave after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union's collapse, but this surge of progress has stalled and is now being rolled back. It is difficult to accept the defeats and contentious debates you must endure in any democracy. It takes time for a culture of tolerance to grow, one reason that democratic development must be planned for the long-term. There are few quick wins in democratic development. Many countries moved positively forward after 1989 but progress stalled, and then setbacks occurred. Democracy is hard: Hungary, for example, became free in 1990 but, according to the index of Freedom House, then went without progress for 13 years (without improving transparency, financing of parties etc.), declined steadily for 5 years (moving against media freedom etc.) and in 2019 fell back with a thud, being classed as only partly free.<sup>9</sup>

The current ebb and flow of democratic development in much of the world is depressing but perhaps to be expected. What is less normal is the distemper of populist nationalist politics that

has turned so many democratic stalwart nations to turn inward and fight division at home. Demagogues have blamed refugees and migrants for wage stagnation and income insecurity. Freedom House writes that “a crisis of confidence in these societies has intensified with many citizens expressing doubts that democracy still serves their interests.”<sup>10</sup> The leader of the democratic movement since the 1980s, the United States has similarly been pulled off course. The attacks of Donald Trump on the media, immigrants, and international governance, have encouraged anti-democratic populists everywhere. Thomas Carothers has termed this the “autocratic relief syndrome.”<sup>11</sup> Viktor Orban of Hungary, for example, has said about Mr. Trump: “We have received permission from, if you like, the highest position in the world so we can now also put ourselves in first place.”<sup>12</sup>

This vacuum in leadership has been happily filled by Russia and China. If today there is an ebb tide in established democracies, it is a high tide for skilled autocratic players. Vladimir Putin has been a strategic disrupter of American and European elections, has become the dominant external influence in the Middle East given the retreat of the United States, and continues to put pressure on Ukraine through his annexation of Crimea. Through the Belt and Road initiative, China has sponsored the greatest investment pool for infrastructure since the Marshall Plan and unlike that earlier American initiative, human rights and democracy are not high on the Chinese agenda. It is telling in the current Venezuela crisis that dozens of countries in the European Union, Canada, the United States and most of Latin America have endorsed Venezuelan opposition leader Juan Guaido as interim president, while it is Russia, China, Cuba, Iran, and Turkey that are the backers of Maduro. The democratic-authoritarian divide has never been clearer.

Building a culture of liberty, tolerance, and democracy is a long slow process. It is normal to have reverses and setbacks. What is unusual about today, and radically different from the context of the 2007 report, is the renewed confidence of autocratic leaders in contesting the democratic space and the distraction and lack of confidence in the past proponents of global democracy. There is now a large democratic leadership gap. Can Canada fill it?

### **Start, Stop and Go: Canada’s Record On Democracy Promotion**

Right from the start of Canada’s post-war foreign policy, our commitment to democratic values was evident. The North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 was one of Lester Pearson’s major achievements and his particular contribution was to insist on Article 2, where the parties to the treaty pledge to “contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being.”<sup>13</sup>

NATO was to be more than just another military alliance, Mr. Pearson hoped: its foundations were to be free institutions and international cooperation. Little was done to actualise Article 2, but it demonstrates that Lester Pearson, the main architect of Canada's post-war foreign policy, began with a commitment to free institutions, the rule of law, and democracy uppermost in his thinking.

In the 1980s, Ronald Reagan gave a major boost to the concept of democratic development with the creation in 1983 of the National Endowment for Democracy, funded annually with an allocation from Congress. The year before, in a speech to the British parliament, Reagan had proposed an institute "to foster the infrastructure of democracy, the system of a free press, unions, political parties, universities."<sup>14</sup> A substantial portion of the National Endowment for Democracy financing is allocated to the National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute so party expertise and political institutions were a key part of the Reagan democracy program (the National Endowment for Democracy also funds hundreds of non-government organisations based abroad which apply for support).

The parliament of Canada certainly noticed the Reagan democracy program, but its support took a different form. In 1986, a Special Joint House-Senate committee for International Affairs proposed a new agency to concentrate on human rights promotion. The Mulroney government, to its credit, passed a bill in 1988 implementing the recommendation of the committee by creating the International Centre for Human Rights and Democracy (soon known as Rights and Democracy). The agency began modestly with a budget of CAD\$5 million dollars annually, but it quickly established credibility with its first two heads being distinguished members of parliament, Ed Broadbent and Warren Allmand. The centre had a non-partisan board, was arms-length from the government, and devoted its grants largely to human rights organisations with little going to party or political development unlike its American counterparts. By the time the House of Commons Foreign Affairs committee issued its report on "Advancing Democracy" in 2007, Rights and Democracy had a budget of CAD\$11 million.

In the 1990s, the World Bank highlighted the fairly obvious point that good governance was a central component of successful development.<sup>15</sup> Governance became a theme in most aid programs and Canada was no exception. In 1996, the Chrétien government issued a concept paper on "Human rights, Democratization and Good Governance" to guide the programs of the Canadian International Development Agency. Between 1996 and 2006, over CAD\$1.3 billion was distributed in 835 democratisation and governance projects. But an internal evaluation report on these efforts found that whatever good the individual project achieved there was little coherence

or “ability to come to terms with what might be required to support governance as a priority sector.”<sup>16</sup>

This critique was the centrepiece of the 2004 study, “The Democracy Canada Institute: A Blueprint” of the Centre for the Study of Democracy at Queen's University.<sup>17</sup> The report noted that there were many good Canadian organizations doing useful things in the field of democracy promotion, and that many Canadians worked for the National Democratic Institute, the International Republican Institute or the United Nations in democratic development. Substantial resources were devoted to the area by the Canadian International Development Agency but what was missing was an organisation to assess, pull together, coordinate and evaluate the totality of Canada’s democratic development efforts, thereby bringing coherence and stability to the field. It called for a stand-alone agency or institute to accomplish these tasks. Partnering with the Institute for Research on Public Policy, the Queen's Centre organised consultations in Ottawa, in Washington with the National Democratic Institute, and then in Stockholm with the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. This comparative examination of international agencies in Europe and the United States helped refine and improve the concept.

In July 2007, after months of study and extensive travel to Washington, London, Oslo and Stockholm, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development released “Advancing Canada’s Role: International Support for Democratic Development,” declaring in the preface of the report “Our committee was advised from all corners that Canada has a great contribution to make in terms of democratic development around the world”.<sup>18</sup> The committee highlighted the importance of democratic development within the broader field of development, the need for multi-year funding given the long timeframe in making democracy work, and recommended an arms-length Foundation for International Democratic Development. Within the purview of that foundation, it also recommended creating a multi-party centre for political parties work and development based on the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy.

The 2007 report was well received by the Harper government. The 2008 Conservative election platform declared that “a re-elected Conservative government led by Stephen Harper will make the practice of Canada’s democratic values on the world stage a major focus of our foreign policy. We will establish a new non-partisan democracy promotion agency that will help emerging democracies build democratic institutions and support peaceful democratic change and repressive countries”<sup>19</sup> The 2008 Speech from the Throne followed through on this commitment with a pledge that “a new non-partisan democracy promotion agency will be established to support the peaceful

transition to democracy in repressive countries and help emerging democracies build strong institutions.”<sup>20</sup> In the summer of 2009, the Honourable Steven Fletcher, the Minister of State for Democratic Reform, established an independent, volunteer, advisory panel to consider how best to implement the 2008 Speech from the Throne commitment, especially recommendation 15 of the Foreign Affairs committee report on creating a centre for multiparty and parliamentary democracy work.<sup>21</sup>

The Panel released its report in November 2009. The minister met with the four-member panel on a regular basis, asking a series of detailed questions on its progress but in no way directing the panel’s work. The panel, like the previous Foreign Affairs committee report, noted that more than 300 Canadians had volunteered to be part of the missions of the National Democratic Institute and more still had served with international bodies like the Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance and the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (the number of Canadians with experience working abroad in political and human rights development would be much greater today, a decade after the release of the Advisory Panel Report). The panel reaffirmed the centrality of democratic assistance, supported the creation of the Canadian Centre for Advancing Democracy, which would operate its own programs, especially in the area of political party development, while providing grants to existing organizations in their respective areas of expertise such as in human rights, legislative bodies, electoral systems and local government. The centre would be established by an act of parliament, reporting to parliament through a designated minister with a small board of eleven to fifteen members. The board would be guided by a larger advisory council made up of Canadian and international experts and from citizens of recipient countries to encourage mutual learning and increase program effectiveness. It was suggested that the centre’s budget should be an annual parliamentary appropriation of CAD\$30 to CAD\$70 million depending on the appetite for programming and the number of field offices established abroad in countries of special priority to Canada. The panel outlined what could be accomplished with budgets of CAD\$30, CAD\$50 and CAD\$70 million.

The democratic development community in Canada thought a promotion agency was in lift off. But in public policy one should never count your chickens before they are hatched. Two events occurred that stalled and then ended the initiative. As Gerald J. Schmitz has written in the definitive study of what happened to the democracy abroad hopes so strong in 2007, democracy promotion started strong “then ambiguity ended in abandonment.”<sup>22</sup> The first problem in 2010 was a series of difficulties in the Rights and Democracy human rights granting body established by parliament in 1988. The board and staff had a falling out over allegations of misspending and grants to groups critical of Israel. Within the government it was hard to advocate for another arms-length granting

agency in governance while an existing arms-length agency in human rights was embroiled in headline making disputes. The message to the panel from the government, naturally enough, was that we have to sort out an existing problem before we can look at creating a new entity. This, however, took some time: The Rights and Democracy agency was eventually abolished in 2012 and some of its work transferred to an Office of Religious Freedom within Global Affairs with a modest budget a CAD\$5 million, the same as Rights and Democracy in 1988. This office, in turn, was closed in 2016. The idea of a new democracy promoting agency became collateral damage in the Harper Government's dispute with Rights and Democracy.

While the battle over Rights and Democracy raged, another even more significant event occurred – the 2008 to 2011 financial crisis. Due to the 2008 crisis, the deficit expanded to meet the Keynesian requirement of re-balancing the business cycle, but the Harper government was deeply committed to balancing the budget as soon as it was able. Major cuts occurred in the budgets of the Canadian International Development Agency and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (now Global Affairs) in 2012. It was hard to argue for increased funding for one part of the development envelope – democratic governance – when many other programs were being reduced. In 2011, in that year's election campaign, like the Conservatives in 2008, the Liberal Party platform promised to create a democracy promotion agency, but the momentum had clearly shifted. The 2009 Advisory Panel report had developed a blueprint for the mission, structure and budget for such an agency, but the Rights and Democracy dispute sidelined the concept before it gained additional traction and the fiscal crisis buried it. The window of opportunity which had opened wide in 2007-2009 snapped shut in 2010-2012.

In 2015, with the election of a new Liberal government, the windows seemed to open a crack. The Trudeau Foundation, sponsored a day-long workshop on democracy abroad in June 2016, led by Ms. Gabrielle Bardall<sup>23</sup> and in that same year the office of Human Rights, Freedom and Inclusion was created within the Global Affairs department with a CAD\$15 million annual budget. In the current 42nd Parliament a parliamentary Democracy Caucus has been formed with members from all parties and this group sponsored a seminar on democracy promotion abroad in February 2018 at Carleton University.<sup>24</sup> In December 2018, Global Affairs announced a CAD\$24 million grant to Ukraine to support electoral reforms and election observers.<sup>25</sup> And currently at the highest level of participation with the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister engaged, Canada is participating in the Lima group, which is trying to bring democracy to Venezuela.<sup>26</sup> This is democracy promotion on steroids!

## **The Need for a New Foreign Policy Instrument**

The Venezuelan crisis has involved the highest levels of the Canadian government and this high profile/high politics event is likely what many have in mind when you raise the issue of democracy promotion. But such a crisis is not what most democracy promotion and human rights advocates do: mostly it is low-level brick-by-brick building of institutions, listening, mutual learning and a great many workshops and professional development exercise. That is why the 2009 advisory panel on the creation of a Canadian democracy promotion agency argued for a stand-alone agency that would quietly sponsor the long and often drawn out work of building institutions and consensus. The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development got it right when it wrote in 2007: “democratisation is a long, difficult and inherently indigenous process and that should be supported but not imported from abroad.”<sup>27</sup> One needs an assessment where the need is greatest or where there is the most opportunity for change: is it in building democracy first in local planning authorities, or helping legislators understand their role, or is it creating an independent statistics agency so data cannot be manipulated, or is it helping parties to persuade women to run for office? The advisory panel knew that local knowledge cannot be acquired quickly or on the cheap; therefore, it recommended field offices (annual cost CAD\$3-5 million each) in the countries of highest priority. Canadian ambassadors are busy people - they support human rights but also trade, visas, etc. They are not working on democracy or human rights all the time. Only a dedicated agency planning for the long haul and working daily to build trust and share expertise can achieve the local sensitivity that is essential for democracy promotion. High profile/high politics events like the Venezuelan crisis are the exception in democracy promotion, low profile/ low politics daily building are the general rule.

A second reason to create a standalone agency reporting to parliament but not part of the government is that it can be a more flexible instrument than relying solely on local ambassadors and dedicated Global Affairs officers in Ottawa. Democracy promotion work often requires regular meetings with opposition figures or members of civil society critical of the existing regime, tasks difficult for an accredited ambassador. Time on task is one argument for a dedicated agency but effectiveness is another. A local representative of a democracy promotion agency has freedom to meet with whomever can contribute to democracy-building without embarrassing our accredited ambassador or High Commissioner or the Government of Canada. Why deny ourselves such a supple instrument, especially as it is almost universally acknowledged in the international community that Canada has a wealth of talent and skilled practitioners in areas like federalism, diversity, gender equity, party management and constitutional protection of human rights?

A third reason to add a dedicated democracy and human rights agency to the existing foreign policy infrastructure of Canada is that research, evaluation and international comparison are crucial to the

success of any democratic development program. This is best organised on an ongoing basis by experts in the field up to date on the latest research and findings. Published case studies of successes and failures are hard to find so democracy assistance efforts are often reinventing the wheel. Evaluation metrics should be established before the project goes into the field: one should be able to answer the question how do we know if we are succeeding before the project begins? A stand-alone agency should therefore have a dedicated in house reach research and evaluation group and such expertise is not readily available to large departments used to administering thousands of grants.

Democracy and human rights promotion abroad also enjoys multi-party support in Canada and this consensus is useful - even important - in a world where partisanship grows ever more pervasive. Both the Liberal and Conservative parties have in the recent past committed to establishing such an agency in their election platforms. The New Democratic Party was a strong proponent of Rights and Democracy. And in the field, former MPs and supporters of all parties have made common cause in trying to use their expertise to help emerging democracies be born, survive and grow. Whatever divides us in Canadian politics at home dissolves abroad when you are working on the fundamentals of free expression, gender equity, human rights and good governance. In a partisan age, multi-partisan support for a good idea is no small thing and should be acted upon readily.

## **Conclusion**

Never has the time been better for Canada to step up and make democracy and human rights promotion a central priority of our foreign policy. The mission to assist the citizens of other countries in creating pluralistic party system that respect human rights emerges directly from Canadian values. Today, the democratic wave that existed when the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development made its landmark report in 2007 has at best stalled and in many countries past democratic gains are being rolled back. A useful and hopeful possibility in 2007, Canadian engagement in democracy abroad efforts is now absolutely crucial in 2019.

As authoritarianism grows those countries once most active in combatting it have been beset by internal divisions. So in 2019 there is now a democratic leadership gap. Canada could fill it. A dedicated independent agency to promote democratic development abroad is an idea whose time has come. Such an instrument would be complementary to the ongoing work of Global Affairs and it could be a flexible instrument able to do things that an ambassador cannot. Max Weber, the German philosopher in his famous essay “Politics as a Vocation” described politics as the “slow, strong drilling through hard boards.”<sup>28</sup> It is certainly a slow and hard process to build a culture of liberty and create viable institutions, but a dedicated democracy and human rights agency would

be well suited to that drilling. Advancing democracy abroad should be a defining priority of Canadian foreign policy and a dedicated agency using the best of Canadian talent could give operational effect to that noble aspiration.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2019>

<sup>2</sup> Canada, Parliament “Independence and Internationalism,” Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Canada’s International Relations. Ottawa: Queens Printer 1986.

<sup>3</sup> House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign affairs and International Development, “Advancing Canada’s Role in International Support for Democratic Development,” Ottawa, July 2007. Hereafter cited as SCFAID

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Carothers “Is Democracy the Problem?” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, January 16, 2019 <https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/01/16/is-democracy-problem-pub-78137>

<sup>5</sup> Michael J Abramowitz, Preface, “Democracy in Crisis” [Freedom in the World 2018 - Freedom House](https://freedomhouse.org/article/democracy-crisis-freedom-house-releases-freedom-world-2018) <https://freedomhouse.org/article/democracy-crisis-freedom-house-releases-freedom-world-2018>

<sup>6</sup> Freedom House “Democracy in Retreat” 2019

<sup>7</sup> Freedom House “Democracy in Crisis” 2018

<sup>8</sup> Ibid

<sup>9</sup> Freedom House “Democracy in Retreat” 2019

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

<sup>11</sup> Thomas Carothers “Three ways the New Congress Can Defend Democracy Abroad,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, November 2018 <https://carnegieendowment.org/2018/11/16/three-ways-new-congress-can-defend-democracy-abroad-pub-77736>

<sup>12</sup> Viktor Orban quote *ibid*

<sup>13</sup> NATO, Text of the North Atlantic Treaty, April 1949

[https://www.nato.int/cps/ie/natohq/official\\_texts\\_17120.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/ie/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm)

<sup>14</sup> Ronald Reagan, Speech to members of the British Parliament in the Royal Gallery at the Palace of Westminster, June 8, 1982 <https://www.heritage.org/europe/report/20-years-later-reagans-westminster-speech>

<sup>15</sup> World Bank, “Governance and Development”, 1992

<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/604951468739447676/Governance-and-development>

<sup>16</sup> The best summary of Canada’s efforts in international democracy assistance is by Gerald Schmitz in “Canada and International Democracy Assistance: What Directions for the Harper Government’s Foreign Policy”, August 2013, Occasional Paper Series, Centre for International and Defence Policy, Queen’s University. As research director of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, Schmitz was the drafter of the landmark 2007 report “Advancing Canada’s Role in International Support for Democratic Development” The evaluation study for the Canadian International Development Agency is quoted in his article p6.

---

<sup>17</sup> Thomas S. Axworthy, Leslie Campbell and David Donovan, “The Democracy Canada Institute: A Blueprint” <http://irpp.org/fr/research-studies/the-democracy-canada-institute-a-blueprint/>

<sup>18</sup> SCFAID, “Advancing Canada’s Role” 2007 p1

<sup>19</sup> Conservative Party, “The True North Strong and Free”

[https://www.poltext.org/sites/poltext.org/files/plateformes/can2008pc\\_plt\\_eng\\_13112008\\_193556.pdf](https://www.poltext.org/sites/poltext.org/files/plateformes/can2008pc_plt_eng_13112008_193556.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> 40th Parliament, 1st session (2008): [SO1-1-2008E.pdf \(PDF, 1.87 MB\)](#)

<sup>21</sup> Privy Council Office, Advisory Panel Report on the Creation of a Canadian Democracy Promotion Agency, November 2009. The members of the panel were Thomas S. Axworthy (chair), Leslie Campbell, Senator Pamela Wallin and Eric Duhaime.

[http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection\\_2015/bcp-pco/CP22-103-2009-eng.pdf](http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/bcp-pco/CP22-103-2009-eng.pdf)

<sup>22</sup> Schmitz, “Canada and International Democracy Assistance,” p26

<sup>23</sup> Gabrielle Bardall, “Promoting Democracy at Home and Abroad” Policy Options, March 7, 2017 <http://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/march-2017/promoting-democracy-at-home-and-abroad/>

<sup>24</sup> <https://carleton.ca/parldiplo/2018/promoting-democracy-abroad-role-canadian-legislators/>

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.canada.ca/en/global-affairs/news/2018/12/canada-announces-support-for-elections-and-democracy-in-ukraine.html>

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/lima-group-ottawa-meeting-venezuela-1.5004086>

<sup>27</sup> SCFAID “Advancing Canada’s Role” 2007 p39

<sup>28</sup> Max Weber “Politics as a Vocation” in From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed.H.H. Garth and C. Wright Mills, New York: Oxford University Press, 1946 p 128