

Jean Chrétien: Policy Entrepreneur

A Case Study of the 2002 G8 Summit in Kananaskis, Alberta

A Thesis Submitted to the College of Graduate Studies and Research
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts
In the Department of Political Studies
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada

Copyright © by Emily Hurd, February 2012. All Rights Reserved.

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Graduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of the University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department of Political Studies or the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies and Research. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Political Studies University of Saskatchewan
9 Campus Drive
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A5

ABSTRACT

The Group of Eight (G8) is one of the most prestigious forums to which Canada belongs. It represents an avenue through which the Canadian government can exercise its opinion on a number of economic and political issues. At the G8 summits in Genoa, Italy (2001) and Kananaskis, Alberta (2002), the Liberal Government of Canada, led by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, ensured that African poverty reduction was a central concern to the group. In 2001, authors of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) presented their plan to the G8. G8 leaders responded with the African Action Plan (AAP). At the Kananaskis summit, G8 leaders focused on African development issues, the specifics of which were addressed in the AAP. Prime Minister Chrétien took the lead in these efforts, developing domestic policies (such as the Canada Fund for Africa and the promises made at the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico) and working through the international concert of the G8.

This thesis adapts John Kingdon's public policy model, the Multiple Streams model, to analyze Canadian foreign policy. It studies how and why African development rose to the top of the agenda for Canada and the G8 in the early 2000s. It illustrates how Prime Minister Chrétien became a Policy Entrepreneur, both in Canada and within the G8. It argues that the streams of problem, policy and politics aligned and that Chrétien was able to couple them, pushing them through a policy window and affecting real policy change. It concludes that, while the Multiple Streams model lacks in predictive power, it is an excellent tool through which to understand policy decisions made both domestically and within an international body such as the G8.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible had it not been for the many individuals who helped and supported me along the way. There were many changes in my life between the time that I embarked on this journey and the time that I completed this work. I was fortunate enough to have many family members, friends, colleagues and academic advisors to guide me along the way.

I would like to thank my entire family, particularly my parents, for their unconditional love and unwavering support. Thank you to my friends and fellow graduate students, who provided me with a great deal of advice, encouragement and laughter. I offer my most sincere thanks to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Jeffrey Steeves. Your help and guidance has been most appreciated. To the members of my advisory committee, Dr. Kalowatie Deonandan, Dr. Donald Story and Dr. Michael Atkinson, thank you so much for taking the time to provide me with input and feedback into this work. I am grateful for it. Thank you also to political studies graduate chair Dr. Hans Michelmann, who was always available when I required guidance.

Finally, I must thank my ever-patient husband, Paul and my daughter Ruby Kathleen for their love, support and kindness. I am so very blessed to have you in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE	2
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	7
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	8
1.1 Background	8
1.2 Focus, Objectives and Research Questions	9
1.3 Organization of Thesis	11
1.4 Contribution of Thesis	12
1.5 Overview of the Study	12
CHAPTER TWO: THE MULTIPLE STREAMS MODEL	13
2.1 Introduction to the Multiple Streams Model	13
2.2 The Three Streams Explained	17
i. The Problem Stream:	17
ii. The Policy Stream	18
iii. The Political Stream:	20
2.3 The Policy Window and the Policy Entrepreneur	22
2.4 Multiple Streams Analysis Applied	24
CHAPTER THREE: CANADIAN FOREIGN AID, G8 AND AFRICA	30
3.1 Canada and Official Development Policy	30
i. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA):	33
3.2 Canada and ODA to Africa	36
3.3 A Brief History of Canada's Role in the Group of Eight	40
3.4 The G8 Summit in Genoa, Italy, July 2001	44
i. The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD)	46
ii. Response to NEPAD by the G8	48
CHAPTER FOUR: THE G8 SUMMIT IN KANANASKIS, ALBERTA	52
4.1 Canada's Africa Policy –Genoa to Kananaskis	52
i. The Canada Fund for Africa	52
ii. The Monterrey Conference	54
4.2 The G8 Summit in Kananaskis, June 26-27, 2002	59
i. Canada Hosts the Summit	60
ii. Overview of the Summit	66
iii. Africa	67
iv. The Role of Other G8 Nations	68
v. Outcomes of the Summit	71
CHAPTER FIVE: THE MULTIPLE STREAMS MODEL APPLIED	73
5.1 Why and How African Aid Emerged on the Agenda for Canada	73
i. Problem	74
ii. Policy	80
iii. Politics	85
5.2 Policy Entrepreneur and the Policy Window	93

5.3 The Policy Window	98
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY	104

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background

Development assistance to sub-Saharan Africa represents one of the most politically charged and enduring elements of Canadian foreign policy.¹ Canada's aid efforts are conducted both bilaterally and multilaterally, through a variety of institutions, including the Group of Eight (G8). The G8 is an international forum that deals with important political and economic matters, of which Canada is a key member. It has been contended that Canada's "engagement with Africa...has waxed and waned throughout the decolonization era," however much of its relations with Africa have been "been motivated by its multilateral affiliations."² This thesis will explore Canada's position on Africa through one of these multilateral instruments: the G8.

One of the most fascinating G8 summits, which led to a great deal of innovation, was held in Kananaskis, Alberta in the summer of 2002. Hosted by Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien (1993-2003), the summit resulted in major policy developments in Canada's relationship with Africa. The G8 had been active on African issues for several years, but the 2002 summit represented a high point in relations. Despite the pervasive concern of terrorism in the post-September 11th environment, Chrétien was able to effectively keep the G8 agenda focused on African development. This was a noteworthy achievement, worthy of exploration. Using John Kingdon's Multiple Streams (MS) policy model, this thesis argues that the Kananaskis summit was a clear case of a policy window opening as a direct result of Chrétien's effective leadership at the summit, at which he acted as a Policy Entrepreneur (PE).

1.2 Focus, Objectives and Research Questions

The thesis will commence by examining the Genoa, Italy summit held in 2001. It was at Genoa that much of the attention to Africa began in earnest for the G8. The overview of the Genoa summit will demonstrate how Chrétien began engineering partnerships, progress and results in advance of the 2002 summit. Over the course of Genoa and Kananaskis, the African Action Plan (AAP) was proposed, developed and agreed upon by the G8. The AAP was a response to the African-led New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) initiative. NEPAD,

¹ From this point on, "Africa" refers to sub-Saharan Africa, not the entire continent, unless otherwise indicated.

² David Black, "From Kananaskis to Gleneagles—Assessing 'Leadership' on Africa," *Behind the Headlines* 62, no. 3 (4 May 2005), 4.

³ Paul A. Sabatier, "The Need for Better Theories" in Paul A. Sabatier, ed. *Theories of the Policy Process*. (Colorado: Westview Press, 1999), 6.

⁴ While this thesis focuses on the creation and innovation of Canada's foreign policy-making in Africa as interpreted by the MS model,

² David Black, "From Kananaskis to Gleneagles—Assessing 'Leadership' on Africa," *Behind the Headlines* 62, no. 3 (4 May 2005), 4.

which was created by African leaders, aimed to generate political and economic renewal for the region. The thesis explores Canada's use of the G8 as a tool through which to increase its aid commitment to Africa. Furthermore, it evaluates Chrétien's role in propelling African development to the top of the agenda both in Canada and internationally in the early 2000s. In order to accomplish these goals, this thesis seeks to address the following questions:

- 1) How and why did African development assistance become a priority for Canada in the early 2000s?
- 2) How and why did Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien act as a leader and innovator (Policy Entrepreneur-PE) in this case?

Kingdon's MS model is an excellent tool with which to examine Canada's role in African development, both through the G8 and domestically in 2001 and 2002. The MS model provides a basis for comprehending how an idea becomes policy. This thesis contends that the three streams (problem, policy and politics) aligned, and a PE was able to "couple" them, resulting in the opening of a policy window. As a consequence of Chrétien's efforts, several policies were adopted. At the national level, these policies were the Canada Fund for Africa and the Monterrey Consensus. Internationally, Chrétien's leadership, and the activism of his G8 allies, resulted in the adoption of the AAP. The pressures of the summit process were crucial for the success of these developments.

This thesis focuses on the creation and innovation of policy as interpreted by the MS model. Kingdon's concept is a model as opposed to a conceptual framework or a theory. Elinor Ostrom (1999) states that, "a model is a representation of a specific situation. It is usually much narrower in scope than a conceptual framework or a theory, and more precise in its assumptions, than the underlying theory... Thus frameworks, theories, and models can be conceptualised as operating along a continuum involving increased logical interconnectedness and specificity, but decreasing scope."³ The MS model seeks to explain and describe the policy process.⁴

Paul A. Sabatier, editor of *Theories of the Policy Process* (1999) explains that "the process of public policymaking includes the manner in which problems get conceptualized and brought to government for solution;

³ Paul A. Sabatier, "The Need for Better Theories" in Paul A. Sabatier, ed. *Theories of the Policy Process*. (Colorado: Westview Press, 1999), 6.

⁴ While this thesis focuses on the creation and innovation of Canada's foreign policy-making in Africa as interpreted by the MS model, there are many models of policy-making which could have been employed for this analysis. Other models designed to explain the creation and success of policy-making include the advocacy coalition framework of Hank Jenkins-Smith and Paul Sabatier and the punctuated equilibrium model, by Bryan Jones and Frank Baumgarner. In the advocacy coalition framework, people come together to solve a problem because they have comparable knowledge of the issue and a common interest in seeing the issue rectified. In their model, Jones and Baumgarner contend that 'policies and agendas, rather than changing gradually over time, actually shift rapidly from one stable point to another.' The advocacy coalition framework, punctuated equilibrium model and MS model are each analyzed by Brian W. Tomlin, Norman Hilmer and Fen Osler Hampson (2008) in *Canada's International Policies: Agendas, Alternatives and Politics*. Tomlin et al conclude that the MS model is the most comprehensive of the three and observe that the MS model is in fact able to subsume the advocacy coalition framework and punctuated equilibrium model within its structure. Brian W. Tomlin, Norman Hillmer and Fen Osler Hampson, *Canada's International Policies: Agendas, Alternatives, and Politics* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2008), 22.

governmental institutions formulate alternatives and select policy solutions; and those solutions get implemented, evaluated, and revised.”⁵ Because the policy process is highly complex, and involves numerous actors, one must attempt to simplify the situation through a theoretical lens.⁶ Kingdon's MS model provides that lens for the purposes of this thesis.

1.3 Organization of Thesis

In addition to the introduction and conclusion, this thesis has four chapters. Each chapter has a unique goal, intended to inform the overall objectives of the thesis. Chapter two is dedicated to a fuller discussion of Kingdon's MS model. It explains the model in detail and outlines its purpose and methods. It addresses some of its limitations and provides a brief overview of the variety of ways the model can be applied. This is done through an examination of past applications of the model. The purpose of this chapter is to familiarize the reader with the MS model and to argue that it can be used in a wide range of cases, including the one explored by this thesis.

The purpose of chapter three is to acquaint readers with Canada's role in African development initiatives both nationally and through the G8, as well as to introduce the origins of NEPAD and the AAP. Chapter three presents background on Canadian international development assistance in the 20th century and on Canada's role in the G8. It also provides an overview of the Genoa summit of 2001, where NEPAD was introduced and the idea for an AAP originated. The Genoa summit served as a catalyst for further action at the Kananaskis summit in 2002.

Chapter four is designed to in the policy decisions made by the G8 and the Government of Canada, both in the period between the Genoa and Kananaskis summits, and at Kananaskis itself. It provides insight into the purpose of Canadian initiatives and discusses the Kananaskis summit, highlighting the achievements in African aid and development policy. The background provided in chapters three and four sets the stage for the analytical discussion of African development policy in chapter five.

Chapter five applies the MS model to the case of Canadian development assistance to Africa in 2001 and 2002, both domestically and multilaterally. The goal of this chapter is to demonstrate how and why Canada led the G8 in the adoption of new and innovative development policies for Africa. Chapter five focuses on how Jean Chrétien acted as PE, illustrating how he ensured that change was implemented, both nationally and internationally.

1.4 Contribution of Thesis

This research is important for several reasons. The G8 is a highly influential forum. There have been persistent discussions about the relevance of the G8, and the calibre of its international contribution. This thesis addresses the strides which Canada and the G8 made in supporting and fostering African development in the early

⁵ Sabatier, 3.

⁶ Ibid., 4.

2000s. There is great value in the discussion of Canadian aid during this time, as the nation has endured criticism for its lack of action in development policy and ODA. The application of the MS model demonstrates its power as a tool to understand the creation and rise of ideas in policy communities. The subject of this thesis is worth exploring because it contributes to the literature on Jean Chrétien and Canadian aid policy through the G8. It also fills a gap in the MS literature, demonstrating how a nation's top leader can act as a Policy Entrepreneur.

1.5 Overview of the Study

The material used to inform this thesis is drawn from both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources include government documents, such as speeches, policy papers and non-governmental reports and publications. Many of these documents come from the Government of Canada, while others are G8 communiqués accessed through the University of Toronto's G8 Information Centre. Secondary sources are used extensively. They provide context, criticism and comments on primary source materials, and inform the explanation of the MS model. The primary and secondary sources cited in this thesis were gathered from books, journal articles, and the internet.

Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework: The Multiple Streams Model

This chapter presents an overview of the Multiple Streams (MS) Model, the theoretical model informing this thesis. The MS model was created by John W. Kingdon in 1984. It explains the process of policy formation, specifically, the processes of agenda setting and decision making, and is a “significant theoretical breakthrough in the field of public policy.”⁷ This chapter will detail the MS model and briefly explore some of the cases to which the MS model has been applied, demonstrating how it has contributed to the literature on policy and policy analysis.

2.1 Introduction to the Multiple Streams Model

The MS Model has its origins in the “Garbage Can Model” (GCM) created by Michael Cohen, James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. In the authors’ much cited article “A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice” (1972), they point to “problematic preferences, unclear technology and fluid participation” as the main characteristics of organized anarchies.⁸ Organized anarchies are places such as academic institutions, businesses and governments, which contain ill-defined and often inconsistent choices and preferences. Cohen et al. note that organizations can be viewed as places where choices are collected and chosen from.⁹ The authors explain that,

Although organizations can often be viewed conveniently as vehicles for solving well-defined problems (...) they also provide sets of procedures through which participants arrive at an interpretation of what they are doing and what they have done while in the process of doing it...an organization is a collection of choices looking for problems, issues and feelings looking for decision situations in which they might be aired, solutions looking for issues to which they might be the answer, and decision-makers looking for work.¹⁰

In Cohen et al.’s model, problems and solutions are placed within a “garbage can.” Participants are free to pick and choose from within, pairing problems with solutions as they see fit. This model uses four streams to analyze the policy process: problems, solutions, participants and choice opportunities.¹¹ The authors contend that the model “enable[s] choices to be made and problems to be resolved, even when the organization is

⁷ Xufeng Zhu, “Strategy of Chinese Policy Entrepreneurs in the Third Sector: Challenges of ‘Technical Infeasibility,’” *Policy Sciences* 41, no.4 (December 2008), 317.

⁸ Michael Cohen, James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, “A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17, no. 1 (March 1972), 1.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid., 2.

¹¹ Steffen Brunner, “Understanding Policy Change: Multiple Streams and Emissions Trading in Germany,” *Global Environmental Change* 18, no. 3 (2008), 501.

plagued with goal ambiguity and conflict, with poorly understood problems that wander in and out of the system, with a variable environment, and with decision makers who may have other things on their minds.”¹²

It is from this theoretical basis that the Multiple Stream (MS) model originates. The MS model starts from a similar starting point: a concern for how problems are developed and solutions are chosen. However, the MS emphasizes the *organized* aspects of decision-making agendas, whereas Cohen et al.’s model is focused on the random and anarchical nature of organizations.¹³ Though there is an emphasis on the orderly aspects of the way decisions are made, Kingdon acknowledges the role which chaos and ambiguity play in the policy process, as well as the importance of self-interest in decision making.¹⁴ The MS model incorporates elements of both chaos and rationality in attempting to determine how and why policies develop when “assumptions of clarity and self interest” are not able to adequately explain policy decisions.¹⁵

In *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* (1984), Kingdon seeks to determine how and why an “idea’s time has come,” how issues become issues and how agendas form and change.¹⁶ His model emphasizes the power of ideas.¹⁷ Kingdon poses the question: in a world where there are an endless number of worthy problems and solutions, how and why do some issues become prominent on policy agendas while others do not? His model investigates why some alternatives are considered and chosen while others are not.¹⁸ Kingdon demonstrates the value of his policy model by employing twenty three case studies relating to policy in the health and transportation departments of the American (US) government. Though created with US public policy in mind, academics have demonstrated the far reaching applicability of the MS model into realms beyond domestic public policy, something discussed later in this chapter.

Kingdon conceives of three streams in the MS model: a problem stream, a policy stream and a political stream. Each stream operates independently, with its own direction and activity.¹⁹ Issues come to receive attention on the policy agenda because a problem is recognized, a solution to the problem becomes available and because the political atmosphere makes the time right for change.²⁰ When the three streams converge, the model dictates that a “policy window” or “window of opportunity” will open, making change possible. Windows can be spontaneous or predictable, and typically do not remain open for long. An opportunity must be seized immediately or else is likely to be lost.

¹² Cohen et al., 16.

¹³ Tomlin et al., 22.

¹⁴ Nikolaos Zahariadis, “Ambiguity, Time, and Multiple Streams,” in Paul A. Sabatier, ed. *Theories of the Policy Process* (Colorado: Westview Press, 1999), 73-90.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 87.

¹⁶ John Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* (New York: Longman, 1984).

¹⁷ Brunner, 501.

¹⁸ Kingdon, 3.

¹⁹ Rick Travis and Nikolaos Zahariadis, “A Multiple Streams Model of U.S. Foreign Aid Policy,” *Policy Studies Journal* 30, no. 4 (Winter 2002), 496.

²⁰ Gary Mucciaroni, “The Garbage Can Model and the Study of Policy Making: A Critique,” *Polity* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1992), 460.

Kingdon emphasizes that policy making is not a linear or straightforward process. Rather, the streams proceed independently until a policy window opens and they are coupled by a policy entrepreneur (PE). A policy cannot be pushed through a policy window without a PE. These fascinating political actors are “highly knowledgeable, committed individuals” who become advocates of a particular policy. They do so for a variety of reasons, including in order to advance personal goals, to promote their beliefs or values, or simply because they “like the game.”²¹ They work tirelessly and creatively to ensure that their ideas receive a favourable reception. They mobilize people and resources to highlight a problem and a potential policy solution, and invest time and effort towards coupling the streams. Entrepreneurs sometimes “bend ideological proclivities” in order to capitalize on opportunities, and often have excellent reasoning and negotiation skills. They are eloquent, tenacious and persuasive. PEs work with constituencies to support certain policies.²² Oftentimes, solutions to a problem can be developed before a problem has been fully elaborated. Policy makers will create a solution and wait for a problem to attach it to. Conversely, politicians may try to promote a particular cause or issue, but until a solution comes along and a policy window opens, little will come of his or her efforts.²³

Gary Mucciaroni, who has used Kingdon’s model extensively in his work, defines PEs as “highly knowledgeable, committed individuals—in or out of government—who are willing to invest their resources to join the streams together.”²⁴ These resources include time, energy, reputation, and money, and are employed to “promote a position in return for anticipated future gains in the form of material, purposive, or solidarity benefits.”²⁵ These individuals are not unique to one location, can be found both inside and outside of government structures, and often have political connections.²⁶ PEs search for unresolved situations and link them with potential remedies. They “bear the reputational, financial, and emotional risks of uncertainty and aim to resolve collective action problems such as free riding.”²⁷ PEs are central to the MS model, and their role cannot be overstated. Once the three streams align, a PE must couple them into a single package and push them through an open policy window. The MS model joins unique and independent activities of policy making under one theoretical framework.²⁸

²¹ Kingdon, 204.

²² Kingdon, 204-205.

²³ Karen Evans Stout and Byron Stevens, “The Case of the Failed Diversity Rule: A Multiple Streams Analysis,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 22, no. 4 (2000), 342.

²⁴ Mucciaroni, 461.

²⁵ Kingdon, 179.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 181.

²⁷ Zhu, 316.

²⁸ Zahariadis, “Ambiguity, Time and Multiple Streams,” 89.

2.2 The Three Streams Explained

The problem, policy and political stream are each dynamic in their own way. The operation of each is crucial for the overall success of a policy being pushed through a policy window by a PE.

i. The Problem Stream:

In *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*, Kingdon explores how and why certain problems capture the attention of people in government.²⁹ The problem stream is where individuals recognize an issue which needs to be addressed. *Indicators* are one of the most prevalent means through which problems are brought to the attention of governments and society at large. Indicators “abound in the political world because both governmental and nongovernmental agencies routinely monitor various activities and events.”³⁰ Indicators come in the form of budgetary expenditures and academic studies, and are used by decision makers primarily to determine the scope and seriousness of a problem and to monitor change to a problem. Those in government monitor indicators to assess change.³¹

At times, problems are not obvious; it takes a *focusing event*, such as a crisis or a disaster, to bring it to people’s attention. They can also appear to individuals in the form of a personal experience or symbol.³² Focusing events are important because they draw attention to a problem, thereby increasing its likelihood of rising onto the governmental and decision-making agenda.

Feedback is the third element of the problem stream. Governments receive feedback regarding existing programs and operations from the public, either formally or informally. Feedback demonstrates that a problem exists and that action is required. Feedback appears through various channels, including impact evaluation studies and letters from constituents.³³ It can also come through the systematic monitoring of existing plans and policies or the experience of bureaucrats.³⁴

Since problems are not always obvious, it is through indicators, feedback and focusing events that problems find their place on the governmental and decision-making agendas.³⁵ While some problems receive attention, others fall off the agenda entirely. This happens if those in and around government believe that a problem has been sufficiently dealt with or solved or because insufficient attention has been paid to an action surrounding a problem. It takes “time, effort, mobilization of many actors and the expenditure of political resources to keep an item

²⁹ Kingdon, 87.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid., 90-91. Also see Travis and Zahariadis, 496.

³² Kingdon holds symbols to be important as they can ‘capture in a nutshell some sort of reality that people already sense in a vaguer, more diffuse way.’ Kingdon., 94, 96-98.

³³ Travis and Zahariadis, ‘A Multiple Streams Model of U.S. Foreign Aid Policy.’ 496.

³⁴ Kingdon, 101.

³⁵ Tomlin et al., 24.

prominent on the agenda.”³⁶ For these reasons, many of the problems circulating in policy communities are not addressed, and it is only through indicators, feedback and focusing events that they receive attention.

ii. The Policy Stream

The policy stream is where a variety of policy alternatives are articulated. Policymakers are aware of many existing problems, but due to time and resources, are able to create only a limited number of solutions.³⁷ Policy communities, or “communities of specialists,” are active in this stream. Kingdon conceives of policy communities as processes of evolution, where ideas are generated. Ideas rise and fall, changing as they evolve, until advocates of a particular policy are able to propose their idea to a wider audience.³⁸ The process resembles what Kingdon calls “primeval soup.” Ideas generated by members of policy communities “float” around. Some become increasingly prominent, while others fade out. Ideas can collide, or combine into a single idea. Others lose out to a competing idea.

Policy communities, which include “bureaucrats, congressional staff members, academics, and researchers in think tanks,” are fragmented to different degrees, due to variations in group cohesiveness.³⁹ This produces varying results; greater fragmentation can lead to instability.⁴⁰ Policy prescriptions are far more likely to be adopted if both the policy communities and the general public have been, in Kingdon’s words, “softened up” to the particular idea. As policy alternatives are developed, the softening up process takes place.⁴¹ *Consensus-building* occurs in the policy stream, through diffusion and persuasion.⁴² Decision-makers are convinced of the merits of a policy through the persuasive efforts of PEs. Diffusion occurs through “bandwagoning,” which is similar to a snowball effect. This is how ideas become more popular.⁴³ People will jump on the bandwagon over time if they believe a policy is well suited for a problem or if they fear losing out by not joining. It is here that entrepreneurs attempt to convince the public and members of government to adopt what Kingdon labels their “pet solution.”

Consensus-building ensures that individuals in and around government are willing to support policy initiatives. Softening up generates excitement about a policy prior to its adoption. If an idea is thought to be feasible and relevant, consensus begins to spread throughout the policy community and beyond, increasing the

³⁶ Kingdon, 104.

³⁷ Zahariadis, Nikolaos, “Selling British Rail: An Idea Whose Time Had Come?” *Comparative Political Studies* 29, no. 4 (August 1996), 407.

³⁸ Kingdon, 116.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 118-119 and Travis and Zahariadis, 496.

⁴⁰ Chris N. Burgess, “Multiple Streams and Policy Community Dynamics: The 1990 NEA Independent Commission.” *The Ohio State University, Occasional Paper #23*. Presented at the 28th Annual Social Theory, Politics and Arts Conference, 2002. Available online: <<https://arted.osu.edu/files/arted/paper23.pdf>> (22 October 2010), 24.

⁴¹ Softening up includes making people familiar with an idea or policy alternative in order to make them more comfortable and potentially more willing to accept the prescription. Zahariadis, “Ambiguity, Time and Multiple Streams,” 86.

⁴² Tomlin et al., 25.

⁴³ This diffusion has been described as a ‘growing realization’ or a ‘widespread feeling.’ Kingdon, 140-1.

chances of its eventual adoption.⁴⁴ The wider policy community and the public must be introduced to the idea as well. This ensures that when an idea's time has come, the public is ready to accept it.⁴⁵ While ideas come and go and fall in and out of favour in the policy stream, they rarely disappear entirely. They may be redesigned or fused with another idea to form a new combination. Entirely new material, however, is not common.⁴⁶ As Kingdon reminds us, "There is no new idea under the sun."⁴⁷

Kingdon differentiates between two agendas in the policy stream: the governmental agenda and the decision agenda. The governmental agenda is the "list of subjects to which governmental officials and those around them are paying serious attention."⁴⁸ This agenda can include specialized agenda items as well as more general items. The decision agenda consists of matters "within the governmental agenda that are up for an active decision."⁴⁹ Both are important to the model and provide information about what stage of consideration a policy proposal has reached.

iii. The Political Stream:

Developments occurring in the political stream have the most significant effects on the decision-making and governmental agendas.⁵⁰ Influences on this stream include "swings in national mood, vagaries of public opinion, election results, changes of administration [turnover]... and interest group pressure campaigns."⁵¹ Jurisdictional matters and "organized political forces" are also crucial elements in this stream. Organized political forces refer to the pressure exerted by interest groups, the behaviour of political elites and political mobilization.⁵² Each factor is imperative to the outcome in this stream and exert influence in different ways.

National mood has significant and far-reaching consequences for the policy stream. A change in mood can have serious effects on the policy agenda and its subsequent outcomes. It can result in a more receptive environment for a particular concept, or conversely, can relegate a policy to obscurity.⁵³ Fortunately for those in the policy making, there are ways to get a sense of the national mood. It can be gauged via meetings and from the feedback politicians receive through their offices. National mood can also be determined through polling,

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 127.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 142.

⁴⁷ Ecclesiastes 1:9, *The Holy Bible: King James Version*, as quoted in Kingdon.

⁴⁸ Kingdon, 4.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Tomlin et al., 25.

⁵¹ Kingdon, 87.

⁵² Ibid., 150

⁵³ Ibid., 146.

lobbyists, the media and social movements, as well as from mail and phone calls from constituents. For politicians not in power, attempts to decipher the national mood often occur through the observation of those in office.⁵⁴

Turnover and change are extremely important to the political stream. When members of government change, so too does the policy agenda. New politicians bring new priorities and provide an opportunity for fresh or reworked policies to be considered and adopted. Jurisdiction, more specifically *disputes* over jurisdiction, can play a significant role in the political stream. Kingdon observes that “agenda setting is affected by battles over turf, and some items are ignored because they are ‘defined away’ by the drawing of jurisdictional boundaries.”⁵⁵ As in the policy stream, consensus-building is prevalent in the political stream. While consensus-building in the policy stream is built primarily through diffusion and persuasion, the political stream uses bargaining tactics and the building of coalitions to create agreements and unity.⁵⁶ Coalitions are “...built through the granting of concessions in return for support of the coalition, or as actual or potential coalition members make bargains.”⁵⁷ One joins a coalition not just because he or she has been “persuaded of the virtue of that course of action,” but also because he or she “fears that failure to join would result in exclusion from the benefits of participation.” People are persuaded to support a particular policy, sometimes in exchange for something else.⁵⁸

The problem stream is significant because it alerts the public to a current strategy which is not working well. The policy stream is important because ideas need time and attention to grow and evolve, to developed and redevelop. The political stream shapes the conditions which must be present for decision-makers to be receptive to new ideas and policies. The political stream is particularly important in the outcome of agendas. If a problem is identified, a solution is developed and the political will is in place, it is possible for a Policy Entrepreneur to harness the change and push a policy through an open window. It is then that change can occur.

2.3 The Policy Window and the Policy Entrepreneur

The streams are ready to be coupled by a policy entrepreneur (PE) when proper conditions have been achieved. If an entrepreneur recognizes and capitalizes on this alignment, change can occur and new policies can be adopted. This process is explained by Tomlin et. al.: “the three streams come together at critical times, so that a problem is recognized, a solution is developed and available in the policy community, a political change makes the time right for policy change, and potential constraints are not severe.”⁵⁹ The alignment of the streams can result in a policy window opening. A policy window can be thought of as “a temporal stimulus for choice.”⁶⁰ Windows can

⁵⁴ Ibid., 149.

⁵⁵ Kingdon notes that in his study of the role of jurisdiction on policy making, the maxim ‘Where you stand depends upon where you sit’ rings particularly true. Ibid., 155.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 159.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 159-160.

⁵⁹ Tomlin et al., 26.

⁶⁰ Zahariadis, “Ambiguity, Time and Multiple Streams,” 82.

be predictable (such as an annual budget) or unpredictable (such as a natural disaster), but they do not remain open for long. Action must be taken quickly before one of the three streams shifts or changes. If this occurs, the window will close and the opportunity is lost.⁶¹ There is only one way to truly determine if a policy window opened: through a test of successful advocacy. Successful advocacy means that the policy has risen past the governmental agenda, onto the decision agenda, where those in government are seriously considering the proposed policy.⁶²

There is another crucial element to this formula that ensures that a policy will achieve attention on the decision agenda. A PE is necessary to ‘couple’ or link the streams and to push an idea through the policy window. Coupling can be understood as searching for a proper fit between problems and solutions.⁶³ PEs must seize the chance for change and persist in their efforts. PEs work to promote their idea, harnessing the energy from people and resources to make the adoption of their policy a reality. They must be dedicated, experienced and willing to commit resources. They must have the ability to search for the right solution, and the skill to recognize when the time is right to act.

In addition to have the drive and enthusiasm to couple a problem and solution on the political agenda, PEs must have a “claim to hearing.”⁶⁴ While countless people would like to be heard, there are only a small number of people who have an audience. A claim to hearing can come from a PE who represents others (such as a Member of Parliament), a leader of an interest group, or a forerunner in his or her field (such as researcher).⁶⁵ There can be more than one PE working to promote the adoption of a particular policy.

If a policy entrepreneur capitalizes on the opportunity of an open policy window, it is likely that he or she will be rewarded by gaining the attention of decision makers. His or her pet solution is then likely to be considered and adopted onto the governmental agenda and potentially the decision agenda. Ultimately, an “issue’s chance of gaining prominence in the agenda are enhanced when problems interact with solutions and politics to produce a single package acceptable to policymakers.”⁶⁶ An entrepreneur is crucial to packaging an appealing solution for policy makers. It is at this juncture that a policy can be accepted, making change possible.

One comment about policy entrepreneurs as it applies to this particular case study: though it is rare that a high ranking political decision maker is a PE, it is not impossible. The MS model dictates that entrepreneurs can be “...found in many locations. *No single formal position or even informal place in the political system has a monopoly on them...*[emphasis added].” In fact, the “placement of entrepreneurs is nearly irrelevant... to

⁶¹ Travis and Zahariadis, 497.

⁶² Tomlin et. al, 27.

⁶³ Zahariadis, “Selling British Rail: An Idea Whose Time Had Come?” 403.

⁶⁴ Kingdon, 180.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Travis and Zahariadis, “A Multiple Streams Model of U.S. Foreign Aid Policy,” 497.

understanding their activities or their successes,” as policy entrepreneurs will “position themselves wherever they consider their activities will produce the highest expected returns.”⁶⁷

Before applying the Multiple Streams model to the case study addressed in this thesis, and the role of Jean Chrétien as leader of African policies through the G8, it is useful to explore other studies which have employed the MS Model to assess policy making.

2.4 Multiple Streams Analysis Applied

Kingdon’s model has been used to analyze many cases and policy decisions. This section briefly examines some of the most relevant applications of the MS model, and emphasizes the wide range of cases for which the MS model is suited. One of the most enlightening examples of the MS model applied can be found in Tomlin et al.’s *Canada’s International Policies: Agendas, Alternatives, and Politics* (2008). The book explores the evolution of investment, trade, defence, development and human security policy of the Canada Government from World War II to present. It includes six case studies, which demonstrate the “utility of the [MS] model as a method of searching for pattern and structure in a very complicated, fluid and apparently unpredictable phenomena.”⁶⁸ Tomlin et al. argue convincingly that Kingdon’s model is best suited for understanding the complexities and unforeseen developments in policy making.

Steffen Brunner (2008) employs Kingdon’s framework to study emission trading in Germany. Brunner seeks to determine why a political turn in emission trading took place in 2007. He finds that, while the model does “concisely capture” many significant elements of the policy process, it is not entirely satisfactory as an explanatory model. He concludes that while the MS model is useful to study emission trading in Germany, particularly as it relates to the opening of a policy window, it is best paired with other explanatory approaches.⁶⁹ While it can be argued that the MS model is better used as a complement to other models, other research has shown that for many cases, it can be used independently to gain insight into policy choices and processes which leads to public policy decision-making and can even subsume other frameworks within its model.⁷⁰

In “Strategy of Chinese Policy Entrepreneurs in the Third Sector: Challenges of ‘Technical Infeasibility’” Xufeng Zhu (2008) uses the MS model to examine the “Detention and Repatriation” policy for urban vagrants and beggars in China, abolished in 2003. Zhu seeks to explain how the policy evolved, and why changes occurred when they did. He looks to the “Sun Zhigang Incident” (the death of an individual mistaken for a vagrant) as a potential impetus for change in the Detention and Repatriation policy. The author notes the limited research on Chinese PEs and uses the MS model to examine this phenomenon, particularly as it compares to Western

⁶⁷ Kingdon, 180 and Michael Mintrom and Sandra Vergari, “Advocacy Coalitions, Policy Entrepreneurs and Policy Change,” *Policy Studies Journal* 24, no. 3 (Autumn 1996), 424.

⁶⁸ Tomlin et al., 276.

⁶⁹ Brunner, 501.

⁷⁰ For instance, Tomlin et. al demonstrate this in *Canada’s International Policies: Agendas, Alternatives, and Politics*

applications of the model. Zhu notes that the model is useful in the case of Chinese public policy, but contends that the model requires modification.⁷¹ The adjustments made by Zhu center primarily on the differences between the way that Western governments are organized (on which the MS model is based), and the organizational structure of the Chinese political stream.⁷²

Another illustration of the MS model is found in the article “Public Sector Sport Policy: Developing a Framework for Analysis” (2005). Author Barrie Houlihan views the model as a “powerful critique of rational models of decision-making,” as well as a challenge to “the assumption of deeply entrenched institutionalized interests that distort the political system.”⁷³ Houlihan notes the absence of analysis of sports policy using the major theoretical policy frameworks and models and seeks to shed light on this area by examining sports policy using four of the best known policy models: the stages model, the advocacy coalition model, institutional analysis, and the MS model.

Houlihan’s study ultimately determines that none of the four models examined are entirely adequate to explain some of the major issues prevalent in sports, such as drug use, violence, accessibility and other ethical issues. Yet he reaches a positive conclusion about Kingdon’s model. He notes the value in its ability to be used alongside other concepts and the emphasis it places on understanding change. Houlihan remarks that there are several components of the MS model, such as the role of PE, which are of particular value to the analysis of sports policy. He considers the MS model useful in some aspects but points out limitations, suggesting that the model can only offer a “partial analysis of stability and change because, while it draws attention to the role of chance and the actions of policy entrepreneurs, it does so through a relative myopia towards structural factors and institutionalized power.”⁷⁴ Although the author believes that the MS model is applicable across different policy areas, he argues that it is “less easily transferable across political systems” particularly those which are more centralized.⁷⁵ While this determination is an interesting assessment of the model, it is not a factor at play in the context of Canada’s decentralized government.

There is a final study of the MS model which merits examination, not only because of its unique application of Kingdon’s model, but also because its use has telling implications for the case studied in this thesis. Rick Travis’ and Nikolaos Zahariadis’ article, “A Multiple Streams Model of U.S. Foreign Aid Policy,” (2002) uses Kingdon’s model to quantitatively explain U.S. foreign aid allocations. This work was the first of its kind to apply the MS model to foreign policy. The authors note that “Foreign policies are jointly determined by domestic and

⁷¹ Zhu, 317.

⁷² Ibid., 331.

⁷³ Barrie Houlihan, “Public Sector Sports Policy: Developing a Framework for Analysis,” *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 40, no. 2 (June 2005), 172.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

international factors,” something which is evident in the case of Canada’s work on Africa through the G8.⁷⁶ The authors reason that although there is an obvious connection between the domestic and international, there is “little cross-fertilization between the fields of domestic and foreign policy analysis” and they seek to examine this interplay.⁷⁷ They demonstrate how a model designed for analysis of the domestic agenda can be used to understand foreign aid allocations and establish the model’s ability to be applied to a variety of policy areas.

Travis and Zahariadis show how the MS model is a useful mechanism to “organize diverse types of information, explore the interactive effects of domestic and external variables, and explain phenomena in domestic and foreign policies.”⁷⁸ They use the MS model in ways which differ from its typical application by applying it to foreign policy. This thesis will do the same. However, while Travis and Zahariadis look primarily to budgetary matters, this thesis undertakes a wider analysis of foreign policy concerns. Travis and Zahariadis use the model to develop a quantitative study of foreign policy outcomes. This is dissimilar to this study, as well as many other applications of the MS model, which rely on qualitative analysis. While Kingdon’s model is helpful in understanding major policy shifts in agenda setting, Travis and Zahariadis look at “incremental change to existing policy.”⁷⁹ Although the concept of incrementalism is a fascinating adaption of the MS model, useful for some cases, especially in the field of budgetary analysis, this thesis declines to use the concept, as the policies enacted in Canada and the G8 in the early 2000s represent a major political shift. The yearly meetings of the G8 and the fast-moving agenda discourage inertia, and in fact, the meetings put pressure on the members to initiate change at a relatively rapid rate.

Travis and Zahariadis make several modifications to the model in their study. They “extend it to cover decision making so that the process of coupling relates to the chances of a policy being adopted rather than merely rising to the top of the government’s agenda.”⁸⁰ This thesis will employ the same change, in order to analyze policies which were actually chosen, not only those which rose to the top of the decision making agenda. Travis and Zahariadis also do not include the concept of a PE. This study maintains that the PE is an integral component of the model. The authors argue that PEs are not as integral in foreign policy as they are in domestic policy and that the importance of the actions undertaken by PEs are diminished in foreign policy. This thesis refutes this claim, and demonstrates that a PE was crucial in this case. Travis and Zahariadis’ study builds upon the MS model by using it in a quantitative fashion, extending it to foreign policy decision making.⁸¹ It demonstrates, as does the work of Tomlin et al., that the MS model can be used to analyze foreign policy, with little analytical loss and

⁷⁶ Travis and Zahariadis, 495.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 495-496.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 495.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 497. The authors note that Zahariadis (1995, 1996) ‘has shown that this extension can be made without loss of analytical utility.’ See: “Selling British Rail: An Idea Whose Time Has Come?” 400-422.

⁸¹ Ibid., 509.

concludes that, “As globalization takes hold, old divisions between domestic and external affairs become more blurred. For political scientists, this has meant renewed attention to breaking down disciplinary barriers....”⁸² This is true for the case of Canada’s work on Africa through the G8.

Overall, Zahariadis’ work on the MS model, both in the aforementioned piece, as well as in other forums (such as his chapter in Paul A. Sabatier’s *Theories of the Policy Process*, 1999) is of the utmost importance to understanding Kingdon’s ideas about policy. He levels several criticisms against the model that shed light on the strengths and weaknesses of the MS model of public policy making.⁸³ Zahariadis points out that, while relatively strong on explanatory power, the MS model has faced criticism for lacking predictive power. He claims that it can be a predictive model; however, more quantitative applications of the model must be employed to prove this.⁸⁴ Though the author argues that the MS model “resembles more a heuristic device than an empirically falsifiable guide to policy analysis,” I believe that it provides an excellent roadmap to analyze the events that lead to a policy window opening in the area of financial aid to Africa from the Canadian government at the turn of the millennium.⁸⁵

⁸² Ibid., 510.

⁸³ Zahariadis, “Ambiguity, Time and Multiple Streams,” 80.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 86.

⁸⁵ Ibid. Zahariadis cites Anthony King, in his 1985 review of Kingdon’s *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* as another who levels this criticism against the model. See Anthony King, “Review [Untitled],” *Journal of Public Policy* 5, no. 2 (May 1985), 281-283.

Chapter Three: Canadian Foreign Aid, G8 and Africa

3.1 Canada and Official Development Policy

Jean Chrétien became the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada in June 1990. He was appointed the twentieth Prime Minister of Canada on November 4th, 1993, at a time when Canada was facing a major fiscal crisis.⁸⁶ The federal deficit was a governmental priority and under Chrétien, the Liberals introduced significant budget cuts.⁸⁷ With Paul Martin Jr. as Finance Minister, the government pursued a foreign policy focused on free trade, neo-liberalism and continentalization.⁸⁸ Chrétien's foreign policy style has been described as "minimalist," largely guided by what has been called "an instrumental view of Canadian foreign policy".⁸⁹ While not considered a political visionary by his critics, Chrétien's "iron fist" leadership style was popular with many within the Liberal Party of Canada and he was, in many ways, a successful leader.⁹⁰

The fiscal crises of the 1990s resulted in many government programs being drastically cut. Historically, when programs are reduced or eliminated due to fiscal problems, development assistance is among the first to be targeted, as it "tends to fall at the lower end of the list of Canadian priorities for government spending."⁹¹ Ronald Labonte et. al (2004) explain that "ODA, whether offered directly or as taxpayers' financial debt relief, is unlike almost any other item of government expenditure in that it lacks a domestic political clientele apart from the politically favoured beneficiaries to tied aid."⁹² It is delivered in the form of grants or loans, either as multilateral or bilateral assistance. Bilateral aid goes directly to the receiving nation's government. Multilateral aid reaches other countries through financial institutions and international aid agencies.⁹³

Canadian ODA spending was relatively low when Chrétien was elected Prime Minister. ODA was largely shaped by cabinet and prime-ministerial priorities during the Prime Ministerships of both Brian Mulroney (1984-1993) and Chrétien (1993-1999). ODA plummeted during the Chrétien years, particularly after funding cuts initiated by Martin in the mid-1990s. The decline in aid spending continued through the second half of the 1990s,

⁸⁶ Chrétien was re-elected in 1997 and 2000. Steve Patten, "Canadian Liberalism, Party Politics and the Chrétien Legacy," *A paper to be presented to the annual MPSA Conference*, April 8, 2005. Available online:

<http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/8/6/8/1/pages86812/p86812-1.php>, 1.

⁸⁷ Steeves, 492.

⁸⁸ Patten, 6.

⁸⁹ Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowland. "A State of Disconnects—The Fracturing of Canadian Foreign Policy." in Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowland, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2005: Split Images*. Don Millis: Oxford University Press, 2005, 5.

Michael Ignatieff had described Chrétien's government as "the most isolationist government since Mackenzie King's in the 1930s, all while touting the official line that internationalism is still the Canadian doctrine in world affairs." Ignatieff, Michael, as quoted in Keating, 125-126.

⁹⁰ Patten, 5.

⁹¹ Tomlin et al., 174.

⁹² Robert Labonte, Ted Schrecker, David Sanders and Wilma Meeus. *Fatal Indifference: The G8, Africa and Global Health* (Cape Town: The University of Cape Town Press), 133.

⁹³ Gerald Schmitz, Marcus Pistor and Megan Furi. "Aid to Developing Countries," *Political and Social Affairs Division, Government of Canada*. Available online: <<http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection-R/LoPBdP/CIR/7916-e.htm> May 2, 2003. (2 October 2010).

when Canadian ODA performance decreased from its 1991 rate of 0.45% to 0.29% by 1998.⁹⁴ This was unfortunate, considering the desire of former Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson (1963-1968) to see ODA reach 0.7 per cent of the Canadian federal budget. The fall of ODA during this time can be attributed to a variety of causes, including fiscal pressures and the implementation of “neo-liberal economic policies in Canada and abroad,” which altered the way in which governments viewed their social responsibilities.⁹⁵

In 1994, the Liberal government conducted a foreign policy review; its findings were published the following year in *Canada in the World* (1995). ODA was “addressed passively” in the document. It was portrayed as a way to promote prosperity and employment, protect Canadian security within a global stable order, and project Canadian values and cultures abroad. First and foremost, ODA was characterized as an “investment in prosperity” and a way for Canada to move into the markets of the developing world. Rather than concentrating aid or focusing on specific issues, Canada’s foreign policy goals were set out in a very general manner. To some, Canada appeared to be trying to be “all things to all people.”⁹⁶

Canada in the World was reflective of the “values versus interests” debate occurring among Canadians. The document carved out a new direction for the Liberal government, as Canada began to seek a larger role internationally. This trajectory faced ardent criticism, and the government’s policies were accused of being too wide-ranging and not targeted enough.⁹⁷ The review illustrated an “absence of government leadership on the ‘big picture/frame-setting aid issues,’” and proved that “policy innovation in CIDA [the Canadian International Development Agency] was at the margins.”⁹⁸ Chrétien appeared reluctant to allocate funds to foreign policy initiatives and to commit Canada to participation in foreign peacekeeping missions, such as in Haiti and Bosnia in the 1990s. Tom Keating (2006) points out that this was not indicative of Chrétien’s lack of foreign policy influence, but rather demonstrated that his priorities lay elsewhere. The Prime Minister’s focus rested with matters of trade promotion, national and international prosperity, concerns of global poverty and inequities and support of international institutions.⁹⁹ Some critics believed that this new direction came partly as a result of the government being uncertain of Canada’s role in a post-Cold War world order, and unclear on what role foreign aid would play

⁹⁴ “Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific, 2001.” *Poverty and Development Division, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific*, 2001. Available online: <<http://www.unescap.org/drpad/publication/survey2001/chapter7.pdf>> (3 August 2010), 237.

⁹⁵ Tim Draimin and Brian Tomlinson, “Is There a Future for Canadian Aid in the Twenty-First Century?” in Fen Osler Hampson and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations 1998: Leadership and Dialogue* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1998), 143.

⁹⁶ David M. Malone, “Canadian Foreign Policy Post-9/11: Institutional and Other Challenges.” Prepared for the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, May 2003. Available online: <http://www.cdfai.org/PDF/Canadian%20Foreign%20Policy%20Post%20911.pdf> (5 August 2011), 9.

⁹⁷ Allan Gotlieb, “Romanticism and Realism in Canadian Foreign Policy,” *C.D. Howe Institute, Benefactors Lecture 2004*, Toronto: 3 November 2004, 23.

⁹⁸ CIDA administers ODA in Canada, and is discussed further in the next section. Draimin and Tomlinson, 144.

⁹⁹ Tom Keating, “A Passive Internationalist: Jean Chrétien and Canadian Foreign Policy,” in Louis Harder and Steve Patten, eds. *The Chrétien Legacy: Politics and Public Policy in Canada* (Toronto: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2006), 125-126.

within it.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, though the Canadian government did acknowledge the need for ODA to be more effective in its impact, it was at the same time hindered by a “decline in resources.”¹⁰¹ CIDA was one of the agencies most affected by this decline.

i. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA):

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) is Canada’s leading development assistance agency and administers Canada’s ODA budget. Created in 1968, CIDA works both domestically and abroad to initiate development and develop policy.¹⁰² Foreign aid was one of the areas most seriously affected by budget cuts in the 1990s. CIDA has its budget cut drastically. Jeffrey Steeves (2007) explains that,

successive budgets from 1993 to 1998 attacked the annual debt, reducing it from over \$40 billion [Canadian] per annum to a balance by 1999. One of the major victims of the Chrétien government’s deficit reduction strategy was foreign aid. Lacking a strong political constituency of support following years of trade emphasis, CIDA was an easy and ripe target for budget cuts.¹⁰³

These cuts resulted in a reduction in CIDA programming and in the development assistance countries were receiving. Despite the reductions, many nations continued to receive CIDA funding. A substantial percentage of Canada’s foreign aid budget went to sub-Saharan Africa, approximately 36% of in 1995-1996.¹⁰⁴ Yet this was nowhere near what many developing nations required for sustained development and tangible improvements. CIDA was facing additional problems during this time. The organization suffered due to rapid turnover in the ranks. CIDA personnel, presidents and ministers included, came and went with rapid succession. For example, CIDA President Jocelyne Bourgon lasted only five months in 1993.¹⁰⁵ This resulted in confusion and organizational chaos.¹⁰⁶

During the years of fiscal austerity, the government “lulled itself into believing that Canada could continue to matter internationally while its foreign policy instruments eroded and while the country’s weight relative to others...declined.”¹⁰⁷ Canada’s approach, which some viewed as lackadaisical, had to change in order for Canada to regain its place in the international community. In the second half of the 1990s, as the budgetary situation improved, Canada’s foreign policy tactics began to change. African issues gained notice in Canadian foreign aid

¹⁰⁰ David R. Morrison, *Aid and Ebb Tide: A History of CIDA and Canadian Development Assistance* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1998), 369.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 370.

¹⁰² Canada. Canadian International Development Agency, “About CIDA.” Ottawa, August 2009. Available online: <<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/acdi-cida.nsf/eng/NIC-5313423-N2A>> (2 accessed August 2010).

¹⁰³ Steeves, 492.

¹⁰⁴ Schmitz, et al.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 375.

¹⁰⁶ Morrison, 369.

¹⁰⁷ Malone, 15.

policy.¹⁰⁸ The balanced budget resulted in an infusion of funds to aid programs, including those in Africa. Many programs, however, were still only offering small amounts of aid, and ODA was nowhere close to Pearson's goal of 0.7%. Still, Chrétien's government expressed a desire to see improvements in foreign aid and to enhance their involvement in international affairs, particularly in Africa. Canada demonstrated its renewed interest in foreign aid in the February 1997 federal budget, where it provided an increase in funds for ODA, including \$50 million for the 1998-1999 International Assistance Envelope.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, the government appeared interested in mitigating African conflicts, for instance, the 1996 refugee crisis in Eastern Zaire. Under Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy (1996-2000), Africa dominated many aspects of Canadian foreign policy.¹¹⁰ Axworthy advocated "a new agenda around the definition of individual security," something which would undoubtedly require additional funding.¹¹¹ These matters are discussed further in the second half of this chapter.

In the early 2000s, CIDA attempted to shape ODA in a manner coherent with emerging norms in the international development community, believing that it would be more effective for its partners, and would create broader support both at home and internationally. CIDA's strategy included pursuing targets in poverty reduction, improving coordination among donors, and fostering sustainable development.

Foreign aid did increase in the early 2000s, but was largely tied aid. In 2001, Canada "offered 68% of its ODA (excluding technical cooperation and administration costs) on a tied basis."¹¹² Yet aid was still below the levels that some deemed necessary. In an October 2001 Senate Committee meeting, Canada's former minister John Manley discussed the "glaring inadequacy" in foreign aid. Stating that Canada's current stance was compromising its international legitimacy, particularly in multilateral organizations, Manley argued that "You can't just sit at the G8 table and then, when the bill comes, go to the washroom...If you want to play a role in the world, even as a small member of the G8, there's a cost in doing that."¹¹³ The Liberal government acknowledged this, eventually making changes in its foreign aid policy; this can be seen through its actions in the G8 summits of 2001 and 2002, discussed at length in chapters four and five.

In 2002, Canada's ODA program underwent a peer review process by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC). In an earlier review (1998), the DAC was critical of Canada's ODA, and raised concerns about its diminishing leadership role in the field of international development. The 2002 review noted improvements and observed that Canada's development

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Draimin and Tomlinson, 145.

¹¹⁰ Chris Brown, "Africa in Canadian Foreign Policy 2000: The Human Security Dilemma." in Fen Osler Hampson, Norman Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations: The Axworthy Legacy* (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2001), 196.

¹¹¹ Norman Hillmer and J.L. Granatstein, *Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World into the Twenty-First Century*, 2nd Edition, (Toronto: Nelson, 2008), 309.

¹¹² Labonte et al., 127.

¹¹³ John Manley, "The Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence. Second Report, Tuesday November 12, 2002." *Second Session, Thirty-Seventh Parliament, Government of Canada*. November 12, 2002.

cooperation has “strong new wind in its sails.”¹¹⁴ This conclusion came partly as a result of initiatives undertaken by CIDA in the early 2000s, which included a renewed focus on poverty reduction and strengthening aid effectiveness, with a more targeted focus on fewer countries.¹¹⁵

Canada’s efforts to improve ODA came partly through its involvement in the G8. Several G8 summits in the 1990s addressed ODA, which declined in Canada, France, Italy, the US and Germany between 1993 and 2001. During this time, Japan’s numbers stayed consistent and the UK saw an improvement.¹¹⁶ The 1999 Cologne Summit emphasised increasing the volume of aid, and established the Cologne Debt Initiative to expand debt relief to HIPC countries. This represented a solid step toward a deeper involvement with development issues. The two subsequent summits focused on improving ODA effectiveness, rather than increasing the quantity of aid, to achieve the UN target of 0.7% of GDP.¹¹⁷

3.2 Canada and ODA to Africa

Historically, Canada’s relationship with Africa has been puzzling, and widely considered to be “peripheral to Canada’s national interest.”¹¹⁸ Canada does not have colonial ties to Africa, nor has it enjoyed a substantial contemporary trade relationship with the continent.¹¹⁹ This begs the question, why was Africa central to the Canadian agenda around the time of the Genoa and Kananaskis G8 summits, particularly given the aid fatigue of the 1990s? This is explored in chapter five, using the Multiple Streams model. Many academics and politicians have sought to explain the relationship between Canada and sub-Saharan Africa. Janis van der Westhuizen (2003) reflects:

With narrowly defined national interest considerations, Canada’s extensive and intensive relationship with Africa is beyond explanation. Its value based foreign policy is based on three historic motivations. First, Canada’s involvement with Africa extends the Canadian national identity, with its relatively balanced links with both English and French Africa. Second, given its marginal position in the global political economy, Africa provided one of very few policy areas where the Canadian government can strike out ‘independently’...Third, consistent with its social-democratic system of government and aid commitments, Canada’s middle power

¹¹⁴ Schmitz et al.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ This is measured as ODA relative to each country’s national economy. Labonte et al., 121.

¹¹⁷ This is evident in the Okinawa Communiqué (paragraph 20) and the Genoa Communiqué (paragraph 14). Group of Eight, “G8 Communiqué Okinawa 2000.” *University of Toronto G8 Information Centre*. July 23, 2000. Available online: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2000okinawa/finalcom.html> <(10 January 2010) and Group of Eight, “G7 Communiqué Genoa 2001.” *University of Toronto G8 Information Centre*. July 22, 2001. Available online: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/finalcommuniqué.html> <(3 August 2011).

¹¹⁸ Chris Brown, 195.

¹¹⁹ Although Canada’s interest in Africa is relatively small, its interest in the continent is not entirely altruistic. The national also has corporate and natural resource interests in the region.

role...is that of ‘helpful fixer’ of emerging problems and inconsistencies within the nature of the capitalist world order.¹²⁰

A result of this limited connection with Africa is that policymakers have a large amount of latitude when it comes to policy creation. With relatively few interests in the region, decision-makers are able to shape policies with a greater degree of freedom.¹²¹ Canada’s engagement with Africa has experienced periods of intensity as well as downswings. In the 1990s, African countries suffered greatly due to constraints placed on Canada’s foreign aid budget, particularly since many had relied heavily on aid to deliver programs and service. In 1993, CIDA announced it was eliminating its conventional bilateral programming in some of the poorest African countries. This was reversed when Chrétien’s Liberal government came into power, but CIDA’s 1993-1994 budget still saw a 10% cut in spending. The early 1990s were a difficult period for many countries receiving money from CIDA, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa. In 1991, the Francophone and Anglophone branches of CIDA merged, resulting in changes to African programs. Several countries experienced funding suspensions or cuts in 1993. This included Zaire, Kenya, Rwanda, and Ethiopia. CIDA also announced that it was withdrawing entirely from Tanzania, previously CIDA’s largest country program, shocking the NGO community.¹²²

Problems continued into the second half of the 1990s as additional programs were cut and relationships that CIDA had built with community-based development groups were severed. Much of the innovative work being done between Northern and Southern NGOs were undermined due to lack of funds and changes in policy direction. For some countries, cuts to CIDA resulted in real and sustained hardship on the ground. The 1990s represented a “serious crisis” period for CIDA.¹²³

Even with the drastic cuts of the 1990s, Canada maintained close ties to Africa, particularly French West Africa. As a “dedicated multilateralist,” Canada stayed engaged partially because of and through involvement with multilateral associations such as la Francophonie, the Commonwealth and the United Nations (UN). Chrétien was a staunch advocate of working through such organizations, as he was a strong believer in dealing with international issues in a multilateral way. “Collective action, whenever possible,” he believed, “[produced] greater long term results than unilateral action.”¹²⁴

There was an increasing realization that Canada’s aid program required a more “comprehensive, programmatic approach that would target aid to clear, defined, strategic priorities where results could be

¹²⁰ Janis Van der Westhuizen, “How (not) to Sell Big Ideas,” *International Journal* 58 (No. 3, Summer 2003), 383.

¹²¹ Chris Brown, 196.

¹²² Morrison, 372.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 310-371.

¹²⁴ Jean Chrétien, “Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.” *Government of Canada, Privy Council Office*. October 1, 2002. Available online: <http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=sft-ddt/2002_reply-eng.htm> (accessed 1 July 2011).

measured.”¹²⁵ Africa was regaining a place of prominence on the Liberal government’s agenda at the turn of the millennium. After the years of cutbacks and austerity, the government was in a better position to pursue a greater role in Africa. In 2000, \$807 million of Canadian aid (approximately one-third of Canada’s total aid budget) went to African countries. This renewed interest in and dedication to Africa was particularly noticeable during Canada’s turn as UN Security Council President (2000), where four of the five Canadian-led priorities were directly related to Africa.¹²⁶ In 2000-2001, CIDA disbursed \$35 million for basic education in Africa, an increase of \$11 million from the year before.¹²⁷ Even so, aid was still widely dispersed. In 2000, Canada “spent at least some aid funds in every African country other than Libya.”¹²⁸ This over-reaching of CIDA programs continued to be a source of criticism. Concentrating aid on fewer countries, in a more direct way, became a central focus of Chrétien during the Kananaskis summit.

African aid and development rose on the Canadian agenda due in large part to Lloyd Axworthy. He created the “motive and opportunity for a heightened level of involvement in a series of issues and causes of potential importance to Africa, as well as various specifically African human security crises.”¹²⁹ Axworthy was very much a PE during his time in government. Through his dedication to African causes, Canada became a “norm entrepreneur,” which led Canada to have an impact on global agenda setting.¹³⁰ Norm entrepreneurs are individuals who attempt to persuade others to see things their way, or to adopt a particular idea or concept. These people break away from the established norms, in order to pursue new and innovative policies or solutions.¹³¹ Canada’s involvement in foreign policy around this time was, to a large extent, more in the realm of norm entrepreneurship as opposed to on the ground action.

Axworthy demonstrated that Canada could be a leader in African security and development. As President of the UN Security Council (1999-2000), Axworthy was active on all African issues. His accomplishments include the “effort to curb the illegal diamond trade that financed rebel groups in Angola and Sierra Leone; the broader question of the effectiveness of international sanctions; the re-examination of peacekeeping operations in light of a major report on the UN’s failure to prevent the 1994 genocide in Rwanda; and proposed or actual UN peacekeeping missions to the Central African Republic, the DRC, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Sierra Leone.”¹³² He

¹²⁵ Tomlin et al., 164.

¹²⁶ Chris Brown, 196.

¹²⁷ Brian Tomlinson, “New Initiatives for Africa: A Canadian Response to NEPAD. A CCIC Briefing Note, September 2002.” *Canadian Council for International Cooperation*, 2002. Available online.

<http://www.ccic.ca/_files/en/archives/003_ccic_briefing_note_on_g8_cdn_initiatives.pdf> (11 June 2011).

¹²⁸ Black, “From Kananaskis to Gleneagles—Assessing ‘Leadership’ on Africa,” 11.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹³⁰ The actual on the ground work was arguably less impressive. Black, “From Kananaskis to Gleneagles—Assessing ‘Leadership’ on Africa.” 7.

¹³¹ Emma Sjostrom, “Shareholders as Norm Entrepreneurs for Corporate Social Responsibility,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, no. 2 (2010), 177 and 179.

¹³² Chris Brown, 198.

helped to “soften up” the international community on matters of African security.¹³³ He worked to focus the Canadian government’s policies on Africa, both domestically and at the G8. This was apparent in many areas, including increasing funding to HIV/AIDS programs in Africa by CIDA,¹³⁴ as well as the government’s cessation of debt collection from a total of eleven heavily indebted poor countries, which had demonstrated a commitment to reform in January 2001. Many of these countries were in Africa.¹³⁵ Axworthy’s entrepreneurship indicated that the Chrétien government was beginning to establish an increased and sustained commitment to African development, and appeared to recognize the potential consequences of inaction.¹³⁶

Axworthy’s entrepreneurship during his period as Foreign Minister is crucial to an understanding of the developments and progress made in the realm of Canadian development policy. He led the Liberal government in a new direction and laid the groundwork for much of the progress made in the following years. He ‘softened up’ the Canadian government to new ideas and policies; this work cannot be overstated. Axworthy’s emphasis on soft power, niche diplomacy, and human security became the “defining element of Canadian foreign policy”.¹³⁷ This attention to human security, which was developed and articulated in the Canadian government, served Chrétien well at Kananaskis in a post 9/11 world.¹³⁸ Axworthy’s belief in a different kind of diplomacy, in which NGOs and governments could together to create new initiatives (such as the campaign to ban landmines) is evident in the G8’s work with NGOs and NEPAD at the summits of 2001 and 2002.¹³⁹

3.3 A Brief History of Canada’s Role in the Group of Eight

The G8 has been described as the “most exclusive club Canada belongs to.”¹⁴⁰ It represents one of Canada’s most significant and valuable diplomatic assets. Created in 1975, its mandate has changed as international circumstances have evolved. Originally comprised of six countries, the first summit was held in Rambouillet, France in 1975, where French President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing met with the Presidents of the United States and Germany and the Prime Ministers of Italy, Britain and Japan to discuss economic issues. The successful event became an annual occurrence, with countries taking turns at hosting. In 1976, Canada joined the group, creating the G7. That same year, a representative from the European Community (now known as the

¹³³ As mentioned in chapter two, Kingdon uses the term “soften up” to denote the process of introducing people to an idea, as to let it become a familiar concept, in hopes that people will eventually become convinced of the idea’s merit.

¹³⁴ Norman Hillmer and J.L. Granatstein. *Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World to the 1990s*, (Toronto: Copp Clark Longman, 1994), 316.

¹³⁵ The Road to Kananaskis: Africa at the Heart of the G8 Summit,” *Canada World View* 15 (Spring 2002) Available online: <<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/Canada-magazine/issue15/15t5-en.asp>> (10 accessed July 2010).

¹³⁶ Malone, 15-16.

¹³⁷ Daryl Copeland, “The Axworthy Years: Canadian Foreign Policy in the Era of Diminished Capacity,” in Fen Osler Hampson, Normal Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations: The Axworthy Legacy*. Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2001), 158.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ John English, “In the Liberal Tradition: Lloyd Axworthy and Canadian Foreign Policy,” in Fen Osler Hampson, Normal Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations: The Axworthy Legacy*. (Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2001), 103-104.

¹⁴⁰ Andrew Cohen, “Seize the Day,” *International Journal* 58, no. 1 (Winter 2002-2003), 140.

European Union, or EU) joined. The EU does not have a turn at the group's rotating presidency and hosting duties, nor is it counted among the group's official members. The EU does, however, participate in meetings and is represented by the country holding the EU Presidency, Commission and Council.¹⁴¹ Russia joined the G8 as a full member in 1997, though it had been included in meetings since 1991, when then President Mikhail Gorbachev was invited as a guest. In 1998, at Birmingham, United Kingdom (UK) a "leader's only" format was introduced. This format still exists today. Leaders' personal representatives ("Sherpa's") and national ministers meet repeatedly in the lead up to the summit.¹⁴² Generally, only heads of government attend the summit meetings themselves. These closed-door meetings generally focus on several major themes.¹⁴³

The G8 has a unique institutional structure. It is a highly decentralized forum; there is no secretariat, nor does it have employees. As explained by authors John Kirton and Ella Kokotsis (2002), a condition of the summit's success is its "direct control, from initial design to ultimate delivery, by popularly-elected democratic leaders who have personal determination and domestic capital to make the meeting produce real results."¹⁴⁴ Through this innovative structure, the G8 handles a variety of issues, crises and concerns.¹⁴⁵

The G8's agenda has expanded significantly over the years. Currently, it addresses a range of social, political and economic issues. It identifies priority issues, sets policy direction, and establishes principles. The main objectives of the G8 have remained the same since its inception: to bestow political leadership upon the international community; to create a system of collective management in which world powers could share responsibilities previously exercised primarily by the US; and to "reconcile domestic and international pressure generated by growing economic interdependence."¹⁴⁶ As the global situation evolves, the G8 remains a highly relevant international body, and is a useful crisis management vehicle—even more so than the UN Security Council.¹⁴⁷ Although the G8 is an effective international management apparatus, it is not immune from criticism,

¹⁴¹ "The EU's Relations with the G7/G8." *European Commission, External Relations*. 2009. Available online: <http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/g7_g8/index_en.htm> (3accessed May 2010).

¹⁴² Sherpas are supported by two "sous-sherpas," one from the foreign ministry and one from the finance ministry. There are also political directors, charged with the preparation of foreign policy subjects. Nicholas Bayne, *Staying Together: The G8 Summit Confronts The 21st Century*. (Aldershot, England, Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 99.

¹⁴³ Canada. "How the G8 Works." *Canada's G8 Website*. Ottawa. August 2010. Available online: <<http://www.canadainternational.gc.ca/g8/index.aspx>> (14 October 2010), 1 and John Kirton, "Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7/8 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002," in Norman Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2002: A Fading Power*. (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2002).226.

¹⁴⁴ John Kirton and Ella Kokotsis. "The G8 from Genoa to Kananaskis and Beyond: Performance, Prospects and Potential." *Paper presented for a conference on "Sustaining Global Growth: Prosperity, Security and Development Challenges for the Kananaskis G8."* Hosted by the University of Calgary, the Guido Carli Association, the G8 Research Group and the Research Group on Global Financial Government. University of Calgary, Saturday June 22, 2002, 8.

¹⁴⁵ Robert Fowler, "Canadian Leadership and the Kananaskis G-8 Summit," in David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson and Norman Hillmer, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus* (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2003), 228.

¹⁴⁶ Bayne, "The G8: An Introduction," 1.

¹⁴⁷ Fowler, "Canadian Leadership and the Kananaskis G-8 Summit," 235 and Kirton, and Kokotsis, "The G8 From Genoa to Kananaskis and Beyond: Performance, Prospects and Potential," 8.

and has a “double edged reputation.”¹⁴⁸ The organizational structure, including its relatively small size can be a strength, especially because the members have comparable economic and political systems, but it can also be detrimental.¹⁴⁹ Some issues are difficult to make progress on, and the G8 can compel only limited changes in the international system. Critics have argued that the meetings produce “little more than bland sentiments and scenic photo opportunities,” with great amounts of rhetoric, but little in the way of tangible results. Canada sought to address this criticism at Kananaskis.¹⁵⁰

Canada has a distinctive role in the G8 forum. At various times, Canada has played the role of supporter, mediator and leader, qualities which would be integral to the success at Kananaskis.¹⁵¹ By 2002, Canada had hosted five summits and had accomplished a great deal through the group.¹⁵² At the 1995 summit in Naples, Italy, Chrétien’s government spearheaded the effort to ban landmines. The Prime Minister’s leadership on this issue was impressive. In fact, the landmine discussion took place ‘despite the fact that [the Chrétien] government had not formally expressed support for a ban’ and Chrétien himself took the initiative to propose the ban.¹⁵³ This example demonstrates the highly personalized leadership that heads of state are able to exercise through G8 summits.

Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau (1968-1979, 1980-1984) was the first Canadian Prime Minister to attend a G8 meeting as a full member. He worked to ensure that the nation carved out a “niche” in the G8 as a champion for the developing world.¹⁵⁴ This objective was also promoted by Chrétien during the summits of the early 2000s. Chrétien recognized the benefits of conducting foreign policy through the G8 early on. The government’s 1995 foreign policy review, *Canada in the World*, reflected a strong determination to work through international organizations. It asserted that Canada could “further its global interests better than any other country through its active membership in key international groupings, for example hosting the G-7 summit.”¹⁵⁵ On the whole, Canada’s performances at G8 summits have been relatively strong and the government has been dedicated to complying with its commitments.¹⁵⁶ Although Canada was restricted due to budget constraints, it still championed African issues at the G8 in the 1990s, particularly at the 1996 and 1997 summit meetings (in Lyon,

¹⁴⁸ William J. Antholis, “Pragmatic Engagement or Photo Op: What Will the G-8 Become?” *Washington Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (Summer 2001), 222.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁰ Carol Harrington, “G-8 Summit security costs to top \$100 million,” *Toronto Star*, December 27, 2001. A31.

¹⁵¹ Kirton, “Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7/9 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,” 212-213.

¹⁵² These summits are as follows: 1981, Montebello, Quebec; 1988, Toronto, Ontario; 1995, Halifax, Nova Scotia; 2002, Kananaskis, Alberta. The 2010 summit will be held in Huntsville, Ontario.

¹⁵³ Tomlin et. al, 210.

¹⁵⁴ Malone, 23.

¹⁵⁵ Canada. Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade “Canada in the World: Government Statement—Summary.” Ottawa, February 1995.

¹⁵⁶ Heather Keachie, John Kirton and Jenilee Guebert, “Accountability Report on Development: The Record of the G8 and the G20, 1975–2009.” *G8 Research Group*. April 30th 2010. Available online: <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/keachie-development-2010.pdf>> (Retrieved 10 October 2010).

France and Denver, Colorado, respectively).¹⁵⁷ Canada did not promise a great deal of aid at this time, but it did try to keep African development on the G8 agenda.

Canada had a distinct advantage in the G8 during Chrétien's leadership, because he was the most experienced of its leaders. He was accustomed to the format of multilateral meetings, including La Francophonie, Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Commonwealth, and Summit of the America leaders. This familiarity with operating within multilateral organizations and with building connections, trust and compromise served Chrétien well as he hosted the G8 meeting in 2002. Chrétien's experience in attending such meetings extended back to 1978 when he attended his first G7 summit as Canada's Finance Minister.¹⁵⁸ This experience would prove to be a valuable asset.

3.4 The G8 Summit in Genoa, Italy, July 2001

The turn of the millennium ushered in changes in the relationship between the G8 and African countries. At the 2000 summit in Okinawa, Japan laid much of the groundwork for the G8's increasing involvement in Africa. In the summit's closing communiqué, leaders stated that the G8 must "engage in new partnerships with non-G8 countries, particularly developing countries, international organizations and civil society."¹⁵⁹ Influenced by the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the G8 renewed its commitment to work with developing countries to support development.

The Genoa summit was proposed by President Giuliano Amato (1992-1993, 2000-2001) and hosted by incoming President Silvio Berlusconi, July 20th to 22nd, 2001. The summit focused on world poverty and globalization. It addressed many pressing issues and represented a notable increase in the attention paid to international aid and development. Like Okinawa before it, Genoa made significant headway in reaching out to developing nations for input, participation and action. It "pioneered outreach by the G8 to both non-G8 countries and to business firms and civil society."¹⁶⁰ In hopes of building on the work of Genoa at Kananaskis, Chrétien and his Canadian representatives worked closely with the Italian delegation to devise a "multiyear emphasis and cadence" that Canada could sustain as it hosted in 2002. The Canadian contingent helped to keep the agenda focused on Africa, both by supporting the development initiatives created at Genoa, and by working with G8 nations to create cohesion between summits, in hopes that the decisions reached at Genoa would be built upon and carried through into 2002.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁷ Kirton, 'Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G7/8 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,' 215-216.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 222.

¹⁵⁹ Group of Eight, "G8 Communiqué Okinawa 2000," *G8 Research Group*. July 23, 2000. Available online: <<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2000okinawa/finalcom.htm>> (10 January 2010).

¹⁶⁰ "About the Global Fund." *Investing in Our Future: The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria*. 2009. Available online: <<http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/>> (10 January 2010).

¹⁶¹ Kirton, 'Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G7/8 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,' 218.

The Genoa summit was successful in several regards. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria was created. This fund created partnerships between governments, civil society, communities and the private sector to develop financial resources to battle these deadly diseases.¹⁶² The summit also worked to bridge the digital divide between nations, and addressed environmental sustainability. During the summit, leaders committed to the OECD-DAC recommendation to untie aid to Less Developed Countries (LDCs) (except for investment-related technical cooperation and food aid). Canada surpassed this commitment by untying technical cooperation to all African nations and LDCs.¹⁶³ Progress was made on African issues as well, discussed in detail below.

Although progress was made at Genoa, the summit faced a great deal of criticism, perhaps more than any before it. It was denounced for being too large. Over 2000 people attended, including heads of states, Sherpas, ministers and aids.¹⁶⁴ It attracted a huge number of protesters and while most of the estimated 300,000 demonstrators were peaceful, some came to blows with Italian police, resulting in fierce clashes. The reasons for the protests were varied: some groups did not believe that eight nations possessed the right to dictate rules for the international community. Others believed that the G8s work with LDCs had been inadequate and required more. Others still protested for environmental reasons.¹⁶⁵ The protests, replete with violence and injury, became the focus of the summit. Genoa made front page news around the world, when a protester was killed during a clash with police officers on the opening day.¹⁶⁶

Despite the violence, Genoa produced a number of lasting initiatives. Along with the aforementioned Global Fund, Genoa produced a forum for the creators of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) to present their innovative program for Africa. By creating a partnership between NEPAD and the G8, the G8 embarked on a highly inventive campaign, combining political and economic elements to build a holistic plan for the renewal of African nations.

i. The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD)

NEPAD (originally called the “New African Initiative” or “NAI”) was a strategic document created by Africans for Africans, designed to generate a renewal of African progress. In 2000, President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa, President Abdelaziz Bouteflika of Algeria and President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria were approached by the Organization for African Unity (OAU) and asked to create a strategy to address Africa’s

¹⁶² “About the Global Fund.”

¹⁶³ See the G8 Genoa Communiqué, paragraph 14 and Labonte et al., 127.

¹⁶⁴ Barry Wood, “Ready for a New G8? The World’s Economic Leaders Are Gathering in a Remote Location in the Canadian Rockies for a Different Kind of Summit. (Economic Affairs),” *Europe* (June 2002), 18.

¹⁶⁵ Jonathan Neale, *You are the G8, We Are 6 Billion: The Truth Behind the Genoa Protests*, (London: Vision Paperbacks, 2002).

¹⁶⁶ Alessandra Stanley and David E. Sanger, “Italian Protester is Killed by Police at Genoa Meeting; New Concerns on Venue. (Group of 8 Summit),” *The New York Times*. A1. July 21, 2001. Available online: <<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/07/21/world/genoa-summit-meeting-overview-italian-protester-killed-police-genoa-meeting.html>> (1 July 2011).

monstrous debt crisis.¹⁶⁷ Several plans were created, including the “Millennium Partnership for Africa’s Recovery Programme” (MAP), introduced by Mbeki, Obasanjo and Bouteflicka, and the “Omega Plan” by President Wade of Senegal. Ideas from the UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) (created by Secretary General K.Y. Amoako of Ghana) and the “Compact for African Recovery,” (designed to ‘provide technical and analytical support to MAP’) were also included.¹⁶⁸ NEPAD was endorsed by fifty-three members of the OAU in July 2001.¹⁶⁹

Described as a “massive, bold and ambitious project aimed at both the enhancement of governance practices and the economic reconstruction and development of the continent,” NEPAD had several objectives including: the eradication of poverty, the acceleration of the empowerment of women, the encouragement of sustainable growth and development among African nations, and the integration of African nations into the globalization process.¹⁷⁰ The plan’s goals were extremely formidable, and included: achieving growth rates of 7% per year, and cutting the percentage of people living in poverty in half by the year 2015.¹⁷¹ For many, NEPAD represented a path out of corruption, towards good governance and greater African involvement in the world economy.

NEPAD proposed a “home-grown” solution to Africa’s development challenges. It was very much “made in (and for) Genoa and Kananaskis.”¹⁷² Steven Langdon (2003) described the plan as “a tough-minded bargain that meeting financial and governance standards can achieve higher sustained aid to a number of well-performing countries,” and “a vision aiming to rekindle a sense of hopefulness.”¹⁷³ Emphasizing partnership, NEPAD sought to avoid placing blame on the West for Africa’s development struggles. Instead, it looked towards new solutions to increase prosperity. NEPAD focused on good governance, and aimed to achieve an “African Renaissance,” which would ultimately lead to a 21st century in which Africa would be a strong presence.¹⁷⁴ The local ownership aspect of NEPAD was seen as vital, both by the creators of NEPAD and to the G8 leaders who supported the plan. The plan contained a peer-review mechanism through which to evaluate country performance.

Just prior to the Okinawa summit, African Presidents Mbeki, Obasanjo and Bouteflicka elected to approach Western nations through the G8. At Genoa, these African leaders were invited to an outreach dinner, along with President Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal and President Alpha Oumar Konaré of Mali, at which they presented

¹⁶⁷ Van der Westhuizen, 373.

¹⁶⁸ “Compact for African Recovery: Operationalising the Millennium Partnership for the African Recovery Programme.” *United Nations Economic Commission for Africa*. Addis Ababa, April 20, 2001. http://www.uneca.org/cfm/compact_for_african_recovery.htm (2 June 2010).

¹⁶⁹ Jean Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*. (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2007), 358.

¹⁷⁰ Van der Westhuizen, 371.

¹⁷¹ Steeves, 496.

¹⁷² Labonte et al., 172.

¹⁷³ Steven Langdon, “NEPAD and the Renaissance of Africa,” in David Carmet, Fen Osler Hampson and Norman Hillmer, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus*. (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2003), 251.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 243.

NEPAD to the G8.¹⁷⁵ The G8 decided to provide funds and other supports to aid NEPAD goals, though these plans were not developed until after the Genoa meetings.

NEPAD faced criticism. It was accused of lacking legitimacy and failing to recognize the diversity of the African people. The North-South Institute claimed that NEPAD did not “have the support of the people, who remain almost entirely ignorant about it...”¹⁷⁶ These criticisms were refuted by leaders and supports of the plan alike, who noted that NEPAD was designed as a program designed by Africans for Africans. Yet the criticisms that the process lacked in public consultations and had failed to earn the support of the wider public were troubling.¹⁷⁷ Still, Chrétien predicted that if fully implemented, NEPAD could “transform the relationship of Africans with each other and with the world.”¹⁷⁸

ii. Response to NEPAD by the G8:

The G8 released a statement on July 21st, 2001 announcing that its leaders supported NEPAD and believed that the initiative provided “the basis for a new intensive partnership between Africa and the developing world.” The leaders reported that they would support the program’s key themes, among them poverty and conflict reduction, democratic reforms, good governance and the stimulation of the economy.

The G8’s formal response to NEPAD was the *Genoa Plan for Africa* (later renamed the *African Action Plan*, or AAP.) It did not commit to specific programs or targets, but it appointed a representative from each nation to “liaise [sic] with committed African Leaders on the development of a concrete Action Plan to be approved at the G8 Summit next year under the leadership of Canada.”¹⁷⁹ These representatives would act under the guidance of Canada to create a plan to support NEPAD and would work with the NEPAD Implementation Committee to address what the plan would look like.¹⁸⁰ This role was defined by Chrétien, and the individuals charged with the task were called “African Personal Representatives” (APRs). Kirton calls Canada a ‘G-7-8 system builder’ for creating this position.¹⁸¹ The AAP was very much the mechanism that placed African issues on the agenda for the G8. It was because of Chrétien’s dedication to facilitating the process that the AAP remained a central agenda item for the group.

¹⁷⁵ Others attended this dinner as well, including representatives from El Salvador and Bangladesh, along with the heads of the WTO, WHO, FAO, UN and World Bank. Bayne, “Staying Together,” 96 and 171.

¹⁷⁶ The North-South Institute as quoted in Mike Trickey, Africa Plan for G 8 ‘lacks legitimacy’: Institute Says Chrétien’s Summit Centrepiece ‘presents no new ideas,” *The Ottawa Citizen*. Ottawa, Ontario, 13 June 2002, A.5.

¹⁷⁷ Roy Culpeper, “Foreword: African Report: Assessing the New Partnership,” *The North-South Institute*. Papers presented at a conference held in Nairobi, Kenya, April 30 to May 2, 2002. Available online: <http://www.nsi-ins.ca/english/pdf/africa_report/foreword_e.pdf> (3 October 2011), 2.

¹⁷⁸ Jean Chrétien, “Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien to the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa,” *Government of Canada, Privy Council Office*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 11, 2002.

¹⁷⁹ Italia, Ministero degli Affari Esteri, “Genoa Plan for Africa,” *G8 Research Group*. Genoa, Italy, July 21, 2001. Available online: <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/africa.html>> (7 January 2010).

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ Kirton, “Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7.8 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,” 216.

The African Personal Representatives were crucial to the creation of the AAP. The Canadian ARP was also Canada's Sherpa, Robert Fowler. Fowler had a great deal of experience, which made him well suited for these dual roles. He was former governmental policy advisor, ambassador to the UN, assistant deputy minister at the Department of National Defense, and diplomat. He was familiar with the summit process, as he had already served as Sherpa at two prior summits. Fowler's responsibilities as Sherpa included "arranging the agenda, documents, accommodations, security, and declarations" for the summit, and acting as the personal envoy of the Prime Minister.¹⁸² The high-ranking diplomat was "deeply convinced of the seriousness of the African vision" and worked tirelessly to ensure that the NEPAD was promoted at the G8 and around the international community.¹⁸³ Fowler was the logical choice to guide the 2002 agenda, which so greatly emphasized Africa. He had ample experience on the continent. He had taught in Rwanda, represented Canada on the UN Security Council (1999-2000), and chaired the UN Security Council's Angola Sanctions Committee (2002). Fowler and the other APRs met several times leading up to Kananaskis, and engaged with members of the NEPAD Steering Group, the NEPAD Heads of State Implementation Committee, and members of civil society. They built on the Genoa Plan for Africa to create a cohesive plan to work with Africa.¹⁸⁴ The APR's also conducted domestic consultations with their respective constituents.¹⁸⁵

Canada was charged with leading the G8's response. It was also among the most engaged country in the NEPAD process. In fact, Van der Westhuizen described Canada as an "interlocutor" in his 2003 analysis of the NEPAD plan.¹⁸⁶ He asserted that Canada helped reconcile the principles of NEPAD to Canadians and to its G8 partners, which assisted NEPAD "fit within existing dominant belief systems and social structures of both African and G8 states."¹⁸⁷ It also gave Canada an opportunity to play a prominent leadership role in the G8, and to act as norm builder and policy promoter locally and internationally. Steeves (2007) points out that this was fortuitous timing, because the "basket of values articulated by CIDA and Foreign Affairs [was] mirrored in...the NEPAD proposal."¹⁸⁸ This joining of values was well timed for Canada's foreign aid program.

Chrétien's decision to make NEPAD a priority was an important moment for Canada and the G8. Fowler reports: "In a late-night meeting at the conclusion of the first day of the 2001 summit, Jean Chrétien insisted that G-8 leaders respond to the African initiative firmly and forcefully, and proposed—for the first time in the 28 years

¹⁸² Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 357.

¹⁸³ As a highly experienced and skilled senior diplomat, Fowler had attended ten G8 summits, and had acted as Foreign Policy Advisor to Prime Minister Elliott Trudeau and Brian Mulroney. Langdon, 249.

¹⁸⁴ The PRA's met in London (October), Addis Ababa (December), Cape Town (February), Dakar (April), Maputo (May) and Kananaskis (June).

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 227.

¹⁸⁶ An "interlocutor" can be described as a person who facilitates or leads a conversation. "Interlocutor," *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Available online: <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/interlocutor?show=0&t=1317683567>> (3 October 2011). Van der Westhuizen observes that an interlocutor can "help make an argument 'fit' within a dominant believe system." (381).

¹⁸⁷ Similarly, the African nation of South Africa acted as 'interlocutor' within Africa. van der Westhuizen, 381.

¹⁸⁸ Steeves, 496.

of Summit history—that a new group of personal representatives be established to address a single issue, in this case, to draw up an “African Action Plan” in response to the NEPAD proposal.”¹⁸⁹ And so began the Canadian Prime Minister’s leadership on this issue through the G8. The adoption of the AAP at Genoa placed Africa on the G8’s agenda, and it was up to Chrétien to harness and facilitate the opportunity for change.

Chrétien’s insistence on personalized and direct attention on formulating an appropriate response to development aid was indicative of his eagerness to see African development as both a Canadian and G8 priority. The AAP demonstrated the willingness of the G8 to work closely with Africa to encourage sustainable change. The NEPAD proposal represented an opportunity for the G8 to be portrayed in a new and more altruistic light. For Canada, it was a way to bolster its ODA program and to “refurbish” its identity as a nation which designed its foreign policy around elements of humane internationalism.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁹ Fowler, 226.

¹⁹⁰ Van Der Westhuizen, 383.

Chapter Four: The G8 Summit in Kananaskis, Alberta, June 2002

4.1 Canada's Africa Policy –Genoa to Kananaskis

Support for the AAP grew after the Genoa summit. In an unprecedented move, Italian President Berlusconi invited Prime Minister Chrétien to take over as G8 chair immediately after Genoa, though he was not slated to take the position until January 2002. In his 2007 memoirs, Chrétien recalled that the “other leaders asked me to pick up the file right away....The request was an honour and a surprise.” In preparation for the Kananaskis summit, Chrétien took two important initiatives to advance Canada's relationship with Africa: in December 2001 he announced the Canada Fund for Africa (hereafter known as the Canada Fund) and at the International Conference on Financing on Development (hereafter known as the Monterrey Conference) he declared that he would be doubling Canada's overseas development assistance by 2010, with at least half earmarked for Africa.

i. The Canada Fund for Africa

In 2002, Chrétien made a personal commitment “not to forget Africa.” At the same time, CIDA stated that Africa was to be “at the center of Canada's cooperation agenda.”¹⁹¹ The Chrétien government acknowledged that improving development in Africa would be a monumental task, and it worked to improve Canada's contribution while encouraging other G8 nations to do so as well. In the December 2001 federal budget, the Canada Fund for Africa was announced. The money for this \$500 million fund was to come from federal budget surpluses over the next three years.¹⁹² Canada was the first G8 nation to create funding to support NEPAD and the African Action Plan (AAP), and in doing so, took a clear leadership role on the issue.¹⁹³

The Canada Fund was created to support initiatives that contributed to sustainable development in Africa. Stressing African leadership and ownership, the Canada Fund focused on governance, peace, security, trade, investment, health, environment, and digital issues.¹⁹⁴ It committed \$50 million to vaccine research and development.¹⁹⁵ It allotted \$100 million to the *Canada Investment Fund for Africa* which was to be cofounded with, and managed by, private sector investors and focus on transport, infrastructure, water and sanitation

¹⁹¹ Canada. Canadian International Development Agency, “Canada Making a Difference in the World: A Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness,” Ottawa. September 2002. Available online: <www.acdi-cida.gc.ca>, 26. (10 June 2010).

¹⁹² Kirton, ‘Canada as a Principal Summit Power,’ 227.

¹⁹³ Canada. Canadian International Development Agency. “Canada Fund for Africa.” Ottawa. 2008. Available online: <<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/canadafundforafrica>> (10 August 2011).

¹⁹⁴ Canada. Canadian International Development Agency, “Focus on the Future—The Legacy of the Canada Fund for Africa,” Ottawa. 2008. Available online: <<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/acdi-cida.nsf/eng/MAR-619131753-NAQ>> (10 June 2010).

¹⁹⁵ Hillmer and Granatstien, 316.

projects.¹⁹⁶ \$9 million was devoted to Parliamentary strengthening,¹⁹⁷ \$35 million to “bridging the digital divide,” \$130 to trade and investment, \$6 million to local governance, and \$28 million to public sector capacity building.¹⁹⁸ There was also \$50 million dedicated to sanitation and water projects through the “Global Water Partnership”, \$18 million to “strengthening governance and civil society engagement”¹⁹⁹, and \$20 million put towards building capacity for export growth.²⁰⁰

Aligned with the principles articulated in the MDGs and the goals of CIDA, the Canada Fund supported African ownership while reflecting Canadian priorities. It demonstrated that Canada was dedicated in its engagement with African development and was prepared to lead by example. The Canada Fund was an important development in Canada’s aid strategy. Yet the critics found its focus on private investment troublesome, as this had the potential to lead to high prices and limited access for the poorest of the poor people in Africa. Others contended that the Canada Fund fell short of the amount required to produce sustained change. Still, the Canada Fund represented an opportunity for Canada to set the stage for increased development assistance at Kananaskis, as did the promises made at the Monterrey Conference.

ii. The Monterrey Conference

At the March 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development held in Monterrey, New Mexico, Prime Minister Chrétien once again signalled his intent to make foreign aid a national priority. The conference, designed to find ways to stimulate developing countries involvement with the global economy, was attended by over fifty heads of government. Topics included “coherence in domestic resources, the role of foreign direct investment, the impact of international trade on development, official development assistance and debt relief and international financial systems.”²⁰¹ The conference aimed to foster the sharing of ideas among stakeholders, which included civil society, business groups, institutional partners and governments. The meeting produced the

¹⁹⁶ David Black, “Canada, the G8 and Africa: The Rise and Decline of a Hegemonic Project? (Draft)” *The Open University*. Date unknown. Available online:< <http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/bisa-africa/confpapers/Black%20D%20Canada%20G8%20Africa.pdf>> (11 June 2010), 15.

¹⁹⁷ “Parliamentary strengthening” denoted a plan to reduce corruption and work toward governance reform in African nations. The Canada Fund for Africa partnered with the “African Parliamentarians Network Against Corruption” (APNAC) in this endeavor. Canada. Canadian International Development Agency, “New Vision, New Partnership: Canada Fund for Africa,” Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada. 2003, 4.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ This initiative was meant to further engage African citizens in the development process and encourage greater and deeper participation. Labonte et al., 125-126.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 126.

²⁰¹ Surya Subedi, “In the News: The International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico, 18-22 March 2002,” *International Law Forum* 4 (2002), 52.

Monterrey Consensus. This unanimously accepted document represented a “landmark framework for global development partnership in which the developed and developing countries agreed take joint actions for poverty reduction.”²⁰² An encouraging international commitment, the document demonstrated the international consensus that the MDGs were the preferred way through which to achieve development.²⁰³ Though not a joint commitment, the *Monterrey Consensus* had important consequences for the G8 organization and its partnership with Africa, as this was the venue through which many promises for the AAP were made.²⁰⁴ Chrétien called it “unprecedented in scope and participation...[it] seeks to take an indispensable step forward together in securing a fundamental common cause of the United Nations. Canada is especially pleased that the consensus acknowledges the complexity of the issues at hand. It resists the temptation to resort to attractive but simplistic solutions.”²⁰⁵

During the conference, Chrétien announced Canada’s commitment to boost its foreign aid by eight per cent per year, resulting in a doubling of Canadian ODA by 2010.²⁰⁶ Chrétien later explained this decision: “At the Monterrey meeting, much to the surprise of my finance minister, who happened to be sitting next to me at the time, I unexpectedly announced that Canada was going to double our overseas development assistance by 2010, with at least half earmarked for Africa.”²⁰⁷ This statement constitutes evidence of Chrétien’s role as a policy entrepreneur in the early 2000s, creating an impetus for change in Canada’s relationship with Africa. This leadership was highly personalized, as Chrétien worked to create policies that he believed to be important.

Chrétien later observed: “Not only did [the Canadian commitment made at Monterrey] serve as a spur to the other G8 members but it demonstrated my personal hope that we as a nation [would] reach Pearson’s goal [of 0.7 per cent of GDP] someday soon.”²⁰⁸ He went on to voice his regret that the first budget he oversaw as Prime Minister reduced foreign aid by thirty percent, but he argued that, “the federal government was virtually bankrupt and we had to treat all departments equally.”²⁰⁹ At Monterrey, Chrétien argued that dealing with the debts of developing nations would continue to be a priority for Canada, and that “As chair of the G8, Canada has made building a development partnership with Africa a priority, with an approach that reflects and seeks to advance the

²⁰² Jeffrey D. Sachs, “Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals,” *United Nations: Report to the UN Secretary General, United Nations Development Programme*, 2005. Available online: <<http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/MainReportComplete-lowres.pdf>> (1 August 2011).

²⁰³ Bryn Gray, Melanie Martin, Maria Banda and Sonai Thakkar, “Issue Objectives for the 20020 Kananaskis Summit—AAP,” *G8 Research Group*, June 2002. Available online: <www.tspace.library.utoronto.ca> (10 June 2011).

²⁰⁴ This was especially true as the US announcement of increased aid was a surprise, and the Japan performance was continuing to decrease. Bayne, 115.

²⁰⁵ Jean Chrétien, “Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien to the United Nations International Conference on Financing for Development,” Monterrey, United Mexican States, March 21, 2002. Office of the Prime Minister. Ottawa.

²⁰⁶ This promise was reiterated at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in August 2002. David Black, “Canadian Aid to Africa: Assessing Reform,” In Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowlands, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2006: Minorities and Priorities* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press), 322-323.

²⁰⁷ Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 361.

²⁰⁸ These statements were made in 2007. *Ibid.*

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 360

Monterrey Consensus.²¹⁰ Chrétien's actions at Monterrey placed him in the position of PE for the G8 on the subject of Africa.

Other important developments occurred around this time, providing further evidence of Canada's new emphasis on African aid and development as priorities. On January 1, 2001, the Chrétien government announced an immediate moratorium on the collection of debt payments from eleven Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC). Many of the countries were African, such as Nigeria, Rwanda, Sudan and Tanzania.²¹¹ In Chrétien's 2001 address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, he signalled his intent to focus more on international assistance. He stated that "We will increase our international development assistance, to expand opportunities for more countries to participate in the benefits of globalization, while promoting peace and human security in the world."²¹² Chrétien's commitments reversed a steep decline in ODA funding in recent years, and reflected the efforts he was making to lead African development. In the 2002 Throne Speech, Governor General Adrienne Clarkson addressed support for Africa. She highlighted some of Canada's recent development commitments, declaring that: "We will double our development assistance by the year 2010, and earmark at least half of that increase for Africa as part of Canada's support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development. As of January 1, 2003, Canada will eliminate tariffs and quotas on almost all products from the least-developed countries."²¹³ Prime Minister Chrétien's response to the Throne Speech announced some of his recent initiatives, and detailed his government's plans for Canadian development assistance, better trade options for LDCs, and a greater focus on African development.²¹⁴

In its 2002 foreign policy statement, *Canada Making a Difference in the World: A Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness*, CIDA highlighted the importance of social development, something it also did in the 1995 review. CIDA had long been criticized for its lack of focus, but the 2002 statement announced a move towards aid programs with more focused sectors and recipients. CIDA also noted a plan for closer coordination with the "priorities and practices" of the donor community as a whole.²¹⁵ CIDA committed to double its investment in social development over the next five years and outlined four specific targets which would be

²¹⁰ Chrétien, "Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien to the United Nations International Conference on Financing for Development."

²¹¹ Canada, Department of Finance. "Helping the Poorest: Update on Canada's Debt Relief Efforts." Ottawa. January 2005. Available online: http://www.fin.gc.ca/toc/2005/cdre0105_-eng.asp (20 August 2011).

²¹² Jean Chrétien, "Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in Reply to the Speech from the Throne," Office of the Prime Minister. Ottawa: January 31, 2001.

²¹³ Governor General Adrienne Clarkson, "Speech from the Throne to Open the Second Session of the 37th Parliament of Canada." Ottawa. Privy Council Office. 30 September 2002. Available online: <<http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=sft-ddt/2002-eng.htm>>

²¹⁴ Jean Chrétien, "Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in Reply to the Speech from the Throne," Government of Canada Privy Council Office, September 30, 2002. Available online: <http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=sft-ddt/2002_reply-eng.htm> (4 June 2010).

²¹⁵ Black, "From Kananaskis to Gleneagles—Assessing 'Leadership' on Africa," 11.

emphasized from 2002 to 2005: child protection, health and nutrition, basic education and HIV/AIDS.²¹⁶ The document focused on African nations and emphasised Canada's resolve to support the MDGs.

In preparation for the Africa-focused G8 summit hosted by Chrétien, the Prime Minister travelled to Africa in April 2002. He met with members of the UN, the Commonwealth, la Francophonie and members of NEPAD to "build and maintain a consensus with regard to the G8's African Action Plan..."²¹⁷ The trip demonstrated Chrétien's personal commitment to improving development efforts in Africa. In conjunction with the Canada Fund for Africa and the commitment made at Monterrey, it also marked the beginning of Chrétien's entrepreneurship, as he sought to set an example for other members of the G8 and, arguably, craft a lasting political legacy for himself. Chrétien worked to generate political will, both at home and abroad. While in Africa, Chrétien traveled to Morocco, Egypt, Algeria, Nigeria, Senegal, Ethiopia and South Africa, and met with fourteen African leaders, some of whom were involved in the creation and implementation of NEPAD, and consulted with them on the African Action Plan.²¹⁸ Meeting with these leaders was especially important because the Presidents of Algeria, Nigeria and Senegal would all be attending Kananaskis to partake in the discussions around the AAP. They were coming at the invitation of the Canadian Prime Minister. This invitation was indicative of Chrétien's commitment to a collaborative G8 partnership with Africa.

During an April 2002 speech in Ethiopia, Chrétien touted some of the progress made by Canada on development issues. Speeches such as these demonstrated to the world the progress which Canada had made in recent years. He stated that,

Much of our foreign policy in recent years has been focused on issues of special concern to Africa...We have forgiven all the development assistance debt of almost all Heavily Indebted Poor Countries, including \$1.3 billion for the thirty four least developed countries in Africa. We have forgiven over forty two billion in other debt payments owing to the Government of Canada. And on January 1st, 2001, we also stopped collecting interest owing on the remaining debt from eight African HIPC's who have committed to reform.²¹⁹

The Canadian government set the stage for an Africa-focused G8 summit in 2002. As the summit approached, Kirton predicted that, "With [his] international experience and domestic political strength, Jean Chrétien [is] in a strong position to make Kananaskis a major success, should [he] display the energy, flexibility, and vision required

²¹⁶ Canada. Canadian International Development Agency, "Canada Making a Difference in the World: A Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness," (Hull, Ontario: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, September, 2002.) Available online: <[http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/inet/images.nsf/vLUIImages/pdf/\\$file/SAE-ENG.pdf](http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/inet/images.nsf/vLUIImages/pdf/$file/SAE-ENG.pdf)> (10 June 2010).

²¹⁷ Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 358.

²¹⁸ Denis Paradis, "Canada Meeting the New Challenge: The African Partnership," *Canadian Speeches* 16, no. (July/August 2002), 17.

²¹⁹ Jean Chrétien, "Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien to the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa."

for global governance in the new twenty-first-century world.”²²⁰ Under the Prime Minister’s leadership, Canada was prepared to lead at Kananaskis. Canada was able to portray itself as compliant with past G8 targets; it ranked number one among the G8 in its compliance to the Genoa priorities (82%). This was commendable, though the lagging compliance of the US and Japan (35% and 44%, respectively) was cause for concern about the lasting success of any progress made at Kananaskis.²²¹ Ultimately, though optimism about the summit 2002 existed, scepticism remained. There were doubts regarding the interest of the G8’s domestic constituencies in the agenda priorities. This was especially true in Canada, where concern for Africa continued to rank low among foreign policy concerns among citizens.²²² It remained to be seen whether the final product at Kananaskis would be rhetoric or real, quantifiable action to aid African nations climb out of poverty.

4.2 The G8 Summit in Kananaskis, June 26-27, 2002

At the 2001 summit in Genoa, Italy confirmed what many observers of international aid policy had been speculating—that the new millennium would bring with it reform and renewal in how countries viewed aid. Increasingly, African development was becoming an international concern.²²³ Because of the high degree of cohesiveness within the G8 at the time, the African aid agenda transferred well from Genoa to Kananaskis. The 2002 Summit presented an excellent opportunity for Canada to provide the international community with a “made-in-Canada” achievement, something which had not occurred on such a large scale in recent years.²²⁴ Although the issue of African development was on the G8 agenda prior to Chrétien’s turn as host chair, he was able to act as a facilitator and policy entrepreneur of specific issues at Kananaskis, driving them forward and working to ensure their success.

With the world watching, and facing intense domestic and inner-party pressure, Chrétien was determined to make the Kananaskis Summit different from those of the past. It was to be a meeting with deliverable results, benefiting not only G8 members, but also developing nations. After the violence of Genoa, Kananaskis aimed to present a more positive image. Hopes were high for the 2002 summit, particularly because the Genoa commitments had been largely kept.²²⁵ The compliance rate post-Genoa was on average 50%, which exceeded the compliance rate from the five summits before it. Kirton and Kokotsis (2000) predicted that, “Led by the vast Summit experience of this year’s host...[the G8] leaders should have the political commitment and capital to transcend the

²²⁰ Kirton, ‘Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G7/8 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,’ 212.

²²¹ Kirton and Kokotsis. ‘The G8 from Genoa to Kananaskis and Beyond: Performance, Prospects and Potential,’ 4.

²²² *Ibid.*, 8.

²²³ David Black, “Canadian Aid to Africa: Assessing Reform,” 319.

²²⁴ Kirton, “Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7/9 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,” 209.

²²⁵ At Genoa, fifty-eight specific and measurable commitments were made, covering fifteen issue areas. Kirton, and Kokotsis. ‘The G8 from Genoa to Kananaskis and Beyond: Performance, Prospects and Potential,’ 2.

quite different concerns of their publics and thus make Kananaskis, on its centrepiece themes, a major success.”²²⁶ To properly benefit from the favourable conditions of the summit, Chrétien had to make use of the capacities of the G8 leaders to agree on a sustainable African policy. His leadership was conducive to the G8 achieving its Africa goals, as Chrétien was “the man most likely to close the deal.”²²⁷

i. Canada Hosts the Summit

In the summer of 2002, Chrétien was preoccupied with G8 Summit preparations, and with convincing other G8 nations to adopt the AAP and ensure that the threat of terrorism did not eclipse Africa as the focus of the summit. Chrétien also had to contend with a growing domestic political crisis, as he wrestled with issues in his own party. Paul Martin, a Member of Parliament since 1998 (and Chrétien’s opponent in the 1990 leadership race), was making a bid for the Prime Ministership. Martin and Chrétien had never enjoyed a warm relationship. Tensions between the two had existed from the late 1990s right up to the present.²²⁸ These tensions played out in the media and within the Liberal party itself. Martin’s camp was unsure as to whether Chrétien would try to remain leader of the party, or relinquish his power post-Kananaskis. For his part, Chrétien appeared to recognise Martin was “working hard” to gather support, but seemed to be unconcerned by the threat. He did not “go out of his way” to either “help [Martin] or to hurt him.”²²⁹

Hostilities continued into the spring of 2000. One week prior to the March biennial Liberal convention, several MPs met, with the alleged purpose discussing how to prevent Chrétien running for leader of the party once again.²³⁰ The Prime Minister reported being hurt by the “betrayal” of Martin, stating: “I felt he owed me, at the very least, the decency of letting me retire on my own terms and some respect for the Liberal tradition—one of our greatest strengths—of supporting the leader.”²³¹ Soon after this meeting, Chrétien announced his intention to run once more, claiming that his motives for wanting another opportunity as Prime Minister came not from wanting to “cling to power, beat Wilfrid Laurier’s record in office, or deny Paul Martin his dream.” Rather, his reasons for staying came from a love of the job and a desire to see the Liberal agenda he created completed. He later recalled, “I was damned if I was going to let myself be shoved out the door by a gang of self-serving goons.”²³²

As summer 2002 approached, there was still strain within the Liberal Party, as speculation grew that Martin’s time as Finance Minister would soon be over. In early June 2002, Chrétien “accepted [Martin’s] resignation.”²³³ Martin claimed he was fired. This event resulted in an increasingly contentious environment, with

²²⁶ Kirton and Kokotsis. “The G8 From Genoa to Kananaskis and Beyond: Performance, Prospects and Potential,” 8-10.

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Bruce Wallace, “Trouble in the family,” *MacLean’s* 112, no. 45 (8 November 1999), 24.

²²⁹ Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 371.

²³⁰ Robert Lewis, “Leadership as a Blood Sport,” *MacLean’s* 113, no. 13 (March 27 2000), 2.

²³¹ Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 257.

²³² Ibid., 257-259.

²³³ Ibid.

battle lines being drawn within the Liberal party. The calls for Chrétien's retirement, along with the sacking of Martin just days before the Kananaskis summit, forced the Prime Minister to consider his next political move, and to contemplate the prospect of competing for the party leadership once again.²³⁴ It also raised questions about shaping a political legacy. Kananaskis had the potential to be the ideal venue for legacy-making, should Chrétien choose to take the opportunity. Politically wounded from his battle with Martin and others in his party, Chrétien shifted his attention to the Kananaskis summit and to developing the AAP policy, through which he contended that a real change for Africa could occur.²³⁵

One of the major challenges Chrétien faced before Kananaskis was to bridge the political divide between US President Bush, France's President Chirac and those on the political left. This would require Chrétien to be a skilled political entrepreneur, building agreement and consensus in areas where little existed. In addition to these ideological and strategic chasms, Chrétien had to contend with domestic turmoil, the anti-globalization forces ever-present at G8 functions, and the challenge of focusing the agenda on Africa so shortly after the terrorist attacks of 9/11. He also faced the glare of the media spotlight. The world was watching to see if he would succeed in the most "ambitious policy proposal of his nine years as Canada's leader."²³⁶ Still, summit-watchers were highly optimistic about Kananaskis and the work that Canada could achieve through the G8.²³⁷

Kananaskis was a departure from past summits in several regards. G8 summits had been criticized for being little more than a political photo-op and an exercise in pomp and rhetoric. In light of the violence of Genoa and a rise of other criticisms, Chrétien chose to host a "back to basics" summit. He scaled the summit back, reduced the delegation size, and took steps to foster a more informal atmosphere.²³⁸ He moved the meeting from its original location of Ottawa, Ontario, to Kananaskis, Alberta. This change in venue provided leaders with a more isolated, intimate setting, while also decreasing the likelihood of protesters travelling to the relatively remote location. The Genoa summit was lambasted for failing to adequately engage the public and for restricting the involvement of non-G8 nations at the event; these were things that Kananaskis sought to remedy.²³⁹

²³⁴ Ultimately, in August of 2002, Chrétien announced that he would not seek a fourth mandate as Prime Minister, stating he would step down February 2004. He later changed this date to December 2003. "In Depth: Jean Chrétien Timeline." *CBC News Online*, 11 May 2006. Available online: <<http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/Chrétien/timeline.html>> (2 October 2011).

²³⁵ Steven Patten, "Canadian Liberalism, Party Politics and the Chrétien Legacy," 8.

²³⁶ Clifford Krauss, "Chrétien Is Hoping to Aid Africa by Mobilizing Rich Nations," *The New York Times*. June 23 2002, 18. Available online <<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/06/23/world/Chrétien-is-hoping-to-aid-africa-by-mobilizing-rich-nations.html?pagewanted=1>> (10 June 2011).

²³⁷ Gary Helleiner, "Keynote Address to the National Forum on Canadian Foreign Policy," *National Forum on Africa*. (Montreal: February 9, 2002), 3. Available online: <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/helleiner/020209HelleinerAddress.pdf>> (10 June 2011).

²³⁸ Each country was limited to bringing thirty five people; in some cases this represented a reduction of seventy percent. Bayne, 127 and "Punks' Not Welcome at 2002 G8 Summit," *CTV News*. July 21 2001.

²³⁹ Bayne, *Staying Together: The G8 Summit Confronts the 21st Century*, 93.

Approximately four hundred officials attended the summit, but only heads of government were present for the discussions.²⁴⁰ Chrétien was determined to keep the focus on the agenda and to reduce outside distractions as much as possible. News media and the majority of civil society organizations were based in Calgary, over ninety kilometres from Kananaskis. In another innovation, Chrétien summarized the summit in a three-page document, dubbed the “Chairman’s Statement.” It was prepared at the conclusion of the summit, and cut down on the massive amounts of paperwork typically produced.²⁴¹ The summit was reduced from its usual three-days to just two. This decision resulted in a number of Canadians asking why Canada was bothering with the summit at all; especially when a rumour surfaced that US President George Bush would attend for less than twenty four hours.²⁴² Chrétien was emphatic that the meetings proceed, even as high profile individuals, including Alberta Premier Ralph Klein, suggested the summit be postponed, or even cancelled altogether.²⁴³ Chrétien wanted to prove that Canada was a foremost power among the G8, capable of hosting a successful summit and ushering in political change. He was determined to steer a meeting with an ambitious agenda, to create targeted goals.²⁴⁴

Taking place ten months after the 9/11 attacks, the threat of terrorism had a serious impact on the Kananaskis summit. Canada was the only G8 member to not experience a terrorist attack on its soil. Safety was of paramount concern at Kananaskis, and an estimated \$300 million spent on ensuring that security was adequately addressed.²⁴⁵ 9/11 also had an impact on the summit’s agenda. The G8 foreign minister’s meeting, traditionally held on September 30th, was postponed. Rescheduled for November 11th, 2001, its agenda was entirely committed to addressing terrorism and instability in the Middle East. Despite the obvious need to alter the agenda to incorporate terrorism and global security, Chrétien was determined to keep the focus on African development and not allow terrorism to eclipse the policy proposals he had so strongly forwarded and supported. As Canada assumed its role as summit host, the government worked to “shape the event in its preferred image.” Chrétien “struggled to deliver a small, informal, private summit focused on reducing poverty in Africa.”²⁴⁶ With the immense influence of the US on the G8 and on world politics more generally, Chrétien could easily have bowed to pressure to change the agenda to focus on terrorism instead of development. Instead, he focused on Africa and NEPAD, “even though [the Canadian government] knew that the Americans weren’t comfortable with the

²⁴⁰Luiza Chwialkowska, “A Guide to Who’s Who, What’s What at Summit.” *National Post*. (Don Mills, Ontario. June 24 2002), A5.

²⁴¹Chrétien prepared this document, which was not pre-negotiated, though it was vetted by the other G8 leaders Fowler, 226.

²⁴²Kirton, “Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7/9 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,” 210.

²⁴³Klein’s reservations regarding the summit were a result of the September 11th attacks on the US, and centered on the threat that hosting the summit could possibly bring to Canada.

²⁴⁴Kirton, “Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7/9 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,” 211.

²⁴⁵Bayne, 129.

²⁴⁶Kirton, “Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7/9 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002,” 225.

subject.”²⁴⁷ He behaved as policy entrepreneur, and managed to create room on the governmental agenda for both global security and development.

The Kananaskis summit was met with other challenges as well. In addition to dealing with the pressure to make terrorism the centerpiece of the summit, Chrétien had to ensure that he could convince the G8 and the African leaders responsible for NEPAD to agree to an overarching policy arrangement, and to put in place the mechanisms and funding to ensure that this new partnership would be a success. Some summit watchers speculated that Chrétien would support the US position on Africa rather than take a stand of his own.²⁴⁸ Others predicted that he would show a general disinterest in aid. This assumption was based on the “relative decline in defence and foreign affairs spending during Chrétien’s period” reflecting his “lack of interest beyond domestic politics.”²⁴⁹ Many questioned why Chrétien chose Africa as a central concern, asking whether the G8 was the correct forum for action, especially with the pressing threat of terrorism. One scholar referred to Chrétien’s newfound focus on Africa as “typical of his flavour-of-the-day approach to foreign policy.”²⁵⁰ Another observed that Chrétien’s foreign policy legacy would be quite minimal altogether.²⁵¹ Though some believed that Chrétien’s convictions on Africa were genuine, lingering doubts remained as to whether the G8 could produce real results, especially with Chrétien at the helm.

The view that Chrétien’s sudden interest in Africa was the result of a legacy bid was not universal. Christopher Sands, director of the Canada Project at Washington’s Centre for Strategic and International Studies, postulated that there was “real conviction” behind the Prime Minister’s motives, possibly as a result of Chrétien’s “traditional sympathy for the underdog.” However, Sands concluded that, “it’s hard to see much there on which he can develop a legacy.”²⁵² Chrétien could have very well been acting on his own motivations, as he had expressed dismay in cutting ODA during the 1990s, and regret for reducing foreign aid by thirty percent in the first budget under his leadership.²⁵³

In discussing the likelihood of success at Kananaskis, Gordon Smith (2002) reported that there was a “reasonable consistency between what African leaders want and what the G8 is prepared to do, at least at the level of words.”²⁵⁴ The events of 9/11, and the connection made between terrorism, underdevelopment and poverty,

²⁴⁷ Chrétien, *My Life as Prime Minister*, 359.

²⁴⁸ Mike Trickey, “‘Once over lightly’: Chrétien’s tenure as PM has been marked by a lack of interest in foreign affairs,” *The Gazette*. (Montreal, Quebec, June 22 2002), B3.

²⁴⁹ Molot, Maureen Appel as quoted in Trickey. “‘Once over lightly’: Chrétien’s tenure as PM has been marked by a lack of interest in foreign affairs,” B3.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ This included Christopher Sands, director of the Canada Project at Washington’s Centre for Strategic and International Studies, who was quoted as saying that “Chrétien’s foreign-policy legacy...is not a particularly big field. Even in the U.S. relationship, he really hasn’t cut a big swath.” In Trickey, “‘Once over lightly’: Chrétien’s tenure as PM has been marked by a lack of interest in foreign affairs.” B.3.

²⁵² Trickey, “‘Once over lightly,’” B.3.

²⁵³ Chrétien, Jean. 2007. *My Years as Prime Minister*, 360.

²⁵⁴ Gordon Brown, “It’s a Long Way from Halifax to Kananaskis,” *International Journal* 57, no. 1 (Winter 2001), 125.

created the pressure to enact new mechanisms to substantially deal with these issues.²⁵⁵ Overall, the outlook was optimistic, and as the meeting approached, conditions were favourable for achieving success on the African agenda.

ii. Overview of the Summit

The Kananaskis summit had one of the most formidable agendas in G8 history, focusing on several major themes. Only three general issues were addressed in detail at the summit itself; others were relegated to pre-summit meetings. Historically, a small summit agenda has been shown to be conducive to its overall success.²⁵⁶ The Canadian contingent promoted their priorities for Kananaskis early on. Fowler proposed an agenda to the G8 Sherpa's at their first meeting in December 2001. He highlighted three priority challenges: "Strengthening world economic growth, building a new partnership for African development and combating terrorism."²⁵⁷ The agenda was agreed on at this time and did not change.²⁵⁸ At Kananaskis, Prime Minister Chrétien devoted a full day of discussion to development in Africa and the G8's response to NEPAD. Canada's leadership on Africa was supported by other nations, including its "summit soulmates" Italy, Japan and France.²⁵⁹ Terrorism was a pertinent issue, and by making a link between lagging international development and terrorism, advocates of the AAP were able to keep Africa as the centre issue at the summit. The G8 chose to highlight the roots of terrorism, reasoning that terrorism was often bred through underdevelopment, poverty and desperation. Making this connection allowed the Canadian hosts to "choose an agenda that not only [matched] the new demands of the fight against terrorism but also provided continuity with earlier summit decisions, especially from Genoa 2001, and maintained the G8's focus on responding to globalisation."²⁶⁰ It was acknowledged that fighting poverty and fostering stronger democracies were inherently important to stopping terrorism. The linkage made in this respect gave Canada a unique chance to forge ahead with its development agenda while still keeping global security at the forefront.²⁶¹

Education was also on the agenda, and a previously convened G8 task force produced a report emphasizing the need for all children to be in school, especially girls. Sustainable development was addressed, and was incorporated into the African Action Plan. Health was discussed, though no substantial progress was made on the G8's Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The unwillingness of the G8 to follow up on this

²⁵⁵ Sylvia Ostry, "Globalization and the G8: Could Kananaskis Set a New Direction?" *O.D. Skelton Memorial Lecture, Queen's University*. University of Toronto. March 2002, 5. Available online: <http://www.utoronto.ca/cis/skeltonlecture_ostry2002.doc> (10 June 2010).

²⁵⁶ Gerald Helleiner, "Round Table: Canada's Kananaskis G8 Summit: What Can and Should be Done?" First Round Table Discussion. *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <www.tpsace.library.utoronto.ca>, 7. (10 June 2011).

²⁵⁷ Fowler, 225.

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

²⁵⁹ Kirton, "Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7/9 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002," 228.

²⁶⁰ Bayne, 129.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

recent commitment created feelings of doubt around the accountability and tenability of the G8's other promises, and was a disappointing indication of the longevity of G8 commitments.²⁶²

iii. Africa:

African development was the centerpiece of the summit, and was inclusive of many subjects, among them sustainable development, global growth, health, education and international security. Joined by several Africa heads of state (President Obasanjo, President Mbeki, President Wade and President Bouteflicka), Kananaskis marked the first real partnership between the G8 and African leaders. It provided the authors of NEPAD a unique opportunity to promote the program to Western leaders. At the conclusion of the summit, the G8 issued a statement highlighting the elements of the AAP. The document spoke to why and how the G8 was supporting NEPAD. It offered an "enhanced partnership" which would match African leaders' commitment to NEPAD, and support countries which demonstrated a commitment to the rule of law, good governance and poverty alleviation. The AAP pointed to several areas of support, including resource mobilization; peace and security; governance; and human resources. The AAP represented a proactive and collaborative plan for addressing underdevelopment in Africa, and was a positive direction for its G8 signatories. G8 leaders also agreed that they would contribute up to \$1 billion dollars toward the HIPC initiative at the summit. This was significant, as many of the HIPC nations were African.

iv. The Role of Other G8 Nations

African issues became central to the G8 agenda because of the AAP. Chrétien acted as a facilitator of the plan, and also as a policy entrepreneur, focused on making progress on African issues. Canada provided innovative and unique leadership for the AAP. But it was not alone in its desire to see the AAP and NEPAD succeed. This section discusses the role of Britain and France, both of which were ardent supporters of NEPAD and the AAP, and briefly summarizes some of the accomplishments of the other G8 nations in promoting African development around the time of Kananaskis.

Britain was instrumental in the creation of the AAP, and was very supportive of Canada's summit agenda. In many respects, Prime Minister Tony Blair spearheaded the G8's initial involvement with NEPAD and was a "premier advocate" of African development.²⁶³ The New Labour government, which came in power in 1997, established the Department for International Development (DFID), which dedicated many resources to Africa. Britain's contributions to African development continued into the early 2000's, and Britain was the largest contributor to the Jubilee 2000 Relief Initiative. In 2000, Britain cancelled all bilateral debt with HIPCs.²⁶⁴ In January 2002, the UK established a US\$350 million Emerging Africa Infrastructure Fund, which Blair hoped

²⁶² Ibid., 133.

²⁶³ Audrey Johnson, Dennise Rudich, and Thineishan Ramanathan, "United Kingdom Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit," *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/uk.pdf>> (10 June 2011).

²⁶⁴ Zoe Wade, "Reassessing Labour's Relationship with sub-Saharan Africa," *The Round Table* 95, no. 383 (January 2006), 145-147.

would gain the support of the G8 at Kananaskis.²⁶⁵ Blair worked alongside Chrétien to create a consensus at Kananaskis, and like Chrétien, traveled to Africa prior to the Kananaskis summit.

France was another enthusiastic proponent of African development. Though the French APR cautioned realistic expectations about what the G8 could offer Africa, France treated the AAP as a priority issue.²⁶⁶ Prior to Kananaskis, France hosted a bilateral meeting with African leaders to gain perspective for the Kananaskis discussions. At the Monterrey Conference, French President Jacques Chirac announced an increase of ODA spending to 0.5% in five years, promising to raise it to 0.7% by 2012. France also cancelled all ODA debts from eligible HIPC nations and committed to strengthening their bilateral programs.²⁶⁷ By the early 2000s, Britain, France and Canada proved to be the most ardent supporters of promoting African development through the G8.

Other G8 nations also showed support for African development around this time. Italy, which had the lowest rate of ODA of the G8 in 2002, was vocal in its approval of the AAP, particularly elements relating to conflict prevention and agricultural subsidies.²⁶⁸ At Monterrey, Italy dedicated funds to support poverty reduction programs in HIPC nations, and in mid-2002, cancelled large amounts of foreign debts owed by Uganda and Mozambique. Germany was an active partner in the drafting of the AAP. German representatives traveled to Africa prior to the Kananaskis summit, and hosted an Economic Conference on Africa in Germany, where Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder promoted the importance of the AAP.²⁶⁹ However, while Germany was supportive of the AAP, its primary interest at Kananaskis lay elsewhere, including the environment, strengthening global growth, and combating terrorism.²⁷⁰ Russia was late in appointing an APR and became only relatively engaged in the process of creating the AAP.²⁷¹ However, in 2001, the Russian Federation hosted several African leaders in Moscow, extolling the virtues of the AAP publicly.²⁷² Japan was less involved in the AAP than some of its counterparts. Facing huge public debt, the Japanese government identified economic growth and reform, environmental concerns, and relations with Russia as the top priorities. The AAP ranked low on the list²⁷³, and Japan's African

²⁶⁵ Gray et al., "Issue Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis Summit—AAP"

²⁶⁶ The French APR stated, 'we won't be able to find in our pockets a big sum of money for a bug fund for Africa by June.' Gray et al. "Issue Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis Summit—AAP"

²⁶⁷ Robert Bacinski and Serena Yoon, "French Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit," *G8 Research Group*, 3. Available online: <<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/france.pdf>> (2 August 2010).

²⁶⁸ Maria Banda and Lara Mancini, "Italian Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit." *G8 Research Group*, 7. Available online: <<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/italy.pdf>> (2 August 2010).

²⁶⁹ Oksana Werbowy and Ralph Czychun, "German Objectives for 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit." *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/germany.pdf>> (3 August 2011), 3-4.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 3-8.

²⁷¹ John Kirton and Ella Kokotsis, "Keeping Genoa's Commitments: The 2002 G8 Research Group Compliance Report," June 2002. *G8 Research Group*, 36. Available online: <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002compliance/2002reportComp.pdf>> (2 August 2011).

²⁷² This included the heads of state from Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, Nigeria, and Algeria.

²⁷³ Jacob Young, "Japanese Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis Summit," *G8 Research Group*. June 2002, 2-3. Available online: <<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/japan.pdf>> (2 August 2011).

policies were “designed around strategic concerns, including the need for African raw material.”²⁷⁴ In fact, Japan’s President Junichiro Koizumi “considered the 50% target [of increased aid] unrealistic.”²⁷⁵ The EU appeared enthusiastic about the AAP and African development. While it had yet to develop a truly integrated approach to poverty reduction, the EU was supportive of the AAP, and shortly before Kananaskis, EU members voted to increase their ODA spending, from an average of 0.33% of GNP to a rate of 0.39% by 2006.²⁷⁶

The United States played a critical role in the AAP development and approval process. Like Japan, the US did not consider the target of a 50% increase of aid promised at Monterrey realistic, though National Security Advisor Condoleeza Rice indicated that this position might change should African nations meet the G8’s conditions.²⁷⁷ The US government did not treat the AAP as a priority issue at Kananaskis, especially in comparison to its concerns with terrorism, Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), Middle East stability and strengthening the US economy. Even so, it was supportive of the African policy, making the link between poverty, instability and terrorism and looking to NEPAD and the AAP as a bulwark against terrorism.²⁷⁸ Like Canada, the US used the Monterrey Conference to promise increased aid to developing nations. However, Labonte et al. contend that this increase, while substantial at first glance, had to be “weighed against the current level of ODA...” and “the uncertainty of implementation and the worrisome proviso of conditions...”²⁷⁹

While some G8 nations increased their ODA spending around the time of the Genoa and Kananaskis summits, including the US, the UK and Italy, others, such as Japan, saw their ODA numbers decline. However, it is important to note that the increased funding promised or provided by some G8 nations was still not commensurate with the needs of developing nations, especially those in Africa.²⁸⁰

v. Outcomes of the Summit

The Kananaskis summit demonstrated leadership and commitment on behalf of the G8, particularly Canada, France and Britain. It was innovative in its format, and the G8 was able to reach agreements which were difficult to accomplish through other channels. It was effective, with leaders overcoming international and domestic pressure on high stakes topics, including debt relief, and the Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons of Mass Destruction. The summit also displayed high levels of solidarity. Bayne asserts that Kananaskis

²⁷⁴ Pamela Jordan, “A Bridge Between the Global North and Africa? Putin’s Russia and G8 Development Commitments.” *African Studies Quarterly* 11, no. 4 (Summer, 2010), 86.

²⁷⁵ Fife, “African aid a turning point...”

²⁷⁶ Labonte et al., 123.

²⁷⁷ Fife, “African aid a turning point...”

²⁷⁸ Bryn Gray, Salimah Ebrahim and Nicol Lorantffy. “US objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit.” *G8 Research Group*, 7. Available online: <<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/japan.pdf>> (15 September 2010).

²⁷⁹ Labonte et al, 130.

²⁸⁰ Furthermore, it is a reality that ODA often corresponds more to the priorities of the donor nation than to the development requirements of the world’s poorest nations. This point is made in Jordan’s 2010 article, “A Bridge Between the Global North and Africa? Putin’s Russia and G8 Development Commitments,” 86.

will be remembered as “one of the most successful G8 summits” in the G8’s history. It was well-organized, and largely free of the tensions of Genoa. Only two arrests were made over the span of the meetings. The AAP, a potential “instrument of historic change,” was refined and agreed upon.²⁸¹ Kananaskis produced a total of 189 commitments, 136 (72%) of which focused on African development, the highest number of commitments in 28 years.²⁸² An illustration of Kananaskis’ success came shortly after the meetings, when at Evian in 2003 President Chirac announced his intention to follow Chrétien’s summit model and emphasis on Africa.²⁸³

What follows in Chapter five is an analysis of the Canadian position on the AAP at Kananaskis, applying the MS model. The analysis demonstrates that a policy window was successfully opened, and that new policies were pushed through, both in Canada and internationally—in large part because of the policy entrepreneurship of Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. The MS model explains how and why Chrétien was able to keep Africa as the top agenda item at Kananaskis, even as the threat of terrorism battled for center stage.

²⁸¹ Bayne, 137.

²⁸² 76% of commitments were “African-related.” In comparison, Genoa produced 58 commitments. Ellen Kokotsis, “Commitments kept or promises broken? Assessing G8 compliance at Kananaskis 2002” In Michele Fratianni, Paolo Savona and John J. Kirton, eds. *Corporate, Public and Global Governance: The Global Contribution*. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.)

²⁸³ Bayne, 135-136.

Chapter Five: The Multiple Streams Model Applied

Using John Kingdon's Multiple Streams (MS) model, this chapter demonstrates how and why Jean Chrétien dedicated significant effort and resources to making development in sub-Saharan Africa a major foreign policy priority in 2002.²⁸⁴ The three streams are briefly addressed, before exploring Chrétien's role as PE.

5.1 Why and How African Aid Emerged on the Agenda for Canada

The G8's involvement with Africa is a multifaceted process. Consensus had to be created within the G8, within NEPAD and between G8 and African leaders. The foreign policy decisions made in Canada and through the G8 were influenced and determined by both domestic and international elements.²⁸⁵ Canada's position towards Africa was determined because of and through the G8. It is difficult to determine what Canada's contribution might have been had Canada not worked in concert with other powers. Each G8 nation created its own plan, while working in concert with other G8 nations to achieve common goals.

The MS model is well suited to analyze a variety of policy scenarios. It shows that policy making is rarely a linear process, and that a PE is required to couple the problem, policy and political streams. The MS model dictates that "an issue's chance of gaining prominence in the agenda are enhanced when problems interact with solutions and politics to produce a single package acceptable to policymakers."²⁸⁶ This is precisely what happened at Kananaskis with the African Action Plan (AAP).

i. Problem

The problem here was inadequate aid contributions on behalf of Canada, particularly in the 1990s and early 2000s. Under-development in African nations required increasing amounts of aid.²⁸⁷ At the turn of the millennium, much of Africa was continuing to fall behind in many areas of development. The disparity between the rich and the poor of Africa has been called "the greatest scandal of our age."²⁸⁸ The problems of underdevelopment, including high mortality rates, low access to education, and lack health care and sustainable livelihoods, were increasing in the era of globalization. Many African nations suffered with low life expectancy, staggering conflicts, fiscal crises,

²⁸⁴ Langdon, "NEPAD and the Renaissance of Africa," 251.

²⁸⁵ Travis and Zahariadis, "A Multiple Streams Model of U.S. Foreign Aid Policy," 495.

²⁸⁶ Ibid., 497.

²⁸⁷ There are many sources which can provide a detailed examination of the staggering development issues faced by African nations, particularly around the time of the Kananaskis summit. For instance: *Race Against Time* by Stephen Lewis (2005), *Inequality, Growth, and Poverty in an Era of Liberalization and Globalization* edited by Giovanni Andrea Cornia (2004), and *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learned and Directions for the Future*, edited by Finn Tarp (2000).

²⁸⁸ Commission for Africa, "Our Common Interest: Report of the Commission for Africa." *Commission for Africa*, Chaired by Tony Blair. March 2005. Available online: <<http://www.commissionforafrica.info/2005-report>>, 18. (11 August 2011).

extreme poverty, increases in illness and disease and deep-seated governance issues.²⁸⁹ While positive changes were gradually occurring in Africa over the years, by the turn of the millennium “the overall balance sheet seemed grim” and many countries continued to require aid.²⁹⁰ The following section addresses the three components of the problem stream, and argues that the dismal showing in Canadian development assistance was a problem in need of a solution.

a) Indicators

Indicators of problems come in many forms, including federal expenditures and studies conducted by government, academics, NGOs and think tanks.²⁹¹ Indications came through budgetary expenditures, studies and reports leading up to Kananaskis.

Federal Government Expenditures on Africa:

Canada’s commitment to African development at the onset of Chrétien’s Prime Ministership was minimal, particularly compared to Western nations of similar status.²⁹² At the turn of the century, Canadian aid to developing nations was at its lowest level in thirty-seven years.²⁹³ Between 1992 and 2002, aid to Africa had plummeted by 40%. Canada’s share of ODA had fallen every year since 1993, and by 2002 stood at a meagre 0.23%.²⁹⁴ These expenditures demonstrated that Canadian aid was diminishing despite the increased need for it worldwide. In a 2002 *International Journal* article, Andrew Cohen discussed Canada’s aid record, noting that Canada ranked number nineteen out of the twenty two OECD donor nations in 2001, with a total of 0.22 per cent of GNP allotted for aid. This was troubling given Canada’s vowed target of 0.7% of GNP just thirty years prior.²⁹⁵

Studies on Canadian Development Assistance:

The inadequacy of Canadian aid was highlighted in studies and reports. For instance, the Canadian medical community brought attention to the problem by publishing reports on underdevelopment on the African continent,

²⁸⁹ Chris Brown, “Africa in Canadian Foreign Policy 2000: The Human Security Agenda,” 197, Langdon, 245, and Lester R. Brown, “HIV Epidemic Restructuring Africa’s Population,” *World Watch Issue Alert*, October 31 2000. Available online: <http://www.earth-policy.org/index.php?/plan_b_updates/2000/alert10> (15 August 15 2011).

²⁹⁰ Langdon, 243.

²⁹¹ It is not the indicators themselves that are critical to the definition of problems, rather it is the individuals who advocate for specific problems as they “search for indicators to use to bolster their arguments...” Tomlin et al., 24.

²⁹² This is based on the Commitment to Development Index (CDI). The CDI “rates 22 rich countries on how much they help poor countries build prosperity, good government, and security. Each rich country gets scores in seven policy areas, which are averaged for an overall score.” Centre for Global Development, “Commitment to Development Index 2003.” *Centre for Global Development*. Available online: <<http://www.cgdev.org/doc/CDI/2009/score%20grids/CDI%202003%20Scores.pdf>> (1 July 2011.)

²⁹³ Cohen, “Seize the Day,” 147.

²⁹⁴ Trickey, “Africa Plan for G8 ‘lacks legitimacy...” A5.

²⁹⁵ Cohen, “Seize the Day,” 147.

noting that Canada had to do more to alleviate the problems.²⁹⁶ One of the most evident indicators of struggles in Africa came in the form of HIV/AIDS statistics. At the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS (UNGASS) (summer 2001), Canada committed over \$73 million dollars for HIV/AIDS programs in Africa and elsewhere. This represented “the highest point of engagement” of Canada with the AIDS epidemic.²⁹⁷ Canada became a leader in the response to combating AIDS; however “Canada’s overall levels of assistance remained far below [their] capacity.”²⁹⁸ Studies from the early 2000’s show that Canadians were well meaning in terms of aid policy, yet it ranked low on the list compared to other federal priorities. For many Canadians, ODA was viewed by as a “luxury.”²⁹⁹

b) Focusing Events

Focusing events call attention to a problem. They come in the form of crises or symbols or through the personal experience of someone in government. In this case, the turn of the millennium was itself a focusing event. Fifty years after African nations began achieving independence, many still struggled with poverty and underdevelopment. The Canadian media brought attention to poverty and underdevelopment in Africa, sensitizing large segments of the Canadian population to international development issues.³⁰⁰ Organized campaigns such as Make Poverty History and the Jubilee 2000 Campaign also brought attention to African issues.

In the early millennium, African underdevelopment became an issue that many celebrities became involved with. Well-known Canadians such as Jann Arden, Alex Trebek and Tom Cochrane drew attention to African causes and Canada’s role. Canadian-based mobilization efforts, such as the Kielburger brother’s social enterprise “Me to We,” brought awareness development issues. Academics and community activists such as Stephen Lewis were vocal on the spread of HIV/AIDS on the continent.³⁰¹ Chrétien noted that “Canada has long been a friend of

²⁹⁶ Examples include *Fatal Indifference: The G8, Africa and Global Health* by Ronald Labonte, David Sanders, Ted Schrecker (2004), “Foreign Aid Must Increase,” *The Star Phoenix* by Steven Gibb, Les McaPherson, Sarath Peiris and Lawrence Thoner (Saskatoon, Sask. 1 February 1999, A4), “More Aid for AIDS” by Ash Khan, *Calgary Herald*, Calgary, Alberta, 26 July 2001, A20, and “Illness Takes Heavy Toll in Third World,” by Edith Gvora (Times-Colonist, Victoria, British Columbia, 10 July 2000, A7.)

²⁹⁷ John W. Foster, “Canada and International Health: A Time of Testing on AIDS.” in *Canada Among Nations 2002: A Fading Power*, eds Normal Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot. (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford, 2002), 194.

²⁹⁸ Foster, 202.

²⁹⁹ Jean-Sébastien Rioux, “Canadian Official Development Assistance Policy: Juggling the National Interest and Humanitarian Impulses,” in Patrick James, Nelson Michaud, and Marc J. O’Reilly, eds., *Handbook of Canadian Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Lexington Books, 2006), 210.

³⁰⁰ For instance: Author Unknown. “Canada to stand behind United Nations at Millennium Summit.” *Sudbury Star*, Sudbury, Ontario. 6 September 2000, A11.

³⁰¹ HIV/AIDS itself has become a symbol of African underdevelopment, with the red ribbon and the Inspi[red] campaign being highly recognizable.

Africa...one million Canadians are of African descent.”³⁰² The African Diaspora in Canada brought attention to the government’s development efforts. African émigrés brought attention to the serious deficiencies in current aid programs and policies.³⁰³

Crises are also significant focusing events in the problem stream.³⁰⁴ African crises appeared frequently in the late 1990s, garnering media attention.³⁰⁵ The violence and human rights abuses occurring in countries such as Ethiopia, Somalia and Rwanda through the 1990s contributed to the growing awareness of African issues. A collective shame was felt by the world for failing to properly intervene during these catastrophes.³⁰⁶

Focusing events can come as a result of the personal experiences of bureaucrats and politicians. Chrétien had African experience, as did Canada’s G8 Sherpa, Robert Fowler.³⁰⁷ In 2001, Chrétien traveled to Africa to liaise with state leaders. This experience influenced the way that Chrétien presented issues to his government, his constituents and international audience. The French language facilitated an especially unique relationship with French West Africa. Chrétien had personal connections to Africa. His nephew and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Raymond Chrétien, was UN Secretary-General’s Special Envoy to Zaire (now the DRC) in fall of 1996. Jean Chrétien was made aware of the intensity of this crisis in part through his nephew, and he sent a Canadian army commander to Zaire to appraise the situation.³⁰⁸ Though no multinational force was sent to mitigate in Zaire, this example demonstrates that Chrétien was listening to feedback about Africa and was repeatedly brought face to face with symbols and crises which represented aspects of the problem.³⁰⁹ His personal experience was a focusing event, though the absence of meaningful action served to further demonstrate that Canada’s policies toward Africa required more work.

The UN Millennium Summit was held in September 2000, at which one hundred and forty seven countries declared their commitment to alleviating poverty in a sustainable way.³¹⁰ This focusing event drew attention to the severity of global underdevelopment and the monumental task of alleviating it. The “Millennium Development Goals” (MDGs) were created and committed to by 192 countries and aimed to decrease poverty and improve

³⁰² Chrétien, Jean, “Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien to the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.” Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Office of the Prime Minister*, Ottawa. 11 April 2002.

³⁰³ Individuals of African origin represent one of Canada’s largest non-European groupings. The number of Canadians with African origin rose 32% between 1996 and 2001. Canada. Statistics Canada, “The African Community in Canada.” Ottawa. August 2007. Available online: <<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-621-x/89-621-x2007010-eng.htm>> (1 August 2010).

³⁰⁴ Crises can lead to leaders taking symbolic action. The MS model dictates that even the *impression* that something is being done about a problem can be enough to satisfy people’s call for action.

³⁰⁵ Even so, it can be argued that the majority of African conflicts have been under reported.

³⁰⁶ “West ‘guilty’ over Rwandan Genocide.” *Cnn.com*. 6 April 2004. Available online: <<http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/africa/04/06/rwanda.dallaire/>> (Retrieved 2 September 2010).

³⁰⁷ Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 361.

³⁰⁸ Cohen, 153-4.

³⁰⁹ Norman Hillmer, *From Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World into the Twenty First Century*, 2nd ed. (Canada: Thomson Nelson, 2008), 321.

³¹⁰ Canada. Canadian International Development Agency, “Canada Making a Difference in the World: A Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness.”

people's quality of life by 2015.³¹¹ In response to this commitment, CIDA tied five key areas of development to the MDGs, focusing their efforts in a more targeted way.³¹²

Genoa itself was a focusing event. With NEPAD leaders in attendance, Genoa demonstrated that Africa needed more help from the G8. It created focus for the Liberal government and CIDA. Chrétien was keenly aware that the world would be watching as he took his turn at G8 host, particularly as he became pressured to retire. Expectations that Africa would be a priority at Kananaskis were high. Chrétien had to ensure that the political environment was receptive. He had to engineer a summit at which real progress was made, demonstrating that the G8 was a useful institution.³¹³ The pressure provided focus for Chrétien to facilitate the AAP policy created at Genoa.

c) Feedback

Feedback demonstrates that a problem exists and that action is required. It comes through the assessment of existing programs and operations. Feedback regarding the inadequacies of Canadian ODA came from a number of sources. For instance, NGOs expressed their dissatisfaction through media appearances, protests and published reports on the Canadian government's aid programs.³¹⁴

Feedback came from constituent letters, opinion pieces, and editorials in newspapers authored by academics and community members. Such feedback asserted that, though Canada had a reputation as "peacekeeper," it failed to live up to this acclaim, even as "popular sentiments continued to support Canadian engagement with the complex humanitarian crises of the post-Cold War era" and Canada sought to regain its image as "the world's Boy Scouts."

³¹⁵ Canadians wanted to live up to the reputation as a "helping" nation, a reputation that was diminishing in the eyes of other countries.³¹⁶ Through indicators, focusing events and feedback, it became clear that Canada's internationally standing was slipping.

³¹¹ The MDG's are as follows: 1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, 2. Achieve universal primary education, 3. Promote gender equality and empower women, 4. Reduce child mortality, 5. Improve maternal health, 6. Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other diseases, 7. Ensure environmental sustainability, 8. Develop a global partnership for development. United Nations Development Programme, "About the MDG's: Basics. What are the Millennium Development Goals?" United Nations Development Programme. Available online: <<http://www.undp.org/mdg/basics.shtml>> (4 July 2009).

³¹² Canada. Canadian International Development Agency, "Millennium Development Goals: What are the Millennium Development Goals?" Ottawa. September, 2010. Available online: <<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/mdgs>> (1 January 2011).

³¹³ For example, see: Joe Lamar, 'G8 Countries Accused of Ignoring Debt Relief.' *BMJ: British Medical Journal* 321 no. 7257 (5 August 2000), 320; Antholis, William J., "Pragmatic 'Engagement or Photo Op: What Will the G-8 Become?' *Washington Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (Summer 2001), 213-226 and, Bayne, *Staying Together: The G8 Confronts the 21st Century*.

³¹⁴ For example, the Canadian Council of Churches was vocal in its disappointment in regards to CIDA cuts to aid in Africa in the 1990s. Morrison, 373. Cranford Pratt also discusses NGO criticisms of government aid programs (though CIDA) in his book, *Canadian International Development Assistance Policies: An Appraisal*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), 103, 110-111.

³¹⁵ Hillmer and Granatstein, 320.

³¹⁶ This view is echoed in many places, for instance: Jason Kirby, "Canada's foreign aid, military need cash now, analyst says: Budget cuts threaten country's reputation." *Edmonton Journal*. Edmonton, Alberta. Nov 7, 1999 B.4 and Mike Blanchfield, "Military criticized for rhetoric on peace: Canada accused of 'speaking loudly and carrying a bent twig.'" *The Ottawa Citizen*. Ottawa, Ont.: Mar 23, 2011. A.1.

ii. Policy

The policy stream is where policy alternatives are articulated and discussed. Kingdon contends that ideas do not get adopted because they are new, but rather because their time has come.

a) The Monterrey Consensus and the Canada Fund for Africa

In the early 2000s, the inadequacy of development efforts of the G8 loomed large in the public eye. The Canadian government initiated two efforts designed to increase aid to Africa: the funds promised at Monterrey Conference, and the creation of the Canada Fund for Africa. Both demonstrated that Canada was committed to African development.

At Kananaskis, G8 leaders announced that half of the funds promised at Monterrey would be directed to Africa. The AAP and the Monterrey Consensus were closely tied—the AAP was a driving factor for, and the main beneficiary from, Monterrey.³¹⁷ The decision of how much of the Monterrey commitment would go to African aid was a contentious one. In a 2002 North-South Institute report, author Roy Culpeper pointed to “deep division” between G8 nations apparent in the final AAP document.³¹⁸ It reads: “we believe that in aggregate half or more of our new development assistance *could* [emphasis added] be directed to African nations that govern justly, invest in their own people and promote economic freedom.”³¹⁹ This meant that the amount of money dedicated to Africa could be less than the \$6 billion promised. Culpeper deemed the commitment inadequate to meet the needs of impoverished African nations.³²⁰ Nevertheless, the Monterrey Consensus was a powerful policy response to NEPAD by Canada. It provided Chrétien with a highly publicised venue to demonstrate his government’s commitment to increasing ODA. It also demonstrated the G8’s commitment to the MDGs.

The Canada Fund for Africa was a commitment to improve aid to Africa. It financed initiatives announced at the end of the Kananaskis summit. The Fund was Canada-specific, and therefore not specifically “Kananaskis deliverable.”³²¹ But Chrétien felt it important that, “as host and chair of the process that led to the creation of the APP, he “walk the talk; in terms of putting the brave words of the AAP into immediate, significant and far-reaching action.”³²² He led by example, demonstrating high level leadership and working to ensure that the G8

This view is discussed at length in Andrew Cohen’s *While Canada Slept: How we lost our place in the world*. (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, Ltd., 2003).

³¹⁷ Fowler, 235.

³¹⁸ Roy Culpeper, “Foreword: African Report: Assessing the New Partnership.” *North-South Institute*. Papers presented at a conference held in Nairobi, Kenya, April 30 to May 2, 2002. Available online: <http://www.nsi-ins.ca/english/pdf/africa_report/forward_e.pdf>, 2.

³¹⁹ Group of Eight, “G8 Africa Action Plan” *G8 Research Group*. Kananaskis Summit June 27th 2002. Available online: <<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/africaplan.html>> (3 August 2011).

³²⁰ Culpeper, 2.

³²¹ All of the AAP commitments were nation-specific, and none were coordinated through the G8.

³²² Robert Fowler, “Canadian Leadership and the Kananaskis G-8 Summit: Towards a Less Self-Centred Foreign Policy.” in *Canada Among Nations: Coping with the American Colossus*, eds David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson and Norman Hillmer. (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2003), 231.

adopted the AAP. A “truly impressive package of projects and policy prescriptions,” the Fund was an indication that the Canadian government was committed to “making the AAP a living reality.”³²³

Around the same time, Canada unveiled other initiatives designed to support the AAP. In June 2002, Chrétien announced that, in the spirit of the NEPAD, Canada would open its markets to nearly all products from LDCs beginning in 2003. He also communicated Canada’s intention of doubling its investment in education in Africa by 2005. Chrétien remained determined to “follow through on [Canada’s] commitment to untie its official development assistance and to deliver aid more effectively on the basis of country-driven strategies and priorities.”³²⁴

b) The African Action Plan

Using both economic and political measures, the AAP drew comparisons with the post-World War II Marshall Plan. Affirmed at Kananaskis, the AAP was very much in line with CIDA’s 2001 document *Strengthening Aid Effectiveness*, which emphasized more tightly focused aid sectors and better coordination with the donor community.³²⁵ Calling NEPAD a “bold and clear sighted vision of African development,” the G8 designed the AAP to “encourage the imaginative effort that underlies NEPAD and to lay a solid foundation for future co-operation.”³²⁶ The AAP had the power to steer the response of eight of the world’s richest nations to the challenge of underdevelopment. It concentrated on two areas of political concern and six economic areas.³²⁷ It covered many areas of development and addressed resource mobilization, peace and security, governance and human resources and was designed as a “road map” to develop a sustainable partnership with Africa.³²⁸ It included provisions for good governance, while supporting citizens of states with poor governance structures³²⁹. Through the AAP, the G8 addressed NEPAD and confronted far-reaching and underlying aspects of development, and committed to work with NEPAD’s principles, with a focus on rewarding countries adhering to its spirit.³³⁰

³²³ Fowler, “Canadian Leadership and the Kananaskis G-8 Summit: Towards a Less Self-Centred Foreign Policy.” 231.

³²⁴ Ibid.

³²⁵ Prior to this, Canada’s foreign aid was widely dispersed. In 2002, Canada was spending aid in every African nation other than Libya, yet were not among the top three donors in any African nation other than Swaziland and Gabon. Black, “From Kananaskis to Gleneagles,” 11.

³²⁶ Group of Eight, “G8 Africa Action Plan.”

³²⁷ These areas are as follows: Peace and security, good governance, trade and investment, debt relief, expanding knowledge, improving health, agriculture and water resources. Bayne, *Staying Together*, 132.

³²⁸ Group of Eight, “G8 Africa Action Plan” and Fowler, 228.

³²⁹ The AAP statement reads: “While we will focus particular attention on enhanced-partnership countries, we will also work with countries that do not yet meet the standards of NEPAD but which are clearly committed to and working towards its implementation. We will not work with governments which disregard the interests and dignity of their people. However, as a matter of strong principle, our commitment to respond to situations of humanitarian need remains universal and is independent of particular regimes.” Group of Eight, “G8 African Action Plan,” Paragraph 7 & 8. <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/afraction-e.pdf>>

³³⁰ Fowler, 229.

Chrétien faced a great deal of pressure to develop a policy acceptable to not only the G8 leaders, but also to the G8's domestic constituents and NEPAD leaders. He succeeded in getting all G8 members to sign on to the AAP, though he failed to get a firm commitment to direct fifty per cent of the money promised at Monterrey to Africa. The vague promises of the AAP had some summit watchers sceptical about the lasting impact of the plan.

c) Consensus-Building and Softening Up: Persuasion and Diffusion

Building consensus and softening up individuals to an idea are key elements of the policy process. Consensus is built through persuasions and diffusion. Diffusion occurs through “bandwagoning.”³³¹ Softening up is necessary for a policy proposal to be taken seriously by those in government.³³² Much of this occurs in the “policy soup” of policy communities, which Kingdon likens to the evolutionary process, and which is discussed further below.³³³ At Genoa, NEPAD creators were able to build consensus around the importance of supporting the partnership by presented their policy to the G8.³³⁴ In the lead-up to Kananaskis, Chrétien and his government devoted resources to persuading G8 members to support the AAP. Chrétien created APRs, who were also instrumental in this process. Canada helped soften up the G8 to the idea of NEPAD through its role as “interlocutor.”³³⁵

Chrétien's priorities at Kananaskis, particularly in the area of development, coincided with former Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy's emphasis on human security—an issue which had received attention in the late 1990s and early 2000s. This emphasis was visible in the AAP, and Axworthy's achievements were responsible for much of the softening up and consensus-building that occurred in Canada.

Canadian Sherpa and APR Fowler was in an extraordinary position to create consensus on African development policy.³³⁶ He recalled that, “in view of the evident dissatisfaction with normal communications methods and channels, we established an extraordinary outreach program”: The Canadian government conducted public consultations for ten months between Genoa and Kananaskis, to combat the perception that the G8 was an unresponsive instrument lacking transparency.³³⁷ The consultations “reached into most population centres across Canada,” building consensus and softening up Canadians to the Canada Fund, Monterrey Consensus and AAP.³³⁸ Canada also reached out to the NGO community, conducting consultations abroad.³³⁹ Chrétien travelled to six

³³¹ This diffusion has been described as a “growing realization” or a “widespread feeling.” Kingdon, 140-1.

³³² Softening up is often necessary in policy communities, as policy communities can be slow and even resistant to change.

³³³ Kingdon, 116.

³³⁴ Italia, Ministero degli Affari Esteri. ‘Genoa Plan for Africa.’

³³⁵ Van der Westerhuizen, 371.

³³⁶ Kirton and Kokotsis. “The G8 From Genoa to Kananaskis and Beyond: Performance, Prospects and Potential.” 11.

³³⁷ Fowler, “Canadian Leadership,” 225.

³³⁸ Ibid.

³³⁹ Ibid.

African nations in the spring of 2002, and met with members of the Commonwealth and la Francophonie.³⁴⁰ He also attended meetings of the Economic Commission for Africa and the Organization for African Unity in Ethiopia. He made appeals “all over the world in support of the African centrepiece of the Kananaskis agenda.”³⁴¹ An April 2002 meeting in Dakar, Senegal was opened by Chrétien, who took the opportunity to assure delegates “that Africa remains a focus area of the G8.”³⁴²

The APRs also worked to create consensus, holding six meetings in between Genoa and Kananaskis, at which members of NEPAD Steering Group and NEPAD’s Heads of State Implementation Committee were often present. The APRs met with the African diplomatic corps, as well as civil society representatives, to discuss the AAP. They held national consultations to build consensus for the policy proposals and to establish dialogue. Fowler met with 105 organizations and 121 groups and individuals to discuss Canada and the G8’s policy to Africa. Fowler noted that “the centrality of the African initiative was widely, even fervently, supported...”³⁴³ The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade conducted hearings across Canada on the Kananaskis meeting. Minister of Foreign Affairs Bill Graham and Governor General Adrienne Clarkson worked to build consensus, even as the summit itself was taking place.³⁴⁴ The work of Chrétien and other high ranking officials displayed a personal investment in the AAP.

The Decision-Making Agenda and the Governmental Agenda:

The governmental agenda is comprised of general issues to which people in and around government pay attention. The decision making agenda is where matters up for active decision are found. Typically, it is where solutions are developed, and where softening up occurs. Once an issue has risen past the governmental agenda onto the decision making agenda, organized political forces begin to shape policy and its outcomes.³⁴⁵ The problem of weak development assistance had been on the Canadian decision-making agenda for decades. After Canada’s fiscal standings improved, and the country became a signatory to the UN MDGs, increasing ODA to developing countries rose to the governmental agenda. The Canada Fund for Africa and the Monterrey Consensus were two policies which moved from the decision-making agenda to the governmental agenda relatively swiftly. The AAP moved nearly as fast. The decision and governmental agenda changed post-9/11, because increased attention was paid to international affairs. Politics and security were “suddenly on everyone’s agenda...” 9/11 helped to propel African development to the governmental agenda, while at the same time threatening to take the attention off of

³⁴⁰ Chrétien travelled to the following countries: Morocco, Algeria, South Africa, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Senegal.

³⁴¹ Fowler. “Canadian Leadership,” 227-228.

³⁴² *Ibid.*, 227.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁵ Tomlin et al., 25.

development and on to terrorism.³⁴⁶ Ideas are created, altered and destroyed in the policy stream. The Canada Fund and the Monterrey consensus survived because they were supported by Canadians and the wider policy community. The AAP survived after going through the policy process. It “bumped up” against other ideas, evolving along the way before developing into its final form.

iii. Politics

Politics is the third stream of the MS model. Developments here have the most powerful impact on agendas. Elements of the stream include public opinion, national mood, organized political forces, and political turnover and jurisdiction. Consensus-building occurs in this stream as well, through bargaining and coalition building. It is here where the G8’s partnership with NEPAD became a reality.

a) Swings in National Mood:

Government officials gather opinions through mail, phone calls, social movements, media, lobbyists and polls, and other sources. These indicators, cumulatively called “the national mood” provide fertile ground for ideas.³⁴⁷ People in and around government are sensitive to national mood because it can affect policy agendas and political outcomes. It also serves as a constraint on policy alternatives, as ideas are judged in the court of public opinion. National mood was certainly a factor in this case. Canadian views on ODA had shifted since the early 1990s, when fiscal restraint was practiced. Individuals were paying increased attention to G8 decisions, in part because of 9/11.³⁴⁸ Through focusing events, the dire situation of less developed nations had come to the public’s attention. Chrétien wanted the G8 to produce better results under his leadership. Moreover, as his political career reached its twilight, many speculated that a legacy-minded Chrétien wanted to be remembered for contributions to the international community.³⁴⁹

National mood is observed through public polling. A winter 2002 poll in Canadian news magazine *Maclean’s* asked Canadians for their opinions on the Kananaskis summit. Readers were asked if, with protests expected at the meeting, the summit should proceed as scheduled.³⁵⁰ Seventy-seven per cent of respondents said meetings should proceed; only twenty one per cent advocated them being cancelled.³⁵¹ When asked about a

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 193.

³⁴⁷ Tomlin et al., 25.

³⁴⁸ Bayne, *Staying Together*, 135.

³⁴⁹ “Here’s a legacy within the PM’s reach: It is better to prove one’s integrity than to trumpet it.” *National Post*. Don Mills, Ontario.: 27 April 2002, A.23.

³⁵⁰ The entirety of the question read: “Government leaders from the industrialized world are meeting in Alberta in June to discuss world trade issues. With anti-globalization protesters threatening to disrupt these meetings, there is a possibility of violent confrontations between police and protesters. Should the meetings . . . a) go ahead as scheduled or b) be cancelled?” “*Maclean’s* Year-End Poll: Since September 11th.” *Maclean’s* 114 (31 December 2001-January 2002), 38.

³⁵¹ It is possible that some of those polled may have also been influenced by the Prime Minister’s earlier decision to move the summit from Ottawa to Kananaskis, as a response to security concerns.

confrontation between the police and protestors, the majority of respondents sided with police.³⁵² Polls like these may have influenced the Canadian government's decision to forge ahead with the summit.

Historically, Canadians have been supportive of ODA—at least in theory. Even as governments changed, sentiments regarding ODA remain largely consistent. “As aid budgets were slashed in the 1990s”, observed Tomlin et al., “only a small majority of Canadians favoured an increase in them, although a strong majority continued to express their support for the general principle of development assistance.”³⁵³ But this discord between what constituents claimed to want, and what was favoured when it came to hard fiscal times, was felt profoundly by the government. Fowler observed that, at the turn of the 21st century, “Africa became once again a legitimate area of endeavour. Concern for Africa had become respectable. Afro-pessimism was no longer in vogue. The perception of Africa's need changed from that of a desperate situation beyond repair to a challenge and rallying cry to the rest of the world.”³⁵⁴ This sentiment was encouraging for the success of the Canada Fund, the Monterrey Consensus and the AAP. A shift in national mood, coupled with healthier economic times, resulted in increased aid for Africa becoming more likely.

b) Public Opinion:

Public opinion has a profound effect on the political stream. The media influences the political stream, and in particular public opinion, in many ways. Most people are removed from the daily occurrences of foreign policy, and learn of events through the media. Media impacts the volume of Canadian ODA and how it is spent. It is a channel through which to observe national mood and public opinion.³⁵⁵ The media presents a particular view of the developing world to Canadians and due to gaps in reporting, “few Canadians were aware of the spending cuts that occurred” in the late 21st century.³⁵⁶ This can result in the public overestimating levels of aid spending and lead to biased opinions on the need to increased or decreased foreign aid.³⁵⁷ Tomlin et al. report that, “as a barometer of national mood, the Canadian media's view of ODA has generally been one of indifference except when crises or scandals have erupted to make headlines.”³⁵⁸ Opinion data from 2001 showed that 76.4% of Canadians believed that it was “important to provide assistance to poor countries” and 53% of Canadians thought that “Canada should

³⁵² When asked “When a violent confrontation between police and anti-globalization protestors does take place, do you tend to blame the police more or the protestors?” 13 per cent said the police, while 63 per cent said the protestors. Ibid.

³⁵³ Tomlin et al., 173.

³⁵⁴ Fowler, 221.

³⁵⁵ Martin draws parallels between the miniscule amounts of Canadian coverage about Africa to the cuts to CIDA. Erica Martin, “The Impact of the News Media in Shaping Canadian Development Assistance Policy.” *Undercurrent*, Volume II, No. 2 (2005), 32-34.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., 31.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Tomlin, 174.

increase the amount of aid that the nation currently provides.”³⁵⁹ Data such as this can influence government and the decisions they make, and the actions they take through instruments such as the G8.

The G8 has endeavoured to appear more inclusive. By inviting outside leaders and organizations, it has strengthened how it is viewed politically. Greater inclusion led to increased political legitimacy for the summit.³⁶⁰ By 2002, public opinion about the summit had changed. This was due to many factors, including the terrorist attacks of 9/11, after which people were perhaps more likely to trust the state, as they faced the outside threats of violence. After the violence of Genoa, some questioned the need for the G8, especially considering the perceived costs and absence of results. The G8 was eager to move past its troubled image, and 9/11 served to galvanize many of the G8’s domestic constituencies. Terrorist threats influenced the national mood and public opinion, deepening and broadening a “sense of common vulnerability,” and reinforcing the “global centrality of G-7/8 institutions in responding to such common enemies”.³⁶¹ This placed a “premium on Canada’s role as incoming chair” and motivated the political powers of the G8 to create a more benevolent image.³⁶²

c) Election Results, Change in Administration, Turnover and Change:

Election results and turnovers in administration have a serious impact on the political stream. A turnover can bring new agenda items to the table. In the G8, turnover occurred through the predictable, yearly change of the G8 host. There was also potential turnover within the Canadian government: Chrétien faced serious pressure from members of his own party to relinquish power. Creating a political legacy was, according to some, in the forefront of Chrétien’s mind as he engineered the Kananaskis agenda. Building a partnership with NEPAD through the AAP represented a potential legacy-making policy. This might have been one of Chrétien’s motives for working so hard on the African issue, despite having relatively little interest in foreign policy in the preceding years. A *lack* of turnover was also influential in this stream. Too much turnover can be a detrimental occurrence.³⁶³ The same leaders from Genoa attended Kananaskis; the sole newcomer was EU President, José María Aznar. The NEPAD leaders were at both Genoa and Kananaskis, though in 2002 they took part as full participants instead of observers. This continuity was integral to the success of the summit and AAP.

Chrétien was one of the most experienced of G8 leaders. He had hosted a successful summit in Halifax (1995). He was among the most seasoned politicians of the group, involved in national politics since 1963 and having attended his first G-7 meeting as Finance Minister in 1978. In fact, each of the G8 leaders had a relatively

³⁵⁹ Noel A.J. Thérien and S. Dallaire, “Divided Over Internationalism: The Canadian Public and Development Assistance,” *Canadian Public Policy* 30, no. 1 (March 2004), 33.

³⁶⁰ Kirton, 220.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 213.

³⁶² *Ibid.*

³⁶³ Kingdon, 79.

large pool of political experience to draw from. This experience was important, as electoral uncertainty and leader inexperience can distract leaders.³⁶⁴

d) Organized Political Forces:

Organized political forces include interest group campaigns, the behaviour of political elites, and political mobilization. It is here that interests align. When parties agree on policy, powerful momentum can develop. NEPAD was an important organized political force, driven by African leaders. By allowing outsiders to take part in summit proceedings, the G8 demonstrated its commitment to work with others to create an enhanced partnership.³⁶⁵ The Sherpas were also an organized political force. Preparation conducted by the Sherpas permitted the heads of government to reach agreements in a short period of time, with logistics already decided upon.

NGOs were also notable political forces. The G8 received a great deal of attention from these groups. Pressure group campaigns advocating increased funds to Africa have often been spearheaded by NGOs.³⁶⁶ Groups such as Oxfam and Make Poverty History promoted policies of debt forgiveness, increased trade liberalization and development programmes on G8 members, including Canada. NGOs drew the attention of politicians, media and those in government to the need for increased development assistance to Africa. Having long exerted influence on government, they worked to bring awareness to issues and generate policy alternatives. Dating back to the Birmingham summit (1998), the G8 has made a point of meeting with NGOs prior to and even during summit meetings.³⁶⁷ Chrétien took pains to ensure that they were included in the dialogue leading to the summit.³⁶⁸

An important element of organized political forces is political mobilization, meaning the way in which “political actors attempt to influence the distribution of power.”³⁶⁹ Chrétien’s international experience, domestic popularity, and “home court advantage” allowed him to mobilize the G8 to create an effectual response to the NEPAD. Additionally, at the time of Genoa and Kananaskis, the G7/8 was becoming a more balanced multilateral instrument: “capabilities [had] become more equal with the revival of Russia, the relatively strong growth of Canada and Britain, the plunge of the United States into a sharpened recession since 11 September, the further fall of a long stagnant Japan, and significant economic slowdown in third ranked Germany.”³⁷⁰ The result was that

³⁶⁴ Kirton, “A Fading Power,” 222.

³⁶⁵ Fowler, 219.

³⁶⁶ Tomlin, 174.

³⁶⁷ Bayne, 207.

³⁶⁸ “Press Briefing-- MAY 6, 2002 - The G8 and Africa: The civil society's point of view,” *Canada NewsWire*. Ottawa: 2 May 2002.

³⁶⁹ Brigitta Nedelmann, “Individuals and Parties—Changes in Processes of Political Mobilization,” *European Sociological Review* 3, no. 3 (December 1987), 181.

³⁷⁰ Kirton, 219.

Canada was able to secure a more influential position within the group and better mobilize political forces to secure the outcomes that it desired.³⁷¹

Consensus-building: bargaining and coalition building

Consensus in the political stream is achieved through bargaining and coalition-building. As in the policy stream, “once adherents of a particular alternative have grown sufficiently in number, then the balance of support will tip overwhelmingly in the direction of that option.”³⁷² Concessions are granted in return for supporting a particular policy. Chrétien was able to point to his own strong domestic policies, therein demonstrating his political resolve to follow through with policies benefiting Africa. This gave him legitimacy when he urged others to do the same. He attempted to portray aid dollars to Africa as an investment, as opposed to pure charity.³⁷³ By creating a dialogue with NEPAD leaders, consensus was built beyond the G8.

The threat of terrorism also created consensus in this stream. International security was high on the agenda. Consensus was built as the link between terrorism and poverty was made. At the United Nations headquarters in 2002, Chrétien argued persuasively for the AAP:

Helping Africa get on it [sic] feet is in our interest from the perspective of our common humanity. From the perspective of creating a more prosperous world with new markets. And it is profoundly in our self-interest from the point of view of our own security. We have seen it right here in New York with tragic consequences that can result from failed states in far away places. Simply put...we can't afford not to address these issues. It is time to act. NEPAD is the blueprint. The rest is simply a matter of political will.³⁷⁴

This demonstrates how Chrétien built consensus in different ways, depending on his audience. Here he depicted aid to Africa as a way to increase economic prosperity, and to mitigate terrorism emerging from the developing world.

The G8 is unique in its ability to establish “linkages between topics” and striking “cross-issue deals” among member nations.³⁷⁵ These cross-issue agreements, often achieved through intense bargaining, were the “highest form of cooperation at the summit.”³⁷⁶ Cooperation was evident in the AAP.³⁷⁷ The G8 had to overcome divides in

³⁷¹ Ibid.

³⁷² Tomlin et al., 25.

³⁷³ Chrétien, *My Life as Prime Minister*, 362.

³⁷⁴ Jean Chrétien, “Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien to the United Nations Security Council on the Occasion of the United Nations General Assembly High-Level Plenary Debate on the NEPAD.” New York, September 16th 2002. Office of the Prime Minister. Ottawa.

³⁷⁵ Bayne, 219.

³⁷⁶ Ibid.

³⁷⁷ Consensus-building and bargaining occurred in other areas as well, including the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) programme and the desire for a clean-up and disposal of nuclear material and chemical weapons in Russia, where President Bush reaching a compromise with EU leadership. In this case, the Americans wanted an agreement on cleaning up nuclear and chemical weapons. The

political philosophies, for example, between those more liberal in their politics (among them Canada and the UK) and those with more right leaning tendencies (such as France and the US). Chrétien had to create consensus with G8 members and in particular Russia, Japan, the US and Germany. He had to compromise and bargain with nations with other priorities.³⁷⁸ Just days before the summit, US President George W. Bush made a highly-publicised speech on the Middle East in which he suggested replacing President Yasser Arafat. This speech, and his focus on security in the region, was viewed as a distraction from Africa. Chrétien worked with Bush to find common ground, and by linking terrorism to underdevelopment in Africa.³⁷⁹ Creating relationships with other leaders was important in this case, particularly as, in the case of the AAP, the direct interventions of the G8 leaders were necessary.³⁸⁰

Supporting the AAP allowed leaders to appear responsive to pressures to improve development to Africa and to rehabilitate the G8's tarnished image. A G8 government raising serious objections to NEPAD or the AAP might have faced criticisms, appearing unconcerned with matters of underdevelopment in Africa.

The Canadian government was determined to see the AAP policy adopted by the G8, becoming "so energetic in advocating NEPAD that various Africa civil society groups and parliamentarians became suspicious that this was really a Canadian set of proposals being circulated through key African leaders!" Chrétien attempted to create consensus among the parties, downplaying differences and creating unity. While there was some split on what the G8 response to the NEPAD entailed, Chrétien created cohesion and consensus amongst the G98 members and other concerned parties.³⁸¹

5.2 Policy Entrepreneur and the Policy Window

A PE couples the streams and pushes them through an open policy window. Entrepreneurs identify problems, shaping how they are viewed and interpreted by those making the decisions.³⁸² PEs can be found anywhere; however a claim to hearing is central to his or her success. PEs are frequently found in and around government and policy communities. These individuals invest resources, time and money advocating for their preferred solution. Typically, the PE is someone in or near government, but is rarely the head of government. In this case, Chrétien was optimally placed to act as PE, and the evidence shows that he performed that role. The study of a head of government as PE is a unique contribution to the MS model.

EU, Canada and Japan wanted a US commitment on the HIPC programme. The two sides were able to concede to the others wish in order to both get their desired policy pushed through. Bayne, 203.

³⁷⁸ Mike Trickey, "Africa still G8 key: PM But President Bush's road map for Mideast is bound to be hot topic." *The Gazette*. Montreal, Quebec.: 26 June 2002, A.13.

³⁷⁹ Chris Varcoe and Grant Robertson with files from Tom Maloney and Joe Paraskevas, "PM backs Bush peace plan: Chrétien offers qualified support as Mideast muscles way onto G-8 agenda." *Calgary Herald*. Calgary, Alberta, 26 June 2002, A.1.

³⁸⁰ Bayne, 203.

³⁸¹ Fife, "Aid a 'turning point' for Africa..."

³⁸² Kirton, 104.

The success of a G8 summit depends on the leaders who design and execute it.³⁸³ As summit host, Jean Chrétien bore this responsibility. Many have professed surprise at his “sudden” interest in Africa, yet it was not impulsive as some have claimed. Chrétien’s political involvement in Africa can be traced to the mid-1990s. Chrétien attended his first summit as Prime Minister in 1994 in Naples, Italy. From then on, he was “constantly talking about Africa, raising its crises, and pushing for action.”³⁸⁴ At the 1997 Denver summit, he “led the discussion on the political issues facing Africa and pressed the United States and the European Union to improve their preferential tariff regimes to help integrate the Africans into the global economy” with the support of Blair and Chirac.³⁸⁵ As the domestic budget crises subsided, development assistance to Africa received more attention from Chrétien. He put more focus on Africa, and he voiced regret regarding cuts to African ODA during the 1990s.³⁸⁶

Why did Chrétien focus on Africa to such an unprecedented extent?³⁸⁷ He might have viewed formalizing a solid Canadian development policy towards African as his legacy. Furthermore, Canadians clearly wanted ODA to be a key part of foreign policy. Canada’s leadership in Africa “conformed with and reinforced a ‘human internationalist’ self-image that has enjoyed substantial and longstanding appeal among the Canadian public and Canadian elites.”³⁸⁸ Canada was in a unique place to help—both as a member of the Commonwealth and la Francophonie, and as a G8 nation. Canada had a rather “benign image” in Africa.³⁸⁹ A plan for Africa was already partially constructed at Genoa, making Chrétien’s work easier, and other leaders were also enthusiastic about the plan. As host, Chrétien was in an ideal position to engineer a response to NEPAD.

Chrétien’s personal interest in Africa led him to be an entrepreneur. When he entered office, he “became absorbed in the issues of Africa, not least because all but a few African nations are members of either the Commonwealth or la francophonie.”³⁹⁰ He reflected that “the more I met with their leaders, the more involved I became in their agendas, the more I wanted Canada to help.”³⁹¹ Hosting the summit gave him the opportunity to shift the focus “onto real matters of governance.”³⁹² But Chrétien faced many challenges. He needed to secure the required resources for financing the AAP. He had to convince the other G8 leaders, among them President Bush, of the merit of the AAP. He to ensure that terrorism did not take center stage, in turn relegating Africa to a minor issue. He had to convince the media, civil society and the general public of the importance of the plan. Finally, he

³⁸³ Kingdon, “Canada as a Principal Summit Power,” 211.

³⁸⁴ Chrétien, *My Life as Prime Minister*, 357.

³⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁸⁶ Tomlin, 197 and Chrétien, *My Life as Prime Minister*, 360.

³⁸⁷ In a 2002 paper, Black claims that the focus on Africa at Kananaskis was unprecedented in summit history. David Black, “Canada, the G8 and Africa: The Rise and Decline of a Hegemonic Project?” 9.

³⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

³⁸⁹ This came largely as a result of Canada never having possessed colonies in the region. *Ibid.*

³⁹⁰ Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 356.

³⁹¹ *Ibid.*

³⁹² Lawrence Martin, 379.

had to foster consensus between the G8 and the African leaders. While he may not have succeeded on all of these fronts, Chrétien's efforts were instrumental in securing support for the AAP.

A successful PE recognises and seizes opportunities. Chrétien realized that Kananaskis was an optimal chance to create change. He endeavoured to ensure that leaders were supportive of the AAP, and attempted to mediate between parties to ensure that this unity was accomplished.³⁹³ As "chief architect" of the broad reforms for Africa tabled at Kananaskis, Chrétien used "will and skill" to bring Bush on board with the African initiatives.³⁹⁴ The Canadian Prime Minister also used his adeptness at summit diplomacy to create consensus and cohesiveness.³⁹⁵ Though his approach at summits can be described as "low key," his experience with summits was beneficial in achieving his goals.³⁹⁶

Reflecting on Kananaskis, Chrétien explained that, "Canada decided to devote a whole day to discussing Africa and the NEPAD process, even though we knew that the Americans weren't comfortable with the subject."³⁹⁷ Chrétien's determination to pursue this "pet solution," is indicative of his behaviour as a PE. Typically, the majority of the planning and preparation takes place in the months prior to the G8 summit and is engineered largely by the leaders' ministers and policy makers. Chrétien's high level of involvement was the exception. He kept the agenda focused on Africa in the transition from Genoa to Kananaskis. His 2002 trip to Africa lent legitimacy and conviction to his goals. Chrétien took the lead in making African development the highest priority at Kananaskis, and was called the "unrivalled dean of the club at Kananaskis."³⁹⁸ Those who worked with Chrétien at the time reported he had a "strong sense of identification with issues of poverty in Africa."³⁹⁹ The path for Africa had been partially set at Genoa, and he was determined to follow it through, the way "he had long felt it should."⁴⁰⁰ He tied the issue of terrorism to the issue of development, so as to not lose sight of either. This is demonstrative of his ability to keep the emphasis on the chosen agenda.⁴⁰¹ In making the link between terrorism, poverty and underdevelopment (regardless of the credibility and reality of this link⁴⁰²), Chrétien was able to draw other leaders to supporting the AAP by presenting it as not only a solution to many of Africa's problems.

³⁹³ Chrétien mentions the need to mediate between Chirac and Bush, in particular. Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 359.

³⁹⁴ Barry Wood, "Ready for a New G8?" *Europe* (417), June 2002, 18 and Kirton, 222.

³⁹⁵ Keating (2006) reports that during his time in office, Chrétien attended more than fifty summit meetings, averaging more than five per year. Keating, 129-130

³⁹⁶ Ibid.

³⁹⁷ Chrétien, *My Years as Prime Minister*, 359.

³⁹⁸ Langdon, 249 and Kirton, 222.

³⁹⁹ Kirton, 222.

⁴⁰⁰ Kirton, "Canada as Principal Summit Power," 223.

⁴⁰¹ Karns and Mingst, 405.

⁴⁰² Tracing the links between terrorism and underdevelopment has been explored by authors such as Alan B. Krueger and Jitka Malecková, "Does Poverty Cause Terrorism?" *New Republic* 226, no. 2 (24 June 2002), 27-33, Gary Helleiner, Gary, 'Keynote Address to the National Forum on Canadian Foreign Policy,' *National Forum on Africa*. Montreal: 9 February. Available online: <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/helleiner/020209HelleinerAddress.pdf>> (10 June 2011) and K. von Hippel in "The Roots of Terrorism: Probing the Myths." *Political Quarterly* Supplement 1, no. 73 (August 2002), 25-39.

Many were sceptical about the timing of Chrétien's newfound interest in Africa and observed that he had no particular interest in the region until the end of his political career. Van Westuizen (2003) argued that "Chrétien's personal interest in NEPAD was consistent with a pattern often displayed in the twilight years of a Prime Minister."⁴⁰³ Chrétien's lobbying has been portrayed as a thinly-veiled attempt to garner respect and preserve or shape his reputation. In his 2003 Chrétien biography *Iron Man: The Defiant Reign of Jean Chretien* (2003), Lawrence Martin notes that, to critics, the Prime Minister's desire to have the AAP adopted by the G8 had the "desperate look of a Chrétien-come-lately to salvage some respect, especially given the heavy cuts in foreign aid in his early years in power."⁴⁰⁴ Cohen (2004) claimed that "All of a sudden, Jean Chrétien discovered Africa...It held no attraction for him in his first eight and a half years of stewardship...So behold Saint Jean of Dakar and Addis Ababa, saviour of Africa's struggling masses."⁴⁰⁵ Clearly, scepticism existed.

Chrétien refuted allegations that his motives were part of a legacy plan, stating "I don't give a damn about legacy."⁴⁰⁶ In the 2002 Address by Chrétien to the Speech to the Throne, he stated: "I have never been concerned about a legacy. I have always been concerned about getting the job done. The job I was elected to do. The coming months will be no different. This is not about legacy. This is about good government."⁴⁰⁷ Even if Chrétien's motives at Kananaskis were rooted in a legacy bid, it is inconsequential. Chrétien wanted to seize an opportunity, already set in motion at Genoa. Kananaskis was a chance to bolster the development record of Canada and its government and to improve his own image.⁴⁰⁸ Altruistic motives are not a prerequisite of a PE. However, the MS model notes that self-interest is not enough to explain policy decisions.

The AAP was created prior to Chrétien's term as G8 meeting host, but he created the momentum required to finalize the policy. He argued that there was both a moral obligation to and an economic interest in helping Africa and he used his experience, skill, charisma and position in the government to accomplish his goals. He coupled the three streams, and overcame barriers to achieve the success of the AAP. His ability to draw all the G8 leaders into supporting the policy was a "stylistic triumph" and an excellent example of a PE at work.⁴⁰⁹

Chrétien provided the leadership required for a policy window to open successfully. Canada was "first out of the gate" in promoting African development at Kananaskis and the Canada Fund for Africa was the "only substantial new commitment to the continent made in connection with the Summit."⁴¹⁰ In fact, "No other country

However many, including James A. Piazza in "Rooted in Poverty?: Terrorism, Poor Economic Development, and Social Cleavages," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 18, no. 1 (March 2006), 159 – 177 maintain that no such connection exists.

⁴⁰³ Van der Westhuizen, 383.

⁴⁰⁴ Lawrence Martin, 379.

⁴⁰⁵ Andrew Cohen, *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World*, 97.

⁴⁰⁶ Jean Chrétien, 'Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.'

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁸ Hillmer and Granatstein, 319.

⁴⁰⁹ Lawrence Martin, 381.

⁴¹⁰ Labonte et al., 125.

[came] close to the enthusiasm of Canada.”⁴¹¹ While some view Canada’s leadership in this case as purely circumstantial, others, including Stephen Langdon (2003), disagree. Canada, along with Britain and France, earnestly wanted to see the AAP adopted by the G8 and this went beyond simply fulfilling a mandate as summit host.⁴¹² These leaders came out as strong supporters of NEPAD, cultivating an appropriate response. Summit host Chrétien facilitated the success of the AAP policy.⁴¹³ He steered the G8 meetings towards his predetermined goal, despite other agenda items threatening to take over the meetings.⁴¹⁴

5.3 The Policy Window

A window opens when the streams align and are coupled by a PE. Leadership alone cannot open a policy window. Rather, windows typically open because a problem has been recognized by government, or because there has been a change or event in the political stream.⁴¹⁵ The only way to know whether a window was successfully opened is through a test of successful advocacy. In this case, the three streams aligned: the problem was worsening, the policy had been proposed at Genoa as well as domestically in Canada, and, in the political stream, the Kananaskis summit was taking place, with an emphasis being placed on African development. Domestically, the Canadian economy was flourishing and the government faced fewer budget restrictions than it had in earlier times. This resulted in a window being able to open.

An open window does not guarantee change, especially if the streams are not aligned in time or long enough, or if a PE is not present to join the streams and push them through the window. In this case, the problem had existed for years, the policy was in place, and the political motivation was there. The timing was right for NEPAD and the AAP. Ian Taylor and Phillip Nel (2002) conclude: “it was inevitable that [NEPAD] would be well received by the G8 since it was spot on in terms of timing and political correctness. When you have rioters trashing Genoa in the name of kinder Third World treatment, no politician is going to say it is a bad idea.”⁴¹⁶

What did the successful opening of a window mean? For Africa, it meant the promise of more aid from G8 nations. For the G8, it represented a new partnership through which development dollars were targeted according to country performance and need. It also created a more favourable image for the G8. The successful policy of the AAP brought African issues—and solutions—to the international agenda. Kananaskis was “pivotal in bringing

⁴¹¹ Langdon, 251.

⁴¹² *Ibid.*, 249.

⁴¹³ *Ibid.*

⁴¹⁴ Though it exceeds the scope of this thesis, it should be noted that Robert Fowler, Canada’s G8 Sherpa, also acted as PE at many times throughout the G8 summit at Kananaskis. Many other Canadians, including members of government and bureaucrats within CIDA, also played crucial roles. These individuals include CIDA President (1999-2003) Leonard Good, who according to Tomlin et al. was, “influential in softening up domestic constituents and placing their own special imprint on Canada’s development agenda—donor coordination and local ownership.” Tomlin et al., 168.

⁴¹⁵ Travis and Zahariadis, “A Multiple Streams Model of U.S. Foreign Aid Policy,” 497.

⁴¹⁶ Ian Taylor and Phillip Nel, as quoted in van der Westhuizen, 380.

African issues to the forefront of the world's concerns and setting the bar high."⁴¹⁷ The AAP was a "new beginning and a fresh hope for the African continent," through which the G8 operated as a collectivity to ensure that globalization worked in favour of all people and that "no continent is left behind."⁴¹⁸ For the G8, the approval and implementation of the AAP is indicative of a window opening. The acceptance of NEPAD and the creation of the AAP was one of the most impressive liaisons with non-G8 governments in G8 history. Because the policy was adopted and acted upon, a window was successfully opened and successful advocacy was achieved.

Changes in CIDA were further evidence of the successful opening of a policy window. The organization received praise from the OECD's DAC, which stated that CIDA should be commended for "broadening and deepening the organizational change" and focusing on a "programme and country focused organization operating within the framework of developing country driven strategies, aimed notably at poverty reduction and the achievement of the MDGs."⁴¹⁹ The DAC called CIDA's new direction a "major policy breakthroughs in aid volume and on the wider policy coherence front."⁴²⁰ A window was successfully opened domestically, as CIDA created a fresh approach to aid and development, influenced by the G8 summits in Genoa and Kananaskis.

Through Canada's leadership, African development was elevated on both the national and international agenda, and a policy window opened at Kananaskis. Yet the Canadian government faced setbacks. Canada was not able to influence the US as much as it would have liked, and US enthusiasm about NEPAD was tepid. US reluctance resulted in the G8's constrained response to NEPAD in the form of "longer-term help, rather than initiating a major and immediate co-ordinated effort."⁴²¹ While this does not affect the opening of a policy window, it does cast doubt upon the lasting impact of the G8's commitment to NEPAD and its ultimate chances for success. Though Kananaskis displayed the ability of "Canadian policy-makers to shape agendas concerning Africa", it also illustrated that Canada was limited in its "ability to shape outcomes."⁴²²

⁴¹⁷ Chrétien. "My Life as Prime Minister," 360.

⁴¹⁸ Lawrence Martin, 381.

⁴¹⁹ Tomlin et al., 176.

⁴²⁰ Ibid.

⁴²¹ Langdon, 251.

⁴²² Black, "Canada, the G8, and Africa: the rise and decline of a hegemonic project?" 12.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

The Kananaskis summit was well organized and orchestrated by its Canadian hosts. The leadership maintained a narrow focus on the three main agenda items and ensured the involvement of non-G8 leaders in the discussions. The partnership between the G8 and the NEPAD leaders was “highly innovative”, giving “priority to Africa as a key element of [the G8’s] fight against the root causes of terrorism.”⁴²³ Shortly after the summit, Fowler stated that he believed that the AAP commitments would be “substantial, substantive, and eminently measurable.” He contended that the enhanced partnerships of the AAP would ensure that “one plan with many executions” could help African nations with their development.⁴²⁴ Kananaskis initiated a “sustained process of engagement with African issues and governments.” Chrétien was behind much of this success.⁴²⁵ The G8 combined economic and political elements into a cohesive strategy. Its response to NEPAD was harmonious with its stance on other political and economic matters, and fit well with the overall strategy of the group. The APR position was maintained as a mechanism to track the AAP’s progress.⁴²⁶

Opinions on the summit were mixed. Many applauded Canada for its leadership on African issues. But others felt that the AAP did not do enough. NEPAD leaders were disappointed in some respects, particularly when it came to the limits the US put on aid flows.⁴²⁷ There was also dismay regarding the state of US trade measures and the fact that no new funds were pledged at the summit itself.⁴²⁸ As for the lasting success of the AAP, Fowler cautioned that expectations had to be “tempered with healthy doses of reality...” and stated that there would be setbacks as well as progress.⁴²⁹ This reflects a stark reality of development and multilateral organizations: even with a solid plan in place, an organization with no enforcement mechanism cannot compel its contemporaries to act. The AAP requires constituents to hold the leaders accountable to their promises. It remained to be seen what level of commitment would follow in summits to come. However, ultimately, for the MS model, “adopting promised policies is more important than actually solving any problems.”⁴³⁰

This thesis has demonstrated that John Kingdon’s MS model is a suitable framework for understanding and explaining Canadian development assistance through the G8 and domestically. It has answered the three main questions raised in Chapter One. It has shown that African development assistance became a priority for Canada in

⁴²³ Bayne, 134 and 183.

⁴²⁴ Fowler, 228-229.

⁴²⁵ Black, “From Kananaskis to Gleneagles—Assessing ‘Leadership’ on Africa,” 5.

⁴²⁶ Bayne, 133-137.

⁴²⁷ Langon, 249-250.

⁴²⁸ Bayne, 133-134.

⁴²⁹ Robert Fowler, “Canadian Leadership and the Kananaskis G-8 Summit: Towards a Less Self-Centred Foreign Policy,” in *Canada Among Nations: Coping with the American Colossus*, eds David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson and Norman Hillmer. (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2003), 236-237.

⁴³⁰ Travis and Zahariadis, “A Multiple Streams Model of U.S. Foreign Aid Policy,” 407.

the early millennium due to an improving national fiscal climate, and because of a shift in priorities for Chrétien. Chrétien was able to act as a leader and innovator in this case for several reasons. As Canadian head of government, he was ideally placed to act as a PE and to initiate and sustain change, both nationally and internationally. He had personal experience with Africa, and with working through multilateral channels, such as la Francophonie and the Commonwealth. As host of the Kananaskis summit, he set the agenda for the meeting, placing African development front and center at the meetings. He led by ensuring that Canada was seen as a leader of African development in 2001-2002, and by insisting that Kananaskis kept its focus on African issues, even as the concern of terrorism threatened to take over the agenda. Chrétien reached out to leaders and organizations in an unprecedented way.⁴³¹ The pressure of the yearly summit, along with the pressure Chrétien may have felt to leave a lasting legacy, contributed to the impetus to achieve success. Supporting and promoting the AAP fit well with the Canadian government's goals for CIDA and Canadian development assistance.

This thesis has argued that under the guidance of Chrétien, Canada was a leader in developing the G8's Africa policy, working at home and abroad to initiate change. It argued that the MS model is well suited to serve as a tool to aid in the understanding of policy, and that it is adaptable enough to fit the case of Canadian foreign policy. The analysis of a head of government as a PE is a unique contribution to the MS model. It showed how the G8 produced a "uniquely high number of innovations and ambitious commitments to Africa."⁴³² Lastly, it contributes to the literature on the Kananaskis summit itself, showing how it was an unusually successful and problem free summit, something to be emulated in future meetings.

⁴³¹ 'Never before had a single summit done so much as Kananaskis did in reaching out simultaneously across the old East-West and North-South divides...' John Kirton, "25. Kananaskis' Contribution to the Global Community," G8 Online 2002 Course. *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/g8online/2002/english/2002/25.html>> (16 October 2011).

⁴³² John Kirton and Ella Kokotis, "An Evaluation of the G8's Commitment to the Kananaskis Pledges." G8/G7 Scholarly Publications and Papers. *G8 Research Group*. Discussion paper prepared for a meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations G8 Africa Round Table Washington, DC, February 4, 2004. Available online: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton2004/kirton_africa_040204.html> (16 October 2011).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antholis, William J.. "Pragmatic Engagement or Photo Op: What Will the G-8 Become?" *Washington Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (Summer 2001), 213-226.

"Compact for African Recovery: Operationalising the Millennium Partnership for the African Recovery Programme." *United Nations Economic Commission for Africa*. Addis Ababa, April 20, 2001. Available online: http://www.uneca.org/cfm/compact_for_african_recovery.htm (2 June 2010).

"Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific, 2001." *Poverty and Development Division, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific*, 2001. Available online: <http://www.unescap.org/drpad/publication/survey2001/chapter7.pdf> (3 August 2010), 235-244.

"'Punks' Not Welcome at 2002 G8 Summit." *CTV News*. July 21 2001.

"Maclean's Year-End Poll: Since September 11th." *Maclean's* 114 (31 December 2001-January 2002), 38.

"Here's a legacy within the PM's reach: It is better to prove one's integrity than to trumpet it." *National Post*. Don Mills, Ontario:, 27 April 2002, A.23.

“Press Briefing-- MAY 6, 2002 - The G8 and Africa: The civil society's point of view.” *Canada NewsWire*. Ottawa: 2 May 2002.

“The Road to Kananaskis: Africa at the Heart of the G8 Summit.” *Canada World View (15) Spring 2002*. Available online: <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/Canada-magazine/issue15/15t5-en.asp> (10 July 2010).

“West ‘guilty’ over Rwandan Genocide.” *Cnn.com*. 6 April 2004. Available online: <http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/africa/04/06/rwanda.dallaire/> (Retrieved 2 September 2010).

“In Depth: Jean Chretien Timeline.” *CBC News Online*. 11 May 2006. Available online: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/chretien/timeline.html> (2 October 2011).

“About the Global Fund.” *Investing in Our Future: The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria*. 2009. Available online: <http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/> (10 January 2010).

“The EU’s Relations with the G7/G8.” *European Commission, External Relations*. 2009. Available online: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/g7_g8/index_en.htm (3 May 2010).

“Interlocutor” *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Available online: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/interlocutor?show=0&t=1317683567> (3 October 2011).

Bayne, Nicholas. *Staying Together: The G8 Summit Confronts The 21st Century*. Aldershot, England, Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.

Bacinski, Robert and Serena Yoon. “French Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit.” *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/france.pdf> (2 August 2010).

Banda, Maria and Lara Mancini, “Italian Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit.” *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/italy.pdf> (2 August 2010).

Black, David. “Canada, the G8 and Africa: The Rise and Decline of a Hegemonic Project? (Draft)” *The Open University*. Date Unknown. Available online: <http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/bisa-africa/confpapers/Black%20D%20Canada%20G8%20Africa.pdf> (11 June 2010), 1-33.

---. “From Kananaskis to Gleneagles—Assessing ‘Leadership’ on Africa.” *Behind the Headlines* 62, no. 3 (4 May 2005), 1-17.

---. “Canadian Aid to Africa: Assessing Reform” In Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowlands, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2006: Minorities and Priorities* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), 319-338.

Blanchfield, Mike. “Military criticized for rhetoric on peace: Canada accused of ‘speaking loudly and carrying a bent twig.’” *The Ottawa Citizen*. Ottawa, Ontario. 23 March 2011. A.1

Brown, Lester R.. “HIV Epidemic Restructuring Africa’s Population.” *World Watch Issue Alert*, October 31 2000. Available online: http://www.earth-policy.org/index.php/?/plan_b_updates/2000/alert10 (15 August 2011).

Brown, Chris. "Africa in Canadian Foreign Policy 2000: The Human Security Dilemma." In Fen Osler Hampson, Norman Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations: The Axworthy Legacy*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Brown, Gordon. "It's a Long Way from Halifax to Kananaskis." *International Journal* 57, no. 1 (Winter 2001), 123-127.

Brunner, Steffen. "Understanding Policy Change: Multiple Streams and Emissions Trading in Germany." *Global Environmental Change* 18, no. 3 (2008), 501-507.

Burgess, Chris N. "Multiple Streams and Policy Community Dynamics: The 1990 NEA Independent Commission." *The Ohio State University, Occasional Paper #23*. Presented at the 28th Annual Social Theory, Politics and Arts Conference, 2002. Available online: <https://arted.osu.edu/files/arted/paper23.pdf> (22 October 2010), 1-31.

Canada. Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade "Canada in the World: Government Statement—Summary." Ottawa, February 1995.

---. Canadian International Development Agency. "Canada Making a Difference in the World: A Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness." Hull, Ontario: Minister of Public Works and Government Services. September, 2002. Available online: [http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/inet/images.nsf/vLUIImages/pdf/\\$file/SAE-ENG.pdf](http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/inet/images.nsf/vLUIImages/pdf/$file/SAE-ENG.pdf) (10 June 2010)

---. Canadian International Development Agency. "New Vision, New Partnership: Canada Fund for Africa." Ottawa. 2003.

---. Department of Finance. "Helping the Poorest: Update on Canada's Debt Relief Efforts." Ottawa. January 2005. Available online: http://www.fin.gc.ca/toc/2005/cdre0105_-eng.asp (20 August 2011).

---. Statistics Canada. "The African Community in Canada." Ottawa. August 2007. Available online: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-621-x/89-621-x2007010-eng.htm> (1 August 2010).

---. Canadian International Development Agency. "Canada Fund for Africa." 2008. Available online: <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/canadafundforafrica> (10 August 2011).

---. Canadian International Development Agency. "Focus on the Future—The Legacy of the Canada Fund for Africa." Ottawa. 2008. Available online: <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/acdi-cida.nsf/eng/MAR-619131753-NAQ> (10 June 2010).

---. Canadian International Development Agency. "About CIDA." Ottawa. August 2009. Available online: <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/acdi-cida.nsf/eng/NIC-5313423-N2A> (2 August 2010).

---. "How the G8 Works." *Canada's G8 Website*. Ottawa. August 2010. Available online: <http://www.canadainternational.gc.ca/g8/index.aspx> (14 October 2010).

---. Canadian International Development Agency. "Millennium Development Goals: What are the Millennium Development Goals?" Ottawa. September 2010. Available online: <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/mdgs> (1 January 2011).

Centre for Global Development. "Commitment to Development Index 2003." *Centre for Global Development*. <http://www.cgdev.org/doc/CDI/2009/score%20grids/CDI%202003%20Scores.pdf> (1 July 1 2011.)

Chretien, Jean. "Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chretien in Reply to the Speech from the Throne." *Office of the Prime Minister*. Ottawa: January 31, 2001.

---. "Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chretien to the United Nations International Conference on Financing for Development." Monterrey, United Mexican States, March 21, 2001. Office of the Prime Minister. Ottawa.

---. "Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien to the United Nations Security Council on the Occasion of the United Nations General Assembly High-Level Plenary Debate on the NEPAD." New York, September 16th 2002. Office of the Prime Minister. Ottawa.

---. "Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Jean Chretien to the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa." *Government of Canada, Privy Council Office*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 11, 2002.

---. "Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in Reply to the Speech from the Throne." *Government of Canada Privy Council Office*, September 30, 2002. Available online: http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=sft-ddt/2002_reply-eng.htm (4 June 2010).

---. "Address by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in Reply to the Speech from the Throne." *Government of Canada, Privy Council Office*. October 1, 2002. Available online: http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=sft-ddt/2002_reply-eng.htm (1 July 2011).

---. *My Years as Prime Minister*. (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2007).

Chwialkowska, Luiza. "A Guide to Who's Who, What's What at Summit." *National Post*. Don Mills, Ontario, June 24 2002, A5.

Cohen, Andrew. "Seize the Day." *International Journal* 58, no. 1 (Winter 2002-2003), 139-154.

---. *While Canada Slept: How We Lost our Place in the World*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, Ltd., 2003.

Cohen, Michael, James G. March and Johan P. Olsen. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17, (no. 1, March 1972), 1-25.

Commission for Africa. "Our Common Interest: Report of the Commission for Africa." *Commission for Africa*. Chaired by Tony Blair. March 2005. Available online: <http://www.commissionforafrica.info/2005-report>. (11 August 2011).

Copeland, Daryl. "The Axworthy Years: Canadian Foreign Policy in the Era of Diminished Capacity." In Fen Osler Hampson, Normal Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations: The Axworthy Legacy*. (Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Cooper, Andrew F. and Dane Rowland. "A State of Disconnects—The Fracturing of Canadian Foreign Policy." In Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowland, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2005: Split Images*. Don Millis: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Cornia, Giovanni Andrea, ed. *Inequality, Growth, and Poverty in an Era of Liberalization and Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Clarkson, Adrienne. "Speech from the Throne to Open the Second Session of the 37th Parliament of Canada." Ottawa. September 30, 2002. Available online: <http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=sft-ddt/2002-eng.htm> (4 June 2010).

Culpeper, Roy. "Foreword: African Report: Assessing the New Partnership." *The North-South Institute*. Papers presented at a conference held in Nairobi, Kenya, April 30 to May 2, 2002. Available online: http://www.nsi-ins.ca/english/pdf/africa_report/forword_e.pdf (3 October 2011), 1-4.

Draimin, Tim and Brian Tomlinson. "Is There a Future for Canadian Aid in the Twenty-First Century?" In Fen Osler Hampson and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations 1998: Leadership and Dialogue*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1998.

English, John. "In the Liberal Tradition: Lloyd Axworthy and Canadian Foreign Policy." In Fen Osler Hampson, Normal Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations: The Axworthy Legacy*. Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Fowler, Robert. "Canadian Leadership and the Kananaskis G-8 Summit: Towards a Less Self-Centred Foreign Policy." In David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson and Norman Hillmer, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Group of Eight. "G8 Communiqué Okinawa 2000." *G8 Research Group*. July 23, 2000. Available online: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2000okinawa/finalcom.htm> (10 January 2010).

---. "G7 Communiqué Genoa 2001." *G8 Research Group*. July 22, 2001. Available online: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/finalcommunique.html> (3 August 2011).

---. "G8 Africa Action Plan" *G8 Research Group*. Kananaskis Summit June 27th 2002. Available online: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/africaplan.html> (3 August 2011).

Gotlieb, Allan. "Romanticism and Realism in Canadian Foreign Policy." *C.D. Howe Institute, Benefactors Lecture 2004*. Toronto: 3 November 2004.

Gibb, Steven, Les McPherson, Sarath Peiris and Lawrence Thoner. "Foreign Aid Must Increase." *The Star Phoenix*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. February 1, 1999, A4.

Gray, Bryn, Melanie Martin, Maria Banda, and Sonia Thakkar. "Issue Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis Summit—AAP." *G8 Research Group*. June 2002. Available online: www.tspace.library.utoronto.ca (10 June 10, 2011).

Gray, Bryn, Salimah Ebrahim and Nicol Lorantffy. "US objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit." *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/japan.pdf> (15 September 2010).

- Harrington, Carol. "G-8 Summit security costs to top \$100 million." *Toronto Star*, December 27, 2001. A31.
- Helleiner, Gary. "Keynote Address to the National Forum on Canadian Foreign Policy." *National Forum on Africa*. Montreal: February 9, 2002. Available online: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/helleiner/020209HelleinerAddress.pdf> (10 June 2011).
- Hillmer, Norman and J.L. Granatstein. *Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World to the 1990s*. Toronto: Copp Clark Longman, 1994.
- . *Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World into the Twenty-First Century, 2nd Edition*. Toronto: Nelson, 2008.
- Hippel, von K.. "The Roots of Terrorism: Probing the Myths." *Political Quarterly* Supplement 1, no 73 (August 2002), 25-39.
- Houlihan, Barrie. "Public Sector Sports Policy: Developing a Framework for Analysis." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 40, no. 2 (June 2005), 163-185.
- Italia, Ministero degli Affari Esteri. "Genoa Plan for Africa." *University of Toronto G8 Information Center, G8 Research Group*. Genoa, Italy, July 21, 2001. Available online: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/africa.html> (7 January 2010).
- Jackson, Robert and Georg Sorensen. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- James, Patrick, Nelson Michaud, and Marc J. O'Reilly, eds., *Handbook of Canadian Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Lexington Books, 2006).
- Jordan, Pamela. "A Bridge Between the Global North and Africa? Putin's Russia and G8 Development Commitments." *African Studies Quarterly* 11, no. 4 (Summer 2010), 83-115.
- Karns, Margaret P. and Karen A. Mingst. *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc., 2004.
- Keachie, Heather, John Kirton and Jenilee Guebert, Jenilee, "Accountability Report on Development: The Record of the G8 and the G20, 1975–2009." *G8 Research Group*. April 30th, 2010. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/keachie-development-2010.pdf> (accessed October 10 2010).
- Keating, Tom. "A Passive Internationalist: Jean Chretien and Canadian Foreign Policy." In Louis Harder and Steve Patten, eds. *The Chretien Legacy: Politics and Public Policy in Canada*. Toronto: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006.
- Khan, Ash. "More Aid for AIDS." *Calgary Herald*. Calgary, Alberta, July 26 2001, A20.
- King, Anthony. "Review [Untitled]." *Journal of Public Policy* 5, no. 2 (May 1985), 281-283.
- Kirby, Jason. "Canada's foreign aid, military need cash now, analyst says: Budget cuts threaten country's reputation." *Edmonton Journal*. Edmonton, Alberta. 7 November 1999. B.4

Kirton, John. "Canada as a Principal Summit Power: G-7/8 Concert Diplomacy from Halifax 1995 to Kananaskis 2002" In Norman Hillmer and Maureen Appel Molot, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2002: A Fading Power*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2002.

---. "25. Kananaskis' Contribution to the Global Community." G8 Online 2002 Course. *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/g8online/2002/english/2002/25.html>> (16 October 2011).

--- and Ella Kokotsis. "The G8 from Genoa to Kananaskis and Beyond: Performance, Prospects and Potential." *Paper presented for a conference on "Sustaining Global Growth: Prosperity, Security and Development Challenges for the Kananaskis G8."* Hosted by the University of Calgary, the Guido Carli Association, the G8 Research Group and the Research Group on Global Financial Government. University of Calgary, June 22, 2002.

---. "Keeping Genoa's Commitments: The 2002 G8 Research Group Compliance Report." June 2002. *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002compliance/2002reportComp.pdf> (2 August 2011).

---. "An Evaluation of the G8's Commitment to the Kananaskis Pledges." G8/G7 Scholarly Publications and Papers. *G8 Research Group*. Discussion paper prepared for a meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations G8 Africa Round Table Washington, DC, February 4, 2004. Available online: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton2004/kirton_africa_040204.html> (16 October 2011).

Kingdon, John. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. (New York: Longman, 1984).

Kokotsis, Ellen. "Commitments kept or promises broken? Assessing G8 compliance at Kananaskis 2002" In Michele Fratianni, Paolo Savona and John J. Kirton, eds. *Corporate, Public and Global Governance: The Global Contribution*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Krauss, Clifford. "Chrétien Is Hoping to Aid Africa by Mobilizing Rich Nations." *The New York Times*. June 23 2002. Available online: <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/06/23/world/chretien-is-hoping-to-aid-africa-by-mobilizing-rich-nations.html?pagewanted=1> (10 June 2011).

Krueger, Alan B. and Jitka Malecková. "Does Poverty Cause Terrorism?" *New Republic* 226, no. 2 (24 June 2002), 27-33.

Helleiner, Gerald. "Round Table: Canada's Kananaskis G8 Summit: What Can and Should be Done?" First Round Table Discussion. *G8 Research Group*. Available online: www.tpsace.library.utoronto.ca. (10 June 2011).

Johnson, Audrey, Rudich, Dennise, and Ramanathan, Thineishan. "United Kingdom Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit." *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/uk.pdf> (10 June 2011).

Labonte, Robert, Ted Schrecker, David Sanders, and Wilma Meeus. *Fatal Indifference: The G8, Africa and Global Health*. Cape Town: The University of Cape Town Press, 2004.

Lamar, Joe. "G8 Countries Accused of Ignoring Debt Relief." *British Medical Journal* 321, no. 7257 (5 August 2000), 320.

- Langdon, Steven. "NEPAD and the Renaissance of Africa." In David Carmet, Fen Osler Hampson and Norman Hillmer, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Lewis, Robert. "Leadership as a Blood Sport.' *MacLean's* 113, no. 13 (March 27 2000), 2.
- Lewis, Stephen. *Race Against Time*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2005.
- Malone, David M. "Canadian Foreign Policy Post-9/11: Institutional and Other Challenges." *Prepared for the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute*, May 2003. Available online: <http://www.cdfai.org/PDF/Canadian%20Foreign%20Policy%20Post%20911.pdf> (5 August 2011), 1-24.
- Manley, John. "The Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence. Second Report, Tuesday November 12, 2002." *Second Session, Thirty-Seventh Parliament, Government of Canada*. November 12 2002.
- Martin, Erica. "The Impact of the News Media in Shaping Canadian Development Assistance Policy." *Undercurrent* 2, no. 2 (2005), 28-40.
- Martin, Lawrence. *Iron Man: The Defiant Reign of Jean Chrétien*. (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2003).
- Mintrom, Michael and Sandra Vergari. "Advocacy Coalitions, Policy Entrepreneurs and Policy Change." *Policy Studies Journal* 24, no. 3 (Autumn 1996), 420-434.
- Morrison, David R. *Aid and Ebb Tide: A History of CIDA and Canadian Development Assistance*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1998.
- Mucciaroni, Gary. "The Garbage Can Model and the Study of Policy Making: A Critique." *Polity* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1992), 459-482.
- Nedelmann, Brigitta. "Individuals and Parties—Changes in Processes of Political Mobilization." *European Sociological Review* 3, no. 3 (December 1987), 181-202.
- Ostry, Sylvia. "Globalization and the G8: Could Kananaskis Set a New Direction?" *O.D. Skelton Memorial Lecture, Queen's University*. University of Toronto. March 2002. Available online: http://www.utoronto.ca/cis/skeltonlecture_ostry2002.doc (10 June 2010).
- Neale, Jonathan. *You are the G8, We Are 6 Billion: The Truth Behind the Genoa Protests*. London: Vision Paperbacks, 2002.
- Pal, Leslie A.. *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Agnicourt, Ontario: Methuen Publications, 1987.
- Paradis, Denis. "Canada Meeting the New Challenge: The African Partnership." *Canadian Speeches* 16, no. 3 (July/August 2002), 17.
- Patten, Steve. "Canadian Liberalism, Party Politics and the Chrétien Legacy." *A paper to be presented to the Annual Midwestern Political Science Association (MPSA) Conference*. April 8, 2005. Available online: http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/8/6/8/1/pages86812/p86812-1.php, 1-17.

Piazza, James A.. "Rooted in Poverty?: Terrorism, Poor Economic Development, and Social Cleavages." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 18, no. 1 (March 2006), 159 – 177.

Pratt, Cranford. *Canadian International Development Assistance Policies: An Appraisal*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.

Sabatier, Paul A. "The Need for Better Theories." In Paul A. Sabatier, ed. *Theories of the Policy Process*. Colorado: Westview Press, 1999.

Sachs, Jeffrey D. "Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals." *United Nations: Report to the UN Secretary General, United Nations Development Programme*, 2005. Available online: <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/MainReportComplete-lowres.pdf> (1 August 1 2011).

Schmitz, Gerald, Marcus Pistor, and Megan Furi. "Aid to Developing Countries." *Political and Social Affairs Division, Government of Canada*. Ottawa. Available online: <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection-R/LoPBdP/CIR/7916-e.htm> May 2, 2003. (2 October 2012).

Sjostrom, Emma. "Shareholders as Norm Entrepreneurs for Corporate Social Responsibility." *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, no. 2 (2010), 177-191.

Stanley, Alessandra and David E. Sanger. "Italian Protester is Killed by Police at Genoa Meeting; New Concerns on Venue. (Group of 8 Summit)." *The New York Times*. July 21, 2001. Available online: <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/07/21/world/genoa-summit-meeting-overview-italian-protester-killed-police-genoa-meeting.html> (1 July 2011).

Steeves, Jeffrey. "Canadian Development Assistance: The Values Framework and the Field Reality of an Africa Country." *The Round Table* 96, no. 391 (August 2007), 489-507.

Stout, Karen Evans and Byron Stevens. "The Case of the Failed Diversity Rule: A Multiple Streams Analysis." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 22, no. 4 (2000), 341-355.

Subedi, Surya. "In the News: The International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico, 18-22 March 2002." *International Law Forum* 4 (2002), 52-53.

Tarp, Finn, ed. *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learned and Directions for the Future*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Thérien, Noel A.J. and S. Dallaire. "Divided Over Internationalism: The Canadian Public and Development Assistance." *Canadian Public Policy* 30 no. 1 (2004), 29-46.

Tomlin, Brian W., Norman Hillmer and Fen Osler Hampson. *Canada's International Policies: Agendas, Alternatives, and Politics*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Tomlinson, Brian. "New Initiatives for Africa: A Canadian Response to NEPAD. A CCIC Briefing Note, September 2002." Canadian Council for International Cooperation, 2002. Available online: http://www.ccic.ca/_files/en/archives/003_ccic_briefing_note_on_g8_cdn_initiatives.pdf (10 June 201a).

Travis, Rick and Nikolaos Zahariadis. "A Multiple Streams Model of U.S. Foreign Aid Policy." *Policy Studies Journal* 30, no. 4 (Winter 2002), 495-514.

Trickey, Mike. "Africa Plan for G8 'lacks legitimacy': Institute Says Chrétien's Summit Centrepiece 'presents no new ideas.'" *The Ottawa Citizen*. Ottawa, Ontario. 13 June 2002, A.5.

---. "Once over lightly': Chrétien 's tenure as PM has been marked by a lack of interest in foreign affairs." *The Gazette* . Montreal, Quebec. 22 June 2002, B3.

---. "Africa still G8 key: PM But President Bush's road map for Mideast is bound to be hot topic." *The Gazette*. Montreal, Quebec. 26 June 2002, A.13.

United Nations Development Programme. "About the MDG's: Basics. What are the Millennium Development Goals?" *United Nations Development Programme*. Available online: <http://www.undp.org/mdg/basics.shtml> (accessed July 4 2009).

Van der Westhuizen, Janis. "How (not) to Sell Big Ideas." *International Journal* 58, no. 3 (Summer 2003), 369-394.

Chris Varcoe and Grant Robertson with files from Tom Maloney and Joe Paraskevas. "PM backs Bush peace plan: Chrétien offers qualified support as Mideast muscles way onto G-8 agenda." *Calgary Herald*. Calgary, Alberta: 26 June 2002, A.1.

Wade, Zoe. "Reassessing Labour's Relationship with sub-Saharan Africa." *The Round Table* 95, no. 383 (January 2006), 141-152.

Wallace, Bruce. "Trouble in the Family," *MacLean's* 112, no. 45 (8 November 1999), 24.

Werbowy, Oksana and Ralph Czychun, "German Objectives for 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit." *G8 Research Group*. Available online: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/germany.pdf> (3 August 2011).

Wood, Barry. "Ready for a New G8? The World's Economic Leaders Are Gathering in a Remote Location in the Canadian Rockies for a Different Kind of Summit. (Economic Affairs)." *Europe* (June 2002), 18-19.

Young, Jacob. "Japanese Objectives for the 2002 Kananaskis Summit." *G8 Research Group*. June 2002. Available online: <http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002kananaskis/objectives/japan.pdf> (2 August 2011).

Zahariadis, Nikolaos. "Selling British Rail: An Idea Whose Time Had Come?" *Comparative Political Studies* 29, no. 4 (August 1996), 400-422.

Zahariadis, Nikolaos. "Ambiguity, Time, and Multiple Streams." In Paul A. Sabatier, ed. *Theories of the Policy Process*. Colorado: Westview Press, 1999.

Zhu, Xufeng. "Strategy of Chinese Policy Entrepreneurs in the Third Sector: Challenges of 'Technical Infeasibility.'" *Policy Sciences* 41 (No. 4, December 2008), 315-334.

