Origins

he Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy
Development was created a year ago in
response to the recommendations of the
1994 Special Joint Committee of Parliament review of
Canadian Foreign Policy and the Government's
commitment to strengthen democracy in foreign
policy making.

The Committee called for increased dialogue with Canadians and greater public input to foreign policy making. The Government's 1995 Foreign Policy Statement promised "to ensure that the voice of Canadians be heard" in the foreign policy process.

In an indirect way the Centre is a descendant of the late Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security (CIIPS), poorer, but with a much more explicit role in policy making. While CIIPS had a broad mandate that included security and arms control, public education, in-house and contracted research, a data base and library development, it had no formal role in policy making. CIIPS, with \$5 million per year and a staff of 42, was shut down by the previous government in 1992. Its residual funds became the

Cooperative Security Competition Program, \$4 million over two years, targeted to peace, security and arms control research projects. A number of these projects were in the \$100,000 range, yet they too had no formal link to policy making (or public reporting).

The Centre's budget of \$1.5 million per year is an accumulation of the last of this funding and some other consolidated Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade "grants and contribution" funds. The first year budget for 1996-97 was \$1.8 million, the extra \$300,000 rolled over from unspent monies the year before.

The Centre is housed at the Department for two reasons. Thanks to partnership with the Policy Planning Staff, the Department provides considerable support in overhead and staff time contributions (accountant, contract management, policy development officer, web site manager). As an autonomous but in-house agency, access to policy makers is immediate, providing opportunity for policy development consultations and the input of public views. This arrangement allows the Centre's four staff greater access and greater results than would be the case if the Centre were outside the Pearson Building.



