

2024

North American Security – Home and Away

Peter Mackay

Andy Leslie

Andrew Doctoroff

Kathryn Lavell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj>

 Part of the [National Security Law Commons](#), and the [Transnational Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Peter Mackay, Andy Leslie, Andrew Doctoroff, and Kathryn Lavell, *North American Security -- Home and Away*, 48 Can.-U.S. L.J. 86 (2024)

Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj/vol48/iss1/9>

This Panel Discussion is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Journals at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Canada-United States Law Journal by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITY – HOME AND AWAY

STEPHEN PETRAS: This is a very appropriate follow-up to Ambassador Cohen's remarks and Jim Blanchard's interview of Ambassador Cohen.

We're here for our final panel; this panel is titled "North American Security—Home and Away". Our moderator of this panel [is] Peter Mackay. Peter is a member of our Executive Committee and he's a very well-known politician and military and political expert in Canada. As has been mentioned earlier, he served as a Member of Parliament, and in that capacity, became the Attorney General of Canada. He served as the Minister of Defense among other very important and prestigious positions. He holds a leadership position in the Conservative Party in Canada. Of great note and importance, and a surprise to him—if you were here last night, you already know this—he's the recipient of the Sidney J. Picker Award, presented by the Canada-United States Law Institute. Sidney Picker was the founder of this organization in 1976. He realized that there was a need for a legal and policy forum for the issues facing Canada and the United States—he's the one who was the brainchild of forming this Institute. He looked around for the right University and he found the University of Western Ontario. The Institute was supported by both the Canadian and US governments It's been strong and active ever since. And the reason it is strong and active is because we have people like Peter MacKay, who roll up their sleeves, bring their expertise, volunteer their time, lead panels, promote the events, and advise us on these important relations. Without further ado, Peter, the panel is yours.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Stephen, thank you very much and thank you for those kind words, introduction, and for the recognition. Ambassador Jacobson, Ambassador Blanchard—who I think is still with us—and to all of you. It's wonderful to be back, to be "three-dimensional", after so many years and months of Zoom calls. It's great to be back in Cleveland.

Just as you were regaling everyone with a little bit about my career in politics, I'm reminded now, being on the outside of a public office, that it's a bit like what Lyndon Johnson said about being in elected office, he said, "politics is a bit like being a jackass standing in a hailstorm—all you can do is stand there and take it." That is sometimes how it feels. It is a relief to watch others do it from a different vantage point.

We have a wonderful panel here of experts on some very important and timely subjects, as Stephen has alluded to. In particular, the security apparatus and infrastructure of North America right now—which, in my view has never been faced with bigger challenges, in terms of our necessity for modernization, our necessity to prepare and insulate ourselves from vulnerabilities and threats, external and otherwise.

To get into the discussion, I'm going to be very brief in my introductions as well. Starting to my left with Kathryn Lavelle. Kathryn is a professor [at Case Western Reserve University Department of Political Science], who has also spent time in Canada. If I'm correct in saying this, [she has been a] Fulbright Scholar at the Munk

School in Toronto. Not only her proximity here in the United States, but she actually spent some time in Canada, and I think it's fair to say has a very good understanding of some of the politics, the dynamics, and the appreciation that both our countries have for the sensitivity and importance of the Arctic, and how that plays into North American security. We'll look forward to getting into that discussion.

Further to my left is Professor Andy Doctoroff, who also has a really specific, but really interesting role vis-a-vis Canada-US economic relations, Canada-US security—as far as our trade relations—and he really is the person tasked with the construction of, in my estimation, the most important infrastructure link that we have between our countries to continue this important connection at the Ambassador Bridge by building a new structure called the Gordie Howe Bridge..

Forgive me if I make one more reference. We've had a great discussion and a wonderful presentation by the United States Ambassador to Canada, and the relations have ebbed and flowed. That's the nature of any good relationship, but particularly two countries that literally share so much in culture and people and values—our military history is entwined, so entwined that I would argue we, in Canada, had a military before we had a country. Someone on the panel here this morning said, "Canada doesn't have to worry too much about external threats, we're surrounded by Arctic water and the United States." Well, the only country that's ever invaded us is the United States and it was a real war, 1812. So much so that we gave you your national anthem. I'm not sure if you knew that the "rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air" were Canadians trying to come in through Baltimore, who later marched on Washington. Now for our trouble, you came to Toronto (then York) and burned it to the ground. I was given the great honor to speak to some cadets at West Point one time, and I reminded them of this history and said, "the understanding was that when you came to Fort York and then went on to torch the entire city," that they were looking for the Stanley Cup. But I said, "You won't find the Stanley Cup in Toronto."

Perhaps if I could, Kathryn, I'll start with you. The Canada-US relationship, of course, plays such a big role, even though many of our citizens may not realize this. Even more so as citizens of both countries, we don't think about the Arctic, except, perhaps, sometimes romantic notions of what it represents. As far as the future security is concerned, but even more so in the immediate sense, things such as critical minerals, energy reserves, ongoing conflicts—legal conflicts that exist around jurisdictional lines.

I'm giving you a very broad question and an opening here, but in your understanding, what is the most pressing of those issues from [an American] perspective? With your extensive knowledge of the Canadian Arctic, let's call it the high Arctic; what are those concerns you feel our collective citizens should be most concerned about?

KATHRYN LAVELLE: Well, thank you for that question and the introduction. Also, thank you for inviting me to participate. It's a huge honor to be here with the other people on the panel and also to speak to the Canada-U.S. Law Institute because of its illustrious history and the prestige that's attached to it. I'm very honored to be here.

With that said—as we’ve had a little bit of a cheating here going on, because we had a bit of a preliminary conversation—I think the most important thing to remember when we think about the Arctic is that unlike other regions of the world, there isn’t a clear set of mountains or a clear river to demarcate where it starts and stops. The Arctic could be defined as the “Arctic Circle.” It could be defined politically (as American law defines it) to include the Aleutian Islands and then the Arctic Circle everywhere else—which is kind of quaint. It could also be the tree line; it could be the countries that are front on the ocean. There are many different definitions. That makes our conception of North America very different, and a very different kind of understanding of security that we have with respect to many other parts of the world because of the success of our integrated defense.

On one hand, your question was, what is the most important part? Well, right now, that’s kind of an easy one, let’s pick the low-hanging fruit here. As the Arctic Ocean melts, submarines and other naval ships can come much closer to the United States and Canada and, having the larger, obvious frontage there—and, threaten us militarily and also economically, with respect to mineral rights and other extractive industries, in a way that is new, environmental, and scientific that the world has really never known because we haven’t had to deal with climate change in the way that we are now. Basically, the front that was the old Cold War frontage between the United States and the Soviet Union—the Western Allies and the Soviet Union in the Arctic—going all the way over to Greenland and NORAD. That’s the obvious threat.

If I went across the street and talked to students, they would probably not see things the same way. They would look at it as a scientific question—that scientific question would be the rate of global warming and the alarming rate that the earth is warming in the Arctic, which leads to three primary threats: the collapse of the Jetstream, the rise of sea level, and permafrost melt, which means that we will all be exposed to more viruses, and diseases that hadn’t been known.

This isn’t something where the United States and Canada would define the threat differently, we would probably have a lot of similarities. People my age would define it differently from my students. That is one of things that makes it an exciting thing to study, but also something that perplexes both of our countries in the alliance. I’ll stop there, because I could just talk all day about that.

HON. PETER MACKAY: I hope that we’ll have a chance to sort of unpack some of this further, because there are so many elements to what has been happening in the hierarchy.

I had the opportunity to go there when I was very young on supply ships. Just within my lifetime, I’ve gone back twenty to thirty years later and seen massive changes—physical—in terms of what’s happening. As you mentioned, some of the knock-on effects of rising waters, exposed foliage and fauna that is now out from under the Arctic ice. The discovery of the [remains of the] Franklin Expedition [involved] far more than just the symbolism of discovering [it], this mystery. It speaks to just how rapidly things have changed in the last ten or twenty years and what this does in terms of the exposure of an entire new flank of North America.

For the purposes of our proximity to Russia, you referenced submarines, exploration, so-called “exploration vessels”—from both China and Russia, that have the ability to do mapping, but also take samples, and even potentially drill in those

pristine waters. That's where the interesting area of law and jurisdiction comes into this. Perhaps you can explain a little of this, [things that] are currently before the United Nations, challenges in some of those jurisdictional areas, including between Canada and the United States in the Beaufort Sea. A ridge that the Russians are claiming, and we have the whole area of jurisdiction within the Arctic Council, although [that's] currently suspended because of Russia's activities, but countries who claim to be 'near Arctic' participants. I'd be interested in your thoughts on those countries' claims.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: I have strong views on "near Arctic." We can define "Arctic" in many different ways, but "near Arctic" is one that, I'll go out on a limb here for our viewers in the web world, I don't buy it. Everybody wants to have a foot in the game there because there's this sense that there's going to be this scramble for resources, even though I think actually it's pretty well determined. There are disputes over individual claims. The United Nations Law of the Sea Convention defines pretty clearly who has what. We understand that pretty well,

Aside from the discrepancies, my understanding is, as you point out, when we talked about NATO. The sticking point between the United States and Canada in NATO was the maritime boundary in the Beaufort Sea and the preference was to keep Arctic issues out of NATO. Correct me if I'm wrong on this, [but] my sense is that that is changing dramatically. The reason it's changing is because the United States conducts freedom of navigation exercises all over the world. The United States conducts freedom of navigation exercises on our allies as well as our enemies. The point of tension had been, again, my recollection is that we honored Canada's [maritime boundaries]. We didn't do it on purpose up there in an antagonistic way. We reserve the right to conduct those exercises in the Beaufort Sea, or however, we saw the Northwest Passage.

Now, the concern is no longer with this issue with Canada, it's obviously freedom of navigation exercises in the Northern Sea route, with respect to Russia. Historically, we've had these great conversations about the history of our relations. It's always best, we have worked best when we have a common enemy. I think what we forget is that when we don't have a common enemy, we can talk about very important principles where we do have different opinions or different understandings, such as the issue of the Law of the Sea, and those particular disputes. It's a healthy thing to have those disputes.

Right now, most of the territorial disputes have been folded into the concern about Russian aggression in the Arctic. We were saying, at least the understanding is, [that] I believe that Russia has recruited troops from the Arctic in order to supply their forces in Ukraine, but those are recruits. In terms of pulling forces back, the Arctic is one area where the Russians have tried to keep as much of a military presence, which had been escalating prior to the current conflict in Ukraine—pretty much since, I think, even before the 2014 invasion of Crimea. So that's been an ongoing concern for people who study national security in this country. I think the concern was, is this a rebuilding of bases and a domain that had been degraded at the end of the Cold War and Putin's way of just kind of going back to a little bit more of what had been there, [though] nowhere near the levels that it had in the Cold War.

However, now, all that thinking is gone. I think the real, primary concern, [certainly] with the most recent defense spending budget—in the United States—and the discussions around NORAD, is just what it was back in the 1950s—a line of defense that extends from the Bering Strait across through Scandinavian Nordic countries.

HON. PETER MACKAY: One of the interesting things that was mentioned in our in our preparatory call was that while Russia has redeployed troops from other various parts of their military deployments, they've left everybody in the Arctic. They have not redeployed anybody to Ukraine as a result. We need to be aware of these realities.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: They want to take people who are not currently in the military from as far away in Siberia as they can. I hate to say they don't know what they're getting into, because they don't have internet access. As we know about the NORAD modernization efforts, a lot of that has to do with bringing really good internet service to the Arctic. You have people who are so far from Moscow, they have no idea what is going on in that war until they actually get there—which is just another level of evil.

HON. PETER MACKAY: In addition to the tremendous challenges of operating probably seven months of the year in the Arctic, the communication system and low satellite communication is extremely challenging in that environment, to say the least.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: I just have to quickly put in a word [for] Jephtha Wade of Case Western, one of our founding people here, [who] financed the Western Union Telegraph expedition that was supposed to lay the original telegraph line across the Arctic. That didn't work because they got it laid in the Atlantic. Anyway, you're absolutely right. Getting a really good communications network up there is a priority for both countries.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Definitely, and we'll be part of that modernization. Andy, I want to bring you into the conversation. People may not see the immediate connective tissue here between the Arctic and the project that you're involved in between Windsor and Detroit. In terms, of building big infrastructure pieces, this is probably the premiere project that our two countries will undertake—in the range of \$4 billion.

As I understand, you can give us more of the details. Perhaps, walk us through where we are and what the challenges will be, given the demands to keep this major artery of trade and connective flow of people and goods across our border at Windsor-Detroit.

ANDREW (“ANDY”) DOCTOROFF: Thank you to everyone for being here. I also appreciate this invitation to speak before the Institute. The connection that you're talking about is one of security, but just a different type of security—in a sense military security, environmental security. With the Gordie Howe International Bridge project, we're clearly talking about economic security. There are also other types of security, in terms of being able to securely access, for example, sources of energy, which is a subject that came up this morning with Line 5. I do see there being a great overlap between what we're talking about going on in the Arctic, and the Gordie Howe International Bridge, or Line 5, and other comparable infrastructure projects.

Before, I answer your question about what's going on, I wanted to jump off of something that came up this morning, or maybe with the Ambassador, which is the perception that Canada is not doing its fair share militarily. From my vantage point, I am in awe of Canada, not only doing its fair share, but doing well more than its fair share. The project on which I am working, the Gordie Howe International Bridge Project, and by the way, I oversee all of Michigan's participation in that project. When it comes to construction, that's in the private sector. That's immediately overseen by a Canadian authority with Michigan playing a strong role.

I want people to know and be able to contextualize my role.

Canada is extremely generous. Canada is financing in its entirety, every single penny. I exaggerate, not by a penny, the 5.7 billion dollars that are being spent to build, operate, maintain, and design this incredibly important piece of international infrastructure. The reasons for that are numerous. Michigan had many, many challenges in the early 2010s that prevented us from participating in the financing. We will be paying back the money that has been contributed on our behalf in the form of tolls. Not only is Canada financing the bridge and the I-75 interchange, which is an important part of the project, but it's financing even the construction of the United States port of entry. It is an incredibly important state-of-the-art security facility that we should talk about when it comes to protecting the border.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Can I ask you a little bit about that? I do understand that the technology, and there was [demonstrable] need to improve and modernize the technology. Perhaps to go back even further, if you could explain a little bit about why this bridge in particular was an anomaly. Was it privately owned?

ANDY DOCTOROFF: Right.

HON. PETER MACKAY: I believe the number is somewhere around 25% of all merchandise that moves in and out of our countries was at that "choke point."

ANDY DOCTOROFF: Yeah. The word "choke point" is one that I was actually just going to use. The Detroit-Windsor border crossing, that trade corridor, is by far, by a factor of many, the busiest trade crossing along the United States-Canadian border. You can cite all sorts of statistics to talk about just how critical this crossing or this trade corridor is to both of our economies. When I say both, I'm not talking about Michigan, I'm not talking just about Ontario. In both countries I'm talking about regional and national. The linchpin, the single linchpin that was able to accommodate, and currently is able to accommodate, commercial traffic was the 95-year-old Ambassador Bridge that was and is privately maintained and owned.

That bridge is or has been in a state of disrepair. A few years ago, slabs of concrete were falling onto the streets of Windsor, Ontario. Often, you will see long lines of semis backing up into Windsor, the semis have to wind their way through about seventeen or eighteen streetlights through the downtown Windsor area. There's reporting in Harper's [Magazine] that the trip across the border for some truckers is or was so daunting, that they had to travel in diapers for fear that they would not be able to timely get out of their car. We have a vulnerable, privately owned major border crossing that is serviced by that single bridge. Again, the Morouns, and I don't want to speak ill of anyone, have been portrayed by many as not being good stewards of the public's interest.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Just to be clear, this is the owner, family that owns—the Morouns. That's not a name you've made up.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: No, it's M-O-R-O-U-N.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Okay.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: The vision behind our bridge, that Canada is generously financing in its entirety, is to provide four functions: [the] first is to increase the capacity to handle expected increases in traffic flow. There will be a need for greater capacity, which is why our bridge is six lanes; [the] second one is to have that seamless border, which allows for “just in time” delivery; [the] third is redundancy, so that we are not dependent on just one bridge; [and] the fourth one is to make sure that our technology is state-of-the-art, so that we are doing what we can on both sides to protect the security of both countries at the ports of entry.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Andy, would you agree that we have very recent examples—the pandemic? In the case of Canada, in February of last year, we had this truckers' strike and demonstration, which really exaggerated some of these needs at that particular border crossing. Has that led to any modifications or any changes in this fast tracking or having the ability on both sides of the border to accelerate these trucks, that in many cases keep the auto sector and are the lifeblood of the auto sector?

ANDY DOCTOROFF: I would say the answer to that question is “no”. The why is because the Windsor Detroit Bridge Authority and our concessionaire bridge in North America entered into a contract that has a very clearly understood schedule for when various components of the bridge will be completed, including the main span. That's not easily alterable.

An incident that was a few days long underscored the imperative of having this bridge development built and open to traffic as soon as possible, so that these types of threats are not going to be as worrisome as they perhaps are right now.

A final thing that I didn't mention about one of the purposes of our bridge, is that it provides for the first time ever – in this invaluable, very busy trade quarter – highway-to-highway connectivity. So that someone who has to make a “just in time” delivery to, say, an assembly facility, can literally go from highway through customs, which are going to be very advanced and technologically sophisticated, onto the I-75 in Michigan, to their ultimate destination. That allows for planning in a way that is not currently feasible and that will create economic security. It will make our economies, both of them, much stronger and more predictable.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Speaking of planning, and I want to come back to Line 5, because this is also a very important, timely part of this overall project. As to the security element, I want to discuss if any preparations are made for future shutdowns of that border by interference by, for example, cyber-attacks or physical attacks.

The fear has always been that if that particular bridge was damaged in a way that stopped traffic altogether, this could cripple the North American economy in many ways, given what's at stake. But if we could [segue] back to the Arctic for a minute, Kathryn, speak for a moment, if you would, about the challenges of building infrastructure in the Arctic, and the energy sector and the importance that may play.

For our part, the Canadian side of the Arctic is about 30% of Canada's landmass, but only about 200,000 people spread out over that mass of land, which is a neighborhood in Toronto or Mississauga. Alaska, I suspect to some degree, is the

same. You have massive land territory to cover but a very sparse population. It is difficult to justify, let alone bring about the actual completion of infrastructure builds in a place like Alaska.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: Right. That's such an important question. Certainly, it was an important question going back to the territorial status of the state when it was territory. When the statehood debate emerged in the 1950s, the difficulty of building infrastructure in Alaska certainly played a role because of the costs. There's no economy; the economy of Alaska, at least then, was pretty much what it is now—fishing, oil extractive industries, mining, and to a certain degree now, tourism. There was a considerable degree of concern that the United States government, the federal government, would have to pick up the bill when President Eisenhower wanted to build the interstate highway system and he thought of the cost.

Second, what I would point to is the difficulty of engineering and permafrost. Here, the commercial sector in the military has an awful lot in common and is in league with the scientific community to understand climate change. When you build something in permafrost, when you scrape away the top of whatever's on top of trees, anything matted, detritus, then it exposes more of a surface area to the sun, which makes it melt faster. Whatever you've built the day before, it's probably gone the next day. Certainly, Russian engineers learned this when they built the Trans-Siberian railroad. When we built the Alaska Canada Highway in World War Two, we certainly learned that pretty quick. It has been a necessity that has propelled the building of this infrastructure. With the exception of the distant early warning line, which was a major construction project in the Arctic.

The other big one was obviously the Alaska Pipeline. There had been a consideration of putting the pipeline through Canada for many reasons. The oil companies didn't want to do that. But again, the engineering challenge was considerable. Now there's the problem of building the infrastructure. There's also the problem that now the infrastructure is there, in order for the oil companies to profit from it, they want to start, like we've seen, the Willow Oil Project in the American news has gotten a lot of attention, because that is the economy of the state of Alaska and the pipeline isn't being put to use now.

Back to defense and back to our friends in Russia and our allies. Why do we care so much? What pushed the [Alaska] Pipeline through Congress in the 1970s? For those of you who remember it as I do, the oil shocks and the necessity of not depending on foreign oil propelled the United States to overlook some environmental concerns at the time and [to] go ahead.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: You're taking the words out of my mouth, exactly. I would argue that in many respects, we're seeing that now, where we're playing this balancing game with not wanting to rely on foreign oil, or at least wanting to rely on the oil that is provided by our close allies. Then at the same time, realizing that in doing what we are doing, we are ultimately making the planet even less safe and contributing to all of the acceleration of all the processes that are going to create bigger problems down the road. So-

HON. PETER MACKAY: When you say, our closest ally, I'm being provocative, but I'm assuming you're meaning Canada, not Venezuela?

KATHRYN LAVELLE: Sure, sure. For oil, we would certainly rather buy oil from you than anybody. No, I think that's pretty well borne. I think the polling and all we would bear that out. But sure, yeah.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Transiting through the Northwest Passage has also been discussed a lot of late and the opening of the ice has certainly enabled that. But talk a little bit, as you've already alluded to, about the sensitivity in transporting oil [that] is, of course, one of the great concerns. But transporting or transforming any of that sensitive ecosystem in the Arctic is something that environmentalists are rightly concerned about, particularly given the inability to really police in any meaningful way.

The activities there, and this is where, if, again, if I could speak for Andrew Leslie, I would suggest much of this has fallen to the Canadian Armed Forces, or our Indigenous People, some of whom, through what we call the Arctic Rangers program, are affiliated with and somewhat like reservists, work in conjunction with the Canadian Forces. But it is really a fingernail clipping in terms of what is actually needed. We have a very, very sparse footprint, not just an infrastructure, but in people to watch over the growing activities that are happening in the Arctic by some of our adversaries.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: Right, so many thoughts. The defense of Alaska, originally in the Ogdensburg Treaty, if I recall correctly, was the fear that Alaska was undefended, and that Canada would help defend Alaska. Now, it's little bit reversed, although, as we've pointed out, Canadian territory is so much bigger. But the bigger concern is obviously environmental, because if there is a significant amount of mining and extractive resources, primarily oil, but any kind of extractive resource of industries that grow up there, there could be horrific environmental disasters.

I think that shipping companies are aware of this, and I think that oil companies are aware of this. It makes it actually not very profitable; I think there was a big rush for a while to think, "Oh, all the oil is going to go from Russia, it's going to come out and it's going to go to China, it's going to be a faster route."

Shipping is an industry that works best when you load and unload at ports. Let's stick to the Russian side for a minute. As you pointed out, the Canadian port system is not developed, and there was not a rail link to the rest of the Canadian infrastructure like there was in Russia. So, you would have to have ports where you could load and unload. That just isn't what goes on in the Russian Arctic. If you have a bad year where the ice doesn't melt, it's not as navigable. If you have a bad year where you start to have environmental issues, where you have to pay for things, it doesn't look as economically feasible when some of the land routes are actually becoming much more sustainable—the rail and the other links across Siberia in going into China and whatnot.

Some of that gets overplayed a little bit. But I think the indigenous rights question is a formidable one, and the role that people play in their own transformation. So, the people who are living with the effects of climate change in North America, in both the American and the Canadian Arctic, who didn't ask for this. They didn't bring it upon themselves.

I think Americans are surprised when they learn that Native Alaskans tend to be very supportive of oil projects. The Willow Oil Project was supported by the major

Alaskan Native groups with the exception of the group that is where the project itself is going to be located. So, it's a catch-22, you need the infrastructure.

My understanding is day-to-day. I understand in Canada it is worse [in terms of] getting something delivered. If you just want a futon, for example, you have to place the order a year in advance for the ship to bring it to you or you have to pay air freight. Just the planning for basics—a refrigerator or anything (that you need delivered) alters peoples' lives considerably. How those people want to govern their own destinies is something that ties us together. The transnational action has been something that's really helped us have low tension.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Well, I think many are struggling, of course, and it isn't confined to the Arctic by any stretch in terms of inflation, the cost of everything. But in the Arctic in particular, it is prohibitively expensive for nutritional food, let alone some of the amenities that we sometimes take for granted. In large part because of shipping, there are fuel issues as well. So I'm going to come back to you and in terms of these critical elements of being able to move goods and relying on big projects like the Gordie Howe Bridge. But energy, in particular, and the ability to transport fuel, liquefied natural gas, of course, is a big part of the North American future, still, in my view.

I was glad to hear Ambassador Cohen reference this as something that's part of our collective future because I think many have taken a little bit of an appetite suppressant now as a result of some of the security pressures that we're under, but that Line 5 is a critical artery for transporting energy. Nobody is denying for a moment the importance of doing this properly and using the best environmental technologies and respect for that construction phase. Can you give us a little bit more insight on that project? The degree of cooperation necessary between our two countries to get us to that point?

ANDY DOCTOROFF: I'm going to answer that question, but I first want to add something to your prior conversation about the difficulties of building infrastructure. The nexus between that insecurity is self-evident, that without the infrastructure, we're not going to have the security.

As a professor being involved with Gordie Howe now working on Line 5, I think that there really is among the public, among our political leadership, among so many other stakeholders, a need to understand what it takes to actually get a mega infrastructure project or sometimes any infrastructure project done. There's precious little understanding about a project lifecycle. If I could wave a magic wand, I would try and create a binational, given our shared interest in security, analytical bureaucracy, where that type of knowledge that can overcome the inevitable attrition, the inevitable questions that are grounded in. I would argue ignorance, that necessarily often arise so that we could do infrastructure more easily, more quickly, in a way that's more efficient, so that our shared security could be enhanced.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Andy, that's still my beating heart. When I was Minister of National Defense—I've noticed that General Andrew Leslie has joined us, and I'm sure this will ring in his ears—procuring anything, whether it's nuts and bolts or fighter aircraft, has bedeviled governments the world over. Here in North America having a much more binational [defence pact] like NORAD, we could really be world

leaders. If we turned our minds to this, had people with your expertise, and others [we could] really attempt to bring this to fruition.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: I'm so shocked by the number of times someone in my position has to explain time and time and time again, very fundamental facts or challenges to different people, because there is that constant change among project leaders, political leaders, etc.

HON. PETER MACKAY: I would be quick to add that some of this is the perpetual election cycle that we now live in, which causes fits and starts and how these projects move forward. If you'll allow me Andy, I want to bring General Andrew Leslie into our conversation, and I had the good fortune to work with him over a period of time when I was at National Defense.

Andrew Leslie is one of the most distinguished and decorated military leaders in our country. He has served on multiple deployments around the globe, including in conflict zones like Afghanistan. He's received much recognition for this. He went on to continue a life of service by entering the battlefield of politics, where he served as the chief government whip of the current administration and has innumerable battle scars in both of his career pursuits but has distinguished himself in every way.

Andy, welcome to the discussion here in Cleveland. Thank you for making time to join us and you've joined it at a perfect time or inflection point, where we've talked about the need for infrastructure builds.

We've been talking about the challenges that we face collectively as nations in the Arctic, the external threats that are there. You, as Commander of the Canadian Army, not only were deployed, but also have taken part in operations like Operation Nanuq. You've commanded both reservists and regular force, including some of our rangers. Talk a little bit about some of those subject matters such as the home game, and the home guard in the Canadian Arctic.

HON. ANDREW LESLIE: Well, thank you, Peter.

As a side script, I was once put in command of all the communications architecture, the communications regiments, the cybersecurity. When I go completely offline for about sixty-five minutes while I'm supposed to be at a conference, my temper tends to get slightly elevated. For reasons beyond my control, here I am for good or bad. Our pristine Arctic, which we and of course the United States share, is in the Canadian context undefended.

Now, it's illogical to assume that Russia would try to launch an invasion of Canada via the Arctic, but certainly they have aspirations to exploit the priceless mineral wealth, and perhaps hydrocarbons on the Arctic floor. Their track record of meeting environmental standards has never been good. Now, it's lower than ever. Of course, Russia is at war with Ukraine. They're making incredibly aggressive noises about NATO. In the context of defense, Alaska has 22,000 Canadian, sorry, American Armed Forces personnel stationed permanently in Alaska. Canada has less than 300. Alaska is that big. The Canadian Arctic is that big. We need to do more to provide surveillance to assert sovereignty, to make sure that people don't get tempted to exploit the incredible natural resources out there. While we're ignoring that, to most Canadians, our Arctic is sacred, sacred water, and certainly to the local populations.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Andy, if the personnel issue, which is obviously pressing, and we could talk about retention and recruitment, but what are the big pieces that we need in order to meet that challenge or to even start to meet that challenge?

We had Ambassador Cohen here, and there was some discussion already about the need to modernize NORAD, which sounds great. The monetary commitment is there. The discussion is advancing. Tick- tock, you know? Time is really going by, given all of the circumstances that you and everyone are aware of.

HON. ANDREW LESLIE: Well, what we have to do in Canada is get our defense procurement systems sorted out, and we have to implement programs quickly. We've seen it happen before. Peter, when you were the Minister of National Defense and others of both political stripes, we're able to get equipment into the hands of the troops very quickly. Within a matter of months, we got tanks. Within a matter of two to three or four [years], we got new helicopters, and the list goes on. We know the system can respond.

In terms of the Arctic, we need new information systems and surveillance systems. We need to be able to see what's happening in our Arctic in conjunction with our allies: NORAD, the United States, but as well, we need new satellite systems to look down. We need new people to have a presence: more Canadian Rangers, exemplary volunteers who are just amazing at what they do.

I know you've been up north in the [winter] months on ski patrols or ski-doo patrols. We need more soldiers stationed there once again, to have a presence. We've talked about a naval port [in the Canadian Arctic] for thirty years, but no action has been taken. Canada is essentially over the last little while, the last decade or so, not stepped up to the plate in ensuring that our portion of our contribution to NORAD has been met.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Andy, a specific question, then I'm going to come back to our panel here, but within the context of a renewed NORAD and a modernized system of systems, as you say, that has to include surveillance and satellite surveillance, but missile defense has always been an awkward discussion in Canada. And it was some reference to it here already, in terms of a cultural difference as to how Canadians view the necessity to have weapons on our territory.

Yet, we were able, to your earlier point, to procure for Ukraine a missile defense system, which never touched down in Canada. It was sent directly into that theater, as it should have been, but it has a lot of people who wear green, yourself formerly, talking again about the necessity of having our own binational joint command missile defense system for the purposes of NORAD.

HON. ANDREW LESLIE: Well, Peter, my following comments are not meant to imply or infer that I'm not proud of my country. I am. I'm extraordinarily proud. And I was proud to be a Canadian soldier and I have the utmost respect for those who still are. But as well as time to speak truth to power to the current government, and quite frankly, their failure to adequately provide basic resources to their Canadian Forces. The Canadian Armed Forces has no ground-based air defense systems now. Perhaps, the Army, more importantly, has none. We're perhaps the only army of an even slightly modernized nation that has none such.

Should we be contributing to anti-ballistic missile defense? Well, in the old days, essentially, we were all going to die should war be declared, mutual assured destruction. Now, with Russia rampaging, it's increasingly likely that the potential for one or two of these missiles to be sold by – for example, Russian generals – is high. They could end up on freighters off our coast. Should a couple [of missiles] come towards Canada, who's going to knock them down? We're not members. We should be contributing. We should be doing more with the United States to make sure there is deterrence in place and effective capability.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Andy, I asked you I think, in general terms, an earlier question about your assessment of the threat to the existing and future bridge between the United States and Canada and other similar structures along the border. That obviously forms part of the discussion in your planning stages.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: Well, the existence of the new bridge, the Gordie Howe Bridge, is intended to address the concern. The fact is, as I suggested earlier, it will provide redundancy. The premise of the entire bridge project is that there will be two international bridges that cross the Detroit River. So that if there is, god forbid, a terrorist incident, there will be the ability to continue to transport goods and people across the Detroit River.

HON. PETER MACKAY: They are not going to close the Ambassador Bridge?

ANDY DOCTOROFF: No, no, no, no, no.

HON. PETER MACKAY: There's no chance of that?

ANDY DOCTOROFF: Look, you have heard certain claims in court pleadings about the economic impact of our bridge, the Gordie Howe, on the Ambassador Bridge. It's safe to assume that SEMCOG regional transportation planners assume that there will be, and we do need, two bridges.

The EIS that was done approximates that going forward into the future to handle various transportation needs and traffic increases; we'll need ten lanes of traffic. No one wants the Ambassador Bridge to do anything other than continue to operate and serve the region in a way that is helpful for everyone.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Can you speak about interoperability? I mean, this is a word often used in military but in border security as well. Gone are the days when to cross from Windsor to Detroit or vice versa you actually got on the bridge and didn't get stopped until you got to the other side. I mean, think about that for a moment. If you wanted to fill a white van with Semtex explosive—this is no secret—all you had to do was begin that journey and stop in the middle of the bridge.

Now, of course, it's reversed. You're stopped before you get on the bridge. A bit like preclearance. The concept seems so obvious now. But it really wasn't that long ago that that wasn't the case. That you could get on that bridge without any—without being impeded or stopped in any way.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: I do not want to step into an area that is not mine, where I'm saying things that I'm not competent about. But what I do know for sure, is that the design of our bridge was done in very close collaboration with the CBSA and the CBP in the United States. Both of the border crossings—where polling takes place, where inspections take place—are designed in a way that is really forward looking to [either] mitigate the risks or hopefully eliminate the risks that you're talking about.

HON. PETER MACKAY: That's very great. Thank you.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: Can I say something really quickly about this?

HON. PETER MACKAY: Please.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: I think on the question of infrastructure, as long as we're on it; I'd like to just say two quick things about what Andy [and] General Leslie said. On the American side of the street, I think that you would hear an almost identical conversation in two respects.

First of all, the lack of a deepwater port in Nome, [Alaska] and the need for that would be something that the military, as well as people in Alaska, I think that is moving forward in the most recent defense spending bill. But I don't think it's where everyone would like it to be for all the same reasons that you were talking about with procurement and things. Just getting to the other things becoming more important and becoming priorities.

I also think that American, the defense community, would be very concerned about the lack of defense in Alaska. Just a general overall concern that it's generally the Coast Guard that operates that has the biggest presence. That there needs to be more of a presence. I would just like to point out that not only do I agree with everything that he said, but amplify it insofar as it's also a problem in the American defense community.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Andy Leslie, I want to look out a little further from the North American challenges and call upon your experience. And one of the things I should have added to your illustrious career was your role in terms of interface, not just with Canadian military, but with American/Canadian military, but the officials on the trade files as well. And the impact that the instability that we're seeing in places like the Strait of Taiwan. And your experience with respect to some of your deployments, where we have seen far-reaching and sometimes very unintended consequences that emerge from conflicts.

The discussion currently about semiconductors, and God forbid, we see a full-blown invasion of the island of Taiwan. Can you talk just a little bit about some of your concern? And calling upon your knowledge of the Asia Pacific and the knock-on effects that we could experience here in North America?

HON. ANDREW LESLIE: A variety of, well, actually a huge number of very distinguished scholars have pointed out that the Indo-Pacific Region probably represents the greatest growth opportunities and the greatest risks to all that we in the West hold dear. The Chinese dragon rustling at scales, of course, is incredibly worrisome in the context of their support or not, perhaps overt support, but tacit support of the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

President Xi has spoken often with increasing ferocity about the reinstatement of the Chinese mainland principle that Taiwan belongs to them, and they're going to have it [Taiwan] one way or the other. The flip side of that is the vast amount of trade that Canada trades with China. They're our second largest trading partner. United States does as well. So, they are economically linked to us in ways that is difficult for all of us to understand, but they got a little bit of taste of what might happen when they had their economic crisis of several months ago, arguably ongoing.

The amount of investors that pulled out of China and the market access diminished a little bit, not a huge amount, but still a little bit. At the same time, Taiwan is booming. As you quite rightly point out, they're really the world's largest

producers as a variety of very strategic assets. Getting across the strait, into Taiwan from China, is going to be a lot tougher than people thought.

The precision of long-range strike, the American naval presence both above and below the waters, the ability to reach further, faster, harder, and hit targets with even more degrees of precise skill, to minimize collateral damage is going to mean that whoever tries that—China—will be in for an incredibly sanguinary activity that won't perhaps succeed. It may. The greater risk is China and others using their naval forces, or quasi-naval forces, to impose blockades on trade, to disrupt the international trade patterns, which would have a horrendous second and third order consequence for North America and indeed, for the world. That is a great risk. Now, it poses an equal risk to China.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Stretching back now to North America and your knowledge of the Chinese military, specifically naval capabilities, submarines, aircraft carriers, interestingly, icebreakers, what do you think is their ambition vis-à-vis the Canadian Arctic?

We know that they've also put military installations recently in the South Pole. They consider themselves a nascent member of the Arctic Council as a near Arctic neighbor. There's no ice in Beijing harbor. They're building icebreakers for a very specific reason. Can you talk about that?

HON. ANDREW LESLIE: Well, when I was a Member of Parliament, I actually represented Canada. I think it was in 2019 at the Arctic Council, which was held in China, so slightly surreal. But they do consider themselves a near Arctic power. They have aspirations there. They're building far more tonnage and icebreakers than Canada has done so in the last twenty to thirty years. And their aspirations are economic, and as well influenced, and they will probably join Russia in challenging Canada's claim to sovereignty over a significant portion of the Arctic waters.

I think China believes that it's "their time." Rather, certain elements of the Chinese authorities believe that it's their time. They believe that the West, led by the United States, has imposed a variety of restrictions on China's growth and ambitions. I think they're watching closely how Russia is resolved vis-à-vis Ukraine to see what their next steps might be. What happens in Ukraine has an impact on all of us, because of the ripple effects that could be felt globally should things either go well for one side or the other.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Kathryn, coming back again to Arctic discussion. From a communication standpoint and a prioritization standpoint for the American administration, how does this work its way into the conversation, given all of the competing challenges and priorities and the economic storm clouds that are gathering? When we talk in Canada or the United States about what's needed and what Andy Leslie has just said is what's needed really massive investment, not just in the infrastructure, but in equipment and in people. In Canada's case, the incorporation of the Indigenous aspirations and where they fit in this and the consultation periods and all of that, also such an important part of this conversation. From the American side of the Arctic, how do you move that file to a place of action?

KATHRYN LAVELLE: Yeah, I think there needs to be an amount of investment of the kind that you're talking about. I think that, just leaving it to Alaska for the moment; what Alaska needs is to have those companies and those commercial

opportunities be headquartered and located within Alaska. It seems that when you're overly dependent on an oil economy you're going to have the same kinds of problems that Russia is having right now. The problem in Alaska right now is that the major industries have headquarters. Either the cruise ship lines are headquartered elsewhere or the oil companies are headquartered elsewhere. You need to have investment that is generated within and works for the people who live there, at least from my development perspective on looking at different Arctic territories and countries. That's certainly one thing. It's not a priority. I know it's a priority for me because I'm very interested in it.

I think it gets the attention; it captures people's imagination because of the polar explorations. The polar explorations are a big problem for Indigenous Peoples because they brought measles and social diseases that killed off chunks of the population. Looking at the Franklin Expedition and the Greely Expedition, [those] in our imagination, were heroic ventures. To other people they brought death and destruction. Understanding those different histories is very important [in order] to work with the people who are in the region and understand why they don't like scientists, why they're very skeptical of people like me who are social scientists. I get it. And I think that we have to understand where these problems came from, in order to go forward.

But right now—let's not kid ourselves—in the American military, China is just much more of a concern. I might disagree how much importance China places on the Arctic because, it seems to me, China wants to be positioned there. I'm not sure Russia will ultimately welcome Chinese submarines *en masse*. If they're going to go, that just might be a minor quibble; but certainly, the American geostrategy is concerned with China much more than the Arctic.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: If I can add to that?

HON. PETER MACKAY: Please.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: Again, we're talking about the linkage between infrastructure and security, which entails actually getting infrastructure done.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Right.

ANDREW DOCTOROFF: One of the key things that so many people overlook is the need to consider how any infrastructure project impacts those who are located closest to it. One of the reasons why the Gordie Howe International Bridge Project, I believe, is succeeding is because we had been scrupulously attentive to what we are doing and how that affects the disadvantaged communities—particularly in Detroit—who live in the neighborhood where the bridge will land. Canada and Michigan worked together to come up with a very, I would argue, groundbreaking model establishing community benefits vision that really helps smooth the way for the projects that we all agree are necessary.

You don't want your conversation about infrastructure to be based solely on engineering, schematics, safety, standards. You have to look at how they actually impact the people who are stakeholders in the projects, but not of the projects itself or themselves. That requires great empathy and sensitivity. The problems that you refer about completely capsizing, or toppling, certain parts of a culture, do not occur, whether we're talking about Indigenous populations in the Arctic or disadvantaged people in southwest Detroit.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: I really agree, and that they're not so far away. That they don't even know them and that they're environmentalists in Ohio, I think that's really important, thank you.

HON. PETER MACKAY: And I think it's interesting we're talking about the heartland in many ways of Canada and America, in terms of this massively populated [region], and movement of goods and services and people, and all of these considerations, and the most remote parts of our country. Yet, some of the considerations are the same. I would overlay the political imperative too. I think Andrew Leslie will agree. As recovering politicians, it has to matter less who gets the credits because these projects inevitably take time if there are these fits and starts—we've seen it in procurement many times—where an incoming administration changes the commitment or abandons the commitment [to] a project of [a certain] size and scope. The biggest that we've seen in my lifetime, might be comparable with the Big Dig in Boston. That was solely in one city, in one jurisdiction.

But the overlay of politics plays an enormous role. For somebody with an engineering, or a legal, or a military background, that is intangible. It is often very hard to understand and hard to punch through.

ANDREW DOCTOROFF: And it is an incredible risk.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Yes.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: Look, the Gordie Howe International Bridge Project is incredibly fortunate because it has been supported tightly. It has been embraced tightly by successive administrations in Canada, at the national level, in Michigan, at the state level with Governor Snyder and now, Governor Whitmer and in Washington with President Biden. President Trump was not a friend of the project; however, he did not get in the way of the project. Obviously before him [there was] President Obama, who issued the presidential permit. Without that political continuity, I don't know how these projects occur and the key thing is for project planners to think ahead and communicate as needed, so that you can get the buy-in from administrations over time. That point is critical and that requires a broader understanding of what infrastructure is (i.e., why it's so important, why it connects us, and why it should be a nonpartisan issue).

HON. PETER MACKAY: A “do no harm” approach. A quick word from you Andy on that subject. I think it's certainly fair to say that military investment should not be a partisan exercise and yet I think that on both sides of the border, sadly, we've seen examples of where it has been.

HON. ANDREW LESLIE: Yeah, the flip side of that, Peter, is perhaps, all politics is local. In the example of the Gordie Howe Bridge, I would submit that the team has done a magnificent job of laying the groundwork, of doing the walking, the knocking on the doors, communing with the variety of local organizations and ethnicities. Such that there's broad consensus that it should proceed. Now that takes time, a lot of time, and when I was Member of Parliament, I was trying to help with the Columbia River negotiations with the United States. There was some frustration from some folk about the length of time of it, as talking to engage in consultations with Indigenous populations, the locals, then the stakeholders both upriver and down river.

The point being is that it's working and some of these things do take time. But for goodness' sake, I know the other Andy is saying this as well. Once you start one of these mega projects, that are so valuable to our combined economies, you have to fight like a wounded badger to make sure that they don't get cancelled. Or they don't fall prey to, not local politics, but national politics.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Yes, and success has thousands of parents and failures' an orphan. I am going to now open the floor. We don't have a lot of time left and I know people, perhaps, have travel arrangements. We've got terrific expertise here, available to you, if you have any questions that you would like to pose to the panel. Yes, sir?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: First, a remark. I submit to you that icebreakers are good for something besides breaking ice. In a confrontation, an icebreaker could incapacitate a multi-billion-dollar aircraft carrier. Without, necessarily, provoking a full-scale military retaliation in a blockade of Taiwan, short of war. Maybe, I've been watching too many re-runs of "Ben-Hur".

HON. PETER MACKAY: That's an interesting point.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I had heard that Canada was trying to build a serious submarine force. I was interested that they're not building ones with nuclear propulsion. American nuclear submarines are actually 21st century battleships. I would think that in the Arctic waters, you would need something between coastal submarines and the behemoths the States unleashes. That's for both of the military people here.

HON. PETER MACKAY: It's been talked about for a long time. We have no immediate plans to procure nuclear subs. Although, that's what's needed. Under heavy arctic ice, we have diesel electric, which were second-hand to us. General Leslie?

HON. ANDREW LESLIE: Absolutely, the only addition I would add, Peter, is we should have submarines to help defend our Arctic. And, to do so, they have to withstand the ice. Whether or not they're nuclear or they're long-range submarines that some other nations – and I'm just choosing one because I know a tiny bit about submarines but not a lot – Japan has very long-range submarines. Obviously, because of their vast seascapes and they are not nuclear. Your point is taken. Australia, for example, is building a modern fleet based on the American submarine force of twelve. A great expense and they believe that that investment is required for their own defense to deter China.

HON. PETER MACKAY: It will be a debate that will continue I suspect. It's the cost prohibitive nature of submarines, but the stealth technology and the proximity for first strike capability, is what's terrifying when it comes to submarine warfare.

Other questions?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have an infrastructure question. With the pandemic, we saw major disruptions at the major ports, at least in the United States. Do you see any benefit in the long-term to secondary ports or growth of other infrastructure, so ports such as Cleveland? Or do you see something like the Gordie Howe Bridge Project occurring at the crossing by Buffalo [and] promoting more economic activity up there? Thank you.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: I'm not sure I understand the question that's directed to me, so I apologize. Can you rephrase it?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just in terms of the disruptions we saw in American ports with the pandemic, we saw greater activity at secondary facilities and in other ports. I'm wondering if you'll see that? Is that going to be a long-term change you foresee?

ANDREW DOCTOROFF: I honestly don't want to say something that I'm not familiar with, so I don't know the answer to that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Fair enough. Is there more activity? Do you see competition coming from the Peace Bridge or crossings in the Buffalo area?

ANDREW DOCTOROFF: Obviously, the hope is for us not to compete with the Peace Bridge given the distance from Detroit. When it comes to COVID, the relationship between it and infrastructure, as I would personally describe it, is that it has significant contractual implications as to who's going to assume the risk for so-called acts of God or pandemics. That's a significant issue. I also think that if COVID does come as it has and has affected many infrastructure projects, the question is how do you mitigate that risk? How do you plan around it? Which, obviously, requires great expertise and planning.

HON. PETER MACKAY: We want as many points of crossing, safe crossing, as we can in the country; and some of that involved major infrastructure, some of it less so. It has to be also coordinated through immigration and our border services. There's been a controversial issue you probably didn't hear as much about here, involving a place called Roxham Road in upstate New York, and people basically flowing into [Canada via it] unimpeded. And so that was one of the discussions between President Biden and our Prime Minister, and I think progress was made but smooth border passage is a critical component for both our countries. I know all ambassadors over the years have been seized with this issue, and I think we've made big improvements. Stephen?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: This has been a fantastic panel, and I really have to congratulate all of you for these great insights. With respect to the Arctic, it seems like we need a missile defense system. We probably need ten to twenty icebreakers. Russia's got 38,000 troops in their Arctic, we need 38,000 troops in our combined Arctic. Is there a plan? What you're talking about is multi-multi-billions of dollars, right, to get to where you want to go; is there in fact a plan already? Is a plan being put together? I mean, if there is a plan, how long is it going to take? Are we talking ten years? Twenty years? Thirty years? What's the status of that?

HON. PETER MACKAY: I'm going to turn to Andy quickly on that. I think that the short answer is "yes", there's a plan. It's the implementation where it all falls apart and the necessity, the urgency and the influx of both people [and] capital. Refueling capability is another part of it. We talked earlier about the F-35; well, if they can't land and refuel, much of their usefulness is lost. Drone capability is another part of that equation. Andy, if you want to take a swing at that.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: There is a plan. It came out in a document in 2017 called *Strong, Secure, Engage*, but it only covers the pre-Russian invasion of Ukraine international circumstances. So obviously, that plan has got to be looked at really hard and more resources allocated to it to provide deterrence to start with and then

defense and development. Having said all that, it's a long way away because everything takes so long in the Arctic. In certain nations' case, it takes very long to actually get big expensive programs up and running and deliver the equipment the troops need.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Yeah, very short build season in the Arctic. Yes?

KATHRYN LAVELLE: I would also say it depends on what is the purpose of what are they coming for? What are they invading for? Again, two things here; when I've heard about it from the American side, I've always heard, "but the Canadians don't even have roads." We have the pipeline, and if we have that, we can get to the north slope or whatever. We have more airfields in the smaller territory.

The other thing is, and I'm not trying to be facetious here at all, I'm a child of the Cold War. We were always taught, why would the Russians want to invade [if] the American people are armed? How could you really take—how could you hold the territory? The point being, you can invade, but then maybe, I think what American defense planners are more concerned about is, then what exactly is the ultimate point of that invasion, or that bombing mission or nuclear device or whatever it is, missile launch, whatever it is that you're trying to do.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Andy?

ANDY DOCTOROFF: Well, as you know, Kathryn, Russia is not our friend. When I say "our" I'm talking about Canada. They currently have a court case before the United Nations, which is contesting Canada's claim to a significant portion of the Arctic. The concern is that without deterrence capability, so an established presence and some patrol ships or surveillance aircraft or satellite systems, they could start to drill for oil or start to do mineral extraction. Literally, we would, probably wouldn't know about it until they're well established. Then what do we do? Do we go to the United States and say, "Who are the nasty Russians here? We need your help not in a case of war, but they're infringing in our sovereignty to extract wealth, which we don't believe is illegal or lawful." Well, now we involve the United States and another potential United States-on-Russia confrontation when it should have been handled by us, a sovereign nation.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Yeah, the sovereignty exercise has always been to come back to Stephen's question, part of that challenge. How do you give meaning to the word sovereignty? It's more than just mere presence or claims and the military plays a big part of that. With the Russians, their audacity is growing by the day. I remember, as [Canada's] Foreign Minister, we faced this bizarre situation where they were planting flags on the ocean floor, like it was the 17th century that they could sail around and simply state claims. This, unpredictability, has given away to an audacity now that is playing out in the most horrific way in Ukraine.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: I just learned twenty-four hours ago that Sweden paid for that mission for those Russians to plant that flag.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Oh, did they?

KATHRYN LAVELLE: Yeah, nice little detail; was a scientific mission and the Swedes paid for it.

HON. PETER MACKAY: There's a lot of conspiracies too.

KATHRYN LAVELLE: Yeah, no, anyway.

HON. PETER MACKAY: I did want to give Andy the chance to, perhaps, say a word on Line 5, I wouldn't want to let you get away without at least a reference to that, because that is another example of an enormously important investment.

ANDY DOCTOROFF: I didn't want to skirt your question. I just wanted to make another point. I appreciate you raising it just for context. Governor Whitmer earlier this year appointed me to be one of three members of the Mackinac Straits Corridor Authority, which is charged with overseeing on behalf of the state, the tunnel project. The question is: *will the tunnel project go ahead?* That's the long-term question. The short-term question is: *will anything get in the way of the current operation of the two lines that Governor Blanchard correctly said this morning, are lying on the bottom of the lakebed?* I think the one thing to remember when you're thinking about Line 5 is that one's position on the current operation of the existing pipelines and the tunnel that has been built, or hopefully will presumably be built under the lakebed, will entail competing considerations and different considerations.

I teach this subject in my class. You have to think very carefully about the policy implications and the imperatives when it comes to the existing pipelines and separate it if you can when you're thinking about the tunnel. The current pipelines, people are very fearful about what's happening to the Great Lakes, which would be an environmental catastrophe. There are also countervailing risks that people pointed out this morning about purportedly shutting them down. Arguably, that would involve shipping propane in a way that's less environmentally friendly [and] riskier affecting people's access to energy.

It's a thorny political issue that I personally stay out of, and don't think I have a role. I am aware of the competing perspectives, and my belief is that the lawsuits that are currently pending will play themselves out. As far as a project which I have responsibility for when it comes to oversight, the permitting process has gone a long way, but we still need a permit from the Michigan Public Service Commission, and as has been in the news recently, we need an elite agency, the Army Corps of Engineers, to complete an EIS (environmental impact statement). There was just an announcement that [the EIS] is going to take longer than had previously been hoped. That's where it is now. I think that it's a very complicated issue that people can talk about either being informed or uninformed about, and please become informed about it.

HON. PETER MACKAY: Well, thank you for helping to make us more informed about it. I want to ask you all to join me in thanking our panelists. We've had a great discussion on various types of security: economic security, environmental security. Our military, of course, plays a huge role in that. If we run into a problem, as you said Andy, we turn to the army to come and do it for us. Thank you very much Andrew Leslie, for your years of service. Thank you all for being part of this discussion. Thank you.