



THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY CAPSTONE PROJECT

An Analysis of Canada's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Strategy for the Canadian Extractive Industry: Is "*Building the Canadian Advantage*" a Subsidy for Canadian Mining Organizations Operating Abroad?

Submitted by:
Adebayo Adejuwon

Approved by Supervisor:
Dr. Jean-Sébastien Rioux

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of PPOL 623 and completion of the
requirements for the Master of Public Policy Degree

Acknowledgements

The successful completion of this Capstone Project would not have been possible without the guidance and support of my supervisor, Dr. Jean-Sébastien Rioux. I thank him very sincerely for his comments and advice. My sincere appreciation also goes to my wife, Olayinka, my daughters, Oluwatomika, Iteoluwakisi and Oluwatoki for creating a tranquil and homely ambience which helped me in the completion of this project. I also thank the Faculty and Staff of The Calgary School of Public Policy for providing and sustaining an environment conducive for stimulating and rewarding academic work. Above all, I thank God Almighty for creating this mid-career academic opportunity and for seeing me through against all odds.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Canadians take pride in their country's commitment to global poverty reduction through the delivery of Canada's Official Development Assistance (ODA) programs which are funded through tax payer's revenue. They also share their government's vision of responsible mining abroad as encapsulated in the *"Building the Canadian Advantage."*

This Capstone Project explores the implication of Canada's policy shift which aligns the delivery its Official Development Assistance(O DA) programs to its economic interest abroad to determine whether the implementation of Canada's International Extractive Sector (CSR) Strategy is a subsidy to Canadian mining corporations operating abroad by asking whether Canada would remain consistently committed to its Official Development Assistance(O DA) programs under this new policy regime and also whether Canada will be better off as a major foreign aid donor by adopting mandatory regulatory CSR strategy for its international extractive industry.

The Capstone Project is explored through qualitative research technique using case study approach. To this end, a study of the cases reviewed by the CSR Counsellor's Office between 2009 and 2013 in the performance of its dispute resolution role was carried out. Also, the research evaluated Canada's partnership in the delivery of Official Development Assistance (ODA) for the same period. From available data and analysis carried out, there is no evidence which supports the claim that *"Building the Canadian Advantage"* is a subsidy to mining corporations operating abroad in the delivery of Canada's ODA programs. Similarly, there is no

direct evidence which suggests that corporations involved in the CSR Counsellor's review partnered with CIDA in the delivery of Canada's Official Development Assistance (ODA) delivery between 2009 and 2013.

Along this line, this Capstone Project recommends that Government of Canada should continue to promote and support Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) best practices in its international extractive sector while it should also focus on delivering its Official Development Assistance (ODA) programs to vulnerable people around the world in demonstration of its commitment to global poverty alleviation and sustainable development.

However, the Government of Canada should empower the Office of the Canadian Extractive Sector Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Counsellor in the performance of its oversight function in the implementation of the endorsed performance standards of the International Extractive Sector CSR Strategy by allowing the CSR Counsellor to exercise mandatory regulatory power over Canadian mining corporations operating abroad.

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction

1.1 The Origins of Contemporary Foreign Aid	1
1.2 History of Canadian Foreign Aid	3

Section 2: Literature Review

2.1 Development and Foreign Aid in a Global World	8
2.2 Foreign Aid, International Development and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)	20
2.3 Canadian Foreign Aid Delivery and “ <i>Building the Canadian Advantage</i> ”	28

Section 3: Research Methodology

3.1 Objective	31
3.2 Research Design	32

Section 4: Findings

4.1 Data Analysis	35
Table 1: Summary of Requests for Review by the CSR Counsellor	38
Table 2: Profiles of Mining Corporations Involved in the CSR Review	39
4.2 Interpretation of Data	42

Section 5: Conclusions and Policy Implications

References	48
-------------------	----

INTRODUCTION

The Origins of Contemporary Foreign Aid

The modern concept of foreign aid as voluntary transfer of public resources from rich to poor countries for the purpose of development started with the Marshall Plan in 1948 (Browne 2006; Picard and Buss 2009; Thérien 2002). Following WWII, Europe was in ruins with a desperate need for infrastructure and economic development. As a result, some Western European nations came together in 1947 and agreed to a plan of action on how to reconstruct Europe. The United States of America supported this effort through the Marshall Plan. To achieve this objective, the Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) was established in 1948 with the mandate to oversee distribution of the American aid, and to also secure cooperation among Western European nations towards the recovery of the continent. The Marshall Plan's contribution of \$US13 billion to the reconstruction of Western Europe was, by far, the most generous foreign assistance ever given. This was the first global broad transfer of money during peace time, making it an important factor in the establishment of institutional global development assistance (Browne 2006; Picard and Buss 2009; Thérien 2002, 453).

While the Marshall Plan is considered as the beginning of contemporary foreign aid programs, there were some private aid transfers by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in form of humanitarian assistance before the Marshall plan. For example, the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief (OXFAM) and Centre for American Relief in Europe (CARE) did some charity work to assist war refugees before the Marshall Plan which suggests that NGOs played a pivotal role in providing private foreign aid through the provision of some form of humanitarian assistance in the pre-Marshall Plan era (Browne 2006, 15; Thérien 2002, 452).

The Marshall Plan's main focus was the rebuilding of Western Europe through infrastructure development, industrial growth and removal of trade restrictions. The success of the Marshall Plan was the impetus for contemporary foreign aid (OECD 2009). However, while contemporary foreign aid is conceived as an offshoot of the Marshall Plan, there have been voluntary transfers of public resources from rich to poor nations before WWII. For example, Athens gave Sparta subsidies during the classical Greek period; Japan also offered technical assistance to the Chinese when they sent the Koreans to teach the Chinese the technology of weaving in 300 AD; similarly, Alexander the Great offered technical assistance to Egypt in 323 BC towards the construction of city port in Alexandria, while some Mediterranean states donated food and relief materials to Rhodes when it was devastated by an earthquake in 226 BC (Picard and Buss 2009, 6).

These examples indicate that the Empires of the pre-Marshall Plan era engaged in some forms of transfer of public resources to other nations for strategic reasons. These forms of transfers could have been influenced by strategic considerations (Picard and Buss 2009; Rioux 2006). When nations transfer public resources to other countries in form of grants, concessionary loans, technical assistance, it can be to enhance the ability of the donor nation to acquire influence in the recipient country.

The four motives often cited as justification for foreign policy decisions are diplomatic, commercial, humanitarian and moral (Piccard and Buss 2009, 13). From diplomatic standpoint, development assistance is viewed as a tool of power politics, which the donor country deploys to gain influence in the recipient country. Development assistance allocation decisions sometimes are also influenced by commercial considerations. In this respect, development assistance is viewed as efforts to protect the commercial interest of the donor nation in the recipient country.

Humanitarian consideration is another motive often cited as justification for development assistance. This perspective views development assistance as philanthropic gesture from wealthy nations to poor ones for welfare and development purposes. There is also the moral imperative perspective which views development assistance as a moral and ethical obligation that the wealthy and advanced nations owe the poor and less developed nations in order to achieve global equality (Piccard and Buss 2009 ; Thérien 2002).

History of Canadian Foreign Aid

Canada's involvement in foreign aid started in the 1950s when it participated in the Colombo Plan. The Colombo Plan was the Commonwealth's development initiative designed to combat poverty in some newly independent Commonwealth countries of Asia. The successful implementation of the Colombo Plan encouraged Canada's commitment to foreign aid. Prior to the Colombo Plan, Canada's foreign policy was tied to whatever United Kingdom practiced until 1931 (Rioux 2006, 210). Beginning with its involvement in the Colombo Plan, Canada continued to play active role in foreign aid until today.

When the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was formed in 1961, Canada was one of its founding members and remains committed to the OECD's goal of improving economic and social well-being of people around the world. Canada is also a member of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is an international forum within the OECD where many of the largest funders of foreign aid and the twenty-seven DAC member countries implement OECD mandate of:

Promoting development co-operation and other policies
so as to contribute to sustainable development, including
Pro-poor economic growth, poverty reduction, improvement
of living standards in developing countries, and to a future
in which no country will depend on aid (OECD 2013).

Similar to what other developed nations do, and from a realist standpoint, Canada would be expected to utilize its foreign aid flow to promote its interest in developing countries that Canada considers to be of strategic importance. In this respect, Canada, on account of its historical and colonial origin, remains a member of the Commonwealth and the organization internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) (Rioux 2006, 213). For example, Canada's foreign aid allocation was hypothesized to be more favourable towards Commonwealth and the organization internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) countries than other countries between 1959 and 1999. However, this trend has been diluted somewhat in recent years even through Canada, just like any other donor nation continues to allocate foreign aid based on strategic consideration (Rioux 2006, 220).

Since the Colombo plan, Canada's commitment to official development assistance has not stopped. In 1968, Canada established the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) to administer the bulk of its foreign aid. It remains committed to the United Nation's official development assistance target, which requires donor countries to provide foreign aid equal to 0.70% of their Gross Domestic Product. Although Canada is yet to meet this target, it continues to give bilateral foreign aid to countries of its choice while it participates in

multilateral aid through the multilateral development banks, such as the World Bank, and some specialized agents of the UN.

According to the OECD's Development Cooperation Report, Canada, in 2010, achieved its 2001 goal of doubling its international assistance within ten years by enlarging its international assistance envelope by 8% per year (OECD 2012). Its bilateral and multilateral ODA for the period between 2005 and 2010 varied from a ratio of 69:31 (bilateral: multilateral) to 75:25. Similarly, the OECD Development Cooperation Report reported that Canada's net ODA in 2011 was \$US 5.29 billion, which translates to a 14% increase compared to its 2010 figure. In this same report however, Canada's net ODA decreased by over 5% in real terms, resulting from its decision to cap its development co-operation budget at 2010 levels. Similarly, Canada's ODA to GNI ratio in 2011, according to the report was 0.31%, short of the UN target of 0.7% of gross national income (GNI) (OECD 2012).

That said, Canada continues to rank fairly high in its commitment to ODA allocation compared to other DAC members. According to the OECD 2012 Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Peer Review, Canada's foreign aid allocation in 2011 ranked eighth amongst DAC member (OECD 2012). The report, however, suggest that these gains may be reversed considering that Canada's real terms allocation dropped between 2010 and 2011 and requested Canada's commitment to a timeline of achieving the 0.7% GNI target (OECD 2012).

However, as Canada continues to participate in ODA delivery, it recently realigned its foreign aid policy with its overseas economic interest as part of its foreign policy. In the 2013 Budget, Canada announced the amalgamation of CIDA into the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD). With this amalgamation, DFATD is mandated to facilitate a

coherent policy, which will support the achievement of Canada's international goals through efficient and effective target programming. The expectation is that the "enhanced realignment of Canada's foreign, development, trade and commercial policies and program", will positively impact Canada's foreign policy objectives (Economic Action Plan 2013, 251).

While Canada's official development assistance effort remains focused on increasing food security, securing the future of children and youth, and stimulating sustainable economic growth in order to achieve the objective of sustainable environment, gender equality, and strong governance institutions and democratic practices in developing countries, the challenge is how Canada will harmonize its development and economic objectives under this new policy regime which aligns ODA delivery with Canada's economic interest abroad (Government of Canada 2013). As Canada continues to demonstrate commitment to making its official development assistance efficient, focused, accountable, and in line with international agreements and recognized best practices, what remains to be seen is whether aligning development goals with economic interest will compromise its development goals.

The realignment of Canada's foreign aid policy with its economic interest abroad raises the issue of whether Canada's policy of harmonizing official development assistance with its economic interest abroad will compromise its commitment to poverty alleviation and sustainable development in the developing nations. Canada's official development assistance objective is framed as an integral part of its commitment to universal human rights and equality. It symbolizes Canadian values of helping less privileged, more vulnerable members of the society. Foreign aid is delivered with tax payers funds. The desired end result is to improve the wellbeing of people in need through poverty alleviation and sustainable environment related programs.

With this in mind, there is a strong reason to believe that Canadians are proud of their country in the international arena. Canadians are proud of Canada's international image and they think that Canada's generous foreign aid may be partly responsible for this. This perception is supported by a study in which 86% Canadians surveyed thought that outsiders have positive attitudes about their country due to its generous foreign aid and its international peacekeeping effort (Rioux 2006). If Canada's activity abroad remains a source of pride to its citizens and if its commitment to foreign aid is perceived as partly responsible for this sense of national pride, it may then mean that Canadian foreign aid policy is important to Canadians.

With this understanding, the challenge therefore for Canada is how to harmonize its foreign aid policy with its economic interest abroad within a policy realignment framework which puts Canadian private corporations as drivers of development without the policy realignment being perceived as provision of subsidy to mining corporations at taxpayers' expense.

Foreign aid is theoretically about poverty alleviation, human rights protection and promotion of sustainable environment; while business is about profit making in the interest of shareholders. To explore this subject, this Capstone Project will examine the prospect and challenges of aligning Canada's official development assistance objectives of poverty alleviation, human rights protection and sustainable environment with profit maximization objective of Canadian mining corporations operating abroad without compromising its development objectives in favour of economic interest.

The analysis will centre around Canada's implementation of its Extractive Sector Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) strategy: "*Building the Canadian Advantage*" with a view

to determining whether this strategy complements and enhances Canada's official development assistance effort or is a form of subsidy to private corporations operating abroad. The analysis will also examine how the implementation of Canada's CSR strategy will not be perceived as an effort geared towards the promotion of the business interest of Canadian extractive sector corporations operating abroad to the detriment of Canada's development assistance objectives. Similarly, this Capstone Project will assess how the Extractive Sector Counsellor's advisory role impacts Canada's ODA delivery. This study will also evaluate the impact of Canada's non-regulatory CSR strategy on Canada's official development assistance programs.

Along this line, this Capstone Project will identify the implication of the gap resulting from this policy which aligns Canada's official development assistance programs with the activities of private corporations, whose primary focus is business and not development. Similarly, this Capstone Project will propose that Canada adopts mandatory CSR and regulatory oversight function for the Extractive Sector CSR Counsellor in the implementation of "*Building the Canadian Advantage*."

LITERATURE REVIEW

Development and Foreign Aid in a Global World

Nations give foreign aid to poor countries for strategic, economic, and humanitarian reasons (Van Belle, Rioux and Potter 2004). Contemporary foreign aid, though conceived as a tool of poverty alleviation and economic growth and a component of international development is also a foreign policy tool. It is within this context that international development as a distinct

academic discipline became prominent in the 1950s, a period when foreign aid became institutionalized following the successful implementation of the Marshall Plan in the reconstruction and recovery of Europe (Thérien 2002; Hook and Lebo 2010; Browne 2006; Picard and Buss 2009).

After the successful recovery of Europe through the Marshall Plan, the United States of America became the arrowhead of global development as it led other developed nations in the battle against global underdevelopment. In the same vein, the Marshall Plan became a model official development assistance tool in international development. In addition, it was also during this era that global institutions such as the UN and multilateral development organizations such as International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) emerged to promote global cooperation, peace and security.

Following the conceptualization of foreign aid as a development tool in the global effort to combat poverty and underdevelopment, the question then becomes whether foreign aid is solely about development. With the understanding that foreign aid allocation is often influenced by donor nation's economic interest and the desire to gain influence in recipient nations, the argument that foreign aid is purely a development tool becomes contentious. It is within this context that the strands of suggestions that foreign aid without efficient management of the domestic economy of recipient nation may not lead to meaningful development gained prominence (Picard and Bus 2006; Browne 2006; Stiglitz 2005; Rodrick 2006).

While underdeveloped nations require resources and a favourable external environment to develop, efficient domestic management is also a critical factor in development and economic growth. This argument does not undermine the role of foreign aid in promoting economic

growth, poverty alleviation, environmental sustainability and democratic governance in developing nations. However, it supports the notion that foreign aid may not necessarily be the “best tool” in promoting economic growth and resource redistribution in a recipient country (Picard and Buss 2009, 8).

Another issue that comes with the conceptualization of foreign aid as a development tool is the difference in focus and emphasis between donor and recipient countries in the delivery of official development programs. This difference in focus and emphasis sometimes raises the concern of whether foreign aid is genuinely about development in the recipient nations. For example, when Western donors allocated foreign aid to Bangladesh, a new country in 1971, the focus of the Western donors was how Bangladesh would redeem the pre-1971 Pakistan debts with less emphasis on the immediate development need of the new country (Browne 2006, 2). This “grafted external solution” makes it impossible for recipients nations to direct their development agenda (Browne 2006, 10). When this happens, foreign aid is viewed as dependent policy which questions the claim that foreign aid is solely about development (Browne 2006).

However, foreign aid is not totally irrelevant in development. There is certainly a place for foreign aid as a development tool. What is required is a balance between implementation of foreign aid programs and efficient management of the domestic economy of recipient nations for development and economic growth to be meaningful. This perhaps explains the source of the doubt on whether meaningful economic progress and development without efficient management of domestic economy will ever be possible (Browne 2006, 10). This claim finds support in the example of nations such as Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea, Brazil, South Africa, Malaysia and Thailand that broke the cycle of poverty without dependence on foreign aid (Brown 2006, 10). It is in recognition of this effectiveness gap between foreign aid and development that OECD

initiated the Aid Effectiveness Agenda aimed at harmonizing official development assistance delivery of donor nations with recipient nation's development objectives.

Foreign aid as transfers from donor to receiving nations takes place within an international context and with development as the goal. But why do sovereign states give foreign aid? In international relations, foreign policy decisions are often influenced by strategic, economic and humanitarian considerations or a combination of all these. It is in this sense that foreign aid, as a foreign policy tool is analyzed from the realist, globalist and pluralist perspectives. From the realist tradition, foreign aid is viewed from a strategic perspective; the globalist paradigm, on the other hand, views foreign aid from economic an perspective, while the pluralist tradition views foreign aid from a humanitarian perspective (Rioux 2006; Van Belle, Rioux and Potter 2004).

Foreign aid, from strategic standpoint is viewed as a diplomatic tool used by donor nations to procure influence within international arena in the promotion of national interest which may be economic, political or military (Rioux 2006; Van Belle, Rioux and Potter 2004). From this perspective, foreign aid policymaking is viewed as the deployment of public resources to secure influence either directly from a recipient nation or within the international community. This is what is often referred to as “realpolitik” or “Exchange theory” of foreign aid (Picard and Buss 2009, 13). This view conceptualizes foreign aid as a tool in power relations to gain influence through all forms of ODA delivery whether they are grants, subsidies or technical assistance.

This form of foreign aid, most likely must have been influenced by “geostrategic interests” (Rioux 2006, 213). The purpose of foreign aid, going by this perspective, is to gain

diplomatic influence with a view to advancing strategic interest of the donor abroad. An example of this is Canada's decision to focus its foreign aid almost exclusively to poor Commonwealth and Francophone countries at one point (Rioux 2006, 220).

Foreign aid is also influenced by commercial considerations. Foreign aid, in this sense is a "support mechanism" through which donor nations promote their commercial interest (Picard and Buss 2009, 16). This fits with the globalist tradition which, views foreign aid from economic perspective. This reasoning is informed by neo-Marxist economic principles that associate foreign policy to economic oppression. This paradigm assumes that the goal of foreign aid is the facilitation of the transfer of transnational capital from developed economies to developing ones through globalization and liberalization of trade. Foreign aid, from this perspective, is construed as purely economic. According to this paradigm, foreign aid is viewed as a tool used by developed economies to further exploit the less developed ones or to preserve a favourable balance of trade (Rioux 2006; Van Belle, Rioux and Potter 2004).

This standpoint supports strands of literature which, argues that foreign aid allocation could be positively skewed in favour of recipient countries that are net importers from their donors. For example, Canada sends more ODA to developing countries which it has positive trade balance (Rioux 2006, 215). This approach to foreign aid is by no means a new development. Foreign aid as an international trade tool had been in use since the nineteenth century when technical assistance was used by the nations in the global North to enter markets in the global South (Picard and Buss 2009, 16).

As well, there is the pluralist paradigm which, views foreign aid from a humanitarian perspective. This tradition argues that humanitarian consideration is a motivation for foreign aid.

While the charity argument for foreign aid is popular among development practitioners, civil society organizations, NGOs and citizens, political and economic motive remains the driving force in the conceptualization of foreign aid policymaking by political and bureaucratic elites of most donor nations. Humanitarian motive is often expressed as charity and philanthropy. Development practitioners and citizens often conceive foreign aid as charity or a form of humanitarian assistance influenced by religious persuasion. For example, humanitarian consideration was a strong justification for the international assistance rendered during the two World Wars (Picard and Buss 2009). In this sense, humanitarianism is conceived as genuine concern for vulnerable people who need support in contradistinction to the motives behind the realist and the globalism paradigm (Rioux 2006; Thérien 2002).

Other than these three traditions, there is a strand of literature, which suggests that ethical consideration is also a justification for foreign aid. This idealist perspective frames foreign aid as a moral imperative. The moral imperative argument is premised on the proposition that in a globalized world order where rich and poor nations co-exist, rich nations are obliged to liberate poor nations from the stranglehold of poverty and underdevelopment. This paradigm, though not quite prominent in literature, argues that foreign aid is an ethical issue which imposes a moral obligation on developed nations to help vulnerable people around the world (Picard and Buss 2009; Thérien 2002). For example, Canada's decision to alter its foreign aid strategy beginning in 2002 when it started to focus on Africa as a continent where some of the poorest nations in the world are located aligns with this perspective (Rioux 2006).

It is with this in mind that the Pluralist paradigm is viewed as a challenge to the notion that foreign aid is solely about diplomacy and economic interests of donors. Pluralist perspective argues that development assistance focuses on welfare of the citizens of the recipient nations and

not just on the diplomatic and economic interest of donor nations alone. The pluralist perspective of foreign aid is often premised on moral and ethical considerations. The reasoning is that developed nations are morally and ethically obliged to help vulnerable citizens wherever they may be in the world (Picard and Buss 2006).

Although, Foreign aid policymaking hardly lends itself to clearly defined lineal motivations, however, there is ample evidence, which suggests that decision makers are influenced by the interest of their countries and the prevailing foreign policy circumstance within which foreign aid decisions are made. Foreign aid policymaking therefore could be considered as a product of confluence of motives within the realist and idealist ideological spectrum (Rioux 2006; Van Belle Rioux and Potter 2004).

The method of foreign aid delivery is also crucial in official development assistance decisions. Two common form of foreign aid delivery used by donors are bilateral and multilateral (Browne 2006; Rioux 2006). Bilateral foreign aid refers to all form of transfers or programs made directly to recipient nations by the donor country in form of direct grants or concessionary loans. Multilateral aid, on the other hand, is an indirect form of foreign aid transfer. Multilateral aid involves cash transfer by donor nations to the World Bank, or other regional development banks, in support of programs undertaken by multilateral organizations. In addition to bilateral and multilateral channels, donors also deliver foreign aid through independent NGOs to support programs or specific projects that is of interest to them (Rioux 2006, 211). Whatever the mode of delivery, there is a balance of evidence, which suggest that donors give foreign aid to gain influence and to promote their interests abroad within the context of international development.

It is with this in mind that institutionalized foreign aid is therefore conceived as a post-1950 development. This was the period when welfare principles became prevalent in the governance of nation states (Thérien 2002; Browne 2006). Furthermore, it was also an era when international cooperation as a means of promoting global peace and security became predominant. For example, the United Nations (UN) was established in 1945 for the purpose of promoting international cooperation among sovereign nations of the world. In this sense, foreign aid could be considered to be founded on the idea of equality and egalitarianism which became entrenched at a time the world started to seek solution to global peace and security through international cooperation (Thérien 2002, 452).

From the foregoing, it will be appropriate to argue that despite the voluntary transfer of public resources from rich nations to poor ones in the pre-WWII era, the Marshall Plan of 1948 remains the origin of institutionalized foreign aid through which several aid organizations such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRAA); the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)- or World Bank- set up in 1944 to finance the reconstruction of the war-devastated economies of Europe came into being (Browne 2006, 16).

In addition, it was also during this era that the United States of America assumed a lead role in proffering enduring solutions to global development challenges. In the process, the US was able to influence the UN with its economic policies, which, ultimately formed part of the development policies of that era. As this was going on, the Cold War further divided the world into two blocks; this was also the time when several countries in the global South attained sovereign status which also made international cooperation very desirable thus pushing international development discourse to the forefront of international agenda. It was during this period that international development begins to emerge as a distinct academic discipline.

International development as an academic discipline studies the relationship between production and allocation of economic resources among sovereign nations within a globalized world where rich and poor nations cohabit within the same space (Hook and Lebo 2010). International development theory therefore is about the assumptions, philosophies, worldviews, traditions and policy frameworks within which global production and allocation of resources among nation states takes place.

For the most part, development theory evolved out of the need to offer solution to the widening prosperity gap between the developed economies and the underdeveloped ones. The emergence of international development as an academic discipline had traversed different paradigmatic shifts since 1950. Within the last fifty years, development theory and practice has evolved through Modernization, Critical Structuralism, Neomercantilism, Neoliberalism, Postdevelopmentism and Development Holism paradigms (Hook and Lebo 2010).

The modernization paradigm of development advocates a universal market driven effort in transforming underdeveloped economies into developed ones through liberation from primitive ideals into modernity. In contradistinction to the modernization paradigm, critical structuralism development perspective argues against universality of economic principles that does not recognize local structural obstacles which may impede development of the global South economies. Neomercantilism paradigm of development is similar to modernization model in its prescription of neoliberal economics principle and its universal application. This was the era of the Washington consensus when most developing economies struggled with huge debt crisis and had to adopt market liberalization economic principle with minimal state intervention. Then came the postdevelopmentism paradigm of development which argues that equitable economic development is attainable only after due recognition and consideration is given to individual

states socio-cultural impediments. Finally, there was also the era of development holism paradigm advocates a broad and inclusive approach to economic development (Hook and Lebo 2010).

It was within this cycle of development worldviews that foreign aid evolved as a tool of international development. From this point onward, almost every nation of the world became involved in foreign aid, either as a donor or as a recipient with huge transfer of foreign aid crisscrossing the world towards development thus conferring legitimacy on foreign aid as a development tool. To underscore the importance of foreign aid in global development for example, the world transferred \$US104.4 billion in ODA in 2006, an amount almost double what was transferred four years earlier (Hook and Lebo 2010).

Although the neoliberal paradigm of development did not take the centre stage in policymaking until the 1980s, there is evidence to suggest that it was deeply rooted in early development worldview of the 1950 during the modernization paradigm era (Hook and Lebo 2010). Starting from the 1980s, the prosperity gap between developed and developed economies widened when most developing economies were under huge debt and required significant financial relief. It was in this circumstance of economic quagmire that that global multilateral financial institutions such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), based on their strategic position and influence in global financial management, responded to the need of these distressed economies with neoliberal economic prescriptions.

The proposed economic growth model prescribed by the World Bank and IMF to the need of these developing economies was based on neoliberal economic principles which promote trade liberalization and globalization. This model conceptualizes development and economic

growth in terms of market efficiency devoid of state intervention. As an ideology, Neoliberalism promotes unfettered free market with focus on macroeconomic stability, privatization and liberalization with little or no role for the state. This was the era of Washington Consensus when International financial Institutions economic prescriptions dominated the development program of the developing economies (Hook and Lebo 2010; Williamson 2009).

The development model prescribed by the neoliberal economic principles, among others encourages unrestricted international trade and investment. The understanding is that a stable and efficient market, which encourages free flow of Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) and trans-border trade will bring about accelerated economic growth. The argument in support of the neoliberal economic principles is that in the era of globalization and information age, unrestricted international trade and investment will bring economic growth and development to less developed economies (Hook and Lebo 2010; Williamson 2009).

Under this regime, Transnational Corporations (TNC) from the developed North could transfer private capital in form of FDI to the underdeveloped South. This capital transfer is facilitated by the international financial institutions as FDI and development credits. At this time, the Washington Consensus was the prevailing economic growth model for development. The Washington Consensus was a term coined by John Williamson in 1989 to describe the ten universal economic policy prescriptions among which are fiscal discipline, tax reform, liberalized interest rates, competitive exchange rates, reordered public expenditure priorities, trade liberalization, inward FDI liberalization, privatization, deregulation and property rights which Washington based financial institutions will consent to as necessary reform requirement for developing economies (Williamson 2009).

It is within the framework of the Washington Consensus neoliberal economic principles that the World Bank and IMF activities impacts international development and development assistance with their economic policies. These institutions initiate and implement policies, which regulates flow of finances and resources from developed to developing economies. While foreign aid flow is a stream of capital transfer, it is certainly not the only form of capital transfer from developed economies to less developed economies (Hook and Lebo 2010; Williamson 2009; Rodrik 2006; Stiglitz 2005).

As it turned out, the Washington Consensus economic reform orthodoxy was a one cap fits all standard prescription for macroeconomic growth prescribed by the international financial institutions. Unfortunately, while the Washington Consensus prescription improved the economic fortune of some countries in Latin America, it was not quite successful in other countries especially in Africa thus casting a doubt on the assumption of universality of the Washington Consensus prescription to economic growth and development (Rodrik 2006; Stiglitz 2005).

Nonetheless, the Washington Consensus guided development as an article of faith for several years. The Washington Consensus over generalized policy prescription, as it turned out, is universally unworkable. This is because of lack of consideration for local circumstance and peculiarities in its formulation and application and its “cookie cutter approach” to economic reform (McCleery and De Paolis 2008, 439). In this sense, the Washington Consensus was eventually discovered to be an application of “market fundamentalism” principle and an unnecessary and insufficient economic reform proposal for development especially because of lack of transparency by the institutions behind its promotion (Rodrik 2006; Stiglitz 2005). To the extent that the Washington Consensus did not lead to economic growth in all countries where it

was adopted further suggests that externally induced development without efficient domestic management of institutions can never bring about economic growth and development (Stiglitz 2005; Rodrik 2006).

Foreign Aid, International Development and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

From the period of industrial revolution in the nineteenth century when large corporations started to acquire power and influence within the society, the issue of what the relationship between business and society should be with respect to corporation's responsibility towards the society has been contentious (Jenkins 2005; Broomhall 2007). The contention is whether corporations have any responsibility towards the society beyond making profit for their shareholders and that if any responsibility exists, should it be mandatory or voluntary.

As a result, the business-society relationship debate was brought to global attention. The uncertainty about what the ideal relationship between business and society should be, especially within the context of international development, pushed the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) discourse to the forefront of global attention starting from the 1980s. The issue is whether CSR should be voluntary or mandatory. This new wave of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) discourse especially within the context of international development is about whether home governments of TNCs should exercise regulatory oversight over the CRS practices of their TNCs in the course of their business operations in their host communities or whether CSR practice should be voluntary.

It is in this sense that the wave of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the 1990s is not considered as a new phenomenon. Prior to 1990, especially from the industrial revolution era, there has been attempt by the society to regulate corporate power while corporation, in turn

had always attempted to retain its legitimacy within the society (Jenkins 2005; Broomhall 2007; Ireland and Pillay 2010). For instance, the emergence of antitrust movement in response to the activities of corporations in the rubber industry in the US in the nineteenth century was an example of society's attempt to regulate business. Similarly, President Roosevelt's New Deal in the US during the Great Depression and the United Kingdom's nationalization law were examples of society's attempt to regulate business (Jenkins 2005; Broomhill 2007).

As corporations became influential, sovereign states thought of the need to regulate corporation's activities for diverse reasons such as the need to protect competition to avoid monopolistic behaviour and the need to protect the environment from the potential negative impact of a corporation's activities. Attempts to regulate activities of corporations had always been controversial. While society would rather exercise oversight functions over corporations' activities, corporations prefer self-regulation. For example, all through the nineteenth century when corporation first emerged, attempts at regulatory oversight by the society met with opposition from corporations as they preferred self-regulation to mandatory regulation ((Jenkins, 2005; Broomhall 2007; Ireland and Pillay 2010).

With the emergence of large transnational corporations (TNC) especially after the post WWII era, public concern over the activities on TNC increased especially in the US. As this went on, the negative impact of corporation's activities on society and the environment became more pervasive. As a result, when the news of the involvement of a US corporation- ITT- in the attempt to forcefully overthrow a democratically elected government in Chile broke, the US public became incensed and worried about how corporations can negatively impact society (Broomhall 2007; Jenkins 2005). This event and other incidences which linked US corporations to the exploitation of the economies of poor countries in the underdeveloped South pushed the

clamour for regulatory oversight over the activities of corporations to the international stage (Jenkins 2005; Broomhall 2007).

With this in mind, the activities of TNCs especially in developing economies began to attract international attention, scrutiny and sometimes, outright condemnation (Broomhall, 2007; Jenkins 2005). The role of ITT in the 1970 attempt to overthrow the government of Chile became a marker of criminal corporate behavior. Under this condition, advocacy for regulatory oversight over the activities of corporations heightened. Also, the rise of Neoliberalism as the predominant model for economic growth and development requiring minimal state intervention in the management of economies also became a source of concern over the activities of corporations especially in economies with weak governments.

As this was going on, there were unsuccessful attempts within the UN to formally establish a set of regulatory codes to guide the activities of corporations. The UNs failure in this regard was due to the resistance of governments and corporations who prefer voluntary regulations to mandatory regulations. However, after the UNs attempt at mandatory regulation failed, the International Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of major TNCs, in 1972, launched “*The Guidelines for International Investment*” with several US TNCs adopting its code of conduct. This was to be followed by several multilateral agreements sponsored by organizations such as the ILO, the UN and the OECD (Broomhill 2007).

The new wave of CSR was a 1980s phenomenon. It was within the context that CSR discourse, was, once again, brought to public arena which compelled TNCs to respond one way or another (Utting 2005; Broomhill 2007; Jenkins 2005; Ireland and Pillay 2010). This new wave of CSR is a continuation of the debate about the relationship between business and society

(Jenkins 2005; Blowfield 2005; Utting 2005; Ireland and Pillay 2010). There are two parts to the debate: one is about whether corporations have any responsibility towards the society in which it operates; and the other is about whether corporations should be subjected to mandatory regulatory oversight or that they should have discretionary power over how their activities impact society (Broomhill 2007).

Prior to the 1980s CSR wave, corporations had always argued in favour of shareholders primacy (Ireland and Pillay 2010, 77). Based on this perspective, corporations did not consider CSR as part of their mandate as business entities. This view has since changed beginning from the 1990s when corporations began to make business case for CSR in response to the wave of pressure against TNC that began from the 1980s (Utting 2005; Ireland and Pillay 2010).

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a broad and somewhat controversial concept which touches on other related concepts such as “corporate citizenship, sustainable business, environmental responsibility, the triple bottom line, social and environmental accountability, business ethics and corporate accountability” (Broohmill 2007, 6). Corporate Social Responsibility has become a very pervasive concept and a “buzzword” used by international development practitioners as synonyms for “corporate citizenship” and “partnership.” (Utting 2005, 375).

There is not yet a universally acceptable standard definition for CSR (Slack 2012). The general notion is that CSR is about how corporations ought to compensate the society for the exploitation of society’s resources in the pursuit of private business interest. Such stakeholders, this reasoning goes, would include employees, host communities, environment and governments who are impacted one way or another by the activities of corporations in the process of making

returns on invested capital for shareholders. The underlining argument is that the activities of the corporations is taking something which are irreplaceable away from these stakeholders and that the stakeholders must be compensated, just like capital is compensated with profit (Broomhill 2007).

The focus of CSR is on stakeholders and not shareholders. Also, the argument in favor of CSR is premised on the idea that corporations owe it as a duty to compensate all stakeholders impacted by their activities, and not just investors. The controversy that this brings up is whether corporations can be mandated to accept this role as legitimate or whether society must find a way through legislation to rein corporations in. Another issue is whether profit making objective can be harmonized with the objective of development. It is within these contexts that CSR is studied from the Neoliberal, Neo-Keynesian or Radical Political Economy paradigms (Broomhill 2007, 6).

The Neoliberal approach conceptualizes CSR as a non-business activity which should not engage the attention of managers of corporation. Under this paradigm, CSR is viewed as a distraction from profit making objective of business. The reasoning under this approach is that the motive for investing capital is neither philanthropy nor altruism; it is business. The claim is that the end result of investment decision is profit and that for as long as corporations use capital in a competitive manner to generate return on investment, they do not have any other responsibility to the society beyond the responsibility they have to their shareholders.

The Neoliberal argument is premised on the principle of shareholder primacy that emphasizes the importance of shareholders interest over the role of corporations as public institutions who should be accountable in some form to stakeholders such as employees,

consumers, creditors, environment and the society (Ireland and Paddy 2010, 77). The Neoliberal argument's holds that CSR is not within the purview of capital's objective of converting resources into good and services for the purpose of profit making. Any investment in CSR, the Neoliberal CSR approach reasons, jeopardizes the role of capital in the market economy and development (Broomhill 2007).

At the heart of Neoliberalism paradigm of CSR is the theoretical argument that CSR practice is not a mandatory role for corporations. This approach views CSR is an unwelcomed intrusion to the ingenuity of capitalism to engage capital in creative competition in a free market environment. This perspective is anchored on the theory that CSR practice can only be a self-imposed voluntary policy by corporations and not a set of externally initiated regulatory oversight. What Neoliberalism advocates is a form of political-economic governance anchored on the principle of market efficiency based on rational economic logic. Under the Neoliberalism paradigm, the focus is on the principle of shareholder primacy in which corporations are viewed from the shareholder-oriented perspective (Ireland and Pillay 2010).

However, there is a strand of moderate neoliberal thought within the broad neoliberal approach to CSR which views CSR as means of leveraging corporation's risk minimizing potential as a strategic business option. The consideration of this strand is that the adoption of CSR on a voluntary basis is a risk management strategy to anticipate and counter negative consequences that corporate infraction may attract to business operations. In practical terms, this reasoning is premised on the proposition that adopting CSR makes strategic business sense.

This consideration is not in any way hinged on the persuasion that CSR is an activity corporations need to engage in; it is viewed as a risk minimizing business strategy. The

reasoning is that voluntarily adopting CSR practice as an adjunct activity may positively impact bottom-line in the long run. In summary, neoliberal thinking sees CSR as a strategic management policy that corporations may freely adopt against risks but not necessarily as a mandatory regulatory oversight over their activities (Broomhall 2007, 7). The contemporary wave of CSR therefore is rooted in neoliberal orthodoxy which holds dearly to shareholder primacy and the promotion of shareholders interest as owners of corporations with little or no attention to the conceptualization of corporation as public institutions (Ireland and Pillay 2010, 87).

The Neo-Keynesian approach to CSR study recognizes the active role of other stakeholders such as customers, business partners, communities, the environment and the society (Broomhill 2007, 7). From this standpoint, neo-Keynesian approach views CSR beyond shareholders interest of profit making alone; it considers the interest of other stakeholder's as important and crucial in its business decision making. As a matter of fact, this approach recognizes and argues for the protection of all stakeholders affected or likely to be affected by the activities of corporations. The reasoning is that business success is possible only when corporations look after the interest of all stakeholders in an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable manner.

The reasoning in the neo-Keynesian approach is that corporate behaviour may lead to consequences such as market failure and lack of awareness, which requires that corporation must deliberately adopt CSR on issue areas such as environment and workplace practices as a strategic option. Under this paradigm, adoption of CSR by corporations is deliberate to avoid problems that may arise from corporate misbehaviour without foreclosing regulatory oversight role for government (Broomhall 2007).

In contrast to both the neoliberal and neo-Keynesian approach, the radical political economy approach to CSR is premised on the argument that corporations are powerful and influential and that activities of corporation should be critically scrutinized to prevent abuse against the society. Much more importantly, this approach recognizes that corporations may use their power and influence to the detriment of the economy of weak nation states. This approach is concerned more about how corporations may ruthlessly deploy their enormous power in the pursuit of profit to the detriment of society and environment (Broomhill 2007, 8). The radical political economy approach does not only call for regulatory oversight of corporation's activities; it actually demands that corporations must be held accountable for the negative impact of their actions on the society.

The radical political economy paradigm does not deny the strategic importance of business in the development of society; what this paradigm argues is that corporations, especially TNCs must not be allowed to use its power and influence against the overall interest of the society. The demand is that corporation must not be allowed to operate without mandatory regulatory oversight by government. This approach is averse to any argument in support of voluntary CRS practice in any form. The reasoning is that corporations, as powerful and influential entities may use their enormous financial and political resources against society through lobbying under a voluntary CSR regime (Broomhill 2007; Ireland and Pillay 2010).

To avoid this, the radical paradigm advocates Corporate Accountability as an alternative to CSR. Corporate Accountability as a governance mechanism demands that corporations be made accountable and responsible for the consequences of their actions on the environment and the members of the community where they operate. It is within this framework that this Capstone Project will examine Canada's approach to CSR with its adoption of "*Building the Canadian*

Advantage” and the establishment of Extractive Office CSR Counsellor in response to the clamor for regulatory oversight over the activities of its mining corporations abroad.

Canadian Foreign Aid Delivery and “*Building the Canadian Advantage*”

With the adoption of “*Building the Canadian Advantage*” by Canada in 2009 and the inauguration of the Extractive Sector Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) strategy as part of the comprehensive policy realignment framework, the expectation is that through this initiative, Canada will be able to harmonize and enhance its development, trade and commercial policies and programs with a view to positively impacting Canada’s foreign policy. This realignment also seeks to facilitate a coherent policy approach, which will support the achievement of Canada’s international goals through efficient and effective target programming.

The concern then becomes whether a policy which aligns official development assistance delivery with business interest of corporations in the extractive industry where operational activities has the potential of negatively impacting the environment and people’s well-being will not compromise development objective. For example, how would Canada’s official development assistance program, delivered in partnership with Barrick Gold Inc., be perceived considering the allegation of environmental abuses leveled against this corporation? Will ODA programs delivered through such partnership not be viewed as a subsidy to protect the business interest of Barrick Gold? Barrick Gold was alleged to have committed environmental abuses through its activities in its Porgera Gold site in Papua New Guinea between 2009 and 2010 (Human Rights Watch 2010; Gilberthorpe and Banks 2012; Hilson 2012).

Canada’s decision to align the delivery of its official development assistance with its economic interest abroad is an integral part of the implementation of Canada’s “*Building the*

Canadian Advantage: A CSR Strategy for the International Extractive Sector.” (Government of Canada 2009). Building the Canadian Advantage is Canada’s CSR strategy designed to improve the competitive advantage of its international extractive sector and the activities of Canadian mining corporations operating abroad. The objective of Canada’s CSR strategy is to enhance the ability of Canadian mining corporations operating abroad so that they will be able to manage the social and environmental risks associated with their operations in their host communities (Natural Resources Canada 2011).

Canada’s CSR strategy came into effect in 2009 through a government policy decision in response to concerns by Canadians and international stakeholders within the extractive sector about the environmental and social performance of Canadian mining corporations operating abroad (Government of Canada 2009; Laplante and Nolin 2011). This was as a result of several calls by stakeholders for regulatory oversight over the activities of Canadian mining corporations which resulted in the constitution of a parliamentary Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade (SCFAIT) in 2005 with mandate to look into allegations of human right abuses by Canadian companies operating abroad (Laplante and Nolin 2011). Part of SCFAITs recommendation was to make governments financial and diplomatic support to Canadian mining corporations operating abroad conditional to their meeting clearly defined corporate social responsibility and human rights standards (Parliament of Canada 2005).

Sequel to the release of SCFAIT’s report, Canada initiated series of multi stakeholder National Roundtables which resulted in the submission of an Advisory Group Report which called for the establishment of an independent ombudsman office to handle complaints, investigate, make rulings, and determine whether companies deserve support of any kind in their future operation. The Advisory Group also recommended legal reform which will make

Canadian corporations liable for their overseas actions with additional recommendation that Canada's financial and diplomatic support to mining corporations abroad be made conditional to meeting prescribed regulatory standards (Government of Canada 2007; Laplante and Nolin 2011).

Canada's response to these recommendations was the "*Building the Canadian Advantage*." Through the "*Building the Canadian Advantage*", Canada conceptualizes CSR as "the voluntary activities undertaken by companies to operate in an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable manner beyond the minimum required by law" (Government of Canada 2011). With this in mind, Canada, through its CSR approach seeks to encourage its corporations operating abroad to abide by their host communities law while also keeping to international CSR best practices (Natural Resources Canada 2011).

From this standpoint, Canada's approach to CSR could be viewed as an adoption of voluntarily CSR practices in which Canadian mining corporations operating abroad operates in a transparent manner and work in collaboration with their host governments and local communities but not through mandatory legislative oversight. Canada's "*Building the Canadian Advantage*" is anchored on four complimentary pillars that are:

- Support for initiatives to enhance the capacities of developing countries to manage the development of minerals and oil and gas and to benefit from these resources to reduce poverty;
- Promotion of the widely-recognized international CSR
- Performance guidelines with Canadian extractive companies operating abroad which includes: OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, International Finance Corporation

Performance Standards on Social & Environmental Sustainability for extractive projects with Potential adverse social or environmental impacts, Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights for projects involving private or public security forces and Global Reporting Initiative for CSR reporting by the extractive sector to enhance transparency and encourage market-based rewards for good CSR performance; The Office of the Extractive Sector CSR Counsellor to assist stakeholders in the resolution of CSR issues pertaining to the activities of Canadian extractive sector companies abroad; The CSR Centre of Excellence to encourage the Canadian international extractive sector to implement these voluntary performance guidelines by developing and disseminating high-quality CSR information, training and tools (Government of Canada 2009).

Following the adoption of this strategy by Canada, the issue then becomes whether the implementation of Canada's "*Building the Canadian Advantage*" within a policy framework which aligns Canada's ODA delivery with its economic interest abroad will enhance Canada's ODA performance and the achievement of its development objective or whether this policy realignment is an economic subsidy for private interest at the expense of development.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objective

This Capstone Project evaluates the impact of "*Building the Canadian Advantage: Canada's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Strategy for the International Extractive*

Sector” on the activities of Canadian mining corporations operating abroad to determine whether Canada’s adoption of voluntary CSR enhances the delivery of ODA. The research evaluates the effectiveness and appropriateness of Canada’s adoption of voluntary CSR on the activities of Canadian corporation under a new policy regime which aligns Canada’s foreign aid delivery with its economic interest abroad. In doing so, the research explores the prospect of a potential policy gap in the realignment framework by asking whether:

1. Canada can continue to deliver its ODA programs designed to achieve poverty reduction, economic growth and sustainable development in developing countries under a policy regime which aligns foreign aid delivery with its economic interest abroad and still remain consistent in its commitment to official development assistance objective?
2. Canada will be better off as a major foreign aid donor and a member of OECD Development Advisory Committee (DAC) with commitment to development programs towards global poverty alleviation, reduction of human right violation and maintenance of sustainable environment by adopting mandatory regulatory CSR strategy for its international extractive sector?

This research explores the potential of finding empirical evidence in support of the question whether “*Building the Canadian Advantage*” is a subsidy to Canadian mining corporations at tax payers’ expense and also to determine whether the Canadian CSR strategy for the Extractive Sector enhances Canada’s foreign aid delivery.

Research Design

This research works with secondary data provided in the review of literature on foreign aid, international development and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). It also works on the

empirical evidence provided in the primary data obtained through qualitative research technique. The primary data is gathered through comparative analysis and case study by evaluating the activities of the Extractive Sector CSR Counsellor's Office in the performance of its advisory and dispute resolution roles and its impact on Canada's ODA delivery since 2009. The research also examines whether Canada partners with mining corporations involved in any of the disputes reviewed by the CSR Counsellor in the delivery of ODA program since the inauguration of *"Building the Canadian Advantage."*

Through this evaluation, the research assesses how the CSR Counsellor's role impacts the CSR activities of Canadian mining corporations operating abroad and also determines its effects on Canada's ODA delivery. This inquiry adopts qualitative research technique methodology and used the empirical data sourced directly from the activities of the agency responsible for the implementation of *"Building the Canadian Advantage."* In doing so, this inquiry leverage on the merits of Grounded theory methodology and inductive reasoning by using the gathered data obtained to conceptually interpret the findings to provide answers to the research questions (Jha 2008; Creswell 2014).

The CSR Counsellor performs advisory and dispute resolution roles in the "implementation of the voluntary performance standards endorsed in the Canada's CSR Strategy for the Canadian International Extractive Sector" (Government of Canada 2013). The CSR Counsellor's advisory role focuses on the implementation of the voluntary performance standards while its dispute resolution role is designed to resolve disputes between Canadian mining corporations operating abroad and members of their host communities. The voluntary performance standards endorsed by Canada in the implementation of its CSR Strategy consist of:

International Finance Corporation's Performance Standards
on Social and Environmental Sustainability; Voluntary
Principles on Security and Human Rights; Global Reporting
Initiative and Organization for Economic Cooperation
and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational
Enterprises. (Government of Canada 2013).

The International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Sustainability Framework promotes sound environmental practices, social practices, transparency and accountability towards positive development. The Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights is a set of guidelines designed specifically for extractive sector industry in which participants voluntarily agree to proactively implement or assist in the implementation of the principles. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) promotes the use of sustainability reporting as a way for organizations to become more sustainable and contribute to sustainable development. In the same vein, the OECDs Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises requires governments to provide an open and transparent environment for international investment to encourage the positive contribution Multinational Enterprises to economic and social progress (Government of Canada 2013).

The CSR Counsellor's Office performs its dispute resolution role through a review process in which affected individuals, groups, communities and corporations voluntarily agree to resolve disputes which arises from the activities of Canadian mining corporations operating abroad. There are about 1600 publicly and privately quoted mining corporations listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange (TSX) (Toronto Stock Exchange 2013). For the CSR counsellor's Office not to be overburdened in the performance of its oversight function involving this vast number of corporations, it requires an effective strategy. In this respect, the CSR Counsellor's

Office assumes that Canadian mining corporations operating abroad behaves responsibly until an alarm is raised by an aggrieved party against any corporation to serve as proxy for bad behavior upon which the CSR Counsellor investigates the allegation and thereafter initiates a dispute resolution process (McCubbins and Schwartz 1984).

In the performance of its oversight function, the CSR Counsellor's Office may adopt either the "Police-Patrol" or the "Fire-Alarm" strategy ((McCubbins and Schwartz 1984). Police Patrol oversight approach is a direct and centralized monitoring mechanism, in which a supervising agency directly monitors, detects and provides remedies against violations. On the other hand, Fire Alarm oversight approach is a non-direct, less centralized monitoring mechanism which relies on established rules, procedures and informal practices upon which external stakeholders' initiates violation allegations against erring corporation (McCubbins and Schwartz 1984).

On account of the voluntary nature of the CSR Counsellor's mandate and the vast number of mining corporations the CSR Counsellor monitors in the performance of its oversight function, the adoption of "Police-Patrol" approach may not be cost efficient and administratively affective. Instead the "Fire Alarm" oversight approach appears to be better option. It is within this framework that this research analyzes the six cases reviewed by the CSR Counsellor's Office between 2009 and 2013.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Data Analysis

For the purpose of this analysis, this research focuses on three categories of data:

1. Disputes reviewed by the CSR Counsellor Office since 2009
2. Profile of Canadian Mining Corporations involved in CSR disputes
3. Canadian ODA delivery Partnership profile since 2009

From available data, six applications for reviews were received by CSR counsellor's Office since 2009. The affected corporations are of Canadian origin by ownership, location and Stock Exchange listings. The CSR Counsellor's office concluded the review of five of the six cases and issued closing reports on the five concluded cases while it issued an interim report on the sixth case. There is no common theme in the cases reviewed as the nature of disputes varied from one to another. In one instance, the dispute was about the impact of mining operation on water quality and community engagement. In another instance, the dispute was about the violation of voluntary principles on security, human rights and the OECDs Guideline on Multinational Enterprise. In still another case, the dispute was about lack of consultation and engagement of the affected indigenous people.

Also, there were two other cases related to the environment. Out of these two, one was on responsible and sustainable mining with respect to environmental, health and welfare issues within Mexico region while the other case centered on the past, present and future impacts to glaciers and periglacial environments. Similarly, there was a case which focused on environment, labour, stakeholder's consultation and engagement. In this particular case, the environmental issue was on emissions of hazardous chemicals, pollution prevention, groundwater contamination and conservation. In all the six review applications received by the CSR Counsellor's Office, three were from Argentina, two from Mexico and one from Mauritania.

There is also a high incidence of voluntary withdrawal by corporations. Three of the five closed cases were as a result of withdrawal from the process by the mining corporations involved. For example, Excellon Resources Inc. withdrew from the review process after it expressed concerns that project affected people did not underpin the request for the review. It also stated that it did not consider the dialogue process facilitated by the CSR Counsellor's Office of any value to it or its shareholders. Similarly, Silver Standard Resources Inc. also withdrew from the review process on the premise that a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) influenced the requesters in bringing their concerns to the CSR Counsellor's office. McEwen Mining Inc., another mining corporation involved in dispute resolution withdrew from the review process after it expressed concerns that the requester raised issues that are matters of Argentina's domestic laws.

However, the case involving First Quantum Limited was resolved with First Quantum committing to specific follow up actions. In the same vein, the Golden Arrow Resources Corporation case also was closed due to lack of further interest by the requester. In this case, the requester did not respond to CSR Counsellor's Office correspondence which informed the CSR Counsellor's Office decision to close the case file. Table 1 below on pages 38 and 39 provide details of the CSR cases reviewed by the CSR Counsellor's between 2009 and 2013.

Table 1: Summary of Requests for Review by the CSR Counsellor adapted from the CSR Counsellor's Office Website

File #	Request Date	Requester	Corporation	Nature of Dispute	Outcome
2011-01-MEX	April 7, 2011	Excellon Workers Union	Excellon Resources Inc.	Violations of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights and OECD Guidelines on Multinational Enterprises.	Excellon Withdrew from Review Process. File Closed
2013-06-ARG	July 9, 2013	Confidentiality has been requested	Golden Arrow Resources Corporation	Lack of adequate consultation with affected Indigenous communities	No follow up by Requester. File Closed.
2013-05-ARG	April 4, 2013	Confidentiality has been requested	Silver Standard Resources Inc.	Environmental impact on Water quality& community engagement.	Silver Standard withdrew from Review Process. Expressed concern over the involvement and influence of a non-governmental organization (NGO) in the request. File Closed
2013-04-MEX	February 11, 2013	Community & Mexico Canada Responsible Mining Network	New Gold Inc.	Sustainable mining with respect to environmental, health & welfare issues	Dispute Analysis Underway. Interim Report available.
2012-03-ARG	July 9,	The Center for Human Rights and Environment	McEwen Mining Inc.	Past, present and future impacts to glaciers and periglacial	McEwen Mining withdrew from the

	2012	(CEDHA), Argentina and Fundación Ciudadanos Independientes (Fu.CI)		environments.	Review Process. McEwen expressed concerns that the issues are matters of Argentina's domestic laws. File Closed
2011-02-MAU	August 14, 2011	Maître Ahmed Mohamed Lemine and others	First Quantum Minerals limited	Chemicals/hazardous materials, emissions/pollution prevention and control of groundwater contamination and conservation.Labour, Stakeholder consultation.	Issues resolved in good faith. First Quantum Minerals Limited agreed to some actions. File Closed.

Table 2 provides details on the profiles of the six mining corporations involved in the CSR review:

Table 2: Profiles of the six Mining Corporations involved in the CSR Review adapted from the Six Mining Corporation's websites.

Corporation	Corporate Office Location	Corporate Overview	Directors	Operational Location	Stock Exchange Listing
Excellon Resources Inc.	Toronto	A Publicly Quoted company with interest in silver mining with lead and zinc as by-products making it one of the lowest cash	Richard Brissenden; Peter Crossgrove; André Fortier; Tim Ryan; Alan McFarland; Thor Eaton; Oliver Fernandez; Ned Goodman; Joanne Ferstman and Brendan Cahill	Operates La Platosa and Miguel Auza Properties in Mexico/ DaSantis property in, Northeastern Ontario and Beschefer Property, Northwestern	(TSX-V: GRG)

		cost silver mines in the Canada		Quebec	
Golden Arrow Resources Corporation	Vancouver	Member of Grosso Group and a Publicly Quoted company which specializes in resource exploration, and working in Argentina where it is highly regarded and trusted since 1993.	Joseph Grosso; Dr. David Terry; Mr. Nikolaos Cacos; Dr. John B. Gammon and Louis P. Salley.	Chinchillas Silver Project;Don Bosco Copper-Gold Project;Caballos Copper-Gold Project;Mogote Copper-Gold Project; Pescado Gold Project and Frontera District - Potrerillos Gold-Silver Project in Argentina	(TSX:GSG)
Silver Standard Resources Inc.	Vancouver	A publicly Quoted mining company with assets throughout the Americas. Owns and operates the Pirquitas mine in Jujuy, Argentina, which is one of the largest primary silver mines in the world.	Michael A.E. Anglin;Richard C. Campbell; Gustavo A. Herrero;Richard D. Paterson; Steven P. Reid; John Smith and Peter W. Tomsett	Operates Pirquitas Mine and Diablillos in Argentina; San Luis and Berenguela in Peru; Pitarrilla,San Agustin, San Marcial and Parral Mining District in Mexico; Challacollo in Chile; Maverick Springs and Candelaria in Nevada; Sunrise Lake in Northwest Territories Canada	(TSX: SSO)

New Gold Inc.	Vancouver & Toronto	A publicly Quoted intermediate gold mining company with a portfolio of four producing assets and three significant development projects across Canada, Mexico, United States and Australia.	Randall Oliphant; The Honourable David Emerson; James Estey; Robert Gallagher; Vahan Kololian; Martyn Konig; Pierre Lassonde and Raymond Threlkeld	Operates Cerro San Pedro in Mexico; Mesquite in California; New Afton and Blackwater in BC, Canada; Peak Mines in Australia; El Morro and Rio Figueroa in Chile.	(TSX: NGD)
McEwen Mining Inc.	Toronto	A privately owned Quoted company with interest gold and silver production in the Americas.	Rob McEwen; Allen V. Ambrose; Dr. Donald R.M. Quick; Richard W. Brissenden; Michael I. Stein Michele L. Ashby; and Dr. Leanne M. Baker.	Operates San José Mine in Argentina; El Gallo in Mexico; Gold Bar and Tonkin Project Nevada and Los Azules in Argentina	(TSX:MUX)
First Quantum Minerals Limited	Vancouver	A publicly Quoted mining and metals company operating seven mines and developing five projects worldwide.	Philip K.R. Pascall; Clive Newall; Peter St. George; Andrew Adams; Paul Brunner; Michael Hanley; Robert Harding; Michael Martineau; Christopher Lemon; Hannes Meyer and Juliet Wall.	Operates Ravensthorpe mine in Australia; Kansanshi mine(largest copper mine inn Africa) in Chingola; Guelb Moghrein copper mine in Mauritania; The Kevitsa nickel-copper-platinum	(TSX:FM)

				mine the Pyhäsalmi mine and in Finland; Çayeli mine in Turkey; The Las Cruces mine in Spain and developing projects in Zambia, Peru and Panama.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

In addition to the data on the reviewed cases by the CSR Counsellor's Office and the profile of Canadian mining corporations involved in the reviewed cases as detailed in Tables 4:1:1 and 4:1:2 respectively, this research also examined CIDA's ODA partnerships between 2009 and 2013 to determine the involvement of mining corporations in ODA delivery since the inauguration of the CSR Counsellor's Office in 2009 (Government of Canada, 2013).

Interpretation of Data

This research is designed to determine whether Canada's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Strategy for The Canadian Extractive Industry "*Building the Canadian Advantage*" is a subsidy for Canadian mining corporations operating abroad by asking if Canada can continue to deliver its ODA programs under a policy regime which aligns its foreign aid policy with its economic interest abroad and still remain consistent with its official development assistance objective commitments; and also whether Canada will be better off as a major foreign aid donor and a member of OECD Development Advisory Committee (DAC) by adopting mandatory regulatory CSR strategy for its international extractive industry.

From the data gathered and analyzed in Tables 1 and 2 on the six reviewed cases by CSR Counsellor's Office, the profiles of the Canadian mining corporations involved in the review process and CIDAs ODA partnership between 2009 and 2013, there is no empirical evidence that supports the claim that "*Building the Canadian Advantage*" subsidizes private mining corporations in the delivery of Canada's ODA programs. Similarly, there is also no direct evidence that suggests that the six corporations involved in the review partnered with CIDA in the delivery of Canada's ODA delivery between 2009 and 2013.

In the six cases reviewed, there is absence of a common theme in the nature of disputes filed with the CSR Counsellor. The disputes were dissimilar in nature and emphasis. Also, all the incidences occurred across different locations which rules out the possibility of a deliberate act of sabotage by corporations towards a specific group or community. In the same vein, there is also no evidence of cross-ownership across the six corporations involved in the review to suggest a pattern of bad corporate behavior. Similarly, there is nothing in the due diligence carried out on the six corporations to suggest a deliberate act of double standard in corporate governance as almost all these corporations have mining properties in Canada, US and other Western countries in the same way they have properties in less developed countries.

However, it is curious that the CSR Counsellor's Office, in the performance of its dispute resolution role reviewed only six cases from 2009 to 2013. While this research does not take a conclusive position on what may be responsible for this low outing, this research however holds the view that this may be partly due to the voluntary nature of the CSR Counsellor's oversight mandate which makes the performance of its dispute resolution role dependent on stakeholders raising alarms after the Office initiates action and also partly on the fact that stakeholders and corporations are allowed to exercise direction in their participation in the review process.

Against this background, this research posits that the findings where only six cases which involved six mining corporations were reviewed by the CSR Counsellor's Office within a period of four years may be suspect and not reflective of the true reality of the CSR activities of the Canadian mining corporation population operating abroad. One concern is whether the six cases reviewed truly reflect the overall CSR activities of Canada's International Extractive Sector industry. Another concern is whether this low number of reviewed cases is as a result of stakeholder's lack of confidence in CSR Counsellor's ability to meaningfully address CSR disputes because it lacks sanction authority or whether this is due to the voluntary nature of the CSR Counsellor's mandate which allows disputing parties to withdraw at will. This is certainly a subject for further scholarly inquiry.

Without a doubt however, the non-regulatory nature of the CSR Counsellor's mandate and the discretionary nature of stakeholder's participation in CSR Counsellor's Office review process undermines CSR Counsellor's ability to effectively perform its oversight function in monitoring CSR performance of Canadian mining corporations abroad. This was demonstrated in three of the five cases closed by the CSR Counsellor in which mining corporations withdrew from the review process. This perhaps might not have happened if participation was mandatory and if the CSR Counsellor had sanction authority.

This argument is predicated on the observation that three out of the five closed cases were at the instance of mining corporations who voluntarily withdrew from the process. Similarly, the fact that one other case was closed at the instance of the requesting parties undermines the dispute resolution role of the CSR Counsellor's Office. To this extent, it remains to be seen whether the CSR Counsellor's non-regulatory mandate will not undermine the implementation of the Canadian CSR Strategy.

Nonetheless, the CSR Counsellor's advisory role through which it offers support services to mining corporations in the implementation of the voluntary performance standards endorsed in the implementation of Canada's CSR Strategy for the Canadian International Extractive Sector promises to be potentially effective. Through its advisory role, the CSR Counsellor's Office is a veritable resource in providing education and enlightenment to mining corporations and stakeholders in the practice of CSR in the extractive industry.

That said, this research suffers some limitations. For instance, even where there is no empirical evidence that confirms that "*Building the Canadian Advantage*" is a subsidy to Canadian mining corporations operating abroad under a policy regime which aligns ODA delivery to Canada's economic interest abroad, it is speculative to conclude that the findings in this research is a true reflection of the overall performance of CSR activities of Canadian Extractive sector operating abroad. Consequently, the findings in this research are not indicative of what the results would be if the CSR Counsellor's Office reviews more cases. It is in this sense that this research recommends further scholarly inquiries on how Canada's ODA delivery will be impacted by the "*Building the Canadian Advantage*" if the CSR activities of more mining corporations are reviewed.

CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

From the review of appropriate literature on foreign aid, international development, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the research findings resulting from the evaluation of the cases reviewed by the CSR Counsellor in the implementation of Canada's International Extractive Sector CSR Strategy between 2009 and 2013, there is no empirical evidence to

support the claim that “*Building the Canadian Advantage*” is a subsidy to Canadian mining corporations operating abroad. It should be noted however that this research is limited by the number of cases reviewed by the CSR Counsellor’s Office within a period of four years. As a result, this Capstone recommends further scholarly inquiry in this area.

Consequently, this Capstone Project concludes that Canada is in a position to continue to deliver its ODA programs designed to achieve poverty reduction, economic growth and sustainable development in developing countries under a policy framework which aligns its foreign aid policy with its economic interest abroad and still remain consistent in its commitment to its official development assistance objective.

Nonetheless, this Capstone Project holds the view that for Canada to continue to be consistent in its commitment to its ODA program delivery as a major foreign aid donor and a member of OECD Development Advisory Committee (DAC) focused on global poverty alleviation, reduction of human right violation and maintenance of sustainable environment and to also remain consistent to CSR best practices it will be appropriate to adopt mandatory regulatory CSR strategy for its international extractive sector in the implementation of the “*Building the Canadian Advantage*.”

Similarly, it is also recommended that for Canada to remain a major foreign aid donor with commitment to CSR best practices it needs to consider changing its strategy in the implementation of its International Extractive Sector CSR. While there is no evidence that links Canada’s implementation of the “*Building the Canadian Advantage*” to the provision of subsidy in support of mining corporations operating abroad under its new policy realignment regime framework which aligns ODA delivery to Canada’s economic interest abroad within the scope of

this research, the voluntary nature of the CSR Counsellor's dispute resolution role which allows voluntary withdrawal by mining corporations involved in dispute resolutions may ultimately erode stakeholders confidence in the ability of the CSR Counsellor's to manage CSR related conflicts.

To this end, this Capstone Project recommends that in addition to Canada adopting mandatory CSR Strategy, the CSR Counsellor's Office should be empowered to exercise sanction authority over mining corporations in the performance of its dispute resolution role.

REFERENCES

- Broomhill, R. (2007). "Corporate Social Responsibility: Key Issues and Debates." *Dunstan Paper Series* 1:1-60. Retrieved from: http://scholar.google.ca.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/scholar?hl=en&q=Corporate+Social+Responsibility%3A+Key+Issues+and+Debates+by+Broomhill&btnG=&as_sdt=1%2C5&as_sdtp on 1/11/2013.
- Browne, S. (2006). *Aid and influence: do donors help or hinder?* London, UK: Earthscan.
- Canada Economic Action Plan (2013). Canada's 2013 Budget tabled in the House of Common on March 31, 2013 By the Honourable James M. Flaherty, P.C., M.P. Minister of Finance. Retrieved from: <http://www.budget.gc.ca/2013/doc/plan/budget2013-eng.pdf> on 2/11/2013.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: Sage Publications.
- Gilberthorpe, E. & Banks, G. (2012). "Development on whose terms? CSR discourse and social realities in Papua New Guinea's extractive industries sector." *Resource Policy* 37(2):185-193.
- Government of Canada (2009). "Building the Canadian Advantage: A Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Strategy for the Canadian International Extractive Sector." *Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada*, Ottawa, ON. Retrieved from: <http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/docDetail.action?docID=10448942> on 2/11/2013.
- Government of Canada (2013). "Development Priorities & Office of the Extractive Sector Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Counsellor." *Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada*. Retrieved from: <http://www.international.gc.ca/development-developpement/index.aspx?lang=eng> on 1/11/2013.
- Government of Canada (2007). "National Roundtables on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the Canadian Extractive Industry in Developing Countries: Advisory Group Report." *Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada*. Ottawa, ON. Retrieved from: <http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/docDetail.action?docID=10449121> on 1/11/2013
- Government of Canada (2013). "Projects by Partner - A-Z Partner Index." *Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada*. Retrieved From: <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/cidaweb/cpo.nsf/vLUWebPartnerEn?OpenView> on 27/11/2013.

- Government of Canada (2013). “Welcome to the Office of the Extractive Sector Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Counsellor” Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada. Retrieved From: http://www.international.gc.ca/csr_counsellor-conseiller_rse/index.aspx On 27/11/2013.
- Hilson, G. (2012). “Corporate Social Responsibility in the extractive industries: Experiences from developing countries” *Resources Policy* 37(2): 131–137.
- Hook, S. W. and Lebo, F.B. (2010) “Development/Poverty Issues and Foreign Policy Analysis.” *The International Studies Encyclopedia*. Denmark, Robert A., ed. Blackwell Publishing, Blackwell Reference Online. Retrieved from http://www.isacompendium.com/subscriber/uid=1050/tocnode?id=g9781444336597_chunk_g97 on 1/11/2013.
- Human Rights Watch (2013). “Gold’s Costly Dividend: Human Rights Impacts of Papua New Guinea’s Porgera Gold Mine.” Retrieved from: <http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/png0211webwcover.pdf> on 1/11/2013.
- Ireland, P. & Pillay, R.G. (2010). Corporate Social Responsibility in a Liberal Age. In Utting, P. & Marque J.C. (Eds.), *Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Governance: Towards Inclusive Development* (77-104). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Jenkins, R. (2005), “Globalization, Corporate Social Responsibility and Poverty.” *International Affairs* 81(3): 525–540.
- Jha, N.K. (2008) *Research Methodology*. Chandigarh, Ind.: Global Media.
- Laplanche, J. P., & Nolin, C. (2011). “Snake Oil and the Myth of Corporate Social Responsibility.” *Canadian Dimension* 45(1): 24-27.
- McCleery R.K. & De Paolis, F. (2008). “The Washington Consensus: A Post-Mortem” *Journal of Asian Economics*, 19(5–6):438–446.
- McCubbins, M. D. & Schwartz, T. (1984) “Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols versus Fire Alarms.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 28 (1):165-179.
- Natural Resources Canada (2011) “*Building the Canadian Advantage: A CSR Strategy for the International Extractive Sector*.” Information Bulletin. Retrieved from <http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/sites/www.nrcan.gc.ca/minerals-metals/files/pdf/mms-smm/pubr-pubr/pdf/bca-rac-eng.pdf> on 2/11/2013.
- OECD (2013) “History of OECD” Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/about/history/> on 1/11/2013

- OECD (2012a). "Canada", in *Development Co-operation Report 2012: Lessons in Linking Sustainability and Development*, OECD Publishing.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/dcr-2012-26-en>
- OECD (2012b). "OECD DAC peer reviews", in *OECD, Development Co-operation Report 2012: Lessons in Linking Sustainability and Development*, OECD Publishing.
doi: 10.1787/dcr-2012-47-en
- Parliament of Canada (2005). The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade Report on Mining in Developing Countries-Corporate Social Responsibility by the House of Commons Standing Committee presented at the 38th Parliament, 1st Session. Report 14. Retrieved from:
<http://www.parl.gc.ca/committeebusiness/ReportsResponses.aspx?Cmte=FAAE&Language=E&%20Mode=1&Parl=38&Ses=1> on 1/11/2013.
- Picard, L.A. & Buss, T. F. (2009). *A fragile Balance: Re-examining the History of Foreign Aid, Security and Diplomacy*. Sterling, VA: Kumara Press.
- Rioux, J.S. (2006). "Canadian Official Development Assistance Policy: Juggling the National Interest and Humanitarian Impulses." In James, P., Michaud, L. & O'Reilly, M.J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Canadian Foreign Policy*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Rodrik, D. (2006). "Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion? A Review of the World Bank's Economic Growth in the 1990s: Learning from a Decade of Reform." *Journal of Economic Literature* 44(4): 973-987.
- Slack, K. (2012). "Mission impossible? Adopting a CSR-based business model for extractive Industries in developing countries." *Resource Policy* 37(2):179-184.
- Stiglitz, J. (2005). "The Post Washington Consensus Consensus." Power Point Presentation. *Policy Innovations, A Carnegie Council Publication*. Retrieved from:
http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/policy_library/data/01232 on 1/11/2013.
- Thérien, J. (2002). "Debating foreign aid: right versus left." *Third World Quarterly* 23(3): 449-466.
- Toronto Stock Exchange (2013). "Mining Companies Listed on Toronto Stock Exchange and TSX Venture Exchange." Toronto Stock Exchange and TSX Venture Exchange. Retrieved from:
http://www.tmx.com/en/listings/sector_profiles/mining.html on 27/11/2013.
- Utting, P. (2005). "Corporate Responsibility and the Movement of Business" *Development in Practice* 15: 375-388. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4029969> on 1/11/2013

Van Belle, D.A., Rioux, J.S., & Potter, D.M. (2004). *Media, Bureaucracies, and Foreign Aid: A Comparative Analysis of United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, France and Japan*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williamson, J. (2009). A Short History of the Washington Consensus. *Law and Business Review of the Americas* 15(1):7-23.