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ABSTRACT

This study was an effort to describe and understand the communication function of the Royal Commission of Inquiry in the Somalia Affair in Canada. A major political scandal in Canada, the Somalia Affair was initially marked by the torture and death of a Somalia man at the hands of a Canadian soldier while on a peace enforcement mission in Somalia in 1993 and resulted in a great deal of media attention as well as the general public reproach of Canadians.

After first providing an overview of Royal Commissions of Inquiry, as well as the historical and social context of the Somalia Affair within Canada, this dissertation argues that this political scandal shook the nation, in part, because it marked a moment of moral dissonance in Canada. That is, the Somalia Affair presented serious incongruities between commonly espoused Canadian values—such as peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency/accountability—and the actions that the Canadian soldiers undertook in Somalia. I connect the issue of moral dissonance to the commission in an attempt to answer why the commission was used in response to the moral dissonance caused by the Somalia Affair. Utilizing an in-depth case study approach to the Somalia Affair, I undertake discourse analysis on the approximately 50,000 pages of primary documentary sources from the commission as well as on the media coverage of the affair. Ultimately, I find that the commission is an appropriate space to deal with the moral dissonance that the Somalia Affair posed for two main reasons. Firstly, because it offers a space to debate, define and potentially reassert the morals that were originally transgressed. Secondly, the commission’s reliance on process and procedure works to institutionalize, rationalize and legitimize those morals that were transgressed as well as display that the
political system itself operates effectively. In all, I argue that it is these two communication features of the commission – as a space for moral discourse to occur within a heavily formal and procedural process – that make the commission an appropriate discursive place to respond to the moral dissonance that occurs in a political scandal like the Somalia Affair.
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EPIGRAPH

I saw an old man in the park;
I asked the old man why,
He watched the couples after dark;
He made this strange reply: --

I am the Royal Commission on Kissing,
Appointed by Gladstone in '74;
The rest of my colleagues are buried or missing;
Our Minutes were lost in the last Great War.

But still I'm a Royal Commission
Which has never made a Report,
And acutely I feel my position
For it must be a crime (or a tort)
To be such a Royal Commission.
My task I intend to see through,
Though I know, as an old politician
Not a thing will be done if I do.

Sir Allen Herbert, 'Pageant of Parliament', more popularly known as 'The Royal Commission on Kissing' (Iacobucci, 1990).
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

"From its earliest moments the operation went awry. The soldiers, with some notable exceptions, did their best. But ill-prepared and rudderless, they fell inevitably into the mire that became the Somalia debacle. As a result, a proud legacy was dishonoured."
(Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia, Vol 1, Preface, xxix)

In the spring of 1993, the Canadian public learned that a Somali teenager had been brutally tortured-to-death at the hands of a few Canadian soldiers while serving on a peace-enforcement mission there. Shidane Arone, the media later uncovered, had wandered into the Canadian camp and was taken prisoner. For three hours in the evening of March 16, 1993, Master Corporal Clayton Matchee allegedly punched and kicked Arone, beat him with a riot stick over a ration pack, struck him with an iron bar across the face and shins, and burned the soles of his feet with a cigarette butt while another soldier, Private Brown reportedly looked on. 'Trophy shots' of Matchee and the half-dead Arone were taken and Arone, who was coming in and out of consciousness, was reported to scream, "Canada, Canada, Canada" over and over again. After approximately three hours of intermittent beating, Arone died. By that time, it was reported that at least 8 members of the Canadian Forces had seen the beating taking place and did nothing to stop it or report it. Accusations later followed that many more either heard the abuse or knew that it
was taking place. Matchee was later arrested on suspicion of murdering Arone, but his failed suicide attempt left him mentally unfit to face trial at a later date.

Shortly after the revelation about Arone hit the media, Major Barry Armstrong, a doctor who served on the Somalia mission, went public with allegations that another Somali, killed on March 4, 1993 had been shot in a suspicious manner. On that day, one Somali had been injured and another killed, reportedly shot in the back after not heeding warning shots and fleeing from the compound. The Somali that was killed had point-blank shots to the head and neck and it later was alleged that the Somalis had been ‘baited’ with food and water to entice them to enter the compound to make an example out of them for other would-be intruders.

After the news of the killings hit the media, public and media attention quickly turned to Defence Minister Kim Campbell, whose role in the release of the information around the killings began to be questioned. Campbell, who was campaigning for the Conservative leadership position at the time, was accused of trying to cover-up the death of Arone and of burying the issue. Campbell ordered a full-scale military probe into the event in Somalia which was also to look into issues of training, discipline, and systemic problems in the military. At the same time, multiple military court martial trials were ongoing for the individuals accused of involvement in the deaths.

Almost two years later, and following the court martial convictions of those involved in the beating and torture of Arone, videotapes of brutal hazing rituals within the Canadian Airborne Regiment (the regiment that made up the majority of soldiers stationed in Somalia) were run on Canadian television stations and the Somalia Affair reared its ugly head again. The first tape, aired January 15, 1995 on CBC, showed
members of Two Commando drinking beer and making racist comments about Somalis, such as ‘we ain’t killed enough niggers yet’ (Jenish and Fisher, 1996). The second tape aired January 19, 1995 on CTV and showed members of One Commando engaged in initiation rites where drunken-troop members were forced to eat feces and urine-soaked bread and imitate sex acts. Perhaps the most shocking image on the tape showed an African American soldier with the letters 'I love the KKK' smeared on his back in feces and being led on all fours on a leash. The soldier was later tied to a tree and sprinkled with white flour, the act titled a ‘Michael Jackson’.

With this final incident of what became known as the ‘Somalia Affair’, there was an outcry, led by politicians and journalists, to put an end to the aggressive and seemingly racist behavior of the Canadian Airborne Regiment (CAR). New Defence Minister David Collenette, responded to the calls and announced on January 23, 1995 that the CAR would be disbanded – a first in the history of the Canadian Forces. In addition, after almost two years of the daily barrage of the military in the press, Collenette appointed a Federal Commission of Inquiry on March 20, 1995. The commission was ordered to investigate the events as well as the allegations that there was a high-level cover-up around the affair within the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence. The commission, which ran until it was forced to produce its final report on June 30, 1997, was the first major public inquiry into the Canadian military in response to arguably the largest scandal in Canadian military history to date.

That the government responded to the scandal of the Somalia Affair with a commission may not surprise some. Royal Commissions of Inquiry, defined as “any body
that is formally mandated by a government, either on an ad hoc basis or with reference to a specific problem, to conduct a process of fact-finding and to arrive at a body of recommendations" (Salter, 1990, 175), have frequently been employed following Canadian political scandals. Despite the fact that they are frequently turned to in time of scandal in Canada, or perhaps because of it, many academics, journalists and citizens alike have criticized commissions, frequently positing that they allow governments to ‘buy time’ until the public and the media become concerned with another issue of the day. These critics have also argued that commissions allow the government to appear as if they are seriously considering an issue and how to handle it, while drowning the issue in details and covering up for decisions and actions that have already been taken. And the criticisms continue. As the poem, ‘The Royal Commission on Kissing’, included in the front pages of the dissertation indicates, commissions are often seen to tackle strange and ridiculous topics, are painstakingly long, and are rarely acted upon when they are finally completed.

But was this the case? Was the Somalia Commission just a way for the government to take the pressure off of itself around the military and its sins in Somalia? Was the commission just another way to delay and detract from the bigger issue at hand? This is what I wondered when considering the role of the commission in the discourse around the Somalia Affair. More specifically, I began to wonder if the commission was simply being utilized as a delay mechanism as the critics suggested, or whether

---

1 For instance, throughout Canadian history, royal commissions have been put into operation following many scandals such as the CPR affair, the Munsinger scandal, the APEC scandal, the Johnson scandal, the Arar affair and the Sponsorship scandal, to name a few.
something else was going on within the discourse of the commission that made it a natural response to a scandal such as this. The question, for me, became – why a commission? What is it about a Royal Commission that made it a seemingly appropriate response to a major political scandal like the Somalia Affair? What is the connection between the Somalia Affair and its commission? What happens in a commission to make it a common reaction in this kind of situation?

As someone who has an English Literature and Communications Studies background, my natural instinct was to question what was going on in the discourse of the commission as a way to understand the meaning making that was occurring. Discourse, as I understand it for this research project, refers broadly to the talk and text that occurs in social practice (Tonkiss, 2004; Wood & Kroger, 2000). This definition understands that all spoken and written forms of language use are included within the broader study of discourse. In addition, it sees that the use of talk and texts, or language use, is a way of doing or accomplishing something, and thus, is a social practice versus just a descriptive tool or medium of communication. With this understanding of discourse in mind, I began to wonder if there wasn’t something interesting going on in the discourse of the Somalia commission itself that could help explain why this was the response to such a significant military and political scandal in Canadian history.

Another operational definition, beyond discourse, is necessary before continuing at this point. In this project, I view commissions as a communications arena. For the purposes of this research project, the term communications arena is adapted from the definition of political arena, frequently used in the study of political science. Broadly
defined, political arena refers to a ‘sphere of intense political activity’ (Mintzberg, 1985). In a similar manner, a communications arena can be understood as a sphere of intense communication activity – a place where the goal, focus and purpose of a gathering of people, resources and efforts is to communicate about a particular topic or interest. A communications arena, then, as I understand it, is one of a number of possible public places for communication, here guided by conflict, to occur.

Looking at commissions as a communications arena, I began to investigate what it was about the Somalia Commission that made it a seemingly appropriate place in which to respond to the Somalia scandal.\(^2\) Specifically, my guiding research question was: What communication functions and/or roles did the Somalia Commission of Inquiry play when responding to the Somalia scandal in Canada? Related and informing research questions included:

- What is the communication process or dynamic that operates in the Somalia commission to make it an acceptable/or unacceptable forum for this kind of work in society?
- What is ‘going on’ in the Somalia commission discursively? What is the discursive function of the Somalia commission in the affair itself?

In all, the research aim of my dissertation project was to describe and understand the communication function(s) of the royal commission when responding to the Somalia scandal in Canada.

\(^2\) The fact that it may not be an appropriate communications arena for a scandal like the Somalia Affair was certainly questioned as well in this project, as will become clear with the conclusion.
To achieve this aim, I undertook an in-depth case study approach to the Somalia Affair and its commission. I opted to focus on one scandal and one commission in order to be able to dig deeply and investigate ‘what was going on’ discursively in detail in the commission. Because royal commissions are often lengthy and document-heavy institutions, I choose to study one in a detailed manner with the hope that this single case study approach could be built on in further research. In addition, I selected to study the Somalia Affair’s commission as a case for a number of reasons; namely, because of its significance as a major military scandal in Canadian history, its recent history, its extensive length and terrific amount of data, and finally, because the royal commission in the Somalia Affair presented a unique case. The Somalia Affair and its commission is a unique case because the scandal wasn’t resolved as a result of the inquiry. This is interesting from a discursive point of view, and I was interested to see how and why this occurred.

To investigate the discursive function of the royal commission on the Somalia Affair, I utilized primary documentary sources from the commission itself and performed an in-depth textual analysis on the data. These sources included the commission documents such as the transcripts of the public hearings, the final report, written submissions, research reports, newspaper articles, and historical and contextual books and articles around the affair and the commission. In all, the documentary sources were many, and totaled close to 50,000 pages of data for analysis. I undertook in-depth textual analysis on these documents. This approach was heavily informed by discourse analysis

---

3 I followed the social constructivist case study approach outlined in Stark and Torrance (2006), explained in more detail within the methodology section in chapter six.
methodology, and so entailed investigating both the ‘how’s’ and the ‘what’s’ of discourse (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003). Following such a detailed, qualitative and inductive approach to data analysis allowed for a close examination of the discourse that occurred within the commission in the Somalia Affair, and thus, helped to meet the research goals of this study.

Undertaking a research project that follows this approach, and focuses on the discursive role within a commission is important for a number of reasons. On a broader societal level, this research contributes to knowledge about the discursive role of commissions in Canadian society, and specifically to the communication function that commissions play in times of national scandal. A great deal of time and money go into royal commissions in Canada, to the chagrin of many Canadians who feel they are a waste of time. Looking closely at ‘what’s going on’ in the discourse of the commission provides insight as to the value or purpose of royal commissions – or lack thereof. In addition, while public inquiries are very frequent in this country, empirical investigation into this important social phenomenon has been rare and my approach to the study – employing an in-depth examination of the inquiry via a qualitative textual method and analysis – brings important new insights into the area. Thus far, the literature on Royal Commissions has generally been limited to descriptions of what commissions are and what they do, rarely postulating seriously about what their purpose in Canadian society may be. In addition, the communication aspect of royal commissions in Canada doesn’t appear to have been investigated in an in-depth textual manner to date. In fact, it appears that there has been very limited empirical social research done on the role of
commissions in general, so this topic is particularly relevant, both from a social theory point of view, but also, presumably to help extend the social policy relevance of the research. Another important contribution that this study makes is the creation of new knowledge and understanding to the communication of the Somalia Affair in Canada, and the many dimensions involved in the affair as an important scandal in Canadian political and military history. In all, this research project is positioned to make a contribution in the field of political communication with its focus on the role of Royal Commissions in the communication of scandal in Canada. While the dissertation is focused on making a contribution to social theory at this point, it is my hope that it will also naturally have social policy implications for public inquiries in Canada as I carry this research focus into the future.

With an understanding of the approach to the study in hand as well as its significance, I will now outline what the reader can expect in the rest of this dissertation. In the following chapter, Chapter Two, I provide the reader with an exhaustive overview of Royal Commissions in Canada based on the literature in this area. To begin, I provide an overview of Royal Commissions, noting their distinguishing features and the way in which they can be differentiated from other similar government review bodies. Next, I discuss the various features of commissions, outlining the ways that commissions can vary in topics, purpose, form, players involved, research, openness, length, cost and their role in reporting and making recommendations. Then, I discuss the public opinion around commissions and the various theories scholars have put forward as to when commissions are likely to occur in Canada. In the next section of the paper, I provide an overview of the history of Royal Commissions in Canada before moving on to a section that outlines
common critiques against Royal Commissions, followed by a section that outlines the importance and significance of Royal Commissions in Canada. In the concluding pages of the chapter, I begin to discuss the role that commissions may be seen to be fulfilling in Canadian society.

In Chapter Three, I present the description of the case study, outlining the background and the events that make up the Somalia Affair. After briefly outlining the political and social setting in which the Somalia mission was undertaken in Canada, I describe the events that made up the Somalia Affair. Finally, I conclude the chapter with a description of the commission that was appointed in response to the Somalia Affair, discussing relevant details such as its appointment date, who it involved, what it covered, the challenges it faced as well as the media coverage of the affair and the commission along the way. In all, this chapter provides the reader with the necessary contextual information about the Somalia Affair in Canada and its commission in order to enable the following chapters on the findings of this dissertation to be fully grounded.

In Chapter Four, I investigate three values that are ascribed as being particularly Canadian and that were especially pertinent to the Somalia Affair. After a brief discussion of peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency, I ground each of these values within their social-political-historical context. This is done in an effort to show that it was these particular values that were transgressed as a result of the Somalia Affair in Canada. In this way, I argue that the Somalia Affair represented a moment of moral dissonance in Canadian society, which made it an incredibly significant event in Canadian political history. I argue that the Somalia Affair presented serious incongruities
between commonly espoused Canadian values and the actions that Canadians undertook in Somalia. There was an inconsistency between the values that are commonly espoused to be Canadian values—peacefulness, acceptance of cultural diversity and a transparent and open government—and the actions that the Canadian soldiers took while in Somalia, as well as the actions that the politicians and bureaucrats allegedly followed after the events in Somalia. Thus, what Canadians generally define as what is right and wrong in terms of accepted rules and standards of societal behaviour in Canada around peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency and accountability of the government were defiled. In all, these transgressions were made public via the media over a period of four years, were certainly subject to disapproval and publicly denounced by Canadian citizens, journalists, and military personnel alike, making this a significant moment of moral dissonance in Canada.

In Chapter Five, I begin to connect the issue of moral dissonance to the commission in an attempt to answer why the commission may have been turned to in response to the moral dissonance caused by the Somalia Affair. This issue is best addressed by relying on the theory of scandals and political scandals and in this chapter, I outline the relevant theories and issues. In Chapter Six, I briefly outline the methodology that I used to carry out this project before moving on to the data analysis. In Chapters Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten, I take the reader through the commission discourse in order to show the communication functions that were evident upon close analysis. To this end, I display how the commission is a place where moral discourse occurs. In other words, I show that the commission is a place where the transgressed norms—peacekeeping, multiculturalism, and transparency/accountability are discussed, debated, defined and
even reasserted at times. Secondly, I show how the discourse in the commission is heavily procedural in nature. The importance of process and formality is frequently made clear in the texts of the commission, and I explain how this is often intimately connected to issues of power within the commission itself.

Finally, the dissertation is drawn together in Chapter Ten where I consider the implications of the findings in terms of the Somalia Affair and its commission, in addition to the possible broader implications that may be evident.
CHAPTER TWO: ROYAL COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY

In this chapter, I provide the reader with a comprehensive overview of Royal Commissions in Canada based on the literature on Royal Commissions of Inquiry and public inquiries, more generally. To begin, I provide an overview of Royal Commissions, noting their distinguishing features and the way in which they can be differentiated from other similar government review bodies. Next, I discuss the various features of commissions, outlining the ways that commissions can vary in topics, purpose, form, players involved, research, openness, length, cost and their role in reporting and making recommendations. Then, I discuss the public opinion around commissions and the various theories scholars have put forward as to when commissions are likely to occur in Canada. In the next section of the paper, I present a section that outlines common critiques against Royal Commissions followed by a section that outlines the importance and significance of Royal Commissions in Canada in closing.
Royal Commissions: An Overview

Since its inception as a nation, Canada has frequently employed Royal Commissions of Inquiry to investigate events of political scandal, accidents and mishaps as well as to research and report on broad areas of policy interest such as healthcare or the status of women in Canada more generally. Also referred to as public inquiries, commissions of inquiry and task forces, Royal Commissions are an independent political body, often headed by a judicial chairperson (or chairpersons), usually mandated into existence and form by the government, and tasked with the job of investigating some topic or event, reporting on said topic or event and then making recommendations as to what the government should do next. The problem with creating a precise definition of Royal Commissions in Canada is that their form and focus often vary so widely. However, very generally, Royal Commissions can be defined as “any body that is formally mandated by a government, either on an ad hoc basis or with reference to a specific problem, to conduct a process of fact-finding and to arrive at a body of recommendations” (Salter, 1990, p. 175). Commissions are often seen as an official review body and notably, can be called and funded at any level of the government including federal, provincial, and territorial. The discussion in this chapter, and the dissertation overall, will focus on commissions called at a federal level which are meant to inform and advise the national public and government (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005).

Commissions have five distinguishing features in Canada. Firstly, they are legislative entities, meaning that commissions are governed by specific government legislation via public inquiry laws that set out how commissions can be created and how
they are to operate. Secondly, they play an advisory role to the government and thus, are unable to force governments to take their advice legally. They are created to investigate a particular issue or event and to make recommendations that the government may or may not accept. Thirdly, commissions are widely thought to be an independent entity from the government. In actual fact, commissions really only enjoy partial independence as the government determines the mandate and purpose of the inquiry, as well as its make-up and budget. However, after the initial factors are determined, the inquiry is generally given independence in the management of its own day-to-day activities and to form its own conclusions and recommendations within its appointed mandate. Fourthly, commissions are very open and public by nature. The general Canadian public is often allowed and encouraged to view the public hearings of the inquiry, as well as to become involved by providing evidence and testimony. The final report of commissions are also made public documents (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). Finally, commissions are temporary in nature. Each commission is an ad hoc body and begins with a clean slate. Likewise, commissions bring together a temporary group of people from many different backgrounds, assembled together for a short-term commitment to achieve a specific task. In all, Royal Commissions are a unique entity in the political framework in Canada. As Cairns (1990) explains:

The royal commission is a bureaucracy with a difference. Its ephemeral existence, absence of routinization, task specificity and independent status distinguish it from the ongoing departments of government with their permanent staff, bureaucratic memory, subordination to political authority and enduring institutional concerns for their own survival and future strengths. (91)

---

4 For examples where commissions didn’t enjoy independence from the government see Bedard (1998), pgs 21-22.
As we will see, the unique form and function of commissions makes them a vital political option in Canada.

Beyond some distinguishing features, commissions can be differentiated from other apparently similar government reviews, such as judicial proceedings and criminal investigations. For instance, while a commission often looks like a judicial review or a trial in its tendency to have judges act as commissioners in addition to the use of a public hearings format which uses witnesses and lawyers to produce and examine the evidence, a commission cannot make a legal finding of guilt or liability, nor can it force the government to act according to its advice. In addition, independence from the government is even more evident in the court system, where judges can't be easily fired for example, and can examine any relevant issue they see fit. Commissions, in contrast, can have their commissioners fired and are forced to review only what the government outlines. Commissions are also unlike a criminal investigation done by a police agency as they are conducted in a very open and public manner and cannot charge individuals with a criminal offence. Finally, commissions are very similar, yet distinct from legislative committees and departmental studies in that commissions are meant to serve the public at large while legislative committees and departmental studies are meant to serve only the government (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005).

History of Royal Commissions in Canada

Royal Commissions of Inquiry in Canada have a long history and are based in the British system of government. As a result, Royal Commissions are mainly utilized as a political institution in commonwealth countries like the UK, Australia and Canada,
although they can be found in the United States as well. Commissions can be traced back in England from the later Middle ages as far back as the Doomsday Book. The first commissions in Canada were English commissions appointed during the colonial period, including “a statutory commission authorized after 1759 to investigate losses and compensation of United Empire Loyalists, to the 1838 commission of Lord Durham to investigate the causes of the 1837-38 rebellions which produced the famous Durham Report” (Anthony and Lucas, 1985, p. 1-2). By 1825, Canadian colonial governments began to appoint royal commissions. And here, as Anthony and Lucas (1985) note, “royal commission appointed under prerogative powers eventually gave way to statutory commissions appointed under provisions of public inquiry acts” (p. 2). The Government of Upper and Lower Canada passed the first Canadian public inquiry law in 1846, and later, in 1868, a modified version was passed by the government of Canada which outlined an act for inquiries into public matters. This act gave commissions the power to compel witnesses to produce requested documents and to testify under oath. It further claimed that any false statements given by a witness would be treated as perjury, although witnesses were protected from answering questions that would leave them open to criminal prosecution (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005).

Since the passing of the first statutes, Parkinson and Makarenko (2005) have noted that there have been numerous revisions and additions to the legislation around commissions. In 1880, commissioners were granted the “power to demand department records, issue subpoenas, and force witnesses to testify under oath” (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). In 1889, moves were made to protect the rights of witnesses so that witnesses were not allowed to refuse to answer so as to not incriminate themselves, but
their testimony could not be used in future criminal proceedings, unless charged with false evidence at the inquiry. In 1906, the two acts were combined as An Act Respecting Public and Departmental Inquiries. The first part of the act dealt with public inquiries while the second part handled departmental investigations. In 1912, individuals under investigation in a commission were given the right to legal representations, and commissioners were also given the right to hire legal counsel and other experts. It also mandated that before issuing a report that found an individual guilty of misconduct, notification must be given to allow the individual the chance to respond. Finally, in 1934, an amendment to the act dealt with International Commissions and Tribunals (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005).

Today, Royal Commissions are legislated via the Public Inquiries Act\(^5\). This act sets out the way in which public inquiries can be called, in addition to some of their powers and responsibilities. For instance, under the act, the Governor-in-Council, the person or body that holds executive power in the government, has sole power to call a public inquiry. Theoretically, this is the Canadian monarch’s representative, the Governor General, but in practice, the executive power lies with the federal Cabinet (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). The act also states that public inquiries can be called into “any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof” (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). Thus, inquiries can be called into any event or issue relating to government and Cabinet has complete freedom in deciding whether or not a commission should be called (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005).

\(^5\) See [http://www.canlii.org/nl/laws/sta/p-38/index.html](http://www.canlii.org/nl/laws/sta/p-38/index.html)
A Typology of Royal Commissions

The many topics that Royal Commissions are tasked to investigate, as well as their many variations in terms of form and process, ensure that describing the various practices and issues around commissions is necessary to understand this important political institution's nuances. As a result, I will outline commissions according to the topics and areas they can cover, their purpose, their form, the different players involved and the roles they play, the amount of research and openness they entail, including their relationship to the media and public, their length and cost, and finally, their role in reporting and making recommendations.

Different attempts have been made in terms of classifying commissions by their topic or area of focus in the literature on public inquiries in Canada. An older classification, but one that remains useful today, is provided by Hodgetts (1960). In his broad overview of Royal Commissions, Hodgetts (1960) suggests that the topics investigated by Royal Commissions generally fall into four categories. Firstly, Royal Commissions often investigate sudden, catastrophic events. This is the case with commissions held throughout Canadian history on issues like the 1897 Quebec landslide, the 1916 fire in the Parliament Buildings or the 1932 explosion in Montreal (See Appendix A: Reverse Chronological List of Canadian Royal Commissions for names and years of commissions referred to within this chapter). Secondly, commissions tend to investigate conflict situations and social or cultural problems. Here, Hodgetts (1960) broadly refers to commissions on labour disputes, issues of 'prohibition, immigration, cost of living, racing and betting, broadcasting, Indian Affairs, and most recently, the so-called 'Culture Commission" (p. 473). Thirdly, Royal Commissions investigate issues of
the Canadian economy. In this category, commissions have often focused on the status of Canadian fisheries, the grain trade, the railway and freight rates, as well as pulpwood, canals, banking and the state of natural resources. Finally, the fourth category that Hodgetts (1960) identifies is the investigation into the Canadian government. While it could be argued that the previous three categories also include a degree of investigation into the government, especially when sudden, catastrophic disasters involve the actions of government personnel, for example, or when social problems and issues of the Canadian economy will have repercussions for government policy, this final category remains separate because Royal Commissions have often been employed to investigate scandal or corruption within the government itself. Here, Hodgetts (1960) notes that the very first commission conducted by the new Dominion of Canada was appointed to investigate the civil service. Other specific issues within this category that have been tackled include the investigation of flaws in government departments, charges against the government generally, or charges against a specific member of the government.

A cursory examination of the almost 100 Royal Commissions that have occurred since Hodgetts’ (1960) article shows that his topical categories remain incredibly relevant. More recent commissions that deal with sudden, catastrophic events include the Air Ontario Crash in Dryden (1992), the Hinton Train Collision (1986), or the Ocean Ranger Marine Disaster (1984). Commissions that have dealt with Canadian economic issues recently include commissions on party financing (1991) or on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada (1985). The majority of Royal Commissions since 1960 can be seen to fall under the remaining two categories that Hodgetts (1960) identifies: social or cultural problems and conflicts and the investigation of the Canadian
government. In the first case, broad policy-driven commissions that investigate issues like the future of health care (2002), aboriginal issues (1996) or Canadian university education (1991) can be placed here. The most recent, and perhaps, best-publicized commissions in the last forty-five years appear to fall under the topic of investigation of the Canadian government itself. For example, the Air India Commission (ongoing) the Gomery Commission (2005), and the Arar Commission (2007), as well as the Krever Commission (1997) and the Somalia Commission (1997) can be put under this heading.

Hodgetts’ (1960) classifications of Royal Commissions is helpful to get a broad sense of the vastly different areas this political institution is tasked to explore and report on. And while it is clear that the commission topic categories remain incredibly useful to understand commissions in Canada almost 50 years after publication, it is imperative to remember that strict divisions between the categories may not be possible. That is, a commission may be investigating a catastrophic event at the same time that it is investigating the Canadian government.

Another useful way to gain a better understanding of Royal Commissions is to examine their varying forms and purpose. Within the literature on commissions, the division of commissions via their purpose is the usual starting point for discussion and explanation of these important political bodies. Thus, commissions are usually referred to, and understood, according to whether their purpose is investigative or fact-finding and hence, ‘event-driven’, versus a commission that is geared towards policy development, or is thus ‘policy-driven’. Commissions are often understood according to this dichotomy of purpose and within the literature on commissions, there are a number of different terms utilized to describe this dichotomy, such as investigative vs. policy oriented (Cairns,
1990; Godsoe 1990), investigatory vs. policy advisory (Mackay, 1990), individual misconduct vs. public issues (Robardet, 1990), fact-finding vs. policy-driven (Salter, 1990), event-driven vs. policy-driven (Howe, 1999), quasi-judicial vs. consultative inquiry (Grenville, 1990), forensic purposes vs. task force (Macdonald, 2003), inquiry as arbitration vs inquiry as research study (Salter and Slaco, 1981), and conflict vs consensus (Macdonald, 2003). From these examples, it is possible to see that the main distinction made within the literature on commissions is between commissions that are investigating specific incidents and those that investigate broader social problems. In the first case, commissions are used to investigate specific events, such as the Air Ontario Crash (1992), in an effort to find out ‘what happened’, or what went wrong (i.e. fact-find). Here, inquiries are utilized as a means of arbitration, attempting, in part, to allocate blame, and to manage conflict. In this way, commissions that deal with topical issues of sudden, catastrophic events often undergo a fact-finding method of investigation, while issues on the Canadian economy and Canadian government could also be framed in this way. These commissions, then, are often driven by specific events in which the commission is concerned to investigate the related facts. These events can be political scandals or government wrongdoing, or can simply be events such as the tainted blood issue in the Krever Inquiry or the Halifax explosion. Commissions that have fact-finding as their foremost purpose are often seen as a kind of “surrogate criminal investigation” in which conflict resolution is the main purpose (Macdonald, 2003).

In contrast, other commissions, particularly around those that deal with social and cultural problems, tend to take more of a policy-driven approach. Here, commissions undertake an issue of broad social import and concern, such as the status of women, and
widely investigate issues around it. The overall goal in these kinds of commissions is the
development of policy recommendations for the government to undertake, and as such,
the commissions work as a kind of policy analysis body. In this way, policy-driven
commissions are often built on a consensus principle so that they are seen as a kind of
task force which relies heavily on information gathering, and sometimes performs
primary research of its own in order to understand the big picture of a broad social
problem and to make policy recommendations. These commissions, then, are a kind of
“surrogate political process” where consensus building is the goal (Macdonald, 2003).

While the dichotomy presented in much of the literature around the purpose of
commissions is a useful starting point to understand what commissions really are and do,
important work by Salter (1990) among others (Godsoe, 1990; Robardet, 1990) has
pointed to the fact that the purposes and forms of commissions are not necessarily an
either-or circumstance. Salter (1990) argues that all inquiries “are mandated to conduct
processes of fact-finding and to arrive at recommendations” (p. 176). This generally
appears to be the case for the Royal Commissions throughout Canadian history. Even
when commissions are ‘event-driven’, such as the Halifax explosion, the commissioners
were tasked with fact-finding about the situation in order to make policy
recommendations for the government so that a similar incident would not happen in the
future.

Despite the acknowledgement that most commissions fulfill both fact-finding and
policy recommendation roles, commissions can be seen to differ in the degree to which
they pursue either fact-finding or achieve policy consensus and thus, can be “arranged on
a continuum with respect to the emphasis given to each aspect of their work” (Salter
Understanding commissions’ varying purposes according to a continuum makes a great deal more sense than via accordance to a strict dichotomy when one thinks about the fact that commissions clearly must undertake some kind of ‘fact-finding’ in order to investigate broad social issues to create policy. And likewise, investigative or ‘event-driven’ commissions are generally not done only to discover ‘what happened’, but also to ensure that similar events do not occur in the future, and thus, make some kind of policy recommendations. Despite these overlapping goals, however, it is possible to differentiate the main purpose of most commissions and as a result, Salter’s (1990) suggestion to utilize a continuum is useful. In this way, an important element of commissions is the fact that they tend to vary in terms of their main purpose – as either more investigative or more policy-driven. For example, the Romanow Commission on the future of health care (2002) was appointed to investigate the broader issues of health care in Canada, and not a specific event. In contrast, the commission on the Hinton Train Collision (1986) was mandated to investigate only the specifics of the disaster itself. However, the Krever Inquiry into the tainted blood scandal (1997) looked at both the event and the policy implications almost equally. As represented by the visual below, a continuum is particularly useful to display the different purposes that commissions can fulfill in Canada.

Figure 1: Royal Commissions of Inquiry Topic Continuum.
Another feature of commissions is their role in allocating blame or assigning responsibility to specific parties or groups. Mackay and McQueen (2003) have noted that Royal Commissions are one mechanism of dealing with accountability that operate in full public view. They note that blaming is an integral part of the growing demand for accountability in Canadian society. Depending on the topic and purpose of the commission, some commissions allocate blame more than others. For instance, the Gomery Commission (2005) investigated systemic governmental problems with the sponsorship program but also included a section ‘assigning responsibility’ to particular individuals. While this section of the report included a disclaimer that stated it was not to be read out of context from the rest of the report and that it was not a judgment that established legal responsibility, it was, nonetheless, the section that the media really highlighted following its release (Now Canadians must judge anew, 2005). Specifically in the Gomery Commission report, Jean Chrétien, Jean Pelletier, and Alfonso Gagliano, among many others, were ‘assigned responsibility’ for the sponsorship program’s mishandling of government money. In contrast, other commissions, mainly those that are driven by policy development, do not allocate blame at all. Because these kinds of commissions are not interested in investigating a specific event or incident of wrongdoing, allocation of blame is a non-issue. An example of a recent commission that didn’t allocate blame would be the Romanow Commission on the Future of Health Care (2002). While this commission approached the topic by conducting a ‘state of the union’ of health care in Canada, its focus was on systemic issues rather than on individual, or even departmental, misconduct and thus avoided allocating blame in a specific manner.
Even still, the allocation of blame or the assigning of responsibility can be a key feature of Royal Commissions in Canada.

Another important feature of commissions, and one that is related to a commissions’ form, is the scope of the commission investigation, more frequently referred to as the commissions’ Terms of Reference. As noted in the definition of Royal Commissions, commissions are appointed into existence and form by the federal government of the day. The topic and the scope of the task they are given by the government is outlined and included in the commissions’ Terms of Reference. However, the interpretation of the mandate is solely up to the commissioners and this interpretation may push the commission in a direction that the government could not have foreseen or wanted. Broadly speaking, Terms of Reference are guidelines that govern the commission’s basic operations. Traditionally included in the Terms of Reference are the name of the person (or people) who will lead the inquiry, the mandate or purpose of the inquiry and what powers the inquiry will have. It may also include an end-date for the inquiry (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). Notably, the Cabinet has complete freedom in setting the Terms of Reference. In this way, commissioners can be mandated to explore and investigate any number of broad issues, or be restricted to a very limited scope. A commission that was appointed to operate under a very limited term of reference, for example, was the Commission of Inquiry into Certain Events at the Prison for Women in Kingston (1996). As we can see, the Terms of Reference for this inquiry included investigating only those issues that directly surrounded the ‘incidents’ that occurred in the prison from April 22, 1994 onwards. The Terms of Reference read:
(a) to appoint, by Commission under the Great Seal, the Honourable Louise Arbour of Toronto, Ontario, a judge of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, as a commissioner to investigate and report on the state and management of that part of the business of the Correctional Service of Canada that pertains to the incidents that occurred at the Prison for Women in Kingston, Ontario, of the Correctional Service of Canada thereto, in particular

(i) the measures in place at the Prison for Women in Kingston, Ontario, in April 1994 to respond to incidents,

(ii) the adequacy and appropriateness of the actions and decisions taken in relation to the seriousness of the incidents that occurred,

(iii) the deployment of an all-male emergency response team, the mandate that was given to the team and the appropriateness of the team’s conduct during its involvement in the incidents that occurred, and

(iv) the subsequent confinement in administrative segregation of the inmates concerned, the reasonableness of their treatment while in segregation and the duration of the segregation. (1996)

From this example, it becomes clear that the terms of reference for this inquiry are quite limited, mandating that the commission only investigate issues directly pertaining to the Kingston prison incidents.

In contrast, other commissions, often public-policy driven commissions, tend to have much broader mandates. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996), also not coincidentally the longest running and most expensive commission to date, had arguably the broadest mandate ever for a Canadian inquiry. Within this commission, the terms of reference state:

The Commission of Inquiry should investigate the evolution of the relationship among aboriginal peoples (Indian, Inuit and Métis), the Canadian government, and Canadian society as a whole. It should propose specific solutions; rooted in domestic and international experience, to the problems which have plagued those relationships and which confront aboriginal peoples today. The Commission should examine all issues which it deems to be relevant to any or all of the
aboriginal peoples of Canada, and in particular, should investigate and make concrete recommendations concerning:

1. The history of relations between aboriginal peoples, the Canadian government and Canadian society as a whole.
2. The recognition and affirmation of aboriginal self-government; its origins, content and a strategy for progressive implementation.
3. The land base for aboriginal peoples, including the process for resolving comprehensive and specific claims, whether rooted in Canadian constitutional instruments, treaties or in aboriginal title.
4. The historical interpretation and application, and potential future scope, of s. 91(24) of the *Constitution Act, 1867* and the responsibilities of the Canadian Crown.
5. The legal status, implementation and future evolution of aboriginal treaties, including modern-day agreements.
6. The constitutional and legal position of the Métis and off-reserve Indians.
7. The special difficulties of aboriginal people who live in the North.
8. The *Indian Act* and the role, responsibilities and policies of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND).
9. Special issues of concern to aboriginal peoples.
10. Economic issues of concern to aboriginal peoples.
11. Cultural issues of concern to aboriginal peoples.
12. The position and role of aboriginal elders.
13. The position and role of aboriginal women under existing social conditions and legal arrangements, and in the future.
14. The situation of aboriginal youth.
15. Educational issues of concern to aboriginal peoples.

When looking at the terms of reference for this commission, it can hardly be surprising that the commission took five years to complete its mandate.

Of course, some commissions have terms of reference that mandate both a limited and a broad approach to the issues. The Krever Inquiry (1997) into the blood scandal is an excellent example of this. Within the Commission of Inquiry on the Blood System in Canada, the terms of reference present both a limited and a broad mandate by specifying that the commission should look into both the tainted blood event itself, as well as the broader system issues that surround it. It states,
AND WE DO HEREBY advise that Our Commissioner review and report on the mandate, organization, management, operations, financing and regulation of all activities of the blood system in Canada, including the events surrounding the contamination of the blood system in Canada in the early 1980s, by examining, without limiting the generality of the inquiry. (Canada 1997)

In all, an important component of Royal Commissions in Canada is their scope of investigation. The commissioners take the terms of reference as their starting and finishing point for their investigations and once they agree to be involved in the commission, they are legally bound to complete the terms of reference.

Commissions enjoy many investigatory powers in order to pursue the process of fact-finding, including the power to compel witnesses and evidence and to make findings of misconduct. For instance, the Public Inquiries Act grants public inquiries the power to compel witnesses to appear, the power to compel witnesses to testify under oath, the power to treat any deliberately false answer given by a witness as perjury, and the power to compel witnesses to produce specific documents. In addition, commissions have the power of inspection of public and private facilities (Scott, 1990). These powers are similar to those found in civil court, while safeguards for those being investigated include the right to be represented by legal counsel. While the purpose of a commission is not to determine guilt, a public inquiry can make a finding of misconduct against an individual or organization. If this is the case, commissioners must ensure that the finding of misconduct is within the commission’s mandate and that the finding must be couched in words so as to avoid reflecting criminal or civil liability and the commission must notify the individual involved and allow for a response when making a finding of misconduct (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). Commissions also allow for a number of rights of witnesses and those involved in the inquiry. For instance, commissions allow for the right
to counsel, the right to participate, the right to respond to a charge of misconduct in the report, the right to insist upon the applicability of the rules of evidence, the right to demand a hearing in public or a hearing *in camera*, the right of cross-examination, and the right to seek judicial review of commission decisions (Scott, 1990).

Research is used frequently in Royal Commissions in Canada. While all commissions can arguably be seen to use research, so that even fact-finding commissions utilize interview methods to determine what has happened, for instance, research here is understood to be the undertaking, and often contracting out, of formal research studies external to the commission but related to its overall topic. These studies are often contracted out to experts in the field, and thus, scholars in academia often conduct them on top of their normal workloads. Beyond the close connection that this results for commissions and academia or the research community, contracting out large and important research studies in addition to the publication of the final report, leaves a ‘double legacy’ by the commission (Cairns, 1990). Even more, “royal commission research both by its specific shaping effect on many of the researchers and by the diffuse long-run impact of its published research on the scholarly community, stimulates an enduring scholarly focus on the commission’s policy agenda” (Cairns, 1990, p. 88). The researchers involved in these external commissions also tend to have limited knowledge and participation in the royal commission itself and the relationship between researchers and the commission can be difficult. While the promise of published research will draw academics to the table, the research contracted out may actually work to weaken the report’s conclusions.
Not surprisingly, policy-driven commissions generally tend to utilize more external studies. However, even commissions that are more investigative have utilized external research studies in order to provide a better understanding of the context of the situation under investigation. The Somalia Commission (1997) is a good example of a commission that is generally considered to be primarily investigative, yet also provided some policy recommendations and in so doing, had 10 background studies contracted and conducted throughout its appointment. In all, a fundamental feature of Royal Commissions in Canada is their use of research methods and the appointment of research studies by people external to the commission itself.

There are many different players involved in commissions. Arguably the most important player is the commissioner. Commissions can be headed by single or multiple commissioners, and commissions have varied in this regard throughout their history in Canada. As mentioned earlier, cabinet names the commissioner and he/she is one of the most important people in the inquiry as he/she influences the format and schedule of the inquiry as well as leads its day-to-day activities. Often, commissioners are former judges, senior politicians or some other professional held in high regard such as a university dean. Well-known single member commissions have included the Romanow Commission (2002), the Gomery Commission (2005), and the Krever Commission (1997) among many others. Well-known multi-member commissions include the Somalia Commission (1997) with three commissioners or the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996), which had seven commissioners in all. It appears difficult to make generalizations about when a commission will follow the single-member rule versus multi-member path. Aucoin (1990) argues that when a commission is dealing with broad social issues and is
policy-oriented, commissions should be multi-membered in order to allow for a broader representation and because ‘two heads are better than one’ in developing national policy. Commissioners are responsible for developing a workplan and budget to complete the inquiry, which he/she then submits to the PCO who handles the administration and financial management of inquiries.

Another important player in the commission context is the commission secretary. The secretary will be one of the first staff members to be hired in an inquiry and he/she is the person who has the overall administrative responsibility for the inquiry (Anthony and Lucas, 1985). If a commission is small, the secretary may act as the personal secretary to the commissioner, attend hearings to receive and record documents and administer oaths to persons giving evidence and other financial and administrative matters, whereas in larger inquiries, the secretary usually deals with more complex administrative matters such as “deal with the government on questions of finance and administration, attend all hearings, travel with the commissioner, and generally be the chief administrative officer” (Anthony and Lucas 1985, 22). Commission secretaries must be good at delegating responsibility, working with others and should have government experience as they are responsible for ensuring the inquiry runs efficiently and must “steer [the inquiry] through the maze of government red tape” (Anthony and Lucas, 1985, p. 22). In all, the commission secretary is responsible for logistics and timing, and ultimately the running of the details of the commission.

Commission counsel is another important player in the commission process. The commission counsel act as counsel to commissioners and their duties often include planning the presentation of witnesses, examining all the witnesses and presenting the
summations of evidence (Estey, 1990). Sopinka (1990) has noted that commission counsel are similar to a prosecutor in a criminal case, and as such, interview the witnesses to be called before the commission, advise the commissioners about procedure, make the opening statement and outline the matters into which the commission will inquire, examines witnesses, cross-examines witnesses and presents the closing argument. Sometimes, the preparation of the final report is also done by commission counsel, but this has been noted as improper as the commission counsel is supposed to be impartial. Commission counsel is usually made up of a team of lawyers, with a single counselor at the head.

Finally, the commission’s technical advisors have an important role to play as well. The chief technical advisor needs to have “sufficient technical knowledge to understand and advise on the evidence” (Anthony and Lucas, 1985, p. 25). A non-biased person works well in this role in order to critically evaluate all evidence and sides. Technical advisors tend to come from consulting firms, universities, or with government departments. The role of the technical advisor is to advise on the definition of the issues the inquiry is to examine as well as “organizing and contracting for research, evaluating technical data, identifying expert witnesses and working with them to prepare technical evidence, reviewing technical evidence for the commissioner and advising him, preparing cross-examination of witnesses for commission counsel, reviewing the technical work of the inquiry staff, and assisting the commissioner in writing the final report” (Anthony and Lucas, 1985, p. 26). In all, the technical advisor lends credibility to the inquiry through his/her knowledge of the topic and involvement in the investigation.
Beyond these key roles, other staff that are often hired include a personal secretary for the commissioner, financial officer, librarian, community relations officer, public relations and word processing staff.

The visibility and openness of the commission is often considered to be a defining feature of commissions in Canada. In particular, the openness of the commission is associated with whether an important feature of commissions – public hearings, the pseudo-court proceedings – are held publicly or in camera (behind closed door). The openness of the commission is up to the commissioners themselves, despite a commonly held belief in Canada that the public visibility of these institutions is a defining feature. There is a powerful and generally accepted argument in Canada that commissions should be held in public, mainly because doing so lend veracity to the inquiry (Ashforth, 1990). In addition, public hearings are believed to build public support for the commissioner’s recommendations, act as a learning mechanism for commissioners and are a means to test out the feasibility of potential recommendations (Cairns, 1990). Furthermore, public hearings are argued to restore credibility to institutional processes in the public’s eye and to ensure that the public understands the magnitude of the problems and possible solutions to solve the problems (Witelson, 2003). When hearings are held in-camera it is often because the evidence presented by a witness could be damaging to the general public or to particular members of the public (Estey, 1990). In this way, witnesses who may be asked to testify on oath about confidential information or trade secrets, for instance, may dictate that a commissioner will undertake the hearings in camera. Most recently, some of the hearings within the Arar Commission took place in camera because of the threat “that the disclosure of that information would be injurious to international
relations, national defence or national security” [http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/206/301/pco-bcp/commissions/maher_arar/07-09-13/www.ararcommission.ca/eng/index.htm]. Similarly, in the Air Canada Inquiry, Estey (1990) made the decision to hold the hearings behind closed doors because the evidence “would have virtually destroyed the career of two or three people, some of whom did not work for the airline” (p. 212). In contrast, both the Gomery Commission (2005) and the Somalia Commission (1997) held open public hearings, made even more open because they were televised and aired on Cable Public Affairs Channel (CPAC). In all, because of the fundamental distinction of a commission as an open and public endeavour, it is highly unlikely that a commission would rely only on in camera hearings today:

Another interesting feature of the openness of Royal Commissions in Canada is the opportunity for public participation. Inquiries provide several ways for the government to satisfy the public’s demand for input into important issues, such as sampling public opinion on an issue, educating the public and inviting the public to participate directly in the process (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). The level of public participation is often dependent on whether an inquiry is policy-driven or event-driven. Policy-driven inquiries are more apt to solicit written and oral submissions from the general public, such as in the Romanow Commission on the Future of Health Care, which held cross-country hearings to gain public input. In contrast, demonstrating direct interest in an event-driven commission is more common, and one must usually obtain standing. In this way, particular groups and individuals will be granted standing and thus are given the right to participate, while others are not. This is directly related to whether or not the parties or individuals have immediate and obvious interests in the commission, are being
investigated, or have had charges made against them. Despite the possibility that commissioners are entitled to disallow particular groups or individuals standing, most inquiries establish generous criterion to enable wide participation.

Many Canadians often believe the participation in a commission is open to everyone and anyone with an interest or a stake in the issue at large. In contrast, while public participation via commissions is generally understood to occur either via representation or through submission of evidence, the ‘right to participate’ is not a given. The right to participate is generally understood as “the right to be present, to examine, and to cross-examine witnesses and to make submissions” (Scott, 1990, p. 141). While it is a common belief amongst Canadians that the public has the right to participate in a commission and its operation, at the Federal level, there is actually no discussion as to standing or participation at all in the discussion of the ‘right to participate’ in the Public Inquiries Act. Instead, the discussion around standing is framed as a right to be represented, that is, to have legal counsel represent your interests in the commission. Furthermore, this right to be represented is discretionary or mandatory depending on whether a person is merely one who is being investigated or one against whom a charge is made (Scott, 1990).

Rodger (1985) has argued that discontent around public inquiries is often because of constraints imposed on the kind of information discussed as well as the categories of people permitted to participate. He explains that commissions operate under a common myth that everybody affected by a commission has the right to debate what ought to happen, despite the fact that they have no legal right to do this. Thus, he argues that public opinion around what a commission should be (i.e. an open process) has
transformed expectations and this results in public discontent around commissions. In other words, the public now believes that to be fair, commissions should be open and impartial hearings.

In all, commissions can adopt a broad or limited understanding of standing, and thus, allow for a broad or restricted opportunity for public participation. Standing is highly related to funding issues and the anticipated costs of the inquiry. The more parties that standing is granted to, the more legal representatives are allowed to be present and to cross-examine witnesses. This not only costs a great deal of time in the public hearings, but ends up costing the government a great deal of money (who usually pay for legal representation for participants with standing or who are accused of wrongdoing). An example of a commission with a more limited ‘standing’ clause is the Gomery Commission (2005). Here, the commission decreed that standing would be given to people if they were directly or substantially affected by the inquiry or if they had clearly ascertainable interests and perspective that were essential to the mandate of the commission (http://www.gomery.ca/en/rulesofprocedure/#2). In contrast, a broader conception of standing can be seen in the commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996).

The openness of a commission also has to do with the role that the media is allowed to play during the commissions’ lifespan. The media plays an essential role in creating the public identity of the commission as it acts as the intermediary between the commission and the public (Mackay, 1990). While some commissions embrace the media’s participation as a way to get the inquiry’s work to the public, other inquiries keep a fairly restricted lid on its internal processes. The role of the media is heavily related to the topic of the inquiry and its purpose and mandate so that commissions that deal with
potentially damaging or confidential information usually keep the media at arm’s length. This was the case with the inquiry on war criminals (1986) that generally relied on press releases and briefings to keep the media abreast of its happenings. In contrast, the Gomery Commission permitted the public hearings to be broadcast across Canada via television live. Thus, some commissions allow the media, and hence, the public, extensive access while others only provide very limited access.

Another feature of commissions is their cost and length. Commissions can be very long and costly, although each commission varies in this respect. According to Mr. Justice Letourneau, the Somalia Commission Chair, the government determines the length of the inquiry by asking the inquiry, by giving the inquiry a time limit within which to operate and a fixed date to report, granting extensions when needed (Witelson, 2003). While some commissions have been completed in weeks, like the Commission to Inquire into the Provision Made for the Persons of the Japanese Race in the Settlements in B.C. (1943), more recently other commissions have taken many years to complete. For example, one of the longest commissions, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996), was established in 1991 and submitted its final report in 1996. Not surprisingly, commissions that tend to deal with broader, social topics appear to take longer than commissions that investigate catastrophes, for instance. The length of a commission is also heavily connected to the amount, and kind, of research that can be conducted. Increasingly, commissions are given deadlines by the government which ensures that “they must be consumers, not producers of intellectual capital” (Osberg in Aucoin, 1990, p. 206). In other words, the strict time limitations that are often imposed and mandated on commissions by the government frequently ensures that commissions must perform
survey-type research, in essence, surveying the ‘best’ of current research that is available rather than conduct new primary research studies in an effort to save time.

Besides the time that they can take, commissions are often quite costly. The great expense of the majority of commissions nowadays is a matter of much negative attention. The most expensive commission to date has been the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996) at $60 million dollars. The Romanow Commission (2002) came in at $15 million while the Royal Commission on Reproductive Technologies (1993) cost $30 million to conduct. Older commissions, such as the Commission of Inquiry into the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1873, often cost significantly less, at just over $2,200 (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). Besides the role of inflation, the increase in costs of commissions has been attributed to the need to hire more staff such as legal experts and researchers in addition to travel expenses. In addition, the cost of commissions is often directly tied to the funding of legal counsel for witnesses. Thus, the right to counsel is often tied directly to the opportunity for participation. It has been argued that to enable fair participation, the government should fund the required counsel for witnesses. However, providing counsel for witnesses is incredibly expensive. For example, 62% of the entire cost of the Bren Gun Inquiry (1939) went to counsel fees. Likewise, in the Grain Commission (1925) $59,000 of the total $141,000 cost for the commission went towards counsel costs (Hodgetts 1960). Inquiries costing between $20 to $30 million dollars include: Economic union and development prospects for Canada (1985); New reproductive technologies (1993); electoral reform and party financing (1992); Citizen’s forum on Canada’s future (1991). In the $10 to $20 million range are: Ocean Ranger Marine disaster (1985); Air Ontario crash at Dryden (1992); National passenger transportation (1992) (Globe and
Mail, Mar. 29, 1997, A5 in Bedard, 1997, p. 24). Of course, a related issue to cost is time. Generally speaking, the longer a commission runs, the more expensive it is. This is clearly the case with the longest running commission at five years, the commission on Aboriginal Peoples, which is also the most expensive at $60 million. A traditional means by which the government controls the cost of commissions is by restricting the time.

The adoption of the recommendations that the commission puts forward to the government can be an important issue, particularly to the commissioners themselves. When people criticize commissions as useless, they often point to the fact that its recommendations were not implemented, thus, the success and public opinion of an inquiry can be tied up with this feature. Godsoe (1990) suggests that thinking about commissions in this way is not an accurate measure of their worth. Rather than consider whether recommendations were implemented, he suggests looking at whether the commission influences the course of public policy which is obviously much harder to answer. Iacobucci (1990) argues that an inquiry must be deemed effective, or not, in comparison to its mandate and not the implementation of its recommendations by government. Like Godsoe (1990), he argues against the tendency to judge the effectiveness of a commission by the degree to which its activities and recommendations are accepted by other institutions and the public. He states, “one must avoid evaluating inquiries by their success in achieving the execution of policy” (Iacobucci, 1990, p. 28). Nonetheless, the adoption of recommendations is another feature of Royal Commissions that is worthy of consideration.

Another important issue around commissions is the public opinion around them. Whether a commission will be seen in a positive or negative light by the public has to do
with many factors: the role of the media, the opportunity for participation, the implementation of recommendations as well as the structure and style of the final report in addition to the time and length of the commission. Generally speaking, the public opinion of a commission can be seen to depend on the topic, cost, length, etc. of the commission. In this way, a 'good' commission is often considered to be one that has achieved its mandate (i.e. did it get the facts and get them straight?), has protected individual rights, and has been efficient and economical (Iacobucci, 1990). The various procedures that a commission follows, thus, has a great deal to do with whether a commission will be viewed favourably by the Canadian public. The portrayal of the commission in the media seems to play an important role in whether public opinion will be favourable. In addition, if a commission is seen to restrict opportunities for participation, the public can be suspicious towards it. Because commissions are assumed to be an open and public arm of government, any commission that limits participation can be viewed more negatively. In addition, whether or not recommendations are implemented within a commission also plays a large role in whether a commission will be viewed positively. If recommendations are generally ignored, the commission can be seen to have been a waste of time and money and as a useless and expensive endeavour. In contrast, if many recommendations are accepted and utilized by the government of the day, the commission is generally viewed favourably for making an important impact in Canadian political and social culture. The final report of the commission can also play a large role in whether or not a commission is viewed positively or negatively. If the information is seen to be accessible and useful to a broad audience, the commission is often thought of in more positive terms. Finally, the shorter and less expensive a
commission is, the more likely it is that the public will view it favourably. Because the Canadian public generally espouses values of efficiency today, when commissions drag on too long or are seen to have cost more than the findings they produce, public discontent can erupt. However, perhaps the single more important factor in determining whether a commission will be thought of positively or negatively in the public’s eye is whether or not it managed to achieve its full mandate.

There are many speculations within the literature on public inquiries in Canada around when commissions of inquiry are likely to occur. Hodgetts (1960), for instance, conjectures that commissions are related to a nation’s growing pains so that with the exception of catastrophes, commissions seem to be concerned with the social and cultural, economic and administrative problems of a maturing nation. While Hodgetts (1960) declares that it is probably hopeless to try to find a pattern in this regard, he nonetheless notes that inquiries seem to appear at times of crisis, growth, or adjustments after growth within Canada. Other scholars have argued that inquiries are triggered by ‘high magnitude, low probability’ events (Elliott and McGuinness, 2002). They further claim that factors that are relevant to whether a commission will occur or not include the degree of media coverage of an event or issue, the number of fatalities (if applicable), unknown causes, and a suspicion of a system breakdown and thus, a need for public reassurance around an issue. Salter (2003) further notes that inquiries seem to occur when there is a failure in public confidence with institutions with a public purpose. In addition, some scholars have noted the relation between inquiries and controversy (Salter, 2003). In this way, a popular conventional belief that can be felt to run implicitly throughout the literature is that inquiries are most often appointed because of a controversy. Thus,
inquiries are conceived to be mired in controversy and cynically viewed as ‘taking the heat off’ of governments. However, predicting when a commission might be appointed based solely on the level of controversy is misleading. Not all controversial issues result in inquiries. In addition, some commissions can be seen to have been appointed in the absence of well-focused controversies such as the MacDonald Commission and the many inquiries on broadcasting, for example. As Salter (2003) explains, “policy inquiries seem to require something other than, or something in addition to, controversy as a rationale for their existence” (p. 206). In all, it appears that there is no easy way to predict when inquiries will erupt in Canada. But a number of factors do seem relevant. These include:

- A time of crisis
- Wide public significance
- Controversy precipitated by a high-magnitude, low-probability event
- Degree of media coverage
- Unknown causes
- System breakdown
- Government attention required

In addition to these factors, another helpful way to speculate on when commissions might occur is to re-consider Hodgetts (1960) topics of commissions. Thus, if there is an issue of catastrophic, social, economic or governmental nature that is of wide public significance in Canada, a commission of inquiry may be appointed in order to address it. Interestingly, Salter (2003) has investigated the link between inquiries and controversy and has found that the inquiries are actually more likely to create controversy than to resolve it. She argues that the relationship between controversy and inquiries
appear to be one of correlation, not cause, and that controversies dissipate on their own for various reasons, quite independently of the contributions they make to both the public discourse and to inquiries. Similarly, Lipsky and Olson (1977), discussing riot commissions in the United States specifically, note that commissions are often established in the following pattern. Immediately after violence erupts, public officials want to suppress it and must explain what happened and why. This follows the surprise phase, where "initial incredulity that what 'couldn't happen here' actually happened" (75). In response to the incredulity, public officials tend to develop an interpretation that responds to the human need for reassurance, such as minimizing the severity of the violence or point to the few bad apples that have caused the trouble. These interpretations arise because of the need to explain that the violence is not an indication of the policy and that it will not happen again (75-76). However, the interpretations that public officials provide are often not enough to ease public anxieties, according to Lipsky and Olson (1977). The public continues to demand that 'something be done' to assure it won't happen again, and officials appoint a commission. In all, there appears to be no agreement in the literature as to why or when a commission can be predicted to occur, but as we have seen, some well-reasoned speculation exists.

**Critiques of Royal Commissions**

Commissions are the subject of much criticism. Often, they are accused of being used as a delay mechanism so that the creation of Royal Commissions allows decision makers to postpone or delay decisions (Aucoin, 1990). In this way, commissions are argued to be an excellent tool because "in a period of high tension, public officials give
the appearance of taking corrective steps without making binding commitments” (Lipsky and Olson, 1977, p. 76). Royal Commissions are accused of creating the impression that solutions are being found until the event slips from public consciousness, and thus act as stalling mechanisms (Elliott and McGuinness, 2002; Bradford, 1999/2000). Because of the accusation that Royal Commissions are used to ‘buy time’ which allows citizen concern to dissipate, they are argued to have a “basically conservative impact” as they “provide a forum for debating controversial racial issues without forcing any public official or city agency to do anything about those issues” (Lipsky and Olson, 1977, p. 77). In addition to delaying dealing with the issue, commissions are often accused of obfuscating the facts so that “death by inquiry means drowning in a sea of facts” (Ashforth, 1990, p. 2). Public inquiries are also criticized for their lack of impartiality, their thoroughness and their underlying purpose (Elliott and McGuinness, 2002). Furthermore, Royal Commissions have been charged with being “cumbersome devices for defining controversy, as a way to distract attention from urgent problems, and as elaborate covers for decisions already taken” (Bradford 1999/2000). Finally, Royal Commissions are seen to frequently issue recommendations that go ignored or even are established to gain legitimacy for proposals already favoured by the government (Lipsky and Olson, 1977).

Schwartz (2003) has argued that Royal Commissions tend to be unreasonably expensive and drawn out, that they are vulnerable to self-serving political manipulation by the government of Canada and that they can present a serious risk to civil liberties. Salter and Slaco (1981) note that Royal Commissions often mirror debates and decisions made elsewhere, they tend to mask serious scientific controversy, they are unlikely to
provide an effective understanding of certain issues like the impact of new technologies, they operate under pressure to produce data that is conducive to comparison and thus, work to simplify policy choices. Others argue that commissions are inherently reformist versus radical as they reflect those who are appointed to them and the context of the times (Simeon, 1987).

Lipsky and Olson (1977) note the ‘commission problem’, that is, the fundamental paradox that commissions are designed to analyze and explain events and make recommendations, while at the same time executive levels of government are free to accept or disregard their advice at will. Thus, “commissions simultaneously may expect, and may not expect, executive support” which works to influence and undermine the commission’s efforts (p. 98). The ‘commission problem’ consists of four sub-problems, political legitimacy, commission integration, scarce resources and implementation. Political legitimacy refers to the dilemma that the commission’s work must be politically acceptable and have scientific legitimacy at the same time. Commission integration refers to the selection of commission members and their representative stature. This representative nature is problematic when commissioners are expected to “agree on and support a meaningful report about a complex problem with clear ideological and value implications” (p. 100). Commissions are also faced with the challenge of insufficient time and resources to accomplish the tasks set before them. The implementation problem points to the fact that as time passes, commissions come to be associated with specific orientations, and are no longer non-partisan and solely acting on the behalf of the polity. Thus, commissions begin to become another competitor in the governmental process and as a result, “they tend to lose their relatively authoritative status and instead must
compete for visibility, persuasiveness, legitimacy and, ultimately, effectiveness (Lipsky and Olson, 1977, p.102).

In all, commissions are heavily criticized for their effectiveness, their independence and their use of resources. As Christie and Pross (1990) point out, the criticisms against Royal Commissions have often “reflected a kind of scoreboard mentality”, examining how much the commission cost, how many recommendations it made and how many were adopted (p. 2). This tendency to simplify the value of commissions into a numbers game overlooks the fact that despite their challenges and weaknesses, commissions have been consistently relied on throughout Canadian history to try to solve some of the most difficult policy and scandalous issues.

**Importance and Significance of Royal Commissions**

Despite the many criticisms directed against them, Royal Commissions of Inquiry have steadfastly maintained their importance throughout Canadian history. With over 500 commissions taking place since confederation and no sign of their use slowing down to date, Royal Commissions have repeatedly and successfully served as vehicles for analyzing policy and for building support for new policy directions. They have brought facts to light both about specific incidents and about matters of policy concern; facts as diverse as what actually happened at a given time and place and the real makeup of public opinion on the subject matter of the inquiry. (Pross, Christie, and Yogis, 1990, p. 1)

Commissions are an important political instrument, especially in the policy analysis role, as they provide a process where specific interest groups and the public can present in a forum that is not subject to government control and thus views from various quarters can be actively solicited. In addition, Royal Commissions are useful for policy analysis
because they are an independent and objective, and yet official organization, and thus have a greater capacity to be, and are seen to be, independent and objective than the government bodies of the day (Aucoin 1990). More specifically, Royal Commissions provide time for analysis, they provide an opportunity to look at the support and demands for various options, and analysts are able to evaluate policy free from partisan controls or institutional limitations (Aucoin, 1990). In addition, commissions play an important role in stimulating research and involving new groups and individuals directly in policy making, all with a high degree of public visibility (Salter and Slaco, 1981). In essence, Royal Commissions are a fundamental institution in the Canadian political landscape and their “ability to focus public attention on an issue, to build consensus and to secure legitimacy make them too effective as instruments of political communication to permit their abandonment” (Christie and Pross, 1990, 1).

Commissions are also often seen to be a uniquely Canadian enterprise. As Mackay (1990) explains, “Sandwiched between our British and French roots and pervasive influences from our American neighbour to the south, Canadians appear to be in a perpetual state of identity crisis. One feature of Canadian political life which might serve to establish a unique identity is the extensive use of public inquiries” (p. 30). In this way, “commissions of inquiry do appear to be a part of the Canadian identity” (Mackay 1990, p. 30-31). There is usually a large amount of public attention directly towards Royal Commissions and Canadians often attach a great deal of importance to them (Iacobucci, 1990). And as a “classically Canadian union of law and politics” in Canada, Royal Commissions have successfully analyzed policy and brought facts to light.
throughout the history of Canada, dealing with some of the most important issues of the day (Mackay, 1990).

Commissions of inquiry have been crucial in the social, economic and cultural development of Canada as a nation (Parkinson and Makarenko, 2005). Examples of important federal public inquiries in Canadian history include: the Royal Commission on National Development of the Arts, Letters and Sciences (1951) which laid the foundations of national cultural policy in Canada; Royal Commission on Health Services (1964) which recommended a comprehensive and universal public medical system for all Canadians; Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1967) which led to the redefinition of Canadian Confederation as an equal partnership between English and French which later evolved into a preference for multiculturalism, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women (1970) which set the standards for sexual equality; etc. In all, commissions over the years “constitute a real library of Canadiana” (Hodgetts, 1960, p. 474), and the country’s political ups and downs could literally be traced via the Royal Commissions of Inquiry held throughout the country’s history.

Such a consistent reliance on commissions of inquiry throughout Canadian history to deal with the most important issues of the day seems to indicate that commissions of inquiry play a very important role in Canada, despite, or even in spite of, the frequent criticisms directed against them. In this way, it “seems reasonable to assume that there might be reasons for the existence of commissions which go beyond their expressed purposes” (Ashforth, 1990, p. 1). This is a fundamental premise that informs this study.
CHAPTER THREE: THE SOMALIA AFFAIR AND ITS COMMISSION IN CANADA

In this chapter, I present the description of the case study, outlining the background and the events that make up the Somalia Affair. After briefly outlining the political and social setting in which the Somalia mission was undertaken in Canada, I outline the sequence of events that made up the Somalia Affair, as explained in the media, via various books and articles about the subject as well as the various investigations on the affair themselves, including the commission. Finally, I conclude the chapter with a description of the commission that was appointed in response to the Somalia Affair, discussing details such as its appointment date, who it involved, what it covered, the challenges it faced as well as the media coverage of the affair and the commission along the way. In all, this chapter attempts to provide the reader with the necessary contextual information about the Somalia Affair in Canada and its commission in order to enable the following chapters on the findings of this dissertation to be fully grounded.
The Setting

In 1992, citizens all over the world were being bombarded by images from the media of the extreme state of starvation and famine in Somalia, situated in the Horn of Africa. The country, which had seen its president, Siad Barre, fall in the previous year, had no functioning central government and was instead subject to a violent power struggle between clans and various factions. While in power, Barre had seen the clan system turn against his regime. There were six main clan families in Somalia that shared similar culture and customs, including religion, ethnicity, and language. Despite their similarities, these clans were historically prone to rivalry and conflict. Barre had managed to subdue the conflicts for some time, but after Somalia’s defeat in the 1977-78 war over Ethiopia’s ethnic Somali Ogaden region, clan favouritism began to become more pronounced and dissatisfaction with Barre began to take hold among certain clans sparking a vicious and violent cycle that eventually turned into full-blown civil war within ten years. When Barre was overthrown in January 1991, it was at the hands of three factions, or rebel militias, and these factions didn’t stop their fighting after Barre fell, instead warring over who would be the next president. The clan system, which traditionally was able to prevent clashes via social contract customs and blood money payments, was no longer effective as a system of cheques and balances and essentially became social institutions that were easily manipulated by the faction leaders (Dawson, 2007).

---

6 This section of the paper relies on the work of Dawson (2007) for its summary. Dawson (2007) is one of the only scholars to tackle the contextual situation around the Somalia Affair in Canada to date and has made a significant contribution to the field and issue in this regard.
Not surprisingly, it was the people of Somalia that suffered throughout this period of civil war. The fighting “interrupted farming, damaged irrigation systems, polluted wells, and [was] the main cause of the catastrophic famine that overtook Somalia” (Dawson, 2007, p. 15). The situation for the people of Somalia was dire, yet the international response was generally weak throughout 1991. While the United Nations (UN) reported that the World Food Programme and the UN Children’s Fund were ‘fully engaged’ and dealing with humanitarian assistance, each actually withdrew at various points from Somalia during this time for fear of safety for its workers. In addition, Somalia was left on its own diplomatically to sort itself out as the UN didn’t take an active role in the reconciliation conferences that occurred in June and July of 1991. The UN was publicly attacked by the International Red Cross for not doing enough for Somalia and this showed that “world opinion was not impressed with the UN’s attempts to excuse itself by pointing to the security risks” (Dawson, 2007, p. 17).

As the famine and situation grew worse, however, media and international attention steadily rose to focus on what was happening in Somalia in the latter half of 1992. In response, the international community, led mainly by the West, began to acknowledge that Somalia’s situation was serious and in need of assistance from the world. By this time, an estimated 300,000 people had already died and it was believed that at least 1.5 million more were at risk of death. Furthermore, roughly 4.5 million other Somalis were believed to be suffering from severe malnutrition and related disease (DND, 1997b). By January 1992, there was a call by UN members for a diplomat to negotiate a ceasefire and the imposition of an arms embargo. Unfortunately, the UN could do little to enforce the embargo, except ensure that international countries were not
selling weapons to Somalia. At this point, bandits and factions were still blocking the UN humanitarian relief efforts and were looting food that was coming into the country, often reselling it back to Somalis via the black market. According to Dawson (2007), the UN felt caught between the expectations for action and its concerns about deploying into a highly insecure environment.

By March 1992, when the embargo and a ceasefire agreement failed to create any real progress in Somalia, the UN authorized the deployment of a seventeen-person technical mission to conduct negotiations on ceasefire monitoring procedure and “to develop a high priority plan to establish mechanisms to ensure the unimpeded delivery of humanitarian assistance” (Dawson, 2007, p. 20). The UN first approached Canada at this time to provide five unarmed military observers and a chief military observer. Ottawa refused and cited excessive risk for its people. However, Ottawa was not that interested in getting involved at this time as the media attention around Somalia remained small and the UN’s efforts were not yet threatened. Finally, in July, the UN decided to significantly expand its Somalia mission (that still only had 50 military observers in place and with no more secure an environment within which to deliver humanitarian assistance). The UN plan, according to Council Resolution 767 (July 27 1992) was to deploy 500 security troops as well as a multinational airlift. This mission was termed ‘Operation Cordon’ and followed a traditional peacekeeping format.

Like the rest of the world, Canada was slow to respond to the humanitarian crisis in Somalia, and did so only after increasing media and public interest in the situation. In the end, Canada made three different commitments to aid Somalia over a short time period: to the UN humanitarian airlift in August 1992; to the UN peacekeeping mission in
August 1992; and to the eventual United States (US) peace enforcement coalition in December 1992.

As the Canadian media increasingly took up the Somalia crisis in its coverage and because it was becoming a major international security issue due to the instability it was creating in Africa, Canada offered troops and aircraft to help the UN’s expanded peacekeeping and famine relief plans in August 1992. Canada offered Hercules aircraft and a 750-person battalion of peacekeepers to this end. Prime Minister Brian Mulroney offered this assistance without being asked by the UN as he wanted to get the operation up and running as quickly as possible so that Canadians would see he was doing something about the situation in Somalia. This came mainly as a result of the media coverage that pointed out that the international community was neglecting Somalia while it was pouring resources into the crisis in Yugoslavia. In this way, Somalia began to become a significant issue for the Canadian government in late July 1992 because the media began to highlight the severity of the crisis and the inadequacy of the UN’s activities in this regard. The media attention also worried the Canadian government because it was interested in maintaining confidence in multilateralism. In response, the Canadian government accelerated the Somali family reunification and immigration process and contributed to the UN airlift and expanded peacekeeping mission in August. The crisis in Somalia was now being given a higher priority by the overall international community and the role appeared to be more credible and visible for the Canadian government (Dawson, 2007).

By December 1992, it was clear that the UN efforts in Somalia were failing and the US stepped in. The airlift was unsuccessful in getting the humanitarian aid to the
people of Somalia and it began to be clear that more assertive methods were going to be necessary. The UN operation was challenging because the traditional consent and impartiality needed for a peacekeeping operation was nearly impossible to achieve amongst the decentralized factions. The UN soon found that it was unable to perform its peacekeeping functions (stabilization, diffusion of tension and efforts at reconciliation) in this context (Dawson, 2007). As a result, the US proposed a Unified Task Force Somalia (UNITAF) with a mission name of ‘Operation Restore Hope’, led by the United States and not the UN. The mission was authorized by UN Resolution 794 and adopted on Dec. 3, 1992. The mission also fell under chapter VII of the UN Charter, indicating that it was a peace enforcement mission versus a more traditional peacekeeping mission. The mission was to create a secure environment for the delivery of humanitarian supplies and troops were authorized to use deadly force if necessary (Bercuson, 1996).

The collapse of the UN-led operation was not a major concern for the Canadian government as it mainly wanted a multinational solution and the US led task force provided this. In addition, the task force was focused on air delivery to Somalia only, which is what the Canadian government had desired all along (versus getting involved in a peace reconciliation process). Involvement in the US-led coalition also appealed to the Canadian government as it related to bilateral interests. President George H.W. Bush personally asked Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to contribute forces and because of the recent success in the Gulf War and the UN’s failure to better the situation in Somalia, the Canadian government was not concerned by “the fact that the intervention was an aggressive non-UN peace enforcement coalition” (Dawson, 2007, p. 120). While some Canadians voiced concerns about the change in the level of force being proposed by the
US-led task force, the government didn’t see the peace enforcement shift as a major change. Furthermore, Canada wanted to increase US involvement in world institutions and believed that Canada’s involvement would help draw support for the operation by ensuring that it wouldn’t be perceived as a unilateral US operative (Dawson, 2007). Once the Canadian government committed itself to involvement in the task force, its main concern began finding a visible role for itself.

The final decision for Canada in regards to its role in Somalia became whether to remain in Somalia after the coalition force withdrew and handed the mission over to the UN. The US-led task force was designed to be a short-term mission to create security so that humanitarian aid could be delivered to the people of Somalia. According to Dawson (2007), Canada decided to withdraw with the task force as it expected the UN-led operation to be a long-term commitment with doubtful prospects. In addition, the Canadian government had been warned that the Canadian Forces could not sustain such a military role. Furthermore, Canada really had no national interest in Somalia at the same time that public support for the extension was generally weak (Dawson, 2007, p. 5). It declined to stay on with the UN despite intense pressure from the world body to remain with its operation.

Politically, while Canada had no direct economic or political national interests in Somalia, some claim that it got involved because it was a high-profile international issue and the federal government at the time, led by Prime Minister Mulroney, was receiving a lot of pressure to get involved and help (Dawson, 2007). In addition, the engagement in Somalia offered Canada and the Mulroney government an opportunity to pursue Canada’s interests in multilateralism, human rights, peacekeeping and to smooth Canada-
U.S. relations. Canada really wanted to support multilateralism and humanitarianism in Somalia, versus a diplomatic role in the peace process, as the Canadian citizens were mainly concerned about the famine. Interestingly, it was the government’s foreign policy ideas at the time that really drove Canada’s decision to engage in Somalia. Firstly, the Canadian government had a vested interest in the success and credibility of the UN. Canada had a feeling of optimism for the UN and it wanted to capitalize on the increase in confidence in UN peacekeeping efforts in the early 1990s. As Dawson (2007) explains, “Canadian officials urged the world body to show leadership because they saw the Somalia crisis as a crucial test of its post-Cold War effectiveness” (p. 5). However, the UN quickly ran into difficulties because of the non-traditional peacekeeping situation in Somalia, mainly its inability to gain consent of the warring parties and the decentralized government that was in place.

Another contextual driver behind Canada’s decision to get involved in Somalia, as mentioned, was the importance of multilateralism to the government of the day. Mulroney felt strongly about the power of multilateralism to make Canada a world player. Mulroney was a Pearsonian and believed in the UN, in human rights, and in peacekeeping. He believed that multilateral efforts were a good way for Canada, as a small power, to take part in international affairs. In this way, the decision to get involved in Somalia was not driven by specific trade or strategic interests in the country, but more about simply strengthening multinational responses (Dawson, 2007).

Finally, the Canadian peacekeeping tradition was another part of the context for the government’s decision to get involved in Somalia. Peacekeeping had become a "national fixation" by this time in Canada and was the subject of much myth making
Canada took immense pride in the consistent requests by the UN for peacekeeping assistance, and “preened over Canada’s superior moral character” (Dawson, 2007, p. 7). Peacekeeping differentiated Canada from the US and it was very much tied to the Canadian national image, often consisting of “Canada’s self-congratulatory rhetoric about its traditions of kindliness, compromise and the negotiation of difference” (Dawson, 2007, p. 7). The kind of myth that surrounded peacekeeping as a uniquely Canadian endeavor also made it difficult to stay out of the Somalia operation. In all, “this context – the Canadian peacekeeping tradition, optimism for the UN and support of multilateralism” informed Canada’s decisions to get involved in Somalia. (Dawson, 2007, p. 8).

**Preparing for the Mission**

Even before the UNITAF mission came into being, the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence had decided that the Canadian Airborne Regiment (CAR) was the appropriate unit to send for a peacekeeping mission in Somalia (later, the CAR was accompanied by a squadron of Royal Canadian Dragoons and an engineer squadron). It had recently trained intensively for an operation in the Western Sahara that had been cancelled and it was believed that participating in the Somalia mission was appropriate to boost morale and to get the CAR back in-theatre as the unit hadn’t been on a mission since Cyprus in 1987.

Formally activated in 1968, the CAR became commonly known as Canada's 'elite' fighting force. Created to be able to mobilize quickly, the CAR was a unit of parachute jumpers who were to "specialize in commando tactics and act as Canada's premier force-
in-readiness for the defence of Canadian territory or for overseas operations" (Bercuson, 1997, p. 169). CAR members were expected to undergo tougher physical training, have a sharper mental attitude, receive a higher level of fieldcraft training and have a better knowledge of small-unit tactics as well as rapid deployment than regular infantry members (Bercuson, 1997). The CAR was supposed to be made even more elite by the fact that raw recruits in the army were forbidden to volunteer with the group; a minimum of four years experience in the army or the acquisition of corporal rank was required. In essence, the CAR had been termed as the 'thoroughbreds' of the Canadian army by some (Bercuson, 1997).

Not surprisingly, the CAR attracted young, intensely physical and combative men by nature – those who were ambitious and looking for a physical and mental challenge, as well as those who were looking to throw their weight around; ultimately the best and the worst of the army (Bercuson, 1997). With such an intense group of individuals in the CAR, discipline problems have been noted to have been a historic challenge (Bercuson, 1997).

The discipline problems that had begun to plague the CAR in the 1990's seemed to come to a head in preparations for the Somalia mission. The CAR was broken down into three commando units, taking soldiers from each of the three regiments that make up the Canadian army – Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry (PPCLI), the Royal Canadian Regiment (the RCR), and the Royal 22e Regiment. These regiments also reflect regional and language divisions within Canada more broadly – western anglophone (PPCLI), central and eastern anglophone (the RCR), and francophone (R22 or the 'Van Doos') (Winslow, 1998). During preparations for the Somalia mission, various discipline
problems arose in Two Commando in particular. Generally, disobedience of unit rules, socially unacceptable behaviour and random criminal activity was evident (Bercuson, 1997; Canada, 1997; Government of Canada, 1997). More specifically, there were persistent problems with the display of the Confederate (or Rebel) flag within the unit's quarters. Furthermore, military pyrotechnics were illegally obtained and discharged more than once, a duty officer's vehicle was set on fire, and excessive drunkenness and aggression were displayed on numerous occasions. While less disciplinary problems were evident in One Commando and Three Commando, there were "reports of illegally stored personal weapons and improperly held ammunition" in these units as well (Government of Canada, 1997).

In addition to the discipline problems that reared their head within the CAR, the unit met some challenges in its training. When the unit began training in September 1992, its understanding of the mission was that it would be operating under Chapter VI and thus, would be undertaking a more traditional peacekeeping mission ('Operation Cordon', Canada's contribution to UNOSOM). However, when the mission changed to a peace enforcement mission so late in the game (in December 1992) it meant that the CAR had conducted every operational activity, training event and logistics preparation towards the preparation of Operation Cordon, a peacekeeping mission. In contrast, the new peace-enforcement mission would mean drastically different training and preparations were needed. Such a late change in this regard "involved a deployment of [Canadian Forces] on an uncertain mission, in a different region of Somalia, under new command
arrangements, and with a changed force structure and different rules of engagement" (Government of Canada, 1997). This was a major challenge.

The Mission

Despite the initial confusion in regards to the mission, the CARBG (Canadian Airborne Regiment Battle Group), is generally considered to have carried out its tasks exceptionally well upon its arrival in Somalia. On Dec. 28, 1992, the troops were flown in to secure the Belet Huen airstrip, alongside some American forces. Reports had indicated that the area could be heavily under attack so the combined forces moved to secure the area to allow Canadian Hercules to bring in more Canadian supplies and troops. After eventually securing their 30,000 square mile area of responsibility around Belet Huen, the 850-man battle group participated in a number of humanitarian activities (Government of Canada, 1997). For example, they rebuilt a crucial bridge, the police station, the hospital and schools. They assisted with local vehicle accidents and medical evacuations in addition to providing safe escort for food convoys.

Despite these early successes, after three months, the Canadian troops started to show signs of disillusionment. As in most military operations, the soldiers were faced with extreme environmental conditions including 40 degree heat, persistent dust and wind, bad food as well as sheer boredom in a situation that was considered 'low' threat (Government of Canada, 1997). However, there was one thorn in the Canadians' sides - the sheer size and set-up of the Canadian compound made it particularly vulnerable to looting. By the end of January, the CAR was aggravated by the persistent attempts by individuals and small groups of Somalis to steal Canadian equipment, supplies and
personal property, such as food, water, gear, radios and even parachute equipment. In the beginning, any Somali that was caught entering the Canadian compound was bound and held overnight to be released the next day to either clan leaders or the local police once re-established. However, it was reported that the same Somalis would often return for a second or third attempt. The looters would sometimes coat their bodies in cooking oil in order to slip through the perimeter wire, but none of them ever carried weapons or attacked the soldiers. Frustrations also arose in February when Canadian soldiers were reportedly attacked by a group of Somalis who began to throw rocks at them while the Canadians were working to secure a bridge. Suggestions have been made that after three months of extreme conditions, witnessing corruption and waste as well as evidencing abuse from those they were trying to help in the form of thievery and attacks, some members of the CAR began to hate Somalia in general, and even began to direct their hate towards the Somalis themselves (Bercuson, 1997).

The Somalia Affair

On March 19, 1993, Jim Day⁷, a reporter on assignment in Somalia, saw a member of the CAR being rushed to the local hospital on a stretcher ("Canadian soldiers under investigation", 2005b). After some digging, Day learned that it had been Master Corporal Clayton Matchee on the stretcher who had attempted suicide by hanging himself by a bootlace in a detention bunker in the compound. Day wondered what could possibly have led a Canadian Armed Forces member to attempt to take his own life in the

---

⁷ Day wrote for the Pembrooke Observer, a small daily newspaper in Ontario with an audience mainly garnered from the Canadian Forces Base in Petawawa.
relatively banal environment that had become the Somalia peace-enforcement mission. The information he discovered next brought to light what would come to be the biggest scandal in Canadian military history.

The Canadian contingent was reportedly beginning to get frustrated with the looting and infiltrating that the Somalis were doing. On Jan. 28, Lieutenant Colonel Carol Mathieu had given his men permission to shoot anyone infiltrating the compound (Bercuson, 1996). Mathieu was particularly frustrated with the situation as important equipment and supplies began to be looted, some, like helicopter refueling pumps, that were considered vital. On the morning of March 16, the commander of Two Commando, Major Anthony Seward ordered Captain Michael Sox’s 4 Platoon to set up a patrol to catch an intruder and to make an example out of him. While Sox was told not to use deadly force, Seward allegedly said “Abuse [the intruders] if you have to, just make the capture” (Bercuson, 1997, p. 7). No one present at that meeting ever denied that the word abuse was used.

Sox called his own meeting later that day and ordered Sergeant Joseph Hillier’s 2 Section to carry out the orders. Sergeant Mark Boland’s section was to provide gate security until midnight which gave Boland jurisdiction and the responsibility for any prisoners that Hillier’s group might catch (Bercuson, 1997, 8). Sox then told his men “we have the authority from two-niner to abuse prisoners” (two-niner was Seward’s radio call sign) (Bercuson, 1997, p. 8). When Boland asked what that meant, Sox replied that they could “beat the shit out of the prisoners” (Bercuson, 1997, p. 8). Boland reported that he never passed the order on because he felt it was ‘an illegal order’.
At about 8 p.m. Hillier’s men reportedly took up their positions, outside an open gate in the perimeter fence. Forty-five minutes later, Shidane Abukar Arone entered the compound and Hillier began running after him. Arone ran into a portable toilet but Hillier opened the door, pulled him out and bound his hands behind his back with self-tightening plastic handcuffs. Arone didn’t resist. According to Bercuson (1997), “Unlike those infiltrators who oiled their bodies to squirm through the concertina wire, Arone was fully dressed in a civilian shirt, gym shorts, sandals, and a skirt of the type worn by Somali men. He had not come to crawl through the wire” (p. 9). Apparently, Sox came upon them quickly, put a riot baton between Arone’s elbows and his body and took him over to the command post where Arone was logged in and a message sent to Seward that a prisoner had been taken. Matchee was put in charge of the prisoner as part of his gate guard duty. After Arone was interrogated (where he told them his clan name and that he had been looking for a lost child), he was left alone with Matchee, a young soldier from Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan, known for his bullying ways and his bad-temperment (Bercuson, 1997). Matchee watched Arone until just before 9 p.m. when Boland came to relieve him. While in the presence of Boland, Matchee reportedly tied Arone’s shirt over his face and poured water over it. Arone began to smother and Boland told him to stop. Matchee listened and then left Boland and Arone together where he proceeded to get drunk with some colleagues. At 10 p.m., he accompanied Private Kyle Brown back to the holding bunker to relieve Boland. According to testimony, Boland sensed that Matchee was in a nasty mood and said, "I don’t care what you do, just don’t kill the guy" (Government of Canada, 1997). Matchee then began what would become his three-hour torture of Arone by repeatedly punching him in the ribs as well as kicking him in the face.
and legs. He's reported to have said, "I want to fucking kill this guy" among other things. Throughout the next three hours, Matchee beat Arone with a riot stick over a ration pack, struck him with an iron bar across the face and shins, burned the soles of his feet with a cigarette butt and continued with the incessant punches and kicks to the body and face. At one point, Brown reportedly left to get a camera and returned to the bunker to take 'trophy shots' of Matchee and himself with the beaten Arone. The half-dead Arone who was coming in and out of consciousness was reported to scream, "Canada, Canada, Canada" over and over again. After approximately three hours of intermittent beating, Arone died. By that time, it was reported that at least 8 members of the Canadian Forces had seen the beating taking place and did nothing to stop it or report it. Accusations later followed that many more either heard the abuse or knew that it was taking place (Government of Canada, 1997).

Two days later, Matchee was arrested on suspicion of the murder of Arone. He was taken to a detention bunker and guarded. Then the next day (March 19, 1993), during a routine hourly check of the prisoner, Matchee was found hanging from one of the beams in the roof by a bootlace. He was cut down and first aid and CPR were administered. He was then transported to the Canadian medical facility and placed in intensive care (Government of Canada, 1997).

Matchee's attempted suicide, and Day's uncovering of the event in the news, sparked a series of arrests. Eventually, Brown was convicted of manslaughter and torture and sentenced to five years imprisonment (of which he served one), Matchee was found
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8 Eventually, nine soldiers were to be charged in connection to the events.
mentally unfit to stand trial after his suicide attempt left him with severe brain damage, Boland was convicted of negligent performance of duty and sentenced to one year's imprisonment, and Seward, the Officer Commanding of Two Commando in charge of the prisoner, was found guilty of negligent performance of duty for giving instructions to abuse detainees. As Brown was the only soldier who served time, he has often been noted as the scapegoat of the affair (Worthington and Brown, 1997). Despite the severity of the incident, it was originally considered to be an example of the actions of a 'few bad apples' in the CAR and not a systemic problem (Government of Canada, 1997).

Then in the spring of 1993, Major Barry Armstrong, a doctor who served in Belet Huen, went public with allegations that another Somali killed on March 4, 1993, had been shot in a suspicious manner. On that day, one Somali had been injured and another killed, reportedly shot in the back after not heeding warning shots and fleeing from the compound. The Somali that was killed also had point-blank shots to the head and neck. Captain Michel Rainville, who claimed to be acting on orders issued by Mathieu, took a small patrol of men outside the Canadian compound. The men were told to apprehend looters using all force necessary. According to some reports, the Somalis had been 'baited'; food and water had been purposefully set out by Rainville and his detachment in an effort to catch the looters. After a few hours of waiting, Rainville's men saw two Somali males approach the compound and one soon began to slither under the wire while the other watched. Rainville apparently shouted 'get them' and the Somali men turned to run. One of them, Abdi Hundebai Sabrie, was shot in the rear by a twelve-gauge shotgun and severely wounded in multiple places. He managed to survive. The other, Ahmed
Afraraho Aruush, was hit by automatic rifle fire and died instantly (Bercuson, 1997). Controversy still surrounds the shootings (Government of Canada, 1997). As Bercuson (1997) claims, “there is no doubt the two men were shot in the back running away, that they had not actually stolen anything, and that they were unarmed. There is some doubt as to whether warning shots were fired, as they ought to have been” (p. 237). Rainville was acquitted of any charges associated with the event (so was his superior, Lieutenant Colonel Mathieu).

Not too long after the convictions of those involved in the beating and torture of Arone, videotapes of brutal hazing rituals within the CAR were run on Canadian news stations. The first tape, aired Jan. 15, 1995 on CBC, showed members of Two Commando drinking beer and making racist comments about Somalis such as 'we ain't killed enough niggers yet', while another called the Somalia Operation ‘Operation Snatch Nig-Nog’. More racist comments came from soldiers on the video who claimed that a stick is used to crack Somali heads and that Somalis were not starving, but that “they never work, they’re lazy, they’re slobs, and they stink” (Jenish & Fisher, 1996; Razack, 2004, p. 5). The second tape aired Jan. 19, 1995 on CTV and showed members of One Commando engaged in initiation rites where drunken-troop members were forced to eat feces and urine-soaked bread and imitate sex acts. Perhaps the most shocking image on the tape showed an African American soldier with the letters 'I love the KKK' smeared on his back in feces and being lead on all fours on a leash. The soldier was later tied to a tree and sprinkled with white flour, the act titled a ‘Michael Jackson’ (Razack, 2004).
Finally, more trophy photos taken in Somalia emerged in the media, with "pictures of soldiers posing with bound and hooded Somali youth, some of whom appeared to have been beaten" (Razack, 2004, p. 5). The children in the pictures were made to wear signs around their necks with the word ‘thief’ in Somali, and forced to sit out in the hot sun. The most surprising element of the trophy photos is that in one of the pictures released to the media, a military chaplain is apparently standing guard over the children. The humiliation of children and other Somalis, as well as the recording of that humiliation via cameras, or trophy photos, was evident in many places (Razack, 2004).

Following all these revelations about the Canadian Forces’ actions in Somalia, the Canadian public was appalled and there was an outcry to put an end to the aggressive and seemingly racist behaviour of the CAR. Then Defence Minister, David Collenette, responded to the calls, and announced on Jan. 23, 1995 that the CAR would be disbanded. Members of the Canadian Forces were stunned at the news of the disbandment, a first in the forces’ history, and the overall feeling was that the regiment had become a liability to the government’s political future (Amaral, 2000). A few months later on March 21, 1995, Collenette also appointed a Federal Commission of Inquiry to investigate the happenings of the Somalia Affair.

The Somalia Commission

After continuous revelations about the incidents around the Somalia mission, as well as various court martials and a military in-house inquiry into the events, the government of the day, now two years after the Somalia mission and led by Liberal Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, announced that it would launch a federal inquiry into the events
of Somalia. The commission was to deal with the recent allegations that there was a high-level cover-up around the affair within the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence. The commission, announced officially on March 21, 1995, was to be the first major public inquiry into the Canadian military in Canadian history. The Privy Council originally estimated that the commission should take nine months to complete, but as Peter Desbarats, one of the commissioners points out in his published diary of the commission’s events, it took months just to get the large entity off the ground (Desbarats, 1997). The commission consisted of three people – namely chairman Justice Gilles Létourneau of the Federal Court of Appeal, Justice Robert Rutherford and journalist Peter Desbarats who was the Dean of Journalism at Western University when appointed. Rutherford replaced commissioner Anne-Marie Doyle, a senior civil servant in Europe as the Canadian Ambassador to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris, when a media storm around Doyle’s appointment indicated that Doyle was a close friend of Robert Fowler, the former Deputy Minister of Defence and a potentially important witness in the commission. She resigned after this came to light and Rutherford stepped in. Stanley Cohen, a lawyer from the Justice Department was the next to join the team as Secretary for the commission, and who got to work hiring the numerous lawyers, researchers and support personnel that are needed to run a commission. The commission established itself in an office in downtown Ottawa, and by June the commission was “holding regular meetings of the three commissioners and staff, collecting thousands of documents from the military, deciding on procedures, assembling a library of essential legal and research documents, meeting military officials for the first of many briefings and announcing an initial round of public hearings” (Desbarats, 1997,
8). The policy hearings began on June 19 to discuss procedure, receive testimony on military affairs and general issues and test the hearings room. At the same time, the commission lawyers began contacting and interviewing possible witnesses for the investigatory hearings that were to come later while military bases were visited and thousands of documents were coming in – with noticeable gaps in the documents, particularly around key events (Desbarats, 1997).

The terms of reference for the inquiry were broad. The commission was charged to “inquire into and report generally on the chain of command system, leadership, discipline, operations, and decisions of the Canadian Forces, and on the actions and decisions of the Department of National Defence in respect of the Somalia operation” (Government of Canada, 1997). In addition, the commissioners were required to look at specific matters in relation to pre-deployment, in-theatre, and post-theatre phases of the operation, such as the suitability of, and state of discipline within, the CAR, the extent to which cultural differences affected the conduct of operations and the manner in which the Canadian Joint Force Somalia (CJFS) responded to the operational, disciplinary, and administrative problems encountered in-theatre, including allegations of cover-up and destruction of evidence, among other more specific things. In all, there were 22 different points which the commission was ordered to address in order “to determine whether structural and organizational deficiencies lay behind the controversial incidents involving Canadian soldiers in Somalia” (Report, ES-6). It was made very clear from the beginning by the government that the commission was not intended to be a trial, citing that those culpable had already been tried in the military courts as well as the separate Board of Inquiry hearing, popularly known as the DeFaye Inquiry. Instead, the commission was
created to look at institutional and systemic issues around the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence.

By October 1995, the commission had settled in. Staff had been hired, thousands of documents had been collected and the initial hearings on issues and procedures had been held while dozens of potential witnesses had been located and interviewed. Finally, the commissioners mapped out their approach to the first part of their investigation (Desbarats, 1997). They decided to cover the events in chronological order and so begin with the pre-deployment phase of the mission when the CAR was selected and trained, then moving on to deployment when the troops were in Somalia, and finally concluding with post-deployment and the return to Canada and the surrounding issues of a suspected cover-up. As Desbarats (1997) notes, between Oct. 2 and Dec. 20, 1995, 35 witnesses were heard and a great deal went into preparation for the examination of the witnesses prior to them taking the stand. Potential witnesses all had to be interviewed with their lawyers in attendance initially, the transcripts of these interviews was then verified and distributed before lawyers were asked to prepare to examine the selected witnesses “in [the] hearing in a way that would help us and the public to understand the whole story” (Desbarats, 1997, p. 9). It was during this interview process that the commissioners began to reportedly run into a ‘wall of silence’ from the witnesses and the numbers of lawyers involved in the commission began to escalate. Because of the seeming conflict of interest of the military lawyers, military and government personnel began to bring in their own lawyers and this quickly slowed the process down and made it much more expensive. The appointed government lawyers in the commission also represented the Department of National Defence and its employees. Thus, the lawyers who were there to protect the
interests of their primary client, the government, were also supposed to represent the interests of the individual soldiers who stood on trial – a glaring conflict of interest that simmered below the surface of the inquiry for its duration (Desbarats, 1997). At the same time as the preparations for, and the hearings were taking place, commission staff were contacting people and preparing witnesses, conducting research, reading significant numbers of documents and handling the administrative work of the inquiry.

By December 1995 the commissioners were beginning to get a picture of the Airborne’s problems (Desbarats, 1997). It began to be clear that the group had trouble getting organized to go to Somalia, that there were significant effects from the late leadership change, and that there was a chronic failure of senior officers in a number of veins including discipline, rules of engagement, etc. The Jan. 16 – Feb 22, 1996 hearings began to focus on the events in the summer and fall of 1992 when the airborne was selected and trained for Somalia. Because the commission was moving up the chain of command in its witnesses, more time was required to do complete examinations and in six weeks, only 10 witnesses were heard in total. The hearings focused on why the CAR was selected to go to Somalia and why the previous commanding officer, Colonel Morneault, was replaced. Big name personnel like General Ernest Beno began to show up in the hearings, and noticeably sat directly in Morneault’s line of vision while Morneault was being examined (Beno was the one who decided to replace Morneault). The conservatism of the military was examined and the lack of cultural training that the CAR received before heading to Somalia was noted. In addition, the witnesses argued that the airborne was the only feasible choice for an overseas operation at the time, in part because of their training, but also because no other group was free to go.
From April to June 1996, the commission turned its attention towards the in-theatre phase of the mission and heard about the positive things that the Canadian soldiers did while in Somalia, partially because of the military and public complaints that the good work done in Somalia by Canadians was consistently being overshadowed by the tragic events so often noted in the press. However, the commission was forced to change its direction when the alteration and destruction of documents related to the Somalia Affair became so prevalent it was impossible to ignore any longer. After almost an entire year of the commission’s staff requesting documents from the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence, important documents were still missing, or pieces of particular documents were noticeably absent. In response to this apparent lack of cooperation, General Jean Boyle, Chief of Defence Staff at the time, ordered the entire military force to stop whatever it would normally do for one working day and search for the missing documents. Despite this show of cooperation, the commissioners felt that it was imperative to their credibility and the success of their report to hold hearings on the apparent cover-up that was taking place in these departments. As a result, the commission interrupted the examination of the Somalia mission to hold hearings on the missing or altered documents, pushing the inquiry’s progress back five months (Desbarats, 1997). Specifically, the commission began to focus on the issue of ‘responses to queries’ (RTQs) (explanations of military actions or policies, created to answer questions from journalists), sparked by the investigations of CBC reporter Michael McAuliffe who requested the RTQs from National Defence during the events in Somalia. It became known that in response to McAuliffe’s request, the RTQ documents were altered and eventually renamed to Media Response Lines (MRLs) so that the
embarrassing information was limited, and so that acquiring more in the future would be difficult as specific names of documents are needed in Freedom of Information Policy requests (Desbarats, 1997). The issue with the RTQs began to lead to questions related to the public affairs office, which could be traced all the way up to General Jean Boyle. Later, Nancy Fournier, a clerk at National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ), testified that she was involved in editing the RTQs and was ordered to destroy Somalia documents in her files – after the inquiry had been ordered to produce them. This focus on the erasure and alteration of documents in NDHQ seemed to garner even more media attention than the original transgressions of the Somalia Affair. As Desbarats (1997) explains, “damaging as the events in Somalia and the notorious hazing rituals of the Airborne regiment were, they were not nearly as destructive to the military’s reputation as the subsequent activities within the National Defence Headquarters” (p. 119). This admission, and the reluctance of higher-ups in the military to acknowledge or take responsibility for the cover-up, began to erode the military’s reputation even further. The shift in focus from the events in Somalia to the cover-up within the government made an interesting derailment in the inquiry. No longer was it the beating and killings of innocent Somalis that was the focus of the commission, instead it became the inner workings and corruption of powerful civil servants. Desbarats (1997) puts this more succinctly when he notes that “the events in Somalia have become almost incidental. Instead, the inquiry has devoted itself to ‘cover-up’ and accountability…document tampering and allegations of interference in the military-justice system…shattered morale and the draining of the reservoir of public goodwill that the Canadian military has always taken for granted” (p. 137). Such a shift in focus began to catch the attention of the government of the day, who
was becoming increasingly impatient and unhappy with the direction and the time the commission was taking. When the commission was first appointed, it was expected to deal with the specific events in Somalia, but the challenges in getting the correct documents changed that. As a result, the commission began to focus on events that took place under the government of the day. Not surprisingly, this wasn’t a favourable move with the government.

It was also during this time in the commission, that one of the many obstacles the commission would face arose. Brigadier General Ernest Beno accused Commission Chairman Gilles Létourneau of bias after Létourneau, frustrated by Beno’s evasive responses to his examination questions, told him that he won’t gain much by ‘fiddling around’. Beno and his lawyer were attempting to show that this comment proved that Létourneau was not impartial to Beno, and as Desbarats (1997) points out, this “legal action to disqualify Létourneau was the first of many attempts by senior officers to delay or invalidate the inquiry” (p. 61). Interestingly, it was the Justice Department who supported Beno’s case (the same department that appointed the commissioners in the first place). The commission was to run into many similar legal and procedural obstacles throughout its course.

By the end of June 1996, all of the witnesses called to speak to the missing documents had been heard except for the most important witness to date, General Jean Boyle. Boyle testified for nine days, which was the longest of any witness throughout the commission. While Boyle had nothing to do with the events in Somalia, he was implicated in the management of its aftermath. Boyle’s high-level position ensured that the media took a special interest in his examination and various media reports discussed
his style, reputation and the likelihood that he would keep his job following the commission. But Boyle was well-prepared for the onslaught of questions, and “[drew] on his mental portfolio of prepared messages, inserting them into his messages whenever he had an opportunity” (p. 153). Desbarats (1997) discusses how a common tactic among the higher level employees, including Boyle, was to produce long and convoluted responses to questions as witnesses were generally free to carry on at their will, and were rarely interrupted.

As the testimony in the commission began to heat up, the Minister of Defence, David Collenette, resigned citing that he had written a letter improperly to the immigration authorities on behalf of a constituent. This was popularly considered to be a convenient way for Collenette to remove himself without implicating himself in the mess that had now become the Somalia Affair. He was replaced by Doug Young. Four days later, Boyle also resigned as Chief of Defence Staff and retired from the military altogether.

The switch in focus onto document tampering had seriously slowed the commission down and because the commissioners were conscious of the time limits and the growing impatience of the government, they decided to focus on the March 4th shooting and wounding of a Somali. As Desbarats (1997) explains, “we felt that a thorough examination of this event would reveal a great deal about command and control of Canadian soldiers by their senior officers. It would help us to understand the highly publicized murder of Shidane Arone several weeks later, as well as other documented examples of misconduct by Canadian soldiers” (p. 175). Thus, between Oct. 1996 and March 1997, the commission heard 24 witnesses related to the March 4th incident.
During this time, on January 10, 1997, the Canadian government announced the termination of the inquiry – a notable break from tradition. The commissioners were shocked and objected publicly to the deadline – 6 months earlier than the requested extension – particularly as it left no time for investigation into the event that started it all, the March 16th beating and killing of Arone. In addition, the shortened time frame meant that the commissioners wouldn’t be able to deal in depth with the claims of cover-up. Each of the commissioners issued an official statement of response noting their objection to the revised schedule. Desbarats (1997) notes that he was particularly disillusioned at this point. After months of listening to military and government personnel evade questions and blatantly lie on the stand, he felt that the government overpowered the commission itself. Despite the fact that the termination of public inquiries is extremely rare, “public inquiries are protected from government interference only by tradition and the force of public opinion” (225). And public opinion didn’t seem to be on the side of the commissioners, as the media also conveyed the opinion that it was time for the commission to end. Desbarats (1997) notes that the most upsetting thing about the termination of the inquiry was the reaction of Canadians. As he explains, “I’m still shocked by the generally passive reaction to the shut down of the inquiry, the acceptance of a blatant government maneuver to protect itself from criticism, a flagrant disregard of a long and unbroken tradition of respect for the independence of public inquiries” (p. 248). He carries on, “I still can’t believe it. The government is going to get away with it. In the United States, even a president couldn’t stop the Watergate investigation. Here, a single cabinet minister can call a halt to a federal inquiry for admittedly political reasons and no one gets excited. It’s enough to make you cry” (p. 266). Thus, the issue for
Desbarats (1997), at least with the termination of the inquiry, was the threat to the independence of public inquiries as an institution. The commission and its staff quickly began to preserve documents and records as a defensive tactic for the next possible move. They were told to halt the Section 13 notices that identify specific individuals that are going to be named within the report and instead to focus on the general government’s role.

Another individual who was incredibly upset about the termination of the inquiry was Kim Campbell, who was defence minister at the time the major events of the Somalia Affair occurred. Campbell had claimed all throughout the Somalia commission that information had been kept purposively from her within the department and that she didn’t get the full story about the murders and beatings until it was too late and already fodder for the media and public. Campbell had been waiting her turn to clear her reputation via testimony at the commission, but was now stripped of any such chance. She was also devastated and made a number of public statements to this regard.

According to Desbarats (1997), the premature closure of the inquiry triggered numerous legal actions by both those that wanted the inquiry to continue and those that didn’t. John Dixon, a former Campbell aide, went to court to oppose the closure, while senior officers who faced potential blame used the time issue to claim that they wouldn’t be able to defend themselves properly. At the same time, the bias charge against Letourneau was rejected. Despite these happenings, investigations into the March 4 incident continued and by the conclusion of the commission on March 16, 1997, 116 witnesses had been heard over 183 days of hearings (since October 1995) which resulted in approximately 38,000 pages of testimony. The commissioners and staff began to work
frantically during March and April in order to get the final report prepared. The commissioners produced an extensive 5-volume final report including an executive summary. The first volume covered the report’s themes: leadership, accountability, chain of command, discipline, mission planning, suitability, training, rules of engagement, operational readiness, cover-up, disclosure of documents and military justice. In addition, it included a section on the structure and organization of the Canadian Forces, the chain of command, military culture and ethics, civil-military relations, the military justice system, the Canadian Forces personnel system, the Canadian Airborne Regiment, peacekeeping and Canada’s role, the situation in Somalia, and the Somalia mission pre-deployment, in-theatre and post-deployment. In the second volume the various themes were tackled as was the rules of engagement. Volume Three covered military mission planning while Volume Four addressed the failures of specific leaders, naming and addressing the various leaders who the commission believed were at fault. Finally, in volume five, the report discussed the March 4th incident, the openness and disclosure of documents, the mefloquine issue, the inquiry’s unfinished mandate, and the military in Canadian society.

The report was released to the public on July 2, 1997. The commissioners put 160 recommendations into the 1,600 page report. Notably, the failure of 11 senior officers was described in detail (the section 13 notices had stood up) as was the tragedy of the March 4 incident, among many other topics of concern. Desbarats (1997) notes that the media was surprised by the harsh tone of the report, but the government was outraged (p. 317). Art Eggleton, the defence minister at the time of the release, essentially rejected the report, claiming that the title ‘dishonoured legacy’ was a slur on the military and that
proof of senior officers lying was necessary to make such claims. The commissioners battled back with a media campaign, and general public and media response to the report was generally positive. According to Desbarats (1997), “Letters to the editor over the following week were almost uniform in their condemnation. In response to my comments at the press conference that I was still puzzled by Canadians’ lack of outrage over the unprecedented closing of our inquiry, many people wrote to newspapers to say that this did not apply to them and to reassure me that they were in fact furious” (p. 320). Despite these small confirmations, the commissioners were stung by the “government’s apparent hostility” and the “indications of public boredom and indifference” (p. 323).

The Canadian reaction to the commission, as well as the media coverage, was something that Desbarats (1997) was acutely aware of throughout his diary. The commission was covered on television full-time on the Canadian Public Affairs Channel (CPAC) and the commission also released daily press reports, which allowed Canadians an in-depth look into the inner workings of the military. Throughout his diary, Desbarats (1997) reports that many strangers approached him during the operation of the commission and discussed its events with him, often offering condolences that he had to endure such hardships on behalf of the country. He notes that the commission developed a kind of ‘cult following’ (p. 127) amongst military as well as ordinary Canadians. In the beginning and early years of the commission, Desbarats (1997) felt a sense of broad public support for the work that the commissioners were doing, as well as a tremendous amount of sympathy. As the commission carried on, Desbarats (1997) said that he felt that the public was still supportive despite the incredible time and money costs of the
commission. By the end of 1996, however, Desbarats (1997) was beginning to notice a change in public sentiment. He notes that people were
torn between resentment at having to pay attention to us for so long, a kind of horrified fascination with the never-ending revelations and insatiable appetite for more...The whole Somalia Affair has become an agonizing addiction for Canadians. It has altered our image of ourselves as a non-violent people admired internationally as the peacekeepers of the world. It's now become one of those national events that will be remembered as watersheds, particularly in the worlds of defence and diplomacy. People will talk about before and after Somalia, perhaps for decades to come. (Desbarats, 1997, p. 184)

In the end, Desbarats (1997) reported that he felt cynical and bitter about Canadians' lack of outrage at the early termination of the inquiry, and what he felt was a serious slight to the public inquiry system.

Beyond the general reaction of Canadians to the commission, the commissioners were painfully aware of the media and public reactions to their work. Desbarats (1997) makes frequent references to articles in the Globe and Mail and the Toronto Star that covered the commission, and is particularly sensitive to criticisms against the commissions' work. Interestingly, Desbarats (1997) seemed to take the pulse of Canadians via the media reports and was particularly interested in how the commission and its work was being portrayed as reflected by his memoirs.
Media Coverage of the Affair and the Commission

Beyond the historical documents written around the affair, and the personal memoirs from a commissioner himself about the commission, examining the media coverage of both the affair and the commission also provides important contextual information about the case. Between March 1992 and Dec. 1997, the Somalia crisis, the Canadian mission, the Somalia Affair and the commission received a great deal of media attention. Examining the vast amount of articles over this time span in 5 of the most popular English Canadian newspapers reveals an interesting variation of themes and coverage over the years.

In the pre-deployment stage, between March to November 1992, the media coverage in the newspapers was mainly focused on describing the terrible political, environmental and social situation in Somalia. Somalia was described as a war-torn and chaotic country, where bloody conflict was occurring within clan warfare and done by armed bandits. In addition, it was noted that over 5,000 people had been killed, while thousands were hungry and injured and that many more were threatened by starvation, famine and drought. In all, the situation was painted as one of anarchy and as a human rights disaster where children were dying while rebels maintained power via guns.

Shortly after the situation in Somalia was highlighted, questions in the Canadian media began to arise as to what Canada was doing to help. Various articles listed Canada’s monetary aid contributions, and later, the fact that technical experts were provided by

---

9 The following section outlines media analysis that was completed for a conference presentation on this topic. It followed a content analysis/frame analysis hybrid model and helped to identify general themes in the media coverage of the Somalia Affair, as well as discursive changes in the representation of the coverage over the years. This information is used as contextual information in this case, and is not considered to be part of the data analysis of the dissertation.

10 Globe and Mail, National Post, Toronto Star, Calgary Herald and Vancouver Sun.
Canada and eventually, peacekeepers for the original UN mission. Interestingly, the focus of the discussions around Canada’s involvement began to turn to questions around why was Somalia being ignored while Sarajevo was receiving so much help from Canada. The international community and the UN was criticized for moving too slowly in this crisis, and by August of 1991, signs that the world was rushing to help were being reported. The Canadian peacekeepers were set to go to Somalia for October and there was a sense of optimism in the news articles about the mission. Journalists noted that the soldiers were looking forward to going to help, that the Canadian Somali community was appreciative, and that challenging conditions were expected. Nonetheless, despite the overall optimism displayed at the Canadian mission, frustrations in the news coverage were becoming evident as the mission was delayed for two months.

By December 1991, the US had stepped into the plans and was leading the mission. The newspaper articles noted the more aggressive role that the mission would now entail and there was anxiety about this increase in force, as about US domination of the UN and its influence on the world. In addition, concerns about the Canadian soldiers not being utilized well were voiced, as were concerns about the lack of detailed rules of engagement that had been produced for the mission. But overall, the media coverage just prior to, and during the early days of deployment, still had a sense of optimism and excitement that the Canadian soldiers were on their way to help Somalis.

In the early phases of deployment, that is during January to approximately March 1993, the optimism and positive coverage remained in the newspapers. While the fact that Canadian soldiers really weren’t facing any clear danger was expressed, and that there were less starving people than expected upon arrival, the media coverage conveyed
the story that the Canadians were helping the Somalis, that they were liked by the locals and that they were needed there. Stories about Canadians keeping their cool and seizing arms caches illustrated that the Canadians were professionals and were successfully accomplishing the mission. Overall, the media coverage focused on the good reaction of Somalis to Canadians, the sacrifices that the Canadian soldiers were making to help, and the difference that the Canadian soldiers were making to the lives of Somalis via the immense amount of building and work being done. By the end of February and beginning of March 1992, however, the first hints of unhappiness with the situation began to be portrayed in the news stories. News articles outlined the fact that Somalis were throwing rocks at the Canadian soldiers and making surly faces. Likewise, Somalis were described as ‘stealing everything’ that wasn’t bolted down. In addition, the tough conditions that the Canadians were facing, including eating only hard rations and the extreme heat and dust, was emphasized. Situations and conditions such as these began to display that the Canadian soldiers were getting slightly fed up and that the humanitarian veneer was beginning to wear down. Stories about Canadians wanting to go home, and Somalis described as hypocrites and with racial slurs by the soldiers, began to become more common.

Then on March 5, 1992, the troubles for the Canadian soldiers began to be reported in the media. The shooting death and wounding on March 4th was reported, although early reports indicated that this death was the result of a looting attempt. Then, on April 1, 1993, the first mention of the death of Arone, described as a Somali citizen, was discussed in the media. Here, the issue that something may have gone amuck was clear as the possibility of murder charges against four Canadian soldiers in connection is
noted. However, Arone was described as trying to infiltrate the Canadian compound, and one soldier was noted to be found unconscious (Matchee). As things began to become more clear in the death of Arone, the coverage took a more negative turn. The situation began to be labeled a case of ‘serious homicide’ and five soldiers were noted to be held in connection. Arone’s death was labeled a beating and it was described that Arone was found dead following contact with the soldiers. Matchee’s suicide attempt was also noted and the military was accused of being too tight-lipped about the event, especially after it was learned that there was a five-day delay before military investigators were even sent to Somalia during this time.

Beginning on April 3, the issue turned political in the media as Kim Campbell’s role in the release of information about the Arone murder began to be questioned and she was criticized for not sharing the information earlier as Defence Minister. The theme of the media coverage over the next month focused on the lack of answers and rampant rumours around the story that one journalist ‘broke’, and questions about Campbell’s role in the lack of information was of the utmost concern. Campbell was accused of attempting to cover-up the Somali death and of burying the issue. In addition, there was pressure for her to stop her campaign for Tory leadership and pay attention to her ministerial duties. Meanwhile, reports that a review was ordered for the March 4th killing of a Somali arose, casting suspicion around another civilian death at the hands of Canadian soldiers. In response, the media coverage noted that Campbell ordered a full-scale military probe to look into the events as well as the training, discipline, and systemic problems in the military. The media coverage at the time was also exploring the military justice system and it was noted that Canadian soldiers would be out of Somalia.
by August. Overall, the media coverage during the months of March and April 1993 dealt with the release of information about two suspicious deaths of Somali citizens by Canadian soldiers. The lack of information being provided by the DND and CF around those deaths sparked cover-up accusations, particularly centered on Campbell’s role in the events.

From May to December 1993, the media coverage really focused on the charges and unearthings that were uncovered in the court martials and the military inquiry into the deaths. Various soldiers were charged and tried in relation, questions about the suitability of the CAR for the mission came up, the issue of combat training and peacekeepers, and the ‘bad apple’ theory were all expressed in the media. In addition, media coverage focused on the link to racists in the military, citing examples of neo-nazis with white supremacist links within the ranks that went to Somalia. Finally, stories about troops feeling bitter about the media and political treatment of their experience in Somalia could be seen. The issue of cover-up and Campbell’s involvement still hasn’t gone away, and by mid-summer becomes a renewed claim in the media.

Between January and December 1994, the media coverage continued to focus on the information being unearthed via the court martials and military inquiry. Things like the role of the officers in the deaths, the culture of the CAR, and the details of torture of Arone surfaced. Various news articles began to make note of calls for a public inquiry rather than a military inquiry and the first conviction of Pte. Brown is reported, while appeals, acquittals and charges are being debated. Near the end of the year, Dr. Barry Armstrong is reported to be making public claims again that the March 4th death of the
Somali citizen was suspicious and in response, Collenette announced that there would be a public inquiry in January to squelch any more public statements.

In January 1995, the first of the hazing videos was released to much media furor and the issue of racism in the army became a renewed topic. Shortly afterwards, reports covered the disbandment of the Airborne and the announcement that the public inquiry was set to begin in June of that year. Campbell continued to deny that she knew anything about the deaths earlier in media reports at this time. Once the commission gets underway, coverage is focused on the information that is passed in this hall, citing reports that the army was aware that CAR was troubled, that there was last minute planning involved in the mission, that there were doubts about Morneault, etc. At the same time, media coverage focused on the RCMP investigation into allegations that defence department officials falsified documents given to a journalist. The allegations of document tampering continue to fill the pages of the newspapers until the end of the year.

By January 1996, the document crisis began to dominate the news coverage, and it did so for the entire year. Cover-up plots and details begin to surface, such as orders for destruction of evidence, and the media was fascinated by General Boyle’s role in the mishandling of documents. Various senior-level officials are reported to have resigned in response to accusations and the coverage noted that the commission would be focusing on the cover-up later in the year. The entire year’s media coverage is dominated by this focus on document tampering and cover-up during 1996.

The following year, between January and December 1997, the media coverage was focused on the imposed deadline of the commission, and called such a move ‘a cover-up of a cover-up’. The commissioners’ objections are noted and Campbell and her
aide, John Dixon, began to talk to the media again about their lack of knowledge of the Somalia events. The mandate was reported as narrowed in response to a federal court order and stories about inquiry fatigue began to surface. When the report is released, the news stories report its condemnation by the government and its blistering findings, including that senior officers received much of the blame of a system that is rotten to its core.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented a contextual view of the case study – the Somalia Affair in Canada. The political and social setting in which the Somalia mission in Canada was undertaken was initially outlined, followed by a description of the Somalia Affair in Canada, and a full description of the Royal Commission around the Somalia Affair and its chronology. In the final section of this chapter, I discussed the overall media coverage during the five years that make up the Somalia Affair (1992-1997) and outlined the various themes in the media coverage. Overall, this chapter should provide the reader with the necessary contextual information about the Somalia Affair in Canada and its commission in order to ground the following chapters of this dissertation.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE SOMALIA AFFAIR AS A MOMENT OF MORAL DISSONANCE IN CANADIAN SOCIETY

In this chapter I discuss three important values that have been commonly ascribed to Canada as a society over the years – peacefulness, tolerance of ethnicity, and an open and responsible government. Admittedly, any discussion of Canadian values or Canadian identity is somewhat problematic because of the difficulty in generalizing such things. I want to be clear to the reader that while I use the terms Canadian values and morals throughout this chapter, I am not making the argument that all Canadians hold these values or feel this way. Instead, through polls, media, and government discourse, these are the values most commonly associated with Canadians, particularly since 1956, and
commonly espoused in both an official capacity as well as at a local level. These ‘Canadian values’, then, are obviously subject to change over time, and have not always been held by Canadians. Likewise, they will continue to evolve and shift as time progresses.

Despite the academic challenges that discussing a nation’s values can bring, nations nonetheless are made up of shared symbols and meanings. This means having characteristics, morals and values that the nation’s general populace accepts as distinctly its own, as part of its identity. As a result, I investigate three values that are ascribed as being particularly Canadian. After a brief discussion of peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency, I ground each of these values within their social-political-historical context. This is done in an effort to show that it was these particular values that were transgressed as a result of the Somalia Affair in Canada. Thus, I am not claiming that these three values are the only, or most important, values in Canada, but that they were the fundamental values that were transgressed in the Somalia Affair. In this way, I argue that the Somalia Affair represented a moment of moral dissonance in Canadian society, which made it an incredibly significant event in Canadian political history. This argument will be developed within this chapter after a discussion of the values of peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency as well as an explanation of how these values were transgressed in the Somalia Affair to result in a moment of moral dissonance.

**Canadian Values**

Within the nation construct that is Canada, a number of values can be noted and ascribed. I argue in the following section that peacefulness, tolerance of ethnicity, and the
belief in an open and accountable government are important Canadian values. These are most often evidenced in, and understood in terms of, the discourse around and the policies of peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency and accountability. As I briefly noted above, with any discussion of national values or identity, there is a danger of painting the country’s diverse citizens with broad, and therefore problematic, strokes. In addition, a viable argument could be made as to whether these values are truly ‘Canadian’, that is, are taken up, believed and enacted by the Canadian citizens themselves, or whether these are the officially promoted values by the governments of the day that have been taken up by other institutions in Canada such as the media, schools, churches, etc. and reinforced via these mechanisms. Whatever the case, it is quite clear that roughly since WWII, Canada as a society has followed the values and policies of peacekeeping, multiculturalism, and accountability and transparency in its government. It is to a discussion of these values that I now turn.

**Peacekeeping as a Canadian Value**

Since the Suez Crisis in 1956, the image of Canadians as non-violent and peaceful, mainly through the image of the peacekeepers who help to make the world a better place, has been ingrained into the country’s national construct. Canadians often purport to see themselves as peacekeeping, mediating, neutral, impartial and non-aggressive actors – particularly on the world stage. This ‘core myth’, traceable to Pearson’s diplomatic efforts during the Suez Crisis and his ensuing Nobel Peace Prize, has come to represent an important piece of the Canadian national construct, and at the
same time, has allowed the governments of the day to strategically pursue Canada’s political and economic interests.

Peacekeeping has been, and remains, an extremely popular activity amongst Canadians. ‘Peacekeeping’ was the most frequent selection of Canadians who were asked what the most positive contribution that Canada as a country makes to the world in 2002 and 2004 Focus Canada studies from Environics. In the same studies, 8 in 10 Canadians reported ‘promoting world peace’ as the most important foreign policy objective for Canada. A GPC International poll in 2003, which focused on the ‘top priorities of Canadians’, found that 81 per cent favoured ‘participating in international peacekeeping operations’. Another study conducted by Environics in 2002 found a 5 percent increase in Canadians who reported that Canada should become more involved in peacekeeping missions abroad (35 % up from 30 %). Other studies indicate that 41 per cent of Canadians believe that Canada should increase it’s spending on peacekeeping, and that Canadians seem to ‘feel’ a moral obligation to help people living in other countries who are suffering due to war, natural disasters or poverty (all studies cited in Ankers, 2005). In all, Canadians seem to support peacekeeping as a military and international intervention above other options.

Interestingly, Canadians seem to support peacekeeping the most when it is traditionally defined. A 2005 study examining Canadian attitudes towards the Canadian Forces found that “a majority of Canadians indeed prefer a ‘traditional peacekeeping role’ for Canadians” (Ankers, 2005, p. 27). A traditional peacekeeping role is generally defined as trying to keep two conflicting sides apart under the United Nations banner – a
role that many scholars argue no longer exists in today’s current political realities (Ankers, 2005; Maloney, 2005).

Why is there confusion between the promotion of peacekeeping as a value and the reality of the Canadian situation? According to various scholars, the Canadian peacekeeping myth is much loved and touted for the benign and altruistic vision of Canadians it creates. As Winslow (2003) explains, “the peacekeeping role appeals to Canadian popular self-images and sentiments of altruism and generosity – doing good to help others who are suffering and so on…The general public sees military action in support of peace operations as nobler and less threatening, less aggressive or less demanding than traditional military tasks” (12). In other words, peacekeeping has become a national value, in part, because of the sentiment that it carries with it – Canadians helping others who are helpless, Canadians who are non-aggressive and impartial international citizens, Canadians who ‘do good’ in the world. As Carol Off (2005) notes, generally, Canadians have a hard time with the notion of conflict and that “we want to see our forces as benign peacekeepers, distributing food and protecting the peace” (Off in Ankers, 2005, 28). Whitworth (2005) explains even further, “the Canadian soldier as peacekeeper is not a warrior but a protector. These are assumptions that fit very well with the more generalized notions of moral purity which pervade Canadian foreign policy and the much-touted view of Canada as a ‘middle power”’ (p. 7). In this way, peacekeeping appears to be a popular value because it represents all that Canadians see as good about themselves and their country – altruistic, generous, non-aggressive, impartial, and international citizens.
Defining Peacekeeping

While much has been written about peacekeeping generally, the concept hasn’t been subject to precise definitional work. One exception comes from Goulding (1993) who traces the evolution of UN peacekeeping and notes that generally, peacekeeping can be understood as a technique which has been developed by the United Nations to help control and resolve armed conflicts. More specifically, he goes on to define peacekeeping as:

Field operations established by the United Nations, with the consent of the parties concerned, to help control and resolve conflicts between them, under United Nations command and control, at the expense collectively of the member states, and with military and other personnel and equipment provided voluntarily by them, acting impartially between the parties and using force to the minimum extent necessary. (Goulding, 1993, p. 455)

Of import from this definition are five basic principles of peacekeeping. First, that peacekeeping operations are United Nations operations which lend them an air of impartiality and officiality. Second, that peacekeeping operations need the consent of the parties in conflict to operate, which works to make peacekeeping more acceptable and less threatening. Third, that peacekeepers must be impartial between the parties so that one sides’ interests are not advanced against those of the other. Fourth, that troops for peacekeeping operations should be sourced by member states. Fifth, that force should be used only to the minimum extent necessary and that fire should normally be opened only in self-defence (Goulding, 1993).

Goulding (1993) also offers a useful classification of peacekeeping operations. He notes that that the first is preventive deployment of United Nations troops before a conflict has actually begun at the request of one of the parties on its own territory. Here,
the force represents an early warning, but also works to increase the political price that would be paid by the potential aggressor. The second type of peacekeeping operation is that of traditional peacekeeping where the goal is to help to create conditions in which political negotiations can proceed. This involves monitoring ceasefires, controlling buffer zones, and so on. The third type of peacekeeping operation are set up to support implementation of a comprehensive settlement which has already been agreed to by the parties while the fourth protects the delivery of humanitarian relief supplies in conditions of continuing warfare. The fifth type of peacekeeping involves enforcement and peacemaking, sometimes called post-conflict peacebuilding. This is the deployment of a United Nations force in a country where the institutions of the state have collapsed and a country is in danger of, or has already failed. Finally, ceasefire enforcement is the sixth type, which is essentially a forceful variant of the traditional peacekeeping. The main issue within this classification system, and of popular opinion more generally, is whether peace enforcement is actually peacekeeping and whether the former practice is desirable or even possible.

The Emergence of Peacekeeping as a Value in Canada

Why has peacekeeping and non-violence become a ‘core myth’ in Canada? Its influence can be traced, in part, back to the narrative that has been constructed around Lester B. Pearson’s diplomatic role in quashing the Suez Crisis in 1956. As the popular version of the narrative goes, in 1956, following two world wars, there was a fear of another global conflict erupting. Egyptian President Gamal Abdal Nasser declared that he was going to nationalize the Suez Canal and force ships wanting to use the canal to pay a
toll. France and Britain were worried about Egypt’s plans to control an important waterway and saw it as a direct challenge to their trading interests. The two countries made secret plans for Israel to attack Egypt, while they planned to send troops to protect the canal. The fighting erupted in October 1956 with the Egyptians on one side and France, Britain and Israel on the other. Immediately, the world community began to be concerned about the Soviet Union coming to help Egypt, forcing the world powers to get involved in another global conflict. Pearson, Canada's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and a former diplomat, made a proposal to the United Nations “that a force sponsored by the UN, made up of soldiers from non-combatant countries, could separate the warring armies and supervise the cease-fire” (McCluskey, 2003, p. 1). The UN General Assembly accepted the proposal and Canadian General E.M.L. Burns was named the commander of the UN force. In the end, Pearson won the Nobel Peace Prize for his diplomatic efforts in the Suez Crisis. Thus, in the popular Canadian narrative of the episode, “a neutral, impartial Canada decided to lead the international community in stopping imperialist aggression undertaken by Britain and France against helpless Egypt, a situation which threatened to bring the world to near-nuclear war when the Soviets prepared to intervene” (Maloney, 2005, p. 41). Hence, Pearson — and by extension Canada — is constructed to have saved the day.

This is the popular Canadian version of how peacekeeping evolved. In reality, peacekeeping was not a Canadian invention, although Pearson’s diplomatic efforts in derailing the Suez Crisis should not be diminished (Granatstein, 2002). In fact, peacekeeping, as it has traditionally been defined, as peace observation missions, really began in 1948 under the auspices of the United Nations. Following WWII, some of the
proponents of the United Nations suggested a large multilateral UN army to police the world and maintain the peace (Maloney, 2005). The UN evaluated this in 1947 and decided that while the Cold War prevented such an undertaking at the time, “a small UN force using the reputation of the institution could be employed discreetly in a dispute resolution to prevent wider conflict” (Maloney, 2005, p. 41). In 1949, a UN mission called the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) was established when there was a threat over the Kashmir issue. UNMOGIP was a multinational military force that patrolled a buffer zone and reported on affairs to the United Nations. This group was lead by a Canadian, Brigadier H. H. Angle until 1950.

In 1948, a similar military observer group, called the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization (UNTSO) was established to stabilize the situation in Palestine/Israel. By 1954, General Burns took command of UNTSO. Burns complained that he couldn’t do anything to quell the tension because he couldn’t use force and suggested that an armed UN force replace UNTSO. In fact, during the Suez Crisis, UNTSO observers were deployed but their lack of arms and their small numbers made them ineffective. Pearson worked to take peacekeeping to a new level by recommending a large-scale UN peacekeeping force, and General Burns, who had been commanding UNTSO in Palestine, was the natural choice for a commander of the bigger version of the force. In 1956, UNTSO was supplemented with the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), when Pearson employed his diplomatic efforts, and Burns took command of the UNEF until 1960. In all, peacekeeping as traditionally understood was well underway within the UN umbrella by the time of the Suez Crisis, despite popular reports that lead Canadians to believe that Pearson created the concept.
Importantly, the purpose of these early peacekeeping missions was strategic and not idealistic – they were meant to freeze a regional conflict between two countries so that the conflict wouldn’t escalate and result in superpower involvement during the Cold War (Maloney, 2005). From the West’s perspective, peacekeeping was a useful tool to fill power vacuums amongst the decolonizing Third World in order to reduce Soviet and Chinese influence. In essence, “UN peacekeeping was a Cold War tool” (Maloney, 2005, p. 42).

Likewise, peacekeeping has been a strategic tool for Canada since 1956, both internationally and domestically speaking. In international terms, peacekeeping has been used as a way to advance Canada’s foreign policy objectives. Peacekeeping was part of the Canadian Cold War strategy to contain the global ambitions of Soviet communism, as an addition to Canada’s North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) geopolitical strategy. Besides an important Cold War tool, peacekeeping as a foreign policy strategy allowed Canada to help its major allies, Great Britain and the United States, to pursue their international interests as well. In this way, Theobald (2004) argues that the major impetus for Canada’s involvement in peacekeeping “was the country’s vital role in assisting American policy and helping its former colonial masters, Great Britain and France, withdraw with ‘honour’ from imperial mishaps…In this period, peacekeeping equaled helping the West out, preventing the East from coming in, and keeping the conflict manageable so that things stayed that way” (p. 11). Looking at things from this perspective shows us that the construction of Canadians as peacekeepers is part of the Canadian national construct, but also of Canadian foreign policy. Peacekeeping works well with Canadian foreign policy ideas of Canada as a ‘middle power’, and it is an
expression of Canada’s commitment to multilateralism via the United Nations. In addition, participating in peacekeeping operations gives Canada some leverage in international affairs. As Winslow (2003) notes, “The desire to be both represented and consulted on international affairs is an important driving force behind Canadian foreign policy and peacekeeping has helped maintain Canada’s profile and influence as an independent sovereign actor in the world” (Winslow, 2003, p. 12). Since 1956, Canada’s role in peacekeeping has enhanced the country’s reputation as a middle power and worked to increase Canada’s stature and influence in the United Nations (Wiseman in Winslow, 2003, p. 12). Thus, “Canada’s reputation as a good international ‘citizen’, a reputation acquired partially through extensive peacekeeping, may have strengthened its position in the United Nations across a wide range of issues on the world agenda” (Jockel in Whitworth, 2005, p. 6). In addition, Canada’s penchant for peacekeeping played an important role in the country’s bid for a Security Council seat in 1998. It has been “Canada’s involvement in peacekeeping and its ‘history of altruism, compassion, fairness, and of doing things irrespective of our own national interest which give its influence internationally far out of proportion to its military or economic power” (Whitworth, 2005, p. 6). Peacekeeping as a foreign policy strategy, then, has given Canada an international role and influence that it wouldn’t likely have had otherwise.

In addition to the usefulness of peacekeeping as a foreign policy strategy on the world stage, the relationship between Canada and the United States plays an important role in Canada’s penchant for peacekeeping, according to some scholars (Nunez, 2004). Canada is not an independent actor when it comes to the defense of the country. Instead, the “defense of the Canadian homeland is dependent upon major United States
Over the years, the Canadian military has been subject to continual reductions in expenditures, ensuring that the military has been less able to undertake a war-fighting or leading role in war operations internationally. In addition, there has never been a direct military threat to Canada, which works to ensure that national security falls down the priority list. At the same time, Canada has given priority to non-war fighting roles in the international arena such as peace operations and assistance to humanitarian operations. Canada has put more money and attention into international versus national security over the years because of the protection and role of the United States in the latter (Winslow, 2003). All of these social and political factors have worked to play a part in the Canadian government’s preference for a peacekeeping role in the world. In addition, Canada’s preference for defining itself in opposition to the United States has allowed the appearance of a benign international role to seem particularly appealing. As Maloney (2005) explains, “The dominant thinking prior to the 1990s was that there was ‘war’ and there was ‘peace’. There was ‘warfighting’ and there was ‘peacekeeping’. This neatly fit with the bipolar Cold War zeitgeist as much as it neatly fit Canadian mythology designed to differentiate Canada from the United States: the United States (war), Canada (peacekeeping)” (p. 45). Thus, in an attempt to define a uniquely Canadian identity, peacekeeping was a convenient way to further distinguish the country from both the United States and Great Britain.

Besides the important foreign policy objectives and the enhancement of an international role amidst dwindling resources that promoting peacekeeping has done for Canada, its domestic history has also ensured that peacekeeping has been a convenient strategic tool. Nunez (2004) argues that domestic politics in Canada has worked to ensure
that creating a national security strategy has been near-impossible over the years. As he explains:

As a country, Canada’s internal stability depends upon keeping its various provinces – particularly Quebec – happy and that is no easy task. There is no unitary political culture, and Alberta and Quebec are polar opposites on the political spectrum. Given these major cleavages, it is risky to articulate a national security strategy because many Canadians are likely to object. (Nunez, 2004, p. 87)

Last (2002) makes a similar argument. He notes:

It is arguable that the real threat to Canadian security and identity came not from the Boers, the Kaiser, and the Nazis, but from the wars themselves – pitting Anglophone against Francophone on matters of policy and principle. From the very beginning of Canada’s political history, negotiating a way around treacherous foreign conflict has been vital to the preservation of national unity. (p. 374)

The Canadian focus on peacekeeping as a national value has done much to allow the country to pursue its political and economic strategies, while at the same time, has placated its citizens with a universally acceptable national image. Thus, “Canadian heralding of multilateralism is more than high-minded liberal internationalism”; it works to allow Canada to focus on its domestic priorities while promoting international trade (Nunez, 2004, p. 88). This practice is also safe from public opinion “since the Canadian military cannot be deployed or employed independently and in significant numbers around the world, it keeps the government from taking decisive action that might be unpopular at home or in other countries. In fact, this is an insurance policy against making a bad call on unilateral intervention” (Nunez, 2004, p. 88).
As we have seen, the reality around the Canadian peacekeeping orientation is geared towards the country’s international, economic and political interests – much more than is often acknowledged. International peacekeeping operations are tied to the country’s security interests as they work to sustain or address security threats before they reach Canadian borders. International peacekeeping operations are tied to the country’s economic interests in that peaceful nations make good trading partners. Finally, international peacekeeping operations are tied to the country’s political interests via an emphasis on collective security and multilateralism, as well as boosting Canada’s influence and reputation on the world stage (Ankers, 2005). It is clear that Canadian peacekeeping as a value has had an important role in Canadian strategy objectives, both politically and economically. This seems to indicate that the ‘core myth’ of peacekeeping in Canada “concern[s] more than just an idealistic desire for world peace” as is frequently espoused (Theobald, 2004, p. 11). The fact that peacekeeping has been used as a convenient foreign policy strategy only helped to further cement the value into the minds of Canadians. It managed to offer advantages to both the government of the day, and was a favourable value in terms of its public relations perspective. This combination of government-driven objectives and publicly ‘safe’ sentiment makes peacekeeping an especially powerful and lasting value in the minds of many Canadians.

Multiculturalism as a Canadian Value

Just as peacekeeping and non-violence are often touted as inherently ‘Canadian’ traits, multiculturalism, tolerance and diversity are also espoused as uniquely Canadian values. Multiculturalism, also known as cultural pluralism, has been a strong component
of publicly cited Canadian values, officially since the 1970s, and tends to emphasize the fact that Canada is a country which houses people of different cultures, ethnicities and nationalities; diverse people who are equally accepted within the society and live harmoniously together. It is often flaunted as a model for the rest of the world, as a place where differences in backgrounds and skin colour can be irrelevant for success and opportunities. Canadian government policy reflects this value as well. Canada was the first country in the world to adopt an official Multiculturalism Policy in 1971 and went even further when the country passed the Multiculturalism Act in 1988 – the only such act to exist in the world. In addition, it remains one of only three officially multicultural societies among the globe (besides Australia and Sweden).

Numerous polls consistently suggest that Canadians believe in, and support, multiculturalism in their society – at least in principle. For instance, a recent survey published by the Centre for Research and Information on Canada (CRIC) in October 2003 found that 54% of those surveyed said that multiculturalism made them feel very proud to be Canadian. Interestingly, this figure rose to 66% among the respondents between 18 and 30 years of age (cited in Dewing and Leman, 2006). A study conducted by Environics Research Group/Focus Canada, commissioned by the Association for Canadian Studies (ACS), about Canadian identity, found that 47% percent of English Canadians and 44% of French Canadians reported that they felt that multiculturalism was ‘very important’, while 39% and 40% felt that it was ‘somewhat important’ to Canadian identity (Jedwab, 2003). Another poll, done in 2003 and sponsored by the ACS via Environics found that 81% of Canadians agree that multiculturalism has contributed positively to the Canadian identity (Jedwab & Baker, 2003). Earlier studies (all of them
cited in Fleras & Elliot, 2002), such as the Environics Research Group study done in 1995, have found that 66% of Canadians knew there was a federal multiculturalism policy and that 62% of Canadians approved of it. Another study conducted by the same group but done in 1996 found that 71% of respondents defined multiculturalism as an important symbol of Canadian unity and identity — only the health care system and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms were more important (while CBC, bilingualism, and hockey were less important).

Embracing diversity has worked to construct Canada as a model for the rest of the world, and has been utilized as a central discourse in nation building. Multiculturalism has been referred to as the “defining feature of the late twentieth century that distinguishes us from Americans”, “one of our greatest successes” and “our Alamo, without the war” (Fleras & Elliot 2002, p. 89). And Canada has received praise for its multicultural approach abroad as well. The British magazine *The Economist* praised Canada as a “‘rich, peaceful, and enviably successful’ country whose racial difficulties are ‘pretty wholesome’ compared to the atrocities in Africa and the Balkans” (Fleras & Elliot, 2002, p. 89). Similarly, the American economist, Tyler Cowan, has called Canada a marvel of the civilized world:

Based on the dual ideas of peace and multiculturalism, Canada is one of mankind’s greatest achievements. It is comparable to notable civilizations of the past, and indeed exceeds most of them in terms of stability, living standards, and civil liberties (cited in Fleras & Elliot, 2002, p. 90).

---

11 While the majority of Canadians seem to support multiculturalism as an ideal, when asked about things such as ethnic identity or immigration patterns, the support for multiculturalism appears to begin to slide. (www.dominion.ca/americannyths/2005_multiculturalism.pdf, Esses, 1996; Wayland, 1997)
In the international frame, Canada has been portrayed as a humane, civilized, and tolerant society, one in which immigrants and refugees are welcomed. As Fleras & Elliot (2002) describe, “With crimes against humanity continuing to claim victims, Canada sparkles as a beacon for all multilayered societies whose borders were created by settlement rather than by history or geography” (p. 90). Canada seems to reap the reputational rewards of promoting itself as a multicultural society. But what exactly are we referring to when we use the term multicultural? As I will discuss in the following section, the word can mean many different things to many different people.

**Defining Multiculturalism**

When considering multiculturalism as a topic of interest, it is important to acknowledge the many different ways in which it can be discussed. As Fleras & Elliot (2002) point out, multiculturalism is often defined in four ways:

- A ‘descriptive’ definition – the existence of ethnically diverse groups who are culturally different and who wish to remain so at least in principle (if not always in practice).
- A ‘prescriptive’ definition – a set of ideals that promote diversity as normal, necessary, and acceptable.
- A ‘political’ definition – a framework for justifying government initiative in diversity issues
• A ‘practical’ definition – something to be used by minority groups to advance their interests, compete for scarce resources, or upbraid society for failing to abide by multicultural principles (p. 15).

In essence, multiculturalism can be understood to be a description, an ideology, a policy, or a practice. Its varied meaning can make it a very powerful concept, as well as one sometimes accused of being empty. In other words, “multiculturalism can mean everything or nothing; it can empower and enable, or it can describe what society must not be allowed to become; it can enlighten people, or it can conceal the truth from them; it can reassure them, or it can instill fear in them” (Fleras & Elliot, 2002, p. 15). The term multiculturalism is often utilized because it can mean many different things to many different people and thus, serves many different interests.

One of the most useful definitions of multiculturalism for our purposes comes from Fleras & Elliot (2002), who break down the term into four dimensions: as practice, critique, fact and ideology. Multiculturalism as ideology is of the most interest for the purposes of this paper – as ‘what ought to be’ versus ‘what is’. As an ideal, multiculturalism “has the capacity to influence behavior, evaluate actions, and legitimize
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12 Dewing and Leman (2006) similarly break multiculturalism down into sociological fact and public policy. Similarly, Wood & Gilbert (2005) argue that multiculturalism is commonly understood as a specific government policy of political pluralism; as a social reality of a demographically diverse society; and as a political ideology advocating cultural pluralism. Angus (1997) has also noted that multiculturalism has been employed to describe a sociological fact, to refer to government policy, and as a social ideal. Kallen (2004) has also stated that multiculturalism refers to the social reality of ethnic diversity, to federal government policy, and to the ideology of cultural pluralism.

13 Multiculturalism as practice refers to the use of the term by various groups who try to use it to advance their own interests and projects, such as attaining practical goals by new and native-born Canadians of colour. In a related manner, multiculturalism can be understood as critique in that it can be used as a way to criticize the government’s policy toward minorities, by noting that the government is at odds with its stated policies. Multiculturalism as an empirical fact of Canadian society refers to Canada’s various demographic features and the acknowledgement that the people of Canada are very diverse (Fleras & Elliot, 2002).
activity” (Fleras & Elliot, 2002, 35). As an ideology, multiculturalism provides a set of ideas and ideals about the value and validity of diversity in society. It has also been argued to be a kind of dominant ideology as it is backed by vested interests, especially official multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is seen as a way to ‘manage diversity’. This turn to cultural pluralism allows different cultures to coexist, while at the same time, ensures that the society’s foundational principles are not challenged. A number of things underpin this ideology, such as taking differences seriously. Here, a commitment to differences is embraced so that a plurality of cultures is promoted as valuable. Thus, diversity is seen as a valuable thing as it makes for a more rewarding and rich life. In addition, all cultures are seen to be equally valued and encouraged for the contributions they make to society. This works under the assumption that members of ethnically diverse groups see themselves as different and wish to remain so. In addition, “a commitment to multiculturalism is consistent with the ideals of unity-within-diversity” (Fleras & Elliot, 2002, p. 38). Diversity is seen to be able to work within the national interest so that people that want to be with ‘their own kind’ are not seen as any less committed to participation in the broader society. While the first affiliation must still be with the state within multiculturalism, men and woman are free to choose a secondary identification so long as it doesn’t interfere with “core institutional values, the laws of the land, or the rights of individuals” (Fleras and Elliot, 2002, p. 38). In all, multiculturalism as ideology claims that “it is both possible to be Canadian and accept multiculturalism. Conversely, it is possible to maintain an ethnic heritage without revoking a strong Canadian identity and attachment to Canada” (Fleras & Elliot, 2002, p. 38). A multicultural ideology also seems to evoke a kind of cultural relativism (i.e. that all
cultures are equally right and good). However, within Canada’s multiculturalism ideology, there is not an ‘anything goes’ attitude. Customs must not deny personal rights or exploit or exclude others. Multiculturalism as an ideology also values respecting others, and is an ideal for intergroup harmony. It works under the assumption that those who are secure in their cultural background will concede a similar right to others. In addition, multiculturalism encourages active acceptance. Finally, in the multiculturalism as ideology definition, multiculturalism is understood to include a commitment to equality, participation, and inclusiveness, resulting in full and equal involvement for all.14

*The Emergence of Multiculturalism as a Value in Canada*

If, as the polls seem to suggest, Canadians generally accept and support the value of multiculturalism, and we understand multiculturalism as a kind of ideology, the next question that naturally arises is – where did this value come from? How did multiculturalism come to be an acceptable value in Canada today? As I will discuss in the next section, various historical, social and political factors have worked to help establish multiculturalism as an important value in Canada. In short, Canada’s immigration, its attempt to separate itself from the United States and Britain, and its domestic struggles, namely between the French and English, all lead to the construction of multiculturalism as an important value.

Centuries of immigration have resulted in Canada’s multicultural diversity and immigration has played an important role in shaping the overall character of Canadian

---

14 Angus (1997) and Kallen (2004) are also interested in exploring multiculturalism as an ideology, in terms of a social ideal as well as a social value.
society. Beginning with the ancestors of Canada’s Native Peoples who trekked across a frozen icepack that linked Asia to North America tens of thousands of years ago, to the Europeans settlers who arrived 500 years ago, Canada has been built by, and established by immigrants ever since. Following the mainly French and British settlers, immigration continued during the 18th and 19th centuries with English, Scottish and Irish immigrants who were drawn to the opportunities of the new world. Americans also immigrated during this time and while the majority of early immigrants came to Canada from Britain or the United States, immigrants from other nationalities, such as those from continental Europe, or the black slaves who were escaping via the Underground Railroad came as well. In addition, thousands of Irish and Chinese laborers were imported as workers to build the Canadian Pacific Railway following Confederation. Other Chinese came to join in the gold rush, while American farmers filled out the prairies, along with central and eastern Europeans who were seeking land (About Canada, n.d.; Wayland, 1997).

Over the next 50 years, an anti-immigrant sentiment began to spread in Canada and the Canadian government, bowing to public pressure, locked its doors to the world—a policy that continued through to WWII (Mackey, 1999). However, the end of WWII saw Canada’s economy expand and workers were desperately needed to keep up. Canada lifted its restrictions on immigration and brought in tens of thousands of workers and their families from Europe. Preference was still given to those from Britain and Western Europe, but soon immigrants from southern Europe and refugees from then-Soviet occupied Europe were allowed in as well. The majority of these immigrants settled into Canadian cities, and many were not laborers, but well-educated and trained professionals. After WWII, “Canadians and their governments began to see that continued
discrimination at home devalued the purpose of the sacrifices that had been made in defeating a racist regime overseas" (Canadian diversity, 2004). Beginning with the Massey-Lévesque Commission in 1950, diversity began to be understood as a key ingredient in Canadian identity. Government policies soon followed suit. The Bill of Rights in 1960 barred discrimination by federal government agencies on the grounds of race, national origin, colour, religion, or sex. In addition, Canada’s Immigration Act in 1962 specifically stated that “any suitably qualified person from any part of the world could be considered for immigration to Canada, without regard to his race, colour, national origin, or the country from which he comes” (Canadian diversity, 2004). This resulted in a dramatic shift in the immigrant population so that Non-Europeans, especially Asian and Caribbean people, began to arrive in increasing numbers. According to one source, today’s immigrants and refugees from the developing world and other non-European sources outnumber European immigrants by about three to one (About Canada, n.d.; Wayland, 1997). In addition, the numbers of immigrants admitted as refugees during the 1970s and 1980s under humanitarian and compassionate grounds further diversified Canada’s population.

This brief history of immigration in Canada shows that, in terms of nationalities and ethnicities of origin, Canada has been historically diverse. However, it really wasn’t until the massive influx of immigrants following WWII that the government and Canadians began to rethink the role and status of ‘other ethnics’ within Canadian society, mainly because of the much more visible role of immigrants in Canada (Breton, 1986; Dewing & Leman, 2006). Prior to this, nation-building was oriented towards replicating a British society. Up until 1947, all Canadians were defined as British subjects and a
variety of symbols, such as the flag and anthem, legitimized the British underpinnings of English-speaking Canada. As Dewing & Leman (2006) explain, during this time, “for the most part, central authorities dismissed the value of cultural heterogeneity, considering racial and ethnic differences as inimical to national interests and detrimental to Canada’s character and integrity” (p. 4). However, following the great expanse of immigrants after WWII, things began to change. As some scholars have argued, the liberalization of Canada’s immigration policy in the 1960s paved the way for recognition of multiculturalism in Canada. The change in the policy in 1962, formalized in the Immigration Act in 1967, ensured that immigration discrimination was no longer possible, and also worked to increase the salience of ethnicity – which many argue led to the next natural step of creating an official policy of multiculturalism to acknowledge acceptance of this new and extended diversity (Esses, 1996). Other scholars have argued that the racist tendencies of Canada’s immigration policies prior to the 1960s had hampered the country’s role in the United Nations and “it was clear that Canada’s policies would have to change if the country wanted to retain credibility in international human rights circles” (Wayland, 1997, p. 44). In all, however, Canada’s change in its immigration policies and thus, the resulting change in its population, had a profound effect on the government and its policies. Most evident was the shift from Anglo-conformity to multiculturalism that came at this time (Wayland, 1997).

Besides the increase in immigration and the liberalization of policies excluding certain nationalities and ethnicities that helped to pave the way towards an acceptance of multiculturalism as a Canadian value, Canada’s relations with the United States and Britain, and more specifically, its attempts to distinguish itself from the two countries
also worked to foster multiculturalism. In this way, multiculturalism was set up as a national symbol for Canadians and helped to fulfill the need for a distinctive Canadian identity, apart from Britain and the United States.

After WWII and the decline of the British empire, the cultural presence of Britain had weakened in Canada. The Citizenship Act in 1947 signalled Canada’s intention to stop identifying so closely with its motherland. Once the act was passed, Canadians were no longer defined as British subjects who lived in Canada, and from then on, Canada was to be a separate society with a distinct destiny (Fleras & Elliot, 2002). At the same time as Canada was disentangling itself from Britain, an increasing American presence led to fears in Canada about the loss of identity (Esses, 1997). During the 1960s, the presence of America via cultural and economic means was increasing. This presence was felt via popular culture, but also via news coverage and educational materials and personnel. As a result, scholars have noted that this increasing presence, which had been experienced as a threat for some time, now presented a particular challenge for Canadian national identity (Breton, 1986). This was compounded by the shift in identity away from Britain. In this way, “it was not the case of a small, young, and independent country submitting to influences from a powerful neighbour. Rather, the growing American influences were experienced by a country that had been economically, culturally, and politically tied to another country, which it considered its mother country” (Breton, 1986, p. 37). The Canadians of British origin especially felt that their collective and individual identities were at stake.

Thus, after WWII, Canada renewed its quest for an essentially Canadian identity – one that would distinguish it from Britain and the United states. Involved in a project of
cultural nationalism during these years, Canada framed this quest in terms of cultural protectionism and state funding and programs were directed towards developing Canadian culture in order to protect against US cultural imperialism (Mackey, 1999). In fact, culture and identity were the basis for four major Royal Commissions in the twenty years after WWII: the Massey Commission (1949) which was focused on the arts, letters and sciences; the Fowler Commission (1955) on television and radio broadcasting; the O’Leary Commission (1961) on magazine publishing; and the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission (1963) on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. As Bumstead (1992) points out, the “disparate subjects of these commissions suggest that culture was virtually all embracing. It was also freighted with political implications” (cited in Mackey, 1996, p. 54). Each of these commissions assumed that cultural development was essential for national identity.

The commissions were interconnected arms of a broader project to develop, articulate and promote national identity and culture. These programmes represent an unprecedented increase in state intervention, control, and surveillance of culture, and the state-sponsored production of national identity. This identity was defined through the state management of many forms of difference: a concern with defining Canada’s difference from the United States, and attempts to define the role of differences within Canada… (Mackey, 1996, p. 54-55)

It was within this context that multiculturalism was developed as a Canadian value. Thus, one of the many factors that helped to create the multiculturalism value in Canada was that it was used to establish Canada as a unique nation generally, but more specifically, to differentiate Canadians from the Americans and even the British (Breton, 1986).
In addition to increased immigration and a desire to distinguish Canadian identity from Britain and the United States, the major impetus behind the shift to multiculturalism as a value lay with the need to quell domestic turmoil within Canada – specifically the French and English divide. In 1971, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau announced the first multiculturalism policy in Canada. It was a direct response to the mobilization by Canada’s ethnic minorities, led by the Ukrainians, who expressed their dissatisfaction with the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism that was appointed in 1963. The independence movement in Quebec was underway and presented a significant challenge to public and state institutions within Canada – and was perceived as such by a large proportion of Canadians (Breton, 1986). Its significance lay in its objectives, but also its rapid growth and sense of urgency. The ‘Quiet Revolution’ made it clear that Quebec would no longer be satisfied to be viewed as a province like all others and Quebec began to voice strong demands for equality as ‘founding peoples’, under the threat of separation from Canada (Kallen, 2003). Lester B. Pearson, minority Liberal leader from 1963-68, came up with a plan to deal with Quebec’s desire for independence alongside the nationalism and identity needs in Canada. He negotiated a series of agreements between Ottawa and the provinces that acknowledge the need for increased consultation and flexibility, which he terms ‘cooperative federalism’. In 1963, he introduced the concept of Canada as an ‘equal partnership’ between French and English Canadians, and enshrined the concepts of ‘cultural dualism’ and the ‘two founding races’ (Mackey, 1999).

Pearson’s Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission was one of the most significant interventions to the independence movement and it was part of Pearson’s
program to deal with the so-called Quebec ‘problem’. The commission was to examine “what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of equal partnership between the two founding races”, namely the English and the French. In other words, the commission “was to explore how the public institutions of Canada should be modified, instrumentally and symbolically, to better reflect the bilingual and bicultural character of the country…the objective was that both English- and French-speaking Canadians be able to consider the national institutions as their own” (Breton, 1986, p. 39). The commission released a number of reports between 1965 and 1968 making recommendations to eliminate the inequalities between the English and the French via the promotion of bilingualism and biculturalism (Wayland, 1997). Legislation that recognized Canada’s official languages as English and French was implemented in 1969 as a result.

During the time of the commission, various ethnic groups, led by the ‘Third Force’ of immigrant ethnic collectivities, made presentations to the government and relayed their concerns that their contributions to Canada were being ignored (Kallen, 2004; Wayland, 1997). These groups were concerned about the dualist vision of the country that underpinned the commission’s analysis and the government’s policies (Wood & Gilbert, 2005).15 The commission responded to these concerns by producing Book IV of the final report, entitled ‘The Cultural Contribution of Other Ethnic Groups’. This book made 16 recommendations around the ‘other ethnic groups’, ranging from
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15 Wood & Gilbert (2005) also notably point out that there was a gap between the elite of an immigrant community and its less politically active citizens so that two years after multiculturalism became policy, a survey of ‘minority groups’ in five cities reveal that more than 50 % of those responding had not heard of multiculturalism.
endorsing basic guarantees of legal equality to enriching all levels of education with the inclusion of the languages and cultures of non-French, non-English Canadians (Wood & Gilbert, 2005). The commission also suggested that the restrictions on broadcasts in languages other than English and French be removed. Essentially, the commission created a policy of multilingualism and multiculturalism, the official adaptation of which was the multiculturalism policy in 1971 (Wayland, 1997). The commissioners believed that Canadians would all benefit from exposure to the variety of cultures living in the country and acknowledged that measures to safeguard the contributions by ‘other ethnic groups’ were needed (Wood & Gilbert, 2005).

The federal government rejected the commission’s promotion of multilingualism and instead suggested that a ‘multicultural society within a bilingual framework’ would best suit Canada’s needs. As Wood & Gilbert (2005) make clear, “Multiculturalism was a unilateral decision of Trudeau and his cabinet, a response to their own perceived political pressure concerning the introduction of bilingualism. It was the view of Trudeau and his government that language and culture were to be regarded as separable in terms of the nation state” (p. 681). Thus, on October 8, 1971, the government proposed that the recommendations made by the commission in fourth volume of the report be accepted. Prime Minister Trudeau stated that while Canada has two official languages, “there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other” (in Mackey, 64). The policy identified 80 different ethnic groups that could apply for financial support in order to preserve their cultural and linguistic diversity. In all, four objectives were set out in the original policy statement: support for Canada’s cultures; assistance to members of cultural groups to overcome barriers to full participation; promotion of interchange
among cultural groups; and assistance to immigrants in learning English or French (Wayland, 1997).

Trudeau’s primary concern during this time was the increasingly hostile relationship between English and French in Canada, particularly in terms of Quebec and the rest of the nation. Thus, “for the Liberals, multiculturalism was not a goal or a vision in and of itself. It was a politically necessary addition to a national bilingual policy introduced to recognize Francophones and Quebec. Multiculturalism was introduced so that bilingualism (adopted two years earlier) would not create extra problems” (Wood & Gilbert, 2005, p. 682). Multiculturalism, in terms of its political history, then, took a back seat to bilingualism. At the actual time of creation, and as Trudeau himself has noted, “multiculturalism was considered incidental and innocuous” (Wood & Gilbert, 2005, p. 682). Despite these humble beginnings, multiculturalism has managed to creep into the vernacular and policy of Canada ever since.

Following the Bilingualism & Biculturalism Commission and the announcement of the first official multiculturalism policy in 1971, multiculturalism became institutionalized in Canada. Nearly $200 million was set aside in the first decade of the policy for initiatives in language and cultural maintenance. In addition, a Multicultural Directorate was created in 1972 to assist in the implementation of multicultural policies and programs, while a Ministry of Multiculturalism was created the following year to monitor the implementation of multicultural initiatives within government departments. The Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism was established in 1973 as well, to help create partnerships between the government and ethnic organizations. This was later renamed the Canadian Ethnocultural Council (Dewing and Leman, 2006).
Throughout the 1980s, multiculturalism continued to be institutionalized. In 1982, multiculturalism was referred to in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in Section 27 where it reads “This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians” (in Dewing and Leman, 2006, p. 5). This is an important shift as it allows the courts to take Canada’s multiculturalism into account at the highest levels of decision making. Then, in 1984, the Special Parliamentary Committee on Visible Minorities produced its report *Equality Now!* and in 1985, a House of Commons Standing Committee on Multiculturalism was created. Two years later, the Committee created a report that called for a new policy on multiculturalism and the creation of a Department. In response, a new multiculturalism policy came into effect in July 1988 when the Multiculturalism Act was adopted by Parliament. This was a first in the world. As Dewing and Leman (2006) explain, “the Act acknowledged multiculturalism as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society with an integral role in the decision-making process of the federal government” (p. 6). In 1991, a Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship was created, only to be dismantled in 1993, when its programs were integrated into the new Department of Canadian Heritage. The department conducted a review of its activities in 1995, following public criticisms, and in 1995, announced a renewed program focusing on three objectives: social justice, civic participation, and identity. In 2002, the government announced that June 27 would be Canadian Multiculturalism Day. In all, official or institutionalized multiculturalism in Canada has considerably evolved since 1971, from a focus on meeting the needs of mainly European immigrant groups to a focus on race
relations (Mackey, 1999). As we have seen, the institutionalization of multiculturalism coupled with the public’s general acceptance of the concept worked to establish multiculturalism as a Canadian value.

Accountability and Transparency of Government as a Canadian Value

Another value that has been noticeably present within Canadian society, especially in the last twenty years, have been the related values of accountability and transparency in regards to government operations. While the move towards accountability and transparency in government operations has been a trend among many democratic nations around the globe lately (Lord, 2006), the recent scandals in Canada, such as the Maher inquiry, the Air India inquiry, and the Sponsorship scandal which revolved around the non-disclosure of government information, illustrate how important government transparency and accountability are within Canadian society today. Government departments themselves have feverishly taken up the value of accountability and transparency within government organizations, and thus, often appear to be the impetus for the increased attention to this value, making transparency and accountability more of
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16 Despite the public’s general acceptance and the government’s continued institutionalization of multiculturalism, there are many criticisms directed toward both the ideology and the policy. Notably, the French have often had difficulty with the concept ever since its inception, as it seems to regulate all ethnicities, including the French, as equal (Dewing and Leman, 2006). In addition, many critics claim that multiculturalism actually works to isolate and divide not only ethnic communities within Canada, but also the country in terms of national identity and solidarity (Granatstein, 1998). The pluralism and relativism that some see as lying behind multiculturalism has also been criticized, as has the efforts of the state to recognize diversity, which is claimed to limit diversity (Mackey, 1999). In all, multiculturalism has been accused of being divisive, marginalizing, essentializing, disempowering and even a hoax (Fleras and Elliot, 2002).

17 While one could reasonably argue that the rule of law is actually a more fundamental value within Canada than accountability/transparency, within the Somalia Affair discourse, and particularly within the commission discourse that I examined, it was the moral of accountability and transparency that was repeatedly privileged.
an official value than one that Canadians perhaps have adopted with the same enthusiasm.

In Canada, the concepts of transparency and accountability have been taken up with much enthusiasm within the government since the 1980s and this can be evidenced via various government acts that have been put into place as well as government discourse found in documents and websites. Recently, for example, the Harper government brought to parliament a Federal Accountability Act, encompassing acts like the conflict of interest act, changes to the Canada Elections Act, Lobbyists Registration Act, Parliament of Canada Act, Public Service Employment Act, and the Access to Information Act to name just a few (Federal Accountability Act, 2006). This 2006 act was a key ingredient in Harper’s bid to win the prime ministry position in the previous election and remains a key component of his overall policy while in power (Government of Canada, 2007a). Press releases announcing new measures to increase accountability within government departments are endless, and come from departments as diverse as the Treasury Board of Canada Secretaries, Public Works and Government Services Canada and the Department of Finance (Government of Canada, 2005; Government of Canada, 2007b; Department of Finance, 2007). The 2006 Speech from the Throne specifically discussed bringing accountability back to government (Government of Canada, 2006) and the Privacy Commissioner of Canada blogs (Privacy Commissioner of Canada, 2007). It appears that accountability and transparency are heavily present within government websites and official documents at present.

The government’s penchant for transparency and accountability is also evident via the Access to Information Act (ATIA) that has been in effect in Canada since 1983. The
law recognized the rights of Canadians to obtain information from government institutions, both information about themselves, as well as general government information. In addition, it established the procedures that had to be followed when requesting said information, and outlined the conditions under which institutions are justified in withholding information. The act also created the position of Information Commissioner to investigate complaints about non-compliance with the act. If the Commissioner decides that a government department has improperly denied a request for information, the matter can be taken up in the Federal Court of Canada (Roberts, 2006).

In all, accountability and transparency can be heavily traced within the official statements and sentiments of the Canadian government, and it has become a common buzzword often employed within Canadian media institutions as well. Whether or not this has trickled down into a value that most Canadians hold dear remains to be seen\(^\text{18}\), but as an official value, it has important ramifications for this study.

**Defining Transparency and Accountability**

What is transparency and accountability? In a general sense, transparency has been defined as “a condition in which information about the priorities, intentions, capabilities, and behavior of powerful organizations is widely available to the global public. It is a condition of openness” (Lord, 2006, 5). The connection of transparency to openness is certainly on the right track in its popular usage, but transparency’s innate connection to governance is relatively ignored here. In contrast, definitions that better

\(^{18}\)Unlike peacekeeping and multiculturalism, Canadian values about transparency and accountability do not seem to have received the same attention of the pollsters unfortunately.
acknowledge the link to governance can be found. For instance, transparency has been
defined as referring to “the availability of information to the general public and clarity
about government rules, regulations and decisions” (Asian Development Bank, 2007).
Likewise, the Oxford Dictionary of Economics defines ‘transparent policy measures’ in
the following way:

Policy measures whose operation is open to public scrutiny. Transparency
includes making it clear who is making the decisions, what the measures are, who
is gaining from them, and who is paying for them. This is contrasted with opaque
policy measures, where it is hard to discover who makes the decisions, what they
are, and who gains and who loses. (Black cited in Hood, 2006, p. 4)

Finally, one of the better definitions of transparency comes from The
Encyclopedia of Democratic Thought that says, “In perhaps its commonest usage,
transparency denotes government according to fixed and publishable rules, on the basis
of information and procedures that are accessible to the public, and (in some usages)
within clearly demarcated fields of activity…” (Hood cited in Hood, 2006, 5). In all,
references to transparency often include references to governments’ ability to make
decisions based on established and published rules versus ad hoc processes, public
reporting mechanisms to indicate who gains and/or pays for public measures, and overall,
government operations that are accessible and understandable to the general public
(Hood, 2006).

Another term that is widely employed and encompasses many things is
accountability.19 From an etymological perspective, accountability can be traced to
accounting in the traditional bookkeeping sense, but the term has shifted away from this

19 Transparency and accountability tend to overlap conceptually and the former is often used for a synonym
for the latter. Thus, transparency is often supposed to actually generate increased accountability.
financial accounting focus into a much broader one. Its current usage now holds promises of fair and equitable governance (Bovens, 2007). Generally speaking, accountability has “come to stand as a general term for any mechanism that makes powerful institutions responsive to their particular publics” (Mulgan cited in Bovens, 2007, p. 449). Bovens (2007) argues that accountability is an evaluative concept, and is frequently used to qualify a state of affairs or the performance of an actor, coming close to ‘responsiveness’ and ‘a sense of responsibility’, in other words, “a willingness to act in a transparent, fair and equitable way” (p. 13). The author explains that while the most concise definition of accountability would be “the obligation to explain and justify conduct”, he chooses to define accountability more narrowly as a specific social relation and states that “accountability is a relationships between an actor and a forum, in which the actor has an obligation to explain and to justify his or her conduct, the forum can pose questions and pass judgment, and the actor may face consequences” (Bovens, 2007, p. 13). Rubenstein (2007) also prefers to highlight the responsibility of the account holder to the public in her definition of accountability. She defines accountability as, “Actor A (the power wielder) is accountable for its treatment of Actor B (the accountability holder) if A faces significant and predictable sanction for failing to treat B according to recognized standards” (Rubenstein, 2007, p. 618). In this, definition of accountability, Rubenstein (2007) is acknowledging the role of power, relationships, standards and sanctions that are involved in accountability within governments. In a more common definition, accountability is seen as the quality or state of being accountable, especially an obligation or willingness to accept responsibility or to account for one’s actions (Accountability, 2006-2007). Within American scholarly and political discourse, accountability is often
used interchangeably with ‘good governance’. However, accountability is not only confined to its political sense. Because of its broad appeal, scholars have identified different types of accountability such as political accountability (elected representatives, political parties, voters, media), legal accountability (courts), administrative accountability (auditors, inspectors and controllers), market-based accountability (customers), professional accountability (professional peers) as well as social accountability (interest groups, charities and other stakeholders). For our purposes, the type of accountability that is of most interest is political accountability.

The Emergence of Accountability and Transparency in Government as a Value in Canada

How did accountability and transparency in government become something valued in Canadian society? Where do these values come from? An investigation into the role of the government throughout Canadian history shows us some interesting things. Notably, that the government has traditionally played a very important and well-respected role in the development of Canada as a society. Canada has been based on elements of conservatism, elitism, authoritarianism as well as a heavy respect for law and order. However, societal shifts, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, seem to have lead to a dramatically different perspective on the role of the government in Canada – leading to a kind of ‘new public management’ function. This new perspective incorporates the values of transparency and accountability in government that we see today.
In terms of its political personality, Canada has been characterized as an conservative, elitist, law-abiding, collectivity-oriented society (especially in comparison to the United States) (Bogart, 2005; Lipsett, 1986). This characterization has been tied to Canada’s reaction to the American Revolution, among other things. Because English-speaking Canada rejected the Declaration of Independence and French-speaking Canada isolated herself from the anti-clerical, democratic values of the French Revolution, the leaders of both linguistic groups “consciously attempted to create a conservative, monarchical and ecclesiastical society in North America” (Lipsett, 1986, p. 115). Canada’s conservative reaction to the American Revolution has been a historical organizing principle of the country. In fact, Canadian historians have pointed out that the democratic or populist elements of society have lost battles on many occasions:

Our forefathers made the great refusal in 1776 when they declined to join the revolting American colonies. They made it again in 1812 when they repelled American invasions. They made it again in 1837 when they rejected a revolution motivated by ideals of Jacksonian democracy, and opted for a staid moderate respectable Whiggism which they called ‘Responsible Government’. They made it once more in 1867 when the separate British colonies joined to set up a new nationality in order to preempt [American] expansionism...[It] would be hard to overestimate the amount of energy we have devoted to this cause. (Underhill cited in Lipsett, 1986, 118)

This historical tendency towards conservatism has ensured that the government in Canada has played a central role in the country. Rebels and renegades have not been worshipped and idolized, and historically speaking, have been quashed by government institutions (as in the case of Métis leader Louis Riel).

Besides conservatism, Canada has also had a strong element of elitism and hierarchy throughout history. The stratification of society was seen as a natural result of
some having larger endowments than others and this was seen to be a positive thing as it allowed those best able to lead to do so. It also meant that those who lead should do so for the public good and exercise their power as a trust in exchange for a strong deference to this authority (Bogart, 2005). In this way, elitism in Canada, as evidenced via a diffuse respect for authority, also worked to encourage a greater role for the state in economic and social affairs. In a similar manner, authoritarian modes of thinking have been traced to Canada's beginnings. Conservatives who were Empire oriented and who feared American expansion brought the British colonies in Canada together. They created a strong central government in Canada, which was empowered to disallow provincial laws (Bogart, 2005). Authoritarian modes of thinking have also been traced to religion where ecclesiastical traditions bolstered values of elitism and order.

Conservative, elitist, and authoritarian traditions in Canada has been coupled with a great tradition of respect for law and order. This can be explained in part by the country's frontier experience. Because Canada was on "constant guard against the expansionist tendencies of the United States, it could not leave its frontier communities unprotected or autonomous" (Lipsett, 1986, 121). Thus, the country's leaders decided that the power of civil authority should operate in advance of the spread of settlement. This led to the centrally controlled North West Mounted Police moving into the frontier before, and along with, the settlers. The presence of the 'Mounties' meant that there was less vigilante activity and explosive wars against the Indians were generally avoided. The presence of the Mounties in the expansion of the Canadian West worked to guarantee that a distinct kind of order would prevail there – one that would set Canada apart from the United States. It was an order "characterized by centralized power, hierarchy, discipline,
and a belief that the needs of the group came before those of the individual. In essence, the force embodied the ‘peace, order and good government’ promised by the British North America Act” (Strange and Loo, 1997, 16). Overall, the need to deliberately plan for the settlement of the west that occurred in Canada has played a part in the history of active state involvement in the political and economic development of the country. Public opinion polls in Canada show that Canadians have a great respect for police and Canadians have been inclined towards “the use of ‘lawful’ and traditionally institutionalized means for altering regulations which they believe are unjust” in comparison to Americans where informal and extralegal means are often used to correct what they perceive as wrong (Lipsett, 1986, p. 130). Generally speaking, Canadians do not see authority or government as an enemy. In fact, “Canadians must be the only country in the world where a policeman [the Mountie] is used as a national symbol” (Atwood in Lipsett, 1986, p. 124).

The Canadian respect for law and order can be evidenced in other ways. Canada has had a tendency to emphasize the rights and obligations of the community instead of the individuals and this is evident in the concern of Canada’s forefather with “peace, order and good government” which implies control and protection (in contrast to America’s focus on ‘life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness which suggests upholding the rights of the individual) (Lipsett, 1986). Canada’s ‘crime control’ model focuses on the maintenance of law and order and is less protective of the rights of the accused and of individuals generally (although this may be argued to be changing recently, as in Bogart, 2005). The ‘crime control’ model in Canada “places heavy emphasis on the repression of criminal conduct, arguing that only by insuring order can individuals in a society be
guaranteed personal freedom” (Hagan and Leon cited in Lipsett, 1986, p. 128). This is in contrast to the American ‘due process’ model, for example, which has a much heavier emphasis on individual rights, so that even the rights of criminals and dissidents are protected. In a related manner, Canada offers less constitutional protection for property rights and civil liberties than the United States. In addition, the Canadian government has greater legal power to restrict freedom of speech and to invade personal privacy (Lipsett, 1986).

In addition to a history of conservatism, elitism, authoritarianism and respect for law and order, Canada has also had a tradition of anonymity and secrecy within its civil service. The doctrine of ministerial responsibility that is evident in the Canadian parliamentary system ensured that civil servants were to maintain political neutrality and remain anonymous (Dwivedi & Gow, 1999). Government ministers were to take public responsibility for administrative decisions that were made by civil servants, whether they were good or bad. In this way, public servants were protected from public scrutiny and thus, felt free to provide advice to their ministers, regardless of political party without fear. Associated with the anonymity and political neutrality of civil servants is the notion of official secrecy within Canadian public administration. The British Official Secrets Act applied to Canada from 1889 to 1939, when Canada then adopted its own Official Secrets Act, which asked public servants with office responsibilities to take the Oath of Office and Secrecy “which binds them not to reveal publicly anything that they may have learned in the course of their duties” (Dwivedi & Gow, 1999, p. 74). The desire to reduce such secrecy led to the creation of the Access to Information Law. While the act reduces government secrecy in general, the situation of public servants has not changed. They are
still not free to divulge documents in their possession. As Dwivedi & Gow (1999) explain, “Anonymity and official secrecy are part of a complex equilibrium that allowed the Canadian political system to operate since 1918 with a career-oriented public service and political direction by elected governments. Recently, relaxations have been introduced to these rules” (75).

In summary, for most of the 19th and 20th centuries, the government of Canada had been respected and was a stable force in the process of nation building. It contributed to the construction of crucial infrastructure, to the delivery of important public services and to the opening up of frontiers. In addition, the creation of the welfare state and the extension of the government’s role in the economy during and after WWII continued to expand the government’s position and import. Beginning in the 1960s, the government via the civil service started to become more controversial to Canadians as civil servants were allowed the right to join unions, to bargain collectively and to strike. The controversy continued as Trudeau’s vision of a bilingual Canada led to an emphasis on the civil service’s ability to serve in both languages and be more representative of French-speaking Canadians. Furthermore, the Glassco Commission (The Royal Commission on Government Organization in 1960) recommended an increase in managerial competence within the government and called for the introduction of modern management techniques to achieve greater efficiency. Apparent centralization of power within the Prime Minister’s Office, the Privy Council Office and the Department of Finance also led to concerns about an influential class of ‘superbureaucrats’. This was connected to a general concern about the ability of civil servants to influence policy and their supposed ‘political neutrality’. At the same time, the Canadian government was
experimenting with new ideas about how budgets should be struck, in an attempt to lessen incrementalism, to emphasize the broader goals being sought by government, and to extend political control over the purse strings. Governments wanted greater rationality in financial decision-making and began to think about the longer-term impacts of their spending. It was issues like these that began to put considerable pressure on the government and led to civil service reform in the 1960s and early 1970s. But while demands for reform were widespread, they were responded to in only a piecemeal way (Tupper, 2000).

While these issues were part of the impetus for the change in public management seen in the 1980s and 1990s, “seen in a broader context, the public management revolution...had no obvious precursors in Canadian political or intellectual life” (Tupper, 2000, p. 147). No political party had advanced a coherent critique or plan for change, and Canadian intellectuals were not paying attention to anti-government or anti-bureaucratic sentiments, although political scientists in Britain and the United States did. Nonetheless, in the late 1980s and through the 1990s, Canada underwent a kind of administrative revolution, driven by management ideas and organizational processes commonly referred to as ‘new public management’. This perspective on government organization is underlined by several assumptions. One, that the modern world is rapidly changing in major ways. Two, that Weberian bureaucracy is unsuitable for the new economy. Three, that modern institutions are deeply interdependent. And finally, that public employees must become entrepreneurial agents of management reform. In addition to these underlining assumptions, the ‘new public management’ model of government has a number of core principles such as governments must steer, not row; that governments
must have and follow clearly defined organizational objectives; that results must be continuously monitored and measured; that governments must make responsiveness to citizens a priority; and that greater decision-making is needed for front-line workers (Tupper, 2000). In this way, the model of ‘new public management’ that has been taken up by the Canadian government as of late, is full of the buzzwords and vernacular of the modern managerial world – such as ‘rightsize’, ‘outsource’, ‘e-government’, ‘mission statements’, etc..

Why has this change come about? According to Tupper (2000), “neither a neat list of factors nor any obviously decisive determinant presents itself. Complex forces are at work in ways that blur cause and effect” (p. 151). He cites examples such as the customer service revolution in retailing and the restructuring of North American corporations as things that have provided models of change for the government. In addition, information technological advances have had important consequences for government administration. Finally, the vision of economic globalization also fits into this scheme as well. Tupper (2000) proposes two other interesting theories to help explain this turn to ‘new public management’ in the Canadian government.

An interesting, in many ways appealing, perspective on new public management is to interpret it as a handmaiden of neo-liberalism, an interpretation that has a vulgar and more refined strand. The vulgar strand sees new public management as a sort of smokescreen, a justifying ideology for the radical cutback of the welfare state and other dimensions of the post-war mixed economy. The more refined version sees new public management as a complex balancing of social and economic forces. Its application allows for the retention of important public services but under new, more business-like operating principles. (p. 151)

In all, this turn to new public management in Canada has definite links with anti-government sentiments and pro-market ideas that have been evident all over the globe in
the last twenty years. What is interesting about the Canadian shift is that it appears to be such a dramatically different perspective than the one followed for so many years before. While Canadians tended to be a conservative, elitist, authoritarian bunch who valued the rule of law and order and were inclined towards secrecy in its government, this shift towards a transparent and accountable government is incredibly interesting. While the social, historical, political reasons for this shift may still be blurry, a noticeable shift has indeed occurred.

The Somalia Affair as a Transgression of Peacekeeping, Multiculturalism and Transparency/Accountability Values in Canada

As I have discussed, three values in Canada are important and can be traced back to political, social and historical origins within the nation. The Somalia Affair presented a particularly difficult event for Canadians and their government in that it could be seen to directly challenge the values of peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency/accountability constructed as inherently Canadian. How this happened will be explained in the following section.

The Somalia Affair challenged the Canadian value of peacefulness in a number of ways. The very aggressive behavior of the Canadians that were stationed in Somalia shocked the nation because of its dissonance with the commonly espoused belief. The aggressive nature of Canadian soldiers came to light when it was reported that they were to shoot anyone who infiltrated the compound, that they were to make an example out of
a prisoner and were permitted, or even encouraged, to abuse the prisoner. The aggressive or rough actions towards the prisoner, Arone, also displayed a kind of dissonance between non-violent values and the actual behavior of Canadian soldiers. In this way, Arone was handcuffed, smothered, punched, kicked, beat with a riot stick, struck with an iron bar, and burned with a cigarette among other things. Later, cases of the use of excessive force also came out, including the March 4th shooting of two Somalis, one of which was shot in the back and another shot at close range in the head and neck. These examples of aggressive behaviour and excessive use of force on the part of the Canadian soldiers seem to represent a dissonance between the moral of non-violence that Canadian society tends to espouse.

In a related manner, the value of peacefulness was transgressed via the group acknowledgement and silent permission behind the aggressive behavior. Tacit permission to abuse or torture Somalis was evident as the Somalia Affair evolved. In the end, it was reported that at least eight members of the Canadian Forces in Somalia had seen the beatings and done nothing, while many more were accused of knowing it was taking place. This tacit group acknowledgement of the aggressive behavior of a few individuals not only challenged Canadian morals of non-violence, but also challenged Canadian morals of ‘doing the right thing’ and speaking out when someone powerless is being abused.

The pride of the aggression that took place also presented a dissonance between Canadian value of peacekeeping and the reality of the actions. In this way, the trophy photos that were taken with abused and humiliated prisoners seemed to offer further evidence that the Canadian soldiers as a group permitted and condoned this aggressive
behavior. The photos taken for posterity to be shared seemed to make this even worse by displaying pride of their aggressive behavior – or defilement of a Canadian norm. This was also evident in the videotapes of the hazing rituals. In other words, while the beatings and the rituals were bad enough in the eyes of Canadians, the fact that Canadian soldiers recorded them for posterity and enjoyment seemed to make the transgression that much worse.

The fact that the transgressors were Canadian soldiers, or as more popularly known to Canadians, as peacekeepers, is particularly relevant here. The transgression of a non-violent moral was made even more significant in Canadian society because it was done by peacekeepers – those who are supposed to be keeping the peace and upholding the moral of non-violence in the minds of Canadians. Instead, Canadians’ representatives of their non-violent moral tortured and killed Somalis while stationed there. This was also a particularly significant moral transgression for Canadians because it occurred in an international context. As the Canadian contingent was part of an international force, led by the Americans, the aggressiveness of some of its peacekeepers was likely perceived as a moral transgression on an international scale. Thus, the Somalia Affair was elevated to an international embarrassment. When keeping the peace has been continuously fed to Canadians and to the world as a particularly Canadian skill ever since the days of Lester B. Pearson, evidence of Canadian aggressiveness and use of force in an unnecessary context, became a national and suddenly international moral transgression.

In a related vein, the abuse of power and position that occurred in Somalia seemed to fly in the face of the Canadian value of helping in international situations rather than hurting. A fundamental Canadian value is that of the country ‘doing-good’ for other
countries, helping out when necessary, but generally not imposing our ideals or beliefs on other countries forcibly. This, of course, is a response to what many Canadians believe is an incorrect foreign policy approach, that of the United States. However, the abuse of power and position over the relatively powerless Somalis on the part of the Canadians was evident within the Somalia Affair. For instance, the cases of entrapment with both Arone and the March 4\textsuperscript{th} shootings, where the gate was left open on purpose to catch an intruder and food and water were left close to the wire as ‘bait’ to entrap looters, appeared to take advantage of the people that Canadians were sent over to help and support. In addition, Arone’s status as a confused Somali who happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time, lead to Canadian sympathies with the Somalis as victims. In part because the Canadian media had framed the country’s participation in Somalia as an international aid issue, Canadians believed that we were there to help the Somalis and the defilement of this value, via the mistreatment of the very people we were supposed to help, represented another major moral transgression.

The much-espoused Canadian value of acceptance of cultural diversity seemed to be fundamentally challenged amidst the Somalia Affair as well. The torture and deaths of Somali citizens – citizens who were not only powerless and poor, but also black – worked to challenge norms of racial equality. While accusations of racism didn’t really come to the fore in the media until the hazing ritual videotapes were released, there was an undercurrent of accusation and discomfort that part of the reason that the Somalis were being mistreated and disrespected was because of their colour. In addition, the kind of imperial role that the Canadian soldiers took on, coming to Somalia to ‘help’ the natives, seemed to create uneasiness amongst Canadians. However, it was really the release of the
hazing videotapes where Canadian soldiers were recorded as making numerous racist comments and actions that certainly provided a dissonance between Canadian values and the actions of particular Canadians in this instance.

Finally, the value of responsible governments or transparency in Canada was also challenged when accusations of a cover-up in the higher levels of the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence took hold, almost immediately after the violence was reported. The lack of respect for due process that was shown in the cover-up of the affair resulted in the third major moral transgression – the failure of leaders to act in an appropriately responsible and accountable way. Thus, the fact that politicians and military leaders were seemingly hiding information from Canadians also challenged important morals for Canadian society.

The Somalia Affair as a Moment of Moral Dissonance

In all, fundamental Canadian values such as non-violence, peacefulness (peacekeeping), cultural diversity and acceptance (multiculturalism), and government transparency and accountability were transgressed in the Somalia Affair marking a significant moment of moral dissonance. Here, moral is defined as a concern with the distinction between right and wrong, and a concern with accepted rules and standards of human behavior (Urdang, 1995). Dissonance is defined generally as a disagreement or incongruity, and more specifically as an inconsistency between one’s actions and the beliefs one holds (Dissonance, 2007). Thus, a moment of moral dissonance occurs when there is an inconsistency between the beliefs one holds and one’s actions about what is right and wrong in terms of accepted rules and standards of societal behaviour.
In this case, the Somalia Affair presented serious incongruities between commonly espoused Canadian values and the actions that Canadians undertook in Somalia. There was an inconsistency between the values that are commonly espoused to be Canadian values – peacefulness, acceptance of cultural diversity and a transparent and open government – and the actions that the Canadian soldiers took while in Somalia, as well as the actions that the politicians and bureaucrats allegedly followed after the events in Somalia. Thus, what Canadians generally define as what is right and wrong in terms of accepted rules and standards of societal behavior in Canada around peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency and accountability of the government were defiled. The moral dissonance that presented itself as a result of the Somalia Affair in Canada was a result of the moral transgressions that the Canadian public viewed to take place during this event. The defilement of those values by Canadians, and notably international prominent representatives of Canadian citizens, appeared to shock and offend Canadians to the core. That is, the Somalia Affair presented a number of major inconsistencies between the values that the nation is constructed to hold and the actions of its citizens. Thus, important morals in Canadian society that are consistently espoused, particularly by the Canadian government themselves, were clearly transgressed by the Canadians in Somalia. In all, these transgressions were made public via the media over a period of four years, were certainly subject to disapproval and publicly denounced by Canadian citizens, journalists, and military personnel alike, making this a significant moment of moral dissonance in Canada.
CHAPTER FIVE: THE COMMISSION AS A RESPONSE TO MORAL DISSONANCE

After establishing how the Somalia Affair can be considered a moment of moral dissonance in Canadian society where fundamental values were transgressed, it is now necessary to explore why it is that a commission of inquiry was enacted as a response to the moral dissonance the affair presented. The explanation that I present is based in the theoretical framework outlined in this chapter from the literature on political scandals. To this end, I begin with an overview and introduction to the area of scandal and its importance. I then undertake to outline scandal as a concept, explaining its etymological background before discussing how scandal is approached today in the academic literature. Next, I discuss the particular characteristics of scandal as well as the
importance of the media in scandal. Following this introduction to scandal more generally, I examine political scandals, exploring what political scandals are and introducing some recent theoretical debates and discussions around the topic, specifically examining the various theories of political scandals that can be identified in the literature around their importance and consequence in society. In all, this section will help to establish the argument that the theory of scandals, and political scandals in particular, is especially helpful to understand the context and findings that occur around the Somalia commission in Canada.

With this introduction to the theory on scandal and political scandals in hand, I then move on to the major argument of my dissertation. I begin by briefly establishing that the Somalia Affair can be considered a scandal according to the definitions and characteristics outlined in the literature, and furthermore, that the Somalia Affair was a particularly important political scandal in Canada. Next, I make the argument that the commission can be seen to be a place where the transgressed norms the Somalia Affair presented were discussed, defined and debated – and even sometimes reaffirmed – via the moral discourse that can be seen to take place in both the public hearings and the final report of the commission. In this way, I argue that discursively, the commission can be understood as a communications arena in which moral discourse can take place, thereby working to define and debate Canadian values in an attempt to reassert and maintain the social and moral order. Next, I argue that the commission can also be seen to rely heavily on process and procedure which helps curtail the abuses of power seen to be occurring as a result of the Somalia Affair. Finally, I bring these arguments together in order to show
that it is these two communication features of the commission – as a space for moral discourse to occur within a heavily formal and procedural process – that make the commission an appropriate discursive place to respond to the moral dissonance that occurred in a political scandal like the Somalia Affair.

Scandal as an Area of Study

The role of scandals in society has been receiving an increased level of academic interest recently. Sociology, communication, and political science scholars have begun to pay more attention to the social conditions that may lead to the establishment of a scandal and what function scandals may fulfill within society. While investigating scandals in any significant way has sometimes been accused of being too frivolous a topic for serious study, ‘scandology’ has begun to be taken up with more vigor in various disciplines, where attention is paid to the way that scandals emerge, develop and the consequences that result from them (Thompson, 1999). Likewise, while scandals were historically viewed as too unique and short-lived for comparative research, new attempts to compare the way that scandals operate and function in society has begun to take hold (Esser and Hartung, 2004).

Those scholars that have begun to take the study of scandals more seriously believe it is important to do so because of the kinds of things that scandals reveal about the world we live in. For instance, scandals provide excellent opportunities to examine internal political processes that aren’t usually available to view. In addition, they are a useful exaggeration of reality (Lowi, 1988) and work as a kind of social pathology that
illustrates normality in society (Neckel, 2005). Investigating political scandals in an institutional manner provides insights into areas which usually remain hidden from the public, such as the activities of economic corporations, party politics, government offices and intelligence service providers. In addition, the topics, development and consequences of political scandals display the social conditions under which they occur and ensure that long-term social processes become legible in scandals (Neckel, 2005). In all, scandals are important to study because of what they disclose about modern political life, as well as the cues they provide around the cultural characteristics of the countries in which they occur.

The Concept of Scandal

In the study of scandal, Thompson’s (2000) work has been incredibly important. As such, I will be utilizing his work on the concept of scandal in the following section. As Thompson (2000) has noted, while the word scandal is frequently used in everyday discourse, its origins and precise meaning are often hard to pin down. The word can be traced back to Greek, Latin and early Judaeo-Christian traditions, but its etymological roots actually come from the Indo-Germanic root ‘skand’ which means to spring or leap. Later, Greek derivatives like the word ‘skandalon’ were used to signify a trap, an obstacle or a ‘cause of moral stumbling’ and eventually, the word became associated with the idea of a test of religious faith. The word ‘scandal’ first appeared in English in the 16th Century, although similar words appeared in the Romance languages at roughly the same time. The early uses of the word in the 16th and 17th centuries were of two main types. First, ‘scandal’ was used in religious contexts to refer to the conduct of a religious person
which brought discredit to religion, or to something that hindered religious faith or belief. Second, ‘scandal’ was used in a more secular manner and had to do with actions or utterances which were scurrilous or defamatory, actions, events or circumstances that were grossly discreditable, or conduct which offended moral sentiments or the sense of decency. The latter two understandings worked to implicate a relation between an individual and a social collectivity whose moral sentiments were offended (Thompson, 2000).

Today, scandal is used to describe a form of moral transgression that is no longer linked to a specific religious code. Popular usage of the term scandal defines it as a “loss or damage to reputation caused by actual or apparent violation of morality or propriety” or as “a circumstance or action that offends propriety or established moral conceptions or disgraces those associated with it” (Merriam-Webster online). In the literature, it has been defined as “the intense public communication about a real or imagined defect that is by consensus condemned, and that meets universal indignation or outrage” (Esser and Hartung, 2004, 1041). Scandal has also been defined as “referring to actions or events involving certain kinds of transgressions which become known to others and are sufficiently serious to elicit a public response” (Thompson, 2000, p. 13). Scandals, then, can be seen to involve a moral transgression (or transgressions) of sort that receives public attention and response – particularly a negative public response.

Beyond these basic definitions, scandal has been noted to have a number of specific characteristics (Thompson, 2000). For instance, scandals are said to occur when certain values, norms or moral codes are transgressed. Transgression is a necessary condition of scandals. However, the nature of the transgression is important as not all
transgressions are scandalous. Some transgressions are too minor (i.e. a parking ticket) while others may be too serious to be considered a scandal (i.e. large-scale genocide). Scandals have been seen to “occupy a sort of middle ground of impropriety” so that they involve transgressions that are sufficiently serious enough to elicit disapproval, but often fall short of the most heinous crimes (King in Thompson, 2000, p. 14). Of course, different values and norms have differing levels of ‘scandal sensitivity’ which depend on the “social-historical context and the general moral and cultural climate of the time, and depending on the extent to which these values and norms matter to particular individuals or groups” (Thompson, 1999, p. 4). Thus, the cultural variability around scandals is an important factor. What is considered scandalous in one context may be regarded as quite acceptable in another time or place.

Despite the acknowledgement that transgressions often differ in context and culture, there are certain norms that have been historically more scandal-sensitive than others. For instance, norms and moral codes around the conduct of sexual relations, norms governing financial transactions, and norms around the exercise of political power are frequently seen to be more scandal-prone than others. In the same manner, there are certain individuals who are more likely to be plagued by a scandal if they transgress a norm. This is linked, in part, to the degree of the visibility of the individuals involved, so that the more visible an individual by virtue of their position, achievements, or responsibilities, the more vulnerable to scandal they are. In addition, individuals who espouse or represent certain values or beliefs, often via their position or affiliation, are also often vulnerable to scandal. In this way, politicians and religious leaders are a few examples of the kinds of individuals who are particularly susceptible to scandal as are
celebrities and sports athletes for instance. Furthermore, these individuals are particularly susceptible to scandal because of the hypocrisy that tends to follow them. Because the individuals or organizations they represent often preach certain norms, the transgression of those norms is seen as especially hypocritical (Thompson, 2000).

The values or norms that are considered to be transgressed in a scandal, must have some degree of moral force or ‘bindingness’ for some groups of individuals. However, this is not to say that the values that are transgressed have widespread consensus or that they are norms that people feel particularly strongly about. Values and norms are often contested features of social life, adhered to by some and rejected or ignored by others. Furthermore, scandals often go beyond the actions or events that transgress the norms to assert or cultivate the norms themselves. Thus, “the making of a scandal is often associated with a broader process of ‘moralization’ through which certain values or norms are espoused and reaffirmed – with varying degrees of effectiveness and good faith – by those who denounce the action as scandalous” (Thompson, 2000, p. 16). A number of values or norms may be transgressed at the same time in a scandal. In addition, scandals can become focused onto ‘second-order transgressions’, “where attention is shifted from the original offence to a series of subsequent actions which are aimed at concealing the offence” (Thompson, 2000, p. 4). Second-order transgressions are often an attempt to cover-up the original transgression and frequently involve deception, obstruction, false denials, and lies and often become more important than the original transgression itself, partly because they involve violations of rules of law, which are considered fundamental or constitutive of forms of life.
Beyond the transgression of a moral, a second characteristic of a scandal is that its occurrence or existence involves an element of secrecy or concealment but that is known or strongly believed to exist by individuals other than those directly involved. People who are involved in a scandal frequently try to conceal the transgression of a norm from non-participants. If the knowledge of the transgression is limited to only the participants, a scandal will not develop. In order to become a scandal, a scandal must be known by others, or at least, strongly or plausibly believed by others to exist. Scandal is always a public affair so that non-participant knowledge of the scandal is paramount (Waisbord, 2004). Because non-participant knowledge of the scandal is a necessary condition, scandals often involve a "drama of concealment and disclosure" (Thompson, 2000, p.18). Here, the participants in the scandal spend a great deal of time and effort attempting to conceal their participation, while non-participants work to uncover the truth. Thus, scandal goes beyond the original actions or events that transgressed the norm(s). It involves a "degree of public knowledge of the actions or events, a public of non-participants who know about them, and a process of making public or making visible through which the actions or events become known to others" (Thompson, 2000, p. 19). The need for a scandal to be known to non-participants is one reason the media plays such an important role in scandal and why scandals often result in deep embarrassment and shame.

A third characteristic of a scandal is that some non-participants disapprove of the actions or events as morally discreditable and may even be offended or shocked by the transgression. Thus, besides the public knowledge of a scandal that is necessary, the public must also disapprove of the action or event that transpired. As Thompson (1999)
states, "The action may flout values or norms which are so fundamental to their sense of self and well-being that they are deeply upset – truly ‘scandalized’ by it" (p. 5). However, shocked reactions may be increasingly rare. More often than not, the values that are transgressed are often adhered to loosely by most, and may be only adhered to in principle than in practice. While many people may pay lip service to the token values and codes, they tend to play a relatively marginal role in their lives.

A fourth characteristic of scandals is that some non-participants express their disapproval by publicly denouncing the actions or events. In this way, it is not enough for the public to generally disapprove of the action or event, but that disapproval must be expressed to others. If an action or event that transgresses a norm becomes known to others, but elicits no response, it will not become a scandal as “scandal is as much shaped by the response of others as it is by the act of transgression itself” (Thompson, 2000, p. 20). If non-participants are not interested or concerned enough with the transgression to publicly denounce it, then a scandal will not arise. Scandal, then, is constituted by both acts (acts of transgression) and speech-acts (those who respond to the acts via expression). Thompson (2000) notes that the responses of others have a performative role in that their responses help to build or create the state of affairs. In this way, the responses of others are imperative to the scandal, and are not simply retrospective commentaries on it or descriptions of it. The general forms of expression that others take tend to follow ‘opprobrious discourse’, which is a kind of moralizing discourse that reproaches and rebukes, scolds and condemns, and which expresses disapproval of actions and individuals (Thompson, 2000). This moralizing discourse implies that the actions are shameful and disgraceful, and thus, that the actions bring shame and disgrace
to the individuals who were involved. This can be a stigmatizing discourse. While the moralizing discourse can vary in degrees and is expressed in different ways and contexts, for a scandal to emerge, at least some of the discourse must be made to be public speech-acts so that it must be uttered in a way that can be heard and received by a plurality of others. In contrast, if the moralizing discourse was to remain among friends, it would not constitute a scandal. But if the moralizing discourse is articulated in public, a scandal can emerge. Thus, scandal depends on the public articulation of reproaching discourse. The role of the media is also important here, for although moralizing discourse can be made public in other ways, the media can help to ensure that the discourse is not a localized affair.

A final characteristic of a scandal is that the disclosure and condemnation of the actions or events may damage the reputation of the individuals responsible for them. Scandals may do serious damage to the reputations of the participants. This is not an inevitable consequence, but is a risk so that scandal is a phenomenon where individuals’ reputations are at stake. While legal prosecution can also be a risk, one’s name and standing as a person of honesty, integrity and good character is often a frequent risk of scandals. Individuals who have been accused of wrong doing will often make an attempt to save their reputation by launching a counter-attack, threatening legal action or rejecting the allegations put forward against them. Alternatively, they can take the moral high ground and try to appeal to higher values in the name of which the original actions were carried out to hopefully persuade others that the ends justified the means. Another strategy often used is the public confession, where individuals acknowledge their guilt in the hope that honesty will elicit sympathy from others. Often, these struggles over
reputation are often not only about honour or personal pride, but represent an important struggle over power and resources (Thompson, 1999). Because reputation is a kind of symbolic resource that individuals can accumulate, cultivate and protect, it is valuable in its symbolic power. Reputation is a resource that individuals can draw on in order to pursue their interests and aims. It is a scarce resource in that it takes time and energy to build, and it is also fragile in that it can be quickly depleted or destroyed. Scandals are events that threaten to deplete an individual’s or organization’s reputation (Thompson, 2000).

Overall, these five characteristics of scandal must be in place for a scandal to exist. Thus, in order for something to be a scandal, there must be a transgression of norms that is made public, is subject to disapproval and publicly denounced and that runs the risk of seriously damaging the reputation of the individuals involved in the original transgression.

From this, two models of scandals have been proposed. The first, a rather simple case, occurs when a concealed act of transgression is publicly disclosed or publicly alleged to have occurred, and the public disclosure and/or allegations elicit public expressions of disapproval. In the second, more complex, model, the disclosures and allegations are met by denials and counter-allegations from the individuals involved, which in turn fuel further investigations and revelations and give rise to a series of second-order transgressions. In this model, the unfolding scandal becomes a cat-and-mouse game where each denial ensures that the stakes grow even higher, and where the second-order transgression may come to assume even greater significance than the original offence. Most scandals tend to follow the latter model, although they tend to be
even more complicated by other elements and details, various plots and subplots that can turn into subscandals or offshoot scandals (Thompson, 2000).

Esser and Hartung (2004) propose a similar, but slightly different model of scandal. They see scandal as a socially constructed communication pattern, and argue that the model begins by someone, the denouncer, publicly suggesting scandal. Then factual information is given, value judgment is passed, the validity of a norm is reaffirmed, others are appealed to share the value judgment and action to end the scandalous state is demanded. According to the authors, denouncers are likely to be opposition politicians, the rivals in one’s own party, or journalists, while the culprits of the scandal are generally those that hold public office or belong to powerful institutions. Finally, the denounced person has a number of defenses at hand, such as admitting wrongdoing and taking responsibility either by resigning or asking for forgiveness, he or she can deny everything, or can admit to some wrongdoing and justify it. The view that scandal can be seen as a socially constructed communication pattern within society is useful here.

In addition to examining the way that scandals operate and proceed, much attention has been given in the literature around the role of the mass media in a scandal. In Esser and Hartung’s (2004) model, for instance, the media is often wooed by both the denouncer and the culprit in a scandal so that a scandal can be thought of as an interaction between the denouncer, the culprit and the mass media (Esser and Hartung 2004). They argue that the media performs three functions in a scandal. First, the media provides a stage for the denouncer to suggest scandal. Second, the media system has to react to make the pattern evolve from the stage of suggesting a scandal to a truly developed one. Third, because it’s hard to determine the real extent of outrage in the
public and because the mass media often serves as a proxy for the public, it is a way for the offender to judge the public’s outrage via the media’s outrage.

Another scholar who has paid a great deal of attention to the media’s role in a scandal is Thompson (2000). In fact, he argues that scandal is a mediated event, arising as a distinct type of scandal event out of the 18th and 19th centuries. According to Thompson (2000), mediated scandals are not just scandals that are reported by the media, but are scandals which are constituted by mediated forms of communication and which extend well beyond the original transgressions or actions that started them. In this way, mediated scandals are no longer localized affairs, but have an increased publicness because of the use of mediated communication to share them, moralize them, and ensure their durability. Mediated scandal ensures that scandals quickly dissipate beyond traditional time and space borders, making them national and sometimes global events. Tying the rise of mediated scandals to the development of communication media, Thompson (2000) notes how new communication media has made public figures much more visible and accessible to the public at large. Rather than see public figures as a distant and great presence, the onset of television and radio diminished the ‘greatness’ and aura that surrounded public figures like political leaders, who suddenly began to present themselves as empathetic, sympathetic, and friendly – in other word’s as ‘one of us’. As a result, these public figures began to be appraised in terms of their personal qualities like honesty, integrity and trustworthiness instead of just their public achievements. Thus, new risks surfaced, giving greater importance to their character and integrity than ever before.
Political Scandals

After briefly exploring what is meant by the term scandal, its characteristics and the theories around how they proceed as well as their relation to the media, it is possible to narrow the focus towards a particular kind of scandal that is of interest to this project—scandals that are considered inherently political. In the literature, political scandals have been defined in various ways. Esser and Hartung (2004), for example, define political scandals as those that concern political actors as well as “any [scandal] in which the validity and applicability of norms is addressed” (1041). Neckel (2005) sees political scandal as intimately connected to the transgression of norms and defines the phenomena as “defiling the symbols of collective belief” that are connected to collective morals (p. 104). Similarly, Lowi (1988) says that political scandal is “corruption revealed” and “breach of virtue exposed”. Other scholars, such as Thompson (2000) pay more attention to the institutional relation of political scandals and define them as “scandals involving individuals or actions which are situated within a political field and which have an impact on relations within the field” (p. 9). Here, political field refers to the field of action and interaction that is shaped by the institutions of the state, such as the parliament, competitive party system and regularized elections. In this way, it is the location of the scandal within this field that makes the scandal political and that provides the context for the scandal and shapes its development. The emphasis of political scandal, therefore, is in its relation to the state and state actors. In this way, celebrity or sports scandals are differentiated from political scandals in the actors and institutions they involve, although obviously, this distinction isn’t always so clear-cut.
Just as in scandals more generally, political scandals are understood to challenge the norms, values and morals of a society. Thus, to become a political scandal, some commonly held norm or value in a society must be challenged or transgressed or a breach of morality must transpire (Neckel 2005; Lowi 1988). In political scandals, however, the moral transgression often has more consequence as the transgression that occurs is done by state actors and institutions – those very people and organizations that tend to advocate the moral values or norms in the first place. As Neckel (2005) explains, “Political scandals always emerge when the normative inventory of politics has been violated by the actors in the political system itself and when the revelation of this violation leads to a conflict between different power groups within society” (p. 104). Political scandals are a kind of conflict that depends upon the normative commitments made by public figures and the consciousness and perceptions of the population at large. Furthermore, politicians are in a naturally conflicting position so that they are “more obliged than society to abide by binding norms”, but are also “power figures who are less able to follow these norms in the face of the functional requirements of power competitions” (Neckel 2005, p. 104). In this way, scandals are particularly bad when politicians as public representatives violate the norms that they publicly espouse to follow. Thus, scandals are triggered “when it becomes public that politicians, institutions, associations or parties violate norms which they themselves claim to ensure; when moral obligations are violated by those who as political representatives, represent the principle of moral obligation towards society as a whole” (Neckel 2005, p. 105). The particular moral transgressions that political scandals create, then, are frequently made more
problematic by the fact that they are performed by public figures that hold an increased amount of responsibility to uphold the values and norms of the collective.

Furthermore, political scandals are seen as especially problematic because of their potential to impede political power. Thompson (2000) argues that political scandals can weaken an individual's symbolic capital, such as reputation and trust, which inhibits their ability to exercise political power, thereby having serious consequences. In this way, political scandal is not a superficial or frivolous element that distracts from the business of politics at hand, but can impinge on real sources of power and often has significant material consequences for the individuals and organizations touched by it. In addition, political scandals in liberal democracies are significant because they are, or can become, struggles over the sources of symbolic power as well. While scandals do not necessarily destroy reputation and trust, the fact that they have the capacity to do so makes them integral in social and political life.

Since the violation of norms most often occurs by those in power in political scandals, some theorists argue that this creates a deficit of legitimation in the political system. Scandal is seen as a challenge to the legitimate rule of political authority and the rule of political power is questioned. The vote of non-confidence that a political scandal creates often is directed more to the individuals involved, however, rather than the political system itself. Thus, while the government personnel of the day may be held accountable, the political system itself will often survive from a scandal intact and will continue to be held with confidence (Neckel, 2005). This is mainly because the moral duties that are taken over by politicians are seen as personal ones, and thus are only personally attributable.
Political scandals, and scandals more generally, have also been noted to work to maintain social stability. This theory is often associated with Durkheim’s work and has been referred to as a ‘functionalist theory of scandal’ (Thompson, 2000). Here, even the most asocial, amoral, pathological actions are seen as ultimately functional to the integration of society. In this way, when a shared belief is violated, the transgression may help not only to reaffirm the belief itself, but also the social collectivity that upholds and sustains that belief. According to this perspective, transgressions and their exposure are necessary and normal to maintain social order (Markovits and Silverstein 1988). Thus, “scandals are rituals of collective absolution: moments when a society confronts the shortcomings and transgressions of its members and, by working through the sometimes painful process of disclosure, denunciation and retribution, ultimately reinforces the norms, conventions and institutions which constitute the social order” (Thompson, 2000, 235). Political scandals are argued to “serve to strengthen the community’s conscience collective” (Markovits and Silverstein, 1988, p. 2) and seen to reaffirm and strengthen the bonds of a common morality as well as to help create the scapegoats, enemies and pariahs needed by all communities.

A particularly robust and useful take on this perspective comes from Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008), who draw on Durkheim’s later work20 to outline the moral nature of political scandals. In contrast to other scholars who have drawn on Durkheim to consider political scandals, Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) emphasize moral

---

20 Jacobsson and Löfmarck’s (2008) reading of Durkheim draws from the scholar’s later works on morality (Durkheim, 1993; Durkheim, 2002; Bellah, 1973). They argue that Durkheim’s later definition of morality as a combination of ideals and duties (or norms) is more dynamic than the structuralist conceptions in earlier Durkheim scholarship (Durkheim, 1984).
heterogeneity and do not presume moral consensus in society. In this way, the authors see political scandal as a reaction to norm violations, and which further operate to display the confrontations between various systems of norms in a society.

Describing scandal as a disruption of moral order, Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) write:

From our perspective, scandals reveal the underlying societal norms that make up the moral fabric of society; they reveal a moral order that is temporarily disrupted. A moral order builds on the categorization of the world into the acceptable and the unacceptable, the permitted and the forbidden, and, to use late Durkheimian vocabulary, the sacred versus the profane (Durkheim, 1995). Every society, even modern ones, has ideas that are sacred in the sense of being inviolable. Transgressions against the sacred tend to lead to strong reactions, strong feelings - the transgressions must be sanctioned against and the border between acceptable and unacceptable maintained or, in some cases, redrawn. (p. 206)

Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) follow the Durkheimian understanding of morality as dual-sided; as being both externally imposed on us by social pressure as well as internalized as embraced ideals. Here, the external side of morality is seen to involve an element of duty, and is often displayed in terms of rules of conduct or norms which are sanctioned, while the internal side of morality involves an element of ideals which are internalized and seen as desirable. The authors explain that in this approach, the moral order is considered supra-individual and as a result, some values or norms are more important to the group than others – usually when tied up with the group’s self-identity. Thus, the collective\textsuperscript{21} reaction to these norm transgressions are considered collective

\textsuperscript{21} According to Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008), collective means "the property of being external to individuals and exerting pressure on us, even though it operates through our individual consciences. It is a 'social fact'" (p. 206). It is that social forces are binding/imperative and external to the individual that make them collective (the general diffusion of collective conscience is not enough to make it collective). In other words, social norms can be effective whether they have been internalized by an individual or not. In part, they can be effective because of sanctions or external mechanisms, to protect values via norm compliance.
because, in fact, it is the collective that is offended (referred to as the collective conscience). In other words, a norm transgression can be upsetting because it offends the collective 'we'. But, as Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) clarify, the collective conscience does not mean everybody. They explain, “Social diversity means moral diversity of which Durkheim was well aware. Moreover, an individual is not embracing only one ideal, since she belongs to many different social groups that all exert pressure on her. We even have several collective consciences operating within us” (Jacobsson and Löfmarck 2008, 206). The social and moral diversity of the collective is often overlooked in other approaches to scandal from a Durkheimian perspective. It is this moral diversity of the collective that Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) see as being relevant to their analysis of the ‘Nannygate’ scandal in Sweden. They see ‘Nannygate’ as a “ritual clarification of disagreement”, so that the discourse analyzed in the scandal is about shared social values as well as about lines of conflict within the moral order. In this way, the authors argue that scandals can provoke moral positioning and help to clarify as well as dramatize the lines of difference or conflict, instead of confirm a suggested moral order. Thus, “the scandal-as-ritual” is important for maintaining moral order -- not by reaffirming collective values and maintaining a consensus, but by provoking a moral position-taking which forces the (temporary) settling of moral order or social stability.

Importantly here, the authors also define ‘society’ in terms of Durkheim’s understanding as a social group. Here, the group, or society, has characteristics that make it irreducible to a number of individuals; it has social forces and dynamics that cannot be explained by reference to its individual members alone and so it is a “synthesis sui generis” (Jacobsson and Löfmarck 2008, p. 214). They also remind the reader that
Durkheim was well aware that we are members of many different groups such as the family, the profession, the company, the political party, and the nation for instance. Noting that there are scholars who claim that modern societies are too pluralistic and individualized to allow for a collective moral order to exist, Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) argue that while there is plenty of moral consensus, there is also plenty of moral diversity in modern society. In addition, some norms are spread over vast geographical and social areas (and thus, are generalized social facts) while others operate more locally (as local social facts). Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) argue that this is linked to the institutional and organizational structure of society. They explain that “modern society is an organized society where the paramount institutions of life are embedded in the organizational structure” (p. 209). Because a distinguishing feature of organizations is that they continue to exist, even when all of its original members have been replaced, it is this durability, via rules and statutes that make organizations effective at diffusing norms across time and space. Thus, Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) suggest that it is organizations in society that may help to explain the persistence of generalized social norms in otherwise pluralistic societies. In this way, “our individual journeys through the various institutions and organizations of society differ greatly – partly by chance or choice, partly by structuring factors, such as class or gender. As moral individuals we come to live in the intersections of the different norms diffused by the various institutions and organizations we encounter” (p. 209). It is this reason, claim the authors, that helps to explain why our individual morality often proves contradictory and inconsistent.

Tied into the arguments around the role of political scandals to provoke moral discussion within a society, certain scholars in this field also importantly note the
connection between political scandals and rituals within a society. For instance, some see scandals as rituals themselves and propose that they provide an opportunity to validate and/or modify the norms involved in a scandal and at times, provide opportunities to clarify different moral positions as well as possibly solidify those moral positions. Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) follow this argument and argue that a ‘scandal-as-ritual’\(^{22}\) communicates messages about social relationships and the collective values and principles underlying them. They argue that rituals, by their nature, invoke the collective and they see a scandal as a ritual to confront transgressors and to sanction against transgressors, such as through legal institutions or public outrage. As they explain:

> Just as crime in Durkheim’s analysis, a scandalous behavior is an attack on a collective conscience. For Durkheim, the social sanction fills the function of preserving a group’s belief in, and support of, a rule of action. The norm violation serves to confirm the norm, not so much for the norm-breaker as for others who are reminded of what is valid and acceptable, and they can, at least temporarily, step away from the issue. The public reaction against the transgression fulfills the function of collective purification and absolution. (Jacobsson and Löfmarck 2008, p. 208)

> The authors also note, however, that members of a public can react very differently to norm transgressions and that a ritual may actually evoke conflict rather than consensus among a collective\(^{23}\). This is also a key argument in this dissertation.

\(^{22}\) Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) define ritual in terms of Couldy (2003) and Wuthnow’s (1987) take on the topic: as a “standardized and therefore predictable pattern of behavior with a symbolic and expressive dimension. A ritual is a set of performed acts, the wider meanings of which may not be entirely understood by the performers” (p. 207).

\(^{23}\) As Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) point out, Durkheim’s work on ritual is often met by two critiques. Firstly, a critique of functionalism in general as well as a critique against an overemphasis on consensus. Those that critique functionalism (Thompson, 2000) seem to ignore that Durkheim (1982) distinguished between causal and functional explanations and did not confuse the two. The critique of consensus can be addressed by focusing on Durkheim’s writings on morality rather than his sociology of religion. Nonetheless, the authors’ work attempts to develop a perspective that argues for the co-existence of conflict and consensus and which sees scandals in terms of confrontation of norms (p. 214).
Importantly, a “ritual is often a response to a sense of crisis or uncertainty as regards the moral order, and rituals then reduce uncertainty about, for instance, commitment to shared values of behavioural options. The ritual helps to clarify how a social group draws the boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable, but, since there are many groups, it can also reveal clashing norms. Furthermore, symbolic or moral boundaries can be subject to conflicts of interpretation and negotiation. In a pluralistic society there is no reason to assume that the ritual dramatizes the same values, or communicates the same message, to everyone. The ritual can lead to conflict rather than consensus. Rather than merely confirming values, the scandal-as-ritual provokes a discussion of values; it demands that a stand be taken. That is, the ritual is important for moral positioning. (Jacobsson and Löfmarck 2008, p. 208-209)

This approach to ritual is particularly helpful when thinking about the role of the commission in the Somalia Affair scandal in Canada.24

Markovits and Silverstein (1988) also tie the moral positioning done via scandals to the ritual aspect of the phenomenon, noting that “while a scandalous act invariably challenges the norms and values of the community, the public ritual of investigation, discussion, and punishment ultimately serve to reinforce the primacy of those shared norms and values” (Markovits and Silverstein 1988, p. 2). Here, the authors seem to be suggesting that while the norm transgressions that are exposed via a political scandal are interesting, it is the public ritual that occurs to deal with the scandals that actually work to keep the moral transgressions in check within a society. In this way, they argue that “the ritual of scandal and punishment provides social systems with a means for self-legitimation and purification” (Markovits and Silverstein 1988, p. 2). Thus, scandals provide an important opportunity to reaffirm social order. Neckel explains,

---

24 Jacobsson and Löfmarck (2008) also, usefully, draw on Turner (1981) and consider scandal in terms of a social drama, with key actors, an audience, a scene, a script, etc. As social drama, a scandal can dramatize the roles and obligations of the actors so that the ‘norm-breakers’ symbolize the boundaries of violation or transgression of collective values. Further, the figures involved in a scandal-as-social-drama as well as their transgressions become well known and help construct familiarity among the collective so that scandals become the collective’s scandals (or ‘our’ scandals).
Political scandal is a mechanism of informal social control interlinking the social relationships of completing power groups in such a way that this serves the function of moral regulation of politics, and at the same time makes it possible to maintain the symbolic reproduction of the ruling power conditions. In this respect scandals do represent a social institution: they provide a normative determination of the way in which special norm conflicts in politics are dealt with, they limit their contents and forms and therefore invest social integration with a certain degree of durability. (p. 109)

Reaffirmation of the social order in political scandals is often done via a purifier character that is charged with ensuring that the transgressor(s) is punished for violating the public trust. The role of purifier has traditionally been performed by seers, prophets, political parties, investigatory committees, and recently, the media (Markovits and Silverstein, 1988). In all, this theory of political scandals claims that scandals reaffirm and consolidate the status quo, and thus, have important consequences. This theory of political scandal argues that scandals temporarily disrupt the social and political order, punish the culprits and restore the status quo. It is the “public demonstration of its capacity to expose and condemn – and perhaps eventually to forgive and pardon – the transgressor” in a political scandal that works to reaffirm the belief in the social order (Thompson, 2000, p. 236).

Polical scandals have also been noted to be intimately connected to power and “tell us something about the nature of power and fragility, about the ways in which power is exercised in our societies about the kinds of resources on which it is based and about the speed and the suddenness with which it can be lost” (Thompson 1999, p. 2).

Interestingly, a common complaint with the Durkheimian understanding of scandals is that it misses the single most important piece in any political scandal – the exercise of, and struggle for, political power (Markovits and Silverstein, 1988). Thus, Markovits and
Silverstein (1988) for one want to elucidate the “central role of power in the construction of social reality, public morality, and the conscience collective” (p. 4). They agree that the Durkheimian approach to scandals successfully displayss the significance and social function of norms in developing a cohesive and integrated social order so that scandals and their punishment work to reaffirm social order. But concentrating only on the social function of norms doesn’t provide a satisfactory analysis of scandals, according to the authors.

Markovits and Silverstein (1988) note the ‘schizophrenic’ way in which power is viewed and used in liberal democracies because “liberalism proclaims the primacy of the individual”, while “democracy demands the subordination of the individual to the collective welfare of the whole” (p. 5). They argue that political scandals are located within this inherent tension of liberal democracies and believe that “political scandals are the manifestations of an ever-present, tension-laden balancing act between the incompatible ingredients of liberal democratic rule in the modern, industrial state” (p. 5). In order to overcome their ambiguity around the use of political power, liberal democracies have a particular faith in process. Thus, “it is only through the firm institutionalization – almost sanctification – of due process that liberal democracies can legitimately curtail the randomness, secretiveness, and exclusive character inherent in the exercise of political power” (p. 6). Markovits and Silverstein (1988) have argued that the logic of due process is fundamental to liberal democracies so that the adherence to formal procedures and to the rule of law is valued above all else so that the tension between power and process lies at the heart of liberal democracies. Furthermore,
Crucial to this system is the public character of politics: politics is only legitimate if it takes place in public. Anything latent, hidden, or not readily apparent is dismissed by liberal theory as nonexistent, or as a matter to be relegated to the private, nonpolitical, realm of social life. To the liberal, the political game must be open and accessible. The liberal's inherent distrust of political power is lessened by a political process defined by strict rules, procedures, and public scrutiny. The liberal conscience extols process; in fact, the celebration of process is perhaps the only 'collective' value in a political arrangement founded on a profound individualism and commitment to personal freedom. To the liberal, the process is the public interest and hence any attempt to escape from the strict rules of the political process—regardless of the ultimate goals—is contrary to the common good. (p. 6)

The violation of process is central to political scandals and political scandals occur at the intersection of power and process, according to Markovits and Silverstein (1988). In all, the "rituals of political scandals and their resolutions take the abstract values of liberal democracy and make them tangible and visible. They reaffirm for the citizenry that the process does work, that it does curtail the arbitrary exercise of political power, and that the political system by and large deserves the support and loyalty of all citizens" (p. 9). In this way, Markovits and Silverstein (1998) argue that it is a betrayal of the public trust in terms of accountability and process of the liberal democratic state that is the breach that marks a political scandal. They further argue that "the resolution of the scandals' challenge to the system is a reaffirmation and strengthening of the public's faith in that system. What begins as an abuse of the liberal tradition inevitably culminates in a celebration of the values of that tradition" (p. 9). In all, Markovits and Silverstein (1988) claim that political scandal arises, not from the status of the individuals involved, but from the nature of the transgression. Thus, a political scandal necessarily involves a 'violation of due process'. Due process here describes "the legally binding rules and procedures which govern the exercise of political power" (Thompson, 2000, p. 91). The
rules and procedures are inherently public and inclusive so that the political game is seen as open and accessible, while the exercise of power in contrast, is necessarily private and exclusive so that power is often exercised in a way that is secretive and hidden from view. As a result, Markovits and Silverstein (1988) argue that political scandals often arise at the point where the logic of due process overlaps with the logic of power. This theoretical perspective is particularly useful for an examination of the discursive role of Royal Commissions of Inquiry in response to political scandals in Canada.  

### The Somalia Affair as a Political Scandal

As we saw in the preceding section, a scandal is defined as conduct that offends moral sentiments or a sense of decency; as actions, events or circumstances that were grossly discreditable; and as circumstances or actions that offends propriety or established moral conceptions or disgraces those associated with it. The events and circumstances of the Somalia Affair certainly offended moral sentiments and propriety in Canadian society, were grossly discreditable, and disgraced those associated with it. In these ways, the Somalia Affair can be defined as a scandal. It consisted of a number of events and actions that involved moral transgressions, and those moral transgressions

25 Thompson (2000) critiques Markovits and Silverstein’s (1988) approach. He states that the connection between power and process they posit means that scandals can only occur in liberal democracies which is not the case. In addition, he argues that this position excludes scandals that involve political figures, sex, or financial interest as political scandals. Despite these obvious limitations, Markovits and Silverstein’s (1988) theory on political scandals remains very useful for this research project.

26 For an excellent discussion on the critiques of political scandals, see Thompson (2000). Here, the no-consequence theory and trivialization theory are outlined, which are addressed in the argument I’ve presented in this chapter.
received negative public attention and response. Particularly sensitive norms at the time were transgressed, such as peacekeeping and multiculturalism. In addition, the Somalia Affair also dealt with norms of political power as the scandal continued via the focus on Kim Campbell’s role and an alleged cover-up. Furthermore, the moral transgressions involved visible government or state officers, especially in the visibility of Canadian peacekeepers and the fact that they are seen to represent the very beliefs that were transgressed, as well as the specific government officials implicated in the affair. In addition, throughout the disclosure of the affair in the media, there was certainly a process of ‘moralization’ where the values that were transgressed were espoused and reaffirmed and this was particularly noticeable in the media coverage about what was appropriate and right that circled around the discussions of the Somalia Affair. This moral discourse was also evident in the public hearings and the final report of the commission, which I will explore in depth in the following chapter. Finally, the Somalia Affair, like many scandals, had evidence of a second-order transgression, whereby attention began to shift away from the original transgressions to the actions and efforts to conceal the transgressions. This occurred in both the media coverage, when the focus shifted to Kim Campbell and her involvement after the original events and circumstances were discussed, as well as in the commission itself when the inquiry took a 4-month time period to investigate issues of cover-up and documentation destruction rather than the events and circumstances of the Somalia Affair itself. Interestingly, the second order transgression in the Somalia Affair certainly revolved around rules of law via the document destruction issue, as well as attention to the processes and systems of the National Defence Headquarters and the Canadian Forces.
Besides the fact that moral transgressions occurred in the Somalia Affair, other characteristics of scandals can be noted in the affair as well. For instance, the affair became known to non-participants in the events via the media coverage of the affair, beginning in April 1993. Through this media coverage, the Somalia Affair became a public affair and was also involved in a drama of concealment and disclosure amongst the government officials and those involved in the affair and the media personnel that were trying to uncover what really happened in Somalia. This drama continued to occur within the commission, as another public affair, as witnesses and their lawyers often tried to limit or control the information that was shared to the commission, and the commissioners and their counsel attempted to force the disclosure of as much information as possible around the affair.

Not only did non-participants of the affair become aware of the events, but they also appeared to disapprove of the circumstances and this was publicly expressed and denounced within the media coverage of the affair, letters to the editors, editorials and the amount of coverage among other indicators. While media coverage may not be the ideal manner by which to take the pulse of the public, it is one of the limited ways to do so. Thus, the media coverage of the uncovering of the events of the affair can be considered the scandal’s ‘responses of others’ and helped to build the state of the affairs, which may help explain why the Somalia Affair began to be more about the second-order transgression. Again, the responses of others, via the media coverage, tended to take the form of ‘moralizing discourse’ and thus the actions of the military and the government officials involved in the transgressions were reproached, rebuked, scolded and
condemned. Not surprisingly, the ‘responses of others’ became dominated by the commissioners (and the media coverage of the commission) once the inquiry began, and clear evidence of moralizing discourse can be seen in both the public hearing transcripts as well as the final report. In both sites, the media coverage and the commission of inquiry, the moralizing discourse was used to show that the actions that occurred were shameful and thus brought shame to the individuals involved. Both the media coverage and the commission of inquiry implicated individuals who were involved and responsible for the transgressions – and all of this discourse took place in the public sphere and was publicly articulated which meant that there was certainly a risk to those individual’s reputations. The reputation of peacekeepers as well as specific military officials like Beno and even bureaucrats like Gonalez were under siege in the Somalia Affair. Risking individual reputations is another characteristic of scandals, and in the Somalia Affair, this occurred in both the media coverage and the commission of the inquiry. In all, a scandal must have a transgression of norms that is made public, is subject to disapproval, is publicly denounced and runs the risk of destroying the reputations of individuals and organizations involved. As we can see, the Somalia Affair certainly meets these criteria and thus, can safely be characterized as a scandal.

In addition, the Somalia Affair meets the criteria for a specifically political scandal as well. According to the literature, a political scandal must concern the political field so that it involves state institutions and state actors. The Somalia Affair certainly centered on both state institutions and actors. For instance, the Somalia Affair’s original transgressions involved Canadian military personnel who were employed by the
Government of Canada via the Canadian Forces organization. Of course, Canadian politicians and bureaucrats were responsible for sending the Canadian military personnel to Somalia in the first place, also clearly state actors. As the affair wore on, other state actors began to get involved, including military and civilian bureaucrats from various state institutions like the Department of National Defence. These individuals ranged from low-ranking employees to highly visible political figures such as the Minister of Defence at the time Kim Campbell, and well-ranked and respected generals in the Canadian military like Generals Beno and Vernon.

It is partially because the individuals involved in the Somalia Affair are actors of the state, and based in state institutions, that the transgressions have more consequence in political scandals. This certainly appears to be the case in the Somalia Affair as well as the transgressions that occurred seem to provoke a very serious public response, presumably because they were done by Canadian peacekeepers, and because the alleged cover-up involved powerful and high-ranking political figures. Furthermore, the actions and events of the Somalia Affair did indeed appear to create a deficit of legitimation in the political system as a result of the actors’ involvement. The questioning of the systems used in the DND and the CF can be seen throughout the discussion around the Somalia Affair in the media and in the commission, such as the exposure of the discipline problems in the CAR and questioning why the CAR was sent in the first place, among other things. In these ways, the Somalia Affair can be seen to be not just a scandal in Canadian society, but as a political scandal that involved crucial state actors and institutions, involved moral transgressions of greater consequence as a result, and
culminated in a deficit of legitimation in the political system. Understanding the Somalia Affair as a political scandal, and using the particular theoretical perspective put forward by scholars interested in political scandals, helps to explain the communication functions of the Royal Commission in the Somalia Affair, as I will show in the following chapters where I present my findings.
CHAPTER SIX: METHODOLOGY

As I noted in the introduction of this dissertation, I follow a broadly defined discourse analytic approach in this study. In this way, I understand discourse to refer to both the talk and text that occurs in social practice (Tonkiss; 2004; Wood & Kroger, 2000). Such a wide definition is useful as it allows the researcher to consider all spoken and written forms of language use within the study of discourse. This definition further sees that language use is a means of accomplishing something, and thus, is considered a social practice versus just a descriptive tool or medium of communication, for instance. Beyond the definition of discourse that I utilize from this field, I also follow its important theoretical approach that it brings to language and language use in action. For instance, I follow discourse analysis’ concern with the use of language and endeavour to investigate the production of meaning through talk and texts. In this way, I see language as something that constructs and organizes social reality rather than simply a neutral medium to communicate information. In a related manner, I am interested, like many
discourse analysts in examining how people use language to construct their accounts of the social world (Tonkiss, 2004). In all, I understand discourse as constructed and constructive, as action-oriented, as situated and often oriented to argument (Potter, 2004).

While I follow the major underlying theoretical assumptions of discourse analysis in this study, it is important to note that I have not followed any particular field of discourse analysis here. That is, while I generally adopt a similar definition and approach to the use of language that is found within the vast field of discourse analysis, I don’t follow any particular camp to the letter. While I certainly appreciate and acknowledge the fields of discourse analysis (like conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, the ethnography of communication, Foucauldian research, or discursive psychology, among many others), none of these approaches suited my particular project in its empirical application. Instead, I follow a more general approach to discourse analysis as laid out in Gubrium and Holstein’s (2003) work on analyzing interpretive practice. Nonetheless, the general approach to the research study that is outlined in Potter and Wetherell’s (1987) ten stages of discourse analysis is useful as a rough frame for discussing how I conducted this study as well.

According to Potter and Wetherell (1987), there are ten important stages that a researcher follows when doing a discourse analytic research project. The next section of the dissertation will discuss the way that I approached each of these stages in this particular research project. As I will display, some of these stages were condensed.
Research Questions

When I first began identifying a research interest for this dissertation, there were some notable Canadian political scandals occurring, and in turn, some notable commissions of inquiry appointed at the federal government level. Both the Maher Arar scandal as well as the Sponsorship scandal received a great deal of media coverage and interest, and the appointed commissions of inquiry that followed piqued my interest tremendously. I was curious as to why a commission of inquiry was used as the apparent, or at least publicly visible, ‘mechanism of choice’ as a governmental response to such a scandal. I began looking into commissions and public inquiries in the literature and located a number of criticisms against these institutions – that they are stall tactics, that they allow for decisions that have already been made to be carried out in public, that they are time-wasters and generally do not amount to any real kind of influence. Yet, because many of these studies didn’t appear to look at the discourse-in-action in a commission, I remained curious about what might be going on ‘behind the scenes’, and particularly, in the discourse, within a commission that might help (or not help) to explain the fact that these institutions were being utilized more and more frequently as of late when a major scandal hits in Canadian politics. I focused in on the relationship between scandals and commissions rather early, and was interested in why a commission was frequently established when a major Canadian political scandal hit. What is it about commissions that make them a reasonable response to scandal I wondered? With this admittedly broad interest in mind, I began to investigate a sample with which to tackle these questions.
Sample Selection

The selection of a sample for this study took a surprisingly long time. At the same time that I was learning about commissions, their functions, their roles and various pieces, I was spending a great amount of time identifying the various commissions that have occurred at a federal level and trying to select which commissions would be useful and interesting for a study geared in this direction. In order to ensure that my sample was logical, if not necessarily representational (as it simply couldn't be), I looked for a list of public inquiries that have occurred in Canada at a federal level to help me make my selection. I quickly discovered that an up-to-date comprehensive list of the public inquiries in Canada didn't exist, and so I began to piece together various sources, academic and governmental, to make a reverse-chronological list of the federal commissions of inquiry in Canada (see Appendix A).27 With this list in hand, I began attempting to categorize the commissions in order to create a manageable sample. At times throughout the process, I had anywhere from 3-5 commissions in my sample, with themes such as military-related issues, national security-related commissions, and major Canadian scandals, for instance. In the end, and with the very useful advice of my supervisory committee, I decided that because I really wanted to take a detailed, in-depth examination of the discourse within a commission, studying more than one commission in this manner would've been beyond the scope of a dissertation research project. Commissions, especially recent commissions, are incredibly lengthy and document heavy beasts, and tend to carry great amounts of data with them. This is a very beneficial

27 George Fletcher's (1967) and Denise Ledoux's (1980) works were particularly helpful in this regard.
situations as a researcher interested in the discourse, but also means that investigating a commission at a discursive level is very time-consuming. Thus, I decided to look for a unique single case to examine. In deciding on this approach, I follow a social constructivist case study outlined in Stark and Torrance (2006) in this research study. According to Stark and Torrance (2006):

...case study seeks to engage with and report the complexity of social activity in order to represent the meanings that individual social actors bring to those settings and manufacture in them. Case study assumes that ‘social reality’ is created through social interaction, albeit situated in particular context and histories, and seeks to identify and describe before trying to analyse and theorize. It assumes that things may not be as they seem and privileges in-depth inquiry over coverage: understanding ‘the case’ rather than generalizing to a population at large. (p.33)

In this way, I opted to focus on one scandal and one commission in order to be able to dig deep and investigate ‘what was going on’ discursively in detail in the commission. As I mentioned, the length and associated documents within royal commissions meant that I had to choose between studying multiple commissions on a surface level or one commission in an in-depth discursive manner and for this research project, it was much more important to investigate what was going on in detail. Later research work that builds on this single case study approach can be built on the findings from this in-depth look.

Stark and Torrance (2006) also note that this approach to case study research derives much of its rationale and methods from ethnography (and is aligned with symbolic interactionism, phenomenology and ethnomethodology as well). This kind of approach is beneficial to a study on the discourse within a commission because it allows
the use of multiple data sources to explore and interrogate an ‘instance in action’ (Stark and Torrance, 2006, 33). Further, it helps to achieve a ‘rich description’ and produces research that “is particular, descriptive, inductive and ultimately heuristic – it seeks to ‘illuminate’ the readers’ understanding of an issue” (Stark and Torrance, 2006, 33). These are the goals that I sought to achieve in this research project.

To identify the single case, I spent two weeks at the National Archives in Ottawa in the summer of 2005 examining transcripts and documents associated with a shortlist of commissions that I had prepared as possibilities for further examination. Eventually, I found that the Somalia Affair and its commission presented the unique case that I was looking for, and was well-suited for an examination of this kind. The Royal Commission on the Somalia Affair was selected as my case study for a number of reasons. The Somalia Affair, occurring over a period of roughly four years from 1993 – 1997 and consisting of a number of events, most notably the torture and death of a Somali man at the hands of a Canadian soldier while on a peace enforcement mission in Somalia, shook the nation. The major military scandal in Canada had significant repercussions for the Canadian military and for military-civilian relations and government spending for the ten years that followed. In fact, those involved in the affair are still feeling the effects of association (Pugliese, 2008). The fact that this was a major political scandal in Canada, with lasting effects, was an important factor in selecting this as my case. Also, this was a scandal that had occurred recently, but not so recently, that the majority of the affair was still undergoing investigation or much publicity. In addition, this case was a particularly useful one as the commission was extensive, with many public hearing sessions and a
large final report, and with all of the commission documents collected onto a CD-Rom, meaning that much data was available and easily accessible for the research. Finally, the Somalia Affair also seemed to present a unique case in that the scandal wasn’t resolved as a result of the inquiry. In this way, the narrative of the Somalia Affair was still ‘untidy’ and questionable following the inquiry. This is interesting from the research perspective that I adopted, and so, investigating why the discourse wasn’t more consistent from the inquiry made this case even more appropriate.

One of the challenges in using a case study approach tends to be drawing feasible boundaries around the case itself for study. In this project, I used the media coverage of the Somalia Affair, as well as the affair itself to guide me. For instance, the media coverage in Canada on the Somalia mission began in March 1992 and continued on to cover the events and the commission until Dec. 1997. The events that made up the Somalia Affair, as well as the relevant pre-affair events (including the pre-deployment issues, the deaths, the cover-up, etc.) also are included in roughly this time frame. Finally, the commission itself, that took place from 1995 – 1997, helped to determine the boundaries of the case. In all, the media coverage, the commission and the Somalia mission itself, helped to orient me to the social and historical context of action, as well as the action itself, of the case (Ragin and Becker, 1992).

Once I had my case selected, I reworked my research question to reflect the narrower focus of my investigation. As I listed in the introduction, my guiding research question for the rest of the investigation became: what communication functions and/or roles did the Somalia Commission of Inquiry play when responding to the Somalia
scandal in Canada? With this question in hand, I aimed to describe and understand the communication function(s) of the royal commission when responding to the Somalia scandal in Canada.

Collecting Documents and Transcription

To investigate the communication function of the royal commission on Somalia, I utilized primary documentary sources from the commission itself. These sources included the commission documents including the transcripts of public hearings, the final report, written submissions, research reports, newspaper articles, and historical and contextual books and articles around the affair and the commission. The commission documents themselves were conveniently put together as a compendium of information on a CD-Rom by the commission and released into public records with the publication of the final report. This made the collection of documents from the commission particularly straightforward. Every document that was associated with the commission, and released for public record, was available on the CD-Rom and I was able to attain a copy of this via the libraries at both University of Calgary and Laurentian University. This CD-Rom included all of the transcripts from the public hearing proceedings (including the procedural transcripts, pre-deployment transcripts and the in-theatre transcripts), as well as written submissions to the commission, historical documents of the commission, and the complete final report of the commission (executive summary and volumes 1 – 5). It also included the ten research studies that were commissioned as part of the commission and
the transcripts and documents of the court martials associated with the Somalia Affair, as well as the military inquiry records. In all, the documentary sources from the commission alone were many, and totaled close to 50,000 pages of data for analysis. Because the relevant commission documents were kept and located in one place via the CD-Rom, I was able to easily print out the data in order to analyze it, making the collection of data an efficient process. As well, the transcription of the data was already completed.

In addition to the commission documents that I used to analyze, I also relied on media reports before, during and after the scandal and the commission (between March 1992 through to Dec. 1997), found within 5 major English Canadian newspapers (Globe and Mail, National Post, Toronto Star, Calgary Herald and Vancouver Sun) to investigate the coverage of the Somalia Affair and its commission. These reports were pulled from two electronic databases located within the University of Calgary library holdings (Canadian Newsstand, and Globe and Mail on CD-Rom). Finally, I used books and articles on the Somalia Affair itself to help understand the historical and social context of the scandal within the nation. Work by Bercuson (1997), Dawson (2007), and Desbarats (1997), as well as the final report of the commission itself were particularly useful in this regard.

In all, the documentary sources were many and I performed discourse analysis to investigate my aim, relying on primary, documentary sources that were public and external. This was an appropriate method to investigate the discourse within the Somalia commission mainly, because it was the only way of accessing the data that exists. While there were a few royal commissions that were ongoing throughout this dissertation
project (i.e. the Gomery Inquiry and the Air India Inquiry, for instance), it was impractical to sit and observe a full inquiry for time and methodological reasons. Because it is the discourse that is of interest for this research project, using textual sources that encapsulate the discourse used in a commission was the most efficient and useful way to obtain the data. Thus, analyzing textual sources was an appropriate method for this project, not only because it was a logical way to gain access to the data, but also because it allowed the workings of the commission to be evident ‘in situ’. Both backstage and frontstage processes were evident in this data set and this approach allowed for the commission to be analyzed within its context – displaying the discourse as it happened.

For a related reason, I decided against doing interviews with the commission participants. I was interested in examining the discourse as it happened, versus how people interpreted the discourse, and thus, interviews would not have provided me with the kind of data I required for a project with these goals. With that said, I can see how interviews with key Somalia commission participants would be an interesting way to check my analysis in a future research project. In other words, a next step for this research may be to move beyond the discourse itself and to ask the participants themselves what they thing was going on ‘discursively’ in the commission. This, naturally, is a different research goal than the one posed here, but future interviews would be an interesting option when considering next steps.
Coding/focusing and Analysis

After identifying the research question/s, selecting the sample, collecting documents and transcribing, Potter and Wetherell (1987) note that the next stage of discourse analytic research is to code or focus the large amounts of printed material that usually results in this approach. Coding helps in this regard by assigning a code (or name) to sections of the data which contain a theme or feature so that similar ‘features’ can be pulled together for selective examination. This leads to the question, ‘how does one know which feature to look for?’ In practice, most analysts begin with some notion of what they wish to investigate (Bozic, Leadbetter & Stringer, 1998). However, in the initial coding stages of the data, I took an open approach and looked at ‘what was going on’ broadly in the commission documents themselves.28 I began by examining the final report, for instance, highlighting passages and phrases that I found interesting and of note. Then I moved on to the procedural transcripts, and the pre-deployment transcripts, doing similar general textual analysis work. I relied greatly on my experience critically examining texts from both English literature studies and communication studies to this effect. The difficulty in describing how textual analysis work gets done sometimes indicates that it is easy or fast work. This was not the case in this research project. In fact, working my way through the data was a long and time-consuming project. When each transcript was approximately 150-200 pages long, analyzing ‘what was going on discursively’ with very little direction or focus at this stage was an interesting and time-

28 In this way, my particular textual analytic approach generally followed the three-step coding process outlined in Neuman (2006).
intensive exercise. Nonetheless, after approximately 6 months of this initial analysis work, certain features of the discourse within the commission, especially within the transcripts, began to be identifiable. For instance, I noted in my analysis diary that issues of power and politics between the commissioners, the lawyers and the witnesses, for example, were at play. It was easy to see in the discourse the tensions between certain players in the commission as well as when certain individuals were shown respect, etc. so issues of power seemed to be prevalent within the discourse. Similarly, I noticed that a major feature of the discourse was the prevalence of many normative statements, so that much of the discourse was focused on, or centered on values (such as fairness, equality, discipline, trust, to name a few). I also noticed the related differences in approaches to these value statements at times from the different players, as well as the fact that there was a heavy focus on documents and process for instance. Many other features were identified as well (such as elements of performance and publicness, hedging discursive work, role of particular players like government counsel interesting). From this, I began to center on the features of the discourse that I found to be most prevalent, and started to put these into broader categories. Thus, in the first stage of coding or analysis, I condensed the mass of data into broad categories in terms of the prevalence of features. Here, I tried to bring interesting and prevalent discursive features in the Somalia commission to the surface from deep inside the textual data. And as frequently happens with initial thoughts about significant features of the data, these ideas and codes were revised after analysis revealed that even more clear and comprehensive patterns could be delineated. This cycle of (re)coding and (re)analysis was repeated many times as I moved
towards new and more refined ways of dealing with the commission data (Bozic, Leadbetter & Stringer, 1998).

In the next stage of my analysis, I used the organized set of initial codes to return to the data, and to attempt to make connections among the codes as well as elaborate on the concepts that the codes directed attention towards. During this second stage, the analysis of the data was more focused because it was framed by the initial codes. No longer was I generally analyzing the data to see ‘what was going on discursively’, but I was looking for signs of value talk, process and power, etc. While additional codes emerged during this time (notably, the concern with documents in the commission discourse became more apparent), the main goal was to review and examine the initial codes to see how concepts or categories clustered together. Here, making sense of the categories and their connections was the ultimate goal and things that were initially noticed, either tended to be discarded as not prevalent within the discourse, or were incorporated as part of a bigger tendency/code in the analysis. By this point in the data analysis process, the commission data had been returned to numerous times, and the initial coding exercise was particularly useful in directing attention to, and away, from broader categories and their connections.

Finally, I started with the last stage of my coding process. Here, the major codes had been identified so the data was scoured again in order to find cases that illustrate the themes and to continue to make comparisons and contrasts. In this stage, the overall analysis began to be organized around several core ideas and led more coherently to the data analysis presented in the following chapters.
By following this approach, I employed an inductive, qualitative research design and thus took a 'bottom-up' method in my study, moving from specific observations to more general theories. Using this kind of approach meant following an open-ended, exploratory approach to social research, and efforts were made to avoid assumptions about what the findings were going to be before the data was collected and analyzed because of the belief that the theory arises after the collection and analysis of data. I began with specific observations and measures of the data, then started to detect patterns, formulated some tentative ideas to explore, and then, finally, ended up developing some general conclusions.

From a more theoretical perspective, I followed the suggestions of Gubrium and Holstein (2003) in their ‘analyzing interpretive practice’ approach to qualitative inquiry. These authors note a movement in qualitative inquiry, where traditional attempts to document the process by which social reality is constructed, managed, and sustained with the emphasis on investigating how social reality is constructed (such as Schutz’s social phenomenology, Berger and Luckmann’s social constructionism, Blumer’s symbolic interactionism, and perhaps most successfully, Garfinkel’s ethnomethodology), is now being met with an interest in “what is being accomplished, under what conditions, and out of what resources” (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003, p. 215). That is, the interest at the detailed textual level as to how meaning is constructed is now being considered in terms of the context in which the text occurs, highlighting the broad cultural and institutional contexts of meaning making and social order. As Gubrium and Holstein (2003) explain:
The emerging empirical horizons, although still centered on processes of social accomplishment, are increasingly viewed in terms of ‘interpretive practice’ – the constellation of procedures, conditions, and resources through which reality is apprehended, understood, organized, and conveyed in everyday life. Interpretive practice engages both the hows and the whats of social reality; it is centered both in how people methodically construct their experiences and their worlds and in the configurations of meaning and institutional life that inform and shape their reality-constituting activity. (pp. 215)

This perspective draws on phenomenology, ethnomethodology and contemporary studies of institutional and historical discourses presented by Foucault, as outlined in depth by Gubrium and Holstein (2003). Summarizing how these conceptual foundations come together for these authors in their interpretive practice is not as useful here, in my opinion, as noting how this perspective tends to be well-suited within this particular research project. In this research study, a focus on social interaction at the everyday level was certainly evident. That is, discourse-in-practice was of interest and analyzed, most directly within the transcripts of the commission’s public hearings, for instance. Also, broader cultural discursive practices was of interest and analyzed within this research project, as seen in the discussion of moral talk within the commission documents, for example. In this way, the focus of this research study was on the “interactional, institutional, and cultural variabilities of socially constituting discursive practice and discourses-in-practice”, and is thus, “concerned with how the social construction process is shaped across various domains of everyday life” (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003, p. 228). In all, discourse was very much analyzed at the “crossroads of institutions, culture and social interaction” within this research project (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003, p. 228-229).
Validation/Report Writing

The final related stages of discourse analytic work, according to Potter and Wetherell (1987) are to validate the interpretation and write the report. The authors suggest testing the interpretation with the participants to see if it makes sense to them, and as I noted above, I believe that this would be an important next step in this research project. Another way to validate the interpretation is to write the research report, and to provide enough transcript data to enable the reader to judge the quality of the interpretation made. The next chapters in which the data analysis is presented, serves the validation and report writing purpose of this project.
Thus far in the dissertation, I have described what Royal Commissions of Inquiry in Canada are and how they generally function, outlined the Somalia Affair and its commission in Canada, argued that the Somalia Affair was a moment of moral dissonance in Canadian political history, and laid out the theoretical framework that I’m using to better understand what communication function Royal Commissions play to make them an arena in which to respond to political scandals like the Somalia Affair. In this chapter, and the three others that follow it, I illustrate this argument through the in-depth textual analysis that I performed on the commission documents. From the analysis, I demonstrate that two notable communication functions were predominant in the Somalia commission discourse. Firstly, the commission is a place where ‘value talk’ occurs. That is, the commission is a place where the transgressed norms – peacekeeping, multiculturalism, and transparency/accountability – were discussed, defined, debated and even reaffirmed. Secondly, the discourse in the commission is heavily procedural in nature. The importance of process and formality is frequently made clear in the texts of
the commission, and this is often intimately connected to issues of power within the commission itself.

As I will illustrate, these values and procedures that can be identified within the discourse of the commission are found in varying places throughout the commission documents that I examined — in the transcripts of the public hearings (procedural hearings, pre-deployment hearings, and in-theatre hearings), in the final report produced for the commission (executive summary as well as Volumes 1-5) and as well in the written submissions to the commission, the historical documents of the commission and the research reports for the commission. In my analysis, I found that the transcripts of the public hearings and the final report were particularly fruitful with talk of values and procedures. This will be evident from the following discussion as I outline where evidence of debate and definition of the values of peacekeeping (chapter seven), multiculturalism (chapter eight) and accountability/transparency (chapter nine) occurred in the commission discourse, as well as the emphasis on process and procedure (chapter ten).

Peacekeeping as a value is covered in considerable depth within the commission discourse, and much definitional work is done around this concept. Often, the discussion around peacekeeping is framed in terms of binary oppositions so that what is a peacekeeper, for instance, is presented as the opposite to the definition of a soldier; or peacekeeping is what Canadians do, not what Americans do, etc.. We can see this at work in the final report, for example. After outlining the five characteristics that differentiate airborne forces like the CAR from more conventional forces (i.e. air mobility; quick
reaction; flexibility in terms of tactical deployment; lightness of equipment; and suitability to low-intensity conflicts such as peacekeeping or peace enforcement), the report reads that “some would contend that there is a basic incompatibility between the elite parachutist’s creed, including a commitment to fight on to the objective and never surrender, and the peacekeeper’s constabulary ethic, which requires a commitment to the minimum use of force” (p. 26). Here, the soldier who is trained to ‘never surrender’ is put into a binary opposition with a peacekeeper who uses a ‘minimum use of force’. By opposing these two concepts, peacekeeping is being defined as entailing the opposite kind of work of the soldier. Of course, this excerpt is also interesting for the use of the phrase ‘some would content’ as a preface, as this seems to imply that it is not the commissioners (or the authors of the report)\(^{29}\) that necessarily take this view, but that they don’t necessarily disagree with this view either. However, the evidence that the commissioners do in fact align themselves with the belief that the CAR was inherently a questionable unit to send to Somalia as peacekeepers is more clear in the statement that wraps up this section. Here, the commissioner’s note that ‘the question for us was whether the selection of a paratroop unit with this different ethic as Canada’s UN standby unit could be offset by proper training preparations’ (p. 26). This is telling in that the commissioners are noting that the ethic of the CAR as was presented above, is a ‘different ethic’ than one that Canada’s UN standby unit should hold. Furthermore, this inappropriate ethic, as presented here, is made even more clear by the presumption that

\(^{29}\) For the purposes of this analysis, I will refer to the authors of this report as the commissioners. While the commissioners themselves didn’t pen every word in this report, the final report is understood to be ‘signed off’ by the commissioners and is to represent their beliefs and opinions about the situation. That is, it is to represent their work. As a result, and to make the analysis more clear, I will discuss the report in terms of the commissioners’ work.
'proper training preparations' could be used to 'offset' this problem. Definitional work on the value of peacekeeping is certainly being accomplished in statements like this, and here we also begin to see glimpses of the importance of process and procedure as a value, so that ‘proper training’ would actually work to overcome the improper selection of the CAR as a unit selected for station in Somalia.

In a related manner, peacekeeping as a value is defined in contrast to war in the report, and this is often tied to beliefs and statements about the appropriate kind of training for soldiers. For instance, when discussing the training used to prepare Canadian Forces’ personnel for missions, the commissioners make the normative statement that “peacekeeping, and even peace enforcement, differ fundamentally from the conduct of war” (p. 28). The report continues to point out that General Purpose Combat Training (GPCT) is the “traditional method of preparing to wage war”, which involves basic soldiering skills, including firing specific weapons, throwing grenades, achieving fitness standards, applying military first aid, performing individual fieldcraft, performing nuclear/biological/chemical defence, applying mind awareness, navigating using a map and compass, communicating using communications equipment, and identifying fighting vehicles and aircraft. (p. 28)

The report positions this kind of training as ‘the traditional method of preparing to wage war’ and thus, is naturally combat oriented (p. 28). In contrast, the next statement after this description of GPCT reads that “In the Canadian Forces, GPCT forms the basis for peacekeeping training” (p. 28). By citing peacekeeping training directly after this list of combat-oriented training, the commissioners appear to be making a normative statement about the inadequacy of GPCT for peacekeeping missions, and thus, work to define what
peacekeeping is, or should be – non-combat-related – as a value. This inappropriateness is made even clearer later in the report when the commissioners state that

Today’s soldiers must be more than avid warriors. They must exercise skills that fit more naturally within the realms of civilian policing, diplomacy and social service....Suffice to say that a mix of generic and mission-specific training beyond GPCT seems to be required. Peacekeeping soldiers require an understanding of the peacekeeper’s roles and responsibilities; they must learn advanced techniques of negotiation and conflict resolution to be effective; the diversity of their assignments demands sensitivity to issues of intercultural relations; they require an appreciation of the full gamut of UN procedures affecting such matters as the establishment of buffer zones, the supervision and monitoring of cease-fires, and the protection of humanitarian relief efforts. The modern peacekeeper must know how to establish and maintain law and order, impose crowd control, conduct searches, and handle detainees, while at the same time lending assistance to relief efforts and co-operating with humanitarian agencies. These general skills must be supplemented by an acquired knowledge of the language, culture, geography, history, and political background of the theatre of operations. (p. 28)

This example is an excellent one to display the way that definitional work is done within the discourse of the commission. Here, peacekeeping as a value is defined explicitly. In this way, peacekeepers are defined in the commission as not being avid warriors. Instead, they are described as following more civilian policing-type roles, focusing on diplomacy and social service. Furthermore, peacekeeping, as defined in this excerpt, involves negotiation and conflict resolution as well as sensitivity to intercultural relations (i.e. a multiculturalism ethic). Peacekeeping is also defined to include work under UN-type guidelines so that protecting humanitarian relief efforts is a priority, as is keeping warring factions apart and maintaining cease-fires. Furthermore, peacekeeping defined as creating and keeping law and order, imposing crowd control, and aiding humanitarian agencies, all in the context of a well-versed education on the linguistic, cultural, geographical,
historical, and political background of the area in which they are situated. This definition of peacekeeping reads like a traditional understanding of the value in Canadian socio-history, as we saw in chapter four, and shows how values like peacekeeping are defined within the discourse of the Somalia Commission. This particular excerpt also works to show how values like peacekeeping are not only defined, but are also reasserted in the commission discourse, as this particular definition tends to follow an understanding of the value as has been generally presented to, and understood by, the Canadian public.

Another excellent example to illustrate how definitional work around values like peacekeeping gets accomplished within the commission discourse can be found when the discussion turns to the underlying principles of ‘traditional’ and ‘non-traditional peacekeeping. Within the final report, the consent of parties to receive the peacekeeping forces is noted as a fundamental principle under the definition of ‘traditional peacekeeping’, as is the non-use of coercive force. Coercive force, in this case, is cited as possibly diminishing the peacekeeper’s ability to mediate and facilitate within the ‘traditional’ understanding of the value. Finally, impartiality is reported as the third basic principle of traditional peacekeeping, with the rationale being that impartial troops are more likely to be accepted by the conflicting parties (p. 187-188). Under the heading, the ‘characteristics of non-traditional peacekeeping’ in the final report, the changing nature of the missions for peacekeepers are listed. For example, the report notes that while traditional peacekeeping forces monitored a cease-fire line between states, now, peacekeeping missions regularly involve dealing with internal conflict, which present new challenges such as ‘irregular forces, the absence of front lines or cease-fire lines, the
dynamic nature of conflict, major impact on civilians, and the collapse of state institutions” (p. 191). In addition, the report notes that “the mandates of peacekeeping missions have expanded to include such tasks as supervising elections, rebuilding national institutions (e.g. police forces) and delivering humanitarian assistance” and as well, “there has been a corresponding increase in the civilian and police components of peacekeeping missions” (p. 193). All in all, comments like these made throughout the report, work to help define what peacekeeping is and how it is evolving as a value. Thus, these kind of normative statements describe the value as it is to be commonly understood. Interestingly, by presenting the definition of peacekeeping as ‘traditional’ and ‘non-traditional’ the commissioners are at once defining and reasserting the value in a commonly understood manner (i.e. peacekeeping as generally understood by the Canadian public, as including consent of parties, non-use of coercive force and impartiality) and at the same time, are expanding and adjusting that definition to reflect the fact that values are not stagnantly defined. Thus, by including the definition of ‘non-traditional’ peacekeeping, the commissioners are allowing for the ‘traditional’ definition of peacekeeping to be reasserted (and explicitly defined), and at the same time, are attempting to present a new definition or understanding of the value of peacekeeping – one where conflict and an expanding definition of purposes are involved. Despite the adjusted definition that is presented here, the emphasis remains on tasks associated with humanitarian missions – that of supervising elections, rebuilding national institutions, and delivering humanitarian assistance, for instance. Thus, while the definition of the value of peacekeeping is defined as ‘presenting new challenges’, the focus for the commissioners and the report, at least, remains on the ‘helping’ function of peacekeeping, and thus,
downplays the role of force, or peace enforcement, that is generally understood to occur in today's missions.

Many other similar normative statements are made throughout the final report that help to define what peacekeeping as a Canadian value is all about. For instance, the following quote was directly inserted into the final report, taken from the Ottawa Citizen's David Rudd's editorial on Feb. 12, 1995. Noting the role of the modern peacekeeper, it reads:

The soldier of the 1990s must be flexible. He must be a diplomat, an aid worker, a policeman, as well as a warrior. He must exercise an unprecedented level of self-discipline by, in effect, programming himself to fit the prevailing situation...The soldier of the 1990s must be better educated than ever before. He must be acquainted with the political, military and socio-cultural dynamics of the crisis area...He must realize that as a representative of his country, his conduct will be held to extremely high standards (p. 559).

Again, there is evidence of definitional work of a value going on here. For instance, the 'soldier of the 1990s', is defined primarily in terms associated with peacekeeping. That is, soldiering is defined as work that entails diplomacy, aid, policing, warring, self-discipline, and political, military and socio-cultural education of the area. This is not generally the way that soldiering has been defined. Instead, 'the soldier of the 1990s' sounds a lot like the 'peacekeeper' as traditionally defined. Beyond the definitional work occurring here, this quote is also interesting for the interplay between the general public's definition of peacekeeping and the commission's. That is, by inserting a quote from an editorial from a popular Canadian newspaper, the commission is implicitly acknowledging its use of contextual information, from a broad Canadian perspective, to
help to define peacekeeping as a value. Thus, the definition of peacekeeping, or soldiering, that is being represented here, is being shown to be in-line with the general understanding of peacekeeping in Canadian society. Also, with the final statement in the quote, peacekeeping is noted to involve the representation of Canadians, as a value and as an action, which is an interesting move in terms of the discursive work being done in the commission. Thus, peacekeeping as defined in the commission discourse here, also entails representing the country and being judged by high societal standards.

Further definitional work is done on the peacekeeping value throughout the commission discourse. Particularly illustrative excerpts can be found around Canada’s connection to peacekeeping and its use of peacekeeping as a foreign policy and identity distinguisher from the United States. For instance, in the final report, there is the claim that “Peacekeeping is often held up as an important achievement of Canadian foreign and defence policy” and is the “‘sole military activity that Canadians fully support’” (p. 196). In addition, the report cites that “promoting global peace for the protection of Canada’s security remained a key element of Canada’s foreign policy” and notes that “peacekeeping has enhanced our international profile as a middle power in international affairs and is viewed by some as the reason for Canada’s stature and influence in the UN” (p. 197). Statements like these work to define peacekeeping as an important Canadian function in an international sense, and thus, also work to reassert the value as it has been traditionally presented. In addition, the role of peacekeeping as a distinctly Canadian enterprise, as compared to America for instance, is also noted in the commission discourse. For instance, the report notes that “peacekeeping has become a characteristic
Canadian métier, a function distinguishing us from Americans and reinforcing our sovereignty and independence. Americans were seen to fight wars, but Canadians pictured themselves as working for peace” (p. 198). This last statement is particularly telling in terms of the kind of definitional work being done in the discourse of the commission. By claiming that peacekeeping is often a distinguishing Canadian characteristic, it works to reassert the value as important in Canada. In addition, the use of the distinction between Americans and Canadians, works to further promote the value of peacekeeping as a particularly Canadian value.

At the same time, the debate around this value is noted within the final report. Outlining Canada’s historical role as peacekeeper in volume one, the report claims:

Despite Canada’s distinguished role as peacekeeper, the Canadian military has been reluctant to embrace peacekeeping as a priority in defence policy. Its first priority remains the retention and advancement of its combat capabilities for the protection of Canadians and their interests and values at home and abroad, notwithstanding the fact that since the end of the Cold War, combat responsibilities have greatly diminished. (p. 242)

Thus, while the definition of peacekeeping as a particularly Canadian value is reasserted in various places throughout the commission discourse, it is also clear that there is debate and discussion around this value, especially coming from the military side of Canadian culture. This also helps to display the differing values or systems of norms that operate within a society. While there is definitional work as well as assertive work being done around the value of peacekeeping, there is also evidence of public debate and discussion around the definition of this value as well, as is evidenced in statements like the one presented above.
Throughout the commission discourse, there is much more general definitional work that can be tied to the value of peacekeeping. For instance, discussing the role of the Canadian Forces, qualities like “fairness, decency, compassion, a strong sense of justice, and pride in our role as peacekeepers” are cited as imperative for leaders within the military – working to help define not only our national character, but interestingly, citing our role as peacekeepers as part of that character. Likewise, the report notes the importance of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms as guiding the Canadian Forces in terms of soldier development and argues:

The values Canadians expect their soldiers to demonstrate in their actions and conduct abroad as makers and keepers of peace may be gleaned from the Charter. These values include fairness, decency, respect for human rights, compassion, and a strong sense of justice. We believe that the characteristics and values of the CF – founded on the traditional core values as reinforced through great sacrifice in waging war and securing peace – can and must be adapted to accommodate the evolving character of Canadian society. (p. 1448)

This is a very strong normative statement about Canadian values and its soldiers. For instance, the excerpt highlights that ‘Canadians expect’ their soldiers, ‘as makers and keepers of peace’ to be fair, decent, respectful of human rights, etc.. Thus, here Canadian soldiers are defined as ‘makers and keepers of peace’ first and foremost, and as makers and keepers of peace, they are expected to uphold the values of the Canadian Charter, so that fairness, decency, respect for human rights, compassion and a sense of justice are understood as part of the job description for Canadian soldiers. The demand for Canadian soldiers to ‘adapt to accommodate the evolving character of Canadian society’ appears to be noting the discrepancy between the values that are traditionally associated with Canada, and Canadians, and those that are followed or defined by the military. Thus,
there is very little leeway in this definition of Canadian soldiers for an understanding that includes combat, force or traditionally understood war-based behavior or values. In this way, the commission discourse is defining peacekeeping as Canadian soldiers’ raison d’être in statements like these, and thus, is reasserting a traditional understanding of the value of peacekeeping as evidenced in Canadian popular imagination.

At the same time as the value of peacekeeping was defined and reasserted in a traditional manner, there were times when this value was defined in a very different manner, indicating the debate and discussion possible around a norm within commission discourse. For instance, throughout the public hearings, witnesses were often given ample room to postulate on their beliefs and opinions on everything from what occurred in Somalia, to the values that a good leader must have, to whether the CAR should have been disbanded. At one place in the public hearing transcripts, Colonel (Ret) Joly describes his experience with returning soldiers to Canada, and frames the peacekeeping value in a way that is very different than the traditional understanding of the value. He states:

And when I saw the repeated news reports of other Canadians who had been maimed and eventually saw them in NDMC [National Defence Medical Centre] when they returned to Canada and when I recognized the absolute horror in which – not horror, poor choice of words, but the terrible conditions under which we sent our troops to places like Yugoslavia where the warring factions did not allow them freedom of movement, where they use them for target practice, where they were tied to poles, where they expected air strikes to occur, where they were taken hostage by people who we were supposed to be trying to protect and support, I came to realize in my own mind that we should not be spilling Canadian blood in that ungrateful piece of soil that we have sent so many Canadians to and in which so many Canadians have died. And so I found it extremely difficult for me to be assembling contingents of young Canadian men and women who were my son’s age to be sent to that country. And I found it extremely difficult to look at them
when they came back and see the condition they were in, and recognize that nobody in Canada really gave a shit about what happened to them because they became a footnote in history. (Vol. 16, Wednesday, November 15, 1995, PG 3066)

This framing of peacekeeping is different than that which is generally put forward because it associates peacekeeping with casualties and carnage, victims, wasted youth, etc. This violent, bloody image of peacekeeping is not the traditional way that the value is framed in common Canadian discourse. In a similar way, the ‘peacekeeping’ that the Canadian soldiers did while in Somalia was framed in terms of a war context by quite a few of the witnesses, although there was textual evidence that not everyone viewed the situation in this light. Describing the ‘dangerous’ situation that they were in, Major Moreau testified:

So we had to assume, every time we left the camp, that everybody was a threat...They favoured ambushed and sniping attacks because they knew the city very well. They knew the lay of the ground so they could maximize the use of buildings, small alleys to try to attract us into sideroads and ambush us. Other tactics that they were using, at one point, one of the warlords distributed toy guns to kids, now when you’re patrolling late evening or early morning it’s not always easy to make the difference between a toy gun and a real weapon. That was done deliberately in the hope that somebody from the Coalition would shoot a kid so we would get bad publicity. (Vol. 52, Monday, April 1, 1996, PG 10351).

In other places too, when officers and sergeants were asked to testify as to their experiences in Somalia as background information for the commissioners, the danger that was present was often highlighted again. This seemed to work to support the need and use of force that the Canadian soldiers were using.
...I was trying to indicate that there was, in fact, some danger to these patrols. It wasn't just a matter of going downtown and walking around. From either this alley or one very similar just a little bit to the south of it, my patrol was fired on directly from this alley. Three shots were fired directly at my scouts who returned two shots into the alley and basically ended the firing right then. No casualties were found, but there was a requirement to carry weapons in the alert position particularly at night and be vigilant at all times because you never knew when something was going to happen. (Vol 54, Wednesday, April 3, 1996, PG 10713).

Sergeant Godfrey later makes an interesting comparison of the Somalia mission to the Rwanda mission, and notes that the Somalia mission was more rewarding because of the experiences they had there. It is an interesting statement, because here, Godfrey is positing the Canadian troops as soldiers versus peacekeepers and is making the issue of what soldiers do versus what peacekeepers do in value terms more clear. As he explains,

The two missions were different in the fact that Somalia was more a rewarding type of mission for an infantier because for years you train to do patrolling, clear and patrols, defensive routine, things like that and you never get to do it. When you go on a UN mission you don’t do any of those things. What you do is you stand at in OP or you patrol a route and you make sure that no one invades the green line. In Somalia, we were doing everything that we had trained to do and it was more satisfying. Rwanda was harder mentally because of the different – well, Rwanda was a lot of carnage and stuff like that. But I felt more satisfied with the Somalia mission for the simple fact that we were soldiering and we weren’t being a police force. (Vol 54, Wednesday, April 3, 1996, PG 10820)

In this example, the witness is presenting the work in Somalia as a traditional military mission by noting that they were ‘soldiering’ as opposed to more traditional peacekeeping work like policing. Rather than making sure ‘no one invades the green line’, the witness presents the soldiering work as more rewarding and enjoyable. Again, this is a different value of peacekeeping than the one generally presented and understood within popular Canadian understanding. This works to show, as I will illustrate further in the next section, that beyond straightforward definitions and reassertions of values like
peacekeeping, there was also debate occurring within the commission discourse as to how peacekeeping should be understood.

Beyond the definitional work being done within the commission discourse, there are also many examples of debate and discussion around the value of peacekeeping. Much of that debate centers on the appropriate use of force for Canadian peacekeepers, such as in the discussion of the difference between a peacekeeping and peace enforcement mission (of which Somalia was the latter). Clarifying how much force was okay to use in either context was a great preoccupation in the commission discourse. For instance, when a military witness in the public hearings is trying to describe peace enforcement, the chairman displays his confusion about the different levels of force that are permitted legally (Vol 2P, p. 49). The witness replies, noting the difference between a Chapter VI UN mission and a Chapter VII, where the first is usually associated with peacekeeping and the latter with peace enforcement missions. He notes, “there is certainly much greater scope under a Chapter VII for the use of force. That gradation would depend on the circumstances of the mission as to how much force was used” (Vol 2P, p. 50). This kind of discussion around the difference between peacekeeping and peace enforcement is evident in many places in the commission discourse, and particularly throughout the public hearings. For example, another witness, Commander McDougall, later defines peacekeeping by noting that in a peacekeeping mission there is consent by host country, impartiality on the part of the peacekeeping force, and force is only used in self-defense. In contrast, he explains that in a peace enforcement situation, no consent is necessary, there may or may not be elements of impartiality and the level of
use of force varies. He goes on to discuss issues of deadly and non-deadly force, as well as excessive use of force and minimum use of force. In all, these frequent discussions around the difference between a peacekeeping mission and a peace-enforcement mission work to display not only further definitional work that is done in the commission discourse around the value of peacekeeping, but also to show how the value is defined and understood differently by various parties or groups within society. Thus, differing norm systems are being displayed. For the commissioners, and as we will see, the norm system of ‘civilians’ (as represented by the commissioners and the lawyers generally speaking), appears to have a difficult time with the definition of peacekeeping as also incorporating peace enforcement (wherein use of force is included and expected). In contrast, the norm system of ‘military personnel’ (as represented generally by the military witnesses and bureaucrats) defines peacekeeping as incorporating both functions, and thus as having a broader definition. The different understanding of the role of force that should or should not be allowed in the definition of peacekeeping as a value, helps us to see that debate and discussion around norms can, and does, occur within the commission discourse.

When discussing the amount of force that was appropriate for Canadian peacekeepers to use in the commission discourse, it is often framed in a discussion of how the Canadian soldiers were trained and also displays evidence of debate over this moral transgression. As I already illustrated, the commissioners and lawyers can be seen to claim that Canadian soldiers should have received more specific peacekeeping training to prepare themselves for Somalia, in comparison to the traditional combat training that soldiers undergo. In response, the military personnel generally reject this idea of training
peacekeepers in a different manner. One military witness, for instance, in response to a question about whether the military should have more specific peacekeeping (or mission) training, replied, “I believe that the army is trained for one thing and that is to fight a war” (Vol 4P, Wednesday, June 21, 1995, PG 645P). This is representative of the kind of response given from the military personnel in regards to the use of force and the necessary training that the soldiers undergo in this respect. Here, it is evident that despite the ‘civilian’ value of soldiers as peacekeepers (as presented in the definitional work, for instance), the ‘military’ take on the value highlights the combat role. Differing norms systems are being presented within the commission discourse in this way, and thus, we can see evidence of debate and discussion within the commission around values like peacekeeping.

A related example of the ‘peacekeeping versus combat’ discussion occurs when a commissioner asks whether combat skills are translatable to peacekeeping operations, and appears to equate combat as bad and peacekeeping as good. In response, a military personnel member displays his difficulty with distinguishing the two domains and states:

**Lieutenant-General (Ret) Foster:** I used to describe our shooting programs as shoot to live and you shoot to live. We’re talking about survival. I wouldn’t know any other way to describe this kind of training other than combat. Now the distinction between that and peacekeeping, those skills, the ability to do reconnaissance, the ability to assess troops that the UN is monitoring or watching or supervising, the ability to know where mortar fire is coming from, or the difference between mortar fire and artillery and what that means to you, the difference between a .50 caliber machine gun and a rifle, are all very useful peacekeeping skills and they come from learning to train for combat. (Vol. 3, Thursday, Oct. 5, 1995, p. 484)

As we can see from this excerpt, there is a fundamental difference in values or perspectives here between the military perspective and the civilian. The civilian
perspective, as displayed by the commissioner’s comment, is attempting to distinguish between peacekeeping and combat training, as these are defined differently from this perspective. In contrast, the military perspective refuses this definition and has a hard time understanding the value system and resulting definition that the commissioner is presenting. This is a useful example to display that norms can be debated and defined differently by different parties in a society, and that debate and discussion of peacekeeping as a value is being played out in the commission discourse, particularly in the public hearings.

In another situation within the public hearings, the discussion turns to a focus on whether the Somali men that were shot on March 4th were entrapped, and if so, whether this is considered appropriate use of force for Canadian peacekeepers/soldiers. Again, within the witnesses’ framework (Buonamici), or ‘military’ perspective, this kind of behavior is understood as acceptable, while the lawyer (Hendin), representative of the ‘civilian’ perspective, frames this in negative terms:

**Mr. Hendin:** The way that Captain Rainville had laid out outside the wire and had hidden his men, camouflaged them at night, would you agree with me that that is a form of deception?

**Major Buonamici:** In a military sense?

**Mr. Hendin:** Yes.

**Major Buonamici:** No, I don’t.

**Mr. Hendin:** I see.

**Major Buonamici:** That’s not my understanding of military deception or military deception plan. (In-theatre, Vol 177, Tuesday, March 11, 1997, PG 36426)
Here, Hendin can be seen to be having a difficult time accepting Buonamici’s response (‘I see’). Hendin appears to be expecting that the witness will frame this behavior as deceptive by his question form, ‘would you agree with me that this is a form of deception?’ Asking for agreement presupposes that agreement is the acceptable response to this question. Interestingly, Buonamici denies this frame, or desired response, and instead continues to follow his own definition of the behavior (as not deceptive in a military sense). Hendin’s response, ‘I see’ is telling in that he is neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the witnesses’ claims, but instead appears to be stalling by considering this response and his next tactic. It also appears to show his unpreparedness for this response. While brief, this kind of exchange also begins to show how differing definitions and understandings of values like peacekeeping are presented within the commission discourse, here about what kind of behavior peacekeeping Canadians should follow (i.e. deception/entrapment, versus transparent/peacekeeping).

The issue of force for Canadian Forces personnel is again debated in the discussion of activities like shooting and fleeing. In this example, Captain Hope frames the fact that a Somali was shot in the lower extremities as a sign of discipline and restraint, while Mr. McManus, counselor for the commission, frames it in as though excessive force was used because the Somali was shot in the back.

Mr. McManus: You talk about high standards of discipline. Can you explain what you mean when you put that in and why you put that there?

Captain Hope: Yes. I work with a lot of professional soldiers from many countries around the world both on training and on operations and especially in Somalia. Disciplined. During that incident that night there were 10 shots fired, single shots fired on order and this is a sign of discipline. Most other troops in
Somalia would have fired full magazines on automatic until they ran out of ammunition and changed magazines. It was customary for some armies to fire whole belts of machine gun ammunition at a suspicious movement. So I believe the fact that they only fired single shots on order is a sign of discipline.

Mr. McManus: All right. Restraint?

Captain Hope: Restraint, same thing. Firing single shots on order. I believe these are professionalism, discipline and restraint. More specifically, restraint in that Sergeant Plante told his men to stop firing, he took it upon himself to chase the guy, fired a shotgun round at his lower extremities and had he not been as disciplined, restrained and professional as he was there is a good probability that man would have been dead.

Mr. McManus: All right. On the other hand, to take it from the other point of view too, for all intents and purposes, unarmed men fleeing from the camp were shot for the most part from behind. Does that – taking if from that point of view or that view of it, does that demonstrate restraint?

Captain Hope: On the 29th of January, 3 Commando patrol was fired on by a fleeing man, an unarmed fleeing man in daylight.

Mr. McManus: Can you explain that?

Captain Hope: Yes. A 3 Commando patrol dismounted to search an area and an individual who was standing by the road started to run away from the, and he was within about 50 metres. This individual stopped and turned and fired half a magazine of AK-47 at the patrol. At that time – and this was in daylight, the patrol thought that man was unarmed and that he was running away. They were fired at and a member of the patrol was almost hit.

Commissioner Rutherford: How can you be sure he was almost hit?

Captain Hope: I talked to the lead man of that section and he was very impressed with the whole incident. He thought he had been.

Commissioner Rutherford: He thought he was almost hit?

Captain Hope: He thought he was, sir, yes.

Mr. McManus: But still then, what you are saying then is that any time someone is running away you still should assume that they are armed?

Captain Hope: No, sir, I’m not saying that. What I would say, given the particular circumstances that existed that night, I believe there was enough doubt to justify opening fire. Enough doubt about potential or possible threat to open fire.
Mr. McManus: It wouldn’t have been better to allow the men, the two Somalis to continue to run until they looked like they stopped or turned around?

Captain Hope: I don’t know what would have been better, sir. I’m just saying that I believe under those specific circumstances they were justified in what they did.

Mr. McManus: I meant by ‘better’ showing greater restraint. If instead of shooting at them they had waited until there was a clear indication that the two Somalis were armed before the Canadians opened fire.

Captain Hope: Troops – those individuals had to make a very difficult call in a confused and very quickly moving situation. They made a call and I believe there was enough there to justify that call.

Mr. McManus: Okay. Again, you say it was a dangerous situation. What was the danger, Captain?

Captain Hope: The danger that two individuals conducted themselves the way they did, moving along that wire gave – or the way they conducted themselves indicated that there was a good probability that they were armed and could damage the patrol or could strike back at the patrol.

Mr. McManus: Wouldn’t it have been more accurate though, given what you knew by the time you wrote this report, that a term like ‘what appeared to be a dangerous situation’?

Captain Hope: I could have said that, yes.

Mr. McManus: Because, in fact, it wasn’t a dangerous situation?

Captain Hope: Well, that may be your interpretation, sir. I believe it was a dangerous situation.

Mr. McManus: Even knowing that the two men were unarmed?

Captain Hope: Sir, the two troops didn’t know that when they opened fire.

Mr. McManus: no, I understand that. But what I’m saying is when you wrote this you knew that the two men were unarmed?

Captain Hope: Yes.

Mr. McManus: So you could say it appeared to the men at the time it was dangerous, but in fact it is not – it wasn’t a dangerous situation, Captain?

Captain Hope: Sir, I described it the way I interpreted it at the time. (Vol 147, Monday, January 20, 1997, PG 30068-30073)
This extended excerpt is a telling one in a number of ways. Firstly, the Canadian soldiers are framed as restrained and generally non-violent compared to other country’s soldiers by Hope, who can be understood to represent the ‘military’ perspective. Interestingly, this understanding is in-line with a traditional understanding of the peacekeeping value. However, because the shots that the Canadian soldiers took were on unarmed and fleeing Somalis, McManus, as representing the ‘civilian’ perspective, is presenting an alternative frame, that of aggressive, undisciplined soldier behavior, which Hope consistently denies. This example not only displays the kind of debates about force and peacekeeping that were common in the commission discourse, but also displays how differing norm systems are represented as well.

Another particularly telling example to show that differing values around force existed in the commission discourse can be seen in the following exchange between a cross-examining lawyer and a corporal within the public hearings:

Mr. Noel: And then you shoot?

Corporal King: Yes.

Mr. Noel: At a person fleeing away, running away?

Corporal King: Yes, he was running in a zig zag direction.

Mr. Noel: Running away from you?

Corporal King: Yes.

Mr. Noel: You shot at somebody that was running away?

Corporal King: Yes.

Mr. Noel: A person zigzagging running away?

Corporal King: Yes.
Mr. Noel: At the time you saw that person in your Starlight, you saw the back of that person?

Corporal King: Yes.

Mr. Noel: And you aimed at the lower extremities in the legs?

Corporal King: Yes.

Mr. Noel: and you shot?


The commission counselor here, Mr. Noel, is displaying his moral leanings in this exchange by his repeated questioning of the situation. In other words, rather than simply accept that King shot at someone running away on the first response, he asks four separate times if he shot at someone running away. By repeating this question over and over, Noel appears to show his incredulity at this moral perspective. At the same time, King shows his different understanding of this moral as acceptable as he makes no excuses or rationalizations to explain his behavior as unusual or inappropriate. Again, the differing display around the use of force within the value of peacekeeping that was discussed, tended to be loosely framed in a civilian (Noel) and military (King) perspective.

The display of differing values over force in peacekeeping was also evident around discussions about the rules of engagement (ROEs) that were created for the Somalia mission. Here, the issue often became to what degree the ROEs that the Canadian soldiers used were similar to the American ROEs.

Mr. Weinstein: And did our product, the Canadian ROEs, differ in great detail from the American ROEs?
Captain McMillan: From the versions that we had started with, started to work on prior to, no. Once we got the Americans – the American rules of engagement or portions of it thereof we were able to compare it to what we had and if indeed there were things in there that we had not included, and it was logical that we did, and appropriate that we did, they were added in an attempt to match the ROEs as best we could within the context of our parameters, our approach to law and international law.

Mr. Weinstein: As I understand, one of the differences – and I’m not suggesting for a moment, sir, it was the only difference – but one of the differences between the American ROEs and our ROEs was the authorization to use gas; is that correct? (VOL 11 Monday, October 30, 1995, PG 2011)

This example is interesting in terms of framing of the issue. Weinstein, as representing the civilian perspective, appears to try to frame the Canadian ROEs as different from the American ROEs. McMillan, as representing the military perspective, understands this issue quite differently and is highlighting how similar they were, noting that when compared, they realized they should add things and that there was an attempt to make the Canadian ROEs match as much as possible to the American ROEs. Rather than accept the frame McMillan presents, Weinstein carries on with his original framing of the issue and responds as though he didn’t hear or understand McMillan’s reframe. Instead, Weinstein continues on with his framing as the ROEs as different and begins to discuss a difference (‘the authorization to use gas’), and also mentions that there are other differences within his question (‘one of the differences – and I’m not suggesting for a moment, sir, it was the only difference’). This is an interesting example of the kinds of value debate going on in the commission discourse. Here, it appears almost as though Weinstein is testifying and asserting values around use of force that can be understood within the peacekeeping value, rather than attempting to listen to, and respect the value as
understood by the witness. It is interesting also to note that Weinstein was the counsel represented the Government of Canada at the time this exchange occurs, and thus, his attempt to differentiate the Canadian ROEs from the American ROEs has a special significance from an official standpoint. As this exchange continues, Weinstein again tries his framing of the issues out when he asks:

**Mr. Weinstein:** Just comparing our ROEs to the American ROEs, what about definitions, definitions of hostile intent and use of force, were they the same or was there differences between the two?

**Captain McMillan:** We tried to make them as close as possible... (Vol 11, Monday, Oct. 30, 1995, PG 2012).

Again, the different approach to this issue is clear between the two participants in the commission discourse. Weinstein is implying that differences within the two ROEs existed and were necessary, while McMillan is highlighting the similarities between the two. While the issue is implicitly addressed and ‘skirted’ around by the commission counsel in this example, cross-examining lawyer Mr. Touhey later makes the value debate around the use of force much more evident when he states, “I wanted to know, Mr. Chairman, did the American ROE provide for a more permissive use of the force when it came to hostile intent than the Canadian rules of engagement on that aspect” (Vol 11, Monday, Oct. 30, 1995, PG 2097). Again, with this statement, there is a normative suggestion that Americans tend to use force in a more permissive manner, and further, that Canadians shouldn’t follow suit as represented via the commissioners and the lawyers (i.e. the civilian stance). In contrast, the military personnel who are testifying don’t seem to understand the value perspective that these people are coming from, and repeatedly note that the ROEs, and thus the use of force, were basically the same between
the two. The value debate around this issue really makes clear the difference between the
civilian and military perspective on the value of force, and thus, peacekeeping.

Another issue that came up and was debated frequently under the peacekeeping
value was the issue of the discipline of the Canadian soldiers. As it is often presented, the
‘civilian’ perspective seemed to posit the correct behavior and discipline of Canadian
soldiers as a normative necessity. In contrast, the ‘military’ perspective presents acts of
misbehavior by soldiers as normal and a fact of life within the commission discourse.
Again, this kind of example works to display how the commission allows room for
debate and discussion over morals like peacekeeping. The issue of differing values
around discipline and correct conduct for soldiers is highlighted in the example below:

**The Chairman:** But there was more than the burning of the car. There was also
all these incidents of the pyrotechnics for which one came up and acknowledged
that he threw one grenade, I think, but there were others involved, and you never
got to the bottom of the matter. Then there was the Algonquin Park incident
where fortunately there you were able, I suppose, to get some of the names
through the registration that was picked up by the warden. But there, again, that
should have been quite telling as to some of the persons involved or at least being
suspected of being involved in these incidents. And yet, when it comes to facing
the issue and coming down to taking the decision to leave these persons behind,
there seemed to be some hesitancy to do that, and I have great difficulties
following that.

**Major Seward:** Perhaps I think two points should be made clear. If we – and the
first point, if you take out the incidents of the possible arson of Sergeant
Wyszynski’s car, what you’re left with is a relatively minor disciplinary problem.
What it basically is young soldiers, young men with lots of energy
misbehaving...You have to expect soldiers who go through training, who have
lots of energy and enthusiasm to get involved in high jinx from time to time and,
in my opinion then, as it is now today, is that although that was an incident or
incidents of discipline – poor discipline, those incidents could be readily handled
by myself and the commando sergeant-major. There was no need to expand them
into a much more evil or malicious connotation. (Vol 30, Tuesday, Dec. 19, 1995,
PG 5826).
Here, what is framed as undisciplined and unacceptable behavior for the chairman, is framed as young men with lots of energy making some minor trouble by Seward. This is a notable difference in values discussion in the commission discourse, and is indicative of other comments that were made in a similar fashion.

Another illustration that there is debate and discussion around discipline in relation to the peacekeeping value is evident within the following statement:

**Major-General (Ret) Gaudreau:** I would not go to war with a unit that does not have any disciplinary or some kind of administrative action problems, for the simple reason that it would not be natural. If you have a unit of 1,000 men with an average age of 27 to 28 years of age, I don’t think there’s an order of monks in the world that can pretend that they don’t have problems with their 1,000 monks. So soldiers are bound to be – to have some problems and, to me, it is quite acceptable and we are highly paid, I believe, to sort these problems out. (VOL 3 Thursday, October 5, 1995, PG 574)

While the issue of discipline had been framed as a valued trait by the commissioners and the commission counsel in the commission discourse in many places, here Gaudreau is framing the test of discipline as a positive and normal trait within the military. Rather than present issues of discipline as a negative factor, as the commissioners and lawyers had done to this point, Gaudreau is suggesting that discipline issues that arise in groups of soldiers are necessary and natural. The fact that issues of discipline should be dealt with, and differences in opinion around this, are also evident in the following exchange:

**The Chairman:** I would like to come back to the state of discipline for a second. You mentioned that nothing special was brought to your attention in relation to the state of discipline within the regiment, but you were aware that there was a burning of a car and not much was done about it, and then there was a Rebel flag that you banned and yet notwithstanding that it was displayed. So what was the state of discipline?
Colonel Holmes: If I can draw an analogy from my time in the First Battalion RCR in the Canadian Airborne Regiment, military units do have disciplinary problems, they tend to come and go depending on the strength or weakness of the leadership of the unit. (Vol. 4, Tuesday, Oct. 10, 1995, PG 601)

Here, the chairman is framing problems of discipline in terms of a car burning and the banning of the rebel flag. He appears to be giving Holmes a second chance to frame the value of discipline in the same terms when he states 'so what was the state of discipline?'. Instead of agreeing with this frame, Holmes provides the alternative 'military' frame of the discipline issue, in a similar way to Gaudreau, when he notes that discipline problems in the military are normal and common. Examples like these also show how debate around the value of peacekeeping, in terms of related issues like force and discipline, are possible within the framework of the commission.

Another interesting discussion over differing values in the commission discourse comes when the government counsel, Mr. Vita, is cross-examining Colonel Holmes in the pre-deployment public hearings. He frames the discussion of discipline in negative terms, so that 'getting rid' of the troublemakers is the ideal situation, whereas Holmes rejects this view and reframes the issue according to 'military values':

Mr. Vita: I appreciate that. I just want to come back to a point which was put to you earlier, even if you would have been able to identify the so-called difficulty persons or troublemakers, you wouldn’t have had the method of getting rid of them at that time?

Colonel Holmes: At that time, if we had a specific individual that we wanted to get rid of, we probably had the wherewithal with the regiments. We talk about getting rid of people who are undesirables. That’s really not the way to deal with the problem. The way to deal with the problem is to deal with the individual there because all you are doing is passing your problem on to somebody else. Wherever possible we try to do that within the military. The general theme is don’t pass
your problems onto someone else. If you have a problem, deal with the individual disciplinary wise or administratively and the cards will fall where they may. (Vol 4, Tuesday, Oct. 10, 1995, PG 725)

While Mr. Vita appears to be arguing that a process of removal is the best practice for dealing with discipline and troublemakers, Holmes rejects this approach and suggests that in the Canadian Forces, there is pride taken for dealing with their own problems, thereby stating that troublemakers and problem-people are not shuffled off to someone else, but are dealt with internally. Discipline challenges are defined differently here by the two parties in the commission discourse.

Beyond definition and debate around the value of peacekeeping that we have seen, the reassertion of the peacekeeping value is also very evident within the commission discourse. One instructive example of this kind of reassertion in the commission discourse occurs when the ‘good works’ of the Canadian Forces in Somalia is discussed at length. For instance, within the final report, there is an 8-page section that discusses the ‘hearts and minds’ approach that the Forces took in Somalia when the soldiers tried to endear themselves to the local population via public relations and rebuilding. In this regard, it is noted that “the troops worked to revitalize institutions, to establish essential community services (involving the creating of security, reconstruction, relief, and political committees) and to attempt to restore some of the functions of the local society that had existed before the civil war” (p. 276). Part of this approach included undertaking humanitarian activities and the report notes that of the numerous witnesses who testified on the ‘hearts and minds’ approach, “These witnesses all testified that they
were proud of the work performed by CF members in Somalia, believed that the mission had been worthwhile, and were impressed with the professionalism and dedication of other CF personnel who had worked with them” (p. 277). Examples of the ‘good deeds’ that the troops had committed included rebuilding bridges, assisting with medical evacuations, providing safe escorts for food convoys, buildings were rebuilt such as the police station, hospital and the school. Medics treated the local population daily and the market had been re-opened. In addition, the report notes that various minefields were cleared so that travel could commence and mine-awareness teams operated to train the local population, especially children, about the hazards of unexploded mines. The local police were trained in basic drill, riot control, and first aid and a local judicial system was established. A jail, a windmill, and a large generator were all repaired and the local population was recorded as educated about burying the slaughter yard waste products. Comments that outlined the list of positive actions that the troops performed were common and read similarly to the following; “they trained 272 local teachers; provided potable water to refugees in the area; repaired approximately 20 wells and many generators in a number of villages in the Canadian area of responsibility; repaired over 200 kilometres of roads; and destroyed ammunition, mines and explosives scattered around local villages” (p. 278). The list of positive contributions that the Canadian Forces personnel made while in Somalia seemingly goes on and on over these pages, and they are indeed listed in this manner. It is as if proof-point after proof-point is provided, and even recorded verbatim from the testimony from the public hearings. Acts of repair, medical service, and donations of equipment and time are outlined in detail in this section. Within the section, there is also a place where excerpts from letters that the
commissioners received, outlining the positive contributions from the troops in Somalia. These letters are quoted directly and extended excerpts are placed within the final report themselves – working to both document and further extend proof of the good deeds of the soldiers. For instance, one letter from the hospital coordinator in Belet Huen reads:

You and your troops were always available to us, anticipating our needs and providing support in every way possible, from security to victim care. For your assistance, we are eternally grateful, and I hope the Somali are as well. A special thank you is due to the many members of your medical team who arrived at the hospital ready to tackle the many problems awaiting us all from generator loans, equipment repair, and laboratory assessment to patient care and teaching...There is no doubt that the community service you have given is far beyond the call of duty and your country will be proud of your efforts (p. 280).

Beyond the fact that this first-person insertion into the document provides a powerful ‘expert’ voice with which to enhance the positive comments already made about the troops’ work in Somalia, it also is interesting for its final statement – that there is ‘no doubt’ that the country will be proud of the troops’ efforts. Of course, this is precisely what the country wasn’t – proud of the troops’ efforts in Somalia in terms of the acts that were associated with the Somalia Affair. Thus, it almost appears that this statement is trying to flip the understanding of the situation in Somalia to highlight the positive contribution versus the negative. In this way, an attempt to reassert the norm of peacekeeping in Canada appears to be going on in the discourse of the commission. By listing the numerous humanitarian acts soldiers performed while in Somalia on what was popularly understood to be a peacekeeping mission, peacekeeping as a value is being defined and reasserted in a very traditional manner (i.e. as helping people in need, working in peaceful ways, etc.).
The positive contributions that the Canadian soldiers made were also expressed throughout the public hearing discourse. One witness, for instance, notes that the Somalis called the Canadians the “clan that never slept” because they “were always a presence” (Vol 54, Wednesday, April 3, 1996, PG 10833). Furthermore, this witness explains his perspective on the mission in Somalia as a successful one, and uses the term heroes:

**Captain Carson:** Sergeant, how do you feel about your tour of duty in Somalia?

**Sergeant Godfrey:** I’m proud of what I did and what the platoon accomplished. Like I said before, we did everything we were trained to do, we followed orders, we completed our missions, there was never any doubt as to whether we left anything undone. I’m actually quite proud of it.

**Captain Carson:** And describe the reaction you got on the return to Canada and how you felt about it?

**Sergeant Godfrey:** When we were in Somalia we were heroes and we were going to get our medals next to the Peacekeeping Monument in Ottawa and that was in the O Groups because in Somalia we didn’t know when the mission was going to end. So it was going to be a year or it could end next week, so we were all excited about going home and accomplishing something. When my plane landed in Ottawa there was a guy at the front of the plane who said, simply get off the plane, don’t look around, head straight for the hanger in a single file and we’ll brief you when you get into the hanger. And we got in the hanger and he explained to us, okay, when you step out of the building there’s going to be a thousand media there, and we were anything but heroes. (VOL 54, Wednesday, April 3, 1996, PG 10833)

This excerpt begins to display the differing values that the military witnesses often had in comparison to the civilian representatives in the commission discourse. For the soldiers, the mission was a success, even so much so that the participants could be understood as ‘heroes’. However, from the civilian or public perspective, the troops needed to be secluded and shuffled into a private area, so as to avoid the media scrum and the label of ‘anything but heroes’.
Military witnesses also framed their experience in Somalia as a mission of accomplishing good deeds, i.e. the hearts and minds approach. Captain Carson, part of the government counsel team in the earlier stages of the public hearings, was often responsible for asking questions that allowed the witnesses to highlight these experiences.

The following exchange is an example of this kind of discourse:

**Captain Carson:** You made very brief comment about an incident where a child lost their fingers as a result of an explosion and mentioned quickly about giving some medications, and I wonder if you could just go back over that again. What happened in that situation?

**Warrant Officer Lehman:** Yes, sir. Outside the cantonment area there was quite a lot of ammunition as well as the school in Balle was almost the munitions depot, there was an abundance of unexploded munitions in the area. A child was found to be playing with a mine fuse and the mine fuse itself exploded in the child’s hand – it’s about the – better than the force of a blasting cap – severing I think three or four fingers, sir – or, sorry, removing three or four fingers, sir. The medics came out, we provided assistance to the child and the medicine itself would have to be administered. We gave it to the town doctor and the elders of the –sorry, the family members told us the doctor wouldn’t give them the medicine and they basically told us that the doctor had sold the medicine on the market and he was not to be seen again, sir. (VOL 54, Wednesday, April 3, 1996, PG 10891)

Another similar example the actions of the troops are presented as admirable can be seen below:

**Mr. McManus:** Why did you not shoot when you went in?

**Sergeant MacAuley:** Our concern was that there were civilians everywhere and we didn’t know who had fired. We didn’t know if the individual who done the firing was inside the building. In fact, when we did go inside the building there were women and children in the building.

**Mr. McManus:** So despite your training to go through the door firing, your concern for the civilians in the area made you not take a greater risk? (VOL 54, Wednesday, April 3, 1996, PG 10725)
Here the fact that the soldier is concerned with mistakenly killing civilians, particularly women and children, is highlighted. McManus, in particular, highlights this action in a normative way. He notes that ‘despite your training to go through the door firing, your concern for the civilians in the area made you not take a greater risk?’ With this statement, the ‘concern for civilians’ is posited against the natural training the soldier has received, which works to construct MacAuley as a thinking, caring, individual who is concerned with the lives of those around him. Thus, this kind of claim helps to reassert the construction of Canadian soldiers/peacekeepers as caring, helpful and cautious. In all, the assertion of the traditional understanding of peacekeeping is often framed within the discourse around the good deeds that the soldiers did while stationed in Somalia. By highlighting their actions as helpful, thoughtful, caring, etc., the traditional understanding of peacekeeping within Canada is reasserted as an important value.

The value of peacekeeping is also connected to issues of process and procedure throughout the commission discourse. For instance, in the discussion around the peacekeeping criteria used to decide whether Canada should become involved in a UN mission, not only are the criteria listed and explained, but the importance of the criteria as the “policy of the government” and the fact that it is outlined in various whitepapers and defence statements of the government is highlighted as well. As these peacekeeping criteria are established as important, the commission notes that “it is unclear whether these criteria have been consistently employed in assessing peacekeeping operations” (p. 201), thereby indicating that consistently employing such criteria is an important step in utilizing them and that the criteria are important in the first place. Along these lines, the
report notes that officials at the ADM (Policy and Communications) “maintained that the ‘criteria’ have never been used as anything ‘more than guidelines’ that are not applied strictly” (p. 202). It also states:

In justifying the process, it was noted that ‘A proposal is addressed through numerous informal and formal meetings during which the Department will review and debate the guidelines contained in the WP (white paper). Depending on the mission their relative weight in the departmental decision-making process will likely vary. This is one of the reasons why we have not instituted a set of strict criteria for the review of our peacekeeping contributions’. (p. 202)

Statements like these found throughout the report indicate the level of import that the commission places on the creation and utilization of procedural measures. By pointing out that no formal process is being used by the government personnel, despite the fact that criteria are available and are supposed to be used, the commission is making a normative statement on the inappropriateness of this behavior. Later in the report, it is noted that the criteria were essentially ignored” and “that planning and analysis took place mostly on a reactive basis” (p. 760-60). More importantly, under the findings section related to this topic, the commissioners note that “there was no single document outlining Canadian Forces policies or procedures for planning and conducting peacekeeping operations” and recommend that new guidelines and compulsory criteria be issued by the Government of Canada to make decisions about whether to operate in peace operations or not. Thus, as we have seen in other places, while the value of peacekeeping is defined and discussed and even reasserted in the commission discourse, there is also often a need to have some kind of process and procedure in place to protect those values according to statements in the commission documents.
In a similar way, the Canadian Forces' lack of a training policy is put under scrutiny in the commission discourse. Here, the training of peacekeepers is aligned with the value as something Canadians 'know' and 'do well'. Stating that "one would expect that by 1992...the CF would have had a clearly defined and conceptualized training system for peacekeeping missions that reflected changes in the peacekeeping field at that time. Amazingly, this was not the case" (p. 558). This is an interesting statement as it highlights the expectations within the commission discourse for the use of policies and guidelines by the Canadian Forces. By using language such as 'one would expect' and 'amazingly, this was not the case', the commissioners display their beliefs and views on what is considered to be appropriate and 'normal' in Canadian government organizations, which works to emphasize the importance of policy and procedure for Canada as a whole.

In all, as we can see from the illustrative cases included above, there was much definitional work going on in the commission discourse around the value of peacekeeping. In addition, there was a great deal of debate, discussion and sometimes even reassertion around this value within the documents of the commission. In this way, 'moral talk' about peacekeeping is evident throughout the commission discourse.
Within the discourse of the commission, the value of multiculturalism is defined in various places. More specifically, the issue of the transgression of the multiculturalism value—racism—is defined within the commission discourse. For instance, racist behavior is defined in the final report as the use of racial slurs, the display of a Nazi flag and paraphernalia, and the display of a Confederate or Rebel flag on the base. In addition, within the final report, it is noted that several Canadian Forces' members "did not have a clear understanding of what activities should be considered racism or racist behavior" (p. 293). A closer look at this statement reveals two implicit things. Firstly, that a clear understanding of what is considered racism or racist behavior should be expected of Canadians. Because the soldiers are posited as not having this knowledge, the implicit suggestion is that this is unusual and unfortunate. Secondly, the other implicit statement is that the commissioners, at least, necessarily do have an understanding of what activities can be considered racist and thus, are able to judge or speak in an expert manner on this issue.
In a similar way, the use of derogatory terms that were used to refer to the local population, such as “Slomali”, “Smufty”, “Moolie”, “Gimme” or “Nig Nog” were also defined as racist behavior in the commission discourse. The fact that these are defined as racist behaviors or terms becomes clear when it states in the final report that “we were surprised to learn that many of these terms were not necessarily considered derogatory or racist by CAR members” (p. 539). This statement holds an implicit suggestion that the commissioners do consider these racist epithets. And because the commissioners note their surprise, they indicate their contradictory opinion about the use of those terms. In addition, this statement displays that there was some debate and discussion around this value and what it constitutes. Thus, the value of racism, or its broader umbrella value, multiculturalism, is being defined in the final report by the commissioners so that using terms and conducting the above activities such as those listed above is defined as racist behavior.

A good example of the multiculturalism value being defined in the report comes with the discussion of the discipline, or lack of it, at Canadian Forces Base (CFB) Petawawa for conducting racist behavior. The report indicates that the fact that racist symbols and behavior went undisciplined is unacceptable. For instance, the report notes that racist symbols were displayed at CFB Petawawa prior to the mission, including Nazi swastikas, and Klu Klux Klan and Confederate or ‘Rebel’ flags. In addition, racist terms such as ‘nigger’ were known to be used and neo-Nazis and other varieties of white supremacists were known to be present among the CAR members. It is not necessarily the fact that these things and actions were present that is the problem, according to the
discourse of the report, but instead it is the fact that the leadership dealt with incidents or inappropriate symbols as matters of discipline rather than racist acts – thus it is the definition of these acts which is problematic. For instance, the report reads, “when Col Morneault banned the ‘Rebel’ flag as 2 Commando’s rallying symbol, he did so because it was seen to interfere with the discipline of the troops, and possibly because it threatened the cohesion of the regiment itself, not because it was considered racist” (p. 294). This is an interesting statement, as the commissioners are indicating not only that the use of these symbols and the words and affiliations were indications and displays of racism, but that the real problem lies in the fact that they were not defined as racist issues. Thus, it is the lack of definition of the issues as racist, or cognizance of the issues as racist, that is the problem for the commissioners. This statement also indicates evidence of debate and discussion around the value of multiculturalism, so that the soldiers were defining it in different ways than the commissioners. With these comments, then, the commission documents show that definitional work of the value of multiculturalism is being done so that what is considered acceptable and unacceptable behavior under this belief is discussed and presented. This also works to reassert the value that was transgressed here in the same manner.

Further definition of the value of racism comes with some findings and recommendations, which not coincidentally, highlight the importance of policies and procedures. For instance the report notes that “there was no policy or process for screening out active racists from deployment on missions, nor was there a policy precluding such persons from joining or serving in the CF in the first place” and that
“existing laws, regulations, orders, and policies were not used adequately or uniformly by
the chain of command” (p. 541). In fact, the first four of six findings in this particular
section deal with the lack of policy or procedure in place to deal with racist-related
occurrences. Beyond the important connection to the procedural aspect of the value of
multiculturalism, the value is defined by citing a zero-tolerance approach. In other words,
the report states that “a key lesson from the Somalia experience is that even a few
extremists can have a pronounced and dysfunctional impact on the CF’s bond with the
Canadian public at large. Clearly, leadership by example, meaningful education and a
zero-tolerance attitude are essential attributes of any attempt to deal with racism in the
CF” (p. 541). With this statement, the report seems to indicate that there is no leeway
when it comes to transgressing the racism value. That is, zero-tolerance of racist behavior
and attitude needs to be in place and there can be no room for extremists within the
Canadian definition of multiculturalism, at least according to the commission discourse.

A related discussion around multiculturalism in the final report indicates that
policies that address issues of racism are important and should be in place (this also
displays the preference for policies and procedures that is found throughout the
commission documents). The issue of policies around racist behavior, or the lack thereof
in the Canadian Forces, was a major issue in the report. For instance, statements like “the
CF had no policy specifically addressing the issue of racism, racist behavior, or right-
wing extremist activity by soldiers” (p. 294) were frequently made. These kinds of
statements seem to imply that it is not even necessarily the fact that there was racist
behavior or right-wing extremist activity by soldiers that is the issue, but the fact that the
CF had no policy around this that is specifically disconcerting. This kind of value talk highlights the importance of policy and procedure as well. Similarly, the value of multiculturalism is tied to policy in the report as it describes the lack of policy in the personnel selection process to deny enrolment to racists or those involved with racist organizations. The report notes that this is surprising behavior as “the Canadian Forces—like all federal institutions—has been prohibited from engaging in practices that discriminate on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, or sex, among other prohibited grounds” (p. 534). Citing this federal policy outlines Canada’s official take on the value of multiculturalism and thus, also works to reassert the value. In addition, the report cites the United States’ military’s rules that prohibit active participation in extremist groups by its members. This statement seems to contrast with the fact that “the CF lacked—and continues to lack—any procedure, apart from the normal chain of command, for complaining about racist conduct” (p. 534). Thus, beyond the fact that the report is claiming that having affiliations with racist organizations should prevent one from being able to join the CF, it is also claiming that not having any procedures or policies in place to report racist behavior is equally unacceptable within the value of multiculturalism in Canada. Here then, we see value talk of multiculturalism surrounded by discussion of policies and procedures within the commission discourse.

Procedurally, it is also interesting to note that of the five organizations given full standing, four of them are groups with multiculturalism affiliations. These include the urban Alliance on Race Relations, Canadian Jewish Congress, B’Nai Brith Canada, and the Coalition of Somali Canadian Organizations. The only organization and participants
given full standing that are not related to the value of multiculturalism are those that were heavily involved in the Somalia Affair and the commission itself, such as Maj. Gen. Lewis MacKenzie, or Maj. Barry Armstrong, and the Canadian Airborne Forces Association for example. This seems to place great import on the value of multiculturalism, at least symbolically, within the commission.

In a related manner, the symbolic importance of the multiculturalism as a value is explicitly discussed in the public hearings transcripts in the beginning of the hearings themselves when the issues that are to be covered are laid out. For instance, in describing the issues that will be examined over the next few weeks of hearings, commission counsel Ms. MsIsaac notes that beyond the issue of suitability of CAR for deployment, the operational readiness, the adequacy of selection and screening as well as training issues, among other things;

We will be looking also at the issue of racism. It is our intention to look at racism at several stages during the course of the inquiry. We will be looking at the issue of racism prior to deployment; the issue of whether there was racist activity in the CAR itself; what actions were being taken by the leadership to address the possibility of racism, to dealing with the possibility of racism, including the question of whether there was appropriate training with respect to cultural issues given to the troops prior to their departure for Somalia. (Vol 1, Monday, Oct 2, 1995, PG 22)

By singling out this issue, the commission counsel is indicating its import to the commission, and thus, as a value of import in the normative commission discourse. Interestingly, the discussion and discourse on racism was much more limited in the actual discourse than is suggested will be tackled here. That is, despite the claim that this will be
an important value of concern in the commission discourse, it actually receives less attention than the value of peacekeeping or transparency in the end.

While the traditional definition of the value of multiculturalism in the commission discourse is presented in terms of racism and tolerance, at one point, is also defined in terms of regional and linguistic difference within Canada. For instance, the report reads that the military is made up of sub-cultures, and that “the Canadian army has regimental divisions reflecting geographic and linguistic divisions in Canada, for example – western anglophone (PPCLI, Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry), central and eastern anglophone (The RCR, the Royal Canadian Regiment), and central francophone (Royal 22e Regiment, or Royal 22nd Regiment, often referred to in English as the ‘Vandoos’)” (pg. 78). This regimental cultural divide is then explained to be a “‘pervasive and often unforgiving milieu within which all combat arms and most other Army personnel live their daily lives’”, working to create a common bond to unite members (p. 79). This is an interesting example of value talk in the commission as it appears to define multiculturalism in one respect, by outlining the different regional (West, East/Central) and language divides (English and French) within Canada. This is one aspect of multiculturalism that is often highlighted within Canada. Interestingly, however, rather than overcome this divide, which is the discourse often used to define multiculturalism in Canada, this divide is noted to continue to exist and be fostered within the army, so that the regional and linguistic divides are continued and cultivated there. This is a different view of the traditional definition of multiculturalism in Canada which often espouses many different cultures living and working together harmoniously. Instead, within the
workings of the army at least, the value of multiculturalism appears to be defined in a different manner than that exposed in the greater Canadian society. This example works to show some of the debate around the value of multiculturalism that is presented within the commission discourse.

Multiculturalism as a value is most commonly presented in terms of racism and its transgression, but there is also evidence of debate and discussion as to the definition of the value of racism. For instance, in one exchange, commission counsel Ms. McIsaac frames the use of the rebel flag as a racist symbol, while witness Colonel Holmes refuses this frame and instead, frames it as a cohesive symbol. Debates such as this are common around the issue of multiculturalism or acts of racism within the transcripts:

**Ms. McIsaac:** Were you aware of the flag having any particularly racist connotations as it was used?

**Col. Holmes:** I can honestly say that I did not see it as a racist issue with this flag. I saw it as a symbol. Possibly a symbol of a unit that wanted to have its own identity and as a result of that they rallied around that particular symbol.

**Ms. McIsaac:** Was it a symbol of a certain rebelliousness on the part of that particular commando?

**Col. Holmes:** I suppose one could say it was, but at the same time I – one of the reasons I banned the flag because I saw it potentially as a symbol of rebelliousness but, on the other hand, one could use it from the point of view of morale from a rallying point for that particular commando. So there is two aspects to it. (Vol 4, Tuesday, Oct. 10, 1995, PG 598)

In this example, McIsaac frames the flying of the rebel flag in racist terms, while Holmes rejects this frame, and suggests a new frame – that of a symbol of a collective. He waffles when McIsaac then suggests that the flying of the flag displays rebelliousness, at once
admitting that it is a sign of this, but reframing once again to pose it as a ‘rallying cry’. A similar debate over the definition of the use of the rebel flag can be seen here:

Mr. Stauffer: Did you see [the rebel flag], and again I’m talking about predeployment, did you see it at that time as a symbol of racism?

Colonel (Ret) Joly: Not at all.

Mr. Stauffer: Were you at all concerned prior to deployment that these troops would be going to a country where the predominant population was non-white taking a flag of that nature into the country?

Colonel (Ret) Joly: I don’t think any of them would really understand what the flag represented in Somalia, if that’s what you’re referring to.

Mr. Stauffer: You mean the population?

Colonel (Ret) Joly: Yeah.

Mr. Stauffer: No, fair enough. What about the troops, though, in their perception of the flag?

Colonel (Ret) Joly: It was a symbol not an attitude

Mr. Stauffer: Was it a symbol of defiance?

Colonel (Ret) Joly: Not at all.

Mr. Stauffer: What was it a symbol of Colonel?

Colonel (Ret) Joly: In the PPCLI, for as long as I can recall, that that’s over a 30-year period, the sports teams of the regiment have been called the Rebels. They were incorporated the rebel flag which is the confederate flag with its 13 or 14 stars on it and cross over black over red, which, indeed, remains a symbol on many of the States of the United States of America, as I understand it. And I don’t believe that it represents or manifests on the flags of those state flags any sort of the attitudes other than a state symbol.

Mr. Stauffer: All right.

Colonel (Ret) Joly: It was for us simply a symbol of our sports teams and for many, many years all of the sports teams of the PPCLI were known as the Rebels as a name, not an attitude. Not a political statement. And I believe that if it evolved, and I was not there to witness it, but certainly if it evolved to something more than a symbol, and perhaps something like an attitude or an expression of intolerable personal conduct of some type, then perhaps it was not so much a
question of the flag being inappropriate, it may have been the leadership being inappropriate. (VOL 18, Monday, November 20, 1995, PG 3355)

This is also an interesting display of the kinds of verbal exchanges that took place within the commission discourse, and shows how values are defined and understood here. As we can see above, Col. Joly is reframing the understanding of the use of the rebel flag in the PPCLI as a sports-related behavior rather than as evidence of racist tendencies. Perhaps even more interesting is his testimony near the end where he distances himself from the implications of racist beliefs and underscores and reaffirms that this could indeed be understood as indicative of racist attitude within the military, and blames the leadership that was present at the time if this is the case. In this way, Joly, while originally reframing the flag issue in the beginning of his testimony, allows for the framing of the flag as a possible racist symbol, disavows said behavior, and thus, actually helps to reassert the value in a Canadian cultural understanding. These examples also help to display how value talk is debated. While one frame is presented as appropriate, it can be rejected or reframed and presented again within the commission discourse.

Further debate over the value of multiculturalism can be seen throughout the commission discourse. An illustrative example of the discussion of the racism value comes when Commander Jenkins testifies. Jenkins was part of a special investigative unit within the Canadian military to examine to what extent Right Wing extremists had ‘infiltrated’ the military. In the following exchange, differing values on the parts of the commissioner and the witness begin to be seen again. This difference in values between what I have referred to as the ‘military’ perspective and the ‘civilian’ perspective, often seemed incompatible and resulted in many discursive battles throughout the commission
discourse. The difference in values from the civilian point of view to the military point of view is evident in the following exchange:

**Commissioner Desbarets:** Mr. Landy, I wonder if I could just verify that the witness did say earlier, according to my notes, and I just want to make sure that I understand him correctly, and I think we’re talking about the ’92 period – June, ’92, just being a member of an extremist group was not a matter of discipline, that’s what you said?

**Commander Jenkins:** That’s correct, sir.

**Commissioner Desbarets:** So, in fact, at that time anyway there was nothing incompatible with being a member of the Canadian Forces and being, say, a member of the Klu Klux Klan?

**Commander Jenkins:** Not based on the policy at the time. The new CFAO\(^{20}\) makes that policy.

**Commissioner Desbarets:** No, but at that time in ’92.

**Commander Jenkins:** That time. That CFAO – in the absence of the CFAO have taken action in the past to inform the members of what’s appropriate behavior and MacKay is an example where his platoon commander advised him in Winnipeg to cease his involvement with the skinheads.

**Commissioner Desbarets:** Even though, as you said, just being a member of an extremist group is not a disciplinary matter?

**Commander Jenkins:** Not disciplinary, in that a person would not be charged because there was no offence, but it’s recognized by the commanding officers well before this issue that this is not appropriate behavior or membership and commanding officers have certainly taken action in the past to sort the members out.

**Commissioner Desbarets:** Thank you. (Vol 14, Thursday, Nov. 2, 1995, PG 2578).

This is a revealing exchange between the commissioner and the witness, as it outlines the value perspective that each takes and appears to understand. Firstly, Desbarats seems to display his disbelief that a member of the Canadian Forces was able to belong to the Klu

\(^{20}\) Canadian Forces Administrative Orders (CFAO).
Klux Klan by using terms like ‘nothing incompatible’ and by posing the Canadian Forces membership in binary opposition to Ku Klux Klan membership. Jenkins ties the value issue into procedural matters by noting that there was no applicable policy at the time to prevent this, and appears to understand Desbarats’ shock and disbelief at the value interpretation because he notes that there is now a policy in place to prevent similar membership problems. Furthermore, Jenkins also indicates his acceptance and understanding of the racism value by stating that ‘appropriate behavior’ does not include involvement with skinheads, as laid out in the next response. Thus, in this example, racism is being defined and thus, the value of multiculturalism (i.e. as accepting ethnic and racial diversities as equal) is reaffirmed in the commission discourse.

Within the commission discourse, there were also instances where value talk about multiculturalism cropped up in ways that are not aligned with traditional understandings of the value in Canada. For instance, in the public hearings, witnesses often described the Somalis in terms of ‘us’ and ‘them’, and expressed shock or surprise at some Somali cultural habits. The clan system in Somali culture, specifically, seemed to leave the military personnel in disbelief, as one witness explains:

Probably the most shocking incident happened shortly after I arrived when one of the field officers asked me to go to a place where some new people had arrived and there were still seven, eight, sometimes 10 people a day dying of starvation, although the kitchens had been operating for some time. And I called in the chairman of the nearest kitchen – each kitchen had a chairman who was responsible for it – and asked him why the people weren’t being fed and I scolded him for this and, as it turns out, they were a different clan and I presumed this was the reason, but the reason wasn’t that he would not feed them, the reason was that they would not go to eat from him. (Vol 53, Tuesday, April 2, 1996, PG 10559).
By describing this incident as ‘shocking’ and then outlining the practice in detail, the witness is displaying his difficulty understanding the Somali culture and displaying less tolerance than usually posited in the multicultural value. In a similar way, Somalis are described in rather negative terms at other times in the discourse, such as ‘looters’ in this instance.

**Sergeant Hobbs:** This is where I got my first experience with the looters...so about halfway down a Toyota pick-up truck pulled out in front of us and we were required to be stopped. As soon as we were stopped we were swarmed by children who actually just cut the stuff off the side of the vehicles. They would cut the straps and run away with all the equipment. I lost a tarp and a jerrycan that day.

**Mr. McManus:** So this is just – you figure it was a set-up, a stop and swarming, it was a plan?

**Sergeant Hobbs:** It was a plan, sir.

**Mr. McManus:** What were you feeling as you were inside your vehicle and this started happening?

**Sergeant Hobbs:** I was kind of amazed at the way it was set up, sir, because it seemed fairly planned and they were extremely organized the way they did it.(Vol 55, Thursday, April 4, 1996, PG 10900).

Here, the organization of the looting surprises the witness, almost suggesting that the fact that the Somalis can be organized and planned is surprising to him. In addition, he doesn’t use the terms Somali children or Somalis, but terms this group as ‘looters’ noting that ‘they actually’ just cut the stuff right off. The fact that these were children also seems to surprise Hobbs, belying a cultural difference that appears hard to fathom and further promoting an ‘us/them’ framework. Hobbs notes his surprise at the behavior of the Somalis when he describes another situation. Here, the soldiers were doing a humanitarian escort when they stopped to help an overturned truck that had 30 people underneath it. He states, “The interesting thing about this is while we were doing this,
while we were helping out the med evac and everything else some of the walk and wounded actually got up, walked over to the overturned truck and stole the spare tire off the casualty vehicle” (Vol. 55, Thursday, April 4, 1996, PG 10914). The difficulty understanding a different culture that these comments seem to display, tends to oppose a traditional understanding of the multiculturalism value, and thus, show how there is room to debate and define values within commission discourse.

In contrast to these kinds of examples, there were many instances of the value of multiculturalism begin reasserted throughout the commission discourse. For instance, when testimony turned to discussions around Captain Rainville’s alleged offer of a case of beer to the first person who shot a Somali, this behavior was framed in negative normative terms by the commission and its counsel, and generally reasserted by the witnesses as we can see in the following example:

**Mr. McManus:** We have evidence that near the end of the O Group Captain Rainville offered a case of beer for someone who got their first Somali. What was your reaction to Captain Rainville’s statement?

**Corporeal Smetaniuk:** That was in bad taste, sir, but it was not by any means taken seriously. It was more of a snide remark, a flip remark, you know. It just wasn’t required I thought.

**Mr. McManus:** So you thought it was in bad taste and wasn’t required. To your mind what was Captain Rainville trying to say when he made that statement?

**Corporeal Smetaniuk:** I don’t believe that he was really trying to say anything, sir, other than the fact soldiers being soldiers have been known to make stupid remarks before.

**Mr. McManus:** Did you feel encouraged to –

**Corporeal Smetaniuk:** No, sir.

**Mr. McManus:** --shoot someone.
Corporeal Smetaniuk: No, sir.

Mr. McManus: Can you tell us exactly what Captain Rainville said about the case of beer?

Corporeal Smetaniuk: Sorry, sir?

Mr. McManus: Can you tell us exactly what Captain Rainville’s exact words were or as close as possible?


Here, the witness Corporeal Smetaniuk agrees with the frame that the comment was made in ‘bad taste’ and disagrees that it made him feel encouraged to ‘shoot someone’ – clearly posited as a negative association and result. In another instance, the case of beer comment became a case of champagne in some witnesses’ minds and it is referred to as a joke, as in the following example:

Corporal Richardson-Smith: I remember people coming back travelling the roads and saying, you know, and joking, you know, geez, came close to that case of champagne just because a Somali shot on them. They would be driving through a fun fire, and, oh, geez, they are shooting and they would come back and with the stress and stuff people joke. That’s all it was, it was a joke and people joked, geez, I came close to getting that case of champagne, we were shot at today. But they never returned any fire or anything. They came back. It was a rover section, I believe, and...

Commissioner Desbarats: So it would have been quite commonly mentioned?

Corporal Richardson-Smith: I believe, yes.

Commissioner Desbarats: Under those circumstances.

Corporal Richardson-Smith: Yes, as a joke sure. People joked about it. (Vol. 109, Thursday, Sept. 26, 1996, PG 21935).

Here, the witness makes clear that this is not a serious statement, reasserting the value of multiculturalism. By only joking about the issue, Richardson-Smith is displaying that this
sentiment is not an appropriate one to take seriously, and that none of the Canadian soldiers did so. Thus, the soldiers are operating within the social norms of society. In another instance, the value of multiculturalism is reasserted in a different manner:

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Finally, when you said the word ‘nigger’ just popped out, can you tell me a little bit more about the actual situation?

**Master Warrant Officer O’Connor:** It’s actually a bit worse than you think. Our chief clerk happened to be standing there, Warrant Officer Paris, who is black, and in the course of my job I ended up doing all sorts of the niggly little tasks from everybody and they have got to be completed. I made a comment to the fact that I have got a shitload more ‘nigger’ jobs to do and Warrant Officer Paris immediately sorted me out on the spot.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Yes, I bet. (Vol 109, Thursday, Sept. 26, 1996, PG 21872).

In this instance, Desbarats is displaying his negative association with the word ‘nigger’ by noting that it just ‘popped out’. He is further asking the witness to clarify his take on this situation by following up on this claim. Warrant Officer O’Connor agrees with the negative frame, indicated by his comment that ‘it’s worse than you think’. More discussion occurs around the use of the word ‘nigger’ later in the same transcript.

**Mr. Stauffer:** Let me start this way, were you concerned that nigger was being used in training?

**Master Warrant Officer O’Connor:** To tell you the truth, no, I wasn’t. The reason for that being it is not a commonly used word and it’s not a nice word. We all know that. However, as I’ve already admitted, I let it slip once in a while. Who is to say this wasn’t a slip. The way I looked at this situation was, yeah, they are slipping and I will take note of it. If it becomes serious, then people will know. (Vol 109, Thursday, Sept. 26, 1996, PG 21861).

This statement is interesting in that O’Connor notes that the word nigger is not a ‘nice’ word and that ‘we all know that’, seemingly acknowledging, or reasserting the value around multiculturalism as it is presently understood within Canada. The other interesting
thing about O’Connor’s comments is that he ‘admits’ he has used it, and that it is a ‘slip’ and that it is not in itself, a serious problem. Just as in these cases, racism is reasserted in negative normative terms in many places in the commission discourse.

One of the most interesting and extensive discussions of racism within the public hearings in the commission came when Corporal Christopher Robin was put on the witness stand. Robin was the African Canadian officer who had the words ‘I love the KKK’ smeared on this back, who was dragged around on all fours by a leash, and who had flour put all over his body in the hazing video. He was, ostensibly, the man who came across as the victim in the video and whose treatment sparked such public outrage. These discussions clearly showed how moral transgressions such as racism could be debated and defined within the public hearings in the commission.

Robin’s testimony is particularly interesting because the affirmation of morals are being evidenced by the commission lawyers, so that the being walked on all fours on a leash, for example, is suggested as ‘bad’ behavior. However, when Robin is asked how he felt about the fact that he had ‘I love the KKK’ on his back, he replies “indifferent” and goes on to explain that he didn’t feel that he was being treated any differently because of his colour, despite the fact that he was the only soldier with the KKK on him and was the only black soldier involved in the hazing. Despite repeated attempts by the commission lawyer to ask whether or not he felt the treatment was racially motivated, Robin refuses to frame the occurrence in this manner. For example, he acknowledges that “certain things were done to me maybe and that have not been done to others. I cannot associate that exactly to racism” (VOL 6, Thursday, October 12, 1995, PG 1035). He
goes on to note that he participated at his own free will and that if he were able to sidestep the activity knowing that there were not negative repercussions, he would still choose to participate again because the goal was to get to know each other. Robin carries on to say that while he’s always been the black guy living in a white community, and agrees that to some degree all societies are racist, he never felt any discrimination in the army. This discussion of the moral transgression of racism works to, on one hand, affirm society’s beliefs about racial equality so that the unfair or racially discriminatory treatment of minorities is seen as morally reprehensible, as displayed in the discourse from the lawyers and the commissioners (often representing the ‘public’ voice), and at the same time, shows that debate about these beliefs and values is possible, particularly from a representative from a minority group itself. Even more, this specific example of discourse displays evidence that the values held in the military, or at least by certain military personnel, does not conform to the values held more broadly by the Canadian public. In this way, the effort made by the lawyers and the commissioners to affirm that the Canadian Forces performed a racist act, and thereby scold the CF and affirm the overall moral of racial equality within society, seems to fail in this example because of Robin’s refusal to accept this frame. In this way, the debate and discussion over moral transgressions can be seen to be happening here.

In all, we can see instances of definition, discussion, and debate around the value of multiculturalism within the commission discourse. In addition, the value is reasserted more times than not, and issues of process and procedure are brought up to further elaborate on the value.
As I have demonstrated in the previous two chapters, there is much normative discussion around the values of multiculturalism and peacekeeping within the discourse of the commission. Interestingly, even more discussion around the related values of transparency and accountability can be found in the documents. This may be explained, in part, by the fact that the commissioners seem to understand their very role to be one of making the senior leaders accountable for their actions and decisions around the Somalia Affair. This is made clear in multiple places, but none more so than in the following example when the commissioners state, "In essence, what the Government of the day and the Canadian people are seeking from this Inquiry is the accountability of senior officials for the failures of the Somalia mission" (p. 21). This is a telling excerpt in that it displays what the commissioners believe the 'Canadian people' are expecting from the commission – 'the accountability of senior officials for the failures of the Somalia mission'. The indication that making senior officials accountable is the public expectation
here, as seen by the commissioners, indicates that their perception about what the Canadian public wanted from this commission helps to explain why there is so much discussion around the values of accountability and transparency within the commission discourse. Later in the commission discourse, a related example is helpful to illustrate this point further. Here, the commissioners note that it is the very ‘principles of accountability’ that they have used to assess the actions and decisions of the senior leaders in the Somalia Affair, thereby noting the significance of the definition and use of the value in the commission discourse overall (p. 380).

Much like the values of peacekeeping and multiculturalism, definitional work can be seen to be operating around the values of accountability and transparency in the commission discourse. For instance, accountability is defined explicitly in the following way:

As we define it, accountability is the mechanism for ensuring conformity to standards of action. In the military, this means that those called upon to exercise substantial power and discretionary authority must be answerable (i.e. subject to scrutiny, interrogation and, ultimately, commendation or sanction) for all activities assigned or entrusted to them. In any properly functioning system or organization, there should be accountability for actions, whether those actions are executed properly and lead to a successful result or are carried out improperly and produce injurious consequences (p. 21).

The definition of accountability put forward within the commission discourse is an interesting one. Here, we see that accountability is understood as a ‘mechanism for ensuring conformity to standards of action’. Thus, accountability is presented as a way to ensure that certain procedures and processes that are expected to be conformed to are followed. Next, this definition of accountability, as presented within the military, where
people ‘exercise substantial power’ and ‘authority’ should be ‘answerable’, defined as ‘subject to scrutiny, interrogation and, ultimately, commendation or sanction’ in accord with all of their actions. Next, the definition of accountability as presented and understood within the commission discourse, points to the fact that in any ‘properly functioning system or organization’ a level of accountability should be expected. This appears to speak to the importance of process and procedure that the commission discourse highlights again and again, so that accountability is enacted and evidenced implicitly via procedures and processes within a properly functioning organization. As we can see, this is a clear statement on how accountability comes to be defined within the commission discourse, and thus, displays how definitional discursive work around values operates within the commission. Here, the value of accountability is laid out for the public and government officials to see and understand. This statement also displays how values like transparency and accountability come to be reasserted in its definition, or clarified, and as well, is reasserted as important within society (i.e. in its discussion at length within the commission). In the commission discourse, accountability is further defined in connection with responsibility:

Accountable leaders cannot shelter behind the actions of their subordinates. Accountable officials are always answerable to their superiors...In any organization, however structured, those at the apex should be accountable for the actions and decisions of those in the chain of authority who are subordinate to them. In a properly linked chain of command, accountability does not become attenuated the farther removed one is from the source of the activity. When the subordinate fails, that failure is shouldered by all who are responsible and exercise the requisite authority – subordinate, superior, and superior to the superior (p. 21).
With this excerpt, accountability is notably defined in terms of the responsibility of leaders to 'shoulder' the blame or failures that have been enacted by their subordinates. In this way, accountability, within the commission discourse, is also defined as incorporating a level of responsibility for one's own actions, as well as the actions of one's subordinates. Despite the connection made between the definition of accountability and responsibility within the commission discourse, responsibility is also differentiated from accountability, when there are claims that the two terms are unique and that "responsible officials are held to account" and that "one cannot delegate responsibility (and hence accountability) even if the authority to act has been delegated" (p. 22).

Responsibility and its connection to accountability is explored in depth in the commission, and is covered in terms of supervision and delegation, ignorance, negligence and willful blindness, as well as sanctions (p. 381-386). This works to both define accountability on one hand, and reassert the understanding of the value, as well as its import in Canadian society.

Within the commission discourse, accountability is also aligned with the value of transparency and is noted to be tied to democratic states. In the report, for instance, the claim is made that:

accountability is therefore a basic attribute of open, democratic societies. Open processes generally are regarded as guarantors of responsibility in the exercise of official authority. In democracies all public officers exercising significant authority are made accountable for their decisions and the effects of them. Accountability provides a vehicle for preventing, or at least controlling, the abuse of state power. (p. 380)
In this way, the commission discourse seems to imply that it is through government processes of accountability, among other processes presumably, that helps to work to control state power. Thus, accountability is defined as important for ensuring the transparent and appropriate action of the government on behalf of its citizens. The connection of accountability or transparency to democracy is important in the understanding of accountability presented within the commission discourse because it works to note the inherent and fundamental connection of this value to Canada and its political system, thereby, defining or clarifying the value, but also reasserting it at the same time.

The fact that the value of accountability is central to the moral discussion occurring within the commission discourse is evident in many places, but of particular note is the presence of an entire chapter within the final report that is devoted to the discussion of the value. The inherent connection of the norm to the operation of the commission is explicitly stated by the commissioners in the clam that “The public inquiry process is an exercise in accountability” (p. 380). This kind of statement reflects the importance of the value within the commission discourse, but also indicates its underlying import in informing the creation and operation behind the workings of the commission, which helps to explain its presence throughout. In many ways, the royal commission, as the commissioners describe here, is the ultimate exercise in accountability for the military personnel involved in the Somalia Affair. In this way, military witnesses and bureaucrats alike were certainly seen to be subject to scrutiny, interrogation and commendation around their involvement in the affair’s activities.
In the commission discourse, the value of accountability is further defined via the ‘general principles of accountability’ that are outlined in the final report. Here, the general principles of the value include ‘responsibility’ (‘responsible officials are held to account’), ‘supervision’ (‘a person exercising supervisory authority is responsible, and hence accountable, for the manner in which that authority is exercised’), ‘delegation’ (‘the act of delegation to another does not relieve the responsible official of the duty to account’), ‘sanction’ (‘the superior remains responsible for the errors and misdeeds of the subordinate’), and ‘knowledge’ (‘it is the responsibility of those who exercise authority….to know what is transpiring within the area of their assigned authority’) (p. 392-394). Statements like these in the commission discourse illustrate how values like accountability get defined, according to the general principles laid out above, and how they get reasserted overall.

These prescriptive comments are also a precursor to the discussion around the specific deficiencies that are noted to exist in the mechanisms and processes within the military and its civilian operations, thereby tying the discussion of the value of accountability to the overall value of process and procedure. For example, the commissioners “identify certain specific institutional or systematic deficiencies in existing accountability mechanisms and processes” (p. 395). Here, normative statements around the various processes within the military in association with accountability and transparency are made such as, “official reporting and record-keeping requirements, policies and practices throughout the DND and the Canadian Forces are inconsistent, sometimes ineffective, and open to abuse” (p. 395). Many of the other comments within
the commission discourse around the value of transparency tie it to the importance of process and procedure such as the statement:

We demonstrate the presence of an unacceptable hostility within the department toward the goals and requirements of Access to Information legislation, an integral aspect of public accountability. There appears to be more concern at higher levels with managing the agenda and controlling the flow of information than with confronting and dealing forthrightly with problems and issues” (p. 396).

With the kind of statement like this, the transparency value’s import is made clear. This statement indicates that hostility toward legislation like Access to Information, which is explicitly noted to be an integral aspect of public accountability, is ‘unacceptable’ and thus, a clear normative claim is made here. Also, the statement notes that ‘managing the agenda’ and ‘controlling the flow of information’ is inappropriate behavior, as compared to ‘confronting and dealing forthrightly with problems and issues’. The values of accountability and transparency are at the same time defined and reasserted with statements like these made throughout the commission discourse. Likewise, a similar claim is made which states:

The current mechanisms of internal audit and program review, which are the responsibility of the Chief of Review Services (CRS), are shrouded in secrecy. Reports issued need not be publicized, and their fate can be determined at the discretion of the Chief of the Defence Staff or the Deputy Minister, to whom the CRS reports. The Chief of the Defence Staff or the Deputy Minister, as the case may be, retains unfettered discretion concerning follow-up and whether there will be outside scrutiny of a report. (p. 396)

Some strong normative language is being used here. For instance, the claim that the current mechanisms of internal audit and review are ‘shrouded in secrecy’ associates this behavior with negative connotations, as being shrouded in secrecy is quite the opposite of the values of accountability and transparency that have been openly promoted
within the commission discourse. In turn, the fact that the CDS ‘retains unfettered discretion concerning follow-up and whether there will be outside scrutiny of a report’ is also posited in unflattering terms as ‘unfettered discretion’ provokes images of a lone figure operating in his/her best interests and without checks. Beyond the obvious reference to transparency with these statements, the fact that there is no official process to make the reports visible to the public also speaks to both the importance of procedure in connection to the values of accountability and transparency in the commission discourse.

Tied to the issue of accountability and transparency is the issue of the utilization of documents within the military. For instance, in one particular excerpt, not only do the commissioners note that these documents can, and should be used for demonstrating and practicing accountability, but they also implicitly suggest their concern about the use and status of their own commission report when published. Here, the report reads:

A disturbing situation seems to exist with respect to after-action reports and internally commissioned studies. These reports and studies can serve an accountability purpose, provided they are considered seriously and their recommendations are properly monitored and followed up. While requirements to produce evaluations and after-action reports are clear in most cases, no rigorous and routine mechanism exists for effective consideration and follow-up. We have numerous examples of problems being identified repeatedly and nothing being done about them or about recommendations in reports addressing and suggesting remedies for the problems. (p. 396).

This excerpt ties up the related issues around the value of accountability we have thus far discussed. On one hand, that accountability is an important and accepted value within society can be seen to be presented here. In addition, the use of these documents to act as mechanisms, or procedures, to ensure accountability is also evident in this statement, as is the implied assumption that mechanisms of accountability are necessary and needed.
Furthermore, this statement seems to also indicate the value placed onto documents and the written word within the commission discourse itself. The fact that numerous reports and documents have been created, and then generally ignored, or at least rarely followed-up on, is presented as problematic by the commissioners here. At once, we can see how particular excerpts within the commission discourse operate on numerous moral levels.

The connection between accountability and procedure is connected in many places throughout the commission discourse. For instance, “numerous deficiencies” are noted in indirect accountability processes within the military such as “courts-martial and summary trials, MP investigations and reports and the charging process, personnel evaluations, mechanisms for instilling and enforcing discipline, and investigating and remedying disciplinary problems and lapses, training evaluations, declarations of operational readiness, and so on” (p. 397). Here, the ‘accountability processes’ are noted as having ‘numerous deficiencies’, which is implied to be less than ideal. In a similar manner, the commissioners note that

There also appears to be little or no interest in creating or developing mechanisms to promote and encourage the accurate reporting, by all ranks and those in the bureaucracy, of deficiencies and problems to properly specified authorities and then to establish and follow clear processes and procedures to investigate and follow up on those reports” (p. 397).

It is perhaps this disregard for procedural options that seems to unnerve the commissioners around the values of accountability and transparency within the discourse the most, as they then eventually move on to argue for the creation of an Office of Inspector General to oversee or investigate military affairs. This move to formally proceduralize the military in an accountable and transparent fashion, speaks to the
attention and gravity with which the transparency/accountability value is dealt with in the commission discourse. The role of the Inspector General, as well as his/her mission, functions and powers are all laid out within the report, which heavily emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability. For instance, some of the powers that the commissioners propose for the Inspector General include the ability to inspect any documents, plans, and orders of the CF and DND, to visit any unit or element of the CF or any defence establishment without prior warning, or to interview any member of the CF or public servant of DND without prior approval of superiors and in complete privacy and confidence (p. 400-401). All of these powers indicate the high regard for openness, accountability and transparency as a value, as well as the minimization of discretionary powers of the military brass.

The importance placed on the documentation of life in general in the commission discourse that I mentioned earlier, can also be evidenced in various places and is also often tied to the values of accountability and transparency. For instance, in the following exchange, the value of documentation is stated by the commissioner and reasserted by the witness:

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Do you think again, in retrospect, that it would have been desirable perhaps if there had been more, more of a written record of that sequence of events? I certainly learned over the last few months that your Army generates nothing but paper, I think our count of documents is 70,000 and still going up, and yet during these critical days a lot of it is being done verbally, as you said, by people in close contact with one another and not very much of a paper trail to indicate recommendations and who recommended what and so forth...

**Lieutenant-General (Ret) Reay:** I think that’s probably a fair statement, yes. (Vol 46, Wednesday, Feb. 14, 1996, PG 9147).
Here, the need to document events is noted by the commission as an important move in order to help establish a ‘paper trail’, which thus, works to enable accountability and transparency. This value, interestingly, is not challenged by Reay, who instead agrees with the value framework put forward by Desbaretts, thereby reasserting the value of documentation, and related values of transparency and accountability at the same time.

Similar and more explicit examples can be found below:

**Mr. Cogan:** Tell me, as a lawyer, do you think – I want your opinion that – is there a specific pattern in the military that they don’t put things in writing so the senior command leaves no trail for their decisions?

**Lieutenant-Colonel Carter:** No, there isn’t.

**Mr. Cogan:** Isn’t that a way of escaping accountability if you don’t have a decision that can be identified to you by not having a letter or memo?

**Lieutenant-Colonel Carter:** My experience, quite frankly, Mr. Cogan, is that the senior military people are more than happy to accept responsibility and accountability and it doesn’t make any difference to them whether it’s in writing or verbally it’s a matter of honor. (Vol 79, Monday, June 17, 1996, PG 15365).

Here, the value of documentation is clearly linked to the issue of accountability by the counselor Cogan, while the witness, Carter, is rejecting the frame that implies that not documenting events leads to opportunities to be unaccountable.

The value of transparency is dealt with in the commission discourse in the section entitled ‘cover-up’ as well. Noting that cover-up allegations surrounded the torture and death of Shidane Arone, as well as the death of a Somali citizen on March 4, 1993, and the truncation of the inquiry, the report defines the term cover-up as:
“A deliberate course of conduct that aims to frustrate broader moral, legal, or public claims to information. Most attempts at a more thorough definition tend to require a purposeful attempt at concealment. It is probably accurate to say that this element of willfulness conforms to the usual understanding of the term cover-up. Most people, we believe, would not consider failures to report, reveal, or preserve information that result from pure accident or even benign neglect as constituting a cover-up. The term has more sinister connotations, usually reflecting a suspicion that the concealment is purposeful and, quite possibly, orchestrated. Cover-up is the handmaiden of conspiracy (p. 31).

Within the commission discourse, the value of transparency is defined and reasserted within the context of the discussion of the cover-up in the Somalia Affair. In this way, the discourse presents the value claim that there must be some obligation, legal or moral, to maintain an accessible record within government bodies, and that reporting or divulging this information must occur (p. 31). If neither of these actions occur, as in the case of the Canadian Forces around the Somalia Affair, the commissioners argue that "the inadequate reporting of significant incidents in-theatre and the inadequacy of the investigations prompted by such reports raise the spectre of one kind of cover-up" while "the alteration and falsification of documents and the manipulation of access to information processes led us in the direction of another, perhaps related, kind of cover-up" (p. 33). Again, as with the value of accountability earlier, the discourse around transparency is frequently centered on the processes in place to avoid cover-up, the undesirable act, in contrast to the norms of accountability and transparency which are preferred.

Another notable section of discourse within the commission around the value of accountability comes in the discussion of the failure of senior leaders in the final report.
Specifically, the segment on Major General Lewis MacKenzie is notable for the discourse on the value of accountability that is presented. For example, one section reads:

MGen (ret) MacKenzie testified before us in an honest and straightforward manner. He alone seemed to understand the necessity to acknowledge error and account for personal shortcomings... Unlike some senior officers who appeared before us, he was never less than courteous and respectful in the way that he gave evidence or responded to our questions. Also, MGen (ret) MacKenzie fully accepted the need for a public accounting of what went on in Somalia. He invariably supported our effort to probe the incidents and events in the wider public interest. We regard his comportment and demeanor throughout his testimony before us as consistent with the highest standards of military duty and responsibility. (p. 988)

With this extended quote, we see how important the value of accountability is for the commission. MacKenzie ‘alone’ is conceived to understand the need to ‘account’ for personal shortcomings. He also ‘fully accepted the need for a public accounting of what went on in Somalia’. Furthermore, because MacKenzie recognized this value, he was highly esteemed and considered a stellar witness compared to other military leaders, who implicitly from this excerpt, didn’t hold the value of accountability as high. Much definitional work around the values of transparency and accountability is evident here.

In a similar manner, while listing the failures of General Boyle in the report, the commissioners again highlight the import of accountability as a value. Beyond the system arrangements of his programs that were noted as flawed and the failures to properly supervise, Boyle is also argued to have

held his subordinates to a standard of accountability that he was not prepared to abide by himself. By his own admission, he failed to respect the spirit of the Access to Information Act, but when asked how he would react if subordinates obeyed the letter but not the spirit of the law, he replied that he would react ‘in a very negative fashion’, and added that he would take remedial measures. (p.1054)
Thus, Gen Boyle's worst offences, according to the commission, include the transgression of the values of accountability and transparency. By reprimanding Boyle for this explicitly in the commission discourse, we can see how moral talk in the commission operates, both working to define and reassert the values of accountability and transparency as important within the Canadian milieu.

The values of transparency and accountability are also evident within the discourse in the commission around the March 4th incident. For instance, the commissioners explain that

within hours of the shootings, Canadian Forces officers in Somalia and at NDHQ tried to conduct damage control and concoct a cover-up 'spin' to avoid bad publicity. The cover-up resulted in a delay of almost six weeks in ordering a Military Police investigation. The result was the loss of valuable time and physical evidence that was vital to determining what took place on the evening of March 4th (p. 1127)

The creation of the abovementioned 'spin' is described in more detail later in the commission discourse:

Having determined the proper 'spin' to place on the events, officers in Somalia and at NDHQ went about managing the flow of information to ensure that the 'correct' version of events was given to the Canadian public. As a result, what had been clearly a suspicious death, involving the use of excessive force, was misrepresented as simply a problem with the interpretation of the Rules of Engagement by a few soldiers on the ground. To the media, the incident was further misrepresented from the outset as an unfortunate event that resulted from concern about 'possible saboteurs' around the Canadian compound at Belet Huen (p. 1127)

In these statements, a number of telling terms are used to connote the very non-transparent behavior that occurred around this incident as negative. For instance, the use
of words such as 'spin', and 'avoid bad publicity' work to imply that manipulation of the event's representation occurred. In addition, the delay in efficiency that resulted in the creation of this 'spin' is claimed to have led to a detrimental delay in the investigation. Likewise, officers are noted to have 'managed the flow of information' to 'ensure that the correct version of events' was presented to the Canadian public, thereby 'misrepresenting' as a simplistic problem. This 'misrepresentation' was noted to continue to occur when the media pursued this issue. In this way, the 'spin' and 'misrepresentation' that the officers are accused of creating around the March 4th incident is presented as an inappropriate act that flies directly in the face of values like accountability and transparency that are preferred. In this way, the direct transgression against these values by these individuals is noted as inappropriate behavior, thereby working to define and reassert the values within the commission discourse.

This lack of transparency around the March 4th incident is described in great detail within the discourse of the commission final report. For instance, the Deputy Minister of National Defence at the time, Robert Fowler, is quoted as emphasizing the necessity for extreme sensitivity in all matters relating to public statements, speeches, press releases, etc. by all members of the Department over the next few months in view of both the expected candidacy of the Minister in the Conservative leadership race and the forthcoming general election. He directed that the department should take as low as profile as possible. (p. 1128)

The fact that efforts were made to keep the military out of the press and public eye are posited as negative acts within the commission discourse as we can see here, and again, with quotes such as, "These events clearly depict a military chain of command seeking to keep whatever dirty laundry it might have from exposure to the press and to the Canadian
public. The effect of the information 'chill' was to erect a virtual wall of silence around the March 4th incident” (p. 1129). More evidence of such discursive work comes from the following excerpt, “In our view, NDHQ should have known, or should have taken reasonable steps to know about the incident. At best, NDHQ acted out of willful blindness; at worst, it deliberately covered up the incident” (p. 1135). Again, we can see in these accounts that in the discourse of the commission, the transgression of the value of transparency and accountability is presented as even worse than ignorance. The fact that this is one of the most serious transgressions of values for the commissioners is made clear in many other places. For instance, the report concludes its section on the March 4th incident by stating that “it is our firm belief, based on the evidence adduced before us, that the failure of the chain of command immediately to address and remedy the problems revealed by the March 4th incident possibly set the stage for the death of Shidane Arone 12 days later” (p. 1145). As the death and torture of Shidane Arone is really what spurred the entire Somalia Affair, and is seen as one of the focal transgressive events that occurred, to claim that actions against the values of transparency and accountability are directly connected to this transgression, is thus to make these values, or the transgression of these values, some of the most important for the commission, and thereby, for Canadians.

Much reassertion work around the norms of transparency and accountability is also evident throughout the commission discourse. This occurs frequently within the discussion around the disclosure of documents to the commission. Here, the fact that the commission requested numerous documentation from the Department of National
Defence and the Government of Canada that was related to the Somalia Affair, and didn't receive either the documents, or perceived good will in this regard, is subject for many normative statements and rebukes. A good example of this kind of value talk is stated in the introduction to the body of the final report. It reads:

One of the basic themes explored in this report relates to openness and the disclosure of information. As we carried out our probe, we were forced to use valuable time, that had been reserved for other purposes, to confront problems of inadequate information disclosure by Department of National Defence (DND) that were affecting the efficacy of our work. At the outset, we expected to investigate how information had been actively or passively withheld from those who should have known about the incidents that initiated our Inquiry. Alarmingly, we were subjected to a process of obfuscation and denial that was strikingly similar to that which we were charged to investigate. The allegations of cover-up that we pursued are of particular concern in that they extend beyond the domain of the military to affect the rights of all Canadians in a free society (p. xvii).

The connection here between the value of transparency and the 'rights of all Canadians in a free society' is an important one for this dissertation. Here, the norm of transparency is explicitly reasserted as important and fundamental to Canadian society. By noting that this value was transgressed by the DND, more than once, and that the process of accountability, here in the commission, was also unable to break free of the non-transparent acts, the issue of openness is clearly shown to be important and valued within the commission discourse.

Similarly, the discussion in the commission discourse around the issue of the change from a Request to Queries (RTQs) to a Media Response Lines (MRLs) makes it clear that this value of transparency must be valued above all others. As the commissioners explain, "the change of name from RTQs to MRLs was, in our view,
nothing less than a vulgar scheme to frustrate Access to Information requests and was, in fact, regarded in this way by the personnel within the public affairs branch” (p. 1046).

The report continues that “the end result of this was to discredit a new system purportedly designed to bring greater transparency to DND’s relations with the media and the public. To the contrary, the actual effect was a gradual erosion of transparency and accountability” (p. 1048). That the end result of this move was the erosion of transparency and accountability is posited here as a serious transgression of the values in Canada, and thus, works to display the import of these values and reasserts them.

Within the commission discourse, this issue of the altered document (RTQs to MRLs) came up again and again in the public hearings, and was heavily tied to the value of transparency. Interestingly, some of the witnesses argued that the name change that occurred (RTQs to MRLs) was made in order to increase transparency of the department for the journalists. This works, on a discursive level, to reassert the value from both sides (witness and commissioner and lawyer), as was the case with the witness Mr. Gonzalez. In the following excerpt, he is questioned about this in great detail, and the commissioners display their disbelief:

**The Chairman:** Just to follow up on that. Mr. Gonzalez, surely you could have updated the RTQs, make them reliable and make the people accountable and still call it RTQs?

**Mr. Gonzalez:** Yes, sir, we could have. But that too could lead to an element of confusion later on because I changed the name to make it certain that people understood that this was the new system that we are going to implement, and let there be no doubt about it -- group principals through their account managers were responsible for the information contained in an MRL. If I left it the same name, then it would be: Are we talking RTQs before the reorg or RTQs after the reorg. So to avoid any confusion we give a new name, and that’s exactly the same thing
I did in parliamentary affairs. I renamed the document to make sure there would be no confusion.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** I can’t help asking, to avoid confusion inside the department?

**Mr. Gonzalez:** Correct.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Everybody understood that the name had been changed?

**Mr. Gonzalez:** Yes, sir.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** What about the clientele, to avoid confusion among them?

**The Chairman:** Or to create confusion among them.

**Mr. Gonzalez:** Obviously it ended up creating confusion outside of the clientele of the department or otherwise we wouldn’t be discussing this. That was not a fact that was considered. What I had considered was to make sure that we were able to respond better by having a better mechanism in there and having accountability where it belonged and it mirrored the reorganization of the whole process of public affairs and the department whose genesis were in August of ’93.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** I understand the reorganization, but if the whole point of RTQs or MRLs is to provide as much transparency as possible, right, that’s the whole point of the exercise?

**Mr. Gonzalez:** Yes, sir.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** As much transparency as possible for the public. So if you are changing the system in order that it is going to do that, shouldn’t you also explain to the clientele, to the journalist or the public, that the system has been changed if the desire is to make it as transparent as possible and understandable?

**Mr. Gonzalez:** Yes, sir.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Any idea why that explanation wasn’t given?

**Mr. Gonzalez:** No sir, I have no idea. (Vol 59, Thursday, April 25, 1996, PG11698-11700).

In this excerpt, we can see that the commissioners Desbarats and Letourneau (the Chairman) are implying that the value of transparency is a good one, and that moves to
make a system or process, such as RTQs/MRLs, is a good one. However, they note that this actually worked to make the military less transparent in the end. Gonzalez, also asserting that the value of transparency should be the goal in an organization, argues that this output was not the intended one, and thus, both parties are seen to be constructing the value of transparency in its traditional understanding and thus reassert its import and necessity. Later, in Gonzalez’s testimony, Desbarats gives him an explicit opportunity to reassert the value of transparency again when he states, “I suppose what I was trying to do was to give you an opportunity if you wanted to make a kind of strong statement in favour of transparency in the bureaucracy” (Vol. 60, Monday, April 29, 1996, PG 11804). This is an interesting exchange in terms of the discourse as it appears that part of the intention or goal of the commissioners in hearing the testimony is to ‘give opportunities’ to make ‘strong statements in favour’ of values like transparency, thereby seemingly acknowledging directly that the commission and its discourse operates at a level to allow moral talk to occur.

Another discussion within the commission discourse that illustrates the definition and assertion of the value of transparency can be found when the issue of the alleged destruction of documents arises. Here, beyond the fact that the documents were alleged to be altered or destroyed for the media, the claim is made that destroying documents so that they are not put into the hands of the commission is a much more serious transgression.

Commissioner Desbarats: I wonder, Mrs. Cardinal, just following up on the Chair’s question, if it had come out that documents were being destroyed to prevent them from falling into the hands of this Commission, wouldn’t that have been a much bigger ‘public relations’ problem than the access to information problem you were faced with it?
Ms. Cardinal: I think the destruction order was given not to prevent the documents from falling into the hands of this Commission because the documents themselves were fairly innocuous. The concern was with Mr. McAuliffe and what he would do when he discovered that documents had been provided to him had been altered. I never had a sense, and, I mean, I don’t believe there was any reason to think that anybody wanted to keep that information from this Commission of Inquiry. It was to keep the process by which the ATI was handled from the knowledge I think of Mr. McAuliffe that the destruction was given.

Commissioner Desbarats: But, in effect, the order was given to prevent the documents being given to the Commission and through that reaching Mr. McAuliffe?

Ms. Cardinal: Yes.

Commissioner Desbarats: If the story had emerged at some point in effect that the documents were being destroyed to prevent them from reaching the hands of the Commission that had been appointed to look into activities in the Defence Department, wouldn’t that have been a much bigger public relations problem?

Ms. Cardinal: Well, it certainly turned out to be, but at the time it wasn’t what I was thinking about. I mean, I should have and, you know, maybe that’s just a lack of awareness on my part, but my No. 1 concern really, quite honestly, at the time was that by the instrument of the Commission this information was going to – not in my mind, in everybody’s mind, the people who did I think were thinking of it that way and, therefore, I thought of it that way. The notion that we were, in fact, not complying with the order of this Commission only struck me later and the seriousness of that. (VOL 75, Monday, June 3, 1996, PG 14575)

From this exchange, the value of the commission’s work and the transparency needed by the commission from the military and DND is made clear on the part of Desbarats, while Cardinal explains that she didn’t originally frame the issue this way. Thus, through this exchange, it appears that the transgression of the transparency value is framed to be even more serious because it is the commission that was hurt as a result.

Similarly, chapter 39 in the final report that deals with the ‘openness and disclosure of documents’, is one of the longest chapters in the entire report at 47 pages. The length and depth at which this issue is treated in the commission discourse also
works to indicate the importance placed on the value of transparency via the disclosure of documents. The chapter opens by noting the obstacles that the commission ran into with the DND, mentioning explicitly the problems of ‘openness and transparency of the Department in its dealings with the public (p. 1199). Shortly thereafter, it ties the concerns the commission has with the department to broader concerns about the government and its levels of openness and transparency.

The story of DND’s compliance with our orders for production of documents and later requests for specific documents might appear to lack the drama of the events that transpired in the Somali desert. However, these issues of compliance evoke much broader policy concerns, such as leadership in the military, allegations of cover-up and, ultimately, the openness and transparency of government – concerns that are of great importance to those planning the future of the Canadian Forces and, indeed, to government and Canadians in general (p. 1199).

This is another particularly telling excerpt. Here, the ‘drama of the events that transpired in the Somali desert’ is directly compared to the ‘DND’s compliance with our orders for production of documents and later request for specific documents’. This, in essence, seems to also posit the transgressions of the moral of peacekeeping/multiculturalism against the transgression of accountability/transparency. In this way, the commission discourse seems to acknowledge that the discussion of morals being challenged is what is at interest here. Interestingly, it is the latter moral transgression, the lack of openness and transparency of the government, that is of ‘great importance’ to the commissioners, and furthermore, to the ‘future of the Canadian Forces, and indeed, to government and Canadians in general’. This is a very strong example of the kind of import placed on discussions of the values of transparency and accountability within the commission discourse.
Likewise, the seriousness of the transgression of the transparency value is further made clear with the following statement:

Actions directly or deliberately leading to delay in producing documents, or the alteration of documents and files ordered for the purposes of fulfilling a mandate under the Inquiries Act, should be seen by all Canadians as an affront to the integrity of the public inquiry process, to our system of government, and to themselves as concerned citizens... On the surface, the events described here suggest either a lack of competence or a lack of respect for the rule of law and the public’s right to know. As we dug deeper, the difficulties we encountered involved tampering with or destruction of documents. The seriousness of these actions and their impact on the investigation conducted by our Inquiry demand that we recount these events in detail. (p. 1200)

The transgression of transparency is tied directly to the Canadian system of government with this statement, which appears to illustrate the importance of this value within the commission discourse more generally. The ‘lack of respect for the rule of law’ and the ‘public’s right to know’ highlight further, associated values with the values of transparency and accountability. In addition, the seriousness of the actions is noted. Over the next 47 pages, the details around the disclosure of documents is provided, highlighting inefficient processes, deliberate obfuscation, altered and destroyed documents and incompetence, thereby providing much discussion and further illustration of the import placed on these values in the commission discourse.

Another telling comment within the commission report about the import of the value of transparency reads:

While it was perhaps to be expected that the public affairs branch of a department would try to minimize the adverse impact of such incidents on the department, the end cannot justify the means. It cannot justify the establishment of a process that, through deceit, provides the public with misleading, incomplete, or inaccurate
information under the *Access to Information Act*. It cannot justify, under the cover of a change in policy, the ruse of allowing a change in the name of official documents, from Response to Query to Media Response Line, to avoid disclosure obligations under the *Access to Information Act*. Finally it cannot justify impeding the public's legitimate right to know about important aspects of the Somalia operation or covering up embarrassing or controversial information relating to that operation (p. 1241).

Using terminology such as 'justify' is interesting within this excerpt, as it helps to make clear that these acts are inexcusable in the commissioners' eyes. Moreover, the public's right to know is highlighted again which is very much aligned with the values of transparency and accountability, working to further reassert those values.

Beyond the great deal of attention to defining and reasserting the values of accountability and transparency within the commission discourse, there are also some examples of the fact that these values are also open to debate and discussion. In one instance, it appears as though the commissioners are trying to get a witness, here, Warrant Officer Ferguson, to agree that transparency, or the lack thereof, is a problem within the military. Ferguson appears to be rejecting that framing of the issue, and a long discussion ensues.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** We have had a lot of discussion at various times about the so-called wall of silence that is supposed to have surrounded two commando, and maybe other parts of the Airborne Regiment as well. The reason you are here, Warrant Officer Ferguson, is because if anybody has experienced the wall of silence, it's you. If there is a wall of silence you spend a good part of the last three or four years running into it head on, and yet you seem to be doing almost everything you can to avoid saying that you were having problems getting information. I mean, if there is a wall of silence it is not a reflection on your professional ability at all. It is just a fact of life that you encountered.

**Warrant Officer Ferguson:** Yes, but –

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Go ahead.
**Warrant Officer Ferguson:** In this case, if they don’t tell the truth and we may know that, but we can’t prove it, then it is just a thing. If the Airborne people—when we did an investigation, you do your investigation to the best of your ability and if they won’t tell you, they won’t tell you and there is no way we can force them to.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** What would have been your own reaction to this? It must have been incredibly frustrating when this would occur over and over?

**Warrant Officer Ferguson:** It didn’t occur over and over. I mean, in this particular time unless there was some real evidence to prove it, we didn’t have it.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Here is an example in this investigation where nobody wants to say anything to you about anything. Now, that is a wall of silence, isn’t it?

**Warrant Officer Ferguson:** Yes.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** As the Chair has pointed out, people in fact tell you that even if they had information about the incident they wouldn’t disclose it. Aren’t they bound if they have information, relevant information to disclose it to you? Aren’t they supposed to?

**Warrant Officer Ferguson:** If you have information in the Canadian Forces you are suppose to, yes, sir.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** They are sitting opposite you in fact saying even if I had information I wouldn’t tell you anyway?

**Warrant Officer Ferguson:** Yes.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Further on, there is an interview with private Okerlund again and there is all kinds of people refusing to take lie detector tests all the way through, refusing to give you written statements and refusing to take lie detector tests, and Private Okerlund states on this occasion that he isn’t going to take a lie detector because his Platoon Warrant Officer had told him not to. Is that usual? Why is his superior noncommissioned officer telling him that he shouldn’t take a lie detector test?

**Warrant Officer Ferguson:** That would be his advice to him. It says in here that he instructed him not to. Maybe he misinterpreted, but we always advise a person that he is not obligated to take a lie detector test.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** I understand that. Is it really the duty of his superior noncommissioned officer to give him that kind of advice as well?

**Warrant Officer Ferguson:** It would be the duty --,
Commissioner Desbarats: To advise him not to take it/ not just that he doesn’t have to, but not to take it.

Warrant Officer Ferguson: Generally not.

Commissioner Desbarats: At the end of the report Private Henderson refused to attend military police section for a second interview because he was advised not to by his superiors. What superiors?

Warrant Officer Ferguson: I don’t know, sir.

The Chairman: You aren’t interested in knowing either from what I can figure out, were you?

Warrant Officer Ferguson: Unless we had grounds to arrest him we couldn’t force him to come to do an interview.

The Chairman: No, but if someone tells you when you were investigating and he says: I am not answering that because my superior had advised me not to answer your questions, I would have thought that you would be interested to know who these superiors are. Would you not?

Warrant Officer Ferguson: Yes, sir.

The Chairman: Or you just move onto something else, just like if it were normal that superiors will tell their subordinates not to assist in any way the military police investigations?

Warrant Officer Ferguson: I think at the time we included in our report and forwarded it up to the Commanding Officer and this would indicate that his unit was not cooperating with an investigation and it would be up to him to deal with it because there is no obligation under the law not to lie, or we could not force him to come here – or come to our section to interview him unless we had grounds to arrest him and physically bring him there.

Commissioner Desbarats: Anyway, just in conclusion, Warrant Officer Ferguson, you agree that this particular investigation is a very good illustration of the so-called wall of silence that in this case, in fact, prevented you from doing what you had set out to do, to find out who was responsible?

Warrant Officer Ferguson: Yes, sir.

As we can see in this extended example, Commissioner Desbarats is repeatedly attempting to frame this as a transparency problem while Ferguson refuses to accept it as such, and thus, a debate ensues. He finally coalesces at the very end, however, when he admits that the wall of silence prevented him from doing what he was supposed to do. This admission by Ferguson, then, ultimately ends up working to reassert the value of transparency overall. Notably, this segment also has to do with accountability – of the soldier who went undisciplined and unpunished for their silence.

Similar differences of perspectives on the importance of value of transparency can be seen throughout the commission discourse, particularly in the in-theatre public hearings that deal with the document issue. For instance, much discussion results around issues of access to information, as we can see in the following exchange:

**Commissioner Desbarats:** But you knew that access to information in fact was a law, was a law?

**Ms. Lemay:** Well, it was not – then it was not as popular as it is today.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** No, no, but it was a law passed by Parliament.

**Ms. Lemay:** It didn’t mean anything more than that to me. It was a document like any other one, to protect anyone and that’s it.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** But Access to Information was a law that was designed to provide journalists and other people with access to some of the kinds of information that was in your system and other kinds of information?

**Lieutenant-Colonel Carter:** If I might, with the greatest trepidation, register something of an objection here, Mr. Chairman, because I think Ms. Lemay has answered this question that she’s got no background in this, she hasn’t dealt with access to information. I’m sure she’ll be happy to agree with whatever Mr. Desbarats says as to what the law it and the purpose of the law because she doesn’t really have anything to judge it against...

**The Chairman:** Let me first deal with this issue of law relating to access to information. The witness is not being asked to give legal opinion as to the
meaning and the contents of the Access to Information act, she’s simply being asked whether she knew that there was a law and nobody is supposed to ignore the law, although as a matter of fact nobody knows the law. ..

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Well, let me perhaps rephrase it slightly Mrs. Lemay. You already said that you knew that there was a law related to access to information?

**Ms. Lemay:** Not a law, but I knew what access to information was.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** Right

**Ms. Lemay:** But a law, no, it’s not my domain.

**Commissioner Desbarats:** No. and in your own mind you didn’t make any connection when you were deleting these documents between that and access to information?

**Ms. Lemay:** Not at all because it’s a tool for us or our daily work is there for us, it’s not a document and very often, you know, I had to duplicate the document, meaning you know retyping it was nowhere, I mean, it’s not something that you can trust as an original document. (Vol 58, Wednesday, April 24, 1996, PG 11446-11449)

Here, Desbarats is placing great import on Access to Information laws, pointing out that following this act is not a negotiable choice but a law that must be followed.

Lemay, in contrast, is arguing that this act informed her behavior to a very limited degree, and doesn’t appear to feel as if she needs to be aware of the law or its repercussions on her own personal behavior within the organization. Thus, the framing of her actions in terms of a blatant disrespect for transparency values, is rejected and reframed by Lemay in this episode.

Within the commission discourse, there was also accusations of cover-up, or lack of transparency, directed towards witnesses in the public hearings occasionally, further pointing to the importance of this value. For instance, at times witnesses are accused of
not being transparent and open in their dealings with the commission. The following exchange displays this kind of discourse that occurred:

The Chairman: It is interesting that you would remember very well this conversation and its contents when so far you haven't been able to remember just about any other conversation that you have had with anyone at any time. Why suddenly do you remember this one?

Commander Caie: It was just an informal conversation with a fairly senior officer, sir. It is something that would probably stick in your mind.

The Chairman: Are you telling us that you have this ability to remember the informal things but not the formal ones?

Commander Caie: No, I'm not telling you anything of the sort. If I had something to remember, I would remember it and I would tell you. That is as frank and direct as I can be.

The Chairman: But it appears to me that all the important things you cannot remember, but the unimportant stuff, common talk, you would remember. I find that surprising from a man of your abilities.

Commander Caie: I am only able to tell you what I know, sir, and that's the best I can do. I can't invent stuff and I won't invent stuff.

The Chairman: So are you saying that Major Duchesneau, who was very positive when he said that he overheard you talking to General Boyle and saying that you wanted to tell him something about Somalia-related documents, are you telling us that Major Duchesneau dreamt that, invented that? (VOL 84, Wednesday, June 26, 1996, PG 16517)

At times, it was very apparent that the commissioners were frustrated with the kind of responses they were receiving, and indicated that they believed that the witnesses weren’t as open and transparent with them as they should have been. This further asserts the value of transparency, and at the same time, displays the differing approach to transparency that the military personnel seem to have, and shows debate and discussion around the morals in play.
This value, framed in terms of transparent participation with the commission, is very evident in the latter portion of the public hearings which deal with the missing documents and the alleged cover-up at the upper levels of the CF and DND. At one point during this testimony, the commissioners begin to question the construction of an organized response, alleged to have occurred to prepare the various military leaders for appearances before the commission. This preparation is framed in negative terms, as against values of openness and transparency. We can see this in the discourse from Commissioner Desbarats who states at one point

And do you see any problems or any contradiction in trying to organize a tactical response to the Inquiry and control the participation in this response by various elements in the military with a very free and open reactive response to the Inquiry? Did you see a contradiction either in implementing a policy like that or, as General Reay had said, in public perception of a policy like that? (Vol. 80, Tuesday, June 18, 1996, PG15551)

This is an interesting comment, because not only is Commissioner Desbarats giving the witness, Major General Vernon at the time, an opportunity to agree with him and thus, reassert the value of transparency, but he also discursively acknowledges that it is the public perception of an alleged prepared statement that is the problem.

Although some discrepancies can be found in the discussion around the values of transparency and accountability, much like the value of multiculturalism, much less debate and discussion occurs. For instance, there are many times when the values of transparency and accountability are reasserted by both the commissioners and the participants in the commission. For instance, Major-General Vernon states, “My personal view was that the Somalia Commission of inquiry was an opportunity and perhaps the
last opportunity that we as soldiers had to explain to the Canadian public and to the Canadian government, for that matter, exactly what had happened, why things had happened, warts and all, and to be as open and frank as we possibly could be...” (Vol 79, Monday, June 17, 1996, PG 15493). Here, transparency and accountability as values are being reasserted as they are traditionally presented.

Finally, there is evidence amidst the commission discourse that the value of transparency is tied to process and procedure, much like the discourse around the other values. For instance, this occurs when the chairman reads a statement about the situation of Corporal Michel Purnelle into the public hearing transcript (In-theatre- Vol, 66, Thursday, May 9, 1996, PG 12829). Purnelle had seven charges laid against him, two of which were related to the fact that Purnelle had left his post without permission to see the commissioners with new evidence, and another related to a media interview he gave. In the latter case, he alone was singled out for discipline. The Chairman uses the forum of the public hearing to note their ‘deep concern’ about these actions and indicate that they will be closely monitoring the situation. The commissioners, thus, appear to be concerned with the value of transparency in this regard, because it appears as though those in the military aren’t interested in being transparent in their processes and procedures.

Procedures of transparency within the commission’s operations are also valued. This is evident in one particular instance when counsel for Col. Labbe, Mr. Hendin, claims that he didn’t get proper and full disclosure for his client. This is a particularly touchy point, as evident by the Chairman’s reply to Hendin. In addition to displaying
evidence of the value of transparency within the commission and the procedures around it
to protect this, it also displays issues of power:

I would like to say to you that out of the perhaps 60 lawyers that have appeared
before us you are the only one to complain about disclosure. We have released
hundreds, literally hundreds of books totaling thousands and thousands of pages
and documents. If anything, some lawyers have complained that they were
receiving too much material and we had instructed Commission counsel, and we
know that they have done that, to indicate to the various counsel the relevant parts
of these documents or this information in order to assist you in fulfilling your task
as counsel to the inquiry and to your client.

We also in that context draw your attention to the information that we thought you
should perhaps concentrate on in order to be more efficient before this inquiry and
in order to better represent the interests of your client. I think as I’ve heard you a
number of times now on this issue of disclosure, either through what you’ve said
in the media or through what you have written to us, I think you are confusing a
trial and an investigation. And although I have said it four times now, if not
maybe five times, I will say it again. This inquiry is not a trial and there is a
tremendous difference in terms of disclosure and in terms of things that ought to
be brought at a trial as opposed to an investigation. At a trial the parties gather the
evidence and once they have gathered the evidence they go before the court to
have the sufficiency of the evidence determined by the judge or the tribunal in
order to know whether their contentions are sustainable on the basis of the
evidence that they have gathered.

An inquiry is a step earlier. We are gathering evidence. We cannot disclose what
we don’t have. What we are trying do is we have allegations that have been made
here and there and we are trying to see whether there is any merit whatsoever in
these allegations in order to get to the truth and the facts. We also investigate the
number of facts that we know have happened and in this context we have some
documentary evidence that relates to those facts and we have filed these
documents with you, and not only with you, but with all counsel, and with the
inquiry. So it is a different process because we are in the process of gathering
some evidence at the same time as we are releasing the evidence that we have
within our hands. We have, and I am confident, that we have revealed and
released all documents that is relevant to the evidentiary hearings. So I wanted
you to know that, Mr. Hendin, perhaps in answer to your letter and to your
grounds of complaint in the context of the subpoena served to Colonel Labbe.
(Vol 147, Monday, January 20, 1997, PG 29908)

This example of the value of transparency and accountability also ties in with the
importance of process and procedure within the commission discourse. In a similar way,
the transparency of the commission is equated to various processes that the commission follows, as outlined by Mr. Evernden, for the Attorney General of Canada, “...I suggest that the appropriate way to proceed is on the assumption that no one appearing before you or any other judicial or quasi-judicial body intends to lie or mislead you. The nature of the oath, the publicity of the process and the risks of cross-examination give some assurance that witnesses will do their best to tell the truth as they see it” (Vol 187, Thursday, April 10, 1997, PG 38020). As we will examine further in the next chapter, the discussion around the values such as accountability and transparency are also often tied to discussions around process and procedure in the commission discourse. In all, just as the values of peacekeeping and multiculturalism, transparency/accountability is defined, debated and sometimes reasserted via the moral discourse found within the commission documents.
CHAPTER TEN: ROLE OF PROCESS AND PROCEDURE IN THE COMMISSION DISCOURSE

After a close inspection of the commission discourse, we have seen how the commission is a place where the transgressed norms of the Somalia Affair, such as peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency/accountability are discussed, defined, and even reasserted. Now, I turn to the examination of the commission discourse in order to illustrate the import of process and procedure that is displayed there. As I will show, the importance of process and procedure are evident in the commission discourse in various ways. Firstly, the processes and procedures that were utilized within the commission itself were emphasized within the discourse in detail, thereby highlighting this norm as an important value. Secondly, the processes and procedures of the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence, or lack thereof in this case, were subject to criticisms and investigation in the discourse. Here again, reassertions of the value of process and procedure are evident by the normative claims made in the commission discourse that argue for increased presence and rigour in the procedures of these two institutions. Finally, process is often used as an important discursive tactic within the commission. Here, when issues of difficulty come up, such as when two counselors are disagreeing, procedure is relied upon frequently to get things back on track. In this way,
we can see how language battles for power, over the framing of issues, morals or the representation of individuals, are often solved via the procedures of the commission. In this way, process is intimately tied up with power in the commission, so that when power struggles ensue, process is usually employed to reign them in, overpower someone or to concede. Thus, ‘saving face’ in the context of a power struggle in the commission seems to be occurring in the discourse through the use of procedure. Rather than examine how morals are defined, debated and asserted within the commission discourse, then, this chapter displays how process and procedure are intently valued within the commission discourse, as well as how process and procedure is inherently utilized within the operations of the commission itself. Such a heavy preference and reliance on process and procedure in both the discourse and operation of the commission has some interesting implications for the communication function of the commission as we shall see.

The commission’s heavy reliance on process and procedure in its operations is evident in a number of places within the discourse. The very purpose of the inquiry, as explained by the Chairman, is noted to examine the procedural issues that may have lead to the Somalia Affair. As he explains, “The purpose of our inquiry is to look at the structural institutional deficiencies which may have contributed to or permitted the occurrence of the sad events that we now know as well as the institutional response to these deficiencies” (Vol 1, Monday, Oct., 2, 1995, PG 3). The reference to ‘institutional deficiencies’ as well as the ‘institutional response’ is interesting in this statement, as it seems to imply that it is not the actual transgressions that are of concern for the commission, but the institutional processes that occurred around and after the
transgressions for which the commission is of most interest. In this way, statements like
these seem to imply that the values that are of most concern in the commission, and that
needs to be clearly reasserted, are those of process and procedure.

The importance of process and procedure within the commission discourse are
found in many other places. For instance, within the initial pages of the final report, the
processes that the commission used are explained at length. Putting this information front
and centre seems to indicate the importance of procedure for the commission. Noting the
methodological approach the commission took, the report outlines a number of
procedures and processes that the commission followed. For instance, the report states
that the commissioners studied “over 150,000 documents” and interviewed “hundreds of
potential witnesses in a relentless search for the truth” (p. 3). In addition, the research
team is noted as carrying out “an exhaustive comparative assessment of rules and
policies” (p. 3) while the commissioners carried out public hearings from May 24, 1995
to September 1996. Rhetorically, these statements work to not only display the process
that the commission used in its investigation, but it also works to establish them as
credible speakers on the topic because of the thorough and fair methods that they are
arguing they used. In this way, because the commissioners studied ‘over 150,000
documents’ and interviewed ‘hundreds of potential witnesses’ in a ‘relentless search for
truth’, they are establishing, not only that they used a process in the commission, but that
they used a very thorough process, and thereby attempt to discursively construct
themselves as credible and reliable speakers on the topic that follows. This kind of
discursive work can be seen to be operating more explicitly when, in the final report, the
rules of practice and procedure that the commission followed are also described as an
effort to display the ‘fairness of the inquiry’s procedures’ (p. 10). These procedures
included applications for standing, the notices given under Section 13 of the inquiries act
in addition to various “rulings on matters of procedure and various motions put before
us” (p. 12). Beyond the value that is placed on procedure within these statements here,
and which is evidenced throughout the commission discourse, the focus on process and
procedure is at the same time operating to establish the credibility of the commission and
the commissioners themselves.

The importance of procedures within the commission is referred to frequently
throughout the commission discourse. For instance, the final report also notes that its own
processes were outlined in the terms of reference, and that “ours were detailed and
complex” (p. 4) and the major matters with which the commission was sent to investigate
are outlined in great detail. The commission’s methodology is included in this section as
well as is the sources that the commission used to obtain its facts, such as documents,
interviews and research trips.

As was often the case within the commission discourse, procedures and processes
were often tied into the issue of documentation that arose in the context of the discussion
of accountability and transparency. In fact, there are many more alliances between the
values of process/procedure and accountability/transparency within the commission
discourse. In this case, the connection between procedure and documentation is made in
the following statement:
On May 24, 1995 we issued a document on rules of practice and procedure that dealt with a number of procedural issues, including the requirements for standing, procedural, and public hearings; provisions for the calling of witnesses; a definition of 'documentary evidence'; the requirements for written submissions; and conditions relating to media coverage of hearings. (p. 12)

Statements like this, indicate the numerous processes that were followed within the commission (i.e. requirements for standing, public hearings, provisions for calling witnesses, etc.), but also displays how often, these procedures were put into a form of document. That is, very often within the commission discourse, the processes and procedures that were followed and discussed were documented and distributed. Thus, the value of process and procedure were put to paper, recorded, and shared as well within the commission discourse.

Much more evidence of the reliance on, and the value, of procedure can be found throughout the commission discourse. For example, the procedural rules of the commission itself are frequently noted within the public hearing discourse. Often included at the beginning of a day of hearings, these processes are frequently read into the record by the commission counsel. The act of reading the rules into the record, also, notably connecting the procedures to documentation again. For instance, when Colonel Mathieu’s lawyer motioned to adjourn the inquiry, commission counsel (Weinstein) used the rules of procedure of the inquiry to respond publicly in the hearings. Here, we can see how process and procedure are clearly favoured in the discourse:

**Mr. Weinstein:** As the Commissioners are aware, the Rules of Procedure of this inquiry under section 6 of your rules, call for written motions for an application for standing. As you are also aware, section 15 of your rules also outlines the procedure if a party wishes to call a witness. Such an application, again, must be in writing, the application stating the reasons and a summary of the anticipated
evidence. If issues such as standing and calling of witnesses have to be initiated in writing with reasons or details given, surely an important issue such as requesting an adjournment of proceedings, surely this also must be in writing in a formal way. I also and most importantly draw your attention to rule 44 of the Rules of Procedure which I will read into the record: ‘Where any matter arises not otherwise provided for by these rules, the practice and procedure shall for that particular matter be determined by the commission by analogy to the provision of these rules.’ (Vol 16, Wednesday, Nov. 15, 1995, PG 2874).

There are a number of things going on in this example from a close examination of the text. For instance, the fact that an issue such as the adjournment of the commission itself is dealt with by reference to the procedures of the institution is very interesting. As we will see in further examples, it appears that when issues of difficulty like this arose, over the framing of the issue or the operation of the commission or even when disputes arise between two parties involved in the commission, the procedures of the commission are often referred to as a way to control the operation of the commission, and thus, its discourse. Here, the move to adjournment is dismissed because the proper procedures to do so, as outlined by Weinstein above, have not been followed.

In addition, this example is interesting in that it illustrates the number of procedures that are utilized within the commission and its discourse. Weinstein refers to the procedures around standing and the calling of witnesses, uses their numbers to refer to them, and also ties the use of these procedures as only deemed to be recognized if they are put into writing. In addition, Weinstein seems to rely on the biggest procedural rule of all in an attempt to control the situation. Referring to Rule 44 as ‘most importantly’, Weinstein himself reads the procedural rule into the official record which notes that when something arises within the commission that can’t be put under the already created rules
and procedures, 'the practice and procedure shall for that particular matter be determined by the commission by analogy to the provision of these rules'. In other words, the other rules will apply to things that crop up that have no rules. The value placed on procedure throughout the commission discourse is evident within this telling statement, as is the application of the procedures to deal with troubles the commission faces.

This example also makes clear the importance of writing and documentation to the commissioners and counsel. While this is clearly tied to the values of accountability and transparency, it is also tied to process within the commission discourse. The following excerpt illustrates:

**Commissioner Rutherford:** As a general practice, Doctor, would you not keep minutes of these meetings?

**Dr. Calder:** A meeting like this – a meeting like this, no, we didn’t.

**Commissioner Rutherford:** I have great difficulty understanding why you wouldn’t.

**Dr. Calder:** Well, I think Commissioner, one has to understand that certainly in my case that I have downsized my organization six times in five years and we are cutting our staff down to the bone and we produce an enormous amount of – enormous amount of documentation. My organization is...

**Commissioner Rutherford:** It would just require a secretary to be present.

**Dr. Calder:** Well, it is not a practice.

**Commissioner Rutherford:** It is not a practice throughout the department?

**Dr. Calder:** No, no. (VOL 81, Thursday, June 20, 1996, PG 15863)

This exchange, and others like it, is obviously related to the commission’s frustration that certain documents were missing and they felt like the military wasn’t being transparent with the commission as we saw in the previous chapter. But it also speaks to the value of
process, for when one records things in a written manner, the process itself is recorded. Without this kind of documentation, things can be very much based on hearsay and the record of process is unavailable. In this way, the discourse around the issues of documentation frequently reasserts the values of process, transparency and accountability all at once.

Within the commission discourse, there are also many examples of the importance of process as a value which is evident based on the description of the processes of the military that are laid out. For instance, a great deal of time is spent in the initial public hearing sessions with people from the military explaining how various processes in the military operate, such as the selection of personnel, or the command system, etc. (procedural hearings). Here, beyond the educational aspect that including this information into a public record performs, it also works to display that various processes and systems are in place in the military, and thus, reasserting the value of process itself.

Throughout the report, the importance of policies and procedure as values is also evident when normative statements are made around the lack of process in place, or processes that were not followed, within the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence. For instance, in discussing the criteria that were available to use in order to determine whether Canada should go on a peacekeeping mission, the report indicates that

senior officers and officials in the Department of National Defence played down the significance of these policy guidelines in the decision-making process. Moreover, both the Deputy Minister and the CDS maintained that the guidelines
were ‘significantly’ flexible and were taken into account only ‘somewhat, not in any particular detail’. (p. 238)

This statement highlights the value of procedure within the commission discourse. Here, the commissioners point out that even though a process was available (i.e. the criteria), the ‘significance of these policy guidelines’ were ‘played down’. Thus, the policy guidelines are posited as significant, and the fact that they were ‘played down’ is included as a negative connotation. In addition, that high ranking officials, such as the Chief of Defense Staff (CDS) and the Deputy Minister, believed that the process was ‘significantly’ ‘flexible’ and were only taken account in a broad fashion also connotes that this behavior is unacceptable. Thus, implicit within this statement is the value claim that process and procedure are not only necessary, but useful and should be utilized in order for successful events to occur. Here, by pointing out the lack of process that was followed within the military and the DND, the commissioners are highlighting that this is where problems can be located.

The lack of process and procedure in the DND and CF that is clearly posited as problematic in the commission discourse, is often evident within the findings and recommendations of the report. Statements such as “we recommend that: The Chief of Defence Staff adopt formal criteria around…” are frequently found, pointing out the preference within the commission discourse for ‘formal criteria’ being adopted and followed, thereby highlighting the value placed on process and procedure (p. 375). Similarly, many findings include terminology such as “there was no policy or process”, “existing laws, regulations, orders, and policies were not used adequately or uniformly by
the chain of command”, “there was no procedure”, “proper policies or procedures did not exist”, etc. (p. 541). Implicit in these statements is the belief that policies and procedures are needed in these instances. Thus, the value of process and procedure is very much reasserted within the commission discourse.

In a similar manner, the importance of the value of process was made evident in the commission discourse when the failures of processes were noted, such as in sections on the personnel selection (“at times, the personnel system seemed to rely blindly and bureaucratically on formal appraisals and was not responsive to other sources of relevant information that were often more revealing” p. 510), or in-theatre training (“We were surprised by the apparent lack of an in-theatre training plan. While there were several pre-deployment documents that gave us the impression that the general possibility of training in theatre was being considered, we heard no evidence which indicated that a systematic or comprehensive in-theatre training plan was developed or implemented” p. 624), decision-making processes (“were dismayed by the lack of explicit doctrine articulating the process at NDHQ for responding to requests for Canadian Forces involvement in peace support operations. While defence policy required that certain criteria be taken into account in decisions, no formal process was in place to give effect to such policy” p. xv), intelligence gathering (“The entire intelligence process was flawed by serious deficiencies in direction, doctrine, co-ordination, and quality control” p. 897), and rules of engagement (“To our amazement and consternation, LCol (ret) Mathieu also stated clearly that the actual rules of engagement per se are a formality more than anything else” p. 1022) among many other topics. In fact, as one can begin to see from
the numerous examples included here, it is the discussion around procedure and process that seems to dominate the discourse of the commission in many cases. That is, it is process and procedure, or lack thereof as in the above instances, which seems to be of major concern to the commissioners. Thus, process and procedure as important values within Canadian social system are being defined and reasserted throughout the commission discourse.

There are many more explicit examples within the commission discourse that highlight the overall import of process in terms of planning. For instance, the commissioners connect successful military missions directly with planning, or process when they state that “The success or failure of a mission is directly attributable to how well it is planned” (p. xvi). This is telling for what it implies about the very basic function of process. Here, it is not the murder, torture, or even racial issues that are of concern for the commissioners, but whether or not a proper process was put into place before, during and after the mission in Somalia. This is indicative of the kind of import placed on the values of process and procedure throughout the commission discourse.

In a related manner, after introducing the discussion on mission planning in the report as well as the March 4th incident, the commission report notes that “They demonstrate so vividly a mission so ill-conceived that many Canadians will wonder why consequences even more shocking than those that led to this Inquiry did not happen or have not come to light” (p. xvii). Even stronger language is used to highlight the import of process and procedure in the following example:
Few would blame a commander whose plan failed honestly. But a careless plan almost always leads to disaster. Commanders must therefore be held accountable for every operation, and especially for operations that fail because of inadequate, careless, or incomplete planning and poor command decisions in circumstances where, with due diligence, problems ought to have been anticipated and other decisions made. (p. 798).

The reference to poor planning here is in direct connection with the idea of procedure and planning, and it is this lack of process that appears to be being blamed for the entire Somalia Affair. This is an important focus of the commission discourse.

Some of the more interesting and explicit discussions around the importance of process in the commission discourse were evidenced around the issue of the lack of processes in the military. This also indicated differences in norms systems as well. For instance, while the ‘military’ witnesses often appeared to simply ‘trust’ the system in which they worked and operated, the ‘civilian’ side, as represented by the commissioners, the commission counsel and the other lawyers, often appeared to be shocked and in disbelief that things were not recorded on paper or that processes upon which to base decisions were not utilized. For instance, in the following exchange, we can see how the Chairman of the commission seems surprised that there are no objective measures or processes in place around training, leadership, command, etc. within the military. The witness, Lieutenant-Colonel Turner appears to have difficulty understanding how such processes could be created, and why, in fact, they are needed.

The Chairman: Yes, but then you’re saying that there has to be standards, standards in relation to training, standards in relation to leadership, standards in relation to command, standards in relation to cohesiveness, there must be something.
Lieutenant-Colonel Turner: Well, I’m not sure how you could possibly qualify a standard with respect to a mission in a place or preparing for a mission in Somalia or anywhere else where obviously there’s going to be so many factors at play. How do you determine or come up with a checklist that says, if you pass 70 of these points you’re operationally ready? I mean, you have to give credit to the chain of command to be competent to do their job.

The Chairman: Are you saying that in the chain of command some people might say: Yes, we think that they are ready and you replace these persons by others who would see the same thing and say: I don’t think they are ready? (Vol 20 Wed Nov 22, PG 3599)

Here, the lack of process across the military about readiness of soldiers is presented as difficult for the Chairman to understand, as in the final statement. At the same time, the fact that a checklist would not be possible or usable to decide these kind of things is clearly represented in the Turner excerpt. The differences in norm systems around the value of procedure are often framed in terms of trust. In this way, the ‘military’ norm system often explains the lack of process or procedure in place within their organizations because they do not need them, because they ‘trust’ each other. For instance, one particularly telling claim reads:

...in the Army we have implicit trust in the organization below us until there is evidence that there is some reason not to trust it. We had five levels of command including the CDS and staff, and if they removed the CO there must have been a good reason. If they felt the regiment wasn’t ready, I guess my sense was they would have told us that it wasn’t ready and they would have to change. (Vol 10, Thursday, Oct. 26, 1995, PG 1956)

In this statement, the trust around decisions in the military organization is used instead of the reliance on process. These kinds of instances also work to display that while the value of process/procedure was repeatedly reasserted by the commissioners in the discourse, there were also attempts to debate and discuss it, and that different norms systems, here, as represented by the military, were framed in a different manner.
Interestingly, issues of procedure are also often tied to issues of power in the commission discourse. This is notable when particular rulings are discussed in the final report. For instance, the report notes that a ruling was put forward on behalf of Brigadier General Ernest B. Beno that sought to disqualify Chairman Letourneau for the Somalia commission or, at least, to disqualify him from making adverse findings about Beno “on the grounds that his conduct with respect to the applicant created a ‘real apprehension of bias’” (p. 13). The Chairman was accused of making statements that demonstrated ‘unfairness’ to the witness. The commission ultimately dismissed the motion “on the grounds that any findings to be made would be based solely and scrupulously on the evidence formally disclosed to the participants and received in our hearings, and that all findings and conclusions would be collective, that is, those of all Commissioners together” (p. 13). Interestingly, it is at this point that the process and procedures that are followed in the commission are outlined, presumably, to establish credibility for the motion’s dismissal and the commissioners’ decision. In this way, process and procedure are used to deal with power struggles that occurred between participants in the commission, here, between Letourneau and Beno.

Interestingly, the report continues on this example and points out that Beno took the motion to the Federal Court Trial Division, which upheld the claim of bias. The commissioners then filed an appeal with the Federal Court of Appeal and “in a unanimous decision, quashed the decision of the Trial Division and concluded that there was no evidence of bias and no reasonable apprehension of bias on the part of the Chairman” (p. 14). By using words such as ‘unanimous’ and ‘quashed’, the discourse is
posited as strongly in favour of the Chairman and the commission more generally.

Likewise, the fact that there was ‘no evidence of bias and no reasonable apprehension of bias’ leaves little room for doubt as to the Chairman’s innocence, according to the discourse presented here. This section of the report works to display the lingering effects of a power struggle between Beno and the Chairman, which, importantly, was worked out through procedural mechanisms.

Another example where process is tied up with power and politics in the hearings comes when Mr. Vita, government counsel, repeatedly objects whenever General Boyle is mentioned in the hearings. The use of the objection tool in the process, works to bring in power and politics into the commission discourse. This can be seen in the following exchange:

**The Chairman:** And I will repeat it again, it is not because every time the name of General Boyle is mentioned that someone has to object.

**Mr. Vita:** No, sir, but there is a man’s reputation on the line here.

**The Chairman:** Go on, Mr. Cogan

**Mr. Vita:** Canada has a great interest in that, Mr. Chairman. (VOL 78, Thursday, June 6, 1996, PG 15190)

Here we can see that Mr. Vita is explicitly acknowledging the political importance of the discourse around General Boyle, and he is utilizing his power of objection, a process within the commission, to help counter this. In this way, a discursive process, the objection, is being utilized in an effort to deal with issues of power amidst the commission discourse. The use of procedure to respond to power struggles and
difficulties that arose within the commission is a notable feature within the commission discourse.

Near the end of the public hearings, various counselors, including the government counselors are given time to make submissions, mainly on issues of concern for them. The issue of Section 13 notices, which very much has to do with power and politics, is a frequent topic. Section 13 notices are notices given out to people involved in the commission’s investigations who are going to be named, or frequently blamed, for issues and happenings that the commission investigated. Here, the concern with receiving a Section 13 notice is that one’s reputation will be tarnished if the commission decides to reprimand and point fingers at certain individuals, in connection to the Somalia Affair. Naturally, this brings up issues of conflict within the commission, as well as broader issues of power. These are once again dealt with in a procedural manner as we can see. For instance, Mr. Evernden, counsel for the government, draws on another commissioner’s decision to try to sway the commissioners to avoid Section 13 notices being used. Evernden cites Madam Justice Arbour’s comments, which claims that it wouldn’t be fair to embark on an attribution of responsibility, and states,

..the natural reticence to destroy careers, to tar people through a process that by its very nature – and this has nothing to do with the truncation of this process but simply by virtue of the inquiry process itself is focused in a particular direction – signals some caution in terms of dealing with individuals. I leave it to the individuals to advance to you the reasons why they should or should not have assessed against them some finding of breach of their responsibilities or an error in accountability, and I’m sure that they will competently address those, so I don’t want to get into that, but I do want to say that from the Government’s point of view we are much more interested for the moment and in these submissions in systems than we are in individuals. (Vol. 187, Thursday, April 10, 1997, PG 38032)
Here, the acknowledgement by Everden that it is the systems that are a priority or issue of interest for the government, and thus, the various processes and procedures that were or were not followed, points to the way that the values of process and procedure are seen to be preferred within the commission discourse, as well as utilized as a tool to deal with power struggles. Thus, process and procedures are frequently used to deal with background politics and power issues in the commission discourse.

Power is also frequently tied up with process in various dealings with witnesses throughout the commission discourse, particularly in the public hearings. In many cases, witnesses repeatedly respond ‘I don’t recall’ to questions posed, frustrating the commissioners and their counsel to no end. This is a process of response that is tied to power, in that it enables the witnesses some protection from reprimand. By responding, ‘I don’t recall’ to questions about troublesome incidents, they are neither claiming no, nor that they don’t remember, but that they’re not sure if they remember or not. In other words, by using the phrase ‘I don’t recall’, a witness can avoid prosecution for lying on the stand. Here, is an example of an exchange around this use of this phrase which begins to point to the power issues around this discursive process:

**The Chairman**: Just before you do, when you say – because the question leads to that – do you recall, it can mean that it never happened, but you don’t remember. So when you say you don’t recall talking to Colonel Mathieu, do you mean to say that you may have talked to him, but you don’t remember or you mean –

**Major Kyle**: I may have talked to him, but I don’t remember.

**The Chairman**: Okay. (Vol. 117, Tuesday, Oct. 22, 1996, PG 23454)

The use of the phrase ‘I don’t recall’ is an interesting discursive move in the commission discourse and throughout the public hearings, it is used 1510 times, while ‘I don’t
"remember" is used 810 times within the public hearings. These related discursive moves are frequently tied to issues of power and transparency in the commission discourse. For instance, the Chairman expresses his frustration with this tactic in the following example:

**The Chairman:** I would have thought that you would remember these matters especially in view of the fact that there was an allegation by Major Armstrong that this was an execution – the person was shot at close range. And I don’t know if you have noticed how many times you have said ‘I don’t remember’ over your testimony today, but eventually we are going to review the transcript and I’m going to add them up and make something out of that. We are dealing with a very important incident and issues that you were alerted to very, very early on that night and right there was an allegation of an execution-style killing and these matters would have certainly been discussed and would have been serious matters and I’m certain puzzled that you wouldn’t remember anything of the kind.

**Major Kyle:** Is that a question, Mr. Chairman?

**The Chairman:** It’s a statement at this time. And perhaps I should remind you that we have the power to comment on the credibility of witnesses in our final report. And again, I would like you to think about that because we are dealing with very serious matters here and it seems that when it comes to a number of issues you don’t remember; on others you remember some details, but when it comes to the crucial issues you don’t remember too well. (VOL 117 Tuesday, October 22, 1996, PG 23581).

The connection between the use of procedures and power struggles is also evident in other places throughout the commission discourse. This has to do with perceived conflict of interest around the employment of the government counselors. Here, the fact that the same members of counsel were representing all of the employees of the government, that is, the soldiers and the bureaucrats at all levels and who often told contradictory stories, was argued to be a conflict of interest for these counselors within the public hearings. One such case was put forward on behalf of Lieutenant-Colonel Mathieu, who motioned for the adjournment of the proceedings because of a perceived
conflict of interest with his court martial trial, and who particularly argued that it is fundamentally unfair for Mathieu to be cross-examined by the Attorney General of Canada who also has responsibility for prosecuting Mathieu's retrial (Vol 24, Thursday, Nov. 30, 1995, PG 4395). As a response to this claim of conflict of interest, the Chairman reads a response into the record in the public hearings testimony, which covers 23 pages in the transcript that addresses the motion. Here, legalese is used, as it is throughout the transcripts in general, in addition to the legal case history and proof in an effort to back up the decision. This works to make the official order to dismiss the motion appear more formal and thorough and also highlights the import of process and procedure as a value utilized to deal with issues of power.

In the public hearings, there are many instances of power play between the commissioners, particularly between the chairman, and the various lawyers, as well as between various lawyers themselves, where sniping comments are made and frustrations become evident. For example, the Chairman often voices his frustration when particular processes within the commission are not followed, as in the following example which was directed at the Government of Canada counselors, Lieutenant-Colonel Carter and Mr. Weinstein;

There is an order to follow. He made his intervention, there was an answer and then there is an answer to the intervention and then intervention and another answer. I mean, you have to decide between the two of you who will make the objection and state the reasons for the objection. We just cannot go on forever. (Vol 19, Tuesday, Nov. 21, 1995, PG 3498)

Examples like this excerpt, where the Chairman uses issues of process to object to interjections and examination that oversteps its bounds, are common and further work to
illustrate how process is often tied up with power and politics within the commission discourse.

In a related manner, there are often moments within the public hearing discourse where conflict ensues between the participants. A particularly interesting example of the kind of conflict that occurs in the commission discourse is shown to occur between the Chairman and the Attorney General counselor Mr. Vita:

The Chairman: Mr. Vita, I don’t want to argue the contents of the report. This is for the witness to testify on the contents of the report, it’s not for you to testify on the report. We were asking him questions and, let me put it mildly, his answers have been useless and evasive, and so...

Mr. Vita: Well, with the greatest respect...

Mr. Chairman: Let’s take it from here and decide. Let’s take it from here and decide whether the witness will carry on testifying or not.

Mr. Vita: But, Mr. Chairman, all I was trying to address, first of all, if I may, is you made a comment that if this kind of charge wouldn’t be wiped off. I’m trying to illustrate to you that the only charge that could have been raised from here, in my respectful submission, would be prejudice to good order and discipline...

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Vita, you’re arguing again. You’re arguing on the basis of trying to defend the witness, and I think we have let you know what our position was. Could we move on with the witness now?

Mr. Vita: Well, let me just, with the greatest respect, if I may, just spend a moment on this.

Mr. Chairman: Well –

Mr. Vita: Mr. Chairman, hear me out, please...

Mr. Chairman: You’re arguing again what you first argued before we made our statement. What do you do with the witness now; do you want the witness to carry on? (VOL 19 Tuesday, November 21, 1995, PG 3511)
This exchange between the government counselor and the chairman carries on for some time, but the example is included to display some of the kind of conflicting discourse that is common within the commission. Notably, when conflicts like this arise, the commissioners often use procedural aspects to try to curtail it, as is the case here around the issue of carrying on with the witness or dismissing him from testifying. Mr. Vita is also relying on procedure to respond to the complaints and frustrations of the Chairman. In this way, process appears to be used in order to air issues, keep them depersonalized (i.e. ‘with the greatest respect’), and carry on with the operation of the commission.

Beyond the conflict that appears between the commissioners and the various lawyers, there is also frequently conflict evident between counselors themselves. At one point, the conflict between two lawyers gets so bad that the chairman intervenes and points to the importance of process in the hearings. He states:

On the other issue of what I would call the relationship between the two of you, I would appreciate for the benefit of this Inquiry and for the benefit of the people who are catching this Inquiry that the lawyers behave properly and everybody will benefit from that. And not only in terms of time saving, but in terms of getting the facts to assist this Inquiry and also in terms of the image being sent to those who are watching us, who are watching this process. So I would appreciate your assistance in this regard so that we don’t make – well, we don’t make a mockery of the process. (Vol. 83, Tuesday, June 25, 1995, PG 16168).

This quote is interesting in that it indicates the importance of process in the public eye. As it notes that the proper behavior of the lawyers is key to ensuring that the process is efficient and effective, it also notes that to do otherwise will create an improper image to the public, and could make a mockery of the process overall. In this statement, it appears as though the chairman is referring to the entire commission as a process, which has
interesting implications for the role of process and procedure in the discursive function of the inquiry.

When the commissioners got frustrated with what they perceived as a lack of transparency or openness on the part of the witnesses, they often relied on process to rein the witnesses in. This also displays issues of power between players in the commission and how they are dealt with in terms of procedure. In the following excerpt, the Chairman displays his frustration with the witness, and uses procedure to display his power position over the witness:

**The Chairman:** I think we have said it to the witness a number of times, and he is back to where we were. Mr. Murray, you have to answer the questions and in the order for us to make some progress, from one question to move to another and then perhaps to another topic, you have to limit your answers to what is necessary to properly answer the questions. Whether the Italians were shooting loosely at people or whether the Pakistanis were doing that, that is not what we are tasked to look at. We are tasked to look at the Canadian Airborne Regiment Battle Group in Somalia, and in the context of the questioning by Mr. Vanveen we are looking at the threat, the level of threat at the Belet Huen camp, Canadian camp. So you should answer the question and limit your answer to the question.

**Vice-Admiral Murray:** Okay, sir. Well, if the question is do I think paragraph 3 was appropriate on the 4th of March in giving a reasonable description of the circumstances –

**The Chairman:** He will put the question to you, sir. He is counsel and he is the one that puts the question and your role as a witness is to answer the question to the best of your knowledge and to the best of abilities. (Vol. 157, Monday, February, 3, 1997, PG 31913).

Here, the procedure, that the counsel will put the question to the witness, and that the witness is to respond accordingly, is reaffirmed when difficulties in the discourse arise. As we have seen, this is a common discursive tactic used in the commission, thereby
highlighting not only the importance of procedure as a value, but also the way it is drawn on in the operation of the commission.

Overall, the importance of process and procedure are evident in the commission discourse in three ways. In the first instance, the processes and procedures of the commission itself are emphasized within the discourse in detail. And in the second, the processes and procedures of the military, or more frequently, the lack thereof, were subject to criticisms and investigation in the discourse. Here again, reassertions of the value of process and procedure are evident. Finally, process is also intimately tied up with power in the commission discourse, so that when power struggles ensue, process is usually employed to rein them in and allow the commission to continue to operate.
As I have illustrated in the previous chapters, analyzing the commission discourse of the Somalia Affair in an in-depth manner provided some very interesting findings. Firstly, we saw how the commission discourse is certainly a place where 'moral talk' is able to occur; that is, the commission allows social values, such as peacekeeping, multiculturalism and accountability and transparency, to be defined, debated and often reasserted within its bounds. Also, we saw how the importance of process and procedure was emphasized, both in terms of a value within the commission discourse, as well as the way that the commission actually operates. The value that was placed on process and procedure in the commission discourse was also often tied to the reaffirmation and sanction of the transgressed values in the discourse, and interestingly, was drawn on as a tool to squelch issues of difficulty, such as battles for power, that arose throughout the commission's discourse and operations. These findings are interesting because of what they suggest about the role of the commission in the Somalia Affair, and for their implications beyond.
The Somalia Commission, Moral Discourse and Social Order

As I have argued throughout the dissertation, the Somalia Affair itself was a transgression of, and reaction to, norm violations within Canada. Serious transgressions around the values of peacekeeping, multiculturalism and accountability and transparency occurred within the events of the Somalia Affair which resulted in a moment of moral dissonance for the social group broadly referred to as Canadians. Thus, the Somalia Affair presented a disruption of the moral order in Canada – a disruption of the moral order so severe that some response or action was needed. As I have found, it was the commission, and the discourse that occurs within its bounds, that provided a useful response to the disruption of moral order that the Somalia Affair presented. As we saw, the occurrence of ‘moral talk’ (the definition, debate and reassertion of social values) was evident within the discourse of the Somalia commission. That is, the transgressions and their associated values were defined within the commission discourse and were also often reaffirmed. In this way, it was via the moral talk that occurs in the commission that helps to define, redefine and reassert the shared beliefs that were violated in the Somalia Affair scandal. This discursive work may also uphold the social collectivity that follows and sustains these beliefs – the Canadian social group. In this way, the values and morals that were transgressed in the Somalia Affair – that of peacekeeping, multiculturalism and transparency and accountability – were defined and reaffirmed throughout the discourse of the commission, both in the public hearings as well as the in the final report that the commission produced in particular. The moral discourse or ‘value talk’ that was shown to be present and notable in the discourse of the public hearings and the final report
generally presents the transgressions of those values as wrong, misguided and unacceptable. Through the display of the moral discourse found in the commission discourse, then, there is an attempt to redefine, readdress and even reassert the Canadian values that were transgressed. This was done in many discursive ways as we saw. In all, it was through the process of disclosure, denunciation and retribution that occurs within the discourse of the commission that enables the norms, conventions and even institutions of Canada to be reinforced. In essence, the bonds of a common morality were also strengthened in this way.

Not only were norms such as peacekeeping, multiculturalism and accountability and transparency defined and reasserted, however, they were also open to debate and discussion within the commission discourse. In this way, the commission can be understood, in terms of its communication functions at least, as a place where the confrontations between various systems of norms can also play out in a society. This was particularly evident in the heavy debate around the peacekeeping value, for instance, when the framing of the value according to a 'civilian' perspective was repeatedly rejected and reframed for a 'military' perspective of the value. This also occurred at times around the values of multiculturalism, accountability/transparency and process and procedure, where values were also debated and discussed broadly in terms of two interesting systems of norms within Canada – broadly defined as the civilian and military system of norms. Thus, the discourse that occurred within the Somalia commission helps to reveal some of the underlying societal norms that make up the moral fabric of Canadian society. Within the commission and its procedures, the differences that operate subtly within various groups and organizations in Canada, came to be publicly discussed,
debated and shared. The commission discourse thus operated to provoke moral position-taking. In this way, debates around what is considered acceptable and unacceptable within Canadian social norms (or sacred and profane) occurred within the Somalia commission. In broader terms, this may explain, in part, why commissions are frequently used in response to a Canadian political scandal. As procedures or rituals that allow, or even encourage, the kind of debate and redefinition around social norms to occur, they may be the best social institution (versus the media, for instance) to allow the kind of discursive work that is necessary for a society to be reinforced — and changed — to occur.

In addition, the Somalia commission, in its communication function, worked particularly well in its ability to deal with the moral transgressions around this scandal not only because it allowed for debates between moral systems to occur, but also because the transgressions are ultimately sanctioned and borders between the acceptable/unacceptable are eventually either maintained or redrawn. This is done particularly well within the final report of the Somalia commission, for instance. While a great deal of the discussion and debate around the transgressed morals was evident within the public hearing discourse, many more examples of strong normative statements around what was posited as unacceptable and acceptable could be found explicitly stated within the final report of the commission. This is interesting because it points further to the integral role of a commission in the discourse of a political scandal like the Somalia Affair. Here, then, we can see how in the Somalia commission, at least, part of the communication function of the commission, was to sanction the transgressions (and transgressors) that occurred, clarifying the border between the sacred and profane in this situation. The final report, in its declarative statements around what occurred in the
Somalia Affair, as well as what happened in terms of the institutions and players involved, presents a normative discursive statement on what should be applauded in terms of the Somalia operation (i.e. the hearts and minds approach) and what should be condoned (i.e. the secretiveness of the government institutions in its operations and document disclosure). Not only are the transgressions discussed within the commission discourse, but they are also sanctioned via the publication of the final report, further reasserting their value, and in some cases, slightly changing their definition. Furthermore, because the transgressions were sanctioned by the commission (discursively, at least), a forced and temporary settling of the moral order (or social stability) can be seen to have occurred.

In a similar way, we can see how in the discourse of the commission in the Somalia Affair, scapegoats, enemies and pariahs were certainly identified, continuing to reaffirm the common norms within Canadian society, here, by sanctioning the transgressors. Klye Brown and Clayton Matchee, for example, were certainly posited as scapegoats at times within the commission discourse. Later, more senior officials, like Generals Beno and Vernon for example, were presented as the pariahs of the political system. By presenting these individuals as the transgressors in its discourse, the commission further reaffirms the morals that were transgressed, and works to purify the social order at the same time, attempting to maintain or reestablish it. The purifier character, charged with ensuring that the transgressors are punished for violating the public trust, in this instance, is the commission and the commissioners themselves. Via the questioning of witnesses in the public hearings and their attempt to get to the bottom of what went wrong in Somalia, the commission around the Somalia affair plays a
purifier character in its attempt to hold those individuals who should be implicated responsible, as well as the systems that were involved.

In all, it appears that in the Somalia Affair, the specific transgressions that occurred and their resulting exposure in the commission may have been necessary and normal to address the social and moral order of the Canadian society. Because the transgressions that occurred during the Somalia Affair can be seen to be fundamental Canadian values at the time, and tied to the group’s self-identity, they critically upset the Canadian social and moral order. Thus, the exposure of the transgressions, and more specifically the resulting consequential actions around the exposure of the transgressions – i.e. the commission discourse – may be seen as an attempt to rebalance the upset Canadian social and moral order. In this way, the commission appears to be one way in which Canadian members’ shortcomings and transgressions in association to the Somalia Affair were worked through.

At the same time, we need to acknowledge the fact that while this was perhaps the intended discursive purpose of the commission – to reinforce the morals that were transgressed and reinstate social order (whether consciously or not by members of government or society) – this may not have been the ultimate consequence of the commission. And in fact, this doesn’t appear to be the case in the context of the Somalia Affair. While the morals around multiculturalism, accountability/transparency, and even process/procedure can be seen to be generally defined and reinforced within the commission discourse (even though debates around these values occur), the attempts to reassert the value of peacekeeping, for example, is more questionable. Here, we saw how
the ‘civilian’ norm system attempted to frame Canadian soldiers (and behavior and characteristics) according to a definition of peacekeeping, while repeatedly, those from the ‘military’ norm system rejected this frame and offered a frame of Canadian soldiers as war and combat-focused. The debate and discussion around this value didn’t seem to be mended, and it displayed vast differences between the two norm groups in their definition. Even in the final report, where the values usually appear to be clarified, there was evidence of this debate lingering. The place and position of Canadian soldiers in Canadian society seemed to be questioned within the commission on the Somalia Affair, and this role was not adequately confirmed within the commission. This lingering debate, may help to explain the recent shift in the representations around the role of Canadians in international conflicts (Richler, 2009). The change in terminology around the Afghanistan conflict in the media, for instance, which refers to the Canadian involvement in Afghanistan as involving a ‘battle group’ which partakes in ‘major offensive’ strikes, is involved in a ‘dangerous’ part of the country where the ‘fighting’ is ‘fierce’ and the ‘casualty’ rate is high (http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2009/02/10/f-afghanistan.html) is particularly telling and in stark contrast to the kind of language used around the ‘hearts and minds’ humanitarian approach that was reported to have occurred in Somalia. The language used to describe the military work being done on the part of Canadian soldiers today is not as commonly eschewed in the broader discourse of ‘peacekeeping’. In fact, if securing a norm system as the predominant and commonly accepted one in society is seen in many ways as occurring via important language battles, then the ‘military’ system of norms, which argued for a definition of Canadian soldiers beyond the peacekeeping definition being presented by the ‘civilian’ system, appears to be winning the war. This
frame may be more appropriate in terms of what the Canadian military does. But what is interesting, from a discursive approach, is not whether this language-shift better reflects the reality of the situation, but why the shift has occurred and in what ways it manifests itself. Perhaps part of the reason that the shift in language or definition around the work in which Canadian soldiers participate was able to occur, was because of the debate and discussion around this norm that took place almost 10 years earlier in the Somalia commission. Perhaps because an appropriate definition couldn’t be agreed upon by the two clashing systems of norms in the commission (military vs. civilian), more room to change, redefine or shift this framework within the public sphere was the result. Thus, while the discourse in commissions may be seen to do important reassertion work within its operations around fundamental values in society, we can also see how cultural definitions and understandings may begin to change and shift in society in this arena. This is interesting in the implications that commissions have for the creation and definition of meaning within Canadian society.

From this perspective, whether the attempt to reassert moral definitions was successful or not in commission discourse may matter very little. What should be highlighted here is that, within the Somalia commission discourse at least, the commission can be seen as a way to provide the social system of Canada with a means for self-legitimation, purification and change. Self-legitimation occurs via the moral discourse that occurs in the commission around the values and norms that Canadians generally hold, and by the fact that another political institution — the commission itself — must be seen to be working appropriately to deal with aberrations in order to show that
the political system more widely is not inefficient or at risk. Purification, on the other hand, occurs by the disclosure, discussion and punishment of the morals that were transgressed. Thus, via the commission, members of Canadian society are able to ‘air their dirty laundry’, acknowledge their faults and responsibilities and move forward. Again, self-legitimation and purification do not necessarily have to successfully occur in order for the commission to be important. Instead, it is the attempt at self-legitimation and purification that matters most with the commission and its discourse as does the possibility for value definitions to shift and change.

In all, a scandal like the Somalia Affair temporarily disrupts the social and political order because fundamental values are shaken and questioned. The commission is a particularly apt body to tackle a political scandal in which serious moral transgressions have occurred because of its ability to debate, define and reassert values within its discursive operations that function in a public manner. It is also particularly adept because of its ability to publicly expose and condemn – and maybe even to forgive and pardon – transgressors. This is done via the various process and procedures of the commission, but can be most obviously seen within the Somalia commission discourse, especially in the public hearings and the final report.

The Somalia Commission, Process and Power

Just as examining the discourse of the Somalia commission led to interesting findings around the evidence of moral talk occurring and the implications around this, it also led to interesting findings about the role of process and procedure in the commission.
Here, we saw that process and procedure was valued as a norm within the discourse of the commission, and as well, its value was evident in the operation of the commission itself so that process and procedure was heavily relied upon throughout the commission’s duration. In addition, we discovered an interesting connection between the role of process and that of power which I would like to explore further here.

That political scandals are often the manifestation of the inherent tension within liberal democracies (i.e. where liberalism demands the primacy of the individual while democracy demands the subordination of the individual) was noted earlier in the dissertation. In addition, I discussed how liberal democracies tend to have a particular faith in process as an attempt to overcome their ambiguity around the use of political power, so that it is only ‘firm institutionalization’ or sanctification of due process that allows liberal democracies, like Canada, to curtail the exercise of political power. Thus, in liberal democracies, the logic of due process and the adherence to formal procedures and to the rule of law is valued above all else. This particular faith in process is very evident within the Somalia commission. In fact, one could argue that the entire institution of the Somalia commission boils down to formal processes and procedures. The commission itself, as a formal institution and a body that is responsible to the government of the day, is imbued with processes and procedures. As we saw, there are procedures in the public hearings about submissions and documentary evidence and the order of examination and rules of evidence and hearsay. There are processes in place for the examination of witnesses and who receives standing. There are processes and
procedures about what the commissioners themselves can say and show. There are procedures and rules about conflict of interest, public statements, and the availability of documents. And the list goes on and on. The commission, in a fundamental sense, is one very large process and procedure. In this way, the commission is an act of sanctification of process. This may explain, in part, why the commission was used in response to the Somalia Affair in Canada. If commissions themselves can be seen as inherently procedural beasts, then the curtailment of the exercise of political power (wherein the abuse of political power was part of the transgressions done within the Somalia Affair, most notably in the cover-up claims) could be seen to have been occurring through the operation of a commission. Thus, part of the discursive function of the commission in response to the Somalia Affair seems to have been in its form—as a communications arena imbued with process and procedure, and thereby helping to curtail the apparent transgression of political power.

In a related manner, the commission’s form, as a particularly open communications arena, helps to further explain the discursive function of the commission in response to the Somalia Affair. The commission was conducted in an open and accessible manner in the public eye. As we saw, politics is often only considered legitimate if it takes place in public within liberal democracies. It is politics in public that enables it to gain the support and belief of the population in a liberal democracy like Canada. Part of the appeal of a commission like the Somalia commission as a response to a political scandal, then, lies in its public hearings, where the operations are conducted in an open and public manner. The public hearings in the Somalia Commission were
independent, while conferences, seminars and workshops on the military profession are now a regular occurrence “of what has become a vibrant intellectual life within the Canadian military” (Bercuson, 2009, p. 38). In addition, a Canadian Forces Leadership Institute was created in 2002 to conduct research on military leadership. The Canadian Defence Academy was also established in 2002 to oversee all formal military education in the Canadian Forces. Finally, major increases in pay and benefits have been provided for personnel, as have a military family resource centre and an Ombudsman’s office to handle grievance cases outside the chain of command. The Ombudsman reports regularly and publicly to the Chief of Defence Staff and the Chief is required to report annually and publicly to the Minister of National Defence.

In all, since the Somalia Affair and its commission, significant transformation of the Canadian Forces can be seen, spurred in large part by the affair and its commission. Beyond the analysis of the discourse of the commission, we can see real, tangible consequences of the events and the commission in the way that the Canadian military and its bureaucratic counterpart operate. This not only helps to tie up the case study from a historical viewpoint, but also to display again the complexity and significance of this case within a broader understanding of Canadian identity and culture. With the Canadian military currently deployed in Afghanistan, how these reforms will actually play out remains to be seen – how the discourse around the Canadian military and its activities is constructed and framed remains to be seen as well.
Significance and Future Research

At the conclusion of a research project such as this, it is important to reflect on its significance as well as consider future research directions. This research project makes important contributions to literature, theory, method and policy. In terms of literature, this research project contributes to an in-depth and detailed analysis of the discourse within a Canadian commission of inquiry. As was noted within chapter two, while there is a sufficient amount of literature on public inquiries and the function and role they play, very little empirical research appears to have been done investigating the discourse within these institutions. Examining commissions from this important communication perspective, I believe, adds a crucial element to the discussion of commissions of inquiry. Examining a commission of inquiry from an in-depth discursive perspective sheds some important light on ‘what is going on’ within commissions and should help direct some future research in this regard.

This research project also makes an important contribution to the theory of scandal and political scandals in its admission that the communication of scandal can be evidenced in multiple institutions. While the communication of scandal is frequently associated with the media, this research project has tied another important Canadian institution – the commission of inquiry – to the communication and process of scandal. This helps to widen the scope of investigations into scandal and political scandals generally. In addition, this research project contributes to the theory on political scandals by testing and finding evidence of its claims within the operations of the Somalia scandal in Canada, and via the commission of inquiry that was appointed in response. Many of
the claims put forward in this theoretical framework could be seen to be operating within the discourse of the commission. In addition, some of the claims were challenged within this approach. Testing and utilizing the theory of political scandal is thus another significant contribution of this study.

In a related manner, this research project makes a contribution to discourse analysis methodology in its attempt to analyze discourse-in-practice via the commission documents, situated within discursive practices found culturally within Canada and institutionally within commissions of inquiry. This research project makes a contribution in its attempt to consider, and make connections between, both the hows and what is of discourse. ‘Analyzing interpretive practice’, as laid out by Holstein and Gubrium (2003) is still a relatively recent move in qualitative inquiry and thus, this research project makes a contribution in this direction.

Finally, this research project may make a contribution to policy in Canada. As I’ve indicated throughout this dissertation, those who criticize commissions of inquiry for their length, cost, futility, etc. tend to outnumber those who support these institutions. I believe that this research project may shed some much needed light on to why commissions may be turned to in times of scandal in Canada. Even more, this research project displays the importance of commissions of inquiry within society, as a way to negotiate and process important social norms, values and morals within society. Commissions appear to offer a lot of opportunity for the discussion and definition of morals within society, couched within the relatively safe fences of process and procedure. This is an important role; one which may be made even more important in times of
certainly open to the public at large to watch, and often, participate in, and were made even more open by their televised nature.

The reliance on a political process defined by strict rules, procedures and public scrutiny is also supposed to lessen the inherent distrust of political power that is found in liberal democracies. The strict rules, procedures and public scrutiny that are needed to lessen this distrust all very much occur in a royal commission like the Somalia commission as we saw. In this way, the fact that the Somalia Commission is heavily dependent on its processes and procedures is not a coincidence in its dealing with moral transgressions. Instead, it is the procedures and processes that are needed to help legitimate the government as a system and as a power holder and wielder. It is the fact that the Somalia commission is itself an organization of process that works to ensure that the morals that are transgressed, especially in terms of political power, are held in check. Thus, it is the process that is the public interest within the Somalia Commission, so that any attempt to escape from the strict rules of the political process was seen as contrary to the common good in a liberal democracy like Canada. This can help to explain why the processes and procedures that are involved in a commission like the Somalia Commission are absolutely fundamental to deal with political scandals like the Somalia Affair and why reference to, and the operation of, process and procedure dominated the discourse. The strict rules that commissions employ in addition to the openness of the commission’s activities, ensures that the distrust in political power can be lessened, which ultimately also helps to reinforce the social order after a moral dissonance like the Somalia Affair occurs.
In a related way, a commission like the Somalia commission works to show that the political system or process works in society. Because the commission is seen as a kind of state institution, the fact that process and procedure is used to curtail power and punish moral transgressors rebalances the deficit of legitimation that arose with the original scandal. Thus, the use of formal process and procedures in a commission helps to re-establish the political system as legitimate and useful at the same time that it reinforces the morals that were originally transgressed. Power is seen to be curtailed via the commission in the forced accountability and punishment of the powerful that have been implicated. Since the powerful are held to be accountable and the system is ‘shown’ to have worked via process and procedure in the commission, the support and loyalty of the people is supposed to continue. Thus, because the commission is supposed to be able to get the ‘truth’ out about the Somalia Affair, the very political system that curtails the politically powerful is seen as functional. In this way, what began as a challenge to the political system ultimately becomes a reaffirmation and strengthening of the public’s faith in the system via the processes and procedures of the commission. In other words, what began as an abuse of the liberal tradition results in the celebration of the values of that tradition.

The Somalia case, however, presents challenges to this understanding. While the Somalia Affair began with a violation of due process in the cover-up and document destruction aspect of the affair, through the operation of the commission via its heavy reliance on procedure, due process is supposed to have been re-established and re-occur with the conclusion of the commission. In all, an attempt to restore trust in the system is
supposed to have occurred via the processes and procedures that are used to overcome the abuses of power and moral transgressions. Interestingly, this doesn’t appear to have been the result of the Somalia commission. The early termination of the commission led to claims, notably, by the commissioners themselves, that they were being silenced and unable to get to the bottom of the scandal. In essence, the commissioners were claiming that the system of process and procedures that was at work in the commission was itself being overtaken by the exercise of political power. And so, the institution that was positioned to be open and accessible, and to rely on due process to curtail the exercise of political power, actually ended up being used to further political power, according to the commissioners and some media takes on the inquiry after the fact. This meant that resolution in the Somalia Affair never truly came and this may explain why ten years later, the affair and its transgressions still rears its ugly head in the public domain (Pugliese, Friday, July 25, 2008, Ottawa Citizen). This is also part of the reason why the case of the Somalia Affair and the discursive role of the commission is so interesting—because the moral order was never really re-established after the affair. What had been positioned as an exercise in restoring the public’s faith in the Canadian Forces’ institution seems to have failed. Possibly because the peacekeeping moral was more challenging to reaffirm completely. Possibly because the institution of process and procedure failed to curtail the exercise of political power and thus, the inherent distrust of liberal democratic reigned supreme. Possibly because the discursive exercise lasted far too long for the attention of Canadians to comprehend. Whatever the reason, the case of the Somalia Affair and its discourse, is particularly interesting in what it implies about the role of commissions, scandals, morals and process in Canada.
Overall, from the theory and from the analysis of the commission discourse, two predominant communication features of the commission appear to make it an appropriate arena in which to respond to the moral transgressions that occurred in the Somalia scandal. Firstly, the commission discourse operates as a purification mechanism as it allows for definition and debate around the morals that were transgressed via the moral discourse that occurs in the public hearings and the final report. This ultimately can be seen as an attempt to reinforce or redefine the original values that were transgressed in an effort to restore the shaken social and moral order. Secondly, political power is curtailed via a commission through its heavy reliance on process and procedures, ultimately working to display to the Canadian public that the political system and order is legitimate and functions accordingly. In both of these aspects, a scandal such as the Somalia Affair, can be seen to be a challenge to the social and moral system of Canadian society. And the commission offers an excellent communication mechanism to deal with, and potentially, reinforce both systems in the end.

After the Somalia Commission: Looking Beyond the Discourse

Beyond the discursive role of the Somalia Affair and its commission in Canada which has been explored in this dissertation, it is important to examine the effect that the affair and its commission had within Canada, and specifically, the Canadian military, more than a decade later. In other words, exploring what has been the tangible policy-related aftermath of the Somalia Affair and its commission in Canada provides some
important concluding contextual information on this case study. So, how does the story of the Somalia Affair end?

In brief, it hasn’t – at least not yet. The Somalia Affair still haunts those directly involved in the events, as evident by the media stories around their promotions and trials (Brandon, 2007; Nguyen & Hutton, 2008; Ward, 2008; ‘Canadian colonel in Somalia Affair’, 2007 ;“Somalia still haunts”, 2008). The affair still rears its ugly head in Canadian news stories from time to time, usually as a dark reference point for the Canadian military, and sometimes contextualized as ‘before- and-after Somalia’.

However, despite the lingering presence of the Somalia Affair’s stain on the military’s reputation in the press, great and needed changes have been evidenced within the Canadian military and its bureaucratic counterpart, the Department of National Defence, spurred, evidently in large part, by the events of the Somalia Affair and its commission. Thus, the Somalia Commission can be seen to have had important, tangible consequences on the Canadian military specifically, and thus the Canadian government and society more broadly.

Bercuson’s (2009) recent article, entitled ‘Up from the Ashes: The Re-Professionalization of the Canadian Forces after the Somalia Affair’ deals with the impact this event, and its commission, had on the Canadian military and the DND. He

---

31 Bercuson (2009) uses the term ‘re-professionalization’ in this article, arguing that many military historians and defence analysts now view the Somalia Affair itself as the “epitome of a loss of professionalization” that affected the Canadian army and which had been evident for many years before the Somalia Affair and its commission. Here, a focus on weaponry, technology and training overplayed an emphasis on military ethics or values, higher education, professional development or work on maintaining ties with an ever-changing Canadian society. Bercuson (2009) argues that the problems within the Canadian army came to a head in the Somalia Affair, and when the military’s own investigation into the events, the De Faye inquiry, noted that it had been limited by resources and its mandate, the government
argues that important changes began to take place within the Canadian military, spurred by the events, even before the conclusion of the Somalia Affair. For instance, the Minister of National Defence in 1996, Douglas Young, appointed a Special Advisory Group on Military Justice and Military Police Investigation Services. This group was led by Former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, Brian Dickson, and was asked to report by the end of 1997 on how to thoroughly reform the military justice system. Young also commissioned three Canadian military historians and one political scientist to report on what they believed was wrong with the Canadian Forces and what should be done. Then, in March 25, 1997, Young issued a report to the Prime Minister which included 65 recommendations of his own and 35 from the Dickson commission. All 100 were accepted by the Prime Minister and work began to implement them. Within these recommendations from Young was an emphasis on revamping the education and professional development systems for both officers and senior non-commissioned officers. Specifically, officers were to obtain degrees, the military education curriculum was to be revised with more of an emphasis on the arts, humanities and social sciences, and an independent military journal was to be established, an ombudsman who worked outside the chain of command was to be appointed, and a Canadian Forces’ ethos was to be defined, among other sweeping recommendations (Bercuson, 2009).
Later that year when the Somalia Inquiry produced its own report, it provided 160 recommendations, most of which were also eventually accepted by the government.\(^{32}\)\(^{33}\) After the release of the report, Minister of National Defence, Art Eggleton, appointed the Minister of National Defence’s Committee to Monitor Change in the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence. He handed this committee more than 300 recommendations in all (taken from the Young report, the Dickson Report, the Somalia Inquiry Report, and a commission that had looked at the restructuring of the Canadian reserves) and mandated it to oversee the implementation of those recommendations. The committee sat for six years (from 1997 – 2003) and publicly reported twice a year to the Minister. According to Bercuson (2009), the committee was interested in seeing evidence of ‘strategic change’ in the military and the department. While it had no power to actually implement the recommendations, “its ability to get at information, to hold \textit{in camera} hearings, to speak to troops out of hearing of officers and even senior NCOs, and then to publicly report – was crucial in keeping the Canadian Forces on the path to reform” (p. 37).

Bercuson (2009) explains that the Canadian Forces’ reaction to these changes at the time was predictable – they resisted it and resented that civilians had been charged with telling the military what to do. The ‘old guards’ generally rejected the move towards

\(^{32}\) Defence Minister Art Eggleton initially dismissed the Somalia Inquiry report, as “excessively critical, unjust to the Canadian Forces and of little relevance to the Chretian government” (“Somalia report flawed, 1997).

\(^{33}\) Out of the 160 recommendations from the report, 132 were accepted in whole or in part by the government. The 28 that were not accepted were to have their objectives achieved through means other than those specified by the commission, driven mainly by resource and personnel constraints (Department of National Defence, 1997).
an emphasis on higher education and professional development and attempted to delay and bury the recommendations.

Not just the army, but the entire Canadian Forces at first crawled, then wandered, then stumbled, but eventually began to march forward with determination to a new professionalism rooted in the history and values of Canadian society, based up on a fighting ethos, with a democratic ethic and with one of the best-educated officer corps of any armed forces anywhere. (Bercuson, 2009, 37)

This process of change in the Canadian Forces noticeably began in late 1997 with a focus on education in the forces. For starters, the curriculum of the Royal Military College was shifted to include a larger dose of arts, humanities and social science studies. As well, the War Studies Masters program was expanded worldwide. At the Canadian Forces College, new courses were introduced and young PhD graduates were hired to teach and design an expanded curriculum. In all, there has been a move to value and make education a major factor in career advancement in the Canadian Forces (Bercuson, 2009).

Later, in 1999, a Special Advisor to the Chief of Defence Staff, Lieutenant General Romeo Dallaire, was appointed, to revise the requirements for commissioned officers and for general officer specifications. The result of this was the development of a statement of requirement, entitled, *Officership in the 21st Century*. Furthermore, in 2003, *Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada*, was published which defined the military profession as having four attributes; responsibility, expertise, identity, and professional ideology. A defence ethics program was also created, which produced a *Statement of Defence Ethics* and which is now required learning of all military members, as is the law of armed conflict. In 2000, publication of a military journal began which is
national scandal. Thus, while commissions may not be the most efficient mechanism to get to the bottom of an issue such as with the Somalia Affair, for instance, they may play an even more important role than truth-seeker in society – they may, in fact, be an institution where important meaning making around cultural norms and identity are defined, and may even be a place where they begin to be changed. Commissions, then, appear to be another communication arena, much like the media, where important cultural values are espoused, debated and possibly taken up. For this reason alone, they should not be dismissed as trivial.

Future research from this study is necessary in my opinion. One clear starting point is to expand the single case study approach to other scandal-driven commissions to see if similar discursive work occurs. Studying commissions that fall outside the scandal-driven definition would also be interesting from this perspective for comparison purposes. Also, conducting interviews with key commission participants to obtain their perspective on what occurred within the commission discourse would also help to strengthen further the validity of this approach. Because this is relatively unexplored terrain, much opportunity exists for the researcher interested in scandal, commissions and Canadian norms.
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Appendix A: Reverse Chronological List of Canadian Royal Commissions of Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission No.</th>
<th>Year Appointed</th>
<th>Name of Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the Investigation of the Bombing of Air India Flight 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry Into The Actions of Canadian Officials In Relation to Maher Arar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada (Chretian promised to repair health care in third term, 6 months in, appointed commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on the Blood System in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Certain Events at the Prison for Women in Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act Review Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Indian Claims Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the air Ontario Crash at Dryden, Ontario (Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies (doctors not following rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (spurred by Oka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing (don’t know why it was started)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education (??)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Commission on National Passenger Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry Concerning Certain Matters Associated with the Westbank Indian Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Canadian Sentencing Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the Facts of Allegations of Conflict of Interest Concerning the Honourable Sinclair M. Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry, Hinton Train Collision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on War Criminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Commission/Inquiry Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Royal Commission of Inquiry into Working Conditions in the Post Office Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on the Pharmaceutical Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Brief to the Commission of Inquiry on Equality in Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Ocean Ranger Marine Disaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Part-time Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Commission on Pacific Fisheries Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Certain Allegations Concerning Commercial Practices of the Canadian Dairy Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on Aviation Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Conditions of Foreign Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Task Force on Canadian Unity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on Educational Leave and Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Financial Management and Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on Redundancies and Layoffs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry Concerning Certain Activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Inquiry into the Automotive Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Airport Inquiry Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Bilingual Air Traffic Services in Quebec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Advisory Commission on Parliamentary Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on Health and Safety in Grain Elevators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Commission on the Costs of Transporting Grain by Rail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry Relating to the Department of Manpower and Immigration in Montreal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the Marketing of Beef and Veal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Corporate Concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Events at the British Columbia Penitentiary June 9 to 11, 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Steel Profits Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Prices and Incomes Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Certain Disturbances at Kingston Penitentiary During April 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Royal commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Relations of Labor and Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Royal Commission Inquiry and Formal Investigation into the Circumstances surrounding the Grounding of the Steam Tanker Arrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the Non-medical use of Drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Mail Transport in Montreal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Commission on the Lobster Industry in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Commission to inquire whether the St. Andrews Company Limited, Charlotte County, New Brunswick, Applicant for Fishing Licenses is Operated in the Interests of United States Citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Natural Resources of Saskatchewan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>West Coast Oil Ports Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Newfoundland Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>The operation of Canadian Security Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Commission to Inquiry into the Costs of Farm Machinery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the Case involving Gerda Munsinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into Complaints Made by George Victor Spencer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the dealings of the Hon. Mr. Justice Leo A. Landerville with Northern Ontario Gas Limited...misbehaviour in his official capacity as a judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Royal Commission of Inquire into Working Conditions in the Post Office Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry into the Increases in Rates of Pay for Civil Servants in Group D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Commission to Inquiry into and Report upon the Marketing Problems of the Freshwater Fish Industry in the Province of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the North-West Territories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into and to Investigate the Charges of Irregularities in the Federal Election of 1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Commission to investigate fully into allegations about any improper inducements having been offered to, or improper pressures having been brought to bear on counsel acting upon an application for the extradition of one Lucien Rivard and all the relevant circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Commission to inquiry into the problem marketing salted and cured fish produced in the Atlantic provinces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the circumstances surrounding the crash of a Douglas DC 8F Aircraft, registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Number</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the problem relating to the future of the aircraft overhaul base maintained by Trans-Canada airlines at Winnipeg International Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the circumstances leading to the dismissal of Mr. George Walker from the position of prairie farm assistance administrator...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Pilotage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Taxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Banking and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Committee of Inquiry into the Unemployment Insurance Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into complaints received concerning certain activities of a station Check-TV, Victoria, B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Automobile Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate the unfulfilled provisions of theatres 8 &amp; 11 as they apply to the Indians of Mackenzie District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Great Slave Lake Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the Desirability of Establishing a New Band of Indians on Seabird Island, B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Royal Commission into the Distribution of Railway Box Cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Price Spreads of Food Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Newfoundland Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Employment of Firemen on Diesel Locomotives in Freight and Yard Service on the Canadian Pacific Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Coasting Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the Nature and Extent of the Damage Caused by the Flood in and Adjoining the Humber River Valley in Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Patients, Copyright, Trademarks, and Industrial Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into the Purchase Price of Certain Land in the Township of Sandwich West, ON, Bought Under the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into the Disorders at Halifax, Nova Scotia and Vicinity thereof, during a celebration of the declaration of victory over Germany on the 7th and 8th of May, 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into an Article in the Montreal Gazette on May 15, 1945, Regarding the Capture of a German Spy in Nov. 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into the Activities and Loyalty of the Japanese in Canada During the War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Investigate the Facts Relating to and the Circumstances Surrounding the Communication, by Public Officials and Other Persons in Positions of Trust, of Secret and Confidential Information to Agents of a Foreign Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Administrative Classification in the Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Indian Act and Indian Administration in General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Commission to Investigate Complaints Made by Walter H. Kirchner, M.C., D.C.M., Secretary, Canadian Combats Veterans Association Inc., Vancouver B.C., Regarding Pension and Treatment Services with Respect to Certain Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Investigate complaints of Canadian citizens of Japanese origin who resided in B.C. in 1941, that their real and personal property had been disposed of by the custodian of enemy property at prices less than the fair market value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Fraser Valley Relief and Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Revision of Criminal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into the Nature and Extent of the Damage Caused by the Recent Fires in the Towns of Rimouski and Cabaro in the Province of Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into the Nature and Extent of the Damage Caused by the 1950 Floods in the Red River Valley in Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into, Review and Report on the Rentals Payable Under the Leases in the Town Sites and Subdivisions of Banff and Jasper National Parks...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the South Saskatchewan River Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into and Report upon the Facts Concerning the Staking of Certain Areas of the Crown in the North-west Territories and Yukon Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Law of Insanity as a Defense in Criminal Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Criminal law relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Agreed Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire Into, Review, and Report on the Administration of Quartz Mining and Placer Mining in the Yukon Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Provisions of the Veterans' Land Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Veterans' Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Co-operatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Taxation of Annuities and Family Corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Matter of Membership in the Indian Bands in Lesser Slave Lake Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Pecuniary Loss Suffered as a Result of the Crash of the Liberator Aircraft EW148 at Montreal, PQ on April 25, 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Investigate the Demands of the Coal Miners of Western Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into and report upon Certain Complaints Made against A. Forget, Local Representative of the Wartime Prices and Trade board, at Mont Laurier, PQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into Charges Contained in Articles in the Vancouver News Herald under the Heading 'Nippon Black Dragon' operates within B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Investigate Wage Rates in Steel Plants at Sault Ste. Marie, ON and Sydney, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into the Most Effective Methods to Secure Maximum Production in the Shipyards of BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into and Report Upon the Organization, Authorization and Dispatch of the Canadian Expeditionary Force to the Crown Colony of Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Ship Building in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Commission to Determine the Amounts, if any, to be Paid by way of a Cost of Living Bonus to the Employees of the Coal Mine Operations of the Estevan-Biesfalt District, SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into the Events Which Occurred at Arvida, PQ in July 1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Strike at the Plant of the Scholfield Woollen Company, Ltd., Oshawa, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the Labour Dispute at the Windsor Plant of the Chrysler Corporation of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Disputes or into any Matter or Circumstances Connected with the Dominion Coal Company, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Causes of the Lack of Capacity Production in the Coal Mines in the Minto-Chipman District of the Province of New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Industrial Dispute at the Plant of Courtaulds (Canada) Limited, Cornwall, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into and Report upon the Navigation of Small Vessels in the St. Lawrence River and Upon Pilotage Matter between Montreal and Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Cost of Living Bonus to be Paid to the Employers of the Coal Mine Operators of Alberta and B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Commission to Investigate the Capture of Salmon by Trapnets in the Sooke Area, B.C. and also, to investigate whether Purse-Seines...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Engineering, Economic, Financial and Other Aspects of the Proposal to Construct a Highway Through B.C. and the N.W.T. to Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Bren Machine Gun Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Dispute Between the Management of the Quebec Central Railway and the Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into the Dispute at Cornwall, ON between Certain Members of the Canadian Seamen's Union and Certain Shipping Companies and into any Matters on Circumstances Connected Therewith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Commission to Inquire into Illegal Lobster Fishing and Canning and Illegal Smelt Fishing in Lobster Fishing Districts...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Royal Grain Inquiry Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Anthracite Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Investigate the Penal System of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the textile Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the industrial dispute involving the shipping federation of B.C. Limited and the long-shore workers at Vancouver, British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the question as to the truth or falsity of statements made by A. C. Hall, a convict of Kingston Penitentiary, and Mr. J.D. Dawson, inspector of penitentiaries in an interview between them in the lecture room of the administrative building of the penitentiary on April 9th, 1935, it being alleged by Miss. Agnes MacPhail, M.P, that during the course of the interview, inspector Dawson used to hail abusive and profane language concerning her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report on all and any complaints in reference to the management of the relief camps for single, homeless mean in the province of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon certain allegations made by the Honourable Peter Veniot, Member of the House of Commons for Gloucester, New Brunswick, as to the administration of the patrol system under the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, in the waters of Baie des Chateurs in the province of New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Royal Commission Appointed to Investigate the Activities of the Canadian Performing Rights Society, Ltd., and similar societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Royal commission on financial arrangements between the Dominion and the Maritime Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the natural resources of Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into allegations affecting the right Honourable Arthur Meighen in the manner in which he discharged his duties as commissioner of the Hydro-electric power commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Royal commission on price spreads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into claims of the late John Ross for advances made to contractors, sections 3, 6, 9, and 15 of the intercolonial railway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the natural resources of Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the status of the Canadian performing right society in reference to certain musical works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Royal Commission on banking and currency in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the circumstances attendant upon an explosion which occurred on June 17, 1932, in the dry dock of the Maisonneuve Plant of the Canadian Vickers Limited, where a number of employees of that company were engaged in repairing the oil tanker S. S. Cymbeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Commission to investigate whether or not the Canadian Performing Right Society Limited is complying with the terms and conditions of the copyright amendment act, 1931, in relation to certain radio broadcasting stations in Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon all matters relating to the loss of the sailing vessel 'Gypsum Queen' on July 31, 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into railways and transportation in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and investigate the circumstances surrounding an accident on May 19, 1928 to Guy Benning to determine whether this employee of the forest service was entitled to further compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the feasibility of constructing a canal across the Isthmus of Chignecto to connect the waters of the Bay of Fundy with the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into trading in grain futures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Commission to investigate as to the correctness or otherwise of certain charges made against Mr. N. Curtis, employed as stockyard agent in the dominion department of agriculture at Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon all matters relative to means of communication for the transportation of persons, goods, and merchandise between Vancouver at the second narrows, Burrard Inlet, British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Commission concerning the administration of Halifax Harbour by farmer commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Royal Commission on reparations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the feasibility, probably cost of construction, economic and national advantages to be gained by the construction of a ship canal across the Isthmus of Chignecto to connect the waters of the Bay of Fundy with the Gulf of St. Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Commission to investigate certain charges of alleged irregularities on the part of employers of the Dominion Distillers, Limited Montreal and the officer in charge of the Customs Bonding Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Royal Commission on technical and professional services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Royal Commission on radio broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the claim of Robert W. McLellan, Barrister, Fredericton, New Brunswick, for renumeration for his services as a pulpwood commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Royal commission on the transfer of the natural resources of Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the illegal removal of alcohol in bond by the Sunset Vinegar Company reorganized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report on conditions in connection with the tobacco producing industry in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate the fisheries of the Maritime provinces and the Magdalen Islands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate charges of political partisanship in the department of soldier's civil re-establishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges of Maladministration etc., preferred against Captain John D. MacKenzie superintendent of pilots at Sydney, Nova Scotia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Royal Commission on reconveyance of land to British Columbia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Royal Commission on customs and excise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Commission to examine and investigate the transactions of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Maritime claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges that frauds and irregularities have occurred in connection with certain contracts for the supply of coal to the department of national defence at Winnipeg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Royal commission to inquire into and report upon affairs of the Home Bank of Canada in the matter of the petition of the depositors on the said home bank of Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Commission for the revision and consolidation of the public statutes of Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into industrial unrest among the steel workers at Sydney, Nova Scotia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the validity of a claim made by certain Indians of the Chippewa and Mississauga tribes who have claimed that the said tribes were and are entitled to a certain interest in lands in the province of Ontario to which the Indian title has never been extinguished by surrender and otherwise, and should the said commission determine in favour of the validity of the said claims, to negotiate with the said Indians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Royal Commissions on pulp wood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report upon the dismissal of Albert M. Gogues from the position of fishery guardian was justified on the ground of inefficiency and whether Wilfred Bourgeois has efficiently discharged his duties in a similar position and whether either of the above named fishery guardians was guilty of political partisanship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Royal Grain Inquiry Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon payment made or authorized by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the affairs of the Six Nation Indians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Great Lakes grain rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report as to whether the dismissal of Albert M. Gogues from the position of fishery guardian was justified on the ground of inefficiency and whether Wilfred Bourgeois has efficiently discharged his duties in a similar position and whether either of the above named fishery guardians was guilty of political partisanship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Royal Commission on pensions and re-establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Commission to investigate fisheries conditions in B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Royal Commission on reparation claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Commission regarding sterling fund-redemption at par to ex-members of the Canadian emergency force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report in respect to the amount require to pay the Ports St. Charles Company Limited, for land occupied by the Quebec Harbour Commission, as per verdict of arbitrator which verdict was later sustained by the superior court in favour of the Plaintiffte company, $60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the subject of the marketing of grain in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the circumstances connected with the disposal of printed matter in the distribution office of the government printing and stationary office and at the same time to investigate the particulars of all material and equipment purchased, sold or otherwise disposed of in or from the government printing bureau since the 1st day of January, 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon production costs of cod operators, District 18, Province of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the treatment of soldiers' dependents on the S. S. Scandinavian who arrived at Port of St. John on Jan. 10, 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into coal mining operations in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Commission to investigate uniformity of laws relating to industrial work in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report concerning a dispute that has arisen between the International brotherhood of teamsters, chauffeurs, stablemen and helpers in the said city of Vancouver as to wage rates and other conditions of employment affecting the above mentioned classes of labour in the employ of the various cartage, transfer, express, and delivery companies, members of the general cartage and warehouseman's association of the said province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the lockout at Guillet and Sons, Marieville, Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the sale of lands, livestock and agricultural equipment to soldiers in the Edmonton district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report upon the conditions pertaining to the running of race meets and betting in connection therewith in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into certain charges by Rev. K. H. Palmer and Sir Sam Hughes relating to the administration oat Guelph Novistate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report upon the potentialities of the Artic and sub-artic regions of Canada as a grazing country for the development of muskox and reindeer herds for commercial and national purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon industrial relations in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report concerning the relations between the firm of J. Coughler and Sons and its employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to investigate illegal lobster fishing in the shadic sub-division of New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to investigate changes in the cost of living in the coal mining localities of the Island of Vancouver affecting agreements between mine owners and employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Commission/Report</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report upon certain representations made concerning the administration of the fisheries in the Berkeley Sound District, and the fisheries district number 3, province of British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Commission to investigate alleged ill-treatment of the men of the Canadian expeditionary force while on board the transport 'Northland' on her voyage from Liverpool to Halifax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Commission to investigate claims from certain election officers in the Western provinces of the Dominion particularly within the province of British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into the alleged unrest existing in the ship building industry in the province of Quebec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Royal Commission of inquiry into the ship-yards in Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Commission to enquire into and report upon the grave friction and unrest existing between various employers in the city of Winnipeg and their workmen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon certain alleged irregularities among the military voters in the December 17, 1917 general election in the riding of Chambly-Vercheres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Commission to investigate unrest in the steel-making, coal-mining, and shipbuilding industries in the province of Nova Scotia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Royal Commission on conditions in the pilotage districts of Vancouver, Victoria, Nanaimo and New Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the charges against Daniel J. Kearney (in land revenue department) – special class excise-man in Montreal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the pilotage districts of Miramichi, Sydney, Louisbour, Halifze, St. John, Montreal and Quebec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report upon differences concerning wages between the municipal corporation of the City of Edmonton and its street car employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the nature and causes of the unrest among the employees of the consolidated mining and smelting company, of trail, in the province of British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the export of hydro-electric power to the United States, in particular by Ontario Power Company, Canadian Niagara Power Company and the Electrical Development Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the wholesale and retail cost of necessities of life for use by miners in District 18, British Columbia and Alberta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the sufficiency of the petition for bringing into force the temperance act into the City of Quebec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the businesses of William Davies Company, Limited and Matthews-Blackwell Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to investigate fishing and canning regulations in District #2, British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into report of Mr. Justice Galt of Manitoba against the Honourable Robert Rogers, Minister of Public Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate the disputes between the Dominion Coal Company, limited and employees at Glace Bay and Spinkhill and the Nova Scotia Steel and coal Company, Limited, and employees at Sydney Mills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the manufacture, sale, price and supply of newsprint paper within Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the prices of food, clothing and fuel in the coalmining districts of Fernie, Lethbridge and Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the seizure of three boats by the captain of the fisheries Patrol boat Hutson when illegally lobster fishing off Richibucto, New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the conditions in regard to the delivery of cargoes of coal to coasting vessels in the maritime provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the unrest in the mining industry at Cobalt, in the province of Ontario, and the nature of causes thereof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the cause of unrest in the asbestos mining industry in the district of Thetfield Mines, in the province of Quebec, including the relations between employers and employees in the said industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into railways and transportation in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the facts and circumstances of or connected with the sale or disposal by the government of Canada, of small arms munitions since the 4th August, 1914, referred to in certain returns made to the house of commons on the first and second days of May, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to inquire in the United Kingdom, France, Belgium and Italy, into the possibilities for the supply of Canadian products, natural and manufactured, which may be needed for the work of reconstruction in the said countries during and after the war and also as to the sources of supply in those countries for commodities needed in Canada and which formerly were obtained from Germany and Austria, and to report upon the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report upon unrest in certain industries of Toronto and Jamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and investigate into and report upon certain contracts made by the committee known as the steel committee, and upon such other matters relating to the acts or proceedings of the said steel committee as may be referred to the said committee by order in council from time to time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission to consider the whole matter of the handling and marketing of grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate the origin and all matters connected with the Parliament Buildings fire at Ottawa, February 3, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the supply and sufficiency of raw materials in Canada required for the production of munitions of war and as to the best method of conserving the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the purchase of coal for the dredging plant of the department of public works in British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Commission to investigate methods of stimulating agricultural production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Commission to examine and report upon certain matters relating to the harbour of Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into, investigate, and report upon the purchase by and on behalf of the government of Canada, through whatever agency the purchase may have been effected, of arms and munitions, implements, materials, horses, supplies and other things for the purposes of the present war and as to the expenditures and payments made or agreed to be made therefor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Commission to investigate a scheme of scientific fishing for sea herring in the Atlantic Waters of the Dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges of corruption and fraud in relation to contracts for construction of drill sheds in the province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the falling off of sardine fisheries in L'etony River alleged to be caused by pollution of water from a sardine cannery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Commission to investigate Hindu claims following refusal of immigration officials to allow over 300 Hindus aboard the S. S. Komagata M? to land at Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the circumstances attached to the acquisition by the pas townsite company of a piece of land for the purposes of a wireless station of the Hudson Bay Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Commission to investigate condition of Indian Affairs in British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report on the works embraced in the construction of a line of railway from a point at or near Millville,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the proposed construction of a deep inland waterway providing for the accommodation of the large lade carriers from the Georgian Bay to the Port of Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the increase in the cost of living in Canada and into the causes which have occasioned or contributed to such result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon certain allegations made by Jeannette M. Cain that her husband, the Reverend John Cain, who had contracted for the purchase of an annuity under the provisions of the government annuities act, 1908, was at the time he entered into the contract, incapable of understanding business, and did not understand the contract referred to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate the state and management of the Kingston penitentiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission to investigate certain charges of malfeasance in office brought against J. E. Miller, inspector of inland revere from the province of British Columbia and B. Parkinson, collector of internal revenue at Vancouver, and into all matters pertaining to internal revenue in the said province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate coal-mining disputes on Vancouver Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission to investigate relations between employers and employees in industries in Port Arthur and By William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon all matters connected with the sale, lease, grant, exchange or disposition by any means whatsoever, since the first day of July 1896 (a) dominion lands; (b) timber and mineral lands and mining rights and privileges, including coal, petroleum and gas lens and rights; (c) water power and rights under the authority or purporting to be under the authority of the dominion lands act, the irrigation act or other statutes of the parliament of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into and report upon claims of certain Canadian pelagic sealers alleged to have been derrified by reason of the Pelagic sealing treaty of the seventh July 1911, between Great Britain and the United States, Russia and Japan, and by the Paris award regulations of 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission respecting Indian lands and Indian affairs generally in the province of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission to Investigate and report upon the water levels of the St. Lawrence River at and below Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Commission to consider and report upon claims of the province of British Columbia for better terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into the state of the records of the public department of the dominion of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the public service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Commission to investigate all proposed power development works on the portion of the St. Lawrence River between the head of Lake St. Francis and the City of Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the condition of sheep breeding and the marketing of their products in the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Commission to investigate alleged Chinese frauds and Opium smuggling on the Pacific Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the conditions and requirements of the fisheries of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the number of boats to be employed by salmon canneries in the province of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Commission to investigate into titles to ownership, by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland of all lands in the Arctic seas, whether acquired by discovery, occupation or otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Royal Commission on industrial training and technical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Commission on the lobster industry in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and study the swine breeding industry of Denmark, Great Britain and Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the existing requirements and conditions of the fisheries in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Commission to inquire whether the St. Andrews Company Limited, Charlotte County, New Brunswick applicant for fishing licenses is operated in the interests of the United States citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate industrial disputes in the cotton factories of the province of Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate losses by the Chinese population of Vancouver, British Columbia, on the occasion of the riots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| #   | Date  | Royal Commission
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>to investigate methods by which oriental labourers have been induced to come to Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>regarding losses sustained by the Japanese population of Vancouver, British Columbia on the occasion of the riots in that city in September, 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>on the Quebec Bridge Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon certain charges made by Joseph S. Perron, of Dawson, in the Yukon Territory, Miner, against Oswald S. Finnie, Chief Clerk in the Office of Gold Commissioner of the Said Yukon Territory, of Wrongful and irregular acts on the part of the said Finnie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>to inquire into and report on the operation of the existing civil service act and relating legislation with view to proposing such changes as may be deemed advisable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Royal Commission regarding the dispute respecting hours of employment between the Bell Telephone Company of Canada limited and operators at Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon certain claims to lands on the St. Peter's Reserve, in the province of Manitoba, and other Matters respecting the said reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon the conduct of Donald Mcphaiden, Esquire, as shipping master for the Port of Vancouver, British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Commission to negotiate a treaty with certain Indians in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and to Investigate, hear and determine the claims of half-breeds therein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the grain trade of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Life Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges against the pilotage commissioner of Hopewell Cape, New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the titles of persons who took up parcels of land at the townsite of field, British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the present state of the Canadian Fishing Industries on the Pacific Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into fishing in Georgian Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into certain complaints preferred against R. C. McDonald of Winnipeg regarding rights of certain Half-breeds in the North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate alleged employment of aliens by the Pere Marquette Railway Company of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Commission to examine and report upon all matters connected with the occupation by squatters of the government lighthouse reserve at Presqu'Isle, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the administration of the Victoria and Esquimalt Pilotage District, British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and examine certain railway claims on the subsidized section between the 70th and 100th mile of the Baie Des Chaleurs division of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Royal Commission to Inquire into the immigration of Italian labourers to Montreal and the alleged fraudulent practices of employment agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate alleged employment of aliens in connection with the surveys of the proposed grand trunk pacific railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Commission to investigate grievances and complaints existing in regard to salmon and lobster fisheries in Gloucester County, New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the different electro-thermic processes for the smelting of iron ores and the making of steel in operation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to make an investigation into the organization, methods and system adopted and in use in matters relating to railways in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon certain claims for wages of persons employed on the subsidized line of railway from Duncan Lake towards Arrow Lake or for sums due for labour or persons or teams so employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the herring and sardine industry of the Bay of Fundy, as well as into the ravages of the dog-fish and the general condition of the lobster shery at the Magdalen Islands, St. Mary's Bay and the Bay of Fundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and ascertain the amount of subsidy payable under Act 1 Edward VII, chapter 7, in respect of certain work done upon the subsidized section between Caplin and Paspebiac of the Baie Des Chaleurs Division of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the conduct of the business of the office of the assistant receiver general at Saint John, New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the treadgold and other concessions in the Yukon territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Royal Commission on transportation of Canadian products to the markets of the world through and by Canadian ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon certain claims for labour, boarding house claims and claims for material and supplies furnished in connection with the section of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway between Caplin and Paspebiac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate industrial disputes in the Province of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the recent defalcations in the department of Militia and Defence, and into the methods of keeping the accounts in the several departments of the government, particularly in relation to the issuing of cheques and the receipts and disposal of public monies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the whole question of a dry dock at Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Commission for the Revision and consolidation of the public statues of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Tobacco Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Commission on the salmon fishery industry in British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the question of the weighing of dairy products at the Port of Montreal, or elsewhere in the dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon certain claims for loss and damage alleged to have been sustained by Mssrs. James and Charles Noble, by reasons of seizure and confiscation of fishing tugs and nets in the year 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the detention of the steamship 'Yukoner' at Dawson, British Columbia in the summer of 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the circumstances attending the death of Dieudonné St. Michael in the shipyard at Sorel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and deal with certain half-breed claims in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate charges made against grain inspectors at Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Royal Commission to investigate Chinese and Japanese immigration into British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon certain alleged fraudulent practices and irregularities in connection with public auction sales of school lands in the Province of Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the abstraction of money from a letter posted by Rev. J. M. Whitelaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon all matters connected with the management and sales of lands comprised within the town sites of Regina, Moose Jaw, Qu'Appelle and Verdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon any claims to bounty for services rendered as scouts or otherwise in connection with the suppression of the north-west rebellion of 1885, preferred before them by persons resident in the districts of Assiniboia and Alberta, in the said North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon any claims to bounty for services rendered as scouts or otherwise in connection with the suppression of the north-west rebellion of 1885, preferred before them by persons resident in the district of Saskatchewan, in the said North-west territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commission to investigate allegations of election frauds prior to and subsequent to the general elections of 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon claims to lands in Yukon territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon certain half-breed claims in the district of Athabaska and adjoining country covered by the said treaty No. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Commission to unrest and discontent among miners and mine-owners in the Province of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the shipment and transportation of grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into claims for patents to lands in the Yukon Territory, and also to inquire into and report upon any other matters in any way connected with, or which in any way concern any lands in the Yukon territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the claims which may be preferred by the half-breeds in the north-west territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges of alleged delay in the construction of a pile trestle bridge on the Pictour branch of the intercolonial railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the administration of the leper lazaretto colony at Tracadie, New Brunswick and the Treatment of inmates thereof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon certain charges preferred against many government officials in the Yukon territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Commission on the lobster industry in the maritime provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the grievances of the workmen on the Crow's Nest Pass railway, and into the circumstances attending the deaths of two of the said employees, Charles P. MacDonald and E. M. Frasher, at or near Pincher Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into charges of unjust treatment of persons engaged in the construction of the Crow's New Pass Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon certain charges of conspiracy to defraud the revenue, preferred against James Devlin, of the City of Kingston, late engineer of the Kingston Penitentiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the grievances of certain settlers residing within the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company's Land Belt on Vancouver Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into certain charges preferred against Sheriff James H. Bensen and others of Regina, North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon charges of Intemperance against Sheriff Owen E. Hughes of the judicial district of Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to investigate, inquire into and report upon the state and management of St. Vincent De Paul Penitentiary, Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the nature and extent of losses incurred by inhabitants of Quebec City in consequence of the landslide that occurred in September, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to investigate, inquire into and report upon charges preferred against certain officers and guards connected with the Stony Mountain Penitentiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report with respect to all material facts relating to alleged sale of certain lots in the Town of Banff, North-West Territories, prior to passing of Rocky Mountains Park Act, 50-51 Victoria, Chapter 32, to any other persons who or whose assigns or other legal representations are now in the possession of such lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Commission to investigate an accident on the Prince Edward Island Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the resignation of C. E. Ewing, collector of customs, Cobourg, Ontario, and the promotion of D. McAllister and Hagerman and the action of G. Guillet, M.P. in relation thereto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon charges preferred against Emile Dube of fraudulent conduct in supplying lumber to the intercolonial railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the reasons for the failure of the election in Algoma riding not to be held on the same day as the other ridings in the general election of that year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into charges regarding the resignation of William Sykes, postmaster, Cobourg, Ontario and the Appointment of C. Guillet, Postmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon claims of G. S. Mayers regarding the construction of a trestle bridge on the Pictou Branch of the intercolonial railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon certain claims of Jabez Snowball, contractor, regarding the construction of the Indian town Branch of the intercolonial railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon certain claims of Messrs. Bancroft, Connolly and company, regarding the construction of the Kingston Graving Dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the right of property in Salmon Stand Bay du Vin claimed by Dudley Perley and Thomas Williston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to hold a conference with the government of Manitoba, for the purpose of ascertaining whether legislation cannot be obtained from the legislature of Manitoba during its present session which will deal in a manner satisfactory to the minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Commission to investigate reports that the dominion steamer 'Qu Adra' did not require the extensive repair carried out after running aground on Fulford Reef, Discovery Island, British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Commission to investigate whether, and if so, to what extent, the sweating system is practised in the various industrial centres of the dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Commission to investigate alleged violations of 'the fisheries act' by Messrs. James and Charles Noble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the pilotage business of the district of the Port of St. John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report on complaints as to discrimination in passenger and freight rates in Manitoba and the North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges by shippers that excessive freight rates are being charged in the export of cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Commission to investigate the administration and affairs of new Westminster Penitentiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon claims of certain contractors arising out of the construction of the Oxford and New Glasgow railway and of the Cape Breton Railway respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report upon the description of nets used, the spawning periods of fish, and other matters connected with the fisheries in the various lakes and other waters in the province of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Royal Commission in reference to certain charges made against the Honourable Sir A. P. Caron, K.C. M.G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into the present condition of the civil service at Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into charges preferred against commissioner Lawrence Herchmer and Assistant commissioner William H. Herchmer, of the North-West Mounted Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report on the fisheries and fisheries regulations in British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Commission to consider the enlargement of the Cornwall Canal in accordance with the general scheme now being carried out to afford a navigable depth of fourteen feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Commission to consider certain improvements suggested for the Montreal Harbour by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Commission appointed to consider the advisability of extending the Trent Valley Canal, and to what extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into and complete the enumeration of half-breeds and claims of white settlers in the North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into and report on the subject of labour, its relation to capital, the hours of labour and the earnings of labouring men and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Commission to investigate alleged irregularities regarding a fuel wood contract at the Citadel, Quebec City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into charges preferred against Charles Thomas Dupont, District Inspector of Inland Revenue Division of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 42  | 1886 | Royal Commission to investigate and report upon all questions connected with the past and future leasing of waters from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Royal Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into the advisability of constitution a court of railway commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into the cause of floods at Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into charges preferred against Jeremiah Travis, stipendiary Magistrate, North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the enumeration of half-breeds in the north-west territories outside of Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon claims for compensation for loss or damage arising out of the late half-breed and Indian and Indian insurrection in the North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Commission to investigate and report upon certain claims arising out of the recent outbreak and rebellion in the North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into the enumeration of half-breeds in the North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Commission of the manufacturing industries of certain sections of the maritime provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into Chinese immigration into British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Commission on the state of the manufacturing industries of Ontario and Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into certain claims connected with the construction of the intercolonial railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Royal commission to inquire into conflicting claims to lands of occupants in Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into charges preferred against the Pullman Palace Car Company of having on many occasions during a number of years past, by their employees and agents, introduced illicitly into Canada, large and valuable quantities of goods liable to customs duty without reporting, entering or paying duty thereon, and other violation of customs laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Commission to collect, examine, and classify the statutes passed by the parliament of the dominion of Canada, since Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and report on the system of laws regulating labour in the state of Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire respecting certain claims to lands in Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into the organization of the civil service commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into matters connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into changes affecting the administration of justice in the North-West Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Commission to inquire into and settle the disputed territory fund in New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges against certain employees of the Welland Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into conflicting claims to lands of occupants in Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges against Captain James Coopers, agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Victoria, British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Commission to investigate charges against Mr. J. A. Provencher, acting Indian Superintendent of the Manitoba Superintendency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Royal Commission to inquire into the management of the Canadian Northern Railway company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>