

## Executive summary

- **Scenarios.** Three scenarios likely guide the defence review: over the next four years, decrease defence budget (no inflation adjustments; no relief from the centre for unforecasted deployments); status quo; modest increase over the next 4 years.
- **Roles.** The key roles are time-tested and need not be changed
  - Defending Canada – ensuring the security of citizens; exercising Canada's sovereignty
  - Defending North America – in partnership with the United States
  - Contributing to International Peace and Security – Canada's prosperity and security depend on stability. Of G7 countries, Canada has 2<sup>nd</sup> highest (GE #1) dependency on trade as % of GDP
- **Threats.** Three current threats to Canadian national security:
  - *Cyber.* Cyber security need not be heavily military
  - *Terrorism.* Mainly law enforcement and central intel responsibility
  - *Climate change.* Likely increase in CAF deployments in the wake of natural disasters (flooding, forest fires, melting permafrost in the north). CAF response requires agile, in-community (reserves), timely deployments of high-value resources (restructure reserves) by tactical airlift
- **Multilateral.** In line with the "Canada's back" theme, shoulder our responsibilities as a member of UN, NATO, NORAD, Francophonie, etc. 1% of GDP does not cut it, especially with the US and UK. While the NATO target of 2% is unattainable in the short-term, 1.5% is a responsible and achievable target. Those that argue that we are in the top ten of total dollars spent on defense, should be promoting the better use of those dollars (see below).
- **Combat.** Maintain general purpose combat capability and avoid the attraction of specialization (over emphasis on the UN, PKO, special forces). Defence is an insurance policy. Specialization is high risk and limits government options. This does not mean not getting involved in UN PKOs but be selective and do not make it our raison d'être. As the last Canadian to command a UN force, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> last to command an international force (MGen Denis Thompson is commanding MFO/Sinai), I raise a cautionary flag concerning full-scale involvement in UN ops. This is one file that warrants considerable due diligence. The UN is not NATO.
- **BMD.** Sign it. This is and has been a no/low cost no-brainer.
- **Defence dollar.** Improve return on the defence dollar:
  - Restructure reserves.
    - *Rationalize.* Units that are established for 150 soldiers regularly parade only half that yet keep the overhead of senior officers. Amalgamate reserve units.
    - *Recruiting.* Speed recruiting. An interested civilian student should be allowed to parade within a month of showing interest. No weapons should be issued until the full screening is complete but basic training and duty pay should start right away. De-link from the centralized regular force system but ensure an audit for quality/standards.
    - *Re-role.* Re-role units to viable overseas and domestic roles. Why do we have a reserve artillery unit on Vancouver Island when what will be needed when the earthquake hits will be engineering and medical expertise. These latter skills are combat enablers for expeditionary missions. The Minister's own BCR would have a better role as a Combat Engineer Regiment with the sappers having civilian 'trade' skills of carpentry, plumbing, electrical, water-treatment; skills which can be used at home, on a PKO, an overseas disaster response, and a combat mission. A student

- (high school or university) would have a civilian recognized skill at the end of their initial reserve contract. Under the current plan, a solitary TAPV will sit on the armoury floor for photo ops. A limited number of units should maintain an augmentation role for armoured and artillery; the rest for infantry.
- Capital procurement. Cease the requirement for federal ships to be built in Canada. Do like the Brits and others. Build the hull offshore and do the high-value systems integration and fitting in Canada.
  - RMC. The return of the taxpayer's investment needs to be reviewed.
    - Officers can be commissioned from RMC without being bilingual (B), without having passed their MOC's physical fitness requirements, and without having the academic requirements enabling the post nominal 'rmc'.
    - For the past six years, only 20% of the intake for western armoured and infantry units came from RMC; 80% were DEO or civilian ROTP.
    - Improve the RMC standard or direct all officer academic programs through civilian ROTP. If the latter, make RMC the new Pearson Peacekeeping Centre (CMR can be the adjunct for Francophonie countries) and, if necessary, move CFC/Toronto to RMC.
  - Bilingualism. Standards are too high.
    - I strongly believe in bilingualism but the current standards are too high. 'Bs' would be sufficient for the majority.
    - If and when an individual is posted to a bilingual position, then he/she should go on an intensive language course.
    - Merit listing is excessively influenced by language proficiency. This may be fine for those in eastern Canada but it discriminates against those who serve in the west. Way too much of the defence budget is needlessly being spent on a skill that few soldiers have to use as most spend the bulk of their career in an English milieu. This is especially true for western-based units.
    - For those of senior officer potential
  - RCAF pilots
    - Why is Canada one of the few remaining countries that requires all pilots to be commissioned officers? Officer pilots are an expensive commodity with limited shelf life in light of the predicted civil aviation high demand for pilots in the next years.
    - NCOs can pilot helicopters. The US, UK, and France have NCO helicopter pilots. A meaningful alternate career for combat arms NCOs. The flight leader could be an officer but the others including instructors could be NCOs. Cuts cost; could improve retention of NCOs.
  - **Leaner and more agile.** Easier said than done. As it is, DND does not have enough project managers to oversee the capital programme and the Army has insufficient trucks to support mobile ops. If serious about 'leaner', close Goose Bay, ground the Snowbirds and Skyhawks. Until that happens, then we are not serious. If serious about agility, by the needed trucks and by a SAR aircraft in sufficient numbers that they can be used for tactical airlift (domestic response to natural disasters).