

Canada-Korea Strategic Partnership Conference 2015

*Co-hosted by Massey College, Munk School of Global Affairs &
the Bill Graham Centre for Contemporary International History at the University of Toronto*

Keynote Address by His Excellency Dae-Shik Jo (Ambassador of ROK to Canada)

Honourable Hugh Segal (Master, Massey College & conference co-chair)
Prof. Don Breaun (Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto)
Mr. Ian Burney (Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada)
Mr. Sonny Cho (Canada Korea Business Council)
Prof. George Georgeopoulos (Department of Economics, U of T)

Hon. Justice Michael Kirby (UN Commission of Inquiry on the DPRK)

Colonel Jang-Min Choi (Embassy of the Republic of Korea)
Mr. John Roach (Department of National Defence Canada)
Senator Yonah Martin (Government of Canada)
Prof. Adam Chapnick (Canadian Forces College)
Vice-President Judith Wolfson (University of Toronto)
Prof. Ann Kim (York University)
Mr. Jae Chong (Korean Canadian Cultural Association)
Q&A Panel Discussion with Ms. Monica Chi (KCWA)
Tina J. Park (conference co-chair)



MASSEY COLLEGE
in the University of Toronto

MUNK
SCHOOL
OF
GLOBAL
AFFAIRS



CONTEMPORARY
INTERNATIONAL
HISTORY

Welcome Remarks by the Honourable Hugh Segal

Hugh Segal: Good morning and welcome to our conference today entitled Canada-Korea Strategic Partnership in the 21st century.

Our partners in this endeavour, the Bill Graham Center for Contemporary International History, the Munk School of Global Affairs, the Asian institute, the David Chu Program in Asia Pacific Studies, the Center for the Study of Korea, the University of Toronto Korean Students Association, and the Canadian studies program at University College, have joined Massey College in this undertaking because we all share one very important perspective: the new free trade relationship with Korea, the historic common ground between Canadians and Koreans in the defence of Korea against communist aggression decades ago; something particularly evocative in this anniversary year of remembrance in honour for those who served and made the ultimate sacrifice are not passive symbols of an existing relationship.

They can, and should be, strong and compelling signposts to a dynamic and deeply productive way ahead where two strong and dynamic democracies, with many complementary demographic, industrial, strategic and economic needs, forge ever stronger relationships on a mutually productive basis. Progress and mutual benefit do not result from passivity or profound embrace of the status quo. Progress, and enhanced cooperation on trade, economic, education, strategic, defence and diplomatic initiatives, will serve as the root to enhanced economic benefits and mutual success of our two countries.

In the same way our Korean friends are very sensitive to Canada's trade and security relations with the United States and our linkages to Europe, those of us in Canada should be sensitive to the cooperative relationship on trade matters between China and Korea, and the common security perspectives which we share. Part of the challenge before us today is that of pursuing realistically and directly what the next steps and initiatives should and need to be. The panels on the future of the FTA with Korea on defence and strategic cooperation, on forging closer ties, on immigration and education, will afford not only our distinguished panellists but all of you here today a chance to ask questions and register your views on these dynamic issues.

We are particularly honoured here today to have as our keynote speaker, his Excellency Daeshik Jo, South Korea's new and distinguished ambassador to Canada, who just recently presented his credentials to the Governor General in Ottawa, having been appointed ambassador on the 27th of March. We are particularly honoured that he should be making his first speech as Ambassador to this conference here at the University of Toronto. It speaks very well of the importance our Korean allies associate with Canada that Ambassador Jo should have been assigned to our country. He has served in Singapore, Oman, Austria, and Sweden, and most recently in the very challenging assignment in Libya from 2011 to 2012. He has played a crucial role in the modernising of the foreign ministry in Seoul, received the Distinguished Service Merit Medal from the President of Korea in 2013. For those of us here this morning who believe that humanities graduates are vital to our common global future together, his Excellency holds graduate and undergraduate degrees in sociology, from the United States and Korea. We are honoured to have him as a vital and leading member of Canada's diplomatic core, and we are especially pleased that he should be making his first speech as ambassador with us here this morning. Your Excellency, the floor is yours.

Keynote Address by His Excellency Daeshik Jo

Ambassador Jo: Thank you so much for your warm introduction. I don't feel so comfortable when I hide behind a podium, so I would like to stand before you. Thank you so much for your warm introduction and warm welcome. Special thanks also go to Massey College and Munk School and the Bill Graham Centre who made this event possible. I am so delighted we have not just students and an academic community, but also those from the business community. I am so happy that we can see experts like Deputy Minister Ian Burney and Jim Peterson, the former minister of International Trade, and Michael Kirby, the special envoy of Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon to the Commission of Inquiry for North Korea, who was my former boss when I was based in Vienna, Austria.

The title I chose today is as you can see the "Next 50 years: Transforming Possibility into Reality." These two lines summarise my presentation today. This is also a vision of my work in the coming few years. Last week, I presented my credentials to his Excellency the Governor General (Pointed to the slideshow) How do you like my traditional costume *Han-bok*?

This is something I can show you, which summarizes everything I want to deliver. [Shows graph] The topic is an analysis of the last 50 years, and what feel is the potential for the next 50 years. This diagram actually shows the big picture of the last 50 years and the coming 50 years. Some of you may think that I have just over one month's experience as the Ambassador here in Canada. Some of you may think how can he visualise this image? But the reason is that my first visit to Canada was 25 years ago, so I have had enough time, more than two decades, to think about the overall status and image.

And this, as you can see here, over the past 50 years we have made great progress in our bilateral relationships. Where we stand at the moment, as you can see here, we are standing at the end of the 50 years. Fifty years ago, South Korea had established an embassy in Ottawa, which was around the time when the first wave of Korean came to Canada. So for 52 years we have established a diplomatic relationship with Canada. If we can say that establishment of diplomatic relations as an engagement, the marriage is the opening of the embassy and the first Koreans setting their foot on Canadian soil. So we are standing on the 50th anniversary of the opening of this embassy, and we are standing at the beginning of a new chapter, a new era of another 50 years, and we have made great progress in many respects, as you can see, but there is still a lot of great untapped potential. I will explain later on what I mean by this untapped potential.

As you can see I am optimistic about the next 50 years, we will grow, we will leap onto the stage. If you ask me the reason why I am so optimistic is because I believe [shows image of house on strong vs. weak foundation] we are not a foolish builder, building a house on sinking sand, but we are a wise builder. We have our solid foundations. I can show you what I mean by solid foundations. Korea and Canada, we are strong allies no doubt, and we are ideal partners, at the same time we are like-minded countries in the global forum addressing these global challenges we face and we share common values: values of democracy, a free, open market economy and respect for human rights. We have a long historical friendship, and we have an enormous amount of people to people exchange.

This is something I believe is a strong foundation. This is a solid rock that we can build our relationship on. Based on this relationship we have developed over the last 50 years, we have made great progress in many respects. In the coming years, if you want to build a strong house, and if you want to move from this stage to another stage, we need a lot of material to build a house.

Of all these materials the most important are pillars, and the three most important pillars are what I would like to highlight today. As you can see, the first, the most fundamental thing, is political cooperation, the second is economic cooperation, and the third pillar is public diplomacy. So let me go into these specific areas.

The first pillar- What I mean by this critical operation is that we have made great progress in political, bilateral and at the same time multilateral relations. In the next coming years we have to maintain this momentum and strengthen, and deepen our relationships. This is some elements of our political cooperation. First the historical ties as you can see date back more than 120 years.

The first Canadians that came to Korea were more than 200 missionaries. One of the reasons why I choose these as the first place to share my vision after my presentation last week is this historical tie. Among the 200 missionaries, Dr. Schofield is University of Toronto alumni and a very proud Canadian. He made a great contribution, those 200 Canadians made a great contribution, not just for evangelization but for modernisation and the independence movement. Also, if you go 60 years back, we have a great contribution by more than 20,000 Canadian soldiers who came to fight against communism and to protect the freedom and democracy of the Korean people. This security cooperation is still very strong, since the Korea War. Like I said before, we do have a very strong bilateral strategic relationship on the global and regional cooperation in many respects as like-minded countries.

In economic cooperation, over the last 50 years, we have focused mainly on these three areas in economic cooperation [Slide shows: trade and investment, energy and resources, immigration and Education]. The next 50 years, I believe we need to expand our areas of cooperation, but at the same time deepen our existing relationships. For the past 50 years, when we say economic cooperation, we were mainly focused on these three areas, now what I am hoping is that we would like to expand into new territories which have great potential, like science, technology and innovation. This is one area which we have to work together, and if we work, we can accomplish so much. And Arctic development, Korea has a top ship building industry, and Korea is one of the main maritime shipping countries, and Canada is one of the largest stakeholders of this issue, a very important topic. So I think this is another area we can explore in the future. Of course then in agriculture, we do have great potential.

So these are new territories especially after the free trade agreement. This is the last pillar, and some of you may not be familiar with this term [projected: public diplomacy]. Think of it as people to people exchanges, which is non-traditional diplomatic area, and also in the coming 50 years, we would like to add in new areas like cultural exchange and understanding between these two countries.

As you can see we have a great number of these changes of Koreans in Canada, and Canadians of Korean heritage are more than 200,000. Twenty-five years ago, when I first came to Canada it was about 40,000. At the time the population of Canada, I remember, was 27 million, now it's 35 million. The size of the Korean community is also increasing and 20,000 Canadians live in Korea now. It is my understanding here at University of Toronto you have lots of Korean students, and Canadian students with Korean heritage. So this shows a great number of exchange in this area. This is something I am working on.

To move forward we need to expedite this cultural exchange. We need to set up a Korean-cultural centre. This is something I am going to do in my term and hopefully we are going to open in the next year. So with these three pillars I think we can achieve these in another 50 years of great relationships between our two countries.

We do have a strong foundation, and we have strong pillars, now the last piece we need to build a new strong house. If we have these foundations and pillars do you think we have everything so we can move forward? Do you think we can transform our untapped potential into possibility to reach our full potential? I don't think so: those foundations and the pillars are not enough, I think. We have to be very realistic. Aside from all the rhetoric, we have to face the realities. One of the most important obstacles we have to overcome to move forward I think is indifference. Koreans' indifference towards Canada, Canadians' indifference towards Korea.

I thought about this image [shows image of unmixed oil and vinegar salad dressing].

I found this image this morning, after Googling, from one of my colleagues. What do you think this image is?

Audience: "Salad Dressing!"

Salad dressing, that's right. Canada-Korea relationship is somehow like oil and vinegar. If you don't stir this pot you will stay separate. Nothing will happen even though we have very good conditions and the complementary nature of our relations structure. We have a great momentum, and we have the greatest unprecedented momentum last year: the signing of the free trade agreement. I think Ian has done great work. It took 10 years to finalise this agreement, until our two leaders have actually put pressure, and also taking initiative to finalise this agreement. This is a starting point, we have to implement the free trade agreement. We have another historic milestone, launching a strategy partnership. Those two historic milestones are an important foundation we can move forward. But to do that we need someone who can stir this pot. Otherwise we will not have a delicious salad dressing, we cannot dip our bread. So if we keep on stirring this oil and vinegar, this Canada and Korea, we will make a very delicious, a very excellent salad dressing. So this is something [that is] my task and my responsibility. And I challenge you to become people who can stir. If we do this, I think we can move forward to the next stage. And we can realise this vision of transforming our potential into reality in the next coming years. Thank you so much. Together, I think we can accomplish so many things in the coming years, and thank you so much for your time. [Q/A followed]

Panel #1 “Canada-Korea FTA: Challenges & Opportunities”

Hugh Segal: Now it is with great pleasure that I introduce the moderator for our first panel on Canada-Korea FTA: Challenges and Opportunities. Dr. George Georgopoulos is a professor at the Department of Economics and has been teaching at the University of Toronto and at York, and who was very much involved in working on economic trade policy, working for the Prime Minister of Canada and the German Chancellor on the underlying economics of the Canada-EU trade agreement. He has been a very active voice on difficult economic ideas in the media and has been actively involved in presenting papers in international conferences including the Academy of International Business in Stockholm and Sweden, and the American Economics Association in Philadelphia. He is also a distinguished fellow at Massey College. We are honoured that he would share this most important panel on trade, and I want to invite him to introduce his colleagues to you on the panel. Thank you George.

Dr. George Georgopoulos: Thank you Hugh for that kind introduction, your Excellency, government officials, academics, business leaders and guests. It’s a pleasure to be here. This is a very exciting time for Canada, yet another free trade agreement signed, so the government of Canada has been pretty busy. They signed a free trade agreement, as you know with Europe last year, and working on a transpacific partnership agreement. These agreements take quite a while to work out. My understanding is that the South Korean one took almost a decade to get to this point. Sometimes it takes years just to get people to a table. So we are here to talk more about some of these issues, challenges and opportunities.

First we have Professor Don Brean. Dr. Brean is a professor of finance and economics at the Rotman School of Management in Toronto. He has published extensively in economic policy form casting analysis of taxation, international finance and investment and industrial organisation. He is a member of the international panel of tax experts of the IMF. He has advised international agencies and governments including the SEATA, The European Community, the UNDP, the IMF, and USAID. He is also the project director of the research program, Taxation in the Chinese Economic Transition for the Ministry of Finance in Beijing. So he has done quite a bit of work dealing with China. I believe he can shed some insights on this new partnership Canada has with Korea, and can it be used to leverage getting into what some people argue to be the largest economy in the world.

We also have Mr. Sonny Cho who is the president and CEO of the Canada Korea Business Council, responsible for establishing, developing, and promoting and operating CKBC. CKBC aims to serve as Canada's business export trade and investment attraction catalysts and advocate on Korea.

Representing the Government of Canada, we have Mr. Ian Burney. Mr. Burney joined the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade in 1987 and has held a wide range of positions in Ottawa and diplomatic postings overseas including trade posts in Bangkok, Thailand, Ho Chi Minh City in Vietnam, and trade postings in the US. In the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Mr. Burney served as Assistant Deputy Minister of the International Business Development, Investment and Innovation Branch. And in September 2011, Mr. Burney was appointed as Assistant Deputy Minister, Trade Policy and Negotiations. He was heavily involved in this current Canada-Korea free trade agreement. So, I'd like to start

off by asking each panellist to speak for approximately 20 minutes on challenges and opportunities you see with this free trade agreement. As mentioned, agreements have been signed, but have not been ratified. That is another potential challenge that perhaps the three of you could mention. What are the sensitive issues and challenges facing that? Let's start with you, Ian.

Ian Burney: Thank you for that introduction, my thanks also to Massey College, to the Munk School, and to the Bill Graham Centre. In particular I would like to thank Hugh Segal, who was one of the driving forces in organising today's conference. This is an historic year for Canada-Korea relations as you know, and I am very pleased to be here today and talk about the Canada-Korea free trade agreement, or CKFTA. I have no doubt that the agreement will have a significant positive impact on our bilateral economic relationship going forward.

On a personal note, let me add that this topic is indeed near and dear to me. As you have heard, I have had the privilege of serving as Canada's chief negotiator for this initiative throughout the 10 year period that it took, for the very first exploratory meeting, right up to the entry in force five months ago. So while the Canada-Korea FTA was certainly a government priority, it's one that I became quite attached to personally and professionally, and I am delighted that we have all opportunity to explore its virtues. As I said to Ambassador Jo actually in our first meeting together, I am now also considering myself something of an unofficial champion of the Canada Korea economic relationship with the public service so I will be doing my part to "stir the salad dressing."

Now before I turn to the CKFTA in more detail, I thought I'd start by situating this in context of Canada's broader policy agenda. Governments around the world are continuing to adapt to the rapid transformation of the global economic landscape, driven by global innovation, and the emergence of major new economic actors in the Asia-Pacific region.

For Canada, where one in five jobs depend on exports and trade is equivalent to about 60 percent of our GDP, this has put every emphasis on trade and investment liberalisation, building on the two decades of experience we had with the NAFTA. Though the strategy for achieving that is laid out in what is called the Global Market Action Plan, or GMAP, which was laid out by our Trade Minister about a year and a half ago. And it outlines how the government plans to leverage its economic diplomacy, its trade promotion resources, and its negotiating agenda in order to pursue opportunities to Canada around the world. The upshot from a trade policy standpoint is what has been called, "the most ambitious negotiating agenda in our history." I can tell you that the view from the front line that that is an accurate description. It has been perused on a multitude of issues on every continent. We are getting results.

Since 2006, Canada has concluded 8 FTA negotiations with 38 countries, bringing the total number of countries we have FTAs with to 43. To put that into perspective that represents about half of the global marketplace and over 80 percent of our two-way trade. Most significantly we concluded negotiations last year of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement with the European Union, or CETA.

And we are now working to prepare that agreement for signature and ratification. When the CETA comes into force, Canada will become one of the only developed countries with preferential access to the world's two largest economies: the EU and the US.

But while we have embarked on an extensive array of issues around the globe, the government clearly recognises the central perks of the Asia-Pacific region. Asia's transformation as you all know has been profound, driven of course by the spectacular rise of China and of the Asian tigers including South Korea before, but also more recently by the seismic shifts taking place in India, by the growing potential of the ASEAN economies, and by Prime Ministers Abe's efforts to reignite the Japanese economy.

It's frankly crucial for Canada's economic prosperity, that our companies be as well positioned as possible for the world, and that is a key element of our strategy. That and Canada is one of 12 countries, seeking to negotiate the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP. Prime Minister Harper recently characterised it as the biggest game on the planet in terms of trade negotiations and with good reason. These countries together represent a market of 8 billion people, and a combined GDP of over 28 trillion dollars which is about 40% of the global economy. TPP talks are now at a very advanced stage. Negotiators are engaged more or less continuously, as participants seek to land this deal while there is still an opening in the US political calendar. But I can't speculate on the outcome. One thing that is certain is that the TPP will continue to attract a great deal of attention in the coming days and weeks, particularly as the U.S. Congress rankles with the trade promotion authority legislation.

But beyond the TPP we are negotiating comprehensive trade agreements bilaterally with Japan, on a separate but parallel track to the TPP. The Canada-Japan Economic Partnership Agreement, also known as CJEPA, got a boost in Canada by the visit of Prime Minister Abe. And we are pursuing a wide range of other initiatives across the region, including exploratory FTA talks with Thailand and the Philippines. I should say that while FTAs tend to capture all the headlines, we are also working to expand the coverage of our bilateral investment and services agreements because those are very important in terms of our trade policy tool kit. But let me now return to our most important achievement from a trade policy stand point.

Returning to the central topic of this morning, which was of course the entry into force of the Canada-Korea free trade agreement on January 1st. This, as you have heard, is Canada's first FTA in Asia and it is a watershed in terms of our bilateral relations with South Korea, which is both a priority market for us and a natural ally. As you heard this morning our relationship with Korea has very deep roots. We shared a very profound legacy of Canada's participation in the Korean War, and in the years since, since Canada and Korea's economic rise, the focus has been focused more on building our trade and investment clients. South Korea today has a population of 50 million, and a 1.6 trillion dollar economy that ranks fourth in Asia and 13th globally. It hosts world leading technology in key sectors, and an impressive array of fortune 500 companies. Bilateral commercial flows between our two countries are also significant. Two-way trade is over 2 billion, and the stock of our bilateral investment is a little over 4 billion. The governments on both sides have long recognised that for two advanced G20 economies like ours, the numbers should be much, much greater still, and the Ambassador alluded to that this morning.

From our perspective, the FTA, given its broad scope and reach, offers a seminal opportunity to transform the economic bilateral relationship, so that we can reach the level of commerce that fits the size and sophistication of our two economies. Our internal economic models justify that the FTA should boost Canada's GDP by 1.7 billion dollars, and expand on our exports by about a third of our current levels. Other models that have been done in the private sector point to even higher returns. So those are significant numbers but they likely still understate the full potential, given that economic models tend to focus mostly on tariffs, not the full scope of modern trade agreements. And they don't capture the strategic value of this agreement for Canada.

To start with, the entry into force of the CKFTA will strengthen both our credibility as a negotiating partner, one that is able to land and deliver big deals with significant partners, as well as our negotiating position in long term negotiations, since other countries now are motivated to seek to level the playing field with the Koreans and our market. As our first FTA in Asia, the CKFTA provides something of a beachhead for countries in Asia, opening doors for our countries, to open doors with Korean firms to pursue business offers throughout the region and beyond. And that may be particularly important for our SMEs, the lack of wherewithal to break into new major markets on their own, but they may be able to do so by shipping niche technology, products or services to Korea's leading conglomerates through the channels that are deeply connected throughout Asia and the world. Most critically though, when you get the CKFTA to reverse the losses our companies were suffering in the Korean market by virtue of the FTAs of our competitors, particularly by the United States and Europe, but also to ensure we didn't lose more current ground as a result of Korea's current FTAs with Australia (in force December 12, 2014) and China (signed on June 1, 2015).

So against that competitive backdrop it was essential for Canada to move quickly, and that's why the final stages of the negotiation, and the ensuing implementation process moved as quickly as they did. Indeed as the agreement was signed during president Park's state visit to Canada last September, legislation was passed and parliamentary approvals came to both countries in just over three months, and that is a speed record for a Canadian FTA. So that allowed the agreement to come to force on January 1, and that was a date our business stakeholders all identified as critical in making a decision about the Korean market.

We may now turn to some of the specific highlights about the agreement, and the opportunities I think that it holds for Canada. In essence, the Canada Korea Free Trade agreement is a comprehensive, state-of-the-art free trade agreement that covers virtually every asset of modern commerce. It covers Canadian goods and services, investment, business mobility, government procurement, intellectual property, technical barriers to trade, labour, environment and so on. At the core though is the elimination of tariffs on virtually all trade between our two countries. And in fact nearly 90% of Canada's exports now enter the South Korean market duty-free as a result of the CKFTA, and all but a tiny fraction of the rest will become duty free over time. The tariff elimination package compares favourably to our competitors who came with their deals with Korea, and is quite advantageous when you consider that Korean tariffs are on average three times higher than Canada's, over 13% versus a little over 4%. So the new duty free access provides new export opportunities for our respective companies, and reduces costs when they are sourcing products for their supply chains. Our consumers now have more choice and pay lower prices on the products they purchase everyday as a direct result of the CKFTA.

And as a result, some of you may have heard of the innovative ads that were run by Hyundai and Kia, I believe earlier this year, touting new FTA sale prices. Of course the same logic applies in respect to Korean consumers buying Canadian goods.

Now let me turn to some specific sectors. All Korean tariffs will be reduced across all industrial and manufacturing sectors, such as aerospace, auto, rail and information technology, chemicals, pharmaceuticals and so forth. Most of these Korean tariffs, which averaged as high as 13% have already been eliminated. Promising opportunities abound, not least in the energy sector. There was a question earlier this morning about that, where Canada is, of course, a major global supplier, and Korea is a major source of imports. In fact, Korea is the second largest importer of LNG, fourth for oil, and fifth for crude oil. And in the area of nuclear power in particular, Canada has a long established partnership with Korea, supplying a large number of CANDU reactors that remain in operation. In April, just a few months ago, key players from Canada's energy industry mounted a trade mission to Korea and concluded a number of MOUs and agreements to take advantage of the CKFTA.

The agreement will also eliminate all Korean tariffs in the forestry sector, where Korea is already a very important market for Canada's industry, and in the fish and seafood sector where Korean tariffs run to nearly 50%, and where the potential is enormous. Indeed in the immediate aftermath of the announcement concluded last year, Korean Airlines cargo launched dedicated weekly flights from Halifax to Seoul to carry large quantities of live Canadian lobster to the Korean market, where they are now coming in through preferential tariff treatment. So Korea could become an important gateway to broadening the appeal of Canadian seafood across Asia. In the area of agriculture, Korea's most heavily protected sector where some tariffs run as high as 900%, key exports already enjoy free trade treatment, including wheat, canola, ice wine, frozen french fries, and fur skins. Over time, Korean tariffs will be eliminated on over 95% of our agricultural exports, and that includes Canadian beef and pork, which were among our highest agricultural priorities in this negotiation, and one of the most sensitive areas to negotiate.

Looking beyond tariffs, the negotiation provides for a wide range of disciplines beyond tariff barriers, including provisions that promote the use of internationally recognised standards and commitments on trade participation that will reduce red tape, promote automated clearance procedures, and provide advanced rulings from customs authorities. The agreement has also tasks to dispute settlement procedures and important obligations in area services, investment, government procurement, intellectual property, labour, and environment.

In short, the agreement provides a strong comprehensive and modern foundation for our trade and investment. It should propel the Canada-Korea economic relationship to a much higher level. The opportunities are virtually limitless, and in my view the biggest challenge we face is to make sure we rise to the occasion, and actually take advantage of the opportunities. The ambassador spoke about the risks of complacency, and we must remember that trade agreements on their own do not create jobs or prosperity. They provide a framework that is intended to stimulate and expand intended trade and investment. In effect they open the doors, but the extent to which the potential is realised depends on the degree they go to our respective business communities. That, I think is the fundamental challenge before us. It is one that the government is taking very seriously.

Minister Fast has been crisscrossing the country, convening all sorts of workshops and seminars, and all sorts of other events to promote the opportunities created by this agreement, and by others who are coming, and to encourage our countries to gear up and take full advantage of them. Other ministers are also engaged in those types of outreach activities, and we welcome initiatives from non-governmental sectors to showcase the other opportunities created by the agreement. But these are still early days and hopefully the proof will be in the pudding, but so far the indications offer well for realising the potential. We only have four months of trade data so far for 2015, but what we do have shows a moderate increase in trade in both directions and sharp increases in those specific sectors where we were expecting to see benefits out of the agreement.

But most important has been the level of enthusiasm we have seen from the Canadian business community that wants this agreement. In February, Minister Fast held a large multi-sector trade mission to Korea to take advantage of the agreement, and more than 100 Canadian participants were able to take part in that initiative. The largest trade mission to any country that he has led in his four years on the job. Other trade missions have also taken place including the nuclear one I mentioned, and a major agricultural and food mission that was led by Minister Ritz. But each of these generated a multitude of new business interactions and ventures that should deliver more returns over time.

To conclude, I think we are off to a strong start, but we need to keep at it in a sustained, focused, and rigorous fashion. If we are able to do that, then I am optimistic we will be able to realise the full potential of this agreement, and see it usher in a new era of the Canada-Korea relationship, one characterised by a more elevated, and more robust commercial engagement. As applied to the outside, nothing would give my key negotiators and I a greater sense of satisfaction than seeing our stakeholders seize the opportunities provided by this agreement, and thereby help create jobs and growth in the economy. So once again I would like to thank the organisers of today's conference for helping raise the profile of this bilateral relationship. I appreciate your attention, and I look forward to the discussion. Thank you.

Dr. Georgopoulos: Thank you Ian. Before we move on to the next panellist, I would just like to clarify the format of our panel for the audience. After the three speakers finish their presentations, there will be a Q & A session, and you will have the opportunity to ask questions via cue cards. Our student volunteers will be collecting them and bring them forward. Next we have Mr. Sonny Cho, who will speak to us from a business perspective. Sonny, the floor is yours.

Sonny Cho: Thank you. I would like to thank the Munk School, Massey College, and also the Bill Graham Centre, and for Tina Park for inviting me to be here with the very distinguished scholars and diplomats. I'll be speaking as a salesman on the ground, which I think is appropriate after Mr. Burney presented that I can give you a perspective from the people that are on the ground and who actually have to make it happen and deliver, and I have very honoured to see Ambassador Jo. As you know, my last name is pronounced "Cho" and spelled Cho, but in Korean it is spelled "Jo", and former ambassador was also "Jo" so these days Jos are doing well.

We have started the Canada Korea Business Council just recently. There is a very active and vibrant Canada-China business council, Canada-India business council, Turkish Council, all those names you need to remember. But as the Ambassador mentioned, there wasn't one between Korea and Canada, and only because of the Canada-Korea Free Trade Agreement, people are now thinking 'Maybe we should be doing something.' So we have incorporated, now the honourable Jim Peterson has just left but he is on our advisory council, and Mr. Robert Wayne who is the vice chairman of Invest Toronto is also on our advisory council and he was able to join us.

Sonny Cho: Thank you. I would like to thank the Munk School, Massey College, the Bill Graham Centre and Tina Park for inviting me to be here with very distinguished scholars and diplomats. I'll be speaking as a "salesman on the ground", which I think is appropriate after Mr. Burney presented the government's perspective. I can give you a perspective from the people that are on the ground and who actually have to make it happen and deliver. I am honoured to present with Ambassador Jo in presence. As you know, my last name is pronounced "Cho" and spelled Cho, but in Korean it is actually written and pronounced "Jo" like Ambassador Jo. The former ambassador was also "Jo" so these days "Jo"s are doing well.

We have started the Canada Korea Business Council just recently. There are very active and vibrant councils like Canada-China Business Council, Canada-India Business Council, Turkish Council and many others. But as the Ambassador mentioned, there isn't one between Korea and Canada. Now that the Canada-Korea Free Trade Agreement is signed, people are beginning to think 'Maybe we should be doing something.' So we have incorporated the Council and we have advisors like Honourable Jim Peterson and Mr. Robert Lane who are with us today.

I'm going to give you some facts first which may bore you a little. You may know all these facts but I want to go over these facts and then some of our challenges that our SMEs and larger Canadian corporations have faced in the past. After that I will talk about the opportunities and conclude with some of the action plans that we have in mind. Some of these facts were already mentioned by Mr. Burney. You know that Canada and Korea are strong trading partners but Mr. Benjamin Tal, who is the deputy economist with CIBC, wrote a couple of years ago, before this agreement was signed, that the last ten years was "the lost decade."

The export to Korea from Canada to was starting to decline while many other countries' exports were going up in the last 10 years. The total Canadian export stayed flat. It is the same level as 10 years ago. We depend quite a bit on the USA. 75-80% of exports are to the USA. We have been talking about diversifying the export markets but the export increase was only to China. China was the only country that Canada exported more. The export to Korea actually declined slightly. Hopefully with the new Free Trade Agreement it will go up substantially. But there is a lot of work to be done. There are apparently 1.1 million SME (small and medium enterprises) in Canada, and of those 1.1 million, only 40,000 SMEs actually export. Of those 40,000, only 11,000 export outside of the USA. That is a very small percentage and that has been discussed in many of the other past forums. The good news is that we have actually sold more to China in the recent years. That means we can compete with other countries on the global market.

So you wonder why more Canadian firms don't export to Korea. Or why don't more Korean firms buy from Canada? If you look at the statistics, Australia sells five times more to Korea than Canada. And people say, "Well, Australia is closer to Korea." Australia is not closer to Korea. From Incheon to Sydney is about 10.5/11 hours flight. From Incheon international airport to Vancouver is only 9.5 hours and 13 hours to Toronto. So do they speak the same language as Koreans do? No, we both speak English. Do they have the same cultural background? No, they don't. Does it cost more to travel for Canadians? No, it costs the same. Does it require a lot of time to export to Korea? Yes, but it is same for Australia. So we are very similar to Australia. Then, why does Australia sell five times more than we do. Something to think about. But Koreans have been very good.

By the way, when you look at me, I look Korean but some of us have lived in Canada for more than 43 years so when I say "we", I am talking about Canadians, but if I say "we" in Korean "woori", I am talking about Koreans. Just in case you might be confused a little bit when I keep saying "we". So it's not the price, it's not the quality, it's not the design and it's not the service. So why do they sell better than we do?

When you ask Koreans, "what do you know about Canada?" – Most will say "Well Canadians are kind, warm and nice people. Canadians say "sorry" a lot, Canada is a little bit colder than Korea and Canadians like to play great Hockey." By the way national coach of the Korean Hockey team is a gentleman by the name of Jim Paek who was the first Korean-Canadian ever to break into the NHL and he played for the Pittsburgh Penguins when they won the Stanley Cup. Now he is coaching the Korean Olympic team. They might even beat us in the winter Olympics coming up in 2018 in PyungChang.

We like each other and respect each other but we keep missing each other. The ambassador talked about it. We have this salad bowl with the oil and vinegar that has not been stirred enough. When Canadians talk about Asia, everyone is talking about China and when Koreans talk about North America, they only see the USA. When Koreans want to send their kids to good engineering schools overseas, they only think about Stanford or MIT. They either forget or don't know that there are great schools like U. of Toronto and U. of Waterloo, Ryerson and UBC.

A company called Future Brand, which is a global research firm, did a survey on brand. Where do you think Canada ranked for country's brand? Canada ranked number two, right behind Switzerland. Guess what rank do you think Korea got? In Top 20? No. Korea didn't rank at all in the Top 20 for the country brand. But when they asked on "made in" brands or what do you know about "made in Canada" or "made in Korea," or "made in Switzerland", South Korea ranked number 10. Canada did not rank at all in the Top 20. So when they asked "what do you know that is made in Canada", they couldn't name anything.

We think that, "Oh yeah, they know about the Canadian maple syrup, Canadian lobster and Blackberry. Apparently they don't. So it shows you that Koreans were not ranked in the country brand in the top 20, but they were number 10. US number 1, France number 2, Germany number 3, Japan number 4, Italy, UK, Switzerland, Sweden and so on. Even China is ranked because "made in China" is known to be cheap. People buy stuff from Germany and Japan for its quality and they buy stuff from France and Italy for its design. They have clear brand identities.

Branding is a challenging part for Canadian exporters. Canada faced a bilateral trade deficit of 2.4 billion dollars in 2013. Just because we have signed a free trade agreement doesn't mean the export sales will go up. Just look at the US side which signed the FTA two years ago. They are ahead of the game. There are US farmers that have been selling pork, beans and other goods at lower prices. They have already captured the customers in Korea and we are going to have to catch up really fast. Once you stop the relationship, it is very hard to displace them.

And also, I'm sure this is where our embassy and our diplomats can work on it, but, you know, there are still some barriers. Koreans are very good at stalling and will ask for all kinds of documentations to slow you down, and this is where... [laughter] Yeah, I know. They are tough negotiators; tough bargainers and they know how to get a deal done. I've done deals with Samsung, LG, and KIA, and all those guys so I can give you lots of my experience on how to work with Korean conglomerates.

Now that is the key part where the sales people can help after diplomats initially help. The Canadian embassy does a great job helping the SMEs. New ambassador Eric Walsh is quite busy. He is on radio talk shows and he is busy putting on promotion events for Canada. I think there needs to be more people with sales background, "Mr. Burney, I don't know if you have the power to do that but, you may want to let the minister of finance know that more money is needed to hire more people on the ground. As Mr. Burney mentioned, and somebody else asked the ambassador earlier, the Korean economy is controlled by top conglomerates. They control the channels and they account for substantial portion of the economy.

So governments can sign all these formal agreements, but it is the businesses that have to penetrate the web of corporate connections and personal connections in Korea. In Korea, your hometown, which university you went to, and your blood connections are important. Those three connections are a critical part of doing business, and this is where, I think, the Canadians of Korean heritage can come in and be good salad dressing mixers.

Many of us are bilingual, bicultural and understand where to help. In Korea, the social capital is very critical in getting the business done. A lot of Canadian companies are not successful because they haven't been able to master the cultural diplomacy and the social capital side of doing business. Relationships take a long time to cultivate and Korean's are very much relationship oriented people when it comes to business. Not only do they want top quality at a cheap price, but relationships are very important for Koreans.

So these are some of the challenges that we have faced and will continue to face, but the opportunities in Korea are incredible. Mr. Burney talked about the agricultural side. There are research done by the Canadian embassy and many of the Canadian think tanks. Forestry, mining, renewable energy and green technology sectors offer huge potential.

The ICT (Information & communications technologies) sector is another good area because LG and Samsung are the top electronic companies in the world. Other good opportunities are also in aerospace, defence, ocean technology, automotive, medical devices, and biotechnology. Most Koreans don't know about our strong industries in aerospace, defence, biotechnology and medical devices. Companies like Magna and Linamar are some of the top Canadian parts manufacturers in the world operating in Korea. Most Korean companies don't know about the advanced industrial clusters we have around Montreal and Toronto.

Next to the Silicon Valley and Boston, Toronto is the top venture capital and technology cluster. We need to inform Koreans through people to people exchange and many other programs. We need to persuade the executives of the large conglomerates that Canada is a great place to purchase some of the top quality technologies and equipment.

There have been some good signs. Green Cross just started building a plant in Montreal, a \$300 million dollar investment. Banting institute of Diabetes is receiving investments from Samsung hospital to do research. FenGate capital, based out of Oakville Ontario just raised 180 million dollars US from the Korean institutional investors to invest in Canadian and American infrastructure. There are many more Korean companies that are invested in Canada. Just recently, a company called Naver in Korea, came to visit University of Toronto and University of Waterloo and looked at our technology ecosystem to see if Toronto is the best place to set up their new R&D lab. So Canada is getting noticed from Korea.

Basically we have to work with everyone like government, industry associations and schools to work on our Canadian brand. Being a nice guy, being a middle-power might sound appealing but as you know, in business, being stuck in the middle doesn't get you anywhere. If you have taken your MBA course you will know that you don't want to position yourself in the middle. Branding is a critical part, and the other part, I think CKBC can play an active role in building relationships with the business people in Korea. I think the Korean government has done an excellent job of taking advantage of Canadians of Korean heritage.

The Korean Government invests a lot of time and money in building relationships with Koreans abroad. They hold a lot of science and technology forums and they learn from the Koreans abroad. It's about time that Canada takes advantage of those Canadians that are teaching English in Korea and learning the culture. The ambassador mentioned that 20, 000 Canadians were living in Korea. These are the people that will become the extended ambassadors for Canada to help us to do more business together, and that both Canada and Korea prosper together.

Dr. Georgeopolous: Thank you Sunny, before you move on, you've touched on a pretty important, sensitive issue to Canadians. Canada is not going to lose to South Korea in hockey for a long time. Next We have Professor Don Greene, to give us insight perhaps to a more academic view and his experience in China discussing the dynamics of discussing a partnership with South Korea.

Professor Don Brean: Thank you George for your fine introduction to this session.

I am honoured to have been invited to share in today's discussions of the important economic ties between Canada and Korea. I congratulate the organisers of the conference, Tina Park in particular, and her associates for putting together an impressive agenda for the day.

While I am closely associated with both Massey College and the Munk School of Global Affairs, my academic base at the University is with the Rotman School of Management. It pleases me to see the integration within the university reflected in today's program.

My fellow panelists, Ian Burney and Sonny Cho, have given me a tough act to follow.

My title, "From Cars and Cows to Intellectual Property and Services", suggests a shift from an old form of trade: cars and cows representing manufactured goods and agriculture, to today's more sophisticated trade in technology-intensive goods and intangible services.

That shift presents both challenges and opportunities. It also marks a transition in nations' priorities in trade negotiations.

I didn't make up the expression "cars and cows". That was the language in trade negotiations involving Korea and the West, especially the United States, a while ago.

From cars and cows to IP and services anticipates my comments on the changing nature of international trade and how that change poses more complex challenges than we have had in the past dealing with traditional trade. I trust my remarks are fitting in today's conference, dealing with the Canada Korea free trade agreement signed January 1st. We will see.

Concerning the historic Canada-Korea Trade Agreement, my immediate reaction is, "Why did it take so long?" In his remarks to open this session, George Georgopolous reminded us that it took 10 plus years of negotiating.

Let's see if we can shed light to why it took so long and explore the implications of those protracted negotiations for the road ahead.

Fifteen years ago, when the Canadian auto sector seemed to be at the start of a long decline, I was asked by the mighty Canadian Automobile Manufacturers Association, essentially a set of American-owned subsidiaries - Ford, Chrysler and GM - to assess the industry effects of removing a 6.1 percent tariff that Canada imposed on imported vehicles. Canada's import tax seemed targeted at Japan and Korea, both of whom were emerging as dominant forces in global automobile production. Canadian automobile manufacturers were of the view that one more car imported into Canada meant one less car produced in Canada. Implications for employment and, of course, the profitability of Canadian auto manufacturers would seem to follow. The analytic task was to identify the consequences of Canada's import tax, and likewise to estimate the negative Canadian consequences of its removal. On the one-more-imported-car-one-less-Canadian-produced-car premise, Canadian auto production would decline, Canadian employment in the auto sector would likewise decline, with loss of the spin offs for companies that serve the Canadian auto sector. Canadian employment and investment in the auto sector would decline.

My work suggested that the effects of removing the 6.1 percent tax on imported vehicles would not be small. The report was widely circulated in policy and political circles, not so much under my name, but under the name of the Canadian Automobile Manufacturer's Association. In the end, the tax remained in place.

We subsequently witnessed the decline of the Canadian auto sector anyway, so it was not entirely a Korean/Japanese problem.

So, as Korea and Canada grappled over each other's protectionist policies, the main saw-off was Korean cars for Canadian cows.

Now, with the new deal, Korean-made vehicles imported into Canada - Kias and Hyundais - will have the import tariff eliminated rather quickly. And Canadian beef producers, heretofore facing 40 percent tariffs on their exports to Korea, will have those duties phased out over 14 years.

Of course the deal extends far beyond those two examples and will ultimately eliminate more than 98 percent of all tariffs Korea currently imposes on Canadian goods. Canada, too, will scrap just under 98 percent of the tariffs it imposes on Korean-made goods.

The cars and cows quip and the historical anecdote about the analysis of the auto-import tariff illustrate that much of the easy stuff in tariff elimination has already been achieved. Identifying the economic consequences of a tariff on imported manufactured goods is relatively straightforward. In the process we watch the world move towards freer trade in most categories of tangible products. The average tariff on internationally traded goods has fallen since the 1960s from 60 percent to less than 3 percent today.

While tariffs are virtually dead, that does not mean protectionism is dead. Canada's tax on imported vehicles was pure protectionism on our part. And now it is about to go. Fifteen years ago, my analytic mandate to explore the economic consequences for the Canadian automotive industry of eliminating the tariff had nothing to do with the impact on Canadian consumers. Indeed, if that tax had been eliminated sooner, Canadian consumers would have had earlier access to lower priced vehicles and a wider variety of vehicles. The reduced investment and employment in the Canadian auto industry that would fade away would flow to other sectors which Canada might better serve Canada's industrial interests.

Now, turning to the new Canada-Korea Trade Agreement, leaders from many of Canada's traditional leaders are understandably pleased. My fellow panelist Sunny Cho points out how happy the agricultural sector is, with the boost for canola, wheat and other grains. And cows.

Canada's economy, as we tell our undergraduates, is built on rocks, fish and trees. We export our natural resources, of which we have an abundance. About 40 years ago I coined an expression, calling Canada the world's richest developing country. The structure of our economy is very much like that of a resource-rich exporter of raw materials.

Much of our export mix is not associated with sophisticated, technology-intensive industrial processes. Of course I am pleased that barley, canola and grains producers are profitable. But what about the more complex international trade in high technology, low weight and often intangible exports such as consulting, banking, engineering and commercial services? Low export weight – specifically value per pound of shipped goods - is a key point. If you think of trade figures being the sum of the value of goods going across borders, 100 years ago \$1000 in trade weighed 100 tons. Think of coal and nickel and copper, and wheat and trees and fish. Today, the weight of \$1000 worth of trade is about 10 percent of that, about 10 tons. Many of our most valuable exports, like consulting services, weight nothing. The real promise for prosperity for a country like ours lies in low weight exports. We are still going to do the traditional stuff and continue to do well by it. But the challenges in trade between us and any other bilateral partner that we are going to deal with is going to pose greater challenges in trade negotiations. Canada's trade remains heavy, but our industrial future lies in lighter, more technology intensive exports. Trade Minister Fast is pleased that we are exporting blue berries, but the real value will be in exporting BlackBerries.

The challenge in expanding trade and investment in higher technology, often intangible trade, is they are not issues that traditional trade analysis is concerned with. David Ricardo, 200 years ago, developed the concept underlying gains from trade and comparative advantage, never thought of low weight, high technology, intangible trade in services. But others, more recently have turned their attention to such issues. I think in particular about Nobel Prize winning Paul Krugman who has in his career constructed what is known as the new trade theory, which really deals with a variety of issues including global value chains *et cetera*, but also the increasing volume of trade in intangibles. But at this stage, my colleagues in international trade really have achieved nothing much more than a sophisticated explanation. It is understandable, meaningful

and helpful, but what they haven't turned to is an understanding of where protectionism fits into the newer trade models. Protectionism in this context is not well defined or not well understood. So it is this topic that will pose a real challenge. Canada has a strong interest in such issues. Canada has a venerable tradition in understanding the evolution of mechanisms underlying international trade. Tradable intellectual property and services are redefining the meaning of protection.

I want to turn to one other point before I close, to remind you that trade policy will always be constrained by distributional concerns. Why did it take so long for Canada and Korea to reach an agreement? It is because of the lobbying of the submissions by interested parties that have consequences for Canadian industry. And that becomes part of the negotiating process. Trade policy is always a political process. I'll give you a little side example. Think of banking. Now what concern would Canadian banks have in respect to a free trade agreement with Korea? Well in many of Canada's free trade agreements, Canada is under the gun, under heat to lower our supply management, especially with the agricultural sector. First year economics would tell you that if you own land and machinery and equipment that produces an agricultural product that has a price elevated by supply management, the value of your land will be higher as a result. So the land and machinery that banks have as collateral against loans to the agricultural sector that have inflated values due to Canada's supply management system. Since banks have an interest in maintaining the value of their collateral, banks will have an interest in any sort of agreement, any sort of process that may threaten supply management. I am not suggesting the CEOs of the big banks are there saying keep up supply management for our eggs and chickens and cheese, but to the extent that banks have influence on such things, that would be one of their concerns.

Now the high level concern from economists and trade analysts, including in Mr. Burney's division, is on gains from trade. That is why so much of the results of the free trade agreement are couched in terms such as anticipated employment and income effects. Those are estimates, and I am not quite sure if they are good estimates, but time will tell.

We know that trade and international investment unambiguously add to global prosperity. Alas, however, there is no promise that the spoils are evenly distributed, not across nations or, more politically important, not within nations. There are winners and losers in the trade liberalization process. While there may be more winners than losers, that is little consolation to the potential losers. Trade policy is always a political process involving competing interests with redistributive consequences. These issues are only going to get tougher in the days ahead.

Mr. Cho made reference to a number of specific sectors of which Canada is justifiably proud. Aerospace, electronics, medical engineering, environmental protection and even banking and financial services. In these sectors lie the prosperity potential for Canada's exports. We are not going to let the traditional sectors go, of course, but the language of the Canada-Korea FTA unfortunately plays more to our heavy, low-value traditional sectors as opposed to the high-value intangibles that define our new comparative advantage. Meanwhile it is in these fields of technology intensive, low-weight trade that the threat of protectionism is greatest and most complex.

Thank you very much.

Hon. Justice Kirby's special luncheon address at Massey College on the human rights situation in the DPRK has been recorded on video. To access it, please visit <https://youtu.be/sj6oVNjoigU>

Panel #2 “Defence & Strategic Partnership in the 21st century”

Tina Park: Good afternoon everyone and welcome to the second panel of our conference this afternoon on defence and strategic partnership in the 21st century. It is with great pleasure that I introduce Dr. Adam Chapnick, He joined the Canadian forces college in 2006 and currently teaches course in Canadian government and strategic decision making, critical reading and writing, and Canadian international policy. Dr. Chapnick is the author, or editor of six books including *Canada's voice: The Public Life of John W. Holmes*, and *the Middle Power Project: Canada and the founding of the United Nations*. In 2013 he became the co-editor of International Journal, Canada's leading journal of Global Policy analysis. We are delighted to have Dr. Chapnick join us this afternoon for this important discussion. Without further delay, please join me in welcoming Dr. Chapnick who will introduce our speakers.

Adam Chapnick: Thank you very much and sorry I couldn't be here for the whole day. I have heard only good things about what has taken place thus far and in that spirit I will try to keep my comments to a minimum, and with two people in military backgrounds, I know that they, within time, which will give plenty of time to ask questions. Our first speaker, though she couldn't be here will be coming to us via video. Senator Yonah Martin is the first Canadian of Korean descent to have ever have served in the senate, in fact, the first Korean –Canadian parliamentarian more generally. 2013 she was appointed deputy leader of the government in the senate, which is an unenviable task right now. She is the patron of the MCHS association and the historic dominions memory project- stories of the Korean War. She is a champion for Korean War Veterans and their families. Her presentation today is called the proud legacy and future of Canada-Korea Relations.

Yonah Martin: Hello everyone. Sincere greetings on behalf of the Senate of Canada as you gather for the Canada-Korea Strategic Partnership 2015 Conference. And a special hello to my former colleague Hugh Segal, whom we all miss dearly! Sincères salutations d'Ottawa et meilleurs vœux pour le succès de la Conférence. Though via video, it is a great pleasure for me to be featured during the strategy and defence panel.

Today, I will speak about two general themes. First of all, I will speak about the efforts being made to recognize Korean War Veterans to ensure they are not forgotten and their legacy continues. Secondly, with the implementation of the Canada-Korea Free Trade Agreement earlier this year, I will discuss the opportunities that are available for a closer partnership between Canada and Korea.

On the first theme, now, I could speak at considerable length about the Korean War and about Canadians who served and sacrificed in the war (but I know I have a time allotment today, so I shall try my best to contain my deep conviction on this topic.)

This year is an important year for Canada's veterans of the Korean War. June 25th marks the start of the 65th Anniversary Years of the Korean War, that will last until July 27th, 2018, which is the year of the Pyeongchang Olympics. Over the course of the 65th Anniversary years, our Office will continue to work closely with Veterans Affairs Canada, Korea's Ministry of Patriots and Veterans Affairs (in Korea), with the Embassy of Korea in Ottawa, particularly the Office of the Defence Attaché, with community partners and various stakeholders, to honour Canada's Korean War Veterans from coast to coast to coast.

Canada's contributions to Korea were both significant, and voluntary. As the international crisis began on the Korean peninsula, in a foreign land, a world and an ocean away, Canadians answered that call to uphold global peace and defend the people of Korea from being overtaken by communist forces.

During the war, Canada contributed 26,791 troops which was the third-largest contingent serving in the United Nations command. It also saw action in both the naval and air forces with eight destroyers, 3,621 naval officers and men, twenty-two fighter pilots and several technical officers. However, Canada experienced its third bloodiest overseas conflict engagement with over 1,500 casualties, including 516 Canadians who made the ultimate sacrifice. The names of these 516 Canadians that died in service, including the 376 Canadians who are at rest at the United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Busan, are on display in the Book of Remembrance in the Peace Tower in Ottawa.

After the armistice was signed in July 1953, approximately 7,000 Canadians continued to serve as peacekeepers until the end of 1955, with some troops remaining in the Republic of Korea until 1957. These troops guarded and patrolled the Republic of Korea's side of the demilitarized zone. Furthermore, since the end of the Korean War, Canada has contributed to security on the Korean peninsula through its continuing presence on the UNC Military Armistice Commission and UN Command.

Canadians and Koreans are indebted to the Canadian men and women, who, in the prime of their youth served to preserve global peace and defend fundamental human rights, and based on all contributions made by Canadians of the Korean war, especially those who made the ultimate sacrifice, 2013 was designated the "Year of the Korean War Veteran." During that year, Canada proudly remembered the heroes of the Korean War and their brave fight to uphold freedom, democracy and the rule of law.

On a personal note, there is so much to say, but I am literally here, alive, being able to grasp the opportunities and live my life to my fullest potential because of what Canadians did in Korea and others that served alongside them. My parents are survivors of the Korean War. They met as a result of, eventually, the Armistice. Obviously, without Canadians and their sacrifice I would obviously not be here. For me, it was just an amazing honour to be able to put forward a Bill, and one of my proudest achievements to date, as a Senator, was the passage of Bill S-213, the Korean War Veterans Day Act, enacted on June 18 of 2013, the Year of the Korean War Veteran. That year at the national commemoration at the Wall of Remembrance in Brampton, Ontario, I was able to really honour our veterans in a significant way with a law that had been passed.

There is also now a ceremony in Ottawa at the Monument to the Canadian fallen, the same memorial which also stands at the United Nations cemetery in Busan. They do face one another, as a symbol of the Canadians that were buried in Korea and the impact that they had on the Korean peninsula. Also, as a British Columbian I am very proud to talk about the ceremony that happens annually at the Ambassador of Peace, the Korean War Memorial in Burnaby, BC.

So, the passage of this law designates July 27th, the Armistice Day, as a day of remembrance in perpetuity. And in Korea, actually, inspired by the law that we passed, Representative Kim Jung-hoon, my counterpart in the National Assembly was able to pass a law as well. So, now July 27th is marked annually in Korea also. Now, however, July 27th does not mark the end of the war, and the war has not ended even though the hostilities have. Tensions remain on the Korean Peninsula, but we do hope, and I know that this is in the hearts of all veterans of the Korean War, and their families and people like me, that there will be a united Korea in the future and peace on the Korean peninsula. And as we did during the war, during the peace keeping years, to this day, to try and really make a difference, we hope that Canada will continue to play that key role. And as a daughter of Canada and Korea, myself and others like me, we call ourselves the 1.5-2nd generation Canadians of Korean descent that we will also play a unique role. And as a Senator of Canada of Korean descent, I am ever ready to serve in ways that I can.

I look forward to Canada and Korea building on our long standing relationship. Canadian and Korean relations have been rooted in a firm foundation of service and sacrifice, as we witnessed with the Canadians in Korea. Bilateral relations between our two countries have unofficially occurred for more than 100 years. So, Canada-Korea relations date back to the 1800s, 1888, when a Canadian missionary James Scarth Gale of Toronto was sent to Korea, and others included Dr. Oliver Avison and Dr. Francis Schofield. These Canadian missionaries and others not only brought Christianity to Korea, but also played a foundational role in improving the lives of Koreans in so many ways.

In fact, the contributions of Canadian missionaries are so significant, that Dr. Frank Scofield, who is a Torontonian, is considered a national hero in Korea because of his assistance in the 1919 Independence Movement against Japanese colonial rule. He is the only foreigner to be buried in the Patriot Section of Korea's National Cemetery. Years later, Canada's involvement in the Korean War also enhanced the Canada-Korea relations which are rooted in a firm foundation of service, sacrifice, sweat, tears and blood.

In 1963, Canada established formal diplomatic relations with the Republic of Korea. As with many relations with other countries, trade is vital. So this year, our Government and our counterparts in the Republic of Korea implemented the Canada-Korea FTA, which we know was almost 10 years in the making, and the negotiations took time to address several challenges, including the fact that being an ocean away, within various time zones, with political, social and cultural differences, as well as different ways in how business is done in the two countries; but with the right will and political commitment, the negotiation was concluded and we now have this FTA.

So in general, Canada and Korea does juxtapose each other in interesting ways: the fact that Canada is 100 times larger, geographically by land mass than Korea, but with 20 million or so fewer people, and the unique landscapes and business climates of both countries which really do contrast. However, despite these variances, I think our shared history provides a firm foundation that binds our two countries deeply together like no other. Furthermore, our future history will create more opportunities between Canada and Korea which outnumber the challenges by leaps and bounds.

This year's implementation of the FTA is the basis to which future economic ties and relations can grow. It is a truly historic agreement and it is Canada's first Free Trade Agreement in the Asia-Pacific region and will provide new access for Canadian businesses and workers to the world's 12th or 11th (I know, the numbers vary), largest economy, so Korea is within the G20, and the fourth largest in Asia. The opportunities are plentiful and is projected to create thousands of jobs for Canadians by boosting Canada's economy by 1.7 billion dollars, and increasing Canada's exports to South Korea by 32%. These are big numbers so clearly the Canada-Korea FTA will provide opportunities for many businesses, especially sectors that deal with natural resources, but others as well.

Moreover, the CKFTA acts as a gateway for Canadian businesses and workers into the Asia-Pacific region. And potentially, in the future, Canada can build on this trade agreement with other countries in the region, which will provide even more opportunities for Canadians. As mentioned many sectors will benefit from the CKFTA, but as with any bilateral trade, each country has its respective comparative advantages. And, as a result, Canada and Korea have complimentary economies that naturally fit together.

The Canadian economy is mainly resource-based and exports primary commodities, while Korea mainly consists of manufactured products. Canada will need an influx of immigrants and skilled workers in various sectors, while Korea has a surplus of highly educated people in sectors that match Canada's needs. So strategic match making is what is needed to match the people to the opportunities, and I hope we can really harness that.

In terms of agricultural products which benefit under the agreement, like beef, pork, wine, canola, and grains, all regions in Canada will benefit, including Ontario. Wood products from Ontario, the Maritimes, BC, Alberta, and Quebec, as well as various manufacturing products will see exports increase including aerospace and rail equipment, plastics, medical devices, cosmetic and aluminum products which will especially benefit central Canada. In addition the Agreement will foster not only trade, but investment opportunities and innovative partnerships in the area of science, technology, and international development.

Therefore, by reducing and removing tariffs on multiple sectors, there will be greater trade and collaboration between Canadians and Koreans in the future. After all, both countries are like minded democracies that share similar values and are known to be innovative and entrepreneurial in complementary ways.

Massey College can actually benefit from one of Canada's greatest exports to Korea - education. Canada is already attracting a large base of Korean international students that can be further increased. Korean universities are looking for partnerships with appropriate institutions, with Massey's stellar reputation, if not already, I am certain Korean universities may wish to collaborate with Massey on innovation, research and/or student exchanges.

Within Canada, our cultural diversity and generous immigration system have fostered a strong diaspora community of Korean-Canadians across Canada in every corner of the country. These individuals will have growing opportunities to assist in creating better relations between Canada and Korea. In particular, as I previously mentioned, people like me, the 1.5/2nd generation Korean-Canadians will have a special role by providing a bridge between communities to mitigate the gaps in communication, business and culture. I think our Prime Minister said it best during a press conference in Seoul, at the Blue House last year, at the conclusion of the FTA negotiations. I quote, "*Our deep friendship in the theatre of war has led to a commitment to peace and prosperity*". There is no way to better encapsulate this long lasting friendship forged in blood, sweat and tears.

So today, our partnership has grown and is greater entrenched with the CKFTA, a legacy of our veterans, which will continually provide prosperity in the future. Going forward, despite some of the challenges that we talk about, Canadians will need to take advantage of the CKFTA to harness these opportunities for trade and partnerships.

The main tool, the FTA itself, is in place. It will be the entrepreneurs and global leaders in both countries that will be the agents and leaders to generate future prosperity and partnership between Canada and Korea. So I hope that today's panel discussion is thought provoking and inspiring and will generate further discussion to build on. So thank you. Merci. And in Korea as we say, "Fighting!"

[Senator Martin delivered her presentation via video-recording. It can be accessed at: <https://youtu.be/8CXtiHMOS9g>]

Adam Chapnick: We give our thanks to the senator and invite our first live panellist. Mr. John Roach who has spent 21 years in the Canadian armed forces where he developed specific expertise in navel communications, security and intelligence. He is currently employed in the department of national defence as a civilian in operations headquarters, what we call CJOHQ as the current board of Directors of the Canada-Korea society and is father to a five year old adopted son from Pusan. His presentation today is called: "Defence and Security Partnership in the 21st century, military diplomacy revisited."

John Roach: Good Afternoon, Distinguished Guest, Conference Organizers, fellow panelists and participants. It is both a pleasure and privilege to be here today. I am not speaking to you today as an official representative of the Department of National Defence, but as a knowledgeable insider on Canada-Korea Military Diplomacy. Military diplomacy, as a subset of Defence diplomacy, like military intelligence, may be construed to be an oxymoron. This would appear reasonable as militaries are traditionally associated with conflict and use of force whereas diplomacy is defined as the art of conducting relationships for gain without conflict.

Militaries, historically, are associated with achieving national aims and objectives in international relations through the use of force. As a corollary, there have been numerous instances of peaceful use of military to further a nation's international relations. This is the roots of the DND/CAF proud Peacekeeping traditions. The peaceful use of the military as a tool of national diplomacy has led to the use of the term 'military diplomacy'. Thus I use the term 'military diplomacy' today to be understood as the (peaceful) use of the military in diplomatic relations, as a tool of national foreign policy. It is what puts the "M" into a DIME strategy. And for me, albeit I do have some bias, there is no better example of military diplomacy than the defence relations between Canada and Korea.

As a starting point I would just like to contrast Canadian and Korean military forces at present. Canadian defence policy is based on three pillars: national defence, supporting the defence of North America and contributing to international operations within an alliance or partnership framework. The Canadian Army, RCN, and RCAF are not separate services but rather components of a unified service known as the Canadian Armed Forces. The unification of the army, navy, and air force, which took place in 1968, has facilitated joint command, support, training, and operations.

Using the RCAF's strategic transport aircraft, many of which were recently procured, the CF can project forces at a global level. The RCN, too, can deploy ships to operations anywhere in the world.

South Korea's primary military concern remains its relationship with the North and its ability to deter or, if required, counter and defeat threats from Pyongyang. Its armed forces are well trained and equipped. The increasingly capable Republic of Korea (ROK) Armed Forces are well along with a major, long term transformation into a modern, networked national force with off-peninsula capability after 60-plus years of maintaining a largely static, defensive posture. But this only tells one side of the story. Military diplomacy is not simply quantitative or capabilities based, it is qualitative as well – the strength of the relations between the capabilities.

As I stated previously, militaries, historically are associated with achieving national aims and objectives in international relations through the use of force. This is where Canada Korea military diplomacy began. As with the two world wars that preceded Korea, Canadians volunteered for military service far from home. More than 26,000 Canadians served in the Korean War, including sailors from eight destroyers and airmen who took part in many combat and transport missions. Canada's military contribution was larger, in proportion to its population, than most other UN sending states.

This is the quantitative but what of the qualitative. The collective experiences and stories of Canada's Korean Veterans provide Canadians with a proud and lasting legacy that will continue long into this country's future. Remembering and reflecting on the significance of the contribution they made, and continue to make in Canadian Korean strategic relations, strengthens multi-tiered dialogues that serve to enable both nations concerns and establish areas of mutual interests.

While Canadian-Korean military diplomacy has its roots in historical use of force, it has since matured and grown and gives indication as to achieving other qualitative objectives of military diplomacy such as; Political, security and strategic defence dialogues – Defence agreements/MOUs/treaties – Professional personal contacts – Exchange of perceptions in both track one and two initiatives – Strengthen defence relationships to promote influence and access – Even appointing Defence Attachés to foreign countries has been an old practice. But it is important to keep in mind that military diplomacy is not simply bilateral. The US, UK, France and other Western alliance nations can be considered the world's leaders in military diplomacy through organizations such as NATO and other similar alliances and coalitions. In the Asia Pacific Region, the 7-Partner Pacific Security Cooperation Working Group is becoming another venue for defence dialogue between Canada and Korea.

While I have spoken in broad terms thus far I would like to focus now on specific military diplomatic actions between Canada and Korea. While Canadian-Korean military diplomacy has its roots in historical use of force, it has since matured and grown and gives indication as to achieving other qualitative objectives of military diplomacy such as; Political, security and strategic defence dialogues – Defence agreements/MOUs/treaties – Professional personal contacts – Exchange of perceptions in both track one and two initiatives – Strengthen defence relationships to promote influence and access – Even appointing Defence Attachés to foreign countries has been an old practice. But it is important to keep in mind that military diplomacy is not simply bilateral.

The US, UK, France and other Western alliance nations can be considered the world's leaders in military diplomacy through organizations such as NATO and other similar alliances and coalitions. In the Asia Pacific Region, the 7-Partner Pacific Security Cooperation Working Group is becoming another venue for defence dialogue between Canada and Korea. One recent example of Canada-Korea diplomatic military relations was in regards to the tragic sinking of the ROKS Cheonan. Canada announced that it would send support and expertise to the investigations. And there were two investigations held: one to determine the cause of the sinking, and a second follow up to determine who the actual perpetrator was.

Canada sent a submarine expert that I know and have worked with alongside the intelligence experts. The first investigation to join a civil military investigation group conducted its investigation with experts from Korean agencies and experts from military experts, experts recommended by the national assembly and foreign experts constituting a force of four teams from the United States, Australia, the United Kingdom and the Kingdom of Sweden. After they concluded their work, a multinational combined intelligence task force began its work to determine who the perpetrator was. This was lead by a Canadian. Though controversial in some circles still, even today, the result of the investigation are conclusive for my colleague.

The take away from this example of military diplomacy is that while aims and objectives of national participation and cooperation could differ, is that the result can create an environment around peace and trust.

Another example of military diplomacy: our exercises. Ulchi Freedom Guardian exercise which tests the operational control of combined forces and defence in the Korean peninsula, Canada's participation has been consistent with personnel from the first Canadian division, acting as division headquarters under the first US board. For the past 3 years Canada has been invited to, and has contributed to this exercise, making the largest contribution of any participant other than then United States and the Republic of Korea. That being said, despite the advantages Canada gains from the region, probably half the participation of UFG, the Canadian participation in 2015 will be significantly less than in the past because of competing priorities at home. Its anticipated though, that in 2016, participation will likely increase once again. Pictured there is admiral Choi who he, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, pictured there with Dean Miller, the first Canadian division commanding General .

Another major exercise: key resolve full eagle, exercise series to the Republic of Korea whose command post in training exercises respectively. The exercises were designed to improve and combine joint and operational posture of South Korea and US military forces. The field exercise full eagle is purely defensive and tests the capabilities of South Korea to defend a system by the armed forces. In 2014, Canada contributes to these exercises with six staff officers and one observer. It is one of the largest military exercises conducted annually in the world. 2015, there will be Canadian participation again with two to three staff officer position, and in 2016 participation will increase.

The SDD is the region's highest ranking multilateral security dialogue platform hosted by the Republic of Korea's Ministry of National Defense. Under the slogan of "security and peace for cooperation" the dialogue aims to improve the security environment and establish military trust for the Asia Pacific region that includes the Korean Peninsula. The ROK has established a DG-level cyber working groups which Canada supported at the 2014 Seoul Defence Dialogues (SDD). A core premise of Canada's Cyber Security Strategy is the need for whole of government and public private cooperation.

Canada believes that the military role in cyber security must carefully defined and that the application of existing international law is essential in maintaining peace and security and in promoting an open free and secure cyber space.

It's also about the human resources and the more intangibles. Staff talks, RCN to the ROKN, but also too it's those Canadian Koreans serving in the Canadian armed forces .The picture on the right, this is acting sub-Lieutenant Song Jane from Maple Ridge British Columbia. He is a naval officer, he is a marine systems engineer in the navy. He graduated with a master's degree from RMC scoring the highest marks in chemical engineering with an overall average of 91 percent. For Tai Kwan Do, he was also the 2012 Canadian armed forces male athlete of the year, Ontario university champion, and finalist in the university championship in Korea and Canada forces national gold medalist in 2012. He came very close to making one of the 3 positions for the 2012 Olympics. One day, we hope to see him in Seoul as a defence attaché.

Canadians have such a timelessness and love of the game of hockey that we can play the sport almost anywhere. It's a game that makes our emotions run high with pride anywhere in the world. While the Imjin Classic is a great way to commemorate the bittersweet memories that Canadian veterans have of the Korean War, it is also an opportunity to help popularize the game of hockey in Korea. Hockey will be featured when Korea hosts the 2018 Winter Olympic Games.

Military and Defence Diplomacy can further country specific foreign policy objectives by managing defence foreign relations and supporting the other diplomatic initiatives of government, such as the CKFTA. While Canada and Korea maintain modest military diplomatic relations, it has been the quality of these relations, first established by Canadian veterans during the Korean War, in which both great nations continue to build their defence and strategic partnership well into the 21st century. While history is important and the sacrifices of our veterans can never be understated, Canada Korea military diplomacy has moved beyond its historical contexts. The 21st century's flatter world is creating new international dynamics. Any nation that does not deploy all its instruments of power in an integrated DIME strategy towards optimizing its security environment will likely face poor performance in international relations.

Canada and Korea have well established defence relations. Both nations have continued to use Military Diplomacy to flourish beyond their roots in the Korean War to strengthen their bilateral relations. It is likely, in my humble opinion, that the revitalisation of the UNC will help further build and propel more quality military diplomatic activities. But we should have no doubt that the quality of military diplomatic relations should ever diminish but only grow stronger. With that, I would like to acknowledge those who had input into our presentation today with the strategic joint staff, the joint operations command, and all of my colleagues in my command who contributed. In conclusion, I would like to thank all the attendees, my fellow panelists and organisers for inviting me here today.

Dr. Chapnick: Finally we will call upon Colonel Jang-Min Choi from the Korean Embassy in Ottawa, the Korean defence attaché to Canada responsible for promoting Canada-Korean relations. He is a fighter pilot by training, he served as the chief of defence planning branch with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, crisis management policy officers for the Korean National Security Council and a military diplomacy officer for the policy branch for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He took up this position in Ottawa in 2013 and his presentation today is called "the future of Canada Korea defence relations: beyond military ties to emotional ties."

Colonel Jang-Min Choi: Thank you. It is my great honour to be here as a panellist today. I have been here around two years as a defence attaché. Two years is not a long time, but I have met many, many Canadians, and many generals, officers, soldiers, and especially Korean War veterans. So through my experiences in Canada I have realised that our military relations are so special and it has great potential to lead other relations, so this time would be a very critical time to think of and reflect on our special relations. I would like to give a short introduction to defence relations and current status, and as a result possible mentions for future defence relations. It is my personal opinion which does not impact Korean Government Position. So English is my second language, my first language is Korean, second language is North Korean, third English [laughter] so hopefully you will understand me.

Canada Korean relations can be categorised into three phases. The first is the late 19th century, with around 200 Canadian missionaries. Second, the Korean War which resulted in 2.5 million casualties, third the established of formal diplomatic relations in 1963 until now. What thing is the most important, critical even for Canada Korean relations. I believe that Korean War was the most critical even in Korean Canada relations. Is not because I'm a military person. The fighting shoulder to shoulder, shedding blood together was the critical, and meaningful turning point.

The official relations between the two countries started with the outbreak of the Korean War on June 25 of 1950 by North Korea's invasion. The Korean War is a very large scale international war with around 70 countries participating directly or indirectly. The Korean War has technically not ended, it's not over yet. It's still an ongoing process under the armistice agreement, and it continues to the present.

So there were 63 countries supporting South Korea during the Korean War, 16 countries, including Canada sent troops, and five countries sent military support. Canada's contribution was tremendous. Canada sent around 27 000 troops to Korea, 516 soldiers gave the ultimate sacrifice during operations, and of all of them 379 soldiers are still buried at the UN memorial cemetery in Busan, which is the second largest city in Korea. Canada sent the third largest troops after the United States and the United Kingdom, Turkey was following. Canada sent army, navy and air forces, all services of the Canadian armed forces. Canada plays a crucial war in more important battles such as Battle Kapyong, Battle Chaum ni, Battle Maehwa San. Not many Canadians know that the second battalion PPCLI renamed after this battle Kapyong to commemorate the battle Kapyong which is the most notorious battles in the entire armed forces history. Canadians fought very well, mostly outnumbered by Korean and Chinese forces. Canadians protected very important routes successfully preventing Seoul, the capital of Korea from being recaptured. Without Canadians, well Seoul, the most important strategic location for Korea would fall into the enemies' hands.

Canadian forces even had a battles on the ice. They brought hockey games on the front line. When I first came to Canada I found most Canadians very nice, very kind. They didn't look like great fighters. But later on I realised, they are good warriors when I saw them play hockey on the ice. Many Canadians don't know that Canadian forces are still active in Korea, that there are still Canadians under UN command in the Armistice commission. Five officers UN command headquarters.

The UN operation in Korea is the longest peacekeeping mission and it is also Canada's longest ongoing peacekeeping mission. Canada and Korea form official relations through military operations in the Korean War. Such relations lead to the growth in other areas such as the growth in trade, culture, the economy etc. For example, the trade between our two countries has expanded by 10 times since the Korean War. Therefore, I believe that the military relations is the backbone of the Canada Korean relations. However, the rapid growth in other areas, the development of defence relations has grown slowly. Although there has been development in defence relations, they have fallen short of our expectations hurting our special relations.

Let's look at the current status of defence relations. A continued presence of Canadian forces in Korea has shown Canada's unwavering support to Korea. They work to supervise and utilise the demilitarised zone under the armistice agreement. To investigate cease-fire violations, one good example was when the ROKS Choenan was sunk by a North Korean torpedo.

Canadian forces sent experts to support the joint military investigation to find the truth. Canada's participating in military exercises in South Korea. Canada sent every year 70-80 soldiers to Ulchi-Freedom Guardian which is one of the world's largest military and government joint exercises held in Korea, and five soldiers to observe Foal Eagle which is another large scale military exercise in Korea.

Canada and Korea defence militaries support regular meetings and conferences to improve military intelligence sharing and cooperate on military defence issues. Every two years, two military attaches come to Canada for promoting military relations, and pay respects to Korean war veterans in Canada. So far we look at the good cases and at the cases needing improvement. Considering our special relations formed by soldier's blood, during the Korean war, it is surprising that there has been no defence minister meeting since the Korean war. There is a direct increase in similar people to people exchanges, there has been a very small number of military personnel exchanges.

Even Canada's defence ministry discontinued sending Canadian officers to Korean military college since 2011. Canada has developed their own capacity. Korea has been leading defence industries, for example Korea is number one in ship building, and has developed high end trade and fighter jet and tanks and precision guided weapons, ammunition etc. However, the defence industry cooperation and trade between Canada and Korea is only lower than 0.5 percent of total trade. Furthermore the regional defence industry cooperation MOU has stalled for three years so there is big room for Canada Korean cooperation to grow. Our common agendas in defence is another area for further development. There has been a lack of effort in identifying and developing common defence agendas between militaries. The cost is less efficient than people to people exchanges and less efficient meetings and conferences.

So based on my experiences I would like to suggest some areas for future development relations. Firstly, people to people exchanges must increase. Especially high level exchanges in militaries are crucial. Now Canada's defence ministry needs to revise it plan, sending Canadian officers to Korean military schools. Now based on the current measuring strategies, policy makers must get together to create common defence agendas. It could be increased in cooperation on combined military exercises, or missions like peacekeeping operations, and military operations like against transnational crime, stopping crime. The advanced industry cooperation is a high potential area that we can develop together, defence industries, WGS of two countries must work actively towards the ways to enhance cooperation. Korea can be the best partner for Canada, with ship building, and the future pilot training system. So I am sure the Canada Korea FTA will expand defence trade as it were.

There is one thing I would really like to put strong emphasis on: emotional ties between Canadians and Koreans. It is true that special military relations lead to great emotional ties between people. One good example is Turkish Korea relations. In 2002, during the world cup there was a soccer match between Turkey and Korea. When the Turkish national anthem was playing, a sudden, huge Turkish national flag spread with Koreans standing, saying "we are brothers." This hart warming event rekindled people to people relations and this moment continued to solidify and expand Turkish Korean relations. As you know, Turkey the 4th largest amount of troops to Korea, following Canada. The trade volume between the two countries has increased dramatically and people to people exchanges have also increased. So is it difficult to see that Koreans and Turkish people call each other brothers.

The Netherland and Canada's relationship between two countries is another good example. The strong ties between Canada and the Netherlands is very long, since Canadian forces liberated the Netherlands. The strong ties lead the Netherlands to be called Canada's gateway to Europe, such strong emotional ties have enhanced all areas of bilateral relations.

So in a recent survey done by Historica, 7 of 10 Canadians do not remember learning about the Korean War in high school. So it seems that Canadians do not have strong enough emotional ties to Korea. Especially since ties can act as a strong glue to bind two countries together. So Korea and Canada should realise this special military relation, it has emotional ties. Korea can be the gateway to Asia, but not only as a trade gate but also as an emotional gate. Canada and Korea should not put the Korean War's sacrifice in vain.

So I would like to pay tribute to Korean War veterans in Canada again, and recently I attended 10 Korean War veterans funerals, Korean War veterans average age is 80, and the number is going down very rapidly, so we must appreciate them. Thank you.

Panel #3 “Forging Closer Ties: Immigration & Education”

Hugh Segal: After the trade agreement one of the next stages to maximise net benefit for both countries and the people of both countries. Well if you think about it the real people to people ties that matter, they often involve immigration, cultural cooperation, and of course, education. We are very, very lucky today to have a very distinguished panel to help us discuss and benefit from their wisdom and experience on the dynamics of education and immigration.

Monika Chi is the executive director in the Canadian Korean Women’s Association, family and social services. It’s a non-profit organisation serving Korean speaking newcomers who settle in Canada. The mission of the organisation is building the Korean Canadian community, one person at a time. We are honoured to have her as chair of this panel, and she will, much more competently than myself introduce the other distinguished members of this panel.

Monica Chi: It is my pleasure to be moderating this great panel, it is a topic that is dear to my heart. So the first panelist that we have here would be Judith Wolfson. Just to introduce her, Judith is a vice president, international and government and institutional relations for the University of Toronto, where she is responsible for the universities government and community relations, international relations, and strategic communications and marketing. She was formerly President and CEO of Interac Association/Acxsys Corporation, the national electronic financial services network serving Canada’s financial institutions and related industries. In 2003 she received the Queen’s Jubilee Medal for leadership and service to the community in recognition of her leadership in a wide range of major community organizations. So for today's conference she will be sharing a talk on the topic of knowledge diplomacy, engaging South Korea and the world through higher education and research. Please join me in welcoming her.

Judith Wolfson: Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the kind introduction, let me first say that I am delighted to be here. I thank Massey College, the Munk School of Global Affairs, and the Bill Graham Centre for International History, all three institutions at this University of which we are enormously proud, and grateful to have at the University of Toronto. There organisation of this conference has been stellar as we have watched it and I do thank you very much for including me. In light of the recent historic trade partnerships between our nations it is very timely for us to discuss and exam Korean -Canada relations.

The bond between our countries is reinforced not only by trade relations and shared geopolitical interests, but also by the creation and exchange of knowledge. The University of Toronto has been part of the Canada-Korea narrative for a significant period of time. The university can trace its linkages back to our alumnus James Gale. After graduating, James worked as an educator, writer and translator in Korea from 1888 to 1927. By the time he left Korea, Gale had become one of the premier English-language authors on Korea and an early translator of western literature into Korean.

In 1971, the University of Toronto was the first Canadian university to offer a course on Korea. Today, with the generous support of the Korean Government, the Centre for the Study of Korea at the Asian Institute here at the Munk School of Global Affairs, is one of the foremost hubs in North America for intercultural learning about Korea and Asia.

UofT is also home to many students and faculty of Korean heritage who serve as a bridge between our two countries. Take for example UofT faculty member Prof. Chih Guhn Lee. As President of the Association of Korean-Canadian Scientists & Engineers and Co-Chair of the Canada-Korea Conference on Science and Technology, Prof. Lee helps facilitate relations between established & early-career scientists, students and entrepreneurs to create enduring and successful partnerships between our countries.

Together with the many mobility programs and research collaborations with Korean universities, our relationship with Korea is going from strength to strength. Just this week, the University had the pleasure of welcoming President Kim from POSTECH University, one of Korea's strongest universities. I have been asked to focus my brief remarks today on the role higher education institutions play in the global knowledge economy and the importance of governments in leveraging this relationship.

Canada's higher education system is rapidly internationalizing. This process is both organic and institutionally driven. Its purpose is primarily to create broader knowledge, transfer that knowledge and develop students who are internationally 'fluent' –not necessarily only in their language skills. Knowledge is the common currency of our global economy; it brings peoples together, and by bringing people together, it brings together ideas and cultures.

As a knowledge economy, Canada is recognized as punching above its weight. We are home to only 0.5 per cent of the world's population, but produce 4.1 per cent of the world's scientific papers and approximately 5 percent of the world's most frequently cited papers. Canada's global knowledge excellence is also the product of favourable governmental policies and strategic international partnerships.

For example, Canada's long history of immigration and programs such as the Canada Research Chairs have helped us to attract and retain some of the best and brightest minds from all over the world. This comparative advantage in knowledge capital and the desire to retain and harness it, has served as both a bridge and a driver of internationalization at the national and institutional level.

At the University of Toronto, we have a long and deep history of international collaborations. These collaborations have resulted in the development and transfer of knowledge, and education opportunities for our students. Our students come from 158 countries and our researchers collaborate with institutions in over 950 municipalities across the world. In fact, in terms of faculty recruitment, more than 50% of our new faculty hires come from outside Canada. 46% of University of Toronto's publications are with an international co-author.

Our partnerships are diverse in their scope. Let me mention just a few: On the research-side, scientists from the University of Toronto, Oxford and UNICAMP (Brazil) are involved in a not-for-profit, public-private partnership on drug discovery through the Structural Genomics Consortium. This is an open-data partnership which allows for the free flow of new ideas and focused research across multiple borders. University of Toronto is also home to the \$20 million dollar Ontario Centre for the Characterization of Advanced Materials. This materials lab has also attracted funding from the Japanese technology giant, Hitachi.

University global partnerships provide students with international exposure. Among the many opportunities that students have, in over 50 countries, students can engage in education, internships, research, development and other activities. Hundreds of students have participated in mobility programs between UofT and our six Korean university partners including Seoul National University, Korea University and Yonsei University. Students can engage in research at RIKEN– Japan’s largest research lab. They can enrol in a joint minor with the National University of Singapore or study innovation in Israel. These partnership opportunities help to build long term ties with countries and in regions of strategic priority to Canada.

While the University of Toronto, and its Canadian peers, might not generally refer to what we do together as ‘knowledge diplomacy’, the contributions of Canadian universities do have a significant impact on Canada’s relationship with the world.

We live in a time where economies are part of global movements and where technology is enabling the proliferation of networks. Faculty, students and universities themselves are creating new opportunities through new networks beyond Canadian shores.

However in addition to this self-driven activity, government stewardship is desirable and, in fact, necessary. Governments add value by providing resources to engage in long term multi-institutional endeavours; by providing an eco-system for the integration of knowledge into the economy; by helping streamline and harmonize national strategies; by assisting institutions to navigate complex political, legal and economic environments; and by helping to create a strong national ‘brand’.

Let me highlight a few examples: IC-IMPACTS is the government of Canada’s multimillion dollar commitment to translational research in water, infrastructure and public health – in partnership with the government of India. This program enables three Canadian universities, a number of post-secondary institutions in India, industry, and local governments in India to work on ambitious projects in areas of shared interest.

A recent example is the Thirty Metre Telescope. Big science requires big commitment, including a financial one. The Thirty Metre Telescope is a great example of how governments from across the world have come together to advance our understanding of the universe. Canada's \$243 million dollar investment will help Canadian scientists, led by UofT faculty member Dr. Ray Carlberg, to sustain Canada's excellence in astronomy and astrophysics by being part of this international consortium.

Governments across the globe are working to improve their ability to harness their higher education resources to engage the world. They understand that it is in their national interest to do so. To quote the former [UK Foreign Secretary David Miliband](#) “the scientific world is fast becoming interdisciplinary, but the biggest interdisciplinary leap needed is to connect the worlds of science and politics.”

Now let me turn to our engagement with Korea. We want to grow and deepen our partnership with a country that has distinguished itself for its transformation into a prosperous, innovation powerhouse within a couple of generations. Along with that growth, Korea has become a major collaborator in higher education and research- a strong aspect of Korea’s knowledge-intensive economy.

The University of Toronto’s current models of engagement guide our approach to scaling up existing collaborations and establishing new ones with partners in Korea. In the physical sciences, University of Toronto researchers can spend time doing research at POSTECH’s synchrotron, which provides them with opportunities to work alongside their Korean counterparts and vice versa. This leads to cooperation in areas of complementary strength.

Entrepreneurship: Governments in both countries are interested in fostering a creative economy. Entrepreneurs at the University of Toronto have created more companies in the last three years than any other university in North America. Higher education institutions in Korea and Canada are working to develop a mature ecosystem that encourages entrepreneurship to sustain their economies. At the University of Toronto, entrepreneurship opportunities, like the Techno Program offered by the Impact Centre, have a long and successful history of mentoring researchers to create companies. We would be happy to welcome budding entrepreneurs from Korea to spend time at the University of Toronto.

Joint Academic Programs: The University of Toronto offers joint programs and courses in a wide range of disciplines with international partners. For example, students from Fudan University and the University of Toronto take courses together, annually, in International Relations, approaching the topic from western and Chinese perspectives. Likewise, undergraduate engineering students from Peking University and UofT problem solve Canadian & Chinese industry challenges. Opportunities such as this help students from both sides to think and succeed outside their cultural frames of reference. We would welcome expanding these types of opportunities to Korean universities.

And let me not forget to mention Prof. Andras Nagy, a University of Toronto researcher who is working alongside his Korean counterparts to develop important discoveries leading to stem cell based therapies.

Whether it is working with India on smart cities, collaborating with Korea on material science or cooperating with Brazil on oncology, the University of Toronto’s global approach not only resonates with institutional strengths and priorities, but also with the priorities of provincial and federal governments. When governments create enabling environments for international partnerships, everyone benefits.

Our free trade agreement with Korea, Canada's first free trade agreement in the Asia-Pacific region, is a step in the right direction and is much more than a parchment focused on waiving tariffs. It complements and sets the tone for broader engagement through such mechanisms as a Science, Technology and Innovation agreement. Governments are responsible to provide the legal, policy and economic frameworks for the prosperity and security of their nations. But an important means to fulfill those goals, an interdependent global economy, is the cooperation between institutions and individuals. The Free Trade Agreement with Korea signals a strong commitment to this end.

I look forward to hearing from my colleagues on the panel on how we can continue to grow our friendship with a longstanding ally and partner.

Thank you.

Monica Chi: Thank you very much for those informative remarks. The second panelist I would like to invite to speak is Mr. Jae Chong. Mr. Jae Chong is a Korean Canadian with over 30 years of international business experience. As a computer science grad from the University of Toronto, he started his career as a software developer and developed the first Korean language word processor which made him known in the industry as the father of the Korean word processor. He has successfully founded and operated several IT companies providing consulting services to a wide variety of industry clients. Jae possesses entrepreneurial spirit, organization skills and international business management experience to excel in new growth opportunities. He has a comprehensive knowledge of all aspects of today's complex IT technology and a wide range of contacts worldwide. His extensive community involvements includes the chair of the Korean Canadian Cultural Association, chair of the Foundation for support of the Korean Studies at the University of Toronto, chair of the Korean Canadian Scholarship Foundation and has been actively involved with the Schofield Foundation in Toronto. Thank you Mr. Chong, it is all yours.

Jae Chong: Thank you for your kind introduction Monica. Good afternoon. My name is Jae Chong. I have done countless number of business presentations but I am always nervous to talk at a university in front of professors and doctors. My topic today is observations of the Korean Canadian community's integration process. As you know, the title of today's conference is Canada Korea strategic relations so I think it is appropriate to begin my presentation by stating some facts about Canada Korea relations.

Initial contact between Korean and Canadian people began in the late 19th century when missionaries from Canada entered the Korean peninsula. James Gale went to Korea in 1888 and published the first Korean version of the bible in 1900. Oliver Avison founded Severance hospital, the first Western style hospital in Korea, and Frank Schofield helped the Korean independence movement and he is the first and only foreigner buried in the patriot section of the national cemetery in Korea. We are at the Munk school of Global Affairs in the University of Toronto today and I am proud to tell you that James Gale, Oliver Avison, and Frank Schofield among the many other Canadian missionaries, and myself are alumni of the University of Toronto.

According to Doctor Young-Sik Yoo, a professor at the University of Toronto, the first Korean to enter on Canadian soil is Yun Chi Ho in 1893 and Kim Il Hwan was the first Korean to stay and study in Canada in 1905, and reverend Moon Jae-Rin who founded the Korean senior citizens society of Toronto, studies at Emmanuel College in 1928.

In 1949, Canada became one of the first countries to recognise that the Republic of Korea is the only legitimate nation in the Korean peninsula, and Canada sent troops to Korea as part of the United Nations during the Korean war. The official diplomatic relationship between Canada and Korea began in 1963. Free trade agreement and the strategic partnership was signed last year and became in effect this year.

Today's conference is about the FTA and strategic partnership. The title of this panel is "Forging closer ties: immigration and education," and I would like to talk about the Korean immigration history. According to South Korea's ministry of foreign affairs and trade there were about 206 000 Koreans or people of Korean descent in Canada as of 2013, making the fourth largest Korea Diaspora behind China, the United States, Japan, and ahead of Russia.

Here is a brief history of Korean Canadians. Korean immigrants began to come to Canada in the 1950s and more Koreans began to come to Canada in the early 1960s. The Korean Canadian Cultural Association, the first Korean organisation was founded in 1965. In 1965 the total permanent Korean population of Canada was estimated at only 70, however in 1967 with the reform of immigration laws, immigration to Canada began to grow and by 1969 there were an estimated 2000 Koreans in Canada. Between 1970 and 1980, 18 000 Koreans immigrated to Canada and another 70 500 came in the following decade. In the late 1990s South Korea became the fifth largest source of immigrants to Canada. Korean immigrants to Canada increased significantly in the early 1970s, this is likely due to the positive immigration factors from the 1960s, the Canadian embassy opening in South Korea in 1973, and poor economic conditions, political instability and military dictatorship in South Korea according to Kim, Nor and Noh, 2012. By late 1970s there were enough number of Koreans in Canada to form a community. The Korean Canadian Scholarship Foundation was established in 1978, the Foundation for support of the Korean Studies at the University of Toronto was founded, the Korean Canadian Symphony Orchestra, the Korean Canadian Women's Association and many, many Korean churches were founded at this time. Then there was a continuous flow of immigrants from Korea. The Korean community consistently and steadily grew. In the 1990s and early 2000s there was another surge in the number of Korean immigrants to Canada. Most scholars believe this is due to South Korea's globalisation policy that opened up economic, social and diplomatic centres in the country.

The Children's education is one of the most important reasons for immigration. Many Korean parents have opted to give up social status, occupation, mobility, and a relatively stable life in Korea and emigrated to Canada to provide better education for their children. A surge in immigration in the 1990s was also caused by Canada's expanded business class immigration program. The group of immigrants from mid-2000 is distinguished by transnational families and younger boarding students. I am going to skip this part and let Anne talk about this. Rather, I am going to map this history to an assimilation, integration, and separation matrix, the AIMS Matrix adapted from Berry & Sabatier.

The X-axis represents the level of maintenance of heritage, cultural, and identity of the home country, while the Y-axis represents the level of integration to mainstream society.

Assimilation occurs when individuals do not wish to maintain their own cultural heritage and seek participation with others in larger society. Integration is when individuals maintain their own cultural integrity, while seeking to participate in a larger part of society. These individuals typically have the most positive psychological well-being, and most adjusted in schools and in the community. Marginalisation is when there is little possibility or interest in cultural maintenance, often for reasons of enforced cultural loss, and little interest in having relations with other groups, often for reasons of discrimination. These individuals are most poorly adapted. Separation is when ethno-cultural group members place a value on holding on to their original culture and at the same time wish to avoid interaction with others.

Korean Canadian community started small in the separation quadrant. In most cases, first generation immigrants have cultural barriers and language problems to be integrated into mainstream society, but it was their wish to have their children educated and grow up as professionals. Most of them wish to have their children assimilated fast so they did not care, or could not afford to have their children learn about Korean language and culture. As the number of these children increase they begin to form their own cohorts in the assimilated quadrant. These are mostly second generation. The second generation typically refers to the individuals born and raised in Canada with parents who emigrated from Korea. In contrast to the first generation, who use their home country as a reference point, second generation Koreans mainly speak English and feel more comfortable with Canadian system and culture. As the early immigrant parents wished, their children became lawyers, doctors, accountants with very little of their Korean heritage. However, it is interesting to notice a movement of this group towards the integration quadrant. As Korea became strong, they realised being identified as Korean is not bad. As they get older, they also realise the importance of networking and the importance of community. Many of them became very successful in their field and became wealthy.

Recently a group of young professionals launched an organization called KPWA. Although they say it is to serve the community through mentoring etc. the real purpose of this organization, in my opinion, is to fill the gap of missing heritage and sense of belonging to the Korean community while doing a meaningful work to the community. There are many other organizations by this group, the Korean Canadian Scholarship Foundation, the Korean Canadian Athletic Association, and others.

There are 20 or so Korean schools in the GTA and more than half of the students are children of parents who do not speak Korean. The numbers are growing and it is clear that this group is moving from the assimilation to the integration quadrant. In the mean time, the court in the separation quadrant kept its position. These are the first generation immigrants who speak Korean and are more comfortable with Korean culture. With immigration surge in the mid 1990s some changes began to happen in the Korean Canadian community in this separation quadrant. First, the number of Koreans increased to the size that newcomers can survive without speaking a word of English. There are more than 100 KC organisations, and more than 300 Korean churches in the GTA area. They do their shopping at Galleria and H Mart, and they do go to Korean doctors, Korean lawyers, Korean accountants and Korean churches.

Their friends are 100 percent Korean, and they are more interested in Korean politics than finding out what is happening in Canada. Secondly, advancements in technology made it possible for Koreans to watch Korean dramas and create a comfort zone and boundaries and boundaries to other cultures. And last, but not least, Korea became more visible in the international community. There are Hyundai and Kia cars everywhere, Samsung and LG phones, TVs and appliance became top choices by Canadian consumers. Koreans became proud of their home country. Perhaps too proud. They look down on smaller ethnic communities and they don't want to go outside their comfort zone that they created. As Korea gets stronger, and the Korean community gets larger, it takes longer and more difficult to be integrated into mainstream society and therefore the Korean community became segregated from mainstream Canadian society.

However it is interesting to watch that this group too started to move upward. Recently the Korean community elected Daniel Lee, generation 1.5 as the new president of the KCCA, an umbrella organisation of the Korean community. I see this as significant, and clear indication that the separated Korean community wants to move upward to the integration quadrant. By the way the term generation 1.5 is used for immigrants who were born in Korea and immigrated with their families before the age of 13 and have memories of Korea, have an appreciation for Korean culture, and are fluent in Korean and English.

Another interesting fact is that the number of immigrants started to decline. In Korea town, nearly 100% of Korean restaurant's customers used to be Korean. But with decrease in size of the Korean community they had to cater their services for non-Koreans in order to survive. Now more than half their customers are non-Koreans. This is another indication that a separate Korean community has moved upward to the integrated quadrant. My prediction in 2013's conference was that there would be two communities, green and blue, but as assimilated Korean Canadians move towards integration, this group will slowly vanish.

In my prediction in 2013, I assumed there would be a continuous inflow of Koreans to Canada but it appears that it's not the case anymore. There used to be a push factor in early stage immigration, South Korea's autocratic government encouraged its citizens to immigrate to other countries in response to population costs by decreasing mortality rate, the post war baby boom, and an influx of North Koreans. In the later stage the pull factor was more evident. Better living conditions and better education were the key reasons for immigration.

Today with Korea's strong economy, good education system, even the pull factor is diminishing. Hence the size of the Korean community will shrink and many separated Koreans will become integrated Koreans. An integrated Korean community is a community of Canadian citizens with Korean heritage, as opposed to Korean citizens living in Canada. This is not a young generation group only. It will have its members across generations. Members will speak both Korean and English fluently and they will understand and appreciate both cultures and they will be led by generation 1.5. Generation 1.5 is derived from generation 1.5 and generation 2, the second generation. It refers to immigrants who speak both languages and feel comfortable with both cultures. I believe this generation 1.5 can play a major role in the era of Canada Korea strategic partnership and this is my wishful new prediction of Canadian Korean new communities in the near future. Thank you.

Monica Chi: Thank you very much Mr. Chong, and I think this ties in very well with our next remarks I am honoured to introduce her to everyone here. Doctor Ann Kim is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at York University in Toronto. She is Faculty Associate of the York Centre for Asian Research (YCAR) and of the Centre for Excellence in Research on Immigration and Settlement (CERIS Ontario). Her research interests fall into three main areas: migration studies; race and ethnicity; and urban sociology. Today she will be talking to us about Korean Canada migration, old and new trends, thank you.

Ann Kim: Thank you to Tina and the organisers for organising this conference and for inviting me. I have to say, when I first got the invitation and noticed that it was about free trade, I thought, well what am I going to talk about I am a migration scholar, and then when I saw the title for the session I thought, "this is perfect, this actually fits in quite well with my research and connections between immigration and education." I want to thank the two previous presenters because as Monica said, it ties in very nicely with what I have to talk about. And in terms of the presentation I have for you it is a slightly different perspective from the ones you have heard. Not that it is more valid, but it is a different perspective.

As we have heard about a lot today, migration is tied to people flows, this is tied to other flows and connections between Canada and Korea. We have heard a lot about the free trade agreement, I'm sure you have heard a lot about historical ties, military ties and so forth, political ties. And we have also heard about historical migration between Canada and Korea so in the past we heard about the Canadian missionaries who would go to Korea and we can also show that the more recent period is not actually a whole lot different. We may actually be going full circle in terms of Korean-Canadian migration in the sense that this connection has to do with cultural diffusion, or if you are a more critical person, you may think of it as tied to neo colonialism. So in the past we had Canadian missionaries going to Korea. Who is going to Korea now? Canadian English language teachers.

Who else, we don't really know who else is going. We don't really know much about how many Canadian migrants are going to Korea so that would be an interesting question. Who came to Canada then, you know it was the missionary students, that is the historical tie, back then in general they [students] were really not allowed to stay [in Canada]. They were allowed to come here on a temporary basis and they were expected to go back to Korea or at least to leave Canada.

In Canada, the largest flow of migrants [from Korea] are the international students, we also have economic migrants and North Korean refugees. I'm going to focus on the international student connection and talk briefly about these different flows. In terms of who are going to Korea, we have English language teachers and depending on which website you go to some of them will say that Korea is the top destination if you want to be an English Language teacher, and other places it might be number two or number three. But if you go to the website, South Korea is one of the top three places to go if you want to teach English.

What about Canada? We understand the Korean Canadian community to be a Korean migrant community as Mr. Chong mentioned, you know people came and they came here to stay from the 1960s to around the early 2000s.

What we see now is a fall, the migration stream falling. In 2013 we counted 4,509 permanent residents, and South Korea was 10th in terms of source countries. You can see from the temporary migration figures that the temporary resident numbers are relatively high, or higher, and we'll need to track the trend, whether this increases or decreases. I can tell you in terms of the international students stream that it's slowly falling after its peak a few years ago. So in terms of temporary migration, South Korea is 9th in the international mobility program which is a highly skilled migration program for which you don't need a labour market assessment to come here you need basically a job that you are connected with. So we see 6,500 people coming in 2013. In terms of the temporary foreign worker program which is lower skilled work, South Korea was 6th with 3,300, and in 2013, we were third in terms of international students. We used to be first for about a decade, and now South Korea has fallen to third, a little over 19,000 in 2013.

To go back, we asked the question, why has permanent residence fallen among South Korean migrants, and what's happening with temporary migrants. Some of it may be explained from the demand side, you know migrants may prefer to be global, transnational, cosmopolitan, and they want to be highly mobile; they don't want to stick to one place, they want to keep their options open, they want to go freely where they would like.

Another explanation has to do with government policy, and if you have been following the news you will notice that the federal government is increasingly pushing towards more and more temporary migration. So we are sort of seeing this return to temporary migration. It is hard to come now as a permanent resident: family reunification policies have changed, business class migration stream, I think it was discontinued although it seems to have opened up again. That [the business class stream] was the stream for Korean migrants, and for a while they [government] made some changes, and they have stopped it. So they have stopped those flows coming from Korea. With the new Expression of Interest program you essentially can't come unless you have a job offer, and many of the Korean migrants who come, come to do small family businesses so they are challenged with [applying for] permanent residence if they come to Canada. As we heard from Professor Wolfson's presentation, international education is a big deal. Universities are highly motivated to internationalise, for good reason as you heard. With international education there are three waves, and Professor Wolfson really described the three different models of international education. So I am going to focus on international students, and as international education is one of the priorities of the Canadian government.

In terms of international students coming to Canada we can see that over the years it has increased, and in general there have been incremental increases for the most part but about 1995 it jumped up so that now we see about 300 000 international students per year; these are the students who have visas. Remember we have also students who come to private colleges and institutions who don't come on visas so really this is an underestimate. But in 2013 we counted over 300 000 international students.

The federal government has a goal to reach over 450 000 students by 2022 and when they talk about internationalisation they talk about the economic benefits of it, and the benefits to the labour pool and so forth, so it is very much tied to economy and labour markets. As you can see in terms of the numbers the 2013 students from South Korea make up less than 10% of the total.

In March we had some funding to do a literature review on international students, and this wasn't focused on South Korean students but broadly on international students. The literature, what does it tell us about international students, particularly with a focus on Canada. And there is quite a lot of literature, both academic and grey literature, which has been put out by universities, think tanks and non profit organisations. The main things that emerged from the literature included the causes of international student mobility, and when you think of the causes, is the demand side explanation in terms of push pull models, what drives students to come to Canada, what is it they are trying to achieve, the conditions in their home countries and what are they attracted to about Canada. What appeared as the single most important factor was the quality of education. Their goal was to achieve a good quality of education by coming to Canada. Then there are also supply side explanations; we have to have institutions, we have to have policies, we have to have certain practices that will admit international students into our country and they have to somehow be coordinated with migration policies because international students have to cross borders.

Students need permission to come here. So there are some supply side explanations and we know that in Canadian universities, provincial and federal governments all support internationalisation and international education. There are also experiences, in terms of the literature one of the key things we found was about experiences. So international students want to come here, they come here, what is their experience like? How do they do?

And the themes that emerged were tied to their academic goals and academic experiences, and experiences in the classroom. Were they able to achieve their educational objectives? And also social psychological issues as well, you know in terms of friendships, integration, and how welcomed they felt and so forth. There were also research studies that talked about future intentions.

That is one of the big key questions in terms of government policy: so international students are here, they are allowed to stay here for a number of years while they finish their program, but what is it that they want to do afterwards? Schooling is temporary for most people, not for everyone but for most people. So what is the plan for afterwards, and in general it was mixed. Depending on the study, somewhere between 20-70 percent wanted to stay in Canada permanently, that is what the research found. So in general I think we can roughly estimate about half of the students who come want to stay here, want to become permanent residents, and want to become Canadian citizens. So that was another key theme in the literature, post study transitions. So once they finished their degree, what happens? Some people stay and some people go back and some of the research talked about their experiences staying, trying to get a job, trying to get permanent residence and the kinds of the struggles and challenges and barriers they felt in terms of doing that. Others talked about going to their home country and feeling this reverse culture shock, so that was another important theme.

So I want to talk more specifically about Korean students and Korean international students. We don't have a lot of literature on students from South Korea. We do have some. In some of the work that I have done and my colleagues have done focus on the early migrants and the early students, and what we found was that clearly the social, political, institutional and economic context is important. We heard from Mr. Chong about how important globalisation policies are in Korea. We also know immigration policies in Canada and who they permit [into the country], all those things are important. But what drives Korean migration to Canada? Conditions in South Korea in terms of their educational policies and educational practices are important push factors. There are also issues around how Korean migration and international student migration affects local communities, my colleague, Min-Jung Kwak, mentioned that, in terms of the local export education industry and how much of it grew from small family businesses, and local businesses and not the big conglomerates that you may think about.

And finally another one of my colleagues Hyunjung Shin, she is now at Saskatchewan, she has looked at the experiences of Korean students while they are here and she sees this juxtaposition between their desires to come, and why they are motivated to come to Canada, and it is about upward social mobility, acquiring cultural capital, but then when they are here, they question their experiences and whether they are able to achieve the goals that they want to achieve. They are faced with this downward mobility kind of experiences. Things like racism, not being able to make friends with Canadians, that was actually quite an important theme in the literature review. And not just about Korean students, but really across all the studies was this desire among international students to interact with Canadians, and many of them felt that they couldn't or that they weren't welcome, you know, by Canadians. This kind of shows you the different side to international education and, really, is Canada prepared?

Are we welcoming enough to international students, so that they will want to stay eventually, because much of the international education policy that we see encourages, or we would like these international students stay in Canada because we have very low population growth in terms of birth rates and so we see immigration as one of the answers to economic growth because we assume population growth is connected to economic growth.

So Canada advertises itself abroad as being a very welcoming place. We have a poster here about Korean break dancing at York and it was great, you know, I have never seen these signs and these advertisements about these kinds of things, promoting Korean culture. There is a[n advertisement for the] Korean film festival. Gangnam Style, you know everyone knows that. I've even heard it on mainstream radio. We've got Koreatown down at Christie, we have one on Yonge Street. We also have our political leaders also being quite open and welcoming to the Korean community. At Korean New Years they give a warm greeting to the Korean community, and they wish the Korean community a happy new year.

But there is sort of another side to the story. This is around international students, and not just international students, but South Koreans as racialised minorities. One story is, and I'm sure you've heard about the strike that occurred at York University, it also occurred here at the University of Toronto. What the strike showed was that international students have to pay a higher level of tuition, and this wasn't always the case It came about in the late 1970s .

You know, in the past there wasn't this clear differential of tuition fees between international and domestic students but now we've got a clear differential between the kind of tuition fees that they pay, and you can see, it may not be that clear [in the graph], if you're a masters or PhD student these are the kind of rates you are looking at, the take home for domestic students. The PhD students take home about \$15 000, the MA students about \$7500, in comparison to about \$2800 for international PhDs and if you're in a masters' program as international student you are going to be in debt.

So there are some severe and serious financial hardships that international students face, so among some of them there is this feeling of exploitation. That they are being taken advantage of when they see these kinds of differentials. And we want to ask ourselves, is this a good thing to do given that almost half of them may stay here on a permanent basis and may eventually become Canadian citizens. I don't mean to be a downer but want to show you another perspective. There are certain experiences international students face, and immigrants face, and we promote ourselves as being very multicultural, very welcoming, very diverse, but there are indications that there are certain fractures within that discourse, and we want to bring it out, and we want to discuss it, and we want to engage with that and deal with it as a country and as a community. More recently there was that article by Maclean's over whether our universities were too Asian; whether Asians were taking the "rightful" spots of white students. There was a local municipal election where Olivia Chow who is a Chinese Canadian was in the lead for the longest time, and kind of towards the end her approval ratings fell and she lost the election. But again it wasn't really public, and there was reaction from some groups and so forth, but in terms of a public reaction there really wasn't a large public reaction to this [racism in the media]. So again, it raises the question of who we are and whether we are really open to welcoming all these international students here.

So thinking about temporariness and the role of these international students, because for the most part while they are here they are here on a temporary basis, there are some benefits., There are some students who have no interest staying here on a permanent basis, they see themselves as cosmopolitan citizens. They want to move around and so forth, transnational mobility; a good thing sometimes for some people. They can seek opportunities everywhere, but there is also this other side. In one sense they are very welcome, the government has policies that can welcome them here. The university has policies, we want to open our doors and so forth and yet at the same time they are also feeling that they are unwanted: high tuition rates, not getting sufficient support while they are here, falling through the cracks and so forth.

Because they are not permanent residents or citizens they are labelled in terms of the undeserving and undesirable class. They are not permanent residents so they have no entitlement to services, to the protections of government and so forth. Social services as well they don't have access to them. That may be changing but at this point there are still eligibility requirements that don't give access to the services and programs that we offer to others. Some scholars are pointing to this issue. That if we increase our temporary resident population, and we don't provide temporary migrants with an avenue to permanent residence there is a huge risk of having an undocumented population. So what we have learned in the past is that countries that had large temporary migrant programs also ended up having undocumented migrants and had to deal with that situation.

So there are some warning signs now about Canada and perhaps if we are moving more and more towards temporary residence, what does that mean in terms of the undocumented population in Canada. And then finally we don't have a lot of research on temporary residence. We don't have a lot of data, so it is hard to know what their experiences are like when they are here.

So “Forging Closer Ties.” This is tied to our literature review in general. Rather than focusing on numbers, the government now has this target of 450 000, but really do we want to go with targets, and quotas and numbers? Or do we want to think about the quality of education. That is something I think is a debate in the field.

We see Australia, and Australia is used as an example. Their international education program has really taken off, they are a big draw for a lot of international students, but some scholars are going, “*wait a minute*,” the value of Australian university credentials have fallen globally.

We don't want to be seen as taking students as cash cows, that it's all about the numbers and we are just churning out degrees. We want to make sure that there is a good quality experience because international students come for the high quality of Canadian education, and we want to make sure that we maintain that. Because if we maintain that, more will come, and when they finish, they are out there and if they do well, again that is good advertising for Canada and Canadian education. The other issue is around the role of education and the purpose of education rather than focusing solely on the labour market. I'm not saying the labour market is not important, but it may not be the only important factor when we talk about education. We want to talk about social development, equitability, and intercultural understanding. Promoting cultural understanding among the students who are here and their Canadian classmates who are here as well but also abroad.

Finally, “supporting pathways to permanent residence.” Again, it is not clear, we used to have a Canadian Experience Class [migration program], where if you have a Canadian degree you would have a leg up to come in as a permanent migrant to Canada, but the Canadian Experience Class is now gone so international students are sort of thrown in the same pool as other migrants who want to come and who basically have to have a job offer. So we want to rethink the whether the avenues we have created [for permanent residence] are sufficient in terms of the international education stream. Thank you.

- END -

For any questions about this transcript, please email: cankor.conference@gmail.com