

**Canada – GENERAL STATEMENT on the “Draft for adoption”
July 27, 2015**

- Allow me to begin by thanking the co-facilitators for their hard work in producing this latest draft.
- In some areas, we believe this draft has improved, particularly in the section on the preamble, which we believe should remain, and on the section on follow-up and review. We are also very pleased with the overall strengthening of language in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as non-discrimination and human rights.
- In other areas, however, we have noted significant changes that raise concerns for Canada. With so much new language, we certainly have considerable work ahead of us given the 31 July deadline, but we are committed to meeting that deadline.

Allow me to address some of our major concerns first:

1- Firstly, the draft does not properly characterize the relationship between FfD and the post-2015 agenda. We continue to believe that we should welcome **and** endorse the FfD outcome document as **the** means of implementation pillar of the post-2015 development agenda. We also believe that the FfD outcome document should be integrated or annexed, given that it comprehensively covers all the issues for the effective implementation of the post-2015 development agenda. Simply “recognizing the important inter-linkages” between Addis and the realization of the SDGs (para 40) seriously underplays the powerful impact that the FfD outcome document will have on implementing the agenda. We also question the need to single out one FfD outcome, the Technology Facilitation Mechanism, in the Declaration, which is now in fact mentioned twice in the document. At the very least, we should remove it from paragraph 42.

2- As we have said in previous sessions, we continue to have significant concerns with the inclusion of CBDR and foreign occupation in this text. We also noticed that the language on the Family in paragraph 44 has not been amended, and reiterate that if it is to remain, it must recognize that various forms of family exist.

3-Thirdly, we note significant amendments and additions to paragraph 41 on ODA. While we do recognize that ODA will be critical to support the sustainable development needs of developing countries, we do not agree with singling it out as a **primary means** to do so. The FfD outcome clearly identifies the “important role” for ODA in support of the SDGs while also underlining the critical role of the

private sector and domestic public resources. At the very least, we would therefore recommend changing “primary” to “important”. We should also ensure consistency of language in describing ODA commitments. Paragraph 66 states that “ODA providers reaffirm their *respective* ODA commitments”. It is essential that the word “respective” is included in other similar references to ODA commitments in the document including paragraph 41.

- We share Japan’s question of the need to caveat our commitment to international law in paragraph 19, with a new reference to “taking into account different national circumstances, capacities and priorities”. We would request that this reference be removed.
- We also have concerns with specific references to cultural diversity, particularly the new reference to culture in paragraph 22. We can accept references to culture as a driver of sustainable development, but cannot accept culture references that undermine any of our collective commitments to the post-2015 development agenda.
- We also disagree with the manner in which policy space is reflected in paragraph 45. We would prefer to say “we acknowledge the need for international financial institutions to take account of domestic policy priorities of each country” and will send in written comments with suggestions to balance the text.
- On climate change, paragraph 31, we would add the word “change” after climate, and add “that is applicable to all parties” after “climate agreement”
- We could support Japan and the UK in calling for the reinsertion of “all economic and social groupings” in paragraph 4.

As a final comment, we have noticed a number of instances where different formulations are used to describe the same issue, for example in relation to poverty eradication. Sometimes we include a reference to extreme poverty, sometime not. Target 1.1 speaks about eradicating extreme poverty for all people everywhere. In some instances we speak about poverty eradication in all its forms, and in others we speak about poverty in all its forms and dimensions. We should be as precise as possible. We should ensure consistency, especially given that this is a central and overarching objective of our agenda.

We also note some inconsistencies in our level of ambition. For example paragraph 21 states: “all forms of gender-based discrimination and violence against women and children *will* be eliminated”. In other instances, we use terms like “work towards” or “strive for”. Canada is a fervent supporter of strong language on the need to eliminate violence against women, but the language here is a statement of fact and we question whether we can be so categorical in our assertions.