

106th Congress }  
2d Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

{ S. PRT.  
{ 106-69

**FORTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE  
CANADA-UNITED STATES  
INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP**

MAY 19-23, 2000

---

**REPORT**

OF THE

**CHAIRMAN**

TO THE

**SENATE DELEGATION**

PURSUANT TO

**Public Law 42, 86th Congress**



Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

69-353 CC

WASHINGTON : 2001

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana  
CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska  
GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon  
ROD GRAMS, Minnesota  
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas  
CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming  
JOHN ASHCROFT, Missouri  
BILL FRIST, Tennessee  
LINCOLN D. CHAFEE, Rhode Island

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware  
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland  
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut  
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts  
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin  
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota  
BARBARA BOXER, California  
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey

STEPHEN E. BIEGUN, *Staff Director*

EDWIN K. HALL, *Minority Staff Director*

## *FORTY-FIRST CANADA-U.S. INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP*

### SENATE DELEGATION

FRANK MURKOWSKI, Alaska, *Chairman*

PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa

MIKE DeWINE, Ohio

SUSAN COLLINS, Maine

GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio

STEVE BENZA, *Manager, U.S. Senate Photo Studio, Sergeant at Arms*

ISAAC EDWARDS, *Legislative Correspondent, Office of Senator Murkowski*

CHARLES FREEMAN, *Legislative Counsel, Office of Senator Murkowski*

JULIA HART, *Office of Interparliamentary Services, Secretary of the Senate*

SALLY WALSH, *Director, Office of Interparliamentary Services, Secretary of the Senate*

BILL WOOLF, *Legislative Assistant, Office of Senator Murkowski*

### HOUSE DELEGATION

AMO HOUGHTON, New York, *Chairman*

PAT DANNER, Missouri

DONALD MANZULLO, Illinois

DONALD PAYNE, New Jersey

COLLIN PETERSON, Minnesota

CLIFF STEARNS, Florida

FRED UPTON, Michigan

Carl Ek, *Congressional Research Service*

Adolfo Franco, *Committee on International Relations*

Jill Quinn, *Committee on International Relations*

Francesca Tedesco, *Committee on International Relations*

Bod Van Wicklin, *Committee on International Relations*

(11)

# C O N T E N T S

---

	Page
FOREWORD .....	v
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL .....	vii
Committee I—Issues in International Trade .....	1
WTO Issues After the Seattle Meetings .....	1
China and the WTO .....	3
Trans-Atlantic Trade Issues .....	3
Free Trade of the Americas .....	4
Agriculture .....	4
Pharmaceuticals .....	5
Internet & E-Commerce .....	5
Softwood Lumber .....	5
Committee II—International Affairs .....	7
Balkans, Southeast Europe and the Caspian Region .....	7
The Russian Elections and the Chechnya Crisis .....	12
National Missile Defense and Arms Proliferation .....	13
The Middle East .....	15
Africa .....	16
Bilateral Security Cooperation—Drugs and Terrorism .....	17
Cuba .....	20
Land Mines .....	20
Internet .....	21
Committee III—Transborder Issues .....	23
Border Facilitation .....	23
Pre-Clearance at Airports .....	23
Water Resources .....	24
Alaska-Yukon-B.C. Railroad Link .....	25
Pacific Coast Fisheries .....	25
Transportation Issues Including Trade Corridors .....	26
Atlantic Coast Fisheries .....	26
St. Lawrence Seaway .....	27
Environmental Issues: Climate Change, Water and Air Quality .....	27
Final Plenary Session .....	29
Report From Committee I .....	29
Report From Committee II .....	31
Report From Committee III .....	33



## FOREWORD

---

### BACKGROUND AND COMPOSITION OF DELEGATION

Public Law 86-42, adopted on June 11, 1959, authorizes U.S. participation in an interparliamentary group conference with Canada. The law provides that members of the U.S. Congress are to be appointed to meet annually with representatives of the House of Commons and the Senate of the Canadian Parliament "for discussion of common problems in the interest of relations between the United States and Canada." The meetings are held alternately in Canada and the United States.

The 41st annual meeting of the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Conference met May 19-23, 2000 on the Steamboat *Delta Queen* along a route from Memphis, Tennessee; through Natchez, Mississippi; on to Baton Rouge, Louisiana; and disembarking in New Orleans, Louisiana. The Co-Chairmen of the U.S. Delegation were Senator Frank Murkowski (R-Alaska) and Congressman Amo Houghton (R-New York). The Co-Chairmen of the Canadian Delegation were Jerry Grafstein (Liberal, Ontario) and Joseph R. Comuzzi, M.P. (Liberal, Ontario).

### UNITED STATES DELEGATION

The United States Senate was represented by Co-Chairman Frank Murkowski (R-Alaska), Patrick Leahy (D-Vermont), Charles Grassley (R-Iowa), Mike DeWine (R-Ohio), Susan Collins (R-Maine), and George Voinovich (R-Ohio).

The United States House of Representatives was represented by Co-Chairman Amo Houghton (R-New York), Fred Upton (R-Michigan), Donald Payne (D-New Jersey), Cliff Stearns (R-Florida), Collin Peterson (D-Minnesota), Pat Danner (D-Missouri), and Dan Manzullo (R-Illinois).

### CANADIAN DELEGATION

The Canadian Senate was represented by Co-Chairman Jerry Grafstein (Liberal, Ontario), Norm Atkins (Progressive Conservative, Ontario), Roch Bolduc (Progressive Conservative, Ontario), John Buchanan (Progressive Conservative, Nova Scotia), Joan Cook (Liberal, Newfoundland), Ross Fitzpatrick (Liberal, British Columbia), and Dan Hays (Liberal, Alberta).

The Canadian House of Commons was represented by Co-Chairman Joseph Comuzzi (Liberal, Ontario), Bill Blaikie (New Democratic Party, Manitoba), Bonnie Brown (Liberal, Ontario), Pierre DeSavoye (Bloc Quebecois, Quebec), John Duncan (Canadian Alliance, British Columbia), Wayne Easter (Liberal, Prince Edward Island), John Godfrey (Liberal, Ontario), Bill Graham (Liberal, On-

tario), Monique Guay (Bloc Quebecois, Quebec), John Maloney (Liberal, Ontario), Ted McWhinney (Liberal, British Columbia), Val Meredith (Canadian Alliance, Ontario), Gary Pillitteri (Liberal, Ontario), Carmen Provenzano (Liberal, Ontario), Monte Solberg (Canadian Alliance, Alberta), Greg Thompson (Progressive Conservative, New Brunswick), and Susan Whelan (Liberal, Ontario).

## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

---

*October 16, 2000.*

Hon. JESSE HELMS,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations  
United States, Senate.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HELMS: Pursuant to Public Law 86-42, it is my honor, as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the 41st annual meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, to submit a report of the meeting held on the Steamboat *Delta Queen* from May 19 to May 23, 2000.

It is my understanding that, in the past, the reports of the Interparliamentary Conference have been published by the authorizing committee of jurisdiction. I respectfully request that this year's report also be published for the benefit of other Senators.

Sincerely,

FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,  
*Chairman, Senate Delegation,  
Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.*

(vii)



## **COMMITTEE I—ISSUES IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Committee I was co-chaired by U.S. Senator Charles Grassley and Canadian Senator Jerry Grafstein.

### **WTO ISSUES AFTER THE SEATTLE MEETINGS**

A U.S. delegate began by moving to consolidate this discussion with the one on China's drive to enter the World Trade Organization (WTO). He had been in Seattle, he said, and noted that this was the first protest organized via the Internet. In particular, he pointed to the website [www.radical.com] as an internet meeting place for professional protesters. He suggested that the true problem of the WTO was a lack of transparency on the part of Europeans.

A fellow American interjected that the lack of transparency was in the WTO, and not just in the European delegation. The process of decision-making in the WTO would be improved, he said, if a televised system of WTO meetings, like C-SPAN, were put in place.

Another U.S. participant suggested that Canada and the United States should play a major role in the post-Seattle WTO proceedings. He suggested that a major impediment to this was that U.S. leadership in Seattle "turned-off" many delegations from the developing world. He said that Presidential fast-track trade negotiating authority was needed to restore American leadership.

A Canadian then said that it was very important that a new round of WTO negotiations begin, understanding and appreciating both the need for WTO transparency and developing-country sensitivities. The need for a new agreement in agriculture and services was dramatic, but these probably wouldn't come about absent a new round, he said.

The Canadian chair suggested that the key problem is the need for public defense of globalism in order to answer the challenges put forward by the highly visible, anti-globalism movement. He agreed that it was critical for the U.S. President to gain fast-track authority. He said he believed the central problem in trade negotiations is European protectionism, and that the only venue to tackle this problem for the United States and Canada was the WTO.

A Canadian, seconded by an American, said that the Seattle protesters were not simply a radical movement. People are anxious that their concerns are not being addressed, that they are being left behind by globalization, that there has been an "over-commoditization" of basic values, and that too much power is being exercised by too few people. There is a need for more democratic involvement in trade negotiations, he concluded.

Another Canadian participant offered the notion that the problem was one of education, that too few people understood how much value had been generated by globalization. Even those who

are most interested in wealth distribution need to recognize that wealth must be generated before it can be distributed, he argued.

An American added that another problem is the snobbery in developed countries about issues like environmentalism. Wealth is the tool needed to deal with environmental problems, he averred, and lesser developed countries need wealth before they can attack environmental issues. He also declared that there was a misconception among protesters at Seattle that environmental and labor concerns were not represented at the WTO meeting; they were represented on many of the delegations, yet the protesters refused to allow these representatives to take part. As for involvement of democratic representatives in trade negotiations, he noted that Congress could never agree on the specifics of a trade deal while it was still in the negotiating stage; these needed to be managed via Presidential fast-track.

A Canadian pointed out that if there is no transparency in the WTO, there could be empowerment of special interests of the worst kind.

An American pointed out that the WTO issues raised by the protesters should not be so easily dismissed, and compared the WTO protests with Vietnam War protests. He claimed that the fundamental issue is one of income disparity, which is rising so rapidly. This can be traced to globalization, and should be managed carefully, he warned.

Another U.S. representative said that the main reason for concern is the loss of sovereignty that the WTO entails. The focus of any WTO reforms should not be on how to overcome globalization, he argued, but on how to trade more freely without a loss of sovereignty.

A Canadian asked how to overcome the sense of powerlessness people feel—do we need to question Bretton Woods, the WTO, and so on? What should be done when the European Union undermines or ignores WTO decisions? The Europeans are becoming increasingly protectionist—how should this be dealt with?

Another Canadian noted that there is great resistance to change throughout the world, including in Europe, and that this has been manifesting itself as political resistance to change. There is a need to convince people that democracy is driving the WTO regime, he said.

On the issue of income disparity, a Canadian said that people needed to be convinced that free trade is not a case of haves and have-nots, but, rather, one of have-nots and have-laters.

Another Canadian suggested forming a grander parliamentary system for the WTO, one that would allow people to feel better represented. He realized, of course, that this would be broadly resisted in the United States because of fears of “world federalism.” Under any circumstances, a new structure for the WTO was needed, he said; at a minimum, more oversight of trade negotiators was necessary.

An American pointed out that the U.S. Congress does have oversight over the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), but that the Canadian parliament does not have similar oversight.

A U.S. representative suggested that a balance between democratic accountability and delegated authority was necessary in

trade negotiations, but that at some point, delegation was necessary.

There was a lively discussion regarding the question of whether the benefits of globalization are trickling down to all sectors of the economy. Some participants maintained that there was little evidence that agricultural workers benefited. Others said that low unemployment was itself proof that the advantages of globalization are being felt.

The two sides agreed that legislators in both countries need to work much harder to educate people about the benefits of trade in order to mute the voices of those who argue against globalization.

#### CHINA AND THE WTO

A Canadian began by stating his country's firm commitment to China's entry into WTO. Canada is aware of the concerns over such issues as human rights, he said, but believes that the best way to manage these issues is to bring China into the international fold. An American agreed, stating that commercial relations will do more to enhance world peace than political solutions.

Another U.S. delegate argued that granting China Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) would surrender all leverage over that country.

A Canadian, seconded by an American, stated that much can be gained by increasing trade with China, and that there are people in other countries, notably Europe, who would be quite happy if the United States were to stay on the sidelines.

A lively discussion followed; there was general agreement—with some dissent—that China can be changed for the better by bringing it into the world of nations through trade. One American suggested that Chinese violations of human rights should not be rewarded through granting preferential trade terms. Another U.S. delegate noted that the United States was only some 35 years away from treating African-Americans as second-class citizens and abusing their human rights. Did that mean, he inquired, that the United States should have been excluded from trade during that time?

A Canadian concluded that a "no" vote on Permanent Normal Trade Relations will not produce a better result in China for the issues of concern to opponents of PNTR.

#### TRANS-ATLANTIC TRADE ISSUES

An American launched the discussion by stating that EU recalcitrance in trade disputes will be muted if the United States and Canada present a united front. In particular, biotech issues should involve a joint effort to: (1) negotiate government-to-government; (2) educate people about the safety of biotech products; (3) point out the hypocrisy between according different treatment to pharmaceutical and farm products; and (4) mobilize the scientific community on biotech issues. There was general agreement that EU concerns were intellectually dishonest, and actually mask protectionism.

A broad discussion then ensued on the topic of EU subsidization, particularly of the agricultural sector. A Canadian suggested that Canada might want to drive a wedge in the EU bloc by negotiating

a free-trade agreement with the United Kingdom. There was general agreement that the best way to combat EU protectionism is to present an opposing bloc to the EU through negotiating a Free Trade of the Americas Agreement (FTAA). However, Brazil is a serious impediment to accomplishing this. At a minimum, the United States and Canada should present a united front in negotiating with the EU.

One Canadian also put forward a theory that the EU was deliberately devaluing the Euro to simultaneously make EU products more competitive overseas and reduce the competitiveness of imports.

Another Canadian, seconded by an American, suggested that there should be greater linkage between trade with Europe and North America's commitment to European security. Europe was vigorously rejecting this linkage. A Canadian strongly objected to the negative impact of European subsidies on his country's farmers. He contrasted this to security cooperation, where North America "had to do all the heavy lifting," and concluded that "we need to start playing hardball."

#### FREE TRADE OF THE AMERICAS

An American made a general statement to the effect that the FTAA talks were stalled, in part because of Brazilian intransigence, and in part because of the absence of fast-track negotiating authority for the U.S. Administration. Delegates were in general agreement that more attention needs to be paid to this, despite the fact that immediate benefits might be fairly negligible—the Canadians characterized the gains of Chile-Canada trade after their free trade agreement as "tiny." Delegates concurred that the major issue confronting FTAA negotiators is Brazil, which appears to be attempting to play the Mercosur countries off North America, while simultaneously negotiating with Europe to improve South America-EU trade.

#### AGRICULTURE

A Canadian began by saying the North Dakota Wheat Commission's recent announcement—that it should pursue a trade action "because of unfair pricing by the Canadian Wheat Board"—could deal a huge blow to the Canadian industry. Subsidies paid to U.S. wheat farmers are difficult enough, he said.

The Canadians contended that their farmers are suffering a serious crisis, and that many people are leaving the land. While some Canadians suggested that a culling of family farmers might be better in the long-run, the situation is in a serious crisis right now.

In the United States, the industry is headed toward a contract basis for farming, said an American. In the long-run, this will lead to higher monopolistic prices to consumers, he said; also, family farmers are retiring and not being replaced, which will put further upward pressure on commodity prices.

Some of the Canadian delegates called for more domestic political solutions to the problem. One Canadian, however, questioned the cabinet's familiarity with agricultural issues.

With some pride, a Canadian pointed to the settlement of a recent dairy dispute, and suggested that trade relations between the United States and Canada are healthy once more. American delegates, however, argued that "milk is thicker than blood," and said that they did not foresee a broad, long-term dairy agreement that will allow greater free trade in dairy. "We can't get agreement from state to state, so how are we going to agree across countries, especially when the world export market for dairy is so minimal?" asked one U.S. delegate. He concluded that North American has already ceded the world market to New Zealand.

#### PHARMACEUTICALS

In a short, spirited discussion, the two sides aired their views on the issue of pharmaceuticals. Attention focused in particular on Canadian drug prices, which are lower than those in the United States. Bus loads of Americans cross the border to fill their prescriptions. The Canadians stated that their country has a different concept of what constitutes research and development in pricing; Canada believes that pharmaceutical companies add unnecessary marketing costs into R&D and fix prices accordingly. The U.S. side said that Canadian prices are too low, while the Canadians maintained that U.S. prices are too high.

#### INTERNET & E-COMMERCE

A Canadian noted that Canada is second to the United States in internet penetration, but lags far behind the Americans in e-commerce. He urged that policymakers pay more attention to consumer protection and security, and added that tax issues need to be resolved in the near term. Several Canadians concurred.

Both sides agreed that there are many issues which are being raised on this front, including intellectual property protection, broadband development, the digital divide, and tax issues.

An American participant contended that Congress has shirked its responsibility by placing a five-year moratorium on internet taxation.

A Canadian said that the internet is making a mockery of Canadian content laws, but added that that might not be such a bad thing if one were a true market capitalist.

Another Canadian suggested that the intellectual property rights issues raised by e-commerce may hold the potential for anarchy.

#### SOFTWOOD LUMBER

There was unanimity on both sides that the quota on Canadian softwood lumber exports to the United States should be allowed to lapse. A Canadian asserted that the true danger is a recurrence of countervailing actions by the United States, which will kill a lot of independent producers. Members of the U.S. delegation said that they understand this issue, but noted that it is so easy to initiate countervailing actions that they can not be easily stopped, and that Congress will never waive this right. However, the U.S. side said that the Canadian side should take heart that the U.S. coalition of lobbyists in support of lumber imports will be a strong voice against future countervailing duties.



## **COMMITTEE II—INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

Committee II was co-chaired by U.S. Senator Patrick Leahy and Canadian Member of Parliament Bill Graham.

### **BALKANS, SOUTHEAST EUROPE AND THE CASPIAN REGION**

A Canadian began by inquiring whether we were right or wrong in the way we handled Bosnia. He noted that historical peace treaties had set international boundaries and seeded minorities throughout the region. When the breakup of Yugoslavia occurred, however, there was no plan, a fact which disturbs North American scholars. After the end of the air war, the operation was returned to the control of the United Nations (UN). Several problems still remain, and there is a possibility of long-term engagement. There is growing unhappiness, he said, with using Canadian Forces within the Balkans as a whole. He urged that, in the event of future interventions, UN authorization be gained, using the UN General Assembly if the Security Council does not approve a particular action.

An American delegate noted that there is a debate on this within the UN. The peacekeepers are in, he said, and NATO has stepped back. At times, the UN has been very ineffective; they put in a peacekeeping operation prior to any peace. In addition, the chain of command was fragmented. Bosnians were rounded up and executed while the peacekeepers stood by. Some now believe that the relevance of NATO is its ability to respond to regional conflicts. He asked his colleague, who traveled to the region, to report on what he learned.

The U. S. delegate said that NATO needs to reassess its role—when they go in and when they don't—against the backdrop of the European Union (EU) creating a rapid intervention contingency force of 60,000 troops. There is an international commitment to stability in Southeastern Europe. The EU is spending \$12 billion over the next few years. The Canadians also should be commended for their contributions. The good news is that the Europeans understand that stability in the region is important, and that the countries in the region eventually need to be brought into the EU and NATO. He also noted that there is good news from Croatia; Tudjman is gone, and new leaders have been elected. In Macedonia, there is a coalition government, which includes ethnic Albanians, Bulgarians, and Romanians. Although economically troubled, the country has good leadership. Even Kosovo is looking better, he said; their chances of success depend upon how they treat their minorities. The Turkish government notes, however, that ethnic Turks are being poorly treated in Kosovo.

An American participant said that, if the people in the region don't work things out, then at some point, someone is going to say, "a pox on all your houses."

Another U.S. representative said that the political structure isn't working in Bosnia; this issue needs to be revisited, he maintained, because the Serb, Croatian, and Muslim groups are not working together. In Serbia, the opposition is not doing very well. Only time will tell whether they will get rid of Slobodan Milosevic.

An American said that the U.S. House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly to withdraw troops from Kosovo, and inquired as to the status of the issue in the Senate.

Another American said that the Appropriations Committee voted on the proposal that basically says "get out" of Kosovo. He noted that only three members voted against it, and that he was one of them. By the time it got on the floor, he said, both Governor Bush and Vice President Gore urged Congress to vote against it.

A U.S. delegate said that the legislation revealed that people are concerned with the issue of burden sharing.

Another American responded that United States troops make up only about 15 percent of the Kosovo force—a fact not known to most people. He contended that we should be patting Europeans on the back, not threatening them; they would say they're leaving, too.

A U.S. delegate said that he, too, voted against withdrawal. It might sound good back home, he said, but we need to look at what happened in Bosnia; if you could predict the endgame, it would be great, but we can't. The choices are either: don't do it, or do it and hope it works. Look at what happened in 1918, he urged.

A Canadian said that it is interesting to watch the kind of critical reflection that has been going on since the Kosovo intervention—it didn't break down along normal political lines. The NDP approved of the NATO action. The human rights community is divided; those who normally disagreed, agreed, and vice versa. The same thing is going on in the United States, it seems.

He added that he would like to mention two things: first of all, there was an inadequacy of information on which the decisions were based. We don't know if it was a problem all the way down the line from the foreign minister, or if there was some misleading going on. The authorities said this would only be a three-day affair, that there would be a short period of therapeutic bombing, after which Milosevic would come to the table. It was supposed to be brief, selective and effective, but it turned out to be none of the above. Who fed us this? What kind of information was it being based on—was it bad intelligence, or were we being misled? The member said that he has not seen the reports yet. Politicians need to reckon with this, he said.

A U.S. participant said that President Clinton invited the foreign policy leadership from both the House and Senate to the White House, along with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the head of the CIA. At that meeting, someone raised the issue of the brevity of the conflict; there was a unanimous reaction among the U.S. Members of Congress, across the political spectrum, that we had backed into this conflict on an *ad hoc* basis. The question now is what impact will it have on NATO.

An American delegate asked the Canadians for their sense of how long the conflict would continue. A Canadian replied that his country will continue to participate as long as it is necessary, and as long as Canada is asked to participate, especially under a UN

mandate. He noted that Canada's resources are stretched as thin as they could possibly be, and that they could hardly do anything in Sierra Leone, because there are no more front line military people available. He added that Canada is dealing with the police by municipalities, not through the RCMP. There's still a willingness to stay engaged. If there's a new government, for example, under the Canadian Alliance, there might be a reluctance to stay involved.

The committee then discussed the issue of Kosovar refugees. A Canadian said that only half have returned. He said that in Canada, a whole host of social problems have arisen, particularly in small towns. The refugees have different cultural values; they don't pay their bills, and have not adjusted well in his area, he said. An American reported that the refugees in his constituency came from a U.S. Air Force base, and that they stayed together as a community. Although he said that he had not heard of any problems, a colleague stated that some Kosovars have reportedly hidden from the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Switching back to the Kosovo conflict, a Canadian said that neither the U.S. State Department nor Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade are competent to face the situation. The NATO operation didn't solve many of the consequent problems, particularly the current diaspora of Serbians.

An American said that his country has not really developed a post-Cold War policy on the use of the military. There has been a huge debate about this. It's a common problem that our allies have to figure out—what is it that the various countries bring to the table that is unique? We're behind where we should be in figuring out where we should be. We haven't focused enough on this, and it will be a challenge for the next President. The problem, he said, is that there is no such thing as a Clinton Doctrine, because there hasn't been sufficient debate.

A Canadian replied that there was no debate about U.S. foreign policy in the Truman and Eisenhower eras; there is an absence of a doctrine today. The American agreed, adding that this is a defining point in history, and that decisions today are even more difficult.

A Canadian raised the question of how long NATO will stay in Kosovo, particularly in light of cost considerations. Canada's involvement in 1999 and 1998 cost \$850 million, and through 2000 it was projected to cost \$1 billion—out of \$10–12 billion on defense. That's 10 percent, he said, and Canada can't continue to do that, as it's a huge amount. He also commented that the UN peacekeeping operations were effective in cases where a peace was in place, but not when a war is going on. Only NATO can manage that, and it can't go out of its own territory. There needs to be some thoughtful reasoning from the United States on what should be done in those circumstances. Canadian foreign policy has been based in recent years on "human security," which is an evolving concept.

Another Canadian remarked that if the UN had said it would do something in 3 days, and it took 11 weeks, we would be talking about how stupid the UN is. But when that happens to NATO, we come up with excuses; there's bias at work. There is an institu-

tional rivalry between the UN and NATO, he asserted. We promote both groups in Canada. We need to examine whether there is an obvious role for NATO. He stated that it is not enough simply for the United States to come up with a modern-day Truman doctrine. It needs to be arrived at a little more consensually, either through the UN, or NATO, or in some other manner.

Another Canadian said that in the United States, the remarkable thing is that after every major intervention, there's a painful period of critical study. The intellectual inspiration, he said, is likely to come from the United States; we Canadians are very minor players. NATO developed the technique of containment, he noted. Was it competent for an offensive operation?

A U.S. participant noted that some of the Kosovars are creating problems; there have been criminal elements, but overall, the majority of the people have worked out; so probably most of the Kosovars are doing all right. On the Truman doctrine, he argued that it was easy then to have a policy to be against Communism. It is easy to be against something, he said; it's more difficult to figure out what you're for. The NATO operation was a very difficult task for General Clark. He had particular problems with the choice of ground targets, many of which were vetoed by various allies.

On the issue of peacekeeping operations and peace-building, an American delegate noted that U.S. transport planes were to have been used to lift Bangladeshi troops to Sierra Leone; but it was too expensive, so the UN chartered commercial airlines instead. The United States just approved a \$310 billion defense budget, he said, but U.S. policymakers say they just can't do things because the United States doesn't have the resources. The delegate said he wonders about this.

Another American discussed the new Eurocorps, a 60,000-strong peacekeeping operation. Right now, he said, NATO makes bad use of its resources, with every country doing its own thing.

When asked by a colleague if this force would materialize, the member replied that he had spoken to NATO officials, and had been told that the Europeans are very serious about this. They realize they couldn't deal with the crisis in Kosovo, and that they need to coordinate their resources. In the long run, he added, they may be able to take over the peacekeeping operation in Kosovo.

On the conduct of the NATO operation, a Canadian noted that American commanders were criticized because of their insistence on high altitude bombing to protect allied pilots. If the Europeans had handled it, however, they would have had gone in by land, he claimed. He added that Canada's connection with NATO gives it a connection to Europe.

An American responded that he thought General Clark had been very much in favor of ordinary bombing—saturation bombing where you really go in. The allied military didn't have the clout they would have had. Slobodan Milosevic would have folded if they had been able to hit him that hard, he said.

A Canadian appealed for allies to pull transatlantic issues together. On the theme of what the United States will see as its role in future security architecture, he said that it is very hard for more modest players such as Canada to do anything until the United States figures things out. He said that he is bothered by the fact

that, with its “smart bombs,” the United States military is the technological leader, but that it won't put troops at risk. He suggested that this would create a world in which there will be enormous resentment against the West in general and Americans in particular, because they are perceived as hiding behind a shield of hi-tech wizardry. Canada doesn't have this technology. The decision not to send in ground troops was a political one. How stable, he asked, was that on a long-term basis?

An American contended that CNN changed all that when they showed an American soldier's body being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu. She said she was disturbed that so many civilians were killed in Kosovo.

Another American reiterated that the Pentagon is being funded at \$310 billion, despite the fact that there was no major enemy; Iran, Iraq, and Cuba are the biggest threats. Politicians make decisions, and nobody wants body bags coming back, he said. Members of Congress and Senators think about how they sound back home, rather than saying what will we do in the world. For example, if we build a national missile defense around the United States, we will become more isolationist, he said. We will have to take the risk of casualties, or we should get out of the business of intervening in conflicts. He said many of the ground troops were from his district, so this concerns him; but if the United States is going to remain a world power, he concluded, that is part of the role.

An American interjected that such an intervention depends, for example, on whether people think being in Somalia is protecting American interests. Her colleague responded that one can isolate everything by saying “we should only protect America, and we should do nothing unless the threat is right at our shores.”

A Canadian observed that he had heard in briefings that, in the next Kosovo in 10 years, the United States would be capable of bombing without pilots. That will just exacerbate problems, he said.

An American said that, with its Cruise missiles, the United States was close to having that capability right now. In World War II, bombing runs were conducted during daylight hours, at low altitude, which resulted in enormous casualties. Commanders knew that a certain percentage of allied bombers would not come back. Today's Stealth bombers are different, he said. But that shouldn't be the question. The questions are: Where do you get involved? Do you get involved pro-actively? For example, the delegate said, in the foreign operations appropriations legislation, the Senate just put in his request for substantially more for polio eradication this year, for a multi-billion dollar immunization program throughout Africa. If you can eliminate diseases, he argued, you can raise living standards, improve economic development, and lower the risk of war. But we are not doing enough of that, he contended. We can spend \$1–2 million per day bombing, but we are reluctant to do preventative things. If all you have are really successful aid programs, then you haven't taken any risks. We handle things episodically, reacting to what happens at the moment, and not over the long term. He speculated that in Korea, this approach might finally pay off; there may be some rapprochement between the North and South. Also, the United States has troops in the Sinai.

But CNN doesn't focus on it, so it isn't there. We could also get into the question of land mines, where there have been some expensive mistakes that could have been prevented, he suggested.

A Canadian introduced the topic of the Caspian region, which he characterized as a potential future Kosovo. He visited the region, he said, and found it to be a volatile mix of politics, complicated by a potentially huge oil deposit. The United States, he said, is encouraging the construction of a pipeline through longer routes because of political problems. The size of the deposit is a key question—whether it is strategically big enough. The United States would like to develop an oil source that is an alternative to the Middle East. Meanwhile, the Great Game is being played between Russia and the United States. Independence of ethnic groups and border conflicts are also an issue. Russia has been suppressing Chechnya. The Russians are fomenting local revolutions; they are simultaneously encouraging the Chechens in Georgia, while crushing them in Chechnya. This region now seems to be one that the United States has chosen as an area of strategic interest. Surveying the region, the delegate said that Azerbaijan is ruled by a dictator, and that Georgia is led by former Soviet Foreign Minister Edward Shevardnadze. Armenia is poor and badly run, and is suffering more out-migration than it did during the great genocide. The Russian arm is there, but they also get support from the U.S. Congress, which helps because of domestic politics. On aid, he reported that the USAID officer told him that they receive more assistance than they ask for or can use. The Turks are also a complicating factor. They are trying to show that they are Europeanizing—for example, through reform of their court system. Although the Turks don't want to talk about Cyprus, they realize it's an important issue for EU membership.

#### THE RUSSIAN ELECTIONS AND THE CHECHNYA CRISIS

An American remarked that President Vladimir Putin is taking powers away from 89 governors and giving it to 7 individuals he trusts. That is a major change, the delegate observed.

A Canadian said that the Russian elections were criticized on the basis of media bias and fairness; however, he added, many elections would be judged unfair if their media were held to the same standards. The participant said that the Canadian deputy speaker is en route to Moscow to be part of discussions with members of the Duma on how to set up a committee system. The delegate added that he hoped the Russians don't adopt Canada's system. President Putin obviously wants to strengthen the state in certain ways, but that could be a positive thing if it restores a climate where things can be done. On Chechnya, little can be said except that Canada thinks Russia has a right to protect its territorial integrity; however, they've gone way beyond what is morally appropriate. But it's unrealistic to respond to Chechnya unless you want a war with Russia; you do what you can do. The delegate also had some criticism for the West on Kosovo. Another aspect is National Missile Defence (NMD) and the extent to which it effects existing Russian relationships and arms treaties. There is a curious aspect to this debate. It seems that the United States is now urging Russia to accept a certain level of nuclear arms and stay on a launch-

on-warning alert system. The delegate said he was not sure what was going on: Russia is being encouraged to do certain things so the United States can do its own thing. This is also a part of the discussion about NATO and how it defines its relevance, especially taking into account Russian paranoia. We've already had one NATO expansion, and there are plans for more. This is of concern in Canada—that NATO not expand further and thereby create a new version of the Cold War.

Another Canadian said that Russia is not an economic power. President Gorbachev was replaced by the chaos of Boris Yeltsin; Russia is an awful mess, which raises the question of whether it is a great power any more.

An American pointed out that Russia remains one of the two largest nuclear powers, regardless of its economic weakness. He said that the old assessments always showed Russia to be way ahead of the United States in military equipment and manpower. They are a major nuclear power, however, and paranoid, and significant to us. They are closer than anyone else in the world to Pakistan or countries that might launch a nuclear war. No one says we should disengage. There are different ways of addressing their frustration, but we can't ignore them. They are attempting to improve their system of justice. They were surprised, for example, to learn that one could sue the federal government in the United States.

A Canadian noted that corruption is a major problem; it is impossible, he said, to do anything in the courts, for example, until someone is paid off; the same thing is true in business, but there are ever-escalating bribes. This is a huge problem for foreign investment, he concluded.

An American said that the Ben and Jerry's ice cream company pulled out of Russia because it wasn't worth it. The delegate recounted the story of a large U.S. energy company that invested in Russia and was told that the taxes were set up with several different authorities and that the U.S. company would be taxed at 300–400% of what it made. The CEO was told to lie like everyone else; the CEO said he would go to jail for that in the United States.

A Canadian remarked that the Russians don't understand the basics of a market economy and don't understand the concept of a contract.

#### NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE AND ARMS PROLIFERATION

A Canadian began by saying that the parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee did a report on disarmament a year ago, and had concluded that proliferation is in serious trouble. There are several non-declared nuclear weapons states, including India, Pakistan, and Israel. Although there are some positive signs, the U.S. Senate's rejection of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was a negative sign for those who are working on nuclear disarmament. The committee's report recommended that NATO re-examine its nuclear policy, but this met with a lot of resistance in the United States. The committee got beat up on that; the U.K., France and the United States opposed the recommendation, but some others thought it would be worth talking about. U.S. military people came up to Canada to talk about this; they seem discouraged about the

prospects, and American nuclear disarmament activists are discouraged. This is linked to the NMD issue, because it could exacerbate the problem. The Canadian said that those who were nervous about it, as he was, are afraid that if the United States proceeds with this plan, then there will be problems with the ABM treaty. The Russians and the Chinese are adamantly against it; they claim it would unravel the ABM treaty and launch a new arms race. They do not see it as a defense against small rogue states. With NMD, the United States would have a shield and they would have no defense. The United States is negotiating with the Russians, however; if they agree, then there might not be a threat of escalation. A lot depends on that, the Canadian said, and on whether or not the system is plausible—scientists have said they are incapable of dealing with the problem of decoys.

An American participant said that one should worry more about a trawler carrying a nuclear bomb entering the New York harbor; he said that he is more concerned about a nuke coming in under the Brooklyn Bridge than one being delivered by a ballistic missile.

A Canadian said that in his country the Defense Minister and the parliamentary Defense Committee tend to lean more toward favoring NMD, because Canada could participate within NORAD. There is a debate in Canada today between the two issues of general nuclear stability and North American security.

Another Canadian said that if negotiations between the United States and Russia could lead to agreement for the Americans to go ahead on NMD, then the problem would be eliminated. However, he said that he questioned the possible tradeoffs. If it creates a collusion between United States and Russia, with an affirmation of the status quo with both systems being on alert all the time, and if it brings a halt to arms reductions in the name of getting the Russians to agree to NMD, then the whole thing is still open to criticism.

An American agreed that the NATO allies are very concerned about this. It came up in the Senate—the issue about Kosovo. If that hadn't been stricken, it would have added another great concern to the Europeans of us pulling out. We need more cooperation, he said.

An American said that there would be some discussion next month when President Clinton goes to Moscow; he speculated that the meeting would end inconclusively. The President, he said, does not feel he can move forward with NMD or cut it off, so it will be put off until next year. No matter who is President, the U.S. participant said, it's a case in which real diplomacy will be a lot more beneficial. The American people will realize that no matter how great this looks on TV, it will protect not U.S. cities, but U.S. missile sites. This does not make sense, as the United States has a massive, invulnerable nuclear weapons delivery system in place: her submarines. In addition, there is a nuclear flashpoint potential between India and Pakistan, and it is impossible to say where that will go if something happens there. No nuclear weapons have been used since Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It is a bad mistake to think that nuclear war is predicated on what the nuclear system is. You can make some pretty primitive delivery systems now because the warheads are so small. No matter who is President, he said, Mem-

bers of the Senate will need to talk about how we get off this image of isolationism that has built up. Businesses in the United States are anything but isolationist, because they're in a global economy, and they need the government's prestige and backing in the international community. There's no way to escape this. The world won't bend its will for the United States; it will just build up resentment. There are so many ways the United States can become influential world-wide, *e.g.*, educationally and economically, that it shouldn't rely on just defense. In addition, the U.S. Air Force budget has been depleted by unnecessary bombers that no one wants to mothball.

Another American said that the White House argues that if the country is well defended, it will be better able to help others. Another U.S. delegate inquired if that reasoning applied to the U.S. foreign aid budget, which keeps being cut.

A Canadian stated that the cost potential is horrendous; what if, for example, the United States asked Canada to contribute 10 percent of NMD? That's \$6 billion, he said.

A U.S. participant said that if there is a successful technological breakthrough, then there will be a whole different set of issues, and destabilization will be a far more difficult issue to debate. If people become convinced that the NMD system will work, it will be a lot harder to stop its development and deployment.

An American said that, if the U.S. system functions, many other countries would want to have such interceptors.

Another U.S. member raised the issue of nuclear proliferation; he noted that more States have recently acquired nuclear capabilities. Turkey, for example, has confirmed a bid on a nuclear reactor. General Electric and the Canadians are bidding to build it. If this continues, he said, the Turkish military may be able to begin working on a bomb.

A Canadian said that his country looked at the reactor sale and concluded that Turkey would not use it to develop a bomb, because Turkey is a signatory of the Nonproliferation Treaty. In addition, the Turks agreed that they would accept the highest level of inspections. The delegate said that he has not heard anyone suggest that Turkey would do what India did with their reactors in the 1950s. The Armenians are relying on a Chernobyl-type reactor for 80 percent of their electric power, he added.

#### THE MIDDLE EAST

A Canadian stated that the United States and Canada share a common interest in bringing peace to the region.

An American responded by pointing out that every time they are close to an agreement, some splinter group throws a wrench in the works. Another Canadian said that at least the various sides were still talking.

A Canadian said that his country still had troops in the region. The water issue, he said, will be part of the resolution of the problems in the area. He reported that a Canadian parliamentary delegation that visited the region was told by the Arabs that they were only allowed to dig wells of a certain depth, but that the Israelis didn't have those restrictions. The delegate speculated that this

could be one strategic issue that might drag the two back to war. They need to be able to share the resource, he said.

An American said that if Israel doesn't give up the Golan Heights, there might not be peace in the region. The extreme groups would leverage that issue. He said that he questioned how long the United States will continue to pour billions of dollars into the region.

A Canadian representative said that the Israelis wouldn't like the Egyptian agreement because they gave up so much land. He shifted the topic to another area where there is some disagreement between the United States and Canada—the sanctions against Iraq. He said that the embargo is having a devastating effect on the population—especially the children. Also, there is resonance among other countries—France, for example—to lighten or eliminate the sanctions.

An American noted that the Senate passed a resolution on humanitarian relief from sanctions.

#### AFRICA

A U.S. delegate reported that he was a member of a delegation that visited Africa, and that they found three important issues: crime, unemployment and AIDS. The last is particularly troublesome, he said, especially in light of South African President Mbeki's position. The United States is trying to put bills through to address this. He said that the situation in many countries is simply overpowering; the things that are going on in Congo and Sierra Leone were gnawing at us all the time, he said.

Another American said that there has been an increase in attention given to Africa. The U.S. Congress finally passed the Africa Trade and Opportunity Growth bill, which was signed into law and will give some trade preferences. The basic goal is to have Africa move more toward democracy, and to have trade transparency and rule of law. However, there are still some problems: Congo, and all the other countries involved there (the conflict has been likened to a mini world war), Ethiopia and Eritrea, and Sierra Leone, where the British have gone in with ground troops and are helping stabilize the situation. He said that there is a difficult question right now over whether or not the UN can send in peacekeepers when there is no peace to keep. Several hundred million dollars have already been put in this year, and the pharmaceutical companies have been helping. There is an AIDS pandemic there, and it is a world issue. It may strike the Indian continent, which is much more densely populated than Africa, or China. The latter two could cause a serious security issue if there is a total breakdown of government and civil society. The Congressional Black Caucus has been addressing this. We have some allies outside the caucus, too, who have gotten really interested.

Another U.S. participant said that Canada had done excellent work in Africa—more than the United States. He suggested that the two countries could go into Africa together on peacekeeping or micro-lending or drug availability. It's not just two countries, he added, it's way beyond the impact of just two countries. He said that in Nigeria, a senator asked whether our over-indulgent country could help in gaining loan forgiveness.

A Canadian added that the West needs to open its gates to Africa's products.

An American suggested that there are specific things that African governments can do. Typically, ambassadors and foreign ministers plead with developed governments for investment in their countries, but the African States don't know how to go about it. They have assets, and they don't know how to explain it.

A Canadian representative said that a French-trained bureaucracy is prevalent in Africa; government intervention is regarded as the main thing to do. Their agricultural policies, for example, are anti-farming; agriculture should be the first thing addressed. Place the African people in charge of their own food supply.

A Canadian argued that the loans being made to African women are working. The West can't develop their industries for them, she contended; they have to do it on their own. And, given the means, they're doing so. It's the women who are working in Africa, not the men, she said. An American interjected that the United States has a similarly successful program that deals with micro-enterprises. Another U.S. participant pointed to a disconnect: everyone thinks this is a good idea, but there's not enough money around. He suggested once more that if Canada and the United States got together it would leverage the assistance.

A Canadian said that the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) had identified AIDS as one of three priorities to address. The AIDS problem in all these countries is the inability to talk about it. In Uganda, a local singer contracted AIDS and sang about it, and they're treating it differently now. But in general, there's been a taboo against speaking about AIDS. The problem cannot be controlled with a few local AIDS programs.

Another Canadian remarked that there is an "involvement fatigue" that affects all avenues; he suggested that debt remission be considered. An American responded that, if loans are forgiven, lender nations ought to ask for something in return, such as good government.

An American described a summit on Africa with regional meetings about 3-4 months ago; it was attended by 8,000 people, and 2,000 delegates. He said that gradually, people have been coming in from all areas, and that this will become more of a group that will make its voice heard.

#### BILATERAL SECURITY COOPERATION—DRUGS AND TERRORISM

A Canadian introduced the topic by stating that there has been a tremendous amount of cooperation between Canada and the United States. The Americans, he said, think that Canada is a funnel for drug traffickers, but it works both ways. Canada's justice system may be encouraging the Mafia in Canada because of the light sentences that are being imposed on them. The same is true of the parole system. Many believe there is a need to toughen up in that area. On terrorism, there could have been a major disaster. No one knows what their plan was; maybe it will never be known. One of the big problems is identifying where these people are coming from and how their missions are being directed. We as a country are willing to do everything we can to cooperate with the United States on addressing this problem, he declared.

A U.S. participant said that one big problem is that when a plan was proposed to tighten up borders with Mexico, it hit both borders, and a number of members of Congress objected. Three members put legislation in the Senate to require a more extensive check of everyone crossing the border, but the participant said that he and others had put in an amendment questioning the funding, and the proposal was dropped. Do drugs flow both ways? Of course. The authorities work closely together, and cooperation is increasing. It would be ridiculous to close down the borders; it would hurt those who have relatives, and cross-trafficking would be gone. And it wouldn't matter anyway, because the frontier, which is unguarded, is so long. There are farms and ranches that span both countries, he said. The delegate suggested that both countries have a lot at stake, and that it is worthwhile to work on it because we never know which side will be targeted.

Another American said that the problem of Section 110 may be on the way to being resolved. If both sides are already working together, what more do we need to do?

A U.S. representative said that Canadians point out that the United States has 10 times their population, and that they have a huge land mass. He called for better liaison on intelligence between law enforcement organizations.

A Canadian spoke about bank account seizures, and the formula for sharing the proceeds. He added that intelligence from third countries also is valuable, and cited as an example the assistance that had been provided recently by Jordan.

A Canadian noted that President Clinton had announced \$300 million in high-technology security measures.

An American argued that if somebody really wants to get across that border, they will, and that can never be changed.

Another American asked the Canadians if there was anything the United States should be doing now that they were not doing. A Canadian admitted that he and his countrymen were paranoid about Section 110. Apart from that, he said, all that is needed is cooperation. The Canadian parliament adopted a bill to allow pre-clearance, and that's reciprocal.

An American said that the United States has a terrific commissioner of customs. He urged the Canadians to go out to Dulles airport with this commissioner to see what people do to get drugs into the United States.

An American suggested that both countries need to address the other side of the drug issue: consumption.

A Canadian said that they definitely feel the United States is too severe on criminalization. Canada, he explained, is more in the European mold, which stresses the need for treatment. About one-third of Canada's drug policy resources are devoted to interdiction, one third to information, and one-third to health. Marijuana has been virtually decriminalized, as it takes up too much police and court time. Canada is struggling with this, and trying to look at the drug issue as a health problem, emphasizing prevention.

An American asked what the Canadians thought the result has been, and a Canadian replied that it was still too early to tell. In some parts of Vancouver and Toronto, he said, it's pretty depressing; it's a social problem of huge proportions. Politically, the Cana-

dian Alliance believes in stronger criminalization, while the BQ views it as a health problem.

A member of the Canadian Alliance said that his party's criticism is focused on how the government deals with violent offenders. Even within the Canadian Alliance, there are people who believe in decriminalization. Most members of the party aren't inclined to imitate the American model because it doesn't appear to be working, he said.

A U.S. delegate stated that the United States has more people in prison than any democratic country in the world. Suddenly, all the states are realizing that the cost is fairly high, and that it creates employment problems, he said.

A Canadian then spoke about the successful rehabilitation program in Quebec. It has a low rate of recidivism. The province has a drug problem, he said, but the program helps people become honest citizens down the road.

Another Canadian said that his government is working with other Latin and South American countries on the decertification process.

Another Canadian said that they often hear in Canada the United States has a higher rate of incarceration, but that Canada's is much higher than the European average, and a very high percentage of the prison population is aboriginal; they are imprisoned for domestic violence, nonpayment of fines, and other social problems.

An American inquired whether anyone thought that demand will ever be reduced under decriminalization.

On the contrary, replied a Canadian. At a UN conference, he said, everyone was saying that even if today's drugs are stopped, they will be replaced by chemical drugs, because the ingredients are already there. He said that the real problem is how one determine what a precursor is for these drugs. An American agreed, noting that the recipes for these chemical drugs are already posted on the internet, which makes them much easier to produce.

An American asked to hear more about the Quebec drug rehabilitation program; what was happening there to make it work? A Canadian responded that the provincial government has a directorate to protect youngsters. A social worker looks at a child who's having problems, and helps him get the proper treatment to help him. The approach does not seek to punish, but to try to reeducate, to provide what's lacking in the home or school. It's expensive to do that, he admitted, but it costs much less than later law enforcement. We don't think legislation will make a youngster think twice, he said; instead, we make sure that we correct as early as possible what is going wrong.

The American responded that, in his state, the best thing going was the civic courts, where the judge was a sort of social worker. Also, the state had alternatives to juvenile facility camps. It's expensive, he said, but probably the best way to deal with the problem.

A Canadian said that, at the WTO summit in Seattle, he had heard that, in one or two Carribean countries, the banana economy had collapsed and people were growing dope. He urged that the

Americans keep that in mind the next time they go after a particular product.

#### CUBA

A U.S. participant began by saying that he thought that the feeling is changing in his country. People say the best thing Castro has going for him is the embargo, because he can blame everything on America. After the dissidents were jailed last year, Castro was very perturbed by the Canadian reaction, referring to "my former friend Lloyd Axworthy!" The policy we have is driven by a vocal lobby in Miami, and their ability to do this has been hampered by the handling of the Elian Gonzales case. All of this has changed the temper here. Cuban-Americans suffered greatly and have strong family values, but they overstepped on the Elian thing, he said.

A Canadian noted that Canada was now sending almost 200,000 tourists a year to Cuba. A lot of American money is going to families in Cuba. The Cuban government is pretty sensible, he said; the issue for them is sovereignty. They are afraid of the United States coming in and taking over. They point to the collapse in Russia. There's an opportunity here. If there were some way to let Cuba develop in a moderate way it would be the best thing for all of us. If the embargo had been gone 20 years ago, Castro would be gone by now.

An American said that there is a feeling of oppression—worrying what one says aloud. He said he finds it very difficult that it's the only country that he can't go to without his government's permission. It's a remnant of the Cold War that should change. The Chamber of Commerce wants things changed, and they're conservative, he said.

#### LAND MINES

A U.S. participant said that the United States was the first country to pass a law to ban the trade in land mines. The most important thing in this movement was the Ottawa process. The treaty was signed, but unfortunately the United States didn't take it seriously. In Oslo, the American concerns about Korea would have been accommodated. The U.S. government officials said they didn't want to listen to other countries that were willing to negotiate. Just before the treaty was to be signed, President Clinton was calling world leaders, but it was too late by then. There is a great deal of reason to try to get the United States into this treaty. There will have to be some accommodation. The Americans are spending much more than anyone else on land mine removal. There are ways of accommodating everyone. The United States is only using self-destruct mines. A lot of the countries that signed the treaty are not abiding by it. Many other countries haven't signed because the United States hasn't. Canadian peacekeepers are in more danger of mines than anything else—in Mozambique, for example. Most of the people in Congress who have been in combat support the land mine ban. I think it's doable, he concluded.

Another American asked whether that was going to happen within the next year or two, and the first American replied that he thought it would. The United States, he said, is not going to use

anything that isn't in the treaty; it's getting rid of all the dumb mines in Korea. There's a realization that even the Korean mine field is a danger to U.S. troops, and that the fields can be breached in a matter of hours. He added that General Shalikashvili had told him not long ago that he was convinced it would pass within a couple of years. It is unlikely for any treaty to be passed this year, due to the elections.

A Canadian said that he wanted to make a couple of points on behalf of the Canadian government. First of all, he said, there was a lot of talk in the NATO delegation that the alliance had to do things because the UN was weak. He said that he had raised the issue of the dues to the UN, and said they were old and should be paid in full, not piecemeal. The United States isn't a third world country negotiating with the World Bank, he asserted. We spoke about isolationism versus multilateralism. The United States wants to cherry-pick issues, and lead when it suits them. Fundamental to this is the UN and the payment of dues. Some of this is due to criticism of the UN, but you have to pay to the club to remain a member and effect change.

An American stated that the message is abortion. Period. He said that he and a lot of other Members were fighting this. In the House last year, he said, there were something like 80 abortion votes-on trade, medicine, and the military. The House leadership is trying to do something about this. There was a motion to eliminate all peripheral issues from the appropriations process—there were 28 amendments pending.

Another American argued that the world is different today than it was in the late 1940s, when we had to pay a higher percentage because the European countries were on their knees. Now they are rich, and should pay more.

A Canadian countered that a reduction in shares has to be negotiated among all members.

Another Canadian said that the attitude at home is: "pay the bills and we'll address the reform issues together." He said that the Americans have someone on the UN staff who has been changing things—it's no longer the Aegean stables, he argued.

An American said that the UN is not understood in the United States; our payment really isn't out of line when you look at what the Europeans pay, as a percentage of GDP. We're paying less than some. Many of us are embarrassed, even if we support reform. He said that he agreed that the United States should not put conditions on its repayment.

Regarding UN reform, a Canadian said that they, too, had their frustrations, but that they want to be in the UN tent trying to change it.

#### INTERNET

A Canadian began by discussing the recent "I love you" virus. We have a lot of problems, he said. The "Mafiaboy" thing is very simple; he said: a guy in Montreal sent messages to addresses in the United States, and shut down their computers. He was arrested. The "love" virus destroyed files, and used address books to move on. Can legislation stop that? Think of an electrical system we have in any home, which is connected to a grid, and a network of grids.

There is an set of breakers that will prevent a shutdown of the whole system. But the Mafiaboy situation should be coped with through breakers, so that a problem can be stopped at the nearest location. Any department in Canada or the United States can build it, he said. As far as viruses are concerned, all of our computers can monitor situations—except for themselves; they aren't intelligent at all that way. The operating systems need to be intelligent enough to protect themselves. We can trace the culprit today, but we need to be able to stop a virus before it spreads.

An American noted that all the preparations that were done for Y2K weren't necessary. The real danger came a few months later, and we weren't ready for it.

It's kids doing this, not foreign countries, said a Canadian. Think of what they could do if they tried. We have all the technology we need to intercept such problems, so let's install it, he urged.

### **COMMITTEE III-TRANSBORDER ISSUES**

Committee III was co-chaired by U.S. Senator Frank Murkowski and Canadian Member of Parliament Joseph R. Comuzzi.

#### **BORDER FACILITATION**

Consideration of border facilitation issues led off with a discussion of efforts to amend Section 110 of the U.S. Immigration Reform Act, which has been a concern of the Interparliamentary Group (IPG) for several years. An American member observed that he had attended several sessions of the IPG, and saw the Section 110 issue as an example of how the IPG can have significant influence by helping educate and persuade members of Congress and the Parliament that certain issues need to be addressed. He noted that the Section 110 matter has been one of the most contentious issues between the two countries, but that a bill to correct the problem was introduced in Congress just before this year's meeting, and is expected to become law well before an existing temporary measure expires. He added that he did not believe this solution would have been possible without the work done by IPG members, and suggested that there were other areas of customs and immigration law that could use similar efforts.

A Canadian delegate responded that the efforts of American members on the Section 110 issue have been highly successful and very satisfactory from the Canadian viewpoint. The delegate agreed that other issues will also require the efforts of IPG members to resolve, noting especially the issues of pre-clearance for customs, and Section 342 of the Immigration Act, which affects healthcare workers.

#### **PRE-CLEARANCE AT AIRPORTS**

On pre-clearance, a Canadian member indicated that Canadian legislation has been passed and is being fine-tuned at the highest government level to resolve issues involving the authority of U.S. officials operating in Canada. Unless that is completed, over 66 sites in the United States will remain inaccessible for direct flights from Canada due to the lack of customs clearance at those locations.

An American agreed, noting a personal experience with an aircraft that was detained overnight because customs officials had gone home when the delayed flight arrived in the U.S.

A Canadian member then suggested that customs coverage needs to be expanded, not just for air travel but for rail and vessel travel as well, saying this would provide smoother transportation and travel throughout the system.

Another American asked if the intention would be to apply the same pre-clearance principle to private travel as well, saying that

private aircraft were often forced to divert to airports with customs coverage before continuing to a final destination. This was noted to be a problem with other forms of private transportation as well, such as snow machines, which are not restricted to highways with border stations.

A Canadian responded that there was no reason why the pre-clearance concept could not be applied to private aircraft. Another said that efforts were being made to work out a call-in clearance system for boaters and snowmobilers.

Another Canadian delegate indicated an understanding that the negotiations toward a reciprocal agreement had broken down, but efforts are being made to get them back on track and deal with two issues: the U.S. desire to have customs officials on Canadian soil armed (as they are when in the U.S.) when Canadian customs officers are not armed, and the issue of U.S. enforcement officers being subject to civil liability if something went wrong.

A Canadian delegate then suggested that the IPG should go on record to encourage both countries to expand the pre-clearance program and make it more generally applicable to all forms of travel.

An American noted that there are a number of inconsistencies in treatment at the present time, calling attention to the fact that the clearance "policy" seems to vary with circumstances—some borders are on an honor system at certain times of the day, for example. The member also called for a strong resolution from the IPG.

Another American suggested the IPG should appoint a sub-committee or working group to bring together customs officials from both sides and work on drafting a report on specific needs. This met with general approval.

An American then raised a non-agenda item described as an irritant: the disparity in the personal exemption allowance for those returning to the two countries. An American returning from Canada can bring in \$200 worth of goods, while a Canadian can only bring back \$50 worth. The members then discussed without resolution whether there are different rules depending on the length of the visitor's stay. After additional discussion, it was decided that two of the Canadian members would get together in the interim and try to define this matter more clearly.

#### WATER RESOURCES

The committee then took up the diversion of water resources, with a Canadian remarking that Canada has serious concerns about the Devil's Lake project, which would divert overflow from the lake into systems that flow into Canada. Two Americans agreed that it was not popular in their areas of the Midwest and Great Lakes regions, either.

An American also noted that the biggest concern may not simply be the possibility of downstream flooding, but also the movement of pollutants such as agricultural chemicals into areas where they may create problems. This individual also stated that the issue has become highly politicized on both sides of the border, a sentiment with which many members agreed.

## ALASKA-YUKON-B.C. RAILROAD LINK

An American next presented information regarding a proposal to connect the continental rail system, presumably through its northernmost point in British Columbia, with the Alaska Railroad system which presently terminates near Fairbanks, Alaska. It was noted that the proposal had originated during the 40th annual meeting, during a discussion of a West Coast trade corridor project. At this time, one of the American delegates has offered legislation to create and fund a bilateral commission to investigate the feasibility of the project and is hoping the legislation will be moved this year. The committee then discussed the project, including various potential routes for new track. An American explained that such a route was actually surveyed during World War II, but events of that conflict resulted in the line never being constructed. In response to a Canadian question, an American clarified that the legislative proposal is silent with respect to a partially similar proposal by a private individual in British Columbia. No support is being offered to that individual, it was stated, but neither is he being opposed.

The committee also heard from an American that other developments could stem from the rail connection, if the latter were completed. Mineral resources such as coal could be shipped from Northwest Alaska, for example, and eventually a connection might be made with the Russian rail system. It was noted that the Russian government has been in the process of extending its system north from Tynda, but has no current plans to move as far up the coast as would be necessary for a connection. The committee consensus on the rail proposal was positive, and a small working group was named to continue encouraging officials in both countries to view it favorably.

## PACIFIC COAST FISHERIES, INCLUDING SALMON

The committee next took up the subject of the Pacific Salmon Treaty, which has been one of the most contentious issues on the IPG agenda for several years. It was reported by a Canadian member that a resolution to the long-standing conflict was reached last summer, and that the treaty revisions will stand for a period of several years. The negotiated settlement will shift emphasis toward conservation, which both countries consider necessary.

An American then noted that another key provision was the agreement to move from giving each country specific harvest quotas to a system in which harvests will reflect actual abundance. According to the American this change will probably be the single biggest influence toward recovering stocks that are currently at low levels.

Finally, a Canadian member noted that the one remaining irritant, the matter of a fee charged by Canada against U.S. fishing vessels in 1994, had also been resolved. An American provided additional detail, explaining that just two days before this year's conference, the Canadian ambassador to the United States had responded to a letter sent by two U.S. members of the IPG last summer, in which they had suggested that an amount equivalent to the fees collected might be productively deposited into salmon con-

ervation funds created under the new treaty provisions. This was agreed to by the Canadian government, with the ambassador's letter specifying that the sum of CAN\$500,000 is to be deposited.

#### TRANSPORTATION ISSUES INCLUDING TRADE CORRIDORS

A Canadian then commenced a discussion of more general transportation needs and trade corridors by noting a recent Canadian national highway initiative, which has been championed by IPG members and is in some respect a response to issues raised in previous meetings. Two Canadian members joined to explain that although the Canadian federal government is not considered responsible for highways, new legislation will put approximately \$150 million per year toward highway and border point needs. While not as much as the United States spends, this is a major change in direction for Canada, which has previously left highway construction to provincial governments.

#### ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES

The committee then turned its attention to Atlantic fisheries issues. Two Canadian members explained that management problems have been aggravated by a recent Canadian court decision—the Marshall decision—regarding aboriginal fishing rights. While specific to eel fishing, other fisheries may ultimately be implicated, and Canada is attempting to work out the new relationships between aboriginal fishers and others. It was noted also that a group of Passamaquoddy Indians from the United States is attempting to use the rights granted to Canadian Passamaquoddies to gain privileges in Canada.

Another Canadian termed the issue of Native American fishing rights "very explosive." He commented that the approach of reducing the number of available non-Indian licenses would have the effect of raising the price for the remaining licenses beyond the means of most fishermen.

A Canadian raised the issue of aquaculture, suggesting that improvements in technology for fish farming had been made in recent years, and stating a belief that environmental organizations opposed to aquaculture are dealing with information that is several years out of date. This led to a discussion between American and Canadian participants about the similarities and differences in the aquaculture debate in Maine and in the Pacific Northwest, especially with regard to Atlantic salmon and depressed stocks in the Columbia/Snake river system.

An American raised the question of whether any of the stocks now remaining in Maine streams could be termed "wild" after so many years of stocking hatchery-bred fish which return to spawn, and questioned the application of the U.S. Endangered Species Act in that case.

A Canadian member observed that it is clear that the courts are entering what the member described as a legislative arena, citing Canada's Marshall case and the Boldt decision in Washington State several years ago, both dealing with aboriginal fishing rights. This section of the agenda closed with several members making in-

dividual observations on aspects of aboriginal/non-aboriginal fishing relationships under the laws as defined.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Discussion then turned to the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence Seaway transportation system. A Canadian delegate noted that the system now moves approximately 225 million tons of cargo per year, mostly bulk goods. Approximately 32 to 35 million tons goes through the St. Lawrence. Among the problems currently facing the system are reduced water levels, which affect the load each vessel can carry through areas where the depth is insufficient for a full load.

The member also noted that tolls and fees under the separate U.S. and Canadian seaway administrations can be prohibitively costly, and suggested that Canada and the United States should combine administrations for the Seaway to achieve a significant cost saving. According to the member, the cost reduction could make it possible to avoid direct tolls and charges, and finance the Seaway through local port authorities. The member noted that the IPG has discussed this proposal several times in the past, and that Canada—as of two weeks before the current IPG meeting—was now prepared to go forward on discussions toward a combined administrative system.

An American delegate asked what would be required for the United States to engage in such discussions. The Canadian responded that it would certainly require a memo of understanding, but legislation may not be necessary.

A Canadian noted that there has been strong support from former U.S. delegates to the IPG, one of whom spoke in favor at a hearing.

An American commented that the United States has been interested in improvements in the Seaway system, and was concerned about Canada's recent move to unilaterally raise rates for passage.

An American then suggested that the committee should go on record supporting the proposal to develop a joint system. This met with general approval.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: CLIMATE CHANGE, WATER AND AIR QUALITY

A Canadian reiterated concern over the falling water levels in the Great Lakes. This led the discussion into the issue of global climate change. An American noted that if the Arctic ice pack is indeed melting at the rate suggested by some, it might solve the low water problem altogether. The member noted that there is a continuing debate over competing hypotheses, and the state of the science is insufficient to draw conclusions.

A Canadian stated that Canada is concerned about the future of the Kyoto Accord, noting the possibility that rising temperatures could cause a cascade of economic effects.

An American commented that it was a very emotional issue, but that the scientific information on human activity as a proximate cause is not consistent. It was noted that solid evidence from ice coring in Greenland indicates there have been a series of cyclical climatic changes in the past, without human intervention. The

member noted that many U.S. parliamentarians felt there would be no net gain from the Kyoto Accord, especially in that it would provide greater flexibility to developing nations despite the fact that some, such as China, will in a fairly short time be surpassing the western nations as sources of pollution. On the other hand, said the member, Congress would be more likely to support a plan to assist developing nations gain the benefit of technical work to help them avoid becoming a problem, and allow all nations to be treated equally.

A Canadian noted that despite strong Canadian support for Kyoto, what mattered most was whether the United States is in fact improving air quality, not the formal agreement to do so.

Another American commented that air quality measurements are indeed improving, and significant strides have been made by the United States.

A Canadian remarked that the financial issues involved go far beyond the cost of new technology, citing the economic and social costs of various respiratory complaints that are aggravated by poor air quality. The same delegate suggested that because clean air is a shared resource, we should work together to devise incentives for businesses to produce cleaner products.

An American cited Michigan as a State that has made significant progress controlling its own pollution sources, but has still not achieved full compliance with air quality regulations because it is affected by sources outside the state. Some of those sources are still operating at higher pollution levels than sources in Michigan because they were dirtier to begin with, and were given more time to comply with regulations.

Another American stated that air quality controls will be an issue as Congress deals with electrical service deregulation, noting that some power companies resent the fact that they had to clean up emissions while others were allowed to continue using cheaper but less environment friendly technology. "Now those companies want to sell us power," remarked the delegate.

A Canadian member summed up the debate on the issue by calling on both American and Canadian members to continue pressing on air quality matters.

## FINAL PLENARY SESSION

### COMMITTEE I

A Canadian began by offering a retrospective on U.S.-Canada trade. Over the last two or three years, he said, a number of controversial issues are resolving themselves nicely through the dispute resolution mechanism. He named dairy as one example; other agricultural issues, he said, were addressed in 1998 under the ROU. In general, there has been "economic peace." The cultural issue has been resolved, although Canada still feels strongly about it; the two sides have come to a fair accommodation on the question of spit-runs.

The delegate then discussed several issues that are still on the agenda. Seattle, he said, demonstrated the need for more transparency and accountability in the WTO. The main issue for growing globalization is how various countries should adjust.

The participant said that he hoped the U.S. Congress would sort out the problems with China. By opening up trade with the Chinese, he said, we will more closely engage them, and reduce the trade imbalance. Hopefully, there will be a breakthrough on communications—they are keeping our high-value equipment out of their markets with high tariffs. On the transatlantic trade dialogue, the delegate characterized Europe as an "iron curtain of trade." The EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is keeping North American farmers from selling in that market. We are prevented on all forms of agriculture from penetrating their markets—that includes raw commodities and processed foods, he said.

The Canadian representative reported that there had been a consensus in the committee on the FTAA. There was a sense that Brazil was attempting to keep out North America. Canada and the United States, therefore, share the same concerns: if we don't penetrate this market, we'll be shut out by the Europeans, who have made a concerted effort to get in.

The delegate said that the bilateral agricultural issues could be resolved; only sugar is going to be a problem. We have to admonish our bureaucrats to be sensitive to that. On pharmaceuticals, the delegate reported that the Canadians had sorted out their price structure. In Canada, there has been a problem with Americans coming over to fill their prescriptions. We think prices are too high, he said. The aging of the population contributes to this issue. On electronic commerce, he said that the United States is way ahead in terms of web sites and commerce. There are some common problems, including intellectual property, privacy, and piracy. Private industry is trying to squash costs; we need to set up some policy about the cost of government, he asserted. Turning to softwood lumber, the Canadian participant cautioned that, once the agreement terminates, serious problems may re-emerge. He said that

the Canadians were in favor of a level playing field, and that they don't want countervailing duties as a threat. Both sides are compared to compete, he said. He closed by stating that Sable gas was providing cheap, efficient gas in the northeastern corner of the United States, and that a lifeline depends on this project.

An American opened by responding that he did not disagree with much of what the Canadian had said—something which was fairly uncharacteristic of many of the recent IPG meetings. He said that, when it comes to the WTO, dispute settlement is pretty much the basis for what we've done for 50 years, and particularly since 1994. The United States wants to keep it going, especially with regard to agricultural problems with Europe. Central to keeping the process working is the leadership the United States has exhibited since 1947; however, this has been in a lull in recent years because the U.S. President hasn't been active, and Congress hasn't provided fast track to allow him to negotiate. We won't get far in reducing barriers to trade—particularly agricultural trade—until we get the United States back into a position of leadership, he contended. There are negotiations on services and agriculture, but there won't be much success in those areas until there's an all-encompassing agreement. Under a new administration, this must be given top priority. This will also help with the transatlantic trade agenda, and the FTAA. The U.S. Government hasn't been doing enough to include Canada, and it should because of the affinity on trade issues. The key nations need to get the Seattle round started again; some believe that environmental and labor issues need to be put on the agenda. On the issue of China, the American said that he thought that Congress would grant China Permanent Normal Trade Relations status by a narrow margin. He then discussed problems with the EU and identified subsidies as the main issue; the Europeans have over 80 percent of all the subsidies in the world, he claimed. The FTAA is closely tied to fast track and involves countries that want to cooperate, isolating Brazil.

The U.S. participant said that he saw improvements in the area of agriculture, noting that U.S. cattle were being exported into Canada. He said that Congress was trying to pass a concurrent resolution to let the softwood lumber agreement expire, and to discourage the countervailing duty cases that would be launched by U.S. industries. The U.S. delegate then characterized the pharmaceuticals issue as "very touchy." It is not primary to Congress, he said, and is probably more of an American than a Canadian problem.

The American closed by discussing the dispute over of meat labeling, which he described as not nearly as acute as in the past. He said that the U.S. side was asking whether it was worth the additional cost, given the harm that it does to U.S. interests. Nevertheless, there is a feeling among American farmers and consumers that they should have information—that food origination ought to be known by the consumer as well as everything else.

A Canadian said that there had been some dissent on the consensus over the WTO, and urged, as Clinton had done, that the concerns being addressed with respect to the need for the globalization paradigm take into account such things as cultural diversity, labor and environment; these are legitimate concerns, the

Canadian said, and they won't go away. He also said that Chapter 11 of the NAFTA should be examined, as both Americans and Canadians are suing as a result of decisions made by State government; even supporters of NAFTA are critical of this, he said. The problem is that decisions are no longer being made by democratically elected politicians; they're done by the WTO. As examples, he cited the U.S. Endangered Species Act, and Canadian gasoline additives. Ultimately, they are political issues, he argued.

Another Canadian stated that, while transparency of the WTO is important, the benefits of the WTO also need to be explained, and that those benefits have not been communicated very well. We need to arm ourselves with the facts to show that trade enriches people, he said, and that income must be created before it can be redistributed.

Another Canadian offered the concrete suggestion that a parliamentary assembly be created for WTO countries and urged that that recommendation be accepted. Otherwise, he argued, the whole of the civil society input will be done by the non-governmental organizations, who aren't elected. We delegates here are the most representative of the people. On FTAA, he said that he had traveled to Brazil and met with many officials, and that he had developed the clear impression that the Brazilians have no interest in pursuing the FTAA. He said that Brazil is the hegemon of Mercosur, and feels it needs to get in control of its own economy and Mercosur. He suggested that consideration be given to "making an end run around them," as Brazil will be hostile to the FTAA for at least another 10 years.

A Canadian urged fellow delegates to contemplate the failure of the WTO to deliver on the promises of the Uruguay Round for freer agricultural trade. Patience is running out, he said. On Chapter 11, he compared the Canadian banning of MMT, a gas additive, to softwood lumber. If there's manipulative activity on legislation, the two sides should go to the dispute resolution mechanism.

An American said that he had met with Brazilian President Cardoso for an hour and came away with the same impression: the Brazilians are going to stay with Mercosur and talk to the Europeans. The United States needs to pass fast track, sit down with the Canadians, and work on the FTAA.

A Canadian pointed to the fallout from the debate over the proposed Multilateral Agreement on Investment, which left people with the impression that big business is in charge of the agenda. The perception is one we're stuck with if we don't address it, he said.

## COMMITTEE II

A Canadian began summarizing the committee's session by saying there were few areas of dispute. On the Balkans, there was quite a debate last year on how appropriate our involvement was; this year it was retrospective. He said that more money ought to be spent on conflict prevention than on the wars themselves. He stated that the committee had also wrestled with the difficult issue of where and when to get involved—Kosovo, but not Chechnya—and had also discussed the use of military force. Canadian forces,

he said, were more geared for peace-keeping operations, and U.S. forces for technological war-making.

Turning attention eastward, the delegate noted that the Caspian region has big potential, but lots of corruption, and that many of the countries in the area are politically unstable. He urged that North America focus on it now, given the resource potentials. On Russia, he summarized the committee's sentiment that the verdict is out on Mr. Putin, but that, given Russia's nuclear capability, it needs to be watched carefully.

On the issue of NMD, the Canadian representative noted that there had been skepticism in the room on lots of aspects of the proposed missile shield, including its technological feasibility, and the effect it might have on relations with Russia. This is a domestic issue for the United States, but we all need to discuss it, he stated; in the meantime, all sides should continue to pursue nonproliferation.

The Canadian also discussed the possibility of the two sides working together more closely, especially on developing health care programs for and improving trade with Africa. On the issue of bilateral security cooperation, he stated that Canada and the United States have the longest undefended border in the world, and that security problems will not be solved by Section 110 but by increased cooperation across the border. He pointed out that there is a lot more trans-border cooperation than people realize—through the police and others—and that it will intensify. He reported that the two sides had discussed their different domestic approaches, with the United States relying more on incarceration, and Canada focusing on health and rehabilitation. Cuba, he said, is not as controversial as it has been in the past. Everyone pretty much agrees that the embargo is counterproductive; the Elian Gonzales case pointed that up. Canada has been pursuing a policy of engagement, but it has not been working as well as hoped—Canada was very disappointed with the jailing of dissidents; the Cuban government broke its word. On land mines, the delegate expressed hope that the United States would adhere to the treaty with some reservations. And on the UN, he said that the committee discussed the payment of U.S. dues and the need for institutional reform. He concluded his report by saying that the committee agreed that e-commerce needed a technical, not a governmental solution.

An American began by saying that both sides are curious about the outcome of the U.S.-Russia summit next month. On missile defense, he said that if the tests are successful, its popularity among Americans will increase, but if it doesn't work, support may falter—especially if people realize that the system will be designed to protect missile sites rather than population centers; finally, the public reaction against spending may decide the debate.

The U.S. delegate said that a number of Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, agreed that Section 110 needs to be put in abeyance, at a minimum. Last week, he said, legislation was introduced to address it. Cuba will continue to be a problem, he said. Many believe that the embargo has outlived its usefulness. More and more people, especially in the farm states, but also within the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, want to make changes in the embargo, and it will likely happen. On the issue of land mines, the

American agreed that the United States does have to find a way to get into the treaty. Otherwise, it will be difficult for the country to exercise leadership on this issue.

An American participant inquired about the Canadian position on missile defense. A Canadian explained that his government would not make a decision until the United States does so. On the other hand, he said, the parliament has held hearings, and there is an internal debate in Canada between the Foreign Ministry and the Department of National Defense. Some policy makers, he said, believe that NMD would increase the possibility of nuclear war; others feel that Canada's position in NORAD compels us to support it.

An American asked the Canadians to comment on the staying power of Canada in the Balkans and on the vote in the U.S. Senate last week on a possible U.S. withdrawal. A Canadian responded that his government was discussing reducing the number of troops in Kosovo and moving them to Bosnia, but that Canada would not reduce the overall number of troops in the area. Another Canadian asserted that there should be clear objectives, and that when those objectives are accomplished, Canada should go. He said that he didn't think those objectives had been clearly delineated yet.

Another Canadian asked about the ABM treaty and how NMD would fit into it. He also asked about the hardware. An American said that he hoped that Clinton and Putin will address not only this issue, but also the danger represented by the dispute between India and Pakistan.

An American reported that his group of lawmakers had really made the change in Section 110 come about in Congress. He said that several Members had orchestrated efforts in the House, working with the White House, the Senate, and the Chamber of Commerce. He discussed legislation that would be introduced soon. He attributed the likely success of the initiative to the efforts of the IPG.

### COMMITTEE III

Before launching his report on Committee III, an American said that, on NMD, the Russians had already built a system, and that the United States had not. The two U.S. tests had been inconclusive; the test in June will help determine what happens. The debate will also focus on the likely sites, whether in North Dakota or in Alaska. The emphasis at this point in the United States is focused on third world countries, although that might change with time. The launch technology also might change, he said.

On trans-boundary issues, a Canadian pointed out that the Pacific Salmon dispute has been resolved. An American replied that gratitude might be more appropriate than a detailed explanation. He outlined some of the highlights of the agreement, and gave special thanks to two members of the Canadian delegation for helping resolve the issue—finally.

A Canadian then thanked the Americans who are working on the Section 110 issue. She also talked about the Devils Lake and Garrison diversion project. She further reported that there had been a resolution in the committee encouraging the two governments to work together on the preclearance issue. She then spoke about

transportation and trade corridors, noting that 70 percent of all goods are transported by trucks, and that there are tens of millions of daily trips; the Canadian government was providing some funding to alleviate problems in this area, she said. She then discussed Atlantic coast fisheries, particularly Maine and the Passamaquoddy Indians. Turning to environmental issues, she said that climate change is still a key issue for her country, and that Canadians hope the Americans will sign the Kyoto Accord. She said that there has been tremendous progress on Great Lakes water quality, but that we still have a ways to go. She noted that the International Joint Commission would like a long-term study on climate change. Finally, she said that air quality is an issue in Southern Ontario.

On the issue of Atlantic Coast fisheries, an American said that the intention to list Atlantic salmon as an endangered species is a very serious issue that would affect not only Maine, but New Brunswick as well. In the United States, both Republicans and Democrats in the area are united in the belief that this is no distinct population of Atlantic salmon. Another American participant raised the question of whether native fishermen would be exempt from the ban under the Endangered Species Act. On climate change, the U.S. representatives said that the Kyoto treaty would not be ratified because it does not apply to developing nations, especially China. But there was a consensus that we need to work to reduce emissions, she said.

On the St. Lawrence Seaway, a U.S. delegate said that there are two organizations—one American, the other Canadian—that are spending \$90 million, and that they should be put together into one, which would reduce the cost down to maybe \$35 million, passing the savings along to shippers. A Canadian talked about boat movement and ballasting. He said that a Michigan representative was introducing legislation on this, and that the regulations might affect traffic.

An American spoke about the Devil's Lake project; North Dakota is proposing to drain the lake 100 miles south, into the Red River. Neither Manitoba nor Minnesota nor the environmentalists are happy about this, he said, but it is a huge issue in North Dakota. The lake has exploded in size, covering whole towns. Some have expressed doubt whether the proposed channel will drain enough water. To meet some of the environmental objections, the North Dakotans are proposing to treat the water so that it will be like municipal water. The environmentalists disapprove of this, however, because it would make the water too clean. The Canadians are skeptical. The delegate also discussed the problem of cormorants, which are creating problems in the region; he proposed that they be hunted more extensively, although the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is opposed.

A Canadian member presented her report on trade corridors. The funding that both countries put into this tends to be disbursed without being prioritized, she said. She highlighted the two recommendations of the report, suggesting that an American organization similar to Canada's be created, so that the two countries could work on the problem together. She said that her report points out a need for Municipal, State and Provincial, and Federal authorities to talk together on what is preventing free movement through

these corridors, which include roads, air routes, waterways, and railroads.

A Canadian raised the issue of a Canadian-American railroad merger that was being blocked. A U.S. participant said that he thought the Surface Transportation Board had said that it wanted to take a year to review its policies on all mergers, but that they were told by a court that they could not do so. So the process is probably back on track, he said, although the major railroads in the United States may challenge this in the courts.

An American spoke of the dream of connecting the state of Alaska by rail through Canada to the lower forty-eight; and made a presentation on the issue.

