

Canada - United States
Inter-Parliamentary Group
Canadian Section



Groupe interparlementaire
Canada - États-Unis
Section canadienne

**Report of the Canadian parliamentary delegation of the
Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group
to the 47th annual meeting
Charleston, South Carolina
May 5-8, 2006**

From 5-8 May 2006, the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group held its 47th Annual Meeting in Charleston, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were seven Canadian Senators and fifteen members of the House of Commons, as well as four American Senators and eleven members of the House of Representatives. The list of delegates is attached.

Report

Briefing on the western hemisphere travel initiative

Delegates began the 47th Annual Meeting with a briefing by officials of the U.S. Department of State (State) and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) on the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI). In general terms, the briefing outlined the parameters of the Initiative and the timeline for its implementation.

Delegates were told that the implementation of the WHTI, which has a Congressional mandate, is a partnership between State and DHS. Section 7209 of the 2004 U.S. Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act, which codifies a recommendation of the 911 Commission, will require all travelers to have “a passport or other document or a combination thereof deemed acceptable by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be sufficient to denote citizenship and identity.” It is anticipated that implementation of the WHTI will strengthen hemispheric border security and facilitate travel without hindering the legitimate flow of people and goods.

The officials informed delegates that, as of 31 December 2006, the WHTI will apply to all air and sea travel to or from Canada, Mexico, Central America, South America, the Caribbean and Bermuda; as of 31 December 2007, the Initiative will also apply to land border crossings. They indicated that the air and sea requirement is likely to be less problematic than the land requirement.

According to the officials, about 6 million Americans will need approved documents related to the implementation of the first phase, and 1 million thereafter; in the next five years, it is anticipated that 27 million people will receive documents, and that two-thirds of these individuals will receive their documents in the next 24 months. Moreover, delegates were informed that passport demand in the United States has doubled in the last three years, and that many more Americans are now renewing their passports than has previously been the case.

Delegates were also told that:

26% of American citizens currently have a passport, a figure that has doubled in the last decade;

40% of Canadians have passports;

there are 17 passport agencies in the United States, with 7,500 sites at other government agencies and 9,000 points of service expected to exist within the next year; and

3.1 million passports were issued in Canada in 2005-2006.

Officials also spoke about the passport card, a secure, credit-card-sized document with the rights of a passport that establishes identity and nationality for land travel. The card is less costly than a conventional, book-style passport.

Finally, delegates were told that the Department of Homeland Security is engaged, with its hemispheric neighbours, in a dialogue about how the Initiative will be implemented. Since the Initiative is currently required by law, the real question is how best to

implement it. At this point in time, it appears that “all options are on the table” and everything will be done through the rule-making process. In closing, the officials noted that implementation of the Initiative is a challenge and the timelines are tight.

Opening plenary

The opening plenary session of the 47th Annual Meeting began with delegates introducing themselves and making a commitment to develop consensus statements in each of the three Committees. It was agreed that these consensus statements would be used to develop a common statement about policy objectives that delegates would like to achieve.

The current political environment in each country was then described. A Conservative Member of Parliament described the make-up of Parliament and the difference between a coalition government and a minority government, which he characterized by saying that a minority government does not need agreement with another party in order to govern. Instead, in a minority Parliament, the governing party seeks support on an issue-by-issue basis, especially with respect to money bills. He also informed delegates that all three opposition parties would have to vote together and against the government in order for the government to be defeated; the Senate, however, is a different matter since there are significantly more Liberal Senators than there are Conservative Senators. In his view, while the government may hold a weak minority in terms of seats, it is a relatively stable minority that will last perhaps two years. He concluded by suggesting that the Conservative Party of Canada tends to be relatively more friendly toward the United States, which should bode well for the future of the bilateral relationship.

A Liberal Member of Parliament noted that there are philosophical differences among the four parties in the House of Commons, but the parties are united on one issue: they do not want another election in the short term, and nor does the Canadian public. The Liberals are currently becoming accustomed to being the Official Opposition, following 13 years as the governing party. He noted that the Liberal Party of Canada has a great deal of experience with bilateral issues.

A Liberal Senator described the Senate as a “check and balance” for the Executive, and noted that the Chamber has blocked and/or defeated government legislation from time to time; for example, it did so with respect to free-trade legislation. Regarding our bilateral relationship, he noted that we need to remember that our interests are sometimes the same, sometimes different. In his view, the axiom that “all politics is local” is important and it should always be remembered that no political party in Canada is anti-American: all parties support the bilateral relationship.

In noting that the Canadian Senate’s legislative jurisdiction is co-equal with the House of Commons only to a point – that point being money bills – a Conservative Senator predicted that there is unlikely to be significant obstructionist activity by the Liberal Senators, who hold a majority. A colleague noted that all political parties in Canada want a good and healthy relationship with the United States.

Attention then turned to the American political situation. A Democratic Representative suggested that the United States is in flux, and mentioned such factors as the war on

terror, rising gasoline prices, a budgetary deficit, etc. She suggested that: the standard of living is falling in the United States; it is increasingly costly to get a good education; the United States has lost its technological edge and must undertake more research and development; and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), with other trade agreements, has resulted in manufacturing job losses.

A Republican colleague described the bilateral relationship as the largest, most important commercial relationship, which is why we should always strive to tackle issues in a bilateral manner. In his view, the NAFTA is a success, with positive benefits for all countries; he suggested that success for Mexico is important, since prosperity there provides a disincentive to fleeing Mexico for such other countries as the United States.

Another Republican Representative focused his comments on the loss of the industrial base, the economic shifts that are occurring as a consequence of globalization and the shortage of skilled workers, while a colleague suggested that illegal immigration is connected to the downward pressure on wages: while the American economy is booming, the average working American has not had a real wage increase in five years. Finally, another colleague shared his view that the November mid-term elections in the U.S. could affect Canada: while the Republicans have a fairly firm control now, a number of seats are in jeopardy.

A Republican Senator shared his view that the parties are becoming increasingly polarized, with fewer in the centre: the Republicans are moving to the right and the Democrats are moving to the left. In his view, trade deficits are growing, energy costs are rising, and there is unease and uncertainty among the American people.

The need to work together to make a positive difference in both of our countries was highlighted by a Democratic Senator, who spoke specifically about the need to reach agreements about the security and defence of our countries. He also identified the need to attract and retain the best qualified employees, since there is a human capital deficit in the United States.

Committee I – Bilateral cooperation on regional trade, economic opportunities and prosperity building

Building economic prosperity through free and fair trade agreements

Background

As one of the most open of the world's major economies, Canada relies heavily on trade, as well as on effective – and effectively enforced – international trade rules. We are the ninth largest exporter and the tenth largest importer in the world, and one in five Canadian jobs is linked to trade.

Our nation's future economic prosperity continues to be tied to an open, transparent, rules-based international trading system at the multilateral, regional and bilateral levels. Canada believes that the international trading system should be characterized by predictable and enforceable rules, improved access to global markets and openness to world trade, while maintaining fundamental Canadian interests and values.

It is for this reason that Canada continues to pursue fundamental agricultural reform as well as other changes at the Doha round of World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations, including:

- the elimination of export subsidies as expeditiously as possible;
- substantial reductions in, if not elimination of, trade-distorting domestic support;
- substantial and meaningful improvements in market access for agricultural and food products;
- increased market access for goods and services;
- improved and clarified rules on trade remedies;
- strong, binding rules on trade facilitation; and
- real benefits for developing countries.

As well, Canada continues to: believe in the benefits of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA); support the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) negotiations; and launch – and continue – trade discussions and negotiations with other countries, regionally and bilaterally.

Discussion

A Member of Parliament open the discussion by suggesting that Canada has “high hopes” for the Doha round of WTO negotiations, in which Canada supports enhanced market access and reduced domestic support for the agriculture industry. In arguing for a level playing field, however, he identified agriculture as a big stumbling block. Finally, he noted that Canada supports state-trading enterprises that are consistent with our international trading obligations. A colleague supported his position on agriculture, noting that trade discussions always seem to get bogged down on this topic.

A Representative responded by commending Canada for its support of greater economic liberalization and the pursuit of additional trade opportunities. He, too, supports lower barriers and access to new markets but noted that the greatest divide between the United States and the European Union is agricultural support. He concluded by expressing his ongoing support for the Free Trade Area of the Americas negotiations, and suggesting that there is growing protectionism worldwide: what we must do is promote prosperity in India and China, and then trade with them.

Discussions continued with a Member of Parliament urging our countries to work together to grow and support our manufacturing base on a North American basis, as well as to protect intellectual property rights. He also noted that the NAFTA has been beneficial for Canada, despite periodic concerns, and indicated that the United States is moving much more quickly than Canada in signing bilateral trade agreements. Finally, he noted that agricultural subsidies are much lower in Canada than they are in the United States and the European Union. A colleague supported his position on the NAFTA, describing the agreement as the cornerstone for strengthening North American competitiveness.

According to another Representative, Brazil is the “real problem” and is among a number of countries that will not open up their industrial market in the foreseeable

future. He focused his comments on the topic of energy, particularly ethanol. He informed delegates that 60% of Brazilian gas is ethanol and, with a recently opened oil field, that country is now self-sufficient in energy; however, Brazil is an “environmental disaster in the making”, since toxic waste is being dumped when the ethanol is produced.

The Representative argued that ethanol may be one means by which farmers can reduce their reliance on subsidies, but noted that another U.S. Farm Bill will be needed before the European Union can really be trusted. He indicated that the United States is moving toward increased ethanol production, which is often owned by farmers or rural communities: farmers can make their corn into ethanol rather than export it at a loss, and earn relatively high profits as a consequence. Nevertheless, in his view and the view of a colleague who has introduced a renewable fuel bill in the House of Representatives, the United States lacks adequate infrastructure to market the ethanol to the consumer. Finally, he predicted that the Doha round will have to be extended, as was the case with the Uruguay round.

In discussing the next Farm Bill, a colleague noted that the fiscal position of the United States is much different today than was the case when the last Farm Bill was concluded; he predicted that the next Farm Bill will be less generous. He characterized energy as the key driver, a position that was supported by a colleague, who indicated that energy is critical and will control everything we do. This colleague also noted the diminishing number of manufacturing facilities, and argued that the U.S. government places no premium on the importance of manufacturing.

A Canadian Senator shared his views on a variety of trade-related topics: the European Union will not significantly reduce its farm subsidies; both countries should identify and exploit niche markets; and trade agreements lead to prosperity and growth. Despite this view on agricultural subsidies, both a Senate colleague and a Member of Parliament stressed that we must continue to push the European Union to reduce its levels of support.

Developing trade capacity in developing and micro economies in the western hemisphere

Background

Canada believes that trade can be an important tool in generating economic activity, which may lead to healthy economies and poverty alleviation. The importance of such other factors as economic stability, good governance, adequate health care and education, etc. must also be remembered.

One way in which countries worldwide – including Canada – support developing economies is through, for example, aspects of the Doha Development Agenda, which highlights the needs and concerns of developing countries around the world. Canada believes that growth and prosperity opportunities for developing countries will result in the attainment of other goals during the WTO negotiations, including: fundamental reform of world agricultural trade; significant increases in market access for goods and services; and binding rules for trade facilitation.

In addition to involvement in various work programs that are important to developing countries, Canada supports effective special and differential treatment as well as well-targeted, sustainably financed trade-related technical assistance and capacity-building activities.

Other trade and development initiatives include: the General Preferential Tariff, the Least-Developed Country Tariff, the Commonwealth Caribbean Country Tariff, and liberal rules of origin.

Finally, in the context of the FTAA process, Canada supports consideration of disparities among participating countries in their economic development as well as the Consultative Group on Smaller Economies.

Discussion

Discussion was launched by a Canadian Senator, who described the Auto Pact as the largest driver of jobs in the region; nevertheless, the domestic automobile industry is losing market share, which is resulting in job losses. A Representative responded by noting that the automobile industry – which is a major source of manufacturing employment and high-tech applications – incorporates all three NAFTA partners and identified the need to think strategically as North Americans. He said that the U.S. needs better regulatory and tax policies, and that productivity should be “incentivized.” A Member of Parliament mentioned changes in Canada with respect to corporate taxation and accelerated capital depreciation in some sectors.

Delegates also discussed human capital issues, with a Canadian Senator mentioning the brain drain and a lack of skills training; with these factors, we are losing some of our learning power for the future. A colleague identified labour mobility challenges associated with interprovincial barriers, as well as other labour challenges in a range of industries.

From the U.S. perspective, a Representative noted that while the U.S. is training engineers, they move to other countries following graduation. He said that the United States must be prepared to import skills that do not exist domestically, and that shortages of certain types of skilled labour put upward pressure on wages that – in some cases – results in firms being unable to compete. Moreover, he noted that American companies face aggressive pressure to undertake technology transfers when they enter Asian markets. A colleague commented on the significant legacy costs that exist with an aging population, with \$1,500 in health care costs embedded in the cost of every car.

Exploring options for better dispute resolution

Background

For some time, Canada has had concerns about the operation of the dispute-settlement system under Chapter 19 of the NAFTA. In recent years, deadlines stipulated by Chapter 19 have not met in a number of instances, and – in some cases – U.S. investigating authorities, the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. International Trade Commission have resisted implementing panel decisions. This situation occurred,

for example, with respect to softwood lumber and led to criticisms in Canada about the ineffectiveness of the dispute-settlement process.

Discussion

Softwood lumber was the starting point for the discussion of dispute resolution, with a Canadian Senator noting that although settlement of the softwood lumber dispute is positive, we need to determine what went wrong in order that we do not make the same mistakes again. In his view, what is needed is a more transparent, fair dispute-settlement system that does not involve costly legal challenges for industry in both countries. He argued that Chapter 19 of the NAFTA may not be the best or the most efficient process, and that Canada prefers the World Trade Organization process, which is perhaps more rules-based, efficient and fair. He urged our governments to work together in order to develop a better process. An American Senator agreed that there is a process is needed that would resolve these types of issues in a better manner.

A Representative questioned what should be the “division of labour” in dispute resolution between the NAFTA and the WTO, and asked whether perhaps different fora should be used for different types of disputes. He also mentioned the involvement of Mexico, and identified the need to find common ground on the role that the international environment should play in dispute resolution. A colleague mentioned the notion of “forum shopping,” to which the Canadian Senator agreed that this problem exists: if you do not like the outcome in one forum, you try another. A Member of Parliament noted the need for greater clarity about which panel – WTO or NAFTA – is used in which circumstances.

A Canadian Senator questioned whether the International Joint Commission (IJC) – which is bi-national and neutral – might be an appropriate option for resolving disputes. A Representative responded that while the IJC is very useful in resolving factual disputes, he did not agree that referral of disputes like softwood lumber would be appropriate since the Commission may lack the needed expertise.

Delegates agreed on the need to work together in developing a better dispute-resolution process that could be applied to softwood lumber first and – if successful – expanded to other disputes and perhaps included in the NAFTA.

Border areas and their importance to the economies of both nations

Background

The trade agreement between Canada and the United States – and subsequently among Canada, the United States and Mexico – has resulted in more, and more diverse, links between Canada and the United States. Cross-border regional relationships are growing in significance, scope and nature, and involve – most particularly – adjacent and nearby areas along the border. Key elements appear to be: geography; history; demography; transportation corridors; economic linkages; socio-cultural similarities; and the presence of cross-border organization.

As these regional relationships grow, there is increased involvement by other stakeholders in the management of the bilateral relationship and suggestions are being made about new ways to approach bi-national issues.

Discussion

Delegates commented briefly on the issue of cross-border regions. Members of Parliament highlighted the importance of transportation networks, gateways, “institutionalized institutions” – like the Pacific NorthWest Economic Region, or PNWER, and the Atlantic Premiers-New England Governors – as models of success.

Comments then focused on a variety of bilateral “irritants,” including: the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative, the closed border for certain cattle and beef, and pharmaceutical prices.

Conclusion

As a result of the discussions in Committee I, delegates to the 47th Annual Meeting agreed to adopt the following resolutions:

Recognizing the goal of promoting productivity and prosperity, and thereby an enhanced standard of living for citizens and businesses in both countries, delegates urge the Canadian and American governments, as well as federal legislators in both countries, to undertake the following actions on an expedited basis:

1. develop an energy security plan by which, within a decade, North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) partners will be self-sufficient. This plan should focus on both renewable and non-renewable energy sources, and should contemplate minimum standards for renewable energy.
2. establish a working group, appointed by the Canadian Parliament and the U.S. Congress and comprised of federal legislators from appropriate committees in both countries, to develop a fair, efficient, long-term dispute-settlement mechanism applicable to the softwood lumber sector in the future.
3. undertake, along with the Mexican government, a comparative study of pharmaceutical drug research, pricing, margins, marketing, etc. in countries worldwide.
4. pursue, both independently and jointly, additional bilateral and multilateral trade agreements. They should also find means to re-engage South American countries in negotiations for a Free Trade Area of the Americas. Regarding trade agreements, the governments should work cooperatively to pressure the European Union to reduce its level of agricultural subsidies.
5. work together, and with relevant states and provinces as well as the private sector, to foster the development of bi-national economic regions.
6. act jointly to preserve and augment the manufacturing base in both countries and to facilitate skills development, labour mobility and a tax regime that enhances competitiveness. They should also initiate a bilateral study of manufacturing productivity, with the automotive industry as the first priority.
7. recognize the impact of the proposed rule regarding export controls on U.S. high-technology products to Canada and on Canadian citizens working in high-technology industries in the United States, and carefully consider any Canadian submissions made in this regard.

8. cooperatively develop and implement, through relevant agencies in both countries, a comprehensive strategy to address the threat of avian influenza. They should coordinate resources to better enable the observation and tracking of potentially infected migratory birds as they fly from nation to nation. As well, the agencies should monitor major north-south flyways – particularly those that cross major poultry-producing regions – to increase the likelihood of detecting an infected bird before it can affect domestic bird populations. Relevant health organizations in both countries should communicate regularly with a view to facilitating early warning of any occurrences and to address all instances where human beings may be affected.

Committee II – Bilateral cooperation on security, defence and democratization issues

United Nations reform

Background

While Canada has not always agreed with the means employed by the United States government and Congress to press for reform of the United Nations – notably the withholding of dues in the 1990s – the two countries have generally worked together on these issues over the past several years. In 2003, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan launched a comprehensive attempt at reform of the organization, first commissioning a report by a High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, and later outlining a package of reforms he hoped would be adopted at a September 2005 summit. While a number of complex and contentious issues such as reform of the Security Council were not resolved at the World Summit, leaders did agree to: establish a Peacebuilding Commission; replace the discredited Commission on Human Rights with a new Human Rights Council; endorse the concept of the Responsibility to Protect; and take action on UN management reforms. Discussions continue in a number of areas – including in relation to the Responsibility to Protect – and in March 2006 the Secretary-General released proposals for an overhaul of the UN Secretariat. Given that Kofi Annan's term in office will soon end, Canada has also recently championed the idea of adopting a more formal process for the selection of the Secretary-General.

Discussion

A Canadian began the discussion on UN reform by noting that a new UN Secretary-General must soon be chosen. Among other issues, the composition of the Security Council remains controversial. If one agrees that the UN is more useful than less useful, the question is how do we counterbalance some of the pressures that have made it somewhat less effective?

An American delegate said that he had recently been spending a lot of time on UN issues. He noted that attempts had been made to improve the new UN Human Rights Council, to make sure the system works and to ensure that the right people are represented there. In terms of reform of the Security Council, Russia and China have made it clear that they do not want Japan represented there. The broader issue is reform of the UN itself, including the proliferation of mandates that are often out of date and many of which are anti-Israel. The case of Japan shows the need for change, since it is the second largest contributor to the UN after the United States and supports

reform, yet is blocked from joining the Security Council. The G-77 states must also realize that unless they agree to some important changes to the UN, they could lose the whole organization.

When a Canadian asked what the American agenda was for UN reform, the American mentioned that both Kofi Annan and the Gingrich-Mitchell commission had identified a number of areas, including the need for a new accounting system, transparency, financial disclosure and whistleblowing. These were basic instruments of accountability. He repeated the need to review existing mandates, and suggested that these could either be reviewed every five years or lapse automatically. In response to a Canadian question about funding, the American responded that the U.S. pays about 22% of both the UN's regular budget and that of special missions. He added that, at the moment, a big issue related to the UN is how the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) recommendations on Iran will play out there.

A Canadian delegate said that we all want measurable results and accountability for the money we spend on the UN. The challenge will be to achieve these goals in the face of vested interests that benefit from the way the game is played today. The big issue for him was moving from the era of UN as a talk shop and lobby for various issues into an entity that can be an honest broker for world crises. If we see this change as the beginning of a new era, the symbolic decision of who will be the next Secretary-General is very important. For reasons of balance, the choice seemed to be leaning toward an Asian track. While the U.S. has a veto, the question was: could it influence the criteria by which the choice is made? Political leadership is very important to U.S. and Canadian objectives. The U.S. got off-side with the UN community over the Iraq issue. The UN has now adopted Canada's proposal for the Responsibility to Protect, and while the Security Council must have a security capability, this requirement does not mean a standing military force. In terms of the Security Council, one idea is to offer some countries a second track of membership with no veto. Another Canadian explained that the Responsibility to Protect meant that when a sovereign government failed to protect fundamental rights of its people or there is a large security threat, the international community can intervene despite Westphalian sovereignty. This principle had basically emerged following the tragedy in Rwanda.

An American delegate responded that this intervention was essentially a police mechanism. The UN has a history of that, which is why Korea today is free and prosperous. Yet the average American does not believe that the UN is effective – only that it takes our money. In terms of the Security Council, in his opinion, ideally there would only be three countries around the table, and they would not include any Communists or backsliders, only countries that ensure the rights of the governed. It was also necessary to have a serious discussion about the nature of various regimes, and we cannot just worry about “failed states;” Nazi Germany was not a failed state.

A Canadian added that something had to be done in the near future about developing countries that like to expand and protect their own interests in the UN system. While the UN is supposed to be a collegial association of nations, this delegate was concerned that there are forces within the UN that are trying to transform it into a world government, which it was never intended to be. Not so many years ago, we had government ministers supporting the creation of a UN standing army. The International

Criminal Court is a monstrosity, and it is only a matter of time before someone in the Americas will be prosecuted.

Nuclear non-proliferation and terrorism (missile defence)

Background

The international community has long recognized the need to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the cornerstone of international efforts in this area remains the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). While the collapse of the Soviet Union led to fears on the part of some that rogue states or possibly even terrorists could acquire "loose nukes," it was only after the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 that the U.S. government drew an explicit link between rogue states, weapons of mass destruction and terrorists. In this new environment, the United States withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty that had prohibited the deployment of national missile defences during the Cold War, and announced that it would develop and deploy a missile defence capability to protect itself and its allies from attack by long-range missiles.

In late 2004, President Bush publicly called for Canada to join U.S. efforts to develop and deploy such systems. While the Government of Canada had earlier agreed to amend the NORAD agreement to allow the transfer of missile warning data to the U.S. commands that would operate such defences, it declined to participate further. Following the general election of January 2006, the new Canadian federal government indicated that if the United States again made a proposal to Canada in this area, the government would be willing to consider it, and would put it before Parliament before signing on.

Discussion

An American noted that while the previous Canadian federal government had declined to participate in the U.S. missile defence program, the new Canadian defence minister had indicated a willingness to re-examine the issue, and he asked for an explanation of the Canadian position.

A Canadian began by noting that Canada did not see its NORAD relationship with the U.S. as part of missile defence. Another Canadian added that the previous Canadian government had privately given the U.S. affirmative signals on Canadian participation, after which President Bush had raised the matter publicly. The Canadian government then said "no" for political reasons. The new Canadian government's position is that if there is a specific proposal, it will review it, and it has committed to putting this issue to Parliament for a debate and a vote before signing on.

In response to a question about the state of the missile defence debate in the U.S., an American said that while the U.S. was spending money to continue missile defence work, it was not enough to really get the system working. (The House recently took money out of its budget for missile defence). Because of doubts about the technology, the fact that the threat assessments do not show that North Korea can hit the California coast with a missile, and the fact that there are so many other urgent issues, this issue has not been getting the debate it should. In his opinion, we will see more debate on

this issue in the future as the situation in the Middle East winds down, and as people realize that China and Iran could emerge as threats.

Another Canadian remarked that his party opposed missile defence, as well as the weaponization of space. He argued that the certainty of assured destruction would prevent North Korea or Iran from attacking the United States. A Canadian argued that terrorists are irrational, and do not think about deterrence.

An American said that Canadians are, to some extent, victims of European public opinion on issues such as these. He did not understand concerns about the weaponization of space, since a working missile defence would prevent attacks by long-range missiles. (People would then find other means.) The early unilateralism of the Bush administration disturbed many, such as its announcement that it was leaving the ABM treaty and pursuing missile defences. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice may now be improving this situation, however. Because of budget pressure, there will be increasing scrutiny of Pentagon and other budgets to ensure we are not spending money on weapons we do not need. Europeans are going to be thinking about this too. A Canadian argued that political pragmatists would begin to switch their opinion on this issue if it could be proved that a missile defence system could work.

Border Security

Background

While Canada and the United States traditionally prided themselves on sharing “the world’s longest undefended border,” the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 immediately changed this situation. While the two countries quickly negotiated a Smart Border Accord designed to increase security without disrupting commerce between them, the years that followed have continued to see arguments by some Americans that their northern border remains insecure, and is therefore a threat to the United States.

Discussion

A Canadian continued from the previous discussion on missile defence by arguing that there is now a huge opportunity, as 11 September 2001 proved, for a small number of people to inflict a huge amount of damage at low cost. That is the proximate threat we should be addressing in North America. If there is a shutdown in the United States, the damage to Canada’s economy is equal to or greater than that to the United States itself. In terms of the border, many Canadians do not understand the symmetry the U.S. applies to its northern and southern borders, which is a negative element in the relationship. Senator Hillary Clinton’s comment that 11 September 2001 terrorists came from Canada caused outrage in Canada.

An American responded that it was very difficult to differentiate between borders when passing legislation. A bilateral treaty could improve on this situation, and would have more weight than any law passed by Congress. (The House of Representatives does not have treaty ratification responsibilities).

Support for democratization

Background

While most democracies have long argued for the adoption of democratic norms around the world and have included governance and other programs in their development assistance, the past several years have seen an even greater emphasis on the promotion of democracy abroad. The United States has long carried out such activities through a number of key national organizations – such as the National Endowment for Democracy—that integrate and export U.S. expertise in this area. In his second inaugural address, President Bush emphasized that the promotion of democracy around the world, and in particular in the Middle East, is key to long-term peace and prosperity. While Canada supports the promotion of democracy abroad mainly through Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) funding for governance programs and through regional organizations such as the Organization for American States (OAS), it does not have national institutions comparable to those in the United States.

Discussion

A Canadian began by stating that the new Canadian federal government would like to build up Canada's contribution to supporting democratization abroad. While Canada spends relatively more than the U.S. on foreign aid in general, it spends less on democracy development. He noted the existence in Montreal of the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, established by the Canadian Parliament over a decade before.

An American noted that the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has done a very good job supporting democratization in that area – including through election monitoring and other activities – to the extent that the Government of Russia has threatened to cut its funding because it has been so successful in Ukraine and elsewhere. It is important to look at the rule of law, training judges and prosecutors, developing criminal codes, etc. We should look at how much support we are giving the OSCE, and what means are best suited to each case. An American colleague noted the importance of people-to-people contact, adding that the traditional top-down government-to-government approach just becomes a question of “throwing money” at the problem. A Canadian agreed with the importance of people-to-people contact, arguing that Taiwanese educated in North America brought North American values back home with them.

A Canadian did not share the enthusiasm for promoting the rule of law and governance in developing countries, arguing that basing a system on judges and lawyers created a system characterized by people with their hands in the till. The British did it by building from the bottom up, training everyone from military officers to students in Britain, which resulted in shared common interests. If we want to put in money, we should put in a direct way of encouraging these people to come abroad to study.

The American responded by pointing to the case of Serbia, which has trained its legal people, and is now trying criminals. The problem in the region is that they are relying on the old guys from the old system. The American Bar Association has really helped build the rule of law. The most practical thing we can do is to identify what has worked best

and to support efforts of that type. He added that the death of former Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic was a real blow because he escaped sentencing.

A Canadian argued that the British had effectively co-opted the elites and made them British. "Public diplomacy" is the key concept. Canada and the U.S. made a huge mistake by abandoning earlier successful programs in this area. The former United States Information Agency and its information centres were enormously important. Now we can do this electronically, by putting everything online. He argued for a committee resolution to develop these programs and cooperate on this issue, and to seek to inform "young developing countries" about our democratic institutions and how we resolve governance issues through the rule of law and an independent judiciary, and through building economic systems that allow people to be upwardly mobile.

An American spoke in support of the comment on the rule of law, quoting James Madison's comment that: 'Justice is the end of the government ... until liberty be lost in the pursuit.' You can not have free market liberalism until you have the rule of law. Corruption should not undermine this goal. Last year, a House of Representatives Democracy Assistance Commission was established, which now has nine Republicans and seven Democrats on it. This Commission looks at new parliaments, which may have had a history of democracy in the past, but have also had oppression. It has established cooperation with a number of countries, including Kenya, East Timor, Indonesia and Macedonia. Representatives from some of these countries were in Washington recently, and interacted with American legislators. While we tend to bang our chests and lecture, we really are not experts: democracy is a work in progress everywhere, including in the United States. The House Democracy Assistance Commission plans to move on to Lebanon, Liberia, Ukraine, Georgia, and possibly Iraq, as well as potentially in this hemisphere. Funding comes primarily from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and is a part of the global war on terror for the United States.

This American delegate also wanted to talk about the diminution of democracy in this hemisphere and the threats to it, especially in Venezuela. We have to look at the substance of the rule of law, and the way that they get to this goal. It has to be done through indigenous institutions and culture. One reason we have problems in South America is that they were the product of colonial Spain and Portugal rather than England, and their experience of de-colonization was different. We tend to be very individualistic societies. How do you foster democracy in a tribal or communal culture, e.g., in Africa? Whatever system comes about it has to have the consent of the governed. It has to be a process of harmonization, and, we have not done a very good job of that.

A Canadian responded that Canada has a lot to offer because of a more benign image in the developing world, which means Canada can play a significant role. There are hundreds of former Canadian political figures who are working in National Endowment for Democracy projects overseas. The new Canadian federal government is talking about replicating some of these programs. Canada also works closely with the Commonwealth and the Francophonie, since many countries in need of help are members of these organizations.

An American pointed out that business, labor and both political parties all have a role. The four core groups were: the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute; the AFL-CIO; and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

A Canadian noted that some people do not like it when supporting democracy involves linkage with military action, since they feel this situation implies the goals are not shared by those we are trying to help. We have to acknowledge that this view exists, and promote the view that establishing a democracy is not always inconsistent with stabilizing a country through intervention by military means. An American added that they regularly had this debate during the 1980s, particularly in regard to Nicaragua. How do you impose self-determination? This goal is what President Bush has said his goals are in Afghanistan and Iraq.

A Canadian argued there was an enormous “pushback” in the Muslim world against Western values, and added that it is having an effect on non-Muslim societies as well. A war of values is being fought. We should be proactive in all aspects of public diplomacy. There are non-democratic elites in some countries, and we must decide how aggressively we are going to deal with them. In addition, democracy does not always result in the promotion of human rights. In South America, it has developed into a new vested elites arising. He argued for a committee resolution showing we recognize the importance of making our values persuasive in the world. We need to be aggressive about putting out our system for study and possible adoption by others. We must not try to impose it on others.

North Atlantic trade organization

Background

The years following the end of the Cold War saw significant changes in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). In addition to establishing relations with Russia and deciding to enlarge the alliance to include former members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, member states responded to the collapse of the Soviet Union by redefining NATO's role. While the NATO would continue to embody the transatlantic link between Europe and North America, it would no longer simply deter and respond to attacks on member states, but would now also work to ensure stability in the broader “Euro-Atlantic area.” This change allowed the NATO to conduct its first “out of area” mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 1990s. The Alliance later moved beyond the Euro-Atlantic area for the first time when it decided to take over command and coordination of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan. Beyond these changes, in recent years the United States has led the NATO in a streamlining of its command structure, and member states have worked to increase the deployability and usability of their forces.

Discussion

A Canadian member said that he was a strong believer in the NATO, adding that the alliance was both a military and a political organization that now had 26 members. The European Union members have now adopted the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which may jeopardize U.S. participation and influence in the NATO, which has implications for both North American countries. He is worried that the

European initiative could break the NATO apart, leaving the two sides isolated on either side of the Atlantic.

An American said that he is active in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. He argued that there has been a change in recent years. Because we are all working together in Afghanistan, different countries have discovered their niches, and we are working together more and more – for example, in the area of flexible deployments. Europeans do not have the infrastructure to do it alone. He believed that we are better off in this area than we were a couple of years ago. The next ministerial meeting is supposed to look at the NATO's future role and next steps.

A Canadian said that Canada is involved in a pretty significant rebuilding of its military capacity that was begun by the federal Liberal government and is being accelerated by the new government. Canadians took the "peace dividend" before and after the end of the Cold War. The Canadian Senate has been quite active in investigating the need to reform and re-commit resources to the military. Canada's 2,200 personnel in Afghanistan and other deployments abroad have pretty much stretched it thin militarily. Canada will have much more capability in the next two to three years; Canada has been punching well under its weight in the NATO.

Another Canadian asked about the sense of mission in the NATO going forward now that the Cold War is done. A Canadian argued that the NATO is more and more becoming the military arm of the UN, as the only ready-to-serve multilateral force; it is now in Afghanistan, and there is talk about going into Darfur.

An American noted that the NATO's mission had changed from one of confronting the Soviet Union to a more general one of European security. There have been two rounds of enlargement, but he said that all of Europe must be covered by having all of the European countries eventually become members. Another American argued that stability in the Balkans will be assured when Serbia, Croatia, Macedonia, etc. all become members of the NATO and the European Union.

A Canadian asked why countries want the U.S. there. An American responded that the U.S. provides security. During the Cold War, the threat was the Soviet Union; today, it is international terrorism. But the NATO does need a clearly defined mission for the twenty-first century. A Canadian argued that it was a setback to the NATO when the U.S. went into Iraq and did not have the support of many members of the alliance.

A U.S. delegate re-emphasized the need for the NATO to express its mission. The difficult question becomes: what triggers NATO intervention? Darfur is an example. It has to be measured by the paradigm of the mission, and right now that is nebulous.

Illegal Drug Trade and Human Trafficking

Background

The illegal drug trade and human trafficking are two issues on which Canada and the United States cooperate at both the multilateral and bilateral levels. In terms of the drug trade, generally marijuana and synthetic drugs flow from Canada to the United States, while heroin and cocaine flow from the U.S. to Canada. While the previous Canadian federal government had announced the intention to decriminalize the possession of

small amounts of marijuana, the new government has reversed this decision. The United States has been a leader in efforts to combat human trafficking, including through the creation of an Office to Combat and Monitor Trafficking in Persons, and the publication of an annual report on the issue. In 2005, Canada created three new criminal offences that specifically address human trafficking, and a Human Trafficking National Coordination Centre was formally established under the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Discussion

A Canadian said that, after lumber, marijuana is British Columbia's biggest export to the United States. The current Canadian federal government has decided not to pursue the previous government's attempt to decriminalize marijuana. A U.S. delegate pointed out that a lot of the money earned through drug trafficking winds up in the hands of terrorists. A Canadian added that, sooner or later, some drug cartels will cause greater problems in the Caribbean. We should discuss these issues before they become too big.

In terms of human trafficking, an American said that this issue was and Canada and the United States should continue to work together. A Canadian agreed. He noted that Canada has recently increased its actions in this area, including penalties for this offence. He also gave credit to the United States and to Congress for taking the lead on this file, notably through the creation of an Office to Combat and Monitor Trafficking in Persons.

China

Background

While China has long been recognized as a key player on the international scene, its tremendous economic expansion in recent years has made it a dominant player in the global economy – effectively decreasing the global price of anything it makes, and increasing the global price of anything it buys – and also a key economic partner of the United States. The U.S. government has responded by encouraging China to recognize its responsibilities as a “responsible stakeholder” in the global system, while also stressing the need to be prepared in case China's rising global power is not peaceful. While the possibility that a Chinese state-owned firm might purchase a Canadian mining company raised protests in 2004, during a 2005 visit to Canada by Chinese President Hu Jintao, the two countries agreed to upgrade their relationship to a “strategic partnership.” At the same time, both Canada and the United States continue to express concern about human rights and other issues in China.

Discussion

A U.S. delegate began by asserting that China and India are two completely different countries, since China is a totalitarian State and everything is done for the greater glory of the state. He suggested that we in the West want to be loved. When the Chinese devalue our currency, steal our intellectual property, etc. they are trying to undermine us. He argued that we turn a blind eye when China supports Iran. We have a

communist nation that has never renounced its past. We should not be dealing with China until we believe that they have adopted democracy and respect for human rights.

A Canadian said that Canada has a quite different approach to its relationship with China. Canada's attitude is that if you declare the Chinese to be the enemy, the chances are they will be the enemy. Canadian policy from Trudeau until recently has been to communicate, to have commerce, and visits, and to remind the Chinese that they have some distance to travel to create a society that puts a priority on individual rights and security. He has seen the evolution, not only of their economy but also of their political system. An enormous dialogue is going on in the political and academic systems as to how to maintain stability and accommodate the governance to a more horizontal form of authority. The Chinese government is fragile, and its military capacity cannot even compare to that of the United States. China is quite effective in the multilateral system. He does not think the Shanghai Cooperation Organization is worthwhile. China has been providing U.S. consumers with low-cost goods, which in turn has created a trade deficit. He was disappointed with the way the U.S. handled Chinese President Hu Jintao's recent visit. It seemed to want to show him some lessons, which does not hurt him. An adversarial relationship will only play into their hands.

An American responded that he thought President Bush had tried to send a message that Americans expected the Chinese to be responsible members of the international trading community, both bilaterally and in the context of the WTO. The U.S. economy is integrated with that of China, so the American goal is to get them to be responsible citizens and realize they are stakeholders. Also, the U.S. government denied the Taiwanese president landing rights shortly before the Chinese President's visit. He maintained that China has shifted its policy toward Taiwan. The Chinese are working with North Korea. In the military area, the question is the appropriate role of the growth of their military. If you go back to Taiwan and South Korea, you will find that they have come a long way.

Another Canadian responded that China is a totalitarian state, while the other two were authoritarian states, which is a big difference. China has been actively supporting "bad actors" such as Sudan and Myanmar on the world stage. He supported a form of constructive engagement. Canada is turning a blind eye to massive industrial espionage, as evidenced by the Canadian federal government's reaction to the cloning of the Blackberry. He said he was basically arguing for the Bush policy of firm constructive engagement.

An American said that we need to determine what we want from China – for example, human rights – and go in there and get it. We have had a lot of people going over to China, without any coordination. We are failing in details of this sort.

A Canadian responded that former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and former President Richard Nixon knew what kind of government China had when they went there in 1973 and relations were opened in 1979. What we are talking about is how to manage a relationship with China that makes them significant players. A U.S. delegate pointed out that the U.S. renewal of its relationship with India has been noticed by the Chinese.

An American delegate said he respects the Chinese, and understands their aims and their methods. They are testing our limits to see our resolve, as we saw with the incident over the capture of a U.S. intelligence plane in 2001. He thought that, in order to have trade with a free country, they have to respect human rights. But that is too much for them to do right now. They are testing us. When he looks at the trade deficit, he thinks they are winning. They are pushing back against the Catholic Church by naming bishops without the Pope's consent. They are "cozying up" to President Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, helping Iran, and no one was punished for the shootings in Tiananmen Square. Look at what they did in Hong Kong – stability and prosperity were emphasized: nothing else.

A Canadian responded that this image of China today is about ten years old. Marxism is not emphasized in China today, and the Chinese are frighteningly entrepreneurial. State companies are so inefficient that they cannot keep up with private enterprise. On human rights in China, there will always be things we don't like. What troubles him is that the Chinese are more focused on and – at this stage – more capable of winning friends around the world than is the United States.

Conclusion

As a result of the discussions in Committee II, delegates to the 47th Annual Meeting agreed to adopt the following resolutions:

Delegates support and urge a policy of aggressive reform of the United Nations that would include: its current mandate; its financing and administration; and its governance issues, including the role of the Security Council, the criteria for its choice and the role of the Office of the Secretary General. Such reform should establish timelines, standards of measurable results and a fixed periodic review.

In dealing with the Canada-U.S. issues of public security and prosperity, including defence against terrorism, our two countries should work closely to develop a bilateral security structure by extension of the current bilateral Smart Border Accord and/or a new treaty relationship.

Delegates believe that it is of paramount importance to North American prosperity that economic/commerce considerations are balanced with security concerns in a risk-based approach to border management.

In democracy building, our countries must continue to commit sufficient resources – especially in the areas of human resources and public diplomacy – to fostering inalienable human rights and the rule of law through a people's traditional culture and customs, in order to accommodate and secure the consent of the governed and the attainment of justice.

Delegates affirm the importance of the Trans-Atlantic link between North America and Europe, and encourage our nations to clarify and determine the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's mission in the world, particularly the war on terror.

Delegates support the continuing efforts and assistance by both countries against drugs and human smuggling.

Committee III – bilateral cooperation on trans-border, environment and other issues

Ensuring an adequate, secure border

The Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) received a great deal of attention from both Canadian and U.S. delegates at the 47th Annual Meeting.

During Committee III's deliberations on this issue, the Canadian and American delegates conceded that the WHTI is the subject of much debate on both sides of the border. Concerns were raised by Canadian delegates that this Initiative could have severe negative economic repercussions for Canada by restricting the ability to cross the border easily. U.S. delegates recognized this reality but maintained that some form of proper identification is required to authenticate citizenship and identity. They also stated that the challenge for the United States is to balance open borders for free trade with security concerns.

The Canadian participants realized that stopping the WHTI was not an option and, throughout the discussions, focused their attention on trying to delay its implementation to allow for a smoother transition to this new regime. They stress the fact that implementation should proceed in an orderly manner and not be rushed: hasty implementation could result in poor documentation and lengthy delays in obtaining proper documents. The Canadian delegates believed that if the process is phased in over a longer period of time, it is more likely that the documents will be "right" and that more people could be documented than would now be the case. It would also help to mitigate any adverse effects on both countries' economies.

The U.S. delegates had some sympathy for the Canadian position and recognized that there could be problems in meeting the current implementation deadlines for the Initiative. They also noted the importance of ensuring that the document used to authenticate citizenship and identity is "right." In addition, they recognized that there could be negative economic impacts on both sides of the border resulting from the Initiative. Nevertheless, no matter what the deadline is or might become, the Initiative is going forward.

Overall, there was a common commitment to look more closely at this Initiative with a view to minimizing any negative impacts that might occur.

Securing hemispheric energy resources and production

Debate among the Committee members centered on the fact that a cooperative approach to develop a North American Energy Strategy is critical to ensure energy security for this hemisphere. Delegates stated that this reality is especially true in light of rising energy costs and instability in world energy markets.

Safeguarding our shared natural resources and improving our air and water quality

Delegates from both countries stated that there is fairly good cooperation between our two countries on environmental and natural resource issues. Delegates did, however, stress that more cooperation will be required over the next few years to address

environmental issues adequately in order to ensure that these resources are safeguarded on both sides of the border. Canadian delegates noted that there were still ongoing irritants regarding Devils Lake, diversion of water from the Missouri River to the Red River Basin and invasive species issues in Lake Champlain.

The U.S. delegates noted the existence of these irritants and said that water quality and access to adequate water supplies are significant issues in the United States. Ensuring water quality should be an essential ingredient in a cooperative environmental effort by both countries to ensure the future of this valuable resource. As one delegate stated, the environment does not recognize borders.

Making our streets safe

The focus for Committee delegates was the increasing spread of the use of crystal methamphetamine. The U.S. delegates stated that, in addition to increased use, there is the problem of trying to cope with the rehabilitation of users. They stated that it is very difficult to treat users once they are “hooked” and that it is very easy and very inexpensive to get addicted to this drug.

The Canadian delegates realized that this problem is growing in Canada and that it has a foothold in western Canada but is now moving to eastern Canada.

Delegates agreed that a comprehensive strategy to deal with the prevention of the use of methamphetamine, and the treatment of those already addicted, are urgently required.

Conclusion

As a result of the discussions in Committee III, delegates to the 47th Annual Meeting agreed to adopt the following resolutions:

Delegates recognize that the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) is a matter of considerable debate on both sides of the U.S.-Canadian border for various reasons, including its potential for substantial negative economic impact. Delegates also recognize, however, that the Initiative continues to move forward toward implementation. During animated discussions, delegates also recognized that the final details about how this border security measure would be implemented are still being considered by the U.S. Departments of State and Homeland Security. It is the consensus of delegates that the process of implementation of the WHTI warrants closer examination by both nations to ensure that it is effective, efficient and user-friendly before it is implemented.

Delegates recognize that a cooperative approach to develop a North American Energy Strategy is critical. Our future energy security will depend on the development and implementation of new technologies. The transfer of this technology globally will deal with the global problem of air pollution and climate change. Both countries should be encouraged to become world leaders in: conservation; carbon dioxide capture and sequestration; coal gasification; efficient use of fossil fuels; and development and implementation of a wide variety of alternative energy sources.

Delegates support the continuing efforts and assistance by both countries against drugs and human smuggling.

Delegates urge the governments of the United States and Canada, through their relevant agencies, to cooperatively develop and pursue more comprehensive environmental strategies that would improve the quality of the water and air along the shared border, with special attention paid to – but not limited to – those waterways that are determined to be most at risk, including the Great Lakes, Lake Champlain, the St. Lawrence Seaway and Devils Lake.

Delegates urge the Canadian and American governments to give immediate attention, through their relevant agencies – including those in law enforcement, health, drug prevention and drug treatment – to the cooperative development and implementation of a comprehensive strategy designed to address the growing problem of methamphetamine use in communities in both nations. Specifically, the two nations should work better to control the supply of pseudophedrine, the main precursor chemical for the manufacture of methamphetamine, track its sale on internet pharmacies, and provide a more comprehensive strategy to prevent the use of methamphetamine and better treat those already addicted. Delegates intend to seek authorization for staff in both countries to, through legislative action, require relevant government agencies to report, within 90 days of enactment but before 1 October 2006, on the impact that methamphetamine has on individual health, family life, crime and other social problems associated with methamphetamine use. Delegates also agree that prevention and treatment programs, designed to address methamphetamine risk and addiction, be reviewed and determinations made to ensure that these programs are located in areas where the prevalence of methamphetamine use is high, such as in rural areas.

Closing plenary

During the closing plenary session, representatives of each Committee summarized the discussions in each Committee, and delegates agreed on the resolutions proposed by each Committee, as presented above. It was determined that these resolutions should be a basis for a work plan for the forthcoming year.

Respectfully submitted,

Hon. Jerahmiel Grafstein, Senator
Co-Chair, Canadian Section
Canada-United States Inter-
Parliamentary Group

Rob Merrifield, M.P.
Co-Chair, Canadian Section
Canada- United States Inter-
Parliamentary Group

Appendix A

List of delegates

Canadian delegation:

Senate

Senator Jerahmiel GRAFSTEIN, Q.C. (Liberal – Ontario), Co-Chair, Senator W. David ANGUS, Q.C. (Conservative – Quebec), Senator Jack AUSTIN, P.C., Q.C. (Liberal – British Columbia), Senator Anne COOLS (Conservative – Ontario), Senator D. Ross FITZPATRICK (Liberal – British Columbia), Senator Frank MAHOVLICH (Liberal - Ontario), Senator Terry MERCER (Liberal – Nova Scotia)

House of Commons

Mr. Gord BROWN, M.P. (Conservative – Ontario), Mr. Rick CASSON, M.P. (Conservative – Alberta), Mr. Jason KENNEY, M.P. (Conservative – Alberta), Mr. Rob MERRIFIELD, M.P. (Conservative – Alberta), Mr. Bob MILLS, M.P. (Conservative – Alberta), Mr. James RAJOTTE, M.P. (Conservative – Alberta), Honourable A. Wayne EASTER, P.C., M.P. (Liberal – Prince Edward Island), Honourable Charles HUBBARD, P.C., M.P. (Liberal – New Brunswick), Honourable John MCKAY, P.C., M.P. (Liberal – Ontario), Honourable Shawn MURPHY, P.C., M.P. (Liberal – Prince Edward Island), Honourable Judy SGRO, P.C., M.P. (Liberal – Ontario), Mr. Claude BACHAND, M.P. (Bloc Québécois - Quebec), Mr. Paul CRÉTE, M.P. (Bloc Québécois - Quebec), Ms. France BONSANT, M.P. (Bloc Québécois - Quebec), Mr. Brian MASSE, M.P. (New Democratic Party – Ontario)

Observer

Mr. Russ HIEBERT, M.P. (Conservative – British Columbia)

American delegation:

United States senate

Senator Mike CRAPO (R-ID), Co-Chair, Senator Daniel AKAKA (D-HA), Vice Co-Chair, Senator Patrick LEAHY (D-VT), Senator George VOINOVICH (R-OH)

United States House of Representatives

Rep. Don MANZULLO (R-IL), Co-Chair, Rep. Thaddeus MCCOTTER (R-MI), Vice Co-Chair, Rep. David DRIER (R-CA), Rep. Louise SLAUGHTER (D-NY), Rep. Collin PETERSON (D-MN), Rep. Phil ENGLISH (R-PA), Rep. Gil GUTKNECHT (R-MN), Rep. Mark SOUDER (R-IN), Rep. Tom TANCREDO (R-CO), Rep. Henry BROWN (R-SC), Rep. Dan LIPINSKI (D-IL)

Appendix B

Travel Costs

ASSOCIATION	Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group
ACTIVITY	47th Annual Meeting
DESTINATION	Charleston, South Carolina
DATES	May 5-8, 2006
SENATORS	Senator Jerahmiel GRAFSTEIN, Co-Chair Senator W. David ANGUS, Senator Jack AUSTIN, Senator Anne COOLS, Senator D. Ross FITZPATRICK, Senator Frank MAHOVLICH, Senator Terry MERCER
MEMBERS	Mr. Gord BROWN, M.P., Mr. Rick CASSON, M.P, Mr. Jason KENNEY, M.P, Mr. Rob MERRIFIELD, M.P., Mr. Bob MILLS, M.P. , Mr. James RAJOTTE, M.P., Honourable A. Wayne EASTER, M.P., Honourable Charles HUBBARD, M.P., Honourable John MCKAY, M.P., Honourable Shawn MURPHY, M.P., Honourable Judy SGRO, M.P., Mr. Claude BACHAND, M.P, Mr. Paul CRÊTE, M.P., Ms. France BONSANT, M.P., Mr. Brian MASSE, M.P. <u>Observer</u> Mr. Russ HIEBERT, M.P.
STAFF	Mr. Serge Pelletier, Mr. Daniel Charbonneau, Mr. June Dewetering, Mr. John Christopher

TRANSPORTATION

AIR TRANSPORTATION \$37,216.84

GROUND TRANSPORTATION \$722.43

ACCOMMODATION

\$35,858.60

HOSPITALITY

\$0

PER DIEMS

\$ 4,053.99

OFFICIAL GIFTS

\$0

**MISCELLANEOUS/REGISTRATION
FEES**

\$163.95

TOTAL

\$ 78,015.81