

**Canadian Council on International Law  
Annual Meeting  
16-18 October**

-----

**“The U.S. Election and Canada/U.S. Relations: An ASIL Perspective”  
Remarks of Charles Hunnicutt, Vice President, ASIL**

Thank you for that generous introduction. It is a great privilege for me to be with you today, representing your sister society in the United States and our ASIL President Lucy Reed.

The ASIL and CCIL have a long and rich history of working together. Our members—many of whom belong to both societies—collaborate in scholarship and work alongside each other—in government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and on arbitral panels. Our societies come together through joint conferences. Most recently with the second “Four Societies” gathering, which brought together young scholars representing the Canadian, Japanese, Australia-New Zealand, and American societies, to discuss their work on “international law and democratic theory.” At the 2007 ASIL Annual Meeting, which I had the honor to co-chair, we were privileged to host a session co-sponsored by the Canadian Council, featuring Canada’s ambassador in Washington, Michael Wilson, for a discussion of challenges posed by the thickening of the U.S.-Canadian border, post-September 11.

That session epitomized the relationship between our countries, between our two societies. It reflected so much that we share—a common heritage, values, a border, and deeply integrated economies. And yet, what the discussion also revealed were some stark differences—in our roles in the world, our foreign relations, our obligations and vulnerabilities, and our perspectives on international law. What is so valuable about the relationship between our international law societies is that it provides a forum in which such differences can be aired, contested, and resolved. And it is in that spirit that I offer you some thoughts today about the issues in U.S.-Canadian relations at stake in the 2008 U.S. elections.

In doing so, I must qualify my remarks as given in my personal capacity—not necessarily representing the views of the ASIL’s very diverse 4000 members. And I hope that I will not disappoint you by avoiding any suggestion of an endorsement of either US presidential candidate. Rather, I will flag the issues at stake, how they have been addressed on the US campaign trail, and what clues that may give us about how these issues may be addressed by the next US administration. And while touching on a range of issues, I will pull for examples from areas of my own practice and expertise, international trade and transportation. And finally, I must note that when I agreed to address this subject, we knew of only one election along our border. I’ll let you argue amongst yourselves the relative impact on Canada-U.S. relations of your election this week.

International legal issues are in play in this Presidential election more than any time in recent memory. This is not so much due to the differences between the candidates—though there are some—but because of the very significant international legal challenges facing the United States. In order to shed light on the candidates' views of these issues, and bring attention to international law within the media and the campaign staffs, a year ago ASIL launched a website project called "International Law 2008." It's all on the ASIL home page at [asil.org](http://asil.org). I invite you to visit the web site and review the statements we have gathered regarding the positions of both Senators McCain and Obama regarding their positions on various aspects of international law. It also contains statements from ASIL leaders about what they see as the most important international legal issues facing the next president.

The issues that IL2008 tracks, and that ASIL members are watching closely in this election, are wide-ranging and should be an important part of the political presidential discourse. We want to know whether a change in administration may bring a renewed interest in multilateral treaty regimes that the U.S. has in recent years kept at arms length. The next president will be faced with continuing and pressing international legal issues, including: trade agreements and the World Trade Organization negotiations; now possibly a review of the Bretton Woods system; the 2012 expiration of the Kyoto Protocol and efforts to regulate human contributions to climate change; the continued viability of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and regulation of weapons of mass destruction; and, the intersection of the Geneva Conventions and counter-terror operations. Will a new president successfully champion the Law of the Sea treaty, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, or the Convention on the Rights of the Child? Will a new administration take another look at the International Criminal Court?

We all want a crystal ball. Unfortunately, these are in short supply in this election season. What we do know is that whoever comes to Washington, we are likely to see a revamping of U.S. detention policies at Guantanamo and elsewhere. Both candidates have expressed an unequivocal opposition to torture and a commitment to closing the Guantanamo base. While this is also now official Bush administration policy, it's fair to expect that a new administration will bring a clearer commitment and fresh energy to achieving these goals. That's what we know.

What we don't know is much greater. And I'm afraid that my best guess is that we will see much less change than we might hope or expect. This is because many of these U.S. policy decisions require not only presidential leadership and vision, but also a majority of the 535 legislators on Capitol Hill, or at least of the Senate. And behind all of these decisions is an artform called "politics" and as you know the views of politicians can be hard to pin down exactly, especially in an election season. The challenge for any president who wants to engage with international institutions or broker international deals—indeed, the challenge for ASIL in pursuing its mission to promote greater understanding and use of international law—is that international institutions, international courts, international law are considered by large swaths of the American public as at best irrelevant and at worst dangerous to American sovereignty.

You need look no further than statements of the Texas governor in the face of an ICJ judgment urging review of a death penalty conviction reached in violation of US obligations under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. Texas rebuffed even its former governor and President, George Bush, who urged restraint and compliance with the ICJ judgment. But in announcing that Texas would go forward with the execution notwithstanding the ICJ judgment, Governor Perry's spokesperson commented that "The world court has no standing in Texas and Texas is not bound by a ruling or edict from a foreign court." Such views reflect the majority public sentiment in the United States toward international legal arrangements, and this presents very significant challenges to any new president pursuing goals in the international arena.

As for our relationship with Canada, your nation is the largest single country trading partner of the United States and our economies are highly integrated. This relationship has presented many opportunities but also many challenges. We are strong friends and allies, but we do have disagreements from time to time. We have much in common regarding our policies and plans for energy, security and international trade. We disagree on the current strategy in Iraq. But, overall we agree and are partners in supporting free and democratic governments around the world. I'm certain we disagree on some aspects on how to best address environmental concerns, but we have worked together on specific problems – most recently regarding water resources in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. We have a long history of co-operation – even before September 11 – of bilateral efforts in ensuring safe and secure borders and law enforcement cooperation. And, finally, our two nations share one of the world's largest investment relationships covering many sectors of our economies.

On a personal note, I want to say that my experience in Kiev, Ukraine in the mid-1990s working closely with Canadian colleagues brought home to me how much we can accomplish when we work together. And this was not at institutional grand levels; this was individuals simply working together for common development goals in Ukraine without concern over whether it was a U.S. or Canadian citizen working on any particular aspect of the project.

Overall, I would say that the two U.S. Presidential candidates certainly recognize the important relationship we have with Canada, and to a large degree even share similar views on policy issues relating to and involving the U.S.-Canada relationship. It would appear to me that one of the areas where the two candidates diverge the most is in their approach to trade; and this could affect our countries' bilateral and regional trade relationship.

Both U.S. presidential candidates take the general position that trade with foreign nations should strengthen the American economy, create more American jobs, and open more markets to American goods. Senator McCain has been quoted stating that his administration would hold "every nation we trade with to the commitments they have made under the agreements we have signed." Senator Obama has promised that his administration would strengthen funding and staffing to enforce trade agreements, and

would pressure the WTO to improve its enforcement. Historically, Senator McCain voted for the Dominican Republic-Central America-U.S. Free Trade Agreement while Senator Obama voted against it. However, both were supporters of the Oman and Peru free-trade agreements. More recently, the senators find themselves on opposite sides with regard to the Columbia and South Korea free-trade agreements with McCain supporting and Obama opposing the agreements.

Both express positions to pursue multilateral, regional and bilateral efforts to reduce trade barriers, level the global playing field and build effective enforcement of global trading rules. Senator Obama takes the further position that his administration would use trade agreements to spread good labor and environmental standards around the world. Thus, his opposition to recent proposed free-trade agreements for perceived deficiencies in those areas. Just last week, the Obama campaign indicated that its initial focus if elected would not be in negotiating new agreements, but enforcing those already in place. The McCain campaign has countered that Senator McCain would seek to forge a bipartisan deal on trade with the Congress in order to revive trade promotion authority so that the executive branch could negotiate new trade agreements.

As for NAFTA, the two Senators have made their positions fairly clear. Senator McCain calls himself an “unashamed and unabashed defender” of the trade agreement. And, Senator Obama’s comments on NAFTA indicate that his administration would seek to work with the leaders of Canada and Mexico to amend and “fix” NAFTA so that it “works” for American workers and bolsters labor and environmental standards. Senator Obama has stated that he believes that “NAFTA and its potential were oversold to the American people.”

These are clearly significant differences on where the two candidates stand with regard to NAFTA and trade in our northern hemisphere. And, the senators are not alone in this debate over NAFTA – in this past session of Congress, several bills were introduced seeking to assess the impact of NAFTA, require further negotiations on certain provisions in the agreement, or to even withdraw from the agreement if certain conditions were not met. While this is an important debate and we must take the critics of NAFTA seriously, it is my personal opinion that we are fortunate that the arguments have remained to date rhetorical and no formal action has been undertaken.

In order to address the critics of NAFTA and the comments of the two U.S. Presidential candidates, let’s take a closer look at the U.S.-Canada trade relationship. Most would agree that the U.S. and Canada enjoy a unique economic partnership and have the world’s largest and most comprehensive trade relationship. Look at how our trade relationship has grown since 1989 – the year the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement went into effect. In 1989, U.S. exports to Canada valued over \$78 billion U.S. dollars and imports from Canada to the U.S. were almost \$88 billion. In 1994, U.S. exports to Canada were \$114 billion, and Canada’s imports to the U.S. were valued at \$128 billion. By 2007, these numbers had increased to nearly \$249 billion in U.S. exports to Canada, and over \$317 billion in imports from Canada. In 2007, overall trade between our countries exceeded 560 billion U.S. dollars. Canada is America’s largest export market, and we in return are

Canada's leading agricultural market. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, since the implementation of NAFTA in 1994, trade in merchandise between the U.S. and Canada has grown by 265%. Overall, from 1993 to 2007, trade among the three NAFTA nations has more than tripled, from \$297 billion to \$930 billion.

For illustrative purposes, let me focus on two different examples in our trade relationship – energy and agriculture. These two sectors provide a picture of both sides of the trade coin – trade success and trade dispute. With regard to energy trade, we have integration, cooperation and some harmony of standards, and so far as I know no big disputes. Concerning agriculture, we have trade barriers, lack of any real harmonization and, as a result, many trade disputes.

The United States and Canada enjoy the largest energy trade relationship in the world. Canada is the United States' largest foreign supplier of energy – including oil, natural gas and electricity. Electricity in its quality as a good under Chapter Six of the NAFTA is subject to the provisions of NAFTA Chapter Three on national treatment and market access for goods. These provisions assure free trade in energy by prohibiting the imposition of minimal export prices or export taxes, and restrict the imposition of supply restrictions. As a result, we now provide almost all of each other's electricity imports. Equally important, our two nations operate an integrated electricity grid.

Canada is the United States largest supplier of energy, accounting for 94% of natural gas imports, nearly 100% of electricity imports, and more crude and refined oil products than any other foreign supplier. And in terms of electricity trade, in 2006, according to the Canadian Electricity Association, the U.S. imported 36.4 million megawatt hours from Canada and exported 18.5 million megawatt hours to Canada. More importantly, as CEA recognizes, our electricity trade enhances the reliability of each country's transmission system, allows for the sale of surplus power, and mitigates risk by providing for power during times of emergency outages or periods of high electricity demand.

This bilateral energy relationship began in 1963 with the informal creation of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation – commonly referred to as NERC -- which was formally established in 1968. NERC's purpose was, and continues to be, developing and promoting rules and protocols for the reliable operation of the bulk power electric transmission systems of North America. In its own words, NERC holds that “effective reliability standards that are clear, consistent and technically sound, coupled with a strong standards enforcement program, form the foundation of NERC's efforts to help maintain and improve the reliability of North America's bulk power system.” While these reliability standards are voluntary, they have been effective. Nevertheless, given the interconnection of our electricity grids – the largest in the world – even NERC members have called for legislative changes to create mandatory reliability standards across North America.

In 2001, the three NAFTA countries created the North American Energy Working Group, which was tasked with collaborating on energy policy issues, enhancing energy trade and working on interconnectivity issues. Since its establishment, the working group has

shared information on technical standards and regulations, and focused on energy security issues.

Many of us recall the northeast electricity blackout of August 2003. Due to that scare, the U.S. and Canada established the U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force. The group was tasked with reviewing the causes of the blackout and developing a plan for preventing future region-wide power failures. In its final report, the task force identified that the failure to comply with voluntary reliability standards was a “significant contributing factor to the blackout.” This has provided further impetus to work toward compatible systems of mandatory and enforceable reliability standards being implemented in both countries.

NAFTA works for our energy sector. It has further enhanced and solidified an already extensive energy relationship between our two countries which operates through physical and regulatory interconnections. But -- and I applaud the Canadian Electricity Association for highlighting this fact and coming to Washington, D.C. annually to meet with U.S. government officials and industry representatives -- the electricity market is facing significant constraints that could hurt our trading relationship. These constraints must be addressed so that our various energy policies and government initiatives do not lead to supply constraints in the years to come. We must build upon the success of our bi-lateral energy trade relationship.

Both U.S. presidential candidates have spoken at length and often on the need for U.S. energy independence, working to ensure reliable energy supplies, and increasing our sources of renewable energy. While I was unable to locate any specific comment by the Obama campaign, in this area I think it safe to assume that he would agree with Senator McCain who has stated that we have much to gain by harmonizing our energy policies with Canada.

Aspects of our trade in agriculture presents a less rosy picture on our overall trade relationship than does our energy trade. While the vast majority of U.S.-Canada trade flows smoothly, we do encounter occasional disputes. From my background in agricultural trade, I would argue that our most contentious disputes fall in the area of market access and government support for our agricultural products. I am not going to touch upon the better known disputes surrounding softwood lumber or beef. Instead, I will give you my personal views on a dispute I was involved with – wheat trade between our countries.

In this instance, you have almost the exact opposite from the cooperation, integration and harmonization of standards which exists in our energy trade. Instead, Canada has the Canadian Wheat Board, a state-trading enterprise which holds a monopoly over western-Canadian wheat. The CWB controls approximately 1/5 of the world’s export markets for both wheat and barley. As any economist will tell you, a state trading enterprise, or STE’s, control over its domestic supply of a product, in this instance wheat, can be trade distorting -- not to mention that the STE’s anti-competitive practices are often grossly inefficient and work to the detriment of market efficiency.

Occasional trade disputes over the activities of the Canadian Wheat Board have arisen between Canada and the United States since the early 1990s. And, despite several attempts at reform, the CWB continues to function with certain monopoly rights, in a non-transparent manner and with the market power to distort bi-lateral trade as well as trade with third countries.

The Canadian Wheat Board has been given monopoly authority under federal legislation which allows it to control the marketing and sale of wheat. Over the years, it has publicly admitted that it has the ability to charge different prices in various export markets as part of its export strategy. This ability to charge different prices to capture third-country export markets has caused major aggravation with U.S. wheat farmers, not to mention the de facto lack of access U.S. wheat has to the Canadian market. Simply put, in the minds of U.S. wheat farmers and most U.S. trade officials, the CWB is a parastatal export monopoly which distorts trade through price discrimination with the assistance of a protected domestic market.

For the most part, the Canadian market remains closed to U.S. wheat imports. With the power of the CWB, the Canadian government has implemented a very unique wheat grading system under which some of the finest U.S. wheat accepted worldwide is virtually guaranteed to receive a grade only as “feed wheat” in Canada. Furthermore, Canadian regulations require that imported wheat cannot be mixed with Canadian domestic grain being received into or discharged out of grain elevators.

Domestic market restriction to foreign wheat has historically been achieved by a grading system which relies upon “Kernel Visual Distinguishability”, or KVD. This is a visual system that identifies classes of wheat within the production and grain handling systems. The CWB has always argued that the system protects premium markets for western Canadian farmers, and provides for quality control and assurance. Critics argue that the system is a blatant effort to keep quality foreign wheat out of the Canadian market. Only in February 2008, did the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the CWB announce that Canada would eliminate kernel visual distinguishability requirements from all classes of western Canadian wheat as of August 1, 2008. It remains to be seen as to how the elimination of the KVD will affect the possibility of U.S. wheat more freely entering the Canadian market.

So, our bilateral trade in agriculture has been less of a success story, even with the implementation of NAFTA. In fact, some would argue that the NAFTA trade dispute process has actually damaged our trade relationship. While I don't believe it has gone quite that far, several of our trade disputes over the last several years and how they were handled under the NAFTA have led to some distrust of the purpose and any benefits of the agreement.

Nowhere, would I argue, has that been more evident in recent years than in the trade dispute settlement provisions of the NAFTA. As many of you know, Chapter 19 of NAFTA provides for a binding, bi-national panel review of final determinations in trade

remedy cases. These panels are required to ascertain whether or not the determinations are consistent with the trade laws of the country conducting the investigation.

Concerning the NAFTA binational panel process, there appear to be conflicted perceptions of its fairness. Panel members are often attacked for a perceived lack of knowledge of the cases they adjudicate, of being biased based on their nationality, or for conducting a “de novo” review of the dispute.

However, the panel, comprised of five members, in general constitutes a more specialized body than those in charge of reviewing AD and CVD determinations in the national proceedings of the NAFTA countries. Supporters of the process would argue the fact that in the first ten years 86 percent of the cases resulted in a unanimous vote is evidence of some consistency and objectivity.

Critics, however, would argue that the dispute settlement mechanism is flawed as the grounds for appealing any NAFTA panel decision are greatly limited, the decision is binding, and cannot be further appealed in any party’s domestic court.

Satisfaction with panel decisions involving U.S.-Canada trade disputes has been much lower with the more high-profile cases, such as wheat, pork, swine, and softwood lumber cases. Much of the disparity in outcomes, real or perceived, is attributed to the nature of the panelists appointed to review a particular case. There are no permanent clerks or research assistants, so unlike traditional appellate courts, the panels have no institutional longevity, increasing the likelihood of poor reasoning or inconsistent decisions.

There are viable reform proposals to be considered that would further maximize NAFTA’s benefits. And there are many proposals out there. From the political perspective, we have a candidate, Senator Obama, who argues that NAFTA must be amended to address and put into place enforceable labor and environmental standards. From the trade practitioner’s perspective, we have many who argue that the dispute settlement process has become fatally flawed. I wish to address some of the broader reform proposals. I will not address those who criticize the mere existence of the NAFTA and wish for the United States to withdraw. And I certainly will not address calls for Canada to withdraw.

As I stated earlier, the two U.S. presidential candidates have publicly taken different positions on the NAFTA. John McCain states that he is a staunch defender of the agreement and that America should continue to engage in multilateral, regional and bilateral efforts to reduce barriers to trade. Barack Obama recognizes the importance of free trade, but has argued that the NAFTA needs to be “fixed” to address labor and environmental protection issues. And, just last week during a panel discussion on trade issues, McCain’s key trade advisor indicated that the Senator takes very seriously the labor and environmental issues as legitimate concerns of many voters, and that McCain takes these seriously “in a way the current administration has not.”

While the two candidates would definitely approach this trade issue in different manners, with this recent statement by McCain’s campaign, one could wonder whether their might be an effort in the next administration, no matter who wins the election, to renegotiate or

“improve” portions of the NAFTA. And, a decade after implementation and in a vastly different world trade system, maybe we have learned some lessons that should be incorporated into the agreement.

Let us think about this for a moment and return to Senator Obama’s statement that “NAFTA and its potential were oversold to the American people.”

I believe there are people on both sides of our border who would probably agree, and thought that the agreement would simply open up our borders to the complete free-flow of goods and commerce. This is simply not the case and, in that regard, the agreement has been mis-understood, not oversold. Some of the arguments for the agreement, with the benefit of hindsight, may have been flawed, and many questions raised by critics may have some validity.

The NAFTA is not a customs union, a monetary union, or an economic union. It is a free trade agreement negotiated by three parties; each seeking certain benefits. However, with or without the 1994 agreement our continent was becoming increasingly integrated. In the words of one author, NAFTA simply clarified how this integration would proceed, at what pace, and to whose benefit. The agreement has caveats, codicils, and yes, some restrictions, which govern our cross-border trade.

At this point in NAFTA’s evolution, one could argue that it has achieved one of its main goals. With regard to the U.S. and Canada, tariffs have been eliminated and we have similar, but not exact, tariff schedules with third countries. What NAFTA has not accomplished – and was not enacted to accomplish – is the requirement for harmonization among our regulations and standards. And, this is what has lead, in my opinion, to numerous and lengthy trade disputes, as well as the general public’s feeling that the agreement was oversold to them.

I honestly think that many people on both sides of our border, including some politicians, think that the NAFTA was intended to allow for the free circulation of all goods within the three countries without any need for coordination of regulatory regimes or major public policies like natural resources management. Critics aside, maybe we should ask ourselves whether it is time to update the purpose and scope of the agreement.

Allow me to briefly review the most commonly mentioned options for renegotiating, updating or “deepening” the NAFTA should the next U.S. president decide to address continued domestic criticism of the agreement and our Canadian and Mexican partners agree.

First, let us acknowledge that there will be vigorous debate over any proposals. Take, for example, the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America which was formally launched in March of 2005 as an effort to increase security among the United States, Canada and Mexico through greater cooperation and information sharing.

Premised on our joint security needs, the SPP seeks to build upon, but is separate from the NAFTA. One of its stated goals is to: “Promote economic growth, competitiveness, and quality of life.” Not only does this partnership call for implementation of common border security strategies, is seeks to improve productivity; reduce the costs of trade; and

enhance the joint stewardship of our environment. As most of the goals of the SPP can be achieved via regulations, many have heatedly debated whether this partnership is deepening our integration without proper input from the public and our legislatures and whether it may affect trade without entering into any formal treaty.

As for deepening the NAFTA, one of the most common proposals is the creation of a customs union. Aren't we already halfway there? Both the U.S. and Canada have already eliminated tariffs between each other, and as I said before, have similar tariff schedules with third countries. A customs union would allow for the free flow of all goods within the union, would create a common external tariff, but would still allow for provisions for sensitive market sectors, such as agriculture. It would also include a common approach to trade policy with third countries and could expand trade further while reducing distortions and differences in our trade agreements with other countries.

While a customs union does not require a harmonization or mutual recognition of each nation's internal regulations, it could potentially provide an avenue to enhance our ability to address trade remedy and dispute settlement. And, from a practitioner's point of view, I would argue that proposed reforms in this area would be a benefit.

Harmonizing and establishing a common external tariff would minimize differences in the most-favored nation tariffs applied to imports from third countries. It could also assist in the eventual phasing out of protective "rules of origin." And, perhaps any customs union could better address antidumping and countervailing duty disputes. One common and growing complaint of the NAFTA is that it is not equipped to deal with certain types of trade disputes – namely agriculture. In my opinion, any free trade area, should be capable of handling these types of disputes and be able to act to correct the system. A dispute settlement system that works for all sectors of the economy may go a long way in addressing problems of the NAFTA. While updating the agreement with aspects of a customs union would pose some challenges, this option is perhaps the most logical next step for the NAFTA parties and could more clearly show additional economic benefits.

The establishment of a common market or economic union is another oft-stated manner in which to deepen the integration of our countries. This type of an approach would require the harmonization or mutual recognition of standards and regulations. It could also require the recognition of supranational institutions for administering the arrangement.

Regulatory cooperation and convergence is by no means a new development. As the world has grown smaller and global trade flourishes, the development of international standards and disciplines has helped to reduce regulatory barriers to trade in goods and services. And, in fact, Canada, the U.S., and Mexico agreed in 2005 to develop a trilateral Regulatory Cooperation Framework to support and enhance existing, as well as encourage new, cooperation among our regulatory bodies. This effort has not progressed far to date, but could be the next step in the progress of our relationships. If some form of a customs union is ever reached, a common market would be a logical next step

forward so that our regulatory systems are harmonized. Such an undertaking would take a great deal of consultation and cooperation; but might be able to eventually overcome criticism if it significantly reduced regulatory differences, addressed certain labor and environmental standards issues, and further enhanced trade in goods and services.

This debate would certainly engage the issue of the role of international law and supra-national governing bodies; and, would likely face opposition on both sides of our border.

Revisiting the NAFTA to analyze and, perhaps, renegotiate certain aspects of the agreement and our countries' relationship is not necessarily a negative development. If done in a calm, reasoned manner, it could create an updated framework for moving our countries' trade agendas forward and positively deepening our relationship.

However, it must be done in a manner that respects the sovereignty of each nation, acknowledges the role of international law, and realizes the unique relationship between our countries. It cannot be achieved in an atmosphere where any party is threatening to walk away from the original agreement. If the next U.S. president finds it necessary to seek new talks on the NAFTA, political and partisan sound bites must be set aside, the benefits of NAFTA recognized, and a supportable rationale and clear path set forth as to the purpose and shared benefits of any "updates" to the agreement and any further economic integration between our great countries. And, if such negotiations come about, CCIL and ASIL should add their voices to the debate.

Thank you for allowing me to be with you today.