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A PARTNERSHIP FOR REGIONAL PROSPERITY AND GLOBAL PEACE

Introduction: Davis Robinson  
Keynote Speaker: Ambassador John Negroponte

INTRODUCTION

DAVIS ROBINSON:

My name is Davis Robinson. I am on the Executive Committee of the Canada-United States Law Institute. John Negroponte and I, we go back so many years. We do not really want at this moment to admit how many years it is, but it is almost sixty years. John Negroponte, in our generation of foreign service officers, I was a foreign service officer myself for several years, he is the most distinguished, and has the most incredible record of any foreign service officer. I do not think there is anyone else who has come close to the number of senior appointments.

His first ambassadorial post, as I recall, was in Honduras, and that actually, I think, became one of the more controversial things in his lengthy career because of the Contras. I was the legal advisor at that time. He was the Ambassador to Mexico, he was the Ambassador to the Philippines, and he was the Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment and Science at the time of the Gulf of Maine negotiations, the Fisheries Agreement, the Boundary Agreement, and the Law of the Sea Convention. He was the Deputy National Security Advisor. He was the first Director of National Intelligence. As you know, in the United States, often when we have turf fights, the way to solve them has been not to solve them but to create something new. So when the Commerce Department, State Department, and the Treasury Department were fighting over foreign trade, what did John


F. Kennedy do? He set up the United States Trade Representatives Office, so then there were four in the fight rather than three. John was then made the Ambassador to Iraq, and his last assignment was as the Deputy Secretary of State, the "#2" in the department. So it is a real honor and indeed a personal privilege to introduce this old friend who has had such a fabulous life, so I introduce you to John Negroponte.

KEYNOTE SPEAKER

JOHN NEGROPONTE:

I am going to take Davis with me wherever I give a speech. Thanks, Davis, very much. Let me start out, first of all, because I do not want Ambassador Heather Hodges to get the wrong impression. I want to acknowledge her presence here. She is our former Ambassador to the country of Ecuador, and she now runs the World Affairs Council chapter here in the Cleveland area. Heather is a very distinguished former senior personnel officer in the Department of State.

I want to thank Davis for having initiated this invitation to me, and I want to thank the organizers of the conference, the Canada-United States Law Institute. I am really delighted to be here. Frankly, I was not as aware as I should have been of the work that you do. And so I think this is a real eye-opener for me and something meaningful that I will take back to Washington. I want to say how delighted I am to see both the current and former Ambassadors of the United States to Canada, delighted that they are here today, and I want to thank everybody else for being involved, and to the number of Canadian friends, some of whom I have renewed acquaintance with after a certain period of time.

I have some prepared remarks, but before I do, I wanted to try and give them a little bit of context. We have emerged from a very difficult decade, the period 2000 to 2010, with these two wars which

7. Id.
are not yet fully resolved by any means (one less so than the other) and a financial crisis that has really put the U.S. economy in a very challenging situation. So I think in summary terms, one could say that the epithet or the characterization of a sole remaining superpower, which Secretary of State Madeline Albright used in the 1990s, is clearly no longer apt. I think we find ourselves in a period of some question back home and some self-doubt. I also think around the world people are looking at us and saying, “what is the role of the United States going to be in the world going forward in the future?” What kind of place are we going to have over the next couple of generations? I always like to say it is a little like Mark Twain’s famous epithet about rumors of my death being premature, and I think that is probably what one could also say about the United States’ role in the world.

I think there is an awful lot going for the United States. It is today, and will be in the year 2050, still the third most populous country in the world. And it is certainly going to be either the largest or the second largest economy in the world. I think its entrepreneurial system and its innovativeness give it a great deal to commend it, and I think that perhaps a factor that we do not think about that much, but when you look at China’s “One Child Policy,” and you look at the aging of Europe, and then you look at the United States demographic picture, the replenishment of our youthful population is really quite dynamic. So, I challenge my own students when I teach and always say, well, try and imagine what things will be like in the year 2050? I mean, it is not so far off. Forty or fifty years back does not look that long a time ago to me. And so, you have to challenge yourself in that same way looking forward, and I think we can look forward to a fairly bright future, provided we do a couple of things.


I think probably the two most important ones involve putting our own fiscal house in order. We must at least come up with a plan that puts us on a trajectory, say over a ten year period, or at least a period of time that is reasonably well defined. And if we can get on that track, I think we are going to have to be more measured with regard to the international engagements, particularly military ones that we undertake. And I think, and very much along the model that President Obama has suggested to us, we are going to have to take more multilateral approaches. We are going to have to do more with other countries that are willing partners, and that, I think, is going to put an even greater premium on alliances, strong bilateral relationships, and close friendships. We are going to have to be more mindful of all of these factors as we try to carry out our objectives, both around the world, and in our own neighborhood.

So that brings me of course, to the discussion about the United States-Canada relationship, which I believe in that context, is going to be even more important in the decades ahead than it has been in the decades past. I entitled my remarks “A Partnership for Regional Prosperity and Global Peace.” Now I recognize that this is an ambitious topic, but I selected it for a very specific purpose, and that is to highlight the broad and multifaceted and holistic nature of United States-Canada relations. The United States-Canada relationship is not just any relationship. It reaches into many spheres of human endeavor and touches many parts of the globe. It touches not just on our common border area but extends to the farthest corners of the world. We sometimes take for granted the extraordinarily friendly and productive nature of our relations. We need only imagine for a few moments a different scenario where our relations were antagonistic, maybe even to the point of having to arm our respective sides of the border, to appreciate the blessings of the peaceful border that we do have.

My own experience with the Government of Canada goes back a long way. Indeed, my first recollection of meeting Canadian officials was in Vietnam in the 1960s when Canada served on the Three-Nation International Control Commission, which supervised the 1954 Peace Accords on Indo-China. I was a political officer in our embassy in Saigon at the time, and from time to time, had the opportunity to meet with Canadian military and civilian officers.
charged with overseeing the ill-fated 1954 truce.\textsuperscript{17} Ill-fated as it may have been, imprinted on my mind from those days forward was the seriousness of Canada’s commitment to peace-keeping and peace-monitoring in the most far-flung places of the world.

A more in-depth exposure to Canada came in the late 1970s when I was named Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries.\textsuperscript{18} I was responsible for revising and renewing fisheries agreements with other fishing countries in light of the recent extension by the majority of costal states of their fisheries jurisdiction from 12 to 200 miles off their respective coasts.\textsuperscript{19} Because of the contiguity of the United States and Canada, our respective 200-mile claims overlapped and had to be sorted out by negotiation. Perhaps the most notable case was the Gulf of Maine Dispute,\textsuperscript{20} which at the time was a major bone of contention between us, so much so that our leaders selected special envoys to negotiate a solution. On our side, the negotiator was Lloyd Cutler, a noted Washington lawyer who later became White House Counsel.\textsuperscript{21} I was privileged to assist Mr. Cutler in my capacity as Deputy Assistant Secretary. Our counterpart was Ambassador Marcel Cadieux, a legendary figure in Canadian diplomacy.\textsuperscript{22} Well, as it turned out, we were unable to resolve, to finally resolve, the matter by negotiation. And in the end, it was settled by arbitration, thereby disposing of one of the more significant irritants in the management of our bilateral ties.\textsuperscript{23} Today, the Gulf of Maine case is but a boring and almost forgotten footnote in the history of United States-Canada relations. But believe me, at the time, it was one that excited considerable interest, and I would say even passion, on both sides of the border.


\textsuperscript{18} See LIEBMANN, supra note 15, at 85.

\textsuperscript{19} See id. at 86.


\textsuperscript{21} See L.S. PARSONS, MANAGEMENT OF MARINE FISHERIES IN CANADA 322 (1993).


\textsuperscript{23} See Brauer, supra note 20, at 473.
My fisheries experience with Canada was not limited to negotiating about ownership of scallops in the Gulf of Maine. One very cold winter in Juneau, Alaska, Ambassador Cadieux and I negotiated a joint fishing agreement over Pacific Halibut.²⁴ It was something like thirty below zero Fahrenheit, and the wind was blowing so hard it was a challenge to get in and out of the negotiating site. And in other talks, of course, we also negotiated endlessly about salmon—Atlantic salmon, Pacific salmon, Fraser River salmon, Bristol Bay sockeye salmon—you name it. I learned more about the life-cycle about the various marine species in that job than I ever thought I would.

In the mid-1980s, I returned to that same Bureau of Oceans, Environment and Science, this time as its Director and graduated to working on even a wider array of bilateral and multilateral issues with Canada.²⁵ For example, we worked on acid rain and what to do about the sulfur-emitting coal-fired power plants in the Ohio Valley which were causing dieback for forests on the Canadian and United States eastern seaboard,²⁶ the International Space Station and bringing Canada on as a partner to build the arm of the space station,²⁷ and perhaps most importantly, the landmark 1987 Montreal Protocol to protect the stratospheric ozone layer.²⁸ I think it is a fitting tribute to Canada’s leadership on international environmental matters that the Protocol has been most important agreement to curb greenhouse gasses thus far and that is was signed in Canada. I also share with many others disappointment that there has not been any further agreement on greenhouse gasses since 1987. Luckily, the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission still exists, and I was reassured to know that it is one part of our bureaucracy that still survives.²⁹ The big challenge then, and I gather it is now, was dealing with the lamprey eel.³⁰


²⁵. See Office of the Historian, supra note 2.

²⁶. See LIEBMAN, supra note 15, at 156-57.


²⁸. See generally LIEBMAN, supra note 15, at 151-155.


not know how many of you know about the lamprey eel, but the only way it can be killed is by a very intelligent German chemical called lampricide and that is the way it is kept under control, and I used to have to go to the State Department Appropriations Committee in Congress yearly and defend a multimillion dollar line item to buy lampricide from Germany to provide to the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, and I gather that still continues.

Not long after working on the Montreal Protocol, I was transferred to the White House to become Deputy National Security Advisor under Colin Powell. One of my most vivid recollections from that position was on January 2, 1989 when General Powell and I went into brief President Regan on the Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement ("FTA"), which he was about to sign in a video conference ceremony. This was after the ratification process on both sides had been completed, and he was about to sign it in a video conference ceremony with Prime Minister Mulroney. And so, as instructed by General Powell, I launched upon a set of talking points extolling the virtues of the agreement, but I had not gotten very far before the President interrupted and gently put me in my place by remarking, and this is probably almost a verbatim quote, he said "Oh, you don't have to remind me of the benefits of free trade. I remember the Smoot-Hauley Tariff." What are you going to do? "Yes, sir."

One of the most intense periods in my diplomatic life was serving as United States Ambassador to Mexico from 1989 to 1993, which was the time of the conception and negotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement ("NAFTA"). Looking back at that period, I think it was one of exceptional strategic cooperation between our three countries, and from which we have all benefitted in the ensuing twenty years. While the Agreement was negotiated between our respective trade negotiators, the Ambassadors played an important

32. See LIEBMANN, supra note 15, at 162.
34. Id.
behind-the-scenes role. David Winfield was the Canadian Ambassador to Mexico at that time, and we became very close partners and friends, I should add, in our common enterprise. I thought our working relations were a model of its kind, and I will always be grateful to David for the friendly cooperation he extended to me during the course of what, at times, was a very challenging negotiation, and I would like to think that I reciprocated to the best of my ability.

I would like to add here one thought about the NAFTA, which is a reflection on what that negotiation might have meant to Canada. I am not sure there was that much interest in Mexico on the part of Canada prior to the NAFTA negotiation, and I think that in some respects, it was a bit of an eye-opener. I think even as a practical matter it can be pointed to as something that generated a spike in Mexico-Canada/Canada-Mexico trade in the ensuing years, so I think it was a positive development in that regard as well. By the way, we had so many problems with Mexico; you really brought back memories today when the previous panel was talking about sanitary and phytosanitary measures and agricultural imports and exports. I had somebody at the Embassy there in Mexico City who worked for the Animal, Plant and Health Inspection Service, and I said, “Now what about these avocados? Why can’t I buy any whole Mexican avocados in the United States? I mean, what’s wrong here?” He said, “Oh, it’s the weevil.” I used to call it the evil weevil because it is a pestiferous creature that is going to ruin our whole agricultural setup. And I said, “Oh but what if we try to find some way to change


39. See generally M. AYHAN KOSE, GUY MEREDITH, & CHRISTOPHER M. TOWE, INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND WORKING PAPER, HOW HAS NAFTA AFFECTED THE MEXICAN ECONOMY? REVIEW AND EVIDENCE (2004) (providing statistics and data that supports increased trade between all NAFTA parties in general, and, increased trade between Canada and Mexico in particular).


that." And he said, "Well, scientifically it may be a manageable but..." And I said, "Why don't we work together and see if we can make some proposals to Washington as to how to change it." He said, "Oh, that's too political." So here I had the scientist telling me how political things were, but I am pleased to see that in American supermarkets now you can buy fresh, imported Mexican avocados in abundance. You can also buy mangoes which you could not get in those days, too, because back then, you had to dip them in some kind of hot liquid with a chemical in it, and that would of course ruin the texture of the mango as we killed probably some other evil weevil. I think it was some kind of a fly. So I heard a bit of deference and respect being expressed towards these scientific regulators, and I share that view, one must be respectful, but at the same time, it never hurts to ask questions. That would be my added thought to that proposition.

I once confronted, as we were trying to promote the NAFTA, a group of tomato farmers in Florida. We were about coming to closure on the NAFTA, and I said, "You know we're going to have to do this, and agriculture's on the table, in fact at U.S. insistence because we stood to benefit from increased U.S. agricultural exports." And they were complaining, "Well, we're going to be flooded by Mexican produce and everything." And I said, "Well, the way we deal with that is to have transition periods. We'll have a ten-year phase-in. It won't all happen right away. And that will, we think, provide an effective solution to the problem." And then I asked these farmers, "What do you think a reasonable transitional period would be?" and there was dead silence in the room for about a minute. And this one guy pipes up in the back, he says, "Fifty years."

Moving fast forward to the penultimate and ultimate stages of my government career, I was confirmed as our Ambassador to the United Nations four days after September 11, 2001.42 Over that following weekend, I made my way to New York, and the first diplomatic colleague I saw was Paul Heinbecker, Canada's permanent representative to the United Nations.43 Indeed, we had dinner that very first night I was in New York because I had known Paul during his service at the Canadian Embassy in Washington and came to regard him as an experienced professional and as a trusted friend. During our time in New York, Paul was always ready and willing to share with me his insightful assessment of the diplomatic landscape in

42. Office of the Historian, supra note 2.

New York and his candid thoughts about how to deal with the challenges we confronted. Later, as Director of National Intelligence, and finally as Deputy Secretary of State, I was able to work with Canadian officials on both global issues such as the phenomenon of violent Islamic extremism and all of those issues, as well as the preparation of our annual regional summits between the leaders of the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Indeed, as Deputy Secretary of State, I was privileged to accompany President Bush to two of his Security Prosperity Partnership meetings with Prime Minister Harper and President Calderón, one at Montebello and one in New Orleans.

These experiences at the culmination of my time in government service confirmed to me what I had been learning gradually during the entire forty-four years of my diplomatic career. First and foremost, we are neighbors, friends and allies. It is difficult to imagine a more important relationship, and in that context, Canada plays an instrumental role which needs to be appreciated, whether it is as a G7 country whose voice counts in global financial circles or as a strong NATO ally whose sons and daughters have been sent into harms way in such faraway places as Afghanistan.

As a neighbor and partner also in regional cooperation, whether in NAFTA or in the Western Hemisphere as a whole, Canada has made a substantial and consistent contribution, and it is not just in recent years. I remember going back into the 1970s when Canada had taken on a special responsibility for the Caribbean region. I remember Philip Habib, one of my mentors in the Foreign Service, had been given the assignment of working on what more we could do to help the Caribbean Basin region. One of the first places he came to was Ottawa to consult with Canada about that.

In this era of globalization, we must work together even more to enhance regional competitiveness if we are to avoid losing our edge to


47. See generally Philip Habib: A Remembrance, FOREIGN SERVICE J., July 1992, at 10-12 (verifying that Philip Habib was a Foreign Service officer as well as John Negroponte’s connection to him).
other parts of the world. Taking the NAFTA to the next level and regulatory cooperation initiatives, I think, will be very important steps in this direction. And finally, we are both Pacific nations facing westward towards peoples and economies that hold great promise and opportunity for the future of this planet. We have only lightly touched upon the diverse facets of United States-Canada relations, but perhaps I can close with the following thoughts. United States-Canada ties are not transient. Specific issues may come and go, and they need to be dealt with in a spirit that behooves neighbors, friends, and allies. There may be irritants that need to be managed, but we must never forget that the relationship is a historic and enduring one, as enduring as any such relationship can be. And this relationship has repercussions at all three levels of our respective diplomacies, the bilateral, the regional, and the global. So, I think it is fitting that we nurture these ties carefully, that we not take our relationships for granted, and that we use occasions such as these to reaffirm the profound and enduring friendship between our two countries. Thank you.