

Report of the Fourth Plenary Assembly

National Congress of Brazil

Brasilia, Brazil

May 19-21, 2005

Foro Interparlamentario de las Américas
Fórum Interparlamentar das Américas



Forum interparlementaire des Amériques
Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Acknowledgements

The FIPA Technical Secretariat is grateful to the Brazilian Congress, Congressman Luiz-Carlos Hauly and the public relations department of the Chamber of deputies for making this event possible.

We would also like to thank the Canadian International Development Agency and the Office for the Promotion of Democracy at the Organization of American States for their financial assistance, as well as the World Bank Institute and the Government of Finland for their support of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas.

Lastly, we would like to express our sincere appreciation to all of the experts and presenters for their valuable contributions to discussions of the 4th Plenary Assembly of FIPA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	5
2.	Opening Ceremony	5
3.	First Session of the Plenary Assembly.....	6
3.1	Election of the Fourth Plenary Assembly Chair	7
3.2	FIPA President's Report.....	7
3.3	Formation of the Working Groups	7
3.4	Other Issues.....	8
4.	The Final Plenary Assembly Session	9
4.1	Working Group Reports	9
4.2	Election of Executive Committee Members for 2005 - 2007	13
4.3	Selection of the site for the next Plenary Assembly	13
4.4	Closing Ceremony.....	13
5.	Appendices.....	16
5.1	Appendix 1 – Participating Countries & Delegates.....	16
5.2	Appendix 2 – Opening Ceremony Speeches	20
5.3	Appendix 3 – The FTAA and the Summit of the Americas: Presentation by the Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs	27
5.4	Appendix 4 – 4th Plenary Assembly Program.....	41
5.5	Appendix 5 – Report of the FIPA President	43
5.6	Appendix 6 – Report and Recommendations of Working Group 1 (Terrorism)	49
5.7	Appendix 7 – Report and Recommendations of Working Group 2 (FTAA)	55
5.8	Appendix 8 – Report and Recommendations of Working Group 3 (Foreign Debt)	67
5.9	Appendix 9 – Report and Recommendations of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas	71
5.10	Appendix 10 – Executive Committee Members 2005-2006	78

1. Introduction

At the cordial invitation of the National Congress of Brazil, the Fourth Plenary Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas (FIPA) was held in Brasilia the 19, 20 and 21 of May, 2005.

This important event was attended by 86 parliamentarians, who participated as official delegates from 15 countries of the Americas and three regional parliamentary organizations (*for a list of the participating countries and delegates, see Appendix 1*).

During the Assembly, three working groups were formed to discuss the role of parliamentarians in the fight against terrorism, the Free Trade Area of the Americas process, and the issue of external debt. The Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas also held its third regular session on the mornings of May 20 and 21, 2005.

2. Opening Ceremony



The formal opening session of the Fourth Plenary Assembly took place in the Chamber of Deputies of the National Congress of Brazil on Thursday, May 19, 2005. It was chaired by the Hon. Renan Calheiros, speaker of the Federal Senate.

After declaring the session open, Senator Calheiros gave the floor to Deputy Luiz Carlos Hauly, who welcomed the participants in his capacity as Brazil's representative to FIPA.

The ceremony continued with an address by the Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette, President of FIPA, who thanked the Brazilian Congress for the warm reception and expressed delight at seeing so many parliamentarians together once again, united in their determination to discuss and contribute to continent-wide economic and social progress.

The Hon. Nelson Jobim, president of Brazil's Federal Supreme Court, spoke next, stressing the value of inter-parliamentary dialogue in dealing with the trans-national problems typical of the 21st century.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Then the Hon. Severino Cavalcanti, president of the Chamber of Deputies, addressed the Assembly, stating that he was honoured to host the Fourth Plenary Assembly, and emphasizing the importance of each topic on the agenda in the day-to-day work of legislators.

The session ended with a speech by the Hon. Renan Calheiros, who emphasized FIPA's role as a leader in inter-American parliamentary dialogue and stated his conviction that strengthening legislative power was the key to building more effective democracies.

(The speeches delivered during the opening ceremony are reproduced in Appendix 2.)

Following a brief pause, Deputy Luiz Carlos Hauly invited the parliamentarians to take their seats for a presentation by the Hon. Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, on the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) process and the Fourth Summit of the Americas. Minister Amorim briefly described the origins of the FTAA project and pointed to certain factors that were currently hindering the advancement of negotiations, such as the slow progress in negotiations at the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the disparity in development levels of the hemisphere's countries. He estimated that the negotiations would take several more years, and he applauded the fact that FIPA was also focusing on political and social issues, which are just as important to the Summits' agenda. *(See Appendix 3 for the Minister's speech.)*

3. First Session of the Plenary Assembly

The work of the Fourth Plenary Assembly officially began with consideration of the agenda, as presented by Senator Hervieux-Payette, President of FIPA. On a motion by Jamaica, seconded by Grenada, the Plenary Assembly unanimously approved the agenda *(reproduced in Appendix*



4). Senator Hervieux-Payette also reviewed a few procedural rules for the discussions.

3.1 Election of the Fourth Plenary Assembly Chair

Senator Hervieux-Payette then presided over the election of the Chair of the Fourth Plenary Assembly. Canada, seconded by Mexico, moved that Deputy Luiz Carlos Hauly of Brazil be elected Chair, a position he was given by acclamation.

3.2 FIPA President's Report

The President of FIPA presented her annual report, summarizing the work of the Executive Committee and the permanent working groups. In particular, she described the results of the two regional forums of the Group of Women Parliamentarians held in Barbados and Argentina and noted how important it was for parliaments to be heard at the Fourth Summit of the Americas in Mar del Plata. In addition, Senator Hervieux-Payette described the efforts made to strengthen FIPA's Technical Secretariat and encouraged parliaments to make their annual contributions as set out in resolution FIPA/PA/2004/RES.1, entitled "For the Official Inclusion of National Legislatures from the Americas in FIPA".

(The President's report is reproduced in Appendix 5.)

3.3 Formation of the Working Groups

The Chair of the Fourth Plenary Assembly gave the floor to the President of FIPA, who provided an overview of the composition and mandate of each working group. Senator Hervieux-Payette also took the opportunity to remind participants that the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas would be meeting in the morning of Friday, May 20, and Saturday, May 21.

The working groups were constituted as follows:

Working Group 1 – The Fight Against Terrorism

Chair: Senator Silvia Hernández (Mexico)

Facilitators: Mr. Mauro Miedico (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime)

Mr. Kevin Newmeyer (Inter-American Committee Against Terrorism, Organization of American States)

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Rapporteur: Mr. Sérgio Fernandes Senna Pires (National Congress of Brazil)

Working Group 2 – Free Trade Area of the Americas

Chair and

Acting Chair: Mr. Don Boudria, MP (Canada) and Senator James Kelleher (Canada)

Facilitators: Ms. Verónica Silva (Division of International Trade and Integration, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean)

Mr. Cesar Parga (Office of Trade, Growth and Competitiveness, Organization of American States)

Rapporteur: Mr. Rosendo Pereira de Melo Neto (National Congress of Brazil)

Working Group 3 – External Debt

Chair: Congressman Luis Arturo Molinari Romero (Argentina)

Facilitator: Mr. James Haley (Bank of Canada)

Rapporteur: Mr. Osmar Perazzo Lannes Júnior (National Congress of Brazil)

Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas

Chair: Congresswoman Margarita Stolbizer (Argentina)

Speaker: Ms. Ana Falu (Southern Cone Regional Office, United Nations Development Fund for Women)

Rapporteur: Ms. Ana Luiza Backes (National Congress of Brazil)

3.4 Other Issues

In the first session of the Plenary Assembly, the President of FIPA reminded participants that elections would be held to replace half of the Executive Committee's members (one in each subregion) during the final plenary session.

She also noted the presence of Mr. Bruce Fox, of the Canadian Commercial Corporation, who had come to invite participants to

attend the Procurement Conference of the Americas, to be held in Atlanta in late October 2005.

4. The Final Plenary Assembly Session

Following a day and a half of discussions, the final session of FIPA's Fourth Plenary Assembly was held on the morning of Saturday, May 21, 2005, in the Federal Senate of Brazil.

4.1 Working Group Reports

The chairs of the working groups each summarized their discussions and submitted their final report and recommendations for approval by the Plenary Assembly.

4.1.1 Working Group 1 – The Fight Against Terrorism

Senator Silvia Hernández of Mexico chaired the Working Group on the Fight Against Terrorism, in which 26 parliamentarians took part. The work began with a presentation by Mr. Mauro Miedico, a terrorism prevention specialist with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Mr. Miedico provided an overview of the various United Nations resolutions and instruments aimed at combating terrorism and offered parliamentarians some ideas for implementing them in a legislative framework. He also briefed the parliamentarians on the UNODC's technical assistance programs. Mr. Miedico's presentation was followed by a discussion period, after which the first working session was adjourned.

The second working session began with a presentation by Mr. Kevin Newmeyer, program director for the Inter-American Committee Against Terrorism (CICTE) at the Organization of American States (OAS). After providing a brief introduction to the Inter-American Convention Against Terrorism, Mr. Newmeyer focused on the role played by legislators, from developing national laws to allocating budgetary resources to the fight against terrorism. He stated that the CICTE welcomed greater involvement by parliamentarians in its activities.

Following a discussion period, the members of the Working Group adopted a series of recommendations. In particular, they reiterated the urgency of ratifying, implementing and enforcing international

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

instruments against terrorism, and requested technical assistance from the CICTE to prepare a handbook for parliamentarians of the Americas.

Following a debate that resulted in some minor amendments, the recommendations were approved unanimously by the Plenary Assembly.

The documents distributed by Mr. Miedico and Mr. Newmeyer will be made available to parliamentarians on the FIPA Website through the Virtual Parliament of the Americas (www.e-fipa.org).

(The report and recommendations of the Working Group on the Fight Against Terrorism are reproduced in Appendix 7.)

4.1.2 Working Group 2 – The Free Trade Area of the Americas Process

The Working Group on the Free Trade Area of the Americas was chaired by Senator James Kelleher and Member of Parliament Don Boudria, both of Canada; 20 parliamentarians took part.

The first working session was devoted to presentations by Ms. Verónica Silva, an economic officer with the Division of International Trade and Integration at the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), and Mr. Cesar Parga, a senior trade specialist with the OAS Office of Trade, Growth and Competitiveness.

Ms. Silva provided an update on the negotiation process in the World Trade Organization (WTO), focusing in particular on the discussions held in connection with the “July 2004 Package” and on the specific situation of Latin America and the Caribbean in current trade negotiations.

Mr. Cesar Parga followed with a presentation on the Free Trade Area of the Americas negotiation process. He mentioned a few of the external factors contributing to the current impasse and some problems inherent in the negotiations themselves. He also remarked on the guiding role that legislators could play in the liberalization process, not only during the negotiation and implementation phases but also in developing a national agenda on competitiveness and productivity.

The second and third working sessions produced some lively debates, which led to the adoption of a series of recommendations, one of which called for the adoption of policies that would

complement free trade agreements by fostering high-quality employment, economic development and social programs, and of competitiveness and productivity policies. The report also contains recommendations concerning agricultural subsidies, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, immigration and labour force mobility, and special and developing country conditions. Lastly, it called on FIPA to pursue interparliamentary trade collaboration.

Following a few amendments at the May 21, 2005, plenary session, the recommendations were approved unanimously.

(The report and recommendations of the Working Group on the FTAA are reproduced in Appendix 8.)

4.1.3 Working Group 3 – External Debt

Nineteen parliamentarians participated in the work of the Working Group on External Debt, chaired by Argentine Congressman Luis Arturo Molinari Romero.

The first working session began with a presentation by Mr. James Haley, a specialist with the Bank of Canada speaking on his own behalf. Mr. Haley explained in particular how, through tight fiscal and monetary policy and efforts to strike a balance, States could – in theory – benefit from external debt. He also made it clear, however, that there was sometimes a gap between theory and practice, and he noted that there was a need to re-examine the role of the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

The work continued with a discussion period, which led to the adoption of recommendations. The parliamentarians recommended in particular that parliaments take part in the deliberations on indebtedness issues and continue to work together through the establishment of an interparliamentary committee to pursue negotiations with international financial institutions. They called on FIPA's Executive Committee to urge the heads of state and government to ratify the commitment to combat inequality, the education access gap, hunger, poverty and corruption by promoting job creation and access to education.

Following a debate that resulted in minor amendments, the recommendations were unanimously approved by the Plenary Assembly on May 21, 2005.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

(The report and recommendations of the Working Group on External Debt are reproduced in Appendix 9.)

4.1.4 Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas

The third regular session of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas was held on May 20 and 21, 2005 and was chaired by Congresswoman Margarita Stolbizer of Argentina.

Deputy Janete Capiberibe of Brazil welcomed the participants and gave the floor to Congresswoman Margarita Stolbizer of Argentina and Grenadian Member of Parliament Glyns Roberts, who presented the results of the regional forums on women's leadership to strengthen democratic governance held in Barbados (March 20-22, 2005) and Argentina (April 6-8, 2005). Their reports were followed by a discussion, during which the parliamentarians commented on the forums' results and made suggestions concerning the work plan of the Group of Women Parliamentarians.

The second session opened with a presentation by Ms. Ana Falu, Director, Southern Cone Regional Office, United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM). The subject of the presentation was the role of parliamentarians in the adoption and implementation of gender equality legislation and policies.

The participants then approved recommendations calling on them to submit the results of their discussions concerning women, poverty and employment to the heads of state and government of the Americas for the Fourth Summit of the Americas at Mar del Plata, and to request that, through FIPA, the voices of parliamentarians be considered in promoting a social dialogue to engage social and government leaders for a development model with more and better jobs. The report also called for the development of a work plan for 2005-2007.

The recommendations were approved unanimously by the Plenary Assembly.

(The report and recommendations of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas are reproduced in Appendix 9.)

4.1.5 Introduction to the Virtual Parliament of the Americas

Ms. Lola Giraldo, Coordinator of the Virtual Parliament of the Americas, an online discussion space for parliamentarians, provided

each working group with a short workshop on how to use the Virtual Parliament of the Americas, illustrating in particular how to register for and participate in on-line discussions. The user guide distributed by Ms. Giraldo is accessible through the www.e-fipa.org Website.

4.2 Election of Executive Committee Members for 2005 - 2007

The Plenary Assembly elected half of the members of the Executive Committee for 2005 to 2007. Representatives of each of the four subregions were elected in the following manner.

Canada's delegation moved that **Mexico** be re-elected to represent North America – carried.

Costa Rica's delegation moved that **Guatemala** be elected to represent Central America, replacing Costa Rica – carried.

Guyana's delegation moved that **Grenada** be elected to represent the Caribbean, replacing Haiti (post vacant since 2004) – carried.

Argentina's delegation moved that **Chile** be elected to represent South America, replacing Argentina – carried.

(The composition of the Executive Committee for 2005-2006 is presented in Appendix 10.)

4.3 Selection of the site for the next Plenary Assembly

The Chair of the Assembly noted the decision made at FIPA's Third Plenary Assembly in Valparaiso, Chile, to accept Colombia's offer to host FIPA's Fifth Plenary Assembly.

The Colombian Congress subsequently confirmed its offer following the Assembly.

4.4 Closing Ceremony

The President of FIPA officially thanked delegates for their participation and thanked the organizers of FIPA's Fourth Plenary Assembly, whose efforts had made the event a success. She expressed special gratitude to the speakers of Brazil's Senate and Chamber of Deputies for their warm reception, and to Mr. Luiz Carlos

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Haully, Brazil's representative to FIPA, and the chairs of the working groups.

She informed the delegates of several on-going projects and invited them to visit the www.e-fipa.org Website to keep up to date on developments.

As Chair of FIPA's Fourth Plenary Assembly Mr. Luiz Carlos Haully then officially adjourned the meeting.

* * * *



Participants in the Fourth Plenary Assembly



Brazilian National Congress

5. Appendices

5.1 Appendix 1 – Participating Countries & Delegates

President of FIPA

Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette

Argentina

Senator Luis Alberto Falco

Senator María Cristina Perceval

Congressman Mauricio Carlos Bossa

Congresswoman María Teresa Ferrín

Congressman Luis Arturo Molinari Romero

Congresswoman Olinda Montenegro

Congresswoman Rosario Romero

Congressman Aníbal Jesús Stella

Congresswoman Margarita Stolbizer

Congresswoman Alicia Ester Tate

Brazil

Senator Cristovam Buarque

Congressman Luiz José Bittencourt

Congresswoman Janete Capiberibe

Congressman Benedito Dias

Congressman Edson Ezequiel de Matos

Congressman João Paulo Gomes da Silva

Congressman Luiz Carlos Haully

Congresswoman Edna Macedo

Congressman Zequinha Marinho

Congressman Colbert Martins

Congressman Antonio Carlos Mendes Thame

Congressman Nilson Mourão

Congressman José Francisco Paes Landim

Congressman Silvio Torres

Congressman Tarcísio Zimmermann

Canada

Senator Michel Biron
Senator Percy Downe
Senator James Kelleher
Senator Madeleine Plamondon
Don Boudria, MP

Chile

Senator José García Ruminot
Congressman Germán Becker Alvear
Congressman Waldo Mora Longa
Congressman Iván Alejandro Moreira Barros
Congressman Luis Iván Paredes Fierro
Congressman Esteban Valenzuela Van Treek

Costa Rica

Mario Calderón Castillo, MLA

Cuba

Tuval Páez Hernández, MNA
Elsa Rojas Hernández, MNA
Ernesto Suárez Méndez, MNA

Ecuador

Congresswoman Ana Lucía Cevallos Muñoz
Congressman Geovanny Flores

Grenada

Glynis Roberts, MP

Guatemala

Congressman Matías Ajvix Locón
Congressman Alfredo De León Solano
Congressman Job Ramiro Garcia y Garcia

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Congressman Hugo Rolando López Barrios

Congressman Gudy Rivera Estrada

Guyana

Genevieve Allen, MP

Honduras

Congressman Jack Arevalo Fuentes

Congressman José María Lagos Blanco

Congressman Francisco Ramos Martínez

Congresswoman Elisa Cristina Ruiz Guevara

Jamaica

Sharon Hay-Webster, MP

Mexico

Senator Noemí Guzmán Lagunes

Senator Silvia Hernández Enríquez

Senator Filomena Margaiz Ramírez

Senator María del Carmen Ramírez García

Congressman Luis Eduardo Espinoza Pérez

Congressman Rogelio Flores Mejía

Congresswoman Blanca Gámez Gutiérrez

Congressman Jesús Porfirio González Schmal

Congressman Francisco Luis Monárrez Rincón

Congressman Mario Alberto Zepahua Valencia

Paraguay

Senator Adriana Franco de Fernández

Senator Alfredo Ratti

Senator Miguel Saguier Carmona

Senator Milciades Alejandro Velázquez Ugarte

Senator Mirtha Vergara de Franco

Congressman Simón Benítez Ortiz

Congressman Juan Roberto Espínola Rivero

Congressman Oscar Fernando Mercado Grau



Congresswoman Rosa Esperanza Merlo Drews
Congressman Juan Bartolomé Ramírez Brizuela
Congressman Edgar Domingo Venialgo Recalde

Venezuela

Rodrigo Cabezas, MNA
Pedro Carreño, MNA
Simón Escalona, MNA
Cilia Flores, MNA
Desirée Santos Amaral, MNA
María Iris Varela Rangel, MNA

Parliamentary Confederation of the Americas (COPA)

Congresswoman Maria José Maninha, President (Chamber of
Deputies of Brazil)
Pierre Moreau, MNA (Quebec National Assembly)

Andean Parliament

Andean Parliamentarian Juana Maria Vallejo Klaere (Ecuador)

Latin-American Parliament

Congresswoman Yeda Crusius (Chamber of Deputies of Brazil)

FIPA Secretariat

Ms. Lola Giraldo
Ms. Emmanuelle Pelletier
Ms. Sabra Ripley

5.2 Appendix 2 – Opening Ceremony Speeches



5.2.1 Speech by the FIPA President

**Speech by the Honourable Céline Hervieux-Payette
Senator of Canada, President of FIPA**

Original: Spanish

Senator Renan Calheiros, President of the Federal Senate, Deputy Severino Cavalcanti, President of the Chamber of Deputies, Minister Nelson Jobim, President of the Supreme Court of Justice, and my friend Mr. Luiz Carlos Hauly, Brazilian representative to the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas, dear friends and colleagues:

I am very pleased to be in this wonderful country again, enjoying the warmth and hospitality of the Brazilian people. Since FIPA began, Brazil has been there, supporting this initiative for parliamentary integration in the Americas, and through our friend and colleague Luiz-Carlos Hauly, the Brazilian Congress has participated actively in consolidating our organization.

In the last four years, FIPA has become an important forum for parliamentary interaction, not only because of its pragmatic agenda but also because it has given parliamentarians from all countries in the hemisphere an opportunity to become acquainted, to dialogue, to debate opinions and to learn from other experiences. It has been no coincidence that the open dialogue in FIPA meetings has helped to resolve crises between countries in the Southern Cone, to create new parliamentary committees in Central America or to advance the issue of gender equity in the Caribbean, to name a few.



I am convinced that only mutual trust will strengthen our determination to overcome the obstacles inherent in an increasingly complex and dynamic world. Therefore I think that communication and interaction among the legitimate representatives of our peoples is more important now than ever. The democracies in our region face many challenges and it is important that we develop common strategies to deal with them.

But at the same time the new world order presents countries in the Americas with many opportunities and we must recognize that individually we cannot benefit from them. Close cooperation among countries in this hemisphere is key to the development of our peoples and therefore this cooperation must exist at all levels, especially among parliamentarians, since legislators are the ones responsible for serving as a direct link between citizens and the institutions that govern them. Thus, parliamentary participation in international negotiation processes is important to ensure the success of cooperation and integration initiatives.

That is why FIPA is trying to create forums for discussing issues on the hemispheric agenda, so that parliamentarians from Canada to Argentina can meet and talk together and thus help pursue joint projects that will advance our social and economic policies. Although our organization works with a very small staff and budget, we have had many positive results in the last four years. In fact, our presence here today is a clear indication of the willingness to cooperate, work together, know each other better and continue to develop this important initiative.

I want to thank all of you for your support and your participation in this event, especially you, the presidents of the Senate, Chamber of Deputies and Federal Supreme Court, because your presence here today is significant recognition of the work of this organization and a clear indication that we are on the right track.

Thank you very much.

5.2.2 Speech by the President of the Federal Supreme Court

**Speech of the Honourable Minister Nelson Jobim,
President of the Federal Supreme Court**

Original: Portuguese

Senator Renan Calheiros, President of the National Congress; Honorable Severino Cavalcanti, Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies; ladies and gentlemen of the directing board; Foreign Minister Celso Amorim; honorable deputies; ladies and gentlemen: I believe that this conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas represents an important understanding, and not only as regards the subject matter, which is highly relevant for Latin America and the whole Western Hemisphere.

You will be dealing with such issues as the Free-Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), security, counter-terrorism, foreign debt and the role of women. But you must also bear in mind that the countries of the Americas generally have a presidential system of government. In such regimes, the modern trend, bearing in mind the rapidity of the decision-making processes, is for the Executive to be much more preponderant than the Legislature. Latin American electoral systems are making their legislatures increasingly more representative, thus reducing the supremacy of the decision-making process. The result is that greater representativity of the legislature always means an operating difficulty, in the sense of reaching a majority decision.

You all know the difficulties of highly representative parliaments, which pay the price for their national representation with difficulties in reaching a majority decision.

Our systems, which are mainly parliamentary regulatory regimes, are perfectly suited to a time when parliaments were less representative, which resulted in a majority that could make decisions.

I believe that the modern crisis in parliaments is precisely this: greater representativity means less ability to make decisions. That is the main reason why parliaments end up becoming more and more remote –not because of their defects, but because of the representativity of the nations' decision-making process– as regards the internationalization of issues.

In the modern world, domestic decisions depend on an outlook of fitting into the world in which sustainable development takes place.

I believe that such discussions, especially a discussion that goes beyond national borders, have to be clear and transparent.

Nineteenth-century-style national sovereignty is no longer able to deal with transnational crime. The legal and political structures that were developed in the 19th century, and continued in the 20th century and on into the 21st century, are not adequate for the transnational model of crime.

Within the context of international organized crime, national borders provide protection and a competitive edge for international crime. That is why, Mr. President, this issue is extremely important, not only in economic discussions, but also as regards the treatment of organized crime and, moreover, in relations between nations as a result of foreign debt.

I believe that this is a great moment. The Federal Supreme Court and I, as its Chief Justice, welcome you to Brazil. Learn, have fun and enjoy this most hospitable country.

Thank you.

5.2.3 Speech by the President of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies

Speech of the Honourable Severino Cavalcanti, Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil

Original: Portuguese

Senator Renan Calheiros, Speaker of the Federal Senate; other members of the directing board; senators; deputies; ladies and gentlemen: I am pleased to take part in this opening session of the IV Plenary Meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas, which the Chamber of Deputies has the honor of hosting.

Events like this are evidence of the new reality that is emerging from the process of globalization. It is no longer enough for parliamentarians to concern themselves solely with routine domestic issues. With the intensification of economic, political and sociocultural exchanges in current international relations, legislatures need to engage more and more in efforts toward integration, and their members need an awareness of what is going on beyond their

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

national borders. Thus, activities related to exchanges between parliamentarians and parliaments are always opportune.

Fortunately, such meetings have been frequent. Just a few days ago there occurred in this country the VI General Conference of the Parliamentary Confederation of the Americas (COPA), currently presided over by Deputy Maninha, a personage who enhances the prestige of the Brazilian parliament. And last month a delegation of Brazilian parliamentarians attended a meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in the Philippines.

The plans for this IV Plenary include meetings of the Working Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas, along with discussions on issues such as terrorism, foreign debt and the Free-Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). These topics were also addressed at the previous plenary meeting, held last year in Chile, and they will be developed further here.

The choice of topics is quite timely, involving issues of interest to all the FIPA member countries.

As Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies, I can assure visiting parliamentarians that this matter has received considerable attention in this House.

Foreign debt has been a hot issue in the Brazilian parliament and has been the subject of countless legislative efforts. Recently, this issue was the subject of a thorough analysis by the Council for Advanced Studies of the Chamber of Deputies, and resulted in a pertinent recommendation to the Executive Power.

The global fight against terrorism has been getting increasing attention among parliamentarians. This is shown both in the formal proposals for outlawing terrorist activities in our criminal legislation, and in the analysis of relevant international acts signed by the Executive Power, such as the recent Inter-American Convention Against Terrorism, which is being dealt with in this House.

As regards the FTAA, despite the ups and downs that have marked its negotiating process, the formation of a free-trade area for our whole hemisphere has been debated by the deputies and followed up by a Special Commission on the FTAA.

So, I can assure you that this House has been dealing with the common problems that affect the parliaments and parliamentarians of the Americas. Let me reiterate that the Chamber of Deputies is

honored to host this event and hopes that all the participants will have profitable and enriching discussions over the next few days.

I hope that our hospitality will provide an opportunity for significant advances in the handling of these issues in our hemisphere, along with deeper parliamentary exchanges, so as to pave the way for a future Parliament of the Americas.

Thank you very much.

5.2.4 Speech by the President of the Brazilian Federal Senate

Speech of the Honourable Renan Calheiros, Speaker of the Federal Senate of Brazil

Original: Portuguese

Severino Cavalcanti, Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies; Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette, President of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas; Minister Nelson Jobim, Chief Justice of the Federal Supreme Court; Minister Celso Amorim, Minister of Foreign Affairs, on behalf of whom I greet all the ambassadors here present; Deputy Luiz Carlos Hauly, our representative at the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas; party leaders; ladies and gentlemen: I am especially pleased to be here at the opening ceremony of the IV Plenary Meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas.

Since its inception in 2001, FIPA has become a major player in the dialogue between friendly nations, through the sharing of experiences and the identification of common interests in hemispheric issues. This was the case at the inaugural meeting in Ottawa in 2001, and also at the plenaries held since then in Mexico, Panama and Chile.

This event in Brasilia will be of major importance as a reaffirmation of the role of our parliaments in the discussion of policies on international cooperation. It will provide a wonderful opportunity to discuss relevant issues, such as the role of women in our parliaments, the Free-Trade Area of the Americas, our foreign debts and anti-terrorism policies.

It is worth noting that this meeting has set the objective of furthering integration as a decisive instrument for sustainable and harmonious growth in the region.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

And there is another objective that ties in with the first one: strengthening the role of the Legislative Power in democracy and in human rights. For us Brazilians, democracy has become part of our national heritage. We lived without it for twenty-one years in the last half of the past century. We struggled to restore it because we sorely missed it and could attest that there is no justice without freedom. Twenty years after the restoration of democracy in Brazil, we are more convinced than ever that democracy is the basis on which the modern state is built. Development, social justice, indeed the progress of the nation will never be achieved without a basic respect for the inalienable right of citizens to freely choose their leaders.

Our region has made admirable progress in the direction of democracy and human rights. In the case of the Brazilian legislature which I have the honor of presiding, I can mention two important issues right off the top. Political reform, now being debated, must undoubtedly increase the representativity and legitimacy of our parliamentarians, thus making Brazilian democracy more efficient. By means of intense debate and constructive criticism, Parliament will stimulate reflections that will enrich the process of shaping our political destiny as a free and sovereign nation in the concert of nations.

I would also like to mention the gun-control law, approved a short while ago, thanks to which our civilian population is literally handing over its weapons to the authorities for disposal. Among other advances, the law prohibits the sale and marketing of weapons. But this ban will become effective only with the approval of society, by means of a referendum to be held on October 2. The gun-control law has certainly already contributed, and will continue to contribute, to reducing urban violence and crime.

I greet all the delegations present here. I hope that, by the end of the proceedings, we will have updated our agenda on behalf of our hemisphere, which is increasingly more integrated and geared to our common development.

Now let's get down to work! May this forum be profitable and successful!

I declare this session adjourned.

Thank you all very much.

5.3 Appendix 3 – The FTAA and the Summit of the Americas: Presentation by the Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs

**Presentation by H.E. Celso Amorim,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil**

Original: Portuguese

Deputy Luiz Carlos Hauly, Vice-President of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas and chairman of this session; Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette, President of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas; dear friend Deputy Maninha; fellow parliamentarians; ambassadors; ladies and gentlemen:

Just yesterday, not at this plenary but in this same House, I had the opportunity to give a long talk on the trade negotiations in which Brazil is involved, and, in that context, I made some references to the FTAA.

To this illustrious audience, I prefer to give a general idea of the Brazilian view of the FTAA, more from the political standpoint, which naturally cannot be separated from certain economic questions. However, I'll spare you unnecessary details – although, as we always say in international negotiations, “The devil is in the details”.

By coincidence, in 1994, when the FTAA was launched –when Bill Clinton was President of the United States and Itamar Franco was President of Brazil– I was intensely involved, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the whole process of the Summit of the Americas and, specifically, within the Summit, of the FTAA itself.

Whether it's a coincidence or not, our current ambassador to Washington was the Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Abdenur, who ended up being more involved in the day-to-day affairs of the Summit, the Miami Declaration and the initial formation of a plan for negotiations.

I mention this because I think it is very important to see the context in which the idea of the FTAA arose and to know a little about how it evolved, strictly from the standpoint of trade negotiations or proposed economic negotiations. Although the FTAA arose during the Clinton Administration, it was really a development of the proposals of President Bush Senior, the father of the current President Bush, who launched the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. One of the results

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

was the bilateral agreement between Mercosur and the United States – the so-called “4+1”. It was a development from that process.

Naturally the FTAA initiative arose in a more ambitious context, within the broader political framework of the Summit of the Americas, as you know. Fortunately, here, on the agenda of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas, we will be discussing not only the FTAA but also issues such as gender, the status of women, terrorism and debt.

I remember that, at the time the FTAA negotiations were launched, we were very emphatic about having other aspects dealt with as well in that Summit process, such as technology transfer and economic and social development issues. But, indeed, there was a major trade component.

To understand the meaning of this trade component, it is necessary to recall that time. In 1994, the Uruguay Round was concluded. That was the first great round of trade negotiations since the Tokyo Round in the 1970s, and the first that covered more than trade in goods, since it also included trade in services, rules for intellectual property and several other aspects.

As I recalled yesterday at the other forum that I attended, the Uruguay Round, which also took more than seven years to complete, marked a very important transition: from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to the World Trade Organization (WTO). But it also had another aim. It was said at the time that the Uruguay Round would be the round to end all rounds. In other words, there were no plans on the horizon to hold another major round of trade negotiations, precisely because the WTO had created a forum and a mechanism that would, theoretically, make it possible to have specific negotiations on various issues, such as agriculture, services and trade facilitation, thus ending the need for further rounds.

As we know, that is not what actually happened. I am only mentioning this now as a reference point, because it affects the current period in which we are living and the very course of the FTAA negotiations.

So then, at that time there was no prospect of any other major trade negotiations. Then the idea of the FTAA arose, a little before the launching of the Miami Summit and a little after discussions on President Bush’s Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. At that time the talk was not so much about the FTAA but about expanding NAFTA.

NAFTA would be expanded to South American countries and would include Latin America and the Caribbean. I am referring, in this case, to the trade aspect. But I reiterate, because the matter is very important, that the Summit of the Americas included many other issues. I repeat: I am pleased to see that many points are being discussed here, but they are closely linked to the trade issue. It is also necessary to talk about development in a broader sense and of concerns that the Free-Trade Area of the Americas not become merely an attempt to open up markets for the benefit of the richer countries of the hemisphere.

I have just completed a visit to some Caribbean countries. We have been paying greater attention to the Caribbean countries in the Government of President Lula. I was in Jamaica, Barbados and, before that, Trinidad and Tobago, not to mention Guyana and Surinam, which are in South America. I noted that in those countries there is great concern that the discussion not be limited to free trade, but be part of the broader context of the Summit process in terms of the development issue. It is a broader subject.

This leads me to make a digression. Then I will return to the more specific theme. This digression has to do with the concept of the Americas. We are a hemisphere with some important features, with great similarities and differences, with some exceptions. There are great similarities because, in general, there are two very strong aspects in our hemisphere. First, an attachment to democracy. That does not mean that there have not been various disturbances, especially in our part of the hemisphere. However, even when we lived under very hard, authoritarian governments, certainly in our country there was at least a formal reference to democracy, which did not stop being important, because it kept the Congress open for a good part of the time and later made possible a fairly smooth transition back to democratic government. I would say that is true, in varying degrees, for practically the whole continent.

The other issue that seems very important to me is the issue of women, as well as the racial issue regarding blacks and aboriginals. This topic has to be included in all discussions about democracy in our hemisphere. For example, not long ago Brazil proposed a convention at the OAS to eliminate racial discrimination; this issue has a strong social, cultural and ethical component.

Another feature of our hemisphere is openness to change. In this regard, perhaps we are a privileged continent, simply because almost

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

everything still has to be done, especially in the southern part of the hemisphere. There is also openness to change in the northern part of the hemisphere.

I note with great pride that my generation began by seeing the incidents in Little Rock on television, and today we see Condoleezza Rice as Secretary of State and, before that, Colin Powell. That shows tremendous openness to change in the space of a generation. The same spirit of openness exists in the southern part of the Americas. Perhaps other signs also symbolize the same thing.

Regardless of the ideological or political line that one takes, the fact that in a society like Brazil, where the pattern of income distribution is extremely unjust, a worker can become President of the Republic, and that this can happen in a peaceful, quiet way, is absolutely remarkable. This too is a sign of our openness to change.

People may agree or disagree with President Lula's ideas or with his government, but that fact, in terms of political sociology, goes beyond party lines and is clear proof that in the southern part of the hemisphere as well we are open to change.

We still have a lot more to do in our country on behalf of women, blacks and aboriginals, but we have made progress. That openness is admirable. Perhaps, in other parts of the world that also pride themselves on being democratic, there is greater resistance to change.

This is an extremely important point, it is something that unites us closely. We have to take advantage of this fact. Speaking in very general terms about the next Summit of the Americas, we have to build on this common openness to change in the social, cultural and economic areas.

As I was saying, this is a hemisphere of great similarities but also of great differences. Undoubtedly, your northern part, especially the United States and Canada, has countries with a per capita income 10 to 15 times greater than that in the countries of the southern part of the hemisphere, specifically from Mexico on down, including the Caribbean, Central America and South America.

This, in some way, was present from the start in the minds of the negotiators who participated in the launching of the FTAA. Its consequences did not become apparent until we moved into the actual phase of trade negotiations, although we had included the

issues of development and transfer of technology in the Miami Declaration. That was in the background and was not the focus of the negotiations.

What happened, in my view, to those negotiations? In a way, they took a long time to really get started, and when they actually began, the high-profile points had a more direct bearing on the richer countries, although they had been discussed and agreed upon. I do not deny that. I am going to be very objective in what I have to say about this.

In addition there are the political aspects, to which I have already referred. They are very important and form the basis of our American identity, to which the creation of a free-trade area would give more economic substance. From the strictly economic and trade standpoint, it should be recalled that we were in the 1990s, when the so-called Washington Consensus was still clearly predominant, and the idea was that "Virtue is its own reward".

At that time, it was also thought that liberalization would bring its own rewards and that, instead of considering the trade negotiations as processes of actual exchange, unilateral liberalizations would be enough and would result in improvements, say, in the investment climate or in the general trade climate, and that this would solve everything.

The so-called "lost decade" after the Uruguay Round –in reality, it was the second lost decade–, the economic difficulties and the brutal trade deficits that accumulated in several of the developing countries, including Brazil, made it necessary to revise that outlook.

In reality, the main thrust of the individuals who originally conceived the FTAA, within the context to which I am referring, was toward homogenization of the economic rules. This meant working to make the economic rules more or less homogeneous throughout the hemisphere, which would naturally improve the business climate and facilitate investment.

However, this approach clearly ignored the fact that the realities were quite different. The rule for a country with a per capita income of \$30,000 is one thing; the rule for a country with a per capita income of \$3,000 to \$4,000, as in the case of Brazil, cannot be the same; and there are countries with a per capita income of \$1,000.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Another aspect not obvious then, but which became apparent as the discussions progressed, was that some issues of special interest to the developing countries involved in this process were more difficult, especially those related to agriculture in general, market access, specifically access to markets for agricultural products, and other issues also linked to trade rules.

No one reads the Declaration of the Miami Summit any more, but if one were to do so, one would find great emphasis on the issue of antidumping, because that was our interest. The issue of agricultural subsidies also receives great emphasis. As the negotiations progressed, these issues were put on the back burner. Here I will leap forward in time, because I do not want to pass judgment on other governments and the attitudes of other negotiators, so I will move on to the Government of President Lula. No sooner had the new government taken office, than within a month we had to make an offer in the goods sector without even being able to consult the public, business and labor.

In short, what did we notice as soon as we came to power? In all those questions that I described as attempts to homogenize the economic rules, we had progressed – in theory, because nothing was decided. We had not made any progress on anything related to the issues of interest to the hemisphere's developing countries – specifically Brazil, for which I can speak, or Mercosur.

For example, everyone knows that we had and still have –both in the round of multilateral negotiations for the World Trade Organization and in the regional contexts, with the European Union, the United States and Canada– some difficulties in the financial-services sector, because one of the features of underdevelopment is a certain lack of regulation. There is much less regulation here. I am not referring to bureaucracy, but to regulation of a prudential kind, such as exists in the developed countries. Some measures of openness that can be taken in developed countries, because there is a whole network of prudential regulatory protection, cannot be done in the developing countries. The same is true in terms of environmental regulations.

I don't know how true it is, because I never investigated, but I read a serious press article, written by an academic who had a problem in Mexico –I don't even know how it was resolved– when the Water Code of Mexico City imposed certain additional environmental requirements on investors, which apparently frustrated the profit-making expectations of the companies that had invested. An

environmental measure, of a general and nondiscriminatory nature, ended up causing problems that might even have led to trade retaliations. Obviously, this is a complex matter which, regardless of its merit, could certainly occur in other contexts.

There is a regulatory deficit in developing countries, especially in our region. This leads to certain additional precautions which are not so necessary in more-developed countries. I noted this during the negotiations with the European Union. As we got further into conceptual aspects and went into details, I could see, in certain issues relating to the financial market and banks, that there were concerns on the Brazilian side, even in sectors that wanted liberalization, because we would naturally need time for greater regulation.

I know that some questions which originally would have caused the same concerns remained outside the discussions on the FTAA. I imagine that Canada has concerns similar to Brazil's in the audiovisual area. I worked in the audiovisual area for a long time and I know that there are great concerns because our competitiveness is limited in some respects that have to be considered, regardless of strictly commercial values.

Therefore, there were these aspects, and much less progress was made in the strictly commercial areas of market access and, especially, agriculture and agricultural subsidies.

What did we try to do when President Lula took office? We were never asked directly whether we were for or against the FTAA, simply because the answer depends on knowing which FTAA and how it will be negotiated. The FTAA is an abstract idea: it offers opportunities and risks. What we have to do is work for an FTAA that will maximize our opportunities and reduce our risks, from the strictly economic standpoint, without that meaning in any way a preoccupation with closing of the economy.

To make a long story short, we are trying to rebalance the FTAA negotiations. We think that, after initial clashes and misunderstandings, as is natural, such a new equilibrium should be achieved. On our side, there were often individuals and groups that said "No" to the FTAA because they saw it as a threat to all our values, including egalitarian social values. On the other hand, there were those who wanted us to sign the FTAA regardless of the terms, simply because we could not afford to lose such an opportunity.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

What we were trying to do was to rebalance the FTAA and move it, as President Lula said, from the realm of newspaper headlines and controversy to the sphere of actual negotiations. I think we have been at least 95% successful in doing this, within the framework agreement that we signed in Miami in 2003.

Unfortunately, a series of factors have prevented Brazil from giving the process the desired course; this has happened with other countries too, I believe. I will give two or three reasons – and here the question of the WTO comes in. The first reason is that we reached agreement on 95% of the issues, and not 100%, leaving an ambiguous 5%. It is clear that, if the politicians did not succeed in resolving these ambiguities, neither have the technical experts in their meetings. These technical experts have spent more than a year discussing these ambiguities, and we still do not have an agreement.

Without going into details, I can say that the issues included agricultural subsidies, on the one hand, and intellectual property, on the other. Then there were these difficulties. Perhaps we ministers made a mistake in not resolving 100% of the issues, thinking that 95% was enough for us to go ahead.

The second aspect –which I consider very important, because it explains the current situation and makes us think about how we can and must proceed– is related to what I said at the beginning. In 1994, there were no major negotiations under way. When the FTAA was launched, it was the only big negotiation. We had negotiations in Mercosur, and although they were important –indeed vital for the region– from the political standpoint, they were smaller in scale. What was at stake, however, for Brazil and Argentina was much easier to manage –at least it seemed so at the time– than a negotiation with the greatest economic power in the world. Then, there were no other major negotiations in play.

In November 2003, when the meeting in Miami took place, there was a round of multilateral trade negotiations that did not exist before, as I have already said. The Uruguay Round was launched to put an end to all the previous rounds. We were in the midst of one round, launched two years previously, that had reached a major impasse at the meeting in Cancún. For many reasons, all the ministers involved in that round had to concentrate on the WTO – and I believe this is true, but I am going to cite only two: Minister Zoellick and I, who, coincidentally, were the two co-chairs of the FTAA.

There was a great deal of discussion on what the priority should be. The fact is that the WTO dictates the general framework of the trade rules. Without knowing what is going to happen in the WTO, it is very difficult to negotiate all the aspects, especially in a regional negotiation of this scope. Both for the United States and Brazil, the priority at that time was to make progress in the WTO. Both Minister Zoellick and I –to mention only two, but this obviously applied to other ministers as well– had to focus our attention on the WTO.

I recall speaking at length with Zoellick last July in Geneva after we succeeded in overcoming the impasse that had arisen in Cancún and reached what seemed an agreement impossible to achieve.

No one believed it because, after Cancún, everyone was saying that the meeting had been a fiasco, a failure. But in the end we reached an agreement considered positive by all – a very rare thing in trade negotiations, since every side always thinks that it has lost or won.

I made a comment and I think Zoellick agreed with me. I cannot speak for him; I am speaking for myself. I told him that if we ministers had devoted as much attention and intensity to the FTAA as to the WTO, we would have made more progress in that process, for the reasons that I have already mentioned. But the fact is, without the WTO, we would not know what the general rules of the game are. It would be as if the soccer federations were to try to draw up specific rules, without the general rules of FIFA. We would not know how to make specific rules. The analogy is not perfect, but that is the rough idea.

Those, then, were the conditions under which we were operating, and in some way they still are. That is so because here in Brazil the media are heavily involved in the debate –and that is good; I prefer critical media to passive media– and the media end up having their influence too. The media, however, do not see all sides of the issue.

But I can say in all honesty –and if I am proved wrong, I will be willing to discuss the matter– that, in my conversations with both the USTR and the Commissioners of the European Union, I sense on both sides a much greater emphasis on the WTO than on regional negotiations. To not talk only about the FTAA and to talk about another topic, it is difficult, for example, to convince European Commissioner Peter Mandelson to come to South America at this time. I realize that he has other problems. Likewise, the USTR has his own issues. I am not

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

saying that the problems are only on one side, but often this is not seen and it seems that the problems occur on this side.

In one of the Caribbean countries that I visited, I heard a representative make the following remark: *“For us, the relative stalling of the FTAA has perhaps been a blessing, because it means we can move ahead with the WTO. By knowing what framework will exist in the WTO, we will be able to try for something more in the FTAA”*. If we don't do this, we run the risk of negotiating advantages that will be eroded afterwards in multilateral negotiations. In other words, we may obtain a seemingly great advantage –I'm not talking about the United States and Canada, I'm talking about Europe– for example, a meat quota, and then the European Union may give a multilateral quota of equal value. Then that great advantage, which we will have exchanged for very difficult things, disappears or is reduced. So, whether we like it or not, there is a link between these negotiations.

It is clear that the FTAA is not only a negotiation with the United States or Canada. But, for a country like Brazil and even for Mercosur, it is basically that. Our main interest in the FTAA is to see what the form of our negotiations with the United States and Canada will be. If we succeed in negotiating Canada/Mercosur, as we proposed –we have already had a discussion on this– the question does not arise. This does not exclude the FTAA, and I will explain why. We have mechanisms for negotiating much simpler trade agreements with all the other South American, Latin American and Caribbean countries, with or without the FTAA. In a year and a half of really intense effort we have managed to conclude an agreement between the Andean Community and Mercosur because the countries have similar levels of development. Why? For a very simple reason. I am willing, as Brazil or as Mercosur, to grant a concession to Ecuador, but I cannot extend it to the United States.

The American trade representative once asked me: *“Are you against a most-favored-nation clause?”* I said, *“No, I'm not against it, but what I concede to Ecuador or Paraguay, for example, I cannot concede to the United States. But what I concede to the United States, I can extend to Ecuador and Paraguay”*.

There is a complexity inherent in negotiations between countries with a per capita income of \$3,000 and others with \$30,000 that does not exist between countries whose difference in per capita income is \$1,000, \$2,000 or \$3,000 at most.

This has to be kept in mind, even if there are differences. In all the negotiations already carried out through Mercosur with the Andean Community, the Caribbean and Central America –which are already starting– Brazil takes into account the principle of asymmetry. It has to be that way.

That does not mean that we do not have to continue with the FTAA, but it is necessary to have a perspective of what is going to happen in negotiating market access, which, by its very nature, is bilateral. Unfortunately, we have not achieved this so far. In my view, that is one of the problems that has held up negotiation of the FTAA.

I also mentioned that wish of ours in my first meeting with the current trade representative, Rob Portman. There is nothing absurd about this wish, since it is based on an agreement that we made during the Administration of President Bush Sr. – the 4+1 agreement between Mercosur and United States.

Then, without setting the FTAA aside, we could try to go further into this agreement, so as to have more clarity about what we can and cannot get. Indeed, it is also consistent with what the United States and other countries have done in relation to third countries.

Curiously enough, the United States –and maybe Canada as well– has free-trade agreements, whether proposed or in negotiation, with all the Latin American countries. The only group of countries with which the United States does not have an agreement, or even a proposed agreement, is Mercosur. That is strange. We wonder why. Is it because there is an expectation that advantages can be gained in the FTAA negotiations that could not be gained in a direct Mercosur–US agreement? I don't know. But the question remains. Nevertheless, we are not going to make a case on the basis of that.

We are prepared to negotiate bilaterally, within the FTAA. But the FTAA is going to have to be the model for such agreements, which will not be equal, for the reasons I have already mentioned. We can make concessions to the Caribbean that we cannot make to the US. And vice versa. I am certain that the United States can do things for the Caribbean or Central America that it cannot do for Brazil, although the differences in level are not as great.

This leads me to a final question, about the time and responsibility of the co-chairs. We have already spent a lot of time in this impasse. It is not fair to the other members of the negotiation to have to continue asking us: “*So, what is happening with the FTAA?*” The Brazilian co-

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

chair is going to Washington or the American co-chair is coming to Brazil, and they don't manage to settle these points, because we continue to insist on the question of subsidies. They continue insisting on the question of intellectual property; we say that intellectual property has to be discussed at the World Trade Organization; they say that subsidies have to be discussed in the WTO, and we don't reach an agreement.

So what do we have to do now? The time frame that came out of the conversation I had with the American trade representative –and I'm not going to say who said it, because it doesn't matter– is three to four years. It is not physically possible to think of completing the FTAA before the Summit of the Americas in Mar del Plata. Nor is it politically feasible, because we have to have an idea –and maybe even the final outcome– of where the WTO agreement is heading or whether there is going to be an agreement. If there is no agreement, the situation changes, and we are more or less back where we were in 1994, because then we can say that we are going to focus all our attention here or not. We will try to build on what we have achieved in the WTO.

For example, if the question of agricultural subsidies is adequately settled in the WTO, I won't have to push this in the FTAA. If the question of intellectual property remains settled as it currently stands in the WTO, with the declarations made in 2002 and 2003, there is also no reason for us to discuss this in the FTAA. This greatly simplifies the negotiations. But before Mar del Plata the co-chairs must clarify the directions in which we are going to continue.

Allow me to make one final comment.

How do I see the FTAA and, in general, the process in the Americas? And how do I see other processes?

Let me go back to the question of similarities and differences. A few days ago we had the election for Secretary General of the OAS. It was a very important and democratically contested election. One candidate won, but the other was also very good. In the end, whichever one won would be good. We have to work so that the OAS continues doing the many things it has already done for the Americas, for example, in the case of women's rights.

In 1994, when I was Minister –to show that I did not deal only with trade– I signed the inter-American convention on women's rights, in Belém do Pará, where the General Assembly of the OAS was held.

Now, as I mentioned, we are proposing a convention on racial discrimination. The OAS has always been a pioneer in these various aspects of democratic values. It has fought against not only government corruption but also corporate corruption, because that also affects countries.

In all these respects, the OAS has a unique role based on that set of common democratic values and, at the same time, on that willingness to change, which exist in both the northern and southern parts of the hemisphere. We have to build on this common ground, while taking into account our differences.

To make it clear, I see the FTAA, the process of the Americas, as a political strengthening of this common ground. Now, it is not a bloc.

It is a mistake to think of the FTAA as a bloc, because a bloc requires many other things, such as a minimum degree of similarity between the partners. There are two essential elements that are not, as far as I know, envisaged in any of the aspects of the summit process, but which should be, if we really want to form a solid group. The first of these is the free movement of workers, which is essential today so that, for example, a German or a Hungarian can feel like a European and not just like someone who is in a particular country providing a temporary service, while under threat from the police, for example. The other is the transfer of resources to compensate for the asymmetries, the inequalities, which are brutal. We are not dealing with economies whose per capita income ranges from \$3,000 to \$5,000, but rather economies whose per capita income ranges from \$30,000 to \$1,000, or even less, as in the case of Haiti. Even Bolivia has a per capita income of about \$1,000.

The disproportion is so brutal that the capital, goods and services markets cannot be united without uniting them as regards manpower or social responsibilities. We have a lot to do.

Someone asked me what I would like to see. I would like us to move in the direction of a bloc of that type. However, I am a realist and I know that such a free movement of workers in the Americas will not be achieved in my lifetime. In Mercosur, it is different. We have even done away with passports as well as visas, and also for countries associated with Mercosur, such as Peru.

I don't believe that in my lifetime I will see financial compensation mechanisms such as those that exist in the European Union. That being so, let us deal with what is useful to us and what will be very positive for

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

the various sides involved in the negotiations: expand the area of common ground and market access, reciprocally. But let's not talk about a bloc, because that is not what's involved. In fact, there is no bloc, because a bloc requires many features that we do not have. Even in Europe, there is still a lot to be done, as we know.

I was Minister of Foreign Affairs, Deputy Antonio Carlos Mendes Thame –you follow these issues with great interest– when the FTAA was launched, with the various themes set forth in the Miami Declaration, such as development, technology transfer, social matters and so on. Let me reiterate: I am very happy to see that some of those issues –along with the role of women, foreign debt and terrorism, which are equally important– will be dealt with at this meeting.

Thank you very much.

5.4 Appendix 4 – 4th Plenary Assembly Program

Fourth Plenary Assembly

National Congress of Brazil - Brasilia, May 19-21, 2005

PROGRAM

Wednesday, May 18, 2005	
Morning & Afternoon	Arrival of Participants <i>Transfer from the Brasilia airport to the Hotel Meliá</i> Registration and Receipt of Documents <i>Hotel Meliá</i>
6:00 -10:00 p.m.	Meeting of the Executive Committee of FIPA <i>Leaders' Meeting Room (Sala de reunião da Mesa), Câmara dos Deputados</i> Dinner of the Executive Committee of FIPA <i>Hotel Meliá (Members of the Executive Committee only)</i>
Thursday, May 19, 2005	
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	Registration of Participants and Receipt of Documents <i>Salão Negro, National Congress</i>
10:00 - 11:00 a.m.	Opening Session of the Plenary Assembly <i>Plenário Ulysses Guimarães, Câmara dos Deputados</i> - Speech of the President of the Senate, <i>Hon. Senator Renan Calheiros</i> - Speech of the President of the <i>Câmara dos Deputados</i> of Brasil <i>Hon. Congressman Severino Cavalcanti</i> - Speech of the President of FIPA <i>Hon. Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette</i> Inauguration His Excellency the President of the Federative Republic of Brazil Luiz Inácio Lula Da Silva (TBC)
11:00 - 11:30 a.m.	Update on the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) process and on the 4th Summit of the Americas Presentation by the Minister of Foreign Relations of Brazil <i>H.E. Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim</i>
11:30 - 12:00a.m.	Break – <i>Salão Nobre</i>

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

12:00 - 12:30 p.m.	First Session of the Plenary Assembly <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Approval of the Program- Election of the President of the 4th Plenary Assembly- Annual Report of the President of FIPA- Consideration of other business			
12:30-1:00 p.m.	Formation and Installation of the Working Groups			
1:00 - 1:15 p.m.	Official Photograph			
1:15 - 2:45 p.m.	Lunch provided by the Organizing Committee <i>Restaurant, Câmara dos Deputados</i>			
3:00 - 6:00 p.m.	Working Group Sessions (Presentations by Experts and Initiation of Discussions)			
	<table border="1"><tr><td>Group 1 – FTAA <i>Committee Room 3</i></td><td>Grupo 2 – Terrorism <i>Committee Room 4</i></td><td>Grupo 3 – Foreign Debt <i>Committee Room 5</i></td></tr></table>	Group 1 – FTAA <i>Committee Room 3</i>	Grupo 2 – Terrorism <i>Committee Room 4</i>	Grupo 3 – Foreign Debt <i>Committee Room 5</i>
Group 1 – FTAA <i>Committee Room 3</i>	Grupo 2 – Terrorism <i>Committee Room 4</i>	Grupo 3 – Foreign Debt <i>Committee Room 5</i>		
8:00 –10:00 p.m.	Reception <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Hosted by the President of FIPA, Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette, and the Ambassador of Canada in Brazil, H.E. Suzanne Laporte, in honour of the delegates to the 4th Plenary Assembly <i>Official Residence, SHIS QI 15, Chácara 32, Lago Sul</i>			

Friday, May 20, 2005

8:30 - 10:30 a.m.	3rd Meeting of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas (Session 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Presentation of conclusions and recommendations of the 2 regional forums and discussions <i>Committee Room 4</i>
10:30 – 11:00 a.m.	Executive Committee Press Conference <i>Committee Room 3</i>
11:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Working Group Sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Continuation of discussions- Production of recommendations
1:30 - 3:00 p.m.	Lunch provided by the Organizing Committee <i>Restaurant, Câmara dos Deputados</i>
3:00 - 6:30 p.m.	Working Group Sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Finalisation of the recommendations- Approval of the final report for presentation to the Plenary
7:00 - 9:00 p.m.	Reception & Cultural Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Hosted by the Plenary Assembly Organizing Committee <i>Salão Negro, National Congress</i>

Saturday, May 21, 2005	
8:30 - 10:00 a.m.	3rd Meeting of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas (Session 2) - Presentations and discussions <i>Leaders' Meeting Room (Sala de reunião da Mesa), Câmara dos Deputados</i>
10:00 - 12:30 a.m.	2nd Session of the Plenary Assembly <i>Plenary Room, Federal Senate</i> - Presentation of the Work Group reports - Consideration of FIPA administrative matters - Election of new Executive Committee Members - Election of the Host Country for the 5 th Plenary Assembly - Closing
13:00 p.m.	Lunch provided by the Organizing Committee <i>Churrascaria</i>

5.5 Appendix 5 – Report of the FIPA President

Annual Report to the Plenary Assembly by the Honourable Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette, President of FIPA

Original: English

Dear Fellow Parliamentarians,

2004-2005 was an eventful year for FIPA, and I would like to take a moment to tell you about the progress we have achieved since we last met at the Third FIPA Plenary Assembly, in Valparaiso, in April 2004.

All of our projects were, of course, implemented with the unfailing support of the members of FIPA's Executive Committee, who met on two occasions: in the Parliament of Canada in Ottawa in August 2004, at the invitation of my colleague Don Boudria, Member of Parliament; and second at the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, in San José, where Congressman Mario Calderón generously received us last February.

During our meeting in Ottawa the Chairs of the Working Groups submitted their action plans based on the recommendations made at our last Plenary Assembly, and I am pleased to inform you that a number of projects and activities submitted have since been implemented, while others, as you will see below, are about to be.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Working Groups

Working Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas

Let me to begin by reporting on the activities of the Working Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas, which underwent considerable growth in the past year. Under the direction of Congresswoman Margarita Stolbizer of Argentina, an ambitious program of two regional parliamentary forums was developed, to discuss leadership and the socio-economic situation of women.

I am pleased to say that both events were carried out and both were highly successful. The first forum, held March 20th-22nd in Barbados and hosted by Barbadian Senator Sandra Husbands, brought together more than 25 women and men representing 11 parliaments of North America and the Caribbean, including a number of ministers and parliamentary speakers. I am also happy to see that some of you have been able to join us again here and to further contribute to our discussions.

At the invitation of Margarita Stolbizer, the second meeting was held in the Argentinean Congress, from the 6th to the 8th of April. Nearly 50 women parliamentarians from 16 countries of Central and South America attended the meeting; an impressive number of women parliamentarians that I hope will become the norm at all FIPA meetings.

In each meeting we examined three crucial issues: the situation of women in politics, the issue of poverty, with emphasis on its connection to HIV/AIDS at our meeting in Barbados, and, lastly, the question of violence against women. The meetings resulted in passionate discussions, moving speeches and presentations of an impressively high-quality by experts and parliamentarians alike.

I should also mention that one of the goals of these meetings was to establish strategic alliances with other sectors of society and too this end we were joined by members of the private business community in Barbados, and civil society in Argentina, all of whom contributed greatly to our discussions.

In both Barbados and Argentina, participants prepared a series of recommendations, which will be studied tomorrow morning by the Women Parliamentarians Group for the purpose of preparing an action plan. I invite all delegates here to attend that meeting as gender equality is an issue that concerns us all.

Working Group on Terrorism

The Working Group on Terrorism also actively pursued the objectives it had set in 2004. First, the Group's Chair, Senator Silvia Hernández, actively promoted ratification of the Inter-American Convention against Terrorism and the UN instruments by sending letters to FIPA member parliaments. Four countries have ratified or joined the Convention in the past year, bringing the number of participating States to 12.

Second, the Group closely monitored the proceedings of the Inter-American Committee against Terrorism (CICTE), encouraging parliaments to contact their national authorities dealing with CICTE to obtain a report on actions and activities carried out by CICTE in the fight against terrorism.

Furthermore, Mexican Senator Raymundo Cárdenas represented FIPA at the Fifth Meeting of CICTE, which was held in Trinidad and Tobago in February 2005. We too will be relying on the assistance of a CICTE expert during the meeting of the Working Group on Terrorism.

Working Group on the FTAA

As for the Working Group on the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), the fact that negotiations are not advancing as quickly as we might like them has not prevented the Group, chaired by Canadian M.P. Don Boudria, from continuing activities on another front, finalizing, with Carleton University's Centre for Trade Policy and Law, a project designed to provide parliamentarians with training on trade issues. Project implementation should begin in September or October 2005. The FIPA Secretariat will keep you informed of scheduled activities in the coming months.

Let me also say that we are also looking forward to renewing our efforts to gain official recognition of FIPA as the voice of parliaments of the Americas in the FTAA process, and we will take full advantage of the Summit in Mar del Plata to renew our request to process Co-Chairs.

Together with the activities promoted by the working groups, FIPA has pursued other long-term objectives over the past year: at home we have worked to consolidate the organization's administrative and financial situation, while working throughout the Americas to strengthen the strategic position of FIPA as the principal legislative organization in our hemisphere.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Administrative Issues

FIPA as a Legal Entity

In administrative terms, 2004-2005 was a year of consolidation for the organization. Last year, I announced that FIPA would become a legal entity. At the Tenth Meeting of the Executive Committee in Ottawa, we were able to elect the members of FIPA's board of directors as a legal entity. The board has met twice since then to adopt its by-laws and perform other administrative formalities.

The work of this new legal entity is supported by the Parliamentary Centre, a non-profit organisation specialising in parliamentary development and democratic governance, with whom a memorandum of understanding was signed this past August.

Member Contributions

As you will remember, one of the major outcomes of FIPA's last plenary assembly was the unanimous adoption of a resolution establishing a system of annual contributions from member parliaments. To date, six of the 35 member parliaments have paid their contributions in whole or in part for the period from October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005, representing 20% of the total expected contributions.

Although the system is in its early stages, these figures show that we must make additional efforts to ensure that this resolution, which is essential to the organization's survival, is implemented. In light of this I encourage all members of the official delegations present here to take appropriate steps with your respective parliamentary authorities to ensure contributions are paid.

Contribution from CIDA

Lastly, I am pleased to inform you that our efforts to seek funding for FIPA's Technical Secretariat from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) are about to produce results. In a few days, we should have an agreement that will enable FIPA's Technical Secretariat to operate for two years. This funding will be in addition to the contributions from member parliaments.

Strengthening the Organization's Strategic Position

We have also take significant action towards strengthening the strategic position of the organisation in the hemisphere.

Public Relations Strategy

In San José, we also adopted a public relations strategy to consolidate FIPA's presence in the region. One of the key elements of that strategy is to improve communication between the parliaments of the Americas. The support of all delegates here will be essential in achieving that.

We invite you, among other things, to designate, as soon as possible, one person who can serve as the main contact with FIPA Secretariat in each of your parliaments. The Executive Committee has also decided to publish the FIPA newsletter on a more regular basis. A new edition of that newsletter will be issued in the coming months.

Summit of the Americas

At the Committee's Eleventh Meeting in San José, its main task, of course, was to continue preparations for the Fourth Plenary Assembly, but also to define FIPA's contribution to the Fourth Summit of the Americas, which will be held at Mar del Plata, Argentina, on November 4 and 5.

As you are aware, the main theme of the fourth summit of heads of state and government of the region is "Creating jobs to confront poverty and strengthen democratic governance". As you may have guessed, this issue is mostly related to the debates that will be conducted within the working groups starting this afternoon, and that is why the Executive Committee has asked working group Chairs to take it into consideration in conducting their discussions. Documents on the subject will be distributed to you when the working groups are formed.

The Mar del Plata Summit is a unique opportunity for FIPA and member parliaments to make their voices heard at the highest decision-making level, and I therefore encourage you to seize this opportunity.

Virtual Parliament of the Americas

I am also taking this opportunity to say a word about the Virtual Parliament of the Americas, which I think is a very promising key tool for communication among our parliaments.

As some of you have noted, the Virtual Parliament (www.e-fipa.org) now enables you to join the four working groups on line. The groups will begin their discussions as soon as the number of registered names permits. Today and tomorrow, you will also be offered a brief

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

workshop on how to use the Virtual Parliament during the working group sessions. The Virtual Parliament coordinator, Ms. Lola Giraldo, will be available in the computer room to assist participants interested in joining a virtual working group.

Commitment for Democracy

In closing, I would like to tell you about FIPA's efforts to strengthen democracy in our hemisphere, as this is one of our main objectives. FIPA's commitment to democratic values, which we reaffirmed at Valparaiso last year, has been our central concern throughout the past year.

In January, FIPA's Executive Committee took a position on the political situation in Nicaragua, urging parliamentary colleagues in Nicaragua to immediately open constructive dialogue with the population of the country to break the political deadlock. The Committee also offered its assistance in facilitating that dialogue.

In addition, the Executive Committee continued studying the situation in Haiti and, in the next few months, plans to carry out a mission of support for women who, conditions permitting, will be running in the election.

Democracy is being sorely tested in many parts of the hemisphere, and we, as representatives of the legislative branch, have a duty to ensure that the institutional pillars of democracy are respected in each of our countries.

5.6 Appendix 6 – Report and Recommendations of Working Group 1 (Terrorism)

Report of Working Group N° 1: Terrorism

Original : Spanish

On May 19, 2005, the Working Group on Terrorism met for its first working session at the *Congresso Nacional do Brasil* in the city of Brasilia, under the auspices of the Fourth Plenary Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas (FIPA), with twenty-seven deputies and senators from twelve member countries of the Forum in attendance.

In its first session, the Working Group elected Mexican Senator Silvia Hernández as its chair.

After the session was formally opened by Senator Hernández, parliamentarians introduced themselves, indicating their positions, names and countries of origin.

Immediately afterwards, Dr. Mauro Miedico, an official with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (*UNODC*), gave a presentation on the role of parliaments in the war on terrorism in which he emphasized following:

- The 12 international instruments dealing with terrorism, including their contents;
- The main problems encountered with regard to legislation governing terrorism: the difficulties in drafting a statutory definition of “acts of terrorism” under each country’s laws; the relatively small number of countries that have ratified international conventions; the frequent failure to pass proposed legislation; limited success in harmonizing anti-terrorism laws; and the slow pace of efforts to incorporate international conventions into domestic legislation.

A. Working Group Discussion

During working sessions, the attending parliamentarians participated actively in vigorous discussions resulting in a broad exchange of information and ideas.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

There was general agreement on the need for the various member countries of the Forum to work together to combat terrorism, implementing joint measures, coordinating efforts and using each country's unique capabilities to best advantage.

It was clear that despite the existence of specialized security agencies, a broader view of the policies for combating terrorism is needed, underscoring the vital role that our parliaments must play in drafting appropriate legislation on both individual and collective security, and thus providing the tools for preventing terrorist acts.

The participating parliamentarians also recognized that terrorism no longer respects political or ideological borders and has spread indiscriminately into virtually every corner of the world. Accordingly, it is a suitable topic for discussion in multilateral forums whose members can work in harmony to develop joint solutions that benefit all parties.

The members were aware that measures proposed by the international organizations are generally not incorporated into the domestic legislation of some countries to the proper extent or with the required speed, either because they are not given priority or due simply to a lack of the political will to do so. There was consensus as well on the need for countries to ratify and implement the international conventions and protocols on terrorism.

In this connection, the representatives from Paraguay, Venezuela, Chile and Brazil gave brief presentations outlining the legislative process for ratification of international treaties in their respective countries.

Attention was drawn as well to the importance of harmonizing anti-terrorism legislation to facilitate prosecution of terrorist acts. This would aid efforts to deal with the complexity of a field that ranges from isolated acts by extremist groups to state-sponsored terrorism.

The member parliamentarians exchanged views on the association between terrorism and transnational crime—drug trafficking, organized crime, money laundering, smuggling of arms and people, kidnapping, etc.—which not only directly supports terrorism but also serves as a source to finance its operations.

A question of particular importance was raised concerning the need to exclude ideological aspects in fighting terrorism since, in the view

of some, certain acts of terrorism could be seen as justifiable if perpetrated to advance a noble cause.

Particularly evident was the need for international organization and parliaments to develop closer ties of technical cooperation in combating terrorism.

Before concluding their first working session, the representative parliamentarians noted the vulnerability of those countries that do not have appropriate and up-to-date laws against terrorism since it is precisely this gap in their legal systems that terrorists exploit to carry out their attacks.

For this reason, the participants expressed the need for countries to speed up efforts to pass updated laws and regulations for preventing and combating terrorism, emphasizing as well the importance of ensuring that all countries in the hemisphere not having done so already should accede to and ratify the Inter-American Convention on Terrorism, along with the 12 United Nations conventions and protocols dealing with this scourge.

In the second working session on May 20th, Mr. Kevin Newmeyer, Director of Programming for the Inter-American Committee against Terrorism (CICTE) of the Organization of American States (OAS), described the different forms of support available to help countries combat terrorism, including provision of training for government officials such as those of the judicial and legislative branches. He noted in particular the importance of strengthening efforts to detect money laundering in various secrecy havens, singling out certain islands in the Caribbean that will need to amend their laws in this area.

Next he discussed the question of databanks designed for the purpose of detecting the movements and activities of potential terrorists, as well as the activities of companies linked to terrorism and the personnel who work in their operations. On the down side, he noted that such measures can have negative effects as well including invasion of privacy and curtailment of individual liberties.

In the course of these discussions, the parliamentarians vigorously defended the right of any person to be considered innocent until proven otherwise, for which reason all such investigations must be carried out under the supervision of a judge of competent jurisdiction, and the information used must be lawfully obtained.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Another proposal called for the creation of an international body to deal with cases of terrorism and extradition.

The members were particularly adamant that measures to combat terrorism be carried out within the framework of international law, emphasizing respect for individual guarantees and human rights.

Legislators from several different countries described specific cases of terrorism which, in one way or another, came to be treated as something other than acts of terrorism, with the result that the perpetrators went unpunished.

The Chair of the Working Group on Terrorism pointed out that while FIPA does not produce final declarations, the discussions that take place and the exchange of ideas among representatives is very important so that parliamentarians have a clear perception of these issues.

Finally, the members were again urged to call for combating terrorism in all its forms, including state terrorism.

B. Recommendations

Approved by the Plenary Assembly, May 21st, 2005.

We, parliamentarians of the Americas, recommend to:

1. **Condemn** terrorism in all its forms and whatever the cause, including that sponsored by extremist groups and state terrorism;
2. **Define** terrorist acts as serious offences and crimes against humanity, regardless of when they occur or in which part of the world;
3. **Repeat** the urgent need for ratification, implementation and enforcement of the international instruments for confronting terrorism, particularly the Inter-American Convention against Terrorism, the 12 United Nations Conventions and Protocols, and related resolutions of the UN Security Council;
4. **Incorporate** within each country's domestic legislation those measures proposed by the international organizations for combating and preventing terrorism, while emphasizing respect for individual guarantees and human rights;
5. **Work** to develop common definitions that will permit speedy prosecution of crimes related to terrorism;

6. **Develop** joint activities and cooperative efforts for combating and preventing terrorism, making best use of parliamentary experience in each country.
7. **Strengthen** ties of technical cooperation between the multilateral agencies and our parliaments, especially with the organizations of the United Nations system and the Organization of American States;
8. **Combat** international criminal acts committed by organized crime groups (drug trafficking, money laundering, arms smuggling, kidnapping and trafficking in persons) related to terrorist activities, whether by directly supporting or providing the financing for such activities;
9. **Request** that the Inter-American Committee against Terrorism (CICTE) prepare an information manual containing useful elements that will aid parliamentarians in pushing ratification of international instruments and drafting domestic legislation governing terrorism.

Mrs. Silvia Hernández,
 Senator of Mexico
 Chair of the Working Group on Terrorism

Mr. Sérgio Fernandes Senna Pires
 Rapporteur

C. Appendix – Participants

Parliamentarians

Argentina	Congressman Mauricio Bossa
Argentina	Congresswoman Rosario Romero
Argentina	Congresswoman Margarita Stolbizer
Brazil	Congresswoman Janete Capiberibe
Brazil	Congresswoman Maria José Maninha
Canada	Senator Madeleine Plamondon
Canada	Senator Michel Biron
Chile	Congressman Waldo Mora
Chile	Congressman Ivan Alejandro Moreira Barros
Chile	Senator Jose Garcia Ruminot
Chile	Congressman Luis Ivan Paredes Fierro

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Costa Rica	Congressman Mario Calderón Castillo
Cuba	Congressman Tuval Paez Hernández
Ecuador	Congresswoman Ana Lucia Cevallos
Ecuador	Congressman Geovanny Flores
Guatemala	Congressman Gudy Rivera Estrada
Honduras	Congressman Francisco Ramos
Mexico	Congressman Luis Eduardo Espinoza Pérez
Mexico	Congressman Rogelio Flores Mejía
Mexico	Senator Silvia Hernandez Enriquez
Paraguay	Congressman Roberto Espinola
Paraguay	Congressman Alfredo Ratti
Paraguay	Congressman Miguel Saguier Carmona
Paraguay	Senator Milciades Alejandro Velazquez Ugarte
Venezuela	Congresswoman Cilia Flores
Venezuela	Congresswoman Desiree Santos Amaral

Experts

Inter-American Committee against Terrorism,
Organization of American States (OAS)

Mr. Kevin Newmeyer

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
(UNODC)

Mr. Mauro Miedico

5.7 Appendix 7 – Report and Recommendations of Working Group 2 (FTAA)

Report of Working Group N° 2: Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA)

A. Working Group Discussion

Original: Portuguese

The FTAA Working Group, as occurred in the previous meeting in Chile, dedicated itself to debate the constitution process of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). The works were directed to debating the causes of the non-fulfillment of the agreement's implementation term and, above all, to the formulation of recommendations which will be presented to the governmental authorities at the Fourth Summit of the Americas, next November in Argentina.

The First Working Group met in Brasília, capital of Brazil, in the headquarters of the Brazilian Parliament, on May 19 - 20 of 2005. The works were carried out by Canadian Member of Parliament and FTAA Working Group Chair, Mr. Don Boudria, and Canadian Senator James Kelleher. A full list of participants is available in the Appendixes.

The meeting included presentations by two speakers, Mrs. Verónica Silva, from the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), and Mr. César Parga, representing the Organization of the American State (OAS), both of whom analyzed the free trade agreements and their correlation with the model in negotiation for the FTAA.

Presentations

Mr. Parga's presentation included a comprehensive report on the FTAA negotiation process, pointing out polemic subjects of the discussions and comparing it with other free trade negotiations, particularly those signed by countries in the region. In general, the OAS representative dealt with the following topics:

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

- a) The free trade agreements signed in the Americas since 1990 and the eight signed with countries in other continents in the period from 1997 to 2002;
- b) The fundamentals of free trade and the history of the FTAA negotiation process;
- c) The current condition of FTAA negotiations, pointing out internal and external factors, remarking the dissatisfaction with globalization;
- d) The Brazil-USA co-presidency and the future of FTAA negotiations, to be addressed at the Summit of the Americas in Argentina next November.

During her presentation, Mrs. Verónica Silva pointed out that the FTAA negotiations must be seen in a global context, remarking the interdependency with other commercial negotiations, in particular those of the World Trade Organization (WTO).

In the case of the agricultural negotiation for example, the representative from ECLAC pointed out the role that countries like Brazil, Argentina and Mexico have played in the WTO, fighting for better market conditions for the agricultural products and joint actions as those foreseen in the objectives of the G-20, Group of Cairns and G-33.

Besides pointing out the mutual influences that the different commercial negotiations are subject to, Mrs. Verónica Silva dealt with:

- a) The risks and benefits of a commercial opening, noting the opening carried out in Latin America and the Caribbean since the 90's as an example;
- b) The Doha Round and the recent developments consolidated in the package of July 2004, pointing out the agricultural question and the services theme, and the perspectives for Latin America;
- c) The interdependence of economies, resulting from commercial opening, and its impact on the conditions of commerce and investments, public politics and negotiation strategies.

Debates

Following the presentations the floor was open for discussion among parliamentarians. During the discussions the asymmetries of the region were pointed out and doubts about the possibility of building a

free trade area involving both economic powers and the poor or developing countries of the region were expressed.

While some expressed fear that the FTAA, as it is being negotiated, may worsen the inequality and poverty in the region, others parliamentarians argued that the problems of the region can be efficiently fought with economic development, such as that generated by commercial opening.

In this context, parliamentarians requested comparative analyses based on the experiences of countries in the region, particularly Chile, with its particular external trade policy, and Mexico, in the context of its integration in NAFTA.

In general, the speakers dealt with the questions in similar ways, noting that:

- a) Whether or not to compromise its self through free trade is the decision of each state, and each will have to analyze its respective economic situation in order to make that decision;
- b) The economic disparities themselves are not a deterrent for those negotiations, as we have to remember that in the WTO disparities are even greater and yet progress has been seen;
- c) The question of comparative analysis is a difficult one as, in the case of Chile; one has to consider the specific circumstances of that country and the difficulty of isolating the effects of one particular commercial treaty;
- d) The comparative question is also difficult to analyse in the case of Mexico, as studies reporting the aggravation of poverty and the destruction of medium and small enterprises in Mexico are not entirely reliable given the countless variables involved.

Parliamentarians continued to debate on the second day of the Working Group meeting. The agricultural question was pointed out at the beginning, emphasizing the agricultural subsidies to the production and exportation as the main difficulty in the progression of FTAA negotiations. Comments were also made on the role played by the multinational corporations in the agricultural sector, pointing out that rural economies are negatively impacted by the formation of oligopolies and the resulting manipulation of prices.

On the topic of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), emphasis was given to the need to establish appropriate safety standards. The

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

question of services and migration in free-trade areas and the correlation to unemployment was also raised.

Mrs. Silva and Mr. Parga, the expert presenters from the first day, returned to the head table to answer the questions of the participants. Concerning the agricultural problem and genetically modified organisms (GMOs) they emphasized that the questions are being treated by the WTO and pointed out the recent progress of those negotiations.

Finally, regarding trade in services, the experts noted the special treatment given to developing countries in the General Agreement on Trade in Services in opening their markets, and emphasized the existence of several modalities for dealing with the supply of services

B. Recommendations

Original: English

Approved by the Plenary Assembly May 21st, 2005.

The FTAA Process

Following a debate, we express grave concern that the FTAA as it is currently being negotiated could, without sufficient input from parliamentarians, affect sovereignty, not solve social problems, benefit only large corporations, and affect negatively the agricultural sector.

We also recognize the existence of other ongoing trade initiatives, such as the Andean Community of Nations, Caricom, the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA) and the Southern Community of Nations.

We are not against free trade agreements in general, but are interested in development and agreements that benefit our peoples.

Reflecting the preceding statements, we demand that governments take radical measures to eradicate poverty and offered the following considerations and recommendations:

IV Summit of the Americas, Mar del Plata, Argentina, November, 2005

SUPPORTING the proposed focus of the Fourth Summit of the Americas on continuing to strengthen democratic governance and to confront inequality, hunger and poverty by creating and promoting jobs;

ACKNOWLEDGING the importance of facing the problems and challenges related to inequality and poverty, including extreme poverty;

RECOGNIZING that economic growth is an indispensable and necessary, but not sufficient, condition for reducing high unemployment, informality and lack of job security that afflict our societies;

NOTING that trade, free of barriers, subsidies and unfair practices, combined with stable productive investment flows, can contribute to prosperity;

RECOGNIZING that governments' ability to respond to people's legitimate demand for employment generation is constrained by protectionist measures restricting trade, especially in the agricultural sector;

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT that for trade agreements to benefit all in a society, they must be implemented in the context a number of different policies, including labour and social policies, that promote development;

CONCERNED with the difficulty of negotiating trade agreements among countries with significant differences in terms of economic and political power;

RECOGNIZING the potential for internet connectivity to improve the economic situation of the citizens of the Americas;

With respect to certain sensitive topics covered by the Working Group:

Agriculture

COGNIZANT of the utmost importance of Agriculture for most countries in the Hemisphere, and

RECOGNIZING the particular vulnerability, sensitivity, and structural difficulties of the agricultural sectors in developing countries,

CONCERNED with the potential negative effects of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) on the health of people, animals and the environment;

ACKNOWLEDGING the relevance for the developing countries of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Doha Round negotiations, particularly in the areas of agriculture and market access;

Migration

RECOGNIZING that migration is a problem derived from the lack of opportunities in countries of origin;

AWARE that we live in an increasingly interconnected world, of which labour mobility is an integral element;

FIPA and Trade Agreements

In light of our role in ratifying and implementing international trade agreements,

WE, PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE AMERICAS:

1. **Recommend** that our governments tailor the FTAA and any other trade agreements to allow countries to undertake policies supportive of quality employment, economic development, and social programs.
2. **Recommend** the implementation of policies complementary to trade agreements in order to improve the competitiveness and productivity of our countries, including areas such as education, science and technology, support to small and medium enterprises (SMES), worker retraining, and infrastructure.
3. **Recommend** that the development needs of countries be taken into account and made an integral part of the FTAA negotiations in agriculture, including traditional methods of farming, food security, and rural development.
4. **Recommend** the elimination of agricultural export subsidies and other trade-distorting practices for agricultural products affecting trade in the hemisphere.
5. **Recommend** that sanitary and phytosanitary measures not be applied in a manner that would constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination between countries or a disguised restriction to international trade.
6. **Recommend** that our countries coordinate to make proposals in the ongoing WTO negotiations that respond the special conditions faced by developing countries.
7. **Recommend** that immigration policies respect migrant' human rights and their personal security.

8. **Recommend** that the FTAA and other trade agreements consider rules that are fair and equitable and take into account increasing labour mobility.
9. **Reiterate** our call to FIPA to continue their efforts to encourage collaboration among parliamentarians to further the exchange of information and experiences regarding the negotiation, implementation and effects of international trade agreements.
10. **Recognize** the existence of other ongoing trade negotiations in the hemisphere, such as the Andean Community of Nations, the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA), Caricom, Mercosur and the Southern Community of Nations.

Mr. Don Boudria, Canadian MP
Chair of the FTAA Working Group

Senator James Kelleher,
Canada
Acting Chair of the FTAA
Working Group

Mr. Rosendo Pereira de Melo Neto
Rapporteur

* * * *

C. Appendix – Participants

Parliamentarians

Argentina	Congresswoman María Teresa Ferrín
Argentina	Congresswoman Olinda Montenegro
Brazil	Congressman Luiz Carlos Hauly
Brazil	Congressman Nilson Mourão
Canada	Mr. Don Boudria, Member of Parliament
Canada	Senator James Kelleher
Chile	Congressman Germán Becker Alvear
Chile	Congressman Esteban Valenzuela Van Treek
Cuba	Congressman Ernesto Suárez Mendez
Guatemala	Congressman Matías Ajvix Locón

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Guatemala	Congressman Alfredo De León Solano
Guatemala	Congressman Job Ramiro Garcia y Garcia
Guatemala	Congressman Hugo Rolando López Barrios
Honduras	Congressman Jack Arévalo Fuentes
Honduras	Congressman José María Lagos Blanco
Honduras	Congressman Francisco Ramos Martínez
Mexico	Congresswoman Blanca Gámez
Mexico	Senator María del Carmen Ramírez García
Mexico	Congressman Mario Alberto Zepahua Valencia
Venezuela	Congresswoman Maria Iris Varela Rangel

Experts

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) Ms. Verónica Silva

Organization of Americans States (OAS) Mr. Cesar Parga

Official Observers

Parliamentary Confederation of the Americas (COPA) – Assemblée nationale du Québec Mr. Pierre Moreau, Member of the National Assembly

D. Appendix – Veronica Silva's Bibliography

Original: Spanish

LAIA (2001), *La normativa OMC y su incidencia en el proceso de integración regional* [WTO rules and their influence on the process of regional integration]. LAIA/SEC/Estudio 131, 23 January 2001. LAIA-General Secretariat [web LAIA].

IDB (2002), *Beyond Borders. The New Regionalism in Latin America. Economic and Social Progress in Latin America. 2002 Report*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Washington, D.C.

IDB-Munk Centre for International Studies/University of Toronto-Inter-American Dialogue (2002), *The trade policy-making process. Level one of the two-level game. Country studies in the Western Hemisphere*. IDB/INTAL-ITD-STA, public document, March [web IDB].

Bustillo, Inés and José Antonio Ocampo (2003) *Asimetrías y cooperación en el Área de Libre Comercio de las Américas [Asymmetries and cooperation in the Free Trade Area of the Americas]*. ECLAC Reports and Special Studies Series No. 13, Mau 2003.

ECLAC (1994), *El Regionalismo Abierto en América Latina y el Caribe. La integración económica al servicio de la transformación productiva con equidad [Open regionalism in Latin America and the Caribbean. Economic integration in the service of productive transformation with equity]*. LC/G.1801/Rev.1-P, Santiago, September 1994. United Nations Publication, Sales No. S.94.II.G.3.

ECLAC (2002), *Globalización y desarrollo [Globalization and development]*. ECLAC, Executive Secretariat. Document LC/G.2157(SES.29/3), Santiago April 2002.

ECLAC (2004), *Panorama de la Inserción internacional de América Latina y el Caribe, 2001-2002 [Overview of Latin American and Caribbean global integration]*. LC/G.2189-P/E, Santiago January 2003. (web DCII-ECLAC).

ECLAC (2004), *Bilateralism and Regionalism in the Aftermath of Cancun: Re-establishing the Primacy of Multilateralism. Note by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)*. Round Table of Executive Secretaries of the United Nations Regional Commissions at UNCTAD XI. Sao Paulo, 15 June 2004.

ECLAC (2004), *Desarrollo productivo en economías abiertas [Productive development in open economies]*. ECLAC 30th Session Period, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 28 June to 2 July 2004. Document LC/G.2234 (SES.30/3), 11 June 2004. (web ECLAC). Chapters 1.II.2., 2.I.1., 5 & 12.

ECLAC (1996 a 2004), *Panorama de la Inserción internacional de América Latina y el Caribe [Overview of the global integration of Latin America and the Caribbean]*, Editions 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999-2000, 2000-2001 y 2001-2002). Documents: LC/G.1941, 1978, 2038-P, 2085-P, 2189-P and 2221-P Santiago. [web DCII-ECLAC].¹

FAO (2005), *Taller Regional de Clarificación sobre Negociaciones Comerciales en Agricultura – América Latina [Regional workshop on clarification of trade negotiations in agriculture – Latin America]*.

¹ This document may be referred to as “PENINSULA”. Version 2003-2004 in preparation (2005).

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Santiago, Chile, 30-31 March 2005 (website:
<http://www.rlc.fao.org/prior/comagric/cncm.htm>)

Finger, Michael and Philip Schuler (1999), *Implementation of Uruguay Round commitments: the development challenge*. Presented at the WTO/WB Conference on Developing Countries' Interests in a Millennium Round, WTO-Geneva, 20-21 September 1999.

Hoekman, Bernard *et al.* (2002), *Development, Trade, and the WTO. A Handbook*. The World Bank. Washington, DC

ICTSD-IISD (2004), *Developments since the Cancun Ministerial Conference* (December 2004). Vol. 3 (website:
<http://www.ictsd.org/pubs/dohabriefings/index.htm>)

Kuwayama, Mikio (2004), *Latin American South-South Integration and Cooperation: From a Regional Public Goods Perspective*. ECLAC, International Trade Series, N° 50, February 2005.

Lamy, Pascal (2004), *The Emergence of Collective Preferences in International Trade: Implications for Regulating Globalization*.

Lengyel, Miguel and Vivianne Ventura (Ed., 2003), *Trade policy reforms in Latin America. Multilateral Rules and Domestic Institutions*. Palgrave, Macmillan, Great Britain.

Maldonado, Raul (2003), *Avance y vulnerabilidad de la integración económica de América Latina y el Caribe [Progress and vulnerability of economic integration in Latin America and the Caribbean]*. ECLAC, International Trade Series N° 32, August 2003.

MERCOSUR (2004), *Un foco para el proceso de integración regional [A focus for the process of regional integration]*. First semi-annual report by the MERCOSUR Secretariat. Montevideo, July (web MERCOSUR).

WTO (2001), *Documents of the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference: (i) Ministerial Declaration (WT/MIN(01)/DEC/W/1, 14.11.2001) and (ii) Decision on issues concerning application (WT/MIN(01)/W/10, 14.11.2001)*

WTO (2003), *Understanding the WTO*. 3rd edition (Previously published as "Trading into the Future") September 2003.

WTO (2003), WTO Ministerial Conference, Cancun 2003: Information notes for Cancun. Published on 9 September 2003 (web WTO-Ministerial Conferences)

WTO (2004), *World Trade Report 2004. Exploring the linkage between the domestic policy environment and international trade* (web WTO).

WTO (2004), *Doha Work Program*. Decision adopted by the General Council on 1 August 2004. WT/L/579, 2 August 2004

Silva, Verónica (2001), *El camino hacia las nuevas negociaciones comerciales en la OMC (post Doha) [The road to new trade negotiations in the WTO]*. International Trade Series No. 23. ECLAC- International Trade and Integration Division, Santiago, December 2001. Document LC/L.1684-P.

Sutherland *et al.* (2004), *The Future of the WTO: Addressing institutional challenges in the new millennium*. Report by the Consultative Board to Director General Supachai Panitchpakdi. (web WTO)

Tussie, Diana and Miguel Lengyel (1999), *Export promotion and multilateral disciplines: possibilities and questions*. LATN Working Papers No. 1, December [web LATN].

UNCTAD (2004), *Review of developments and issues in the post-Doha Work Program of particular concern to developing countries: A post-UNCTAD XI perspective*. UNCTAD Secretariat Note. TD/B/51/4, 31 August 2004. Trade and Development Board, 51st Session Period, Geneva, 4-15 October 2004.

Ventura-Dias, Vivianne *et al.* (2003), *Globalización y servicios: cambios estructurales en el comercio internacional [Globalization and services: Structural changes in international trade]*. ECLAC-DCII. International Trade Series No 46. Document: LC/R.2054/E

World Bank (2005), *Global Economic Prospect*. 2005

Periodical publications (web references):

Bridges Weekly Trade News Digest <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/index.htm>

Geneva Update <http://lists.iatp.org/listarchive>

Latin American Trade Network (LATN) - Newsletter www.latn.org.ar

SELA – Noticias <http://sela2.sela.org/>

Third World Economics – Third World Network (TWN) <http://www.twinside.org.sg/twe.htm>
www.redtercermundo.org.uy/revista_de_sur/

Websites of interest

Final Report
Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

APEC	www.apecsec.org.sg
CAN	www.comunidadandina.org
CARICOM	www.caricom.org
ECLAC Trade Division (DCII)	www.eclac.cl/comercio
European Union	www.europa.eu.int
FTAA	www.ftaa-alca.org
ICONE-Brazil	www.iconeBrasil.org.br/portugues/default.asp
IDB-INTAL	www.iadb.org/intal
LAIA	www.aladi.org
LATN (Flacso Argentina)	www.latn.org.ar
MCCA-SIECA	www.sieca.org.gt
MERCOSUR	www.mercosur.org.uy
NAFTA	www.nafta-sec-alena.org
OAS	www.sice.oas.org/TUnit
OECD	www.oecd.org
SELA	http://sela2.sela.org
UNCTAD	www.unctad.org
USTR/USA	www.ustr.gov
World Bank	www.worldbank.org
WTO	www.wto.org

5.8 Appendix 8 – Report and Recommendations of Working Group 3 (Foreign Debt)

Report of Working Group N° 3: External Debt

Original: Spanish

A. Working Group Discussion

The Working Group N° 3, chaired by Argentinean Congressman Luis Arturo Molinari Romero, approached the topic “The Foreign Debt as a Conditioning Factor of the Economic Growth and Quality of Life”, having the participation of 19 parliamentarians from eleven countries. The members of the Working Group made their contributions and, among others, the following considerations were made:

- The indebtedness level of some of the FIPA member-countries has meant a very strong conditioning for the development of their economies, thus limiting the possibilities to improve the quality of life of their peoples.
- Available statistics indicate that the balance of the foreign debt of the members of the FIPA has been growing, although the amount already paid largely surpasses the original loans. So, under a practical point of view, this debt can be considered unpayable for many of the countries of the region.
- The policies imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to the debtor nations do not take into account the specific national contexts; neither do they consider the implications of their adoption in the decrease of the life quality of the population, growth of misery, and the consequent and dangerous loss of the faith of the peoples in democracy. Thus, the analysis of the question of the external debt should consider not only the financial dimension, but also the political and social ones.
- Thus it was agreed to highlight the need of a redefinition of the role of the IMF and of other international credit organizations. Also highlighted was the negative role the risk rating agencies play and their growing influence in determining the conditions of

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

the loans – using approaches that are not in accordance with the realities of each country.

- The debt restructuring processes make it advisable to think that in the future it will become necessary to find a new strategy under which to articulate the alternatives for linking the affected countries with the international financial community. In this sense, there was support for the recent debt restructuring experience of Argentina, in the exercise of its political and economic sovereignty, carried out under the principles of good faith and isonomy among the different private creditors. There was consensus in supporting the demands of the countries of the region that the public investment not be considered part of the expense, for the purposes of the credits granted by multilateral organisms. Also, it was proposed that the Parliaments pronounce themselves to request the rich or developed countries to agree to pardon the debt of the countries of smaller economic development, i.e. Bolivia, Haiti and Nicaragua.
- It cannot be forgotten that the capacity of payment of the debt is linked to the capacity of production of a country, so it is indispensable to stimulate investments of productive capital so that they provide added value to the primary production, in order to achieve growths in the income, employment, and national competitiveness. However, these efforts should correspond to the elimination of the protective measures of the developed countries.
- It has also been observed that societies are less vulnerable to financial and economic crises to the extent that their political system is more democratic and transparent and their public accounts are well managed. Therefore, one of the elements that must be taken into account in the construction of sound and stable economic systems is the formulation and implementation of public policies that strengthen the political system and care for the constant fight against corruption.
- The Parliaments should then assume a proactive role as their function is fundamental both as generators of appropriate legal instruments and in the exercise of an appropriate follow-up and control of the correct operation of the institutions involved. Also, the parliamentarians shared their concern with the difficulties that the external crises impose to the most vulnerable countries.

B. Recommendations

Approved by the Plenary Assembly on May 21, 2005.

We, parliamentarians of the Americas:

1. **Recommend** that the Parliaments, as representatives of the peoples of the Americas, become definitely involved with the problems of the indebtedness and play an effective and active role in the definition of the international negotiations of the debt.
2. **Recommend** that the appropriate legal instruments be designed so that the actions for the financial restructuring of the countries are socially and legally sustainable, avoiding the worsening of the problems of the external debt.
3. **Recommend** that effective integration of the region be achieved, something for which the role of parliamentary diplomacy is fundamental, and it should include the coordination of macroeconomic policies, and favour the creation of an inter-parliamentary committee to follow-up the negotiations with the international financial institutions.
4. **Ratify** what was expressed by the Working Group II, in the 2nd Plenary Assembly of the FIPA in Panama 2003, which is that the international community: *“...must improve the interregional integration mechanisms and ask international financial institutions to review their economic policy proposals with a view to encouraging economic growth rather than becoming yet another element that promotes recessions.”*
5. **Recommend** that at the Fourth Summit of the Americas, to be held in Mar del Plata (Argentina) on 4th and 5th November 2005, FIPA’s Executive Committee raise the need for the heads of state and government in the Americas to ratify their commitment to combat inequalities and differences in access to education, and eliminate hunger, poverty and corruption through job creation and promotion of employment and the promotion of education, while sustaining the principles of regional integration, equity and cooperation in order to reinforce the democratic system as the only viable means of participation by our peoples.

Congressman Luis Arturo Molinari Romero, Argentina
Chair of the Foreign Debt Working Group

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Dr. Osmar Perazzo Lannes Júnior

Rapporteur

C. Appendix – Participants

Parliamentarians

Argentina	Congressman Anibal Jesús Stella
Argentina	Congressman Luis Arturo Molinari Romero
Argentina	Congresswoman Alicia Ester Tate
Brazil	Congressman João Paulo Gomes da Silva
Brazil	Congressman Tarcísio Zimmermann
Canada	Senator Percy Downe
Cuba	Congresswoman Elsa Rojas Hernández
Ecuador	Congresswoman Ana Lucia Cevallos Muñoz
Grenada	Mrs. Glynis Roberts, MP
Guyana	Mrs. Genevieve Allen, MP
Honduras	Congresswoman Elisa Cristina Ruiz
Honduras	Congressman Jack Arévalo Fuentes
Jamaica	Mrs. Sharon Hay-Webster, MP
Mexico	Senator Filomena Margaiz Ramirez
Mexico	Congressman Francisco Luis Monárrez Rincón
Mexico	Congressman Jesús Porfirio González Schmal
Venezuela	Congressman Pedro Carreño
Venezuela	Congressman Rodrigo Cabezas
Venezuela	Congressman Simón Escalona

Experts

Bank of Canada Mr. James Haley

Official Observers

Andean Parliament – Andean Parliamentarian Juana Maria Vallejo
Ecuador Klaere

5.9 *Appendix 9 – Report and Recommendations of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas*

Report of the 3rd regular session of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas

Original: Spanish

FIPA's Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas met in Brasilia, conducting its activities in two sessions convened in the Chamber of Deputies on May 20th and 21st.

The meeting was formally opened and a welcoming address given by Brazilian Congresswoman Janette Capiberibe, and the sessions were presided over by the president of the Women's Group and Member of the Argentine Chamber of Deputies, Margarita Stolbizer.

The activities of the Group are aimed at creating conditions of equality to aid in the strengthening of democratic governance.

The Conclusions and Recommendations of the Sub-regional Forums held in Barbados and Buenos Aires were presented in the first session, followed by open discussions which resulted in new suggestions for action plans and policies, and further recommendations to be presented at FIPA's Plenary Assembly and the Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Americas to be held in November in Mar del Plata, Argentina.

The second session consisted of a presentation by Ana Falú, Regional Director of UNIFEM, who afterwards took part in an extensive exchange with parliamentarians participating in the Group's meeting.

The text of Mrs. Falú's presentation is available at www.e-fipa.org.

A. Presentation of Results from Regional Forums

Barbados

The Forum held in Barbados on March 20-22 had as its objective to share experiences and endorse conditions of gender equality in public policies. The presentation was given by Mrs. Glynis Roberts,

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Member of Parliament from Grenada. The main recommendations were to:

1. *Encourage* women to participate in politics, creating networks and links between women parliamentarians and gender-based groups in order to strengthen and expand the women's movement.
2. *Fight* to create an environment that is more conducive to women's participation, particularly through educational policies.
3. *Identify* discriminatory legislation in each country and seek to revoke or amend laws that incorporate inequalities.
4. *Strengthen* legislation designed to combat domestic violence by redefining actions and penalties.
5. *Review* the international conventions dealing with this area, as well as successful experiences in our countries.

Argentina

The Forum took place in Buenos Aires on April 6-8 and had as its central theme the development of a leadership role for women in the strengthening of democratic governance. The report on this meeting was prepared by Congresswoman Margarita Stolbizer of Argentina.

The issue of how to build leadership was discussed, with agreement that it is first necessary to recognize the obstacles and be able to overcome them. The "feminization of poverty" was mentioned, stressing the difficulties women have in gaining access to land, housing, jobs, information and new technology. One way to overcome these obstacles is to invest in education, adopting and implementing public policies that promote basic education and training to reduce inequalities.

Emphasis was also placed on the importance of developing a leadership role for representative women who are committed to social issues and guided by ethical principles. Quota legislation has proven to be an efficient means of encouraging female participation in politics. But these laws must be enhanced with policies designed to change those stereotypes that are a sign of discrimination. It is also necessary to discuss the models created through the communications media.

Another topic of debate in the Forum was domestic violence, the consensus being that the acceptance of a relationship of inequality in the family/home environment is extended to an acceptance of this

same inequality in social spheres. To combat domestic violence it is necessary to act at the legislative level, promoting laws that punish such violence, and also to provide training so that women can defend themselves and make use of these laws. To aid in these efforts, there is also a need for educational campaigns to raise awareness of this problem and the new laws and penalties.

On the public policy side, it was recommended that women take up the fight in their parliaments in order to obtain the allocation of resources under the respective budgets.

B. Working Group Discussion

In light of the results of the 2 regional forums and the expert presentation participants raised the following points:

Legislation:

- Existing legislation governing gender issues needs to be enforced, and countries that do not yet have such legislation should promote passage of the necessary laws.
- We need to promote awareness of existing legislation and order the exchange of information among the different countries.

Violence against women:

- There is a need for improved laws to prevent and punish sexual exploitation of children and prevent the spread of modern forms of this offence via the Internet.
- It is necessary to stop the murder of women, ensuring that those responsible are punished and developing policies for prevention of this offence which is deemed a crime against humanity under the international conventions.
- Laws on sexual violence must be improved where they are deemed insufficient to prevent abuse.
- There is a need to combat all types of violence against women, not just physical violence but also financial domination and psychological abuse in its various forms.

Education:

- The importance of education and training cannot be over-emphasized, particularly the essential role of parliaments in

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

changing the patterns that reproduce inequalities. Informal networks must be created to take part in the educational process.

- Training is also necessary for greater participation by women in politics, as a means of enhancing the quality of democracy.

Public awareness campaigns:

- Media campaigns are needed to clarify legislation that is little understood at present.
- Specific issues relating to women and children must be selected for discussion by the Group.
- The communications media must be examined in search of new models designed to promote values and raise awareness of gender issues.

Integration activities:

- There is need for an inter-parliamentary network to promote the right to a life free from violence against women. Its mandate would be to coordinate the activities of women parliamentarians, facilitating the exchange of information on national policies and encouraging advances in the field of gender issues.

Other items examined:

- The fight to decriminalize abortion.
- The importance of formal legal equality between the sexes.
- The importance of housing policies to those most in need.
- Creating political systems that are consistent with policies regarding equality, education, housing and human health.
- Incorporating men into the discussion of these issues.

Proposals Made by Participants

Following discussions, participants agreed on the need to:

- Urge the revaluation and reinforcement of parliament's role in ensuring a smooth balance in the division of powers within the democratic system.
- Proclaim their concern over sexual exploitation of children, which must be included in the Group's agenda for harmonization of our national laws to prevent and eradicate these offences.

- Using the FIPA's Virtual Parliament, promote the creation of an Inter-Parliamentary Network for the right to a life free from violence against women.
- Underscore the importance of access to information, education and training for promoting new leadership which is efficient, ethical and committed to meeting social needs.
- Urge our countries to implement public policies that guarantee objective conditions of equal access to health, education, land, housing, jobs, new technologies and communications media.

C. Recommendations

Approved by the Plenary Assembly, May 21st, 2005.

We Parliamentarians of the Americas,

HAVING SEEN the recommendations of the 1st and 2nd Regional Forums on Women's Leadership to Strengthen Democracy held in Barbados, March 20-22, 2005, and Argentina, April 6-8, 2005; and

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT the views expressed during the 3rd Meeting of the Group of Women Parliamentarians held in Brasilia, Brazil, May 20 & 21, 2005.

1. **Endorse** the recommendations and conclusions issued during the 2 Regional Forums above mentioned.
2. **Agree** to submit recommendations of parliamentarians regarding women, poverty and employment made at the regional forums to the Heads of States and government at the Fourth Summit of the Americas in Mar del Plata, Argentina, November 4-5, 2005 and request that, through FIPA, the voice of parliamentarians be taken into account in promoting social dialogue that commits governmental and social actors to a development model with more and better employment.
3. **Request** that the technical secretariat of FIPA present to the Executive Committee, in co-operation with the Chair of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas, and based on the recommendations made in Barbados, Argentina and Brazil, a concrete plan of action for the group for the years 2005-2007.

Final Report

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Brasilia, Brazil, May 19-21, 2005

FIPA/PA/2005/REP/e Original : French

Congresswoman Margarita Stolbizer, Argentina

Chair of the Group of Women Parliamentarians of the Americas

Mrs. Ana Luiza Backes

Rapporteur

D. Appendix – Participants

Parliamentarians

Argentina	Congresswoman Alicia Ester Tate
Argentina	Congresswoman María Teresa Ferrín
Argentina	Congressman Luis Molinari Romero
Argentina	Congresswoman Olinda Monternegro
Argentina	Congresswoman Rosario Romero
Brazil	Congresswoman Janete Capiberibe
Brazil	Senator Serys Shessarenko
Canada	Senator Madeleine Plamondon
Canada	Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette
Cuba	Congresswoman Elsa Rojas Hernández
Cuba	Congressman Ernesto Suárez Mendez
Ecuador	Congresswoman Ana Lucia Cevallos Muñoz
Grenada	Mrs. Glynis Roberts, Member of Parliament
Guyana	Mrs. Genevieve Allen, Member of Parliament
Honduras	Congresswoman Elisa Cristina Ruiz
Jamaica	Mrs. Sharon Hay-Webster, Member of Parliament
Mexico	Congressman Jesús Porfirio González Schmal
Mexico	Congresswoman Blanca Gámez
Mexico	Senator Noemí Guzmán Lagunes
Mexico	Senator Silvia Hernández
Mexico	Senator María del Carmen Ramírez García
Mexico	Congressman Luis Eduardo Espinoza Pérez
Paraguay	Congresswoman Rosa Esperanza Merlo Drews



Venezuela Congresswoman Cilia Flores

Venezuela Congresswoman Desiree Santos Amaral

Experts

UNIFEM Mrs. Ana Falú

Official Observers

Parliamentary Confederation of the
Americas – Legislative Assembly of
the State of Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Mrs. Aparecida Gama, Member of
the Legislative Assembly

Andean Parliament - Ecuador

Mrs. Juana Maria Vallejo Klaere,
Andean Parliamentarian

*5.10 Appendix 10 – Executive Committee Members
 2005-2006*

FIPA Executive Committee Members for 2005-2006

<u>Representing</u>	<u>Parliamentarian</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Tenure</u>
Presidency	Senator Céline Hervieux-Payette	Canada	2004 - 2006
North America	Don Boudria, MP	Canada	2004 - 2006
	Senator Silvia Hernández	Mexico	2005 - 2007
Central America	Congressman Jack Arévalo	Honduras	2004 - 2006
	Congressman Gudy Rivera Estrada	Guatemala	2005 - 2007
Caribbean	Senator Sandra Husbands	Barbados	2004 - 2006
	Senator Brenda Hood	Grenada	2005 - 2007
South America	Senator Alejandro Velázquez	Paraguay	2004 - 2006
	Congressman Iván Moreira Barros	Chile	2005 - 2007
Host Country	Representative Nancy Patricia Gutiérrez	Colombia	2005 - 2006
Secretary	Ms. Emmanuelle Pelletier		

