

sherpas) varies widely. Only some Summit commitments reflect detailed discussion and even drafting by the leaders at the Summit table. More generally, when the head of state or government attaches a high degree of personal importance and commitment to certain issues, the degree of implementation is even higher.

The political control factor also takes into account the leader's individual personality and the importance he/she places on international institutions and agreements more generally. For example, if a head of state or government demonstrates an attachment to sustainable development initiatives, consistently advances these themes at the annual Summits and elsewhere, and demonstrates a commitment to multilateralism and the G7 process more specifically, compliance levels by their countries will generally tend to be higher.

Yet because G7 heads are not merely leaders, but *democratically-elected* ones, their ability to impose their implementing will within their government is constrained by their political standing within society at large. When leaders and their parties enjoy high approval ratings and popularity, their ability to implement is increased. In addition, when domestic public opinion favours a particular issue area - such as the environment in both Canada and the US - even unpopular leaders at the time, facing a likely electoral defeat (such as Prime Minister Mulroney and President Bush in 1992) will comply with their communique commitments. This is primarily because leaders recognize the effects of public opinion and political pressure in areas important to their electorate.

To summarize, these three studies indicate an overall and rising level of Summit compliance in the positive range by Canada and the US with environment and development issues during the last cycle of summitry from 1988-1995 and by all members, over all issue areas, from 1975 to 1997. These studies find that institutional