

the course of sanctions, given that they - and not the P-5 - serve as chairs of the various sanctions committees.

David Malone then criticized the Security Council for failing to design sanctions with a view to the type of regime it is attempting to influence. In particular, he argued, the Council members tend not to distinguish between states in which public opinion may serve to change policy, and those in which the voice of the people is viewed by the regime as irrelevant. Nigel Fisher (Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development) agreed, arguing that states have rarely tried to integrate sanctions into a comprehensive diplomatic strategy. Toward this end, Prof. Doxey suggested that it would be desirable to assess the likely political and humanitarian effects of sanctions before imposing them. This information, she suggested, would allow policy-makers to approach the design of sanctions strategically.

The discussion then proceeded to consider a number of points about the mechanics of sanctions. Douglas Forsythe (Legal Adviser, DFAIT) noted that, in cases involving financial sanctions, the need to conduct pre-assessments is complicated by the need to impose sanctions quickly, in order to prevent targets from anticipating and evading measures such as assets freezes. Carolyn McAskie highlighted the importance of physically monitoring embargoes (particularly arms embargoes) to ensure that they remain as leak-proof as possible. This requires working in concert with significant trading partners of the target state.

The next session dealt with the humanitarian impact of sanctions. Don Hubert (Human Rights Division - DFAIT) provided an overview of the issues involved. He noted that there is considerable opposition to comprehensive economic sanctions among members of the international humanitarian community. Such sanctions produce disproportionately severe effects