

three working groups.

Louis Guay, Western Anglophone Africa, DFAIT, pointed out that lessons may also be learned from the Mining Policy Research Initiative. The MPRI was a multi-stakeholder body set up during the investment surge in Latin America to promote good practices among Canadian companies in the region.

Such a solution would be beneficial to Minister Axworthy and the Canadian government because it would allow the government to manage the discussion on resource exploitation in conflict zones and social corporate responsibility. It could also be seen as a constructive reaction to the conundrums posed by Talisman. If anything there will be more such challenges in the future.

Senator Wilson added that in order for such body to work, business would have to be intimately involved. She recalled a similar forum created by the International Centre for Human Rights and Development in Montreal. The representatives of business were targeted by NGOs and others to the point they felt compelled to walk out. She cautioned against repeating this mistake and encouraged a balanced inclusive approach. A national consultative body should include as many actors as possible: securities commissions, stock exchanges, lobby groups/associations, businesses, members of the financial sector (banks, insurance companies), government officials, International Financial Institutions, multilateral agencies, trade unions, churches, NGOs, and the academic community. The countries of impact should also be involved through a set of their own institutions and contact groups. Information/company reports should be accessible not only to shareholders by others as well.

*Some suggested that Minister Axworthy could capitalise on the moral, as opposed to executive, authority of his office and adopt a language punitive to unethical corporate behaviour.* There is little tangible leverage the government has *vis a vis* the private sector today. Others, however, cautioned against any strong expression of moral outrage on the part of the Minister since, without concrete remedial steps, moral outrage could undermine his credibility. Nonetheless, the government should encourage corporate responsibility. The Minister could set a benchmark by publicly stating how he expects Talisman to react (before May 3, 2000). Concretely, he could address dilemmas related to private security arrangements, the necessity of a neutral monitoring mechanism, a compensatory mechanism for those affected, as well as revenue management.

*In the longer term, the government should develop a broad public discourse which would reflect the complexity of the issues and adopt a pro-active rather than defensive approach.* (This could be achieved by convening a national consultative body on the lines of the Norwegian KOMpakt.) It should promote the discussion of the issues in various multilateral bodies and get the endorsement of the UN Secretary General. The government should also focus on doable goals and use those legal mechanisms that exist. Moral suasion and leadership should be matched by legal pressure. Activities aimed at developing a normative and legal framework for resource