

experimental psychiatric treatment at the Allan Memorial Institute in Montreal during the late 1950s and early 1960s (see "International Canada" for December 1983 and January 1984). The so-called MK-ULTRA mind-altering experiments, involving the administration of hallucinogens, psychic driving and brainwashing, were secretly funded by the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). The ongoing legal wrangle over suitable compensation had stalled with a US offer of an out-of-court settlement of \$20,000 for each victim. In a November 1 letter to NDP Leader Ed Broadbent, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark stated that while the facts of the case remained "unclear," the government would exert to the fullest extent possible its influence to settle the matter to the satisfaction of the claimants. However, following a review, the US Secretary of State Legal Advisor concluded that the US was not liable and that US courts should decide the case. Meeting with Secretary of State George Shultz, Mr. Clark emphasized that Canada attached the "highest priority" to an early resolution and called for the US administration to ensure that the case was handled "expeditiously." As well, Canada had accepted a US offer to brief the Canadian Justice Department on the "facts" as seen by the US. In view of the advanced age of the victims, Mr. Clark said that an appeal to the International Court at the Hague would be inappropriate, given the lengthiness of Court proceedings. Canada, he added, would continue to press for "just compensation" (External Affairs communiqué, November 1).

Despite such assurance, the US lawyer for the nine Canadians, Joe Rauh, appealed directly to the Administrative Office of the US Courts to seek an end to "inordinate delays" in the case. Mr. Rauh stated that the Canadian government had "impeded" his efforts to achieve a resolution through "obvious blunders and ineffectual posturing" (*Globe and Mail*, November 20). Abandoning diplomatic channels, Mr. Rauh had appealed to the Administrator "as the last and only means of obtaining rulings and preventing a major miscarriage of justice through deaths of plaintiffs before final judicial action."

NORAD Renewal and SDI

With the renewal date for the North American Aerospace Defence (NORAD) agreement between Canada and the US approaching, questions were raised that NORAD might be used to draw Canada into an unwilling participation in the US Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI). While the federal government had rejected any formal involvement for Canada in SDI research, it had indicated that the private sector would be permitted to do so (see "International Canada" for August and September 1985). Meetings were held in early October between US Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and Canadian Defence Minister Erik Nielsen, covering both the upcoming five-year NORAD renewal and Canadian private sector contributions toward SDI research. Mr. Weinberger stressed that NORAD remained a "vital" agreement, from which stemmed "important bilateral relationships" (*Globe and Mail*, October 11). However, opposition critics suggested that NORAD might develop into an integral part of SDI, should the initiative ever reach the deployment stage. The agreement no longer retains a clause (deleted in 1981) whereby Canadian participation in NORAD did not guaran-

tee Canadian involvement in active strategic defence against ballistic missiles.

Days later, reports emerged that NORAD officials were in the process of developing plans in which Canada would be linked directly to future space and ballistic missile defences (including SDI). NORAD's proposed Strategic Defence Architecture Plan 2000 (SDA 2000), while not formally a part of SDI, would outline any integration of SDI deployment with NORAD (*The Citizen*, October 17). The plans were called "speculative" contingency planning. While the second phase of SDA 2000 involving defence against incoming missiles would require Canadian approval, NORAD remained firmly based on the concept of North America as an integral unit. Thus any US deployment of SDI would almost certainly call for Canadian participation if the fabric of NORAD were to be maintained. Receiving a qualified Canadian "No" on SDI, the US was seeking Canadian cooperation through NORAD on the development and "integrated analogous planning" for space defence (*Globe and Mail*, November 7).

Chemical Waste Dumps

Speaking in the Commons October 17, Environment Minister Tom McMillan stated that US Environmental Protection Agency head Lee Thomas had tabled that day an "extensive proposed action plan" covering "every facet" for the cleanup of pollutants in the Niagara River stemming from leakage in US chemical waste dumps. This included the possibility of "extraction and elimination" as well as containment. The Minister added that there were provisions for enforcement, compliance, tightening the standards for toxics, and monitoring and surveillance. While Canada remained committed to extraction and elimination rather than containment, the government would pass "final judgment" on the US proposal with "equal measures of fairness and criticism." Among the major points were:

- the extraction of chemicals from the ground water and areas surrounding dump sites;
- the pre-treatment of toxic chemicals from industries surrounding the area;
- tighter restrictions on companies discharging industrial waste into the Niagara River;
- bilateral research into the burning of toxic wastes at dumps;
- joint monitoring of toxics in fish from the Great Lakes;
- a review of storm water runoff problems from waste sites; and
- an examination of the advisability of implementing cleanup plans at other US sites (*The Citizen*, October 17).

Responding to questions from Charles Caccia (Lib., Davenport), a former Environment Minister, on funding for the cleanup proposals, Mr. McMillan stated that he and his department would be reflecting on the issue "methodically," and provided no details. Later speaking to reporters, the Minister added that while the US had not provided indications as to what monies would be allocated for the plan, cost was of secondary importance provided the proposals were satisfactory. He said that the US would be announcing a decision on the final form of its cleanup program following consultations with other governments