

lance systems. It calls for the Canadian Rangers, which patrols the North, to be expanded and its equipment upgraded. It proposes that a northern military training centre be established in the 1990s. Last spring Ottawa announced a \$200 million Canada-US project to establish five forward operating locations for CF-18 fighter aircraft in the North. The US-Canada treaty furthers Canada's claim. But that's no reason for complacency. Ottawa must ensure that Canada's hold on the Arctic is strong."

Reservations were expressed by John Merritt, Executive Director of the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, who pointed out that the Canadian government failed to push the Americans to include the words "prior consent" in the agreement with reference to future voyages of ice-breakers. The agreement does nothing to further advance the cause of Arctic sovereignty, according to Mr. Merritt (*Edmonton Journal*, January 13).

Defence and foreign affairs columnist John Best, writing in the *Regina Leader-Post* on January 12, summed up the reaction to the agreement. "It is not quite what the government and Canadians would have wanted. Nevertheless, the Canada-US agreement on Arctic cooperation represents a considerable achievement. It is another building block, if you like, in the gradually expanding structure of Canadian sovereignty in the North."

Soviet Arctic Cooperation

The idea of Arctic cooperation with the Soviet Union also received some attention. John Merritt, writing in the *Toronto Star* of January 22, cited a "significant" development in Arctic cooperation in February 1987 when a delegation from the Soviet embassy in Ottawa met with a group of Canadian government officials and presented a draft text of a proposed treaty for Canadian-Soviet Arctic Cooperation. Dave Nickerson (P.C., Western Arctic) also raised the issue in the Commons on January 28, when he referred to Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Murmansk on October 1, 1987. Mr. Nickerson concerned himself with "four proposals in the non-military field," and invited a response from the government. Jean-Guy Hudon, Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, responded that Canada was "pleased to learn that the Soviet Union is interested in the establishment of an Arctic Scientific Council, a project in which Canada, Norway and other countries are involved." The Parliamentary Secretary added that "Canada has asked for more detailed information about what the Soviet's interest means for all practical purposes" (*Hansard*, January 28).

Mr. Nickerson stated that it was evident that a great deal of thought and preparation had gone into Mr. Gorbachev's presentation for there were a number of new policy initiatives contained therein.

Mr. Gorbachev was trying to take a "polar view of the world," according to Mr. Nickerson, in making his six major points. The first two dealt with defence issues and contained "a lot of rhetoric which one expects," Mr. Nickerson observed. Mr. Gorbachev had made reference to a "northern nuclear-free zone" and while he realized that it could not happen overnight, he suggested methods by which this might be achieved over a number of years or how discus-

sions could be started toward that end.

Mr. Nickerson pointed out that Mr. Gorbachev had also made proposals to restrict naval activity in certain northern waters through mechanisms such as agreements on notification of naval maneuvers and the possibility of having observers in the area when those maneuvers take place.

"What I really want to talk about is the other four proposals in the non-military field," said Mr. Nickerson. "There was a proposal concerning cooperation in developing the natural resources of the north — oil, gas, and minerals in particular. There were offers made of possible joint business projects which might take place in the northern part of the Soviet Union. There was a proposal for a joint Arctic Scientific Council made up of the Soviet Union, Canada, the United States, Finland, Sweden and Norway as well as Greenland and Denmark," Mr. Nickerson noted. Another point was cooperation on environmental protection and the possible opening up of northern sea routes with lots of ice-breaker protection. (See "International Canada," October and November 1987.)

Acid Rain

The long standing contentious issue of Acid Rain in Canada-US relations, according to the *Toronto Star* of January 12, "got only a cursory mention" from Secretaries Shultz and Clark during their 1-day meeting in Ottawa on January 11 although, according to the *Ottawa Citizen* of the same date, "acid rain was near the top of Clark's list when he met with Shultz." In lamenting the lack of action on the part of the United States, the *Regina Leader-Post* of January 16 marvelled "at the US ability to delude itself, to ignore the symptoms of profound damage to its own water and lands," and encouraged Canada "to continue to badger the Americans at every opportunity." The editorial concluded, "We are being a better friend in so doing than if we blithely let our neighbor continue on a suicidal course." The *Ottawa Citizen*, quoting a *CP Wire* story, reported on January 27 that US officials had refused to consider cutting acid rain in half by 1994 and reported discouraging remarks by the Federal Minister of Environment who was reported to have said that Canada would not likely get the accord it needed. "The yellow brick road to a Canada-US accord on acid rain has been littered with false hopes and broken promises," observed the *Toronto Star* editorial on January 14, following the Clark-Shultz meeting in Ottawa. It concluded with the following dismal account: "A decade ago the two governments considered a treaty on trans-boundary air pollution. But that went up in smoke when Ronald Reagan was elected President. It took five years for Reagan to even agree that acid rain is a problem. Then the slow dancing began. Reagan and Prime Minister Brian Mulroney made a show of being big pals. Personal diplomacy would be the answer, and both men agreed in 1985 to appoint acid rain envoys, who eventually called for a US\$5 billion program to improve technology to control acid rain. Yet nothing has happened since. All that Shultz would say this week is that the USA does not think the problem is as severe as Canada says. Meanwhile, 14,000 lakes in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes have died from acid rain."

CIA-
Th
at the
tion a
CIA fo
plan
A
Halifa
paym
costs
sona
June

Bri

A
past
spira
Can
last J
ited
Star

M
ques
polic
wear
north
peat
by p
cour
the
16).

Fiji

Min
S
pres
foll
gove
pos
curr
citiz

Vis

F
Car
nou
inst
in C
ing

Fr

Fis
(
bou