

Canadian embassy in Washington. Mr. Trudeau had been asked by Jack Shields (P.C., Athabaska) to consider postponing the construction of the \$38 million embassy at "this time of economic difficulties." Mr. Trudeau justified the expense, saying that the planned embassy would make Canada's diplomatic operations in Washington more efficient and effective. The Prime Minister had been under attack in the House since late April when it was revealed that Cabinet had overridden the advice of a selection committee in choosing an architect for the new Canadian embassy in Washington.

US Ambassador Speaks Out

Newspaper reports between April 21 and April 28 charged Paul Robinson, US Ambassador to Canada, with being loose-lipped, patronizing and hawkish following several speeches and press conferences during that week (*Globe and Mail*, April 21; *Toronto Star*, April 24; *Citizen*, April 28). A second wave of criticism levelled at the US envoy began after a May 11 speech to the Canadian Club of Hamilton. Journalists and politicians joined "a growing chorus of Canadian critics" in challenging Mr. Robinson's suitability for his post (*Citizen*, May 13).

Statements made by Mr. Robinson at an April 20 meeting of the Calgary Chamber of Commerce and at a later press conference were quoted in the *Globe and Mail* April 21. Mr. Robinson mentioned the "unfortunate condition of the Canadian Armed Forces relative to her NATO allies." He said, though, that Canada's recent budget plans to increase defence spending were a "step in the right direction," which he hoped would continue. (*Globe and Mail*, April 21).

NDP external affairs critic Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam) raised the matter of Mr. Robinson's comments on Canadian policy in the House of Commons April 22, asking the Canadian government to complain to Washington about the diplomat's behavior.

John Miller, the managing editor of the *Toronto Star*, editorialized in his front-page report of a speech given by Mr. Robinson at the Canadian Press annual dinner meeting April 21. According to Mr. Miller, Mr. Robinson's speech was "insulting to this country, riddled with historical inaccuracies." Mr. Miller was referring to comments made by Mr. Robinson which dealt with the "peril and danger" of implied Soviet military superiority. Mr. Miller approached Mr. Robinson after the speech, and was told by the Ambassador to "shove off, kid" in response to a question about the perceived Soviet threat (*Toronto Star*, April 24).

Government reaction to some of Mr. Robinson's statements came from Defence Minister Gilles Lamontagne on April 27. The *Citizen* April 28 said that Mr. Lamontagne told reporters after a House of Commons External Affairs and National Defence Committee that the Ambassador "should know better than to criticize the country he is in." The *Citizen* reported that Mr. Robinson has also attacked Canada's metric conversion program, saying it could adversely affect Canada's trade with the United States.

The furor surrounding Mr. Robinson resurfaced after a speech he gave to the Canadian Club of Hamilton May 11. The *Citizen* May 12 reported that Mr. Robinson told the Canadian Club that he believes that Canada spends too

much on social services, but Americans are pleased that Canada has increased its military spending eighteen per cent. Mr. Robinson liked the November 12 budget for two other reasons; it did not extend the National Energy Program and it did not expand the Foreign Investment Review Agency, the *The Citizen* reported.

Mr. Robinson's comments again aroused Pauline Jewett. In an NDP press release, Miss Jewett was quoted as saying: "The Ambassador interferes too much in Canadian affairs, has too many opinions, is insulting and patronizing to this country and its people." In calling for Mr. Robinson's resignation, Miss Jewett said that he "is unable or unwilling to learn the rules of diplomacy or understand his role in Canada. It seems the only message he can understand is his message to a *Toronto Star* reporter, 'Shove off, kid!'"

External Affairs Minister Mark MacGuigan was asked by NDP leader Ed Broadbent in the House of Commons May 13 what action the government was prepared to take to ensure that these incidents involving the US Ambassador do not happen again. Mr. Broadbent pointed out that two former US Ambassadors to Canada had stated that they did not believe in using a public forum to criticize Canadian policies. An Ambassador's role, when he has differences with the government of a country, is to express those differences through "quiet, diplomatic channels," ex-US Ambassador to Canada William Porter had been quoted as saying in a May 13 *Citizen* article.

Mr. MacGuigan's response amounted to a "mild rebuke" (*Globe and Mail*, May 14). Mr. MacGuigan told the House of Commons: "There are some instances which, from time to time, could be considered borderline. In those cases, by and large, I think it is better that those be dealt with, as long as they are borderline, by the normal political and free speech process of this country."

A report in the *Toronto Star* said that Mr. Robinson denied in a May 28 telephone interview that he had criticized Canada's spending on social services. Mr. Robinson also said that he believed it was proper of him to urge Canadians to spend more on national defence, according to the May 29 *Star* article.

Acid Rain: Criticism of NEB Decision

A National Energy Board (NEB) approval of an Ontario Hydro request to sell coal-generated electricity to the US prompted both federal Liberal and Opposition spokesmen to argue that the federal Cabinet should not give approval to the sale. The multi-million-dollar sale of electrical power to Jersey Central Power and Light, a subsidiary of General Public Utilities (GPU), was approved by the NEB April 27. A certificate issued to Ontario Hydro by the NEB authorizes the construction and operation of a 300-kilovolt, direct-current interconnection to run 103 kilometres under Lake Erie from Nanticoke, Ontario, to a site near Erie, Pennsylvania (NEB news release, April 27). The sale must be approved by federal and provincial cabinets before it is finalized (*Globe and Mail*, April 28). Environmental spokesmen opposed the decision on the grounds that acid rain would be increased because Ontario does not have sufficient acid rain controls. Acid rain is causing environmental and structural damage in large parts of eastern North America.