

cleanup funds should be raised through a mine-head tax on West Virginia coal since it was politicians of that state who had kept high sulphur coal in use.

A Canadian participant observed that acid rain cleanup obviously faced major political obstacles in the U.S., but wanted to know what practical steps might be taken in the next 5 years. The U.S. side answered that in addition to an extended and expanded Clean air Act, which Canada should actively support, the Clean Water Act could also be used to support cleanup activities. A Congressman added that he would advise Mr. Davis, Canada's Acid Rain Envoy, to seek agreement on specific goals for acid rain reduction. He warned that the appointment of the envoys had been supported by the Reagan administration "as a dodge" but said that Canada should press "to make their mandate meaningful". The U.S. co-chairman of Committee III said that he would remind members of an observation made by the Canadian delegate in his opening statement, namely that the people of the U.S. were ahead of the politicians on acid rain. He said that evidence continued to accumulate that acid rain represented a serious threat to the environment and natural resources. Sweden, for example, now reported 10 thousand dead lakes. It was also apparent, however, that economically depressed areas like West Virginia could not pay the full or even the major costs of cleanup. He strongly urged Canada to "keep the pressure on".

There was also a brief discussion of acid rain in the Plenary Session. A Canadian Member of Parliament opened the discussion by saying that acid rain was a far more immediate problem in Canada-U.S. relations than many of the other issues on the agenda. He went on to say that he had seen a tremendous growth in public awareness over the past five years, but that awareness was not enough. Action, and particularly action at the political level, was required. He repeated the account he had given in Committee III of the recent steps taken or planned by Canadian governments and said that the hope in Canada was that the U.S. would now work cooperatively to solve the problem. He concluded by saying that we should all be grateful that there were only two jurisdictions in North America which had to agree on acid rain. The U.S. side responded by saying that he strongly endorsed the preceding remarks. Despite the differences in regional interests and attitudes regarding acid rain, there had to be an overriding awareness that the two countries shared a continent and that the devastation being wrought by acid rain would adversely affect all North Americans. He alluded, as he had in Committee III, to the damage done to Sweden's lakes by acid rain originating in the pollution of the Ruhr Valley. He argued that it was essential for Canada and the U.S. to work together. "We may not all be in the same boat but we are all in the same waters".

### III. Multilateral Issues—the African Famine

(In joint session with Committee II)

The discussion of the African famine was begun by a Canadian M.P. who said that the world had been warned about an impending crisis some time ago, but had not responded until the media brought it to the public's attention. The Member went on to describe the drought and resulting famine as affecting about one-half of Africa. The Canadian response had been three-fold: first, an enormous public outpouring of concern and donations; second, the matching of private contributions by the Canadian government; and, third the appointment of a Canadian Emergency Coordinator/African Famine supported by all 3 political parties. Altogether it was estimated that the Canadian financial response to the immediate crisis was on the order of \$100 million. The Canadian delegate went on to say that while a great deal was being spent on the immediate crisis, very little effort was being devoted to the long-term problem. She argued that there was no point in apportioning blame for the crisis because "there is plenty of blame to go around." Instead, the world had to get on with the massive effort of development to guarantee that the crisis would not endlessly repeat itself in the future, "Nothing less than an effort on the scale of the Marshall Plan will do".

A U.S. Congressman responded for the U.S. delegation by describing the African famine as a "global issue". He agreed that the scale of suffering and its coverage by television had focussed attention to an unusual degree, but that the famine was not really a new phenomenon. He pointed out that up to 40 million people a year died of starvation and related illnesses. "Only now are we recognizing the reality of this in Africa." He reported that whereas Ethiopia had been hard hit in the past few years, the most acute problem now appeared to be the Sudan. The Congressman went on to say how pleased he was that both Canada and the U.S. had responded generously in a non-partisan way, a notable accomplishment considering the budgetary problems of both countries. He estimated that the total U.S. contribution had been an extra \$1.2 billion, with U.S. direct food aid exceeding donations from the rest of the world combined. He remarked that, regardless of party, the Reagan Administration deserved to be commended for its response. But, like the opening Canadian speaker, the Congressman went on to express deep concern about the long-term problem, "beyond just keeping people alive". He argued that long-term international planning was called for. He cited the work of UNICEF in trying to galvanize public commitment over the long haul by arranging for U.S. communities to "adopt" communities in Africa. He noted that officials from the Maryland municipality in which he lived had visited Africa and, on their return, had raised \$1/2 million for an area in Rwanda. He concluded his remarks by saying that emergency