

United States, except during crisis years such as Korea in the 1952 campaign, Vietnam in 1968 and 1972, and the Iran hostage-taking episode in 1980.

Besides the public attention to domestic issues, both candidates had reasons to downplay the Central America issue. In 1988 Dukakis's main concern lay in winning back the so-called "Reagan Democrats" from their 1980 and 1984 allegiances. But stressing Central America could lead to red-baiting by the Republicans; a Dukakis adviser, for example, observed that for these conservative Democrats, "It's all economy, jobs, and being tough with the Russians. Nothing else has much credibility."

On the Republican side, however, the conservative House member Henry Hyde agreed that the issue of Contra aid was "not a winner" with the public. During the last days of September the Congress showed the same reluctance to rehash the issue by passing without argument the appropriation bill for the military with only "humanitarian" aid for the Contras, leaving the problem for the new administration and Congress.

Security questions

In the field of policy on military spending and NATO, what may turn out to be of greatest interest to Canada was a growing belief in the United States from Jesse Jackson to Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci that the European allies have not carried their fair share in money or troops in the alliance. No reference was made to Canada, perhaps because of the Progressive Conservative government's armament plans. On the topic of NATO the Democrats have been more outspoken, enough for Carlucci to warn of "isolationism" in the United States in approaching the issue of Europe.

On the question of superpower negotiations, Bush, if anything, placed himself to the right of Reagan, arguing after the Moscow summit that the President might be going "too far" and that "The Cold War is not over." Such statements put Dukakis in the surprising position of being able to claim, in a speech on September 13, that his strong but flexible policy of dealing with the Soviets resembled Reagan's more than Bush's; the latter, however, spoke of the need to grab "opportunities for change."

Free Trade

Shifting to subjects that Americans mostly see as domestic issues, but which Canadians closely watch, the legislation implementing the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement in the United States was signed by the President on September 28. What gained headlines, however, was a Presidential veto the same day of a bill severely restricting textile imports. Always looking for a way to make a point, the Great Communicator cleverly dealt with the two bills together to stress his ideological opposition to protectionism (modified several times in practice during the Reagan years).

More than any recent American trade legislation, including the Free Trade Agreement which finally passed with large majorities in both houses, the textile bill has pointed up the divisions in the country on trade. The problem was bigger for the Democrats. The Republican ticket and most Congressional Republicans opposed the bill. Most Congressional Democrats, however, responsive to the textile industry and to workers' fears of lost jobs, supported it, including Vice-Presidential candidate Lloyd Bentsen. Dukakis, however, took no position on the bill, reflecting the fears of some Democrats that consumers might resent higher clothing prices and that protectionism mainly protected certain business owners.

For Canada, of course, the trade issue then came to depend on the results of their own election on November 21. The continuation of the Mulroney Conservative government means that implementation will proceed as planned in early 1989.

Environment

Canadians will want to know, finally, how the environment fared as an issue. Let us start with the most prominent issue, acid rain. In contrast to the policies of the Reagan administration, both candidates clearly stated that they would seek reductions in coal-burning emissions. In Bush's case, this position represented one of his few breaks with his predecessor. (His mild criticism of the ethics of many in the administration was another.) To bring about his goal, the president-elect promoted the development of clean coal technology that would eliminate acidic side effects. Canadians, however, should note with dismay that he refused to mention specific goals for reducing emissions.

As a Governor of a state hit by acid rain, and in response to political pressure from around the country, Dukakis put forward more specific targets. He said he would cut sulfur dioxide emissions by twelve million tons a year and nitrogen oxides by four million tons. Furthermore, he promised to cooperate more with Canada on this matter. For Canadians the differences on this issue between the tickets may have been the most important and substantial of all, with the possible exception of Central American policy.

For Canada, environmental issues in the United States go beyond acid rain. Important to us, for example, is the dispute between fishermen and oil companies over the shared and rich east coast fishery of Georges Bank. Again, as the Governor of Massachusetts, Dukakis has so far refused permission for drilling.

In the United States, of course, the environmental issue also goes far beyond acid rain; other types of air and water pollution, global warming, and toxic waste cleanups, if anything, get more publicity. Since Canada suffers from these problems too, sometimes because of American actions, we should know what the candidates proposed to do. On nuclear power Bush was more supportive; Dukakis did not forthrightly reject this controversial energy source, but stressed the role of regulation by the states and questioned the economic feasibility of many plants.

On the "greenhouse effect" and the danger to the ozone layer, both favored an international conference and reduction of offending gases. With respect to pesticides, Bush favored more development of biotechnology and a review of current regulations; Dukakis would increase the testing of pesticides, which he argued has fallen behind in the Reagan administration.

From their past actions and current positions, therefore, US environmentalists in groups such as the League of Conservation Voters preferred Dukakis to Bush, giving them grades of B and D respectively. Dukakis may have delayed too long in starting the massive cleanup of Boston Harbor (a shortcoming greatly played up by Bush), but the Vice President in 1981 angered environmentalists by supporting, as chair of the Commission on Regulatory Relief, the weakening of a number of environmental regulations, a role which Dukakis pointed out during the campaign.

Rising above the issue

What implications can we draw from the way these issues emerged in the campaign? In the context of the 1988 election we can start with the much ballyhooed subject of image politics. In campaign speeches and appearances the candidates must raise