

exemptions to Americans holding conventions in Canada, during a Senate debate in April 1977. Both senators had cited Canada's Bill C-58, which had rescinded tax exemptions for Canadians advertising on U.S. border TV stations, as reasons for their opposition. Neither objected to the Committee proposal that Garrison funds be deleted prior to the IJC report.

As it turned out, most of the \$18 million appropriated by H.R. 7553 had to be deferred while the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, an agency of the Department of the Interior, formulated modified plans for the Garrison project, as a result of a lawsuit that had been brought against the Secretary of the Interior by the National Audubon Society in 1976. In May 1977, Carter's Interior Secretary reached an out-of-court settlement with the Audubon Society that provided that no further construction would take place on Garrison before an environmental-impact statement was prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation and the entire project re-submitted to Congress by the Interior Department. A revised scheme, eliminating the more contentious aspects of the project and meeting most of the IJC recommendations, was submitted to Congress early in 1978.

The separation of powers in Washington has always been a potential source of disruption in Canadian-American relations. Congressional powers of appropriation, in particular, continue to play an important role in shaping the course of relations between the two countries in a number of issue areas. The role of Congress on the Garrison Diversion Unit suggests that, in environmental relations between the two countries, particular attention must be paid to the legislative branch in Washington.

Congress continued to appropriate funds for Garrison construction well after the first expression of Canadian concern that the project would cause transboundary pollution. Not unnaturally, Congressmen are disinclined to subordinate domestic interests to foreign concerns of their own accord. But at the same time, when the IJC's role in Garrison became more visible in 1977, the House of Representatives refused to embroil Garrison in the larger struggle with President Carter over the future of water projects. This is a welcome indication that the IJC's proceedings, far from being ignored by the House, assumed some importance in this case.

In the Senate, where the membership is smaller, the tenure more fixed, the atmosphere "clubbier", the IJC's role was

not ignored by senators on the Appropriations Committee, but there was less generosity, and they preferred to put the onus on the IJC to demonstrate why their pattern of appropriation should be changed. If this attitude can be attributed to the presence of both North Dakota senators on the committee, together with two others who were unhappy with Canadian tax policy, what emerges as important in this case is the degree of commitment by the Senate Committee to weigh the IJC recommendations when they were released.

The issues dealt with by the IJC — transboundary pollution, present or anticipated — usually spring from parochial concerns, generally peripheral to the grand design of national policy. But where there are issues of local importance, there are also the elected representatives of the people, eager to demonstrate to constituents that their concerns do not go unheard at the federal level. In Washington, the elected representatives have an independent source of policy-making power to ensure that local programs are protected. In the case of the Garrison Diversion Unit, Congress demonstrated its willingness to consider the deliberations of the IJC. The continued readiness of Congressional appropriations committees to accord both attention and importance to the IJC, particularly when the constituency interests of Congressmen are directly involved, will help to ensure the continued success of the Commission's work.

Gremlins attack

Somewhere between proofreading the galleys, which were correct, and sending the page-proofs to the printer, the gremlins attacked our September/October issue. The result was an incomprehensible paragraph in the article on the United Nations by Hans Tabor. The first full paragraph in the second column of Page 18 should have read as follows:

But the Western world will have to widen its own values, especially that of equality, to include the poorer countries. The West will have to show an increase in the will to diminish the disparities in the standards of living and will have to realize that it is more than regrettable for the world economy to have continued underactivity in the developing countries. Otherwise, the discussions in the UN and its Specialized Agencies will be futile.