

Most of the industrial decline is due to higher taxes, energy costs and regulatory costs. It is expected that value added taxes on energy consumption will increase for all goods and services. As well the government is already discussing mandated restrictions on transportation, utility and hydro plant building and the development of oil reserves. For instance it wants to switch the shipment of goods from trucks to shipping, canals and railroads. Given that the vast preponderance of shipping is done today by trucking and the rail network is not extensive, it is unclear if the government has properly forecasted the economic costs of forcing uneconomical and often times impossible shipping restrictions on business. The government has hinted that it might mandate that trucks cannot use the main highways at certain times of day and that forced car pooling might be feasible as well as entrance tolls to cities.<sup>782</sup>

By 2010 when Kyoto fully kicks in, a typical Canadian family of four will face a tax increase of \$4400, and the general economy will suffer from excess costs in real terms of at least \$40 billion per year.<sup>783</sup> These costs were never disclosed to the Canadian public nor reported by the mainstream media. There was absolutely no parliamentary debate or hearing into Kyoto. Kyoto was even signed before an implementation plan was made to describe how Canada would cope with such economic dislocation. The current government plan on implementation consists of 50 power point slides with vague bullet point remarks such as 'turn down the thermostat, fill the dryer'.<sup>784</sup> Such a lack of detailed planning is strange from a department with 4,000 employees looking at an internationally binding agreement that will cost anywhere from C\$20-75 Billion per annum.

Instead Canadian politicians have focused on the sacrifices needed without revealing the economic costs to their citizens. The Government has resolutely demanded that Kyoto "must become a national project, calling upon the efforts and contributions of all Canadians, in all regions and sectors of the economy—producers and consumers, governments and citizens."<sup>785</sup> Such rhetoric sits uneasily with many who must pay the costs of such a program or question its necessity. The opposition leader in Canada's parliament queried the necessity for a system of wealth transfers to other countries

given Canada's peculiar, industrial, geographic and energy configuration, "... He is the Prime Minister of the second largest country in the world, a northern exporting country of immense distances that has an energy requirement for transportation, an energy requirement for heating just for survival, an energy requirement for manufacturing, and processing that is particular to the country and requires a particularized approach to CO2 emission limits."<sup>786</sup> Such national peculiarities militate against a one-size fits all environmental solution on climate change. However, no logic can dissuade the buying of votes. They are also opposed to many studies pointing out that wealthy prosperous countries are far more environmentally friendly and clean.<sup>787</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Differing and profound national characteristics make Kyoto difficult to implement leading most probably to a selective implementation of the accord—and the destruction of the accord's integrity. Nations will most likely not impose economic pain nor willingly engage in wealth transfers to poorer countries, but neither will they want to be seen as bad global citizens or unworthy of left wing votes. Nation-states are, and will continue to be, the most important political units that take responsibility for organizing human responses to global environmental change and such accords should not be used as vehicles to enhance or discriminate on economic and trade issues. As such we will probably witness some muddled and halfhearted implementation of Kyoto, which will most likely only aggravate trade tensions.

It can be argued that national government's are best equipped to deal with the broad environmental changes that occur within the borders of any given country. Although international and regional organizations, such as the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU), play a crucial role in forging consensus for international action concerning the global environment, it is the nation-state that must ultimately implement agreed upon strategies. For example, regional and institutions play an important role in framing the scope