

immediate one which required immediate action. Damage could only "accelerate" in the event that North America continued to "study without responding." As well, it was of critical importance that neither the US nor Canada be "paralyzed" by the short term, "very large costs" of pollution control. Mr. Davis added that new US legislation was not required in order to commence a "real" clean-up, with viable options currently available through both existing laws and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Speaking before the US National Press Club, EPA head Lee Thomas later gave a qualified endorsement to tentative suggestions from the US acid rain envoy Drew Lewis for a \$1 billion program based on technology development (*The Citizen*, December 6). (Messrs. Davis and Lewis were preparing a joint report on the problem for their respective governments.) Mr. Thomas stated that the development of technology for reductions in both sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions held out "promise." He added that much depended on the "direction" in which the proposed billion dollars was used — with the areas of burning and coal-scrubbing requiring the most attention. However, days later, when testifying before the US Senate's environment committee, Mr. Thomas reiterated the perennial call for more research. "An immediate decision on additional controls would be inappropriate . . . premature and unwise," he stated (*Toronto Star*, December 12). Mr. Thomas suggested that several years would be required before Canada could expect concrete action by the US in the form of prescribing new emission controls.

In mid-December the Ontario government announced its own provincial program for cutting emissions, with costs estimated in the millions. Ontario smelters would be required to cut emissions by more than the 50 percent previously announced by the year 1994. The cuts, coming from three Ontario smelters as well as Ontario Hydro's coal-fired generating stations, would depend upon advances in pollution control technology over the program's timespan (*Globe and Mail*, December 13). In an interview December 17, US Senator George Mitchell (Democrat-Maine) viewed the Ontario announcement as a "positive step forward," and possibly providing Prime Minister Brian Mulroney with "some basis for taking a strong and aggressive stand" in future meetings with President Ronald Reagan (CBC Radio [External Affairs transcript], December 17). This favorable response was echoed by US Senator Robert Stafford (Republican-Vermont), chairman of the Senate environment committee. Ontario's program would prove helpful in efforts to "persuade the Reagan administration and Congress to enact meaningful acid rain controls" in the US, he stated (*Globe and Mail*, December 19). "Fairness," said Senator Stafford, required that the US "act as good neighbors and respond to this initiative in Canada."

On January 8 William Davis and his US counterpart, Drew Lewis, issued their joint report on acid rain. While recommending a \$5 billion program for pollution control technology in the US (to be spent over five years and provided equally by the US government and industry), the report failed to set specific targets for active US reductions in emissions. The report, widely regarded as a watered-down version of what both envoys had repeatedly called for, received harsh criticism from both US and Canadian

environmentalists and the Ontario government (*Globe and Mail*, *The Citizen*, January 8). While failing to set limits on current emissions, the report did include several recommendations for joint Canada-US cooperation on research into pollutants and a sharing of information on pollution control technology. As well, the report represented an advance in that the US envoy did suggest that transboundary acid rain was an increasingly serious problem requiring remedial action.

Mr. Davis stated in an interview January 8 that the report represented what both envoys viewed as being acceptable to the US administration. Without sacrificing the ultimate objective of concrete reductions, the envoys had hoped to establish two fundamental principles on acid rain (both of which had been taken for granted by Canada): that the problem existed and that it was transboundary (CBC Radio [External Affairs transcript], January 8). Since neither principle had previously been a part of US policy, both envoys felt that "specific target reductions" would not have been accepted by the US administration. The report was a recommendation for the application of technology, some of which already existed, in order to build "momentum" for emissions cuts — especially those emissions from the US which "impacted" on Canada.

Following submission of the report, Mr. Lewis stated that while President Reagan had expressed "great concern about the Canadian situation," the US was constrained by the degree to which the problem might be solved without creating "great social and economic unrest in the area that would be most adversely affected by any action" (*Globe and Mail*, January 9). In a significant departure from past policy on the necessity of further research, Mr. Lewis had indicated to the President that the "seriousness of the problem, especially as it affects diplomatic relations with Canada, dictates that we act; the uncertain effects and high costs of control dictate that we act prudently" (*New York Times*, January 9).

In Canada, opposition environment critics expressed their disappointment over the report's avoidance of targets. Charles Caccia (Lib., Davenport) cited the failure to note the "cost of inaction," stating that the report operated in an "economic vacuum." (Several critics had noted that yearly damage due to acid pollution topped \$5 billion — the entire budget suggested by the report for technology development.) Bill Blaikie (NDP, Winnipeg-Birds Hill) suggested that the report had answered the US administration's desire for delay (*New York Times*, January 9). Responding to questioning in the Commons January 13 from the two environment critics, Environment Minister Tom McMillan stated that Canada would endeavor to "push" further the report's recommendations, including cabinet level mechanisms and the placing of acid rain on future Summit meeting agenda. Attention would focus on the "application" of technological development, not merely on research. While Canada was not satisfied with the progress made on acid rain, the report was to be regarded as a first rather than last step toward acid rain abatement.

Instituting one of the report's recommendations, Canada appointed Mr. McMillan as Canadian co-chairman of a joint committee on transboundary pollution. Speaking before a US audience in late January, the Environment Minister stated that acid rain would remain "a key bilateral issue"