

The *Ottawa Citizen* also reported on September 28 that a report prepared by the EPA concluded that Canada had overstated its claim of reducing acid rain causing emissions by 50 percent by 1994. Only Ontario and Quebec, the report said, would come close to that level of reductions, with Nova Scotia and Manitoba increasing their acid rain pollution under the Canadian controls program by 6 percent and 14 percent respectively. In addition, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had not promised in writing to take part in the controls program, the report said, and only Ontario and Quebec had enacted acid rain regulations. The report also raised questions regarding the cost of reductions and the methods used by some polluters, such as Ontario Hydro, to make them. Michael Perley of the Canadian Coalition on Acid Rain said that the report — prepared by the US consulting firm ICF Inc. — was accurate in some respects, but that the worst polluters, Ontario and Quebec, received the least amount of criticism in it, while the other eastern provinces "are minor players."

Finally, at the end of September Environment Minister Tom McMillan announced that the authors of the NAPAP report would be visiting Canada in October to discuss with Canadian scientists their conclusion that acid rain was not inflicting major damage on US lakes and streams. The Minister said in Washington that he and Lee Thomas of the EPA had met about the study, and "[Mr. Thomas] expressed some displeasure with the comments I have made, but I restated them and confirmed in spades that Canada disagrees with the fundamental assertion that acid rain is not a serious problem" (*Globe and Mail*, September 30).

Great Lakes Water Levels

A study conducted at the University of Windsor's Great Lakes Institute — one of seventeen studies commissioned across Canada by the Canadian Climate Centre on the economic impact of the "greenhouse effect" — suggested that shipping costs in the Great Lakes could increase by as much as 30 percent by early in the twenty-first century, as accelerated evaporation caused a drop in water levels of up to seventy-five centimetres. Marie Sanderson, former director of the Institute, said that hydro production would decrease with the reduced water volumes, but that warmer temperatures would mean that less electricity would be required by both Canada and the US. "You won't notice it right away," Ms Sanderson said, "because the lakes are going up and down every year anyway, but every year there will be a lower [average level] . . . You'll first see it as a reduction in the ice cover on the lakes, which is what we saw just last winter. Maybe that was a foretaste of things to come. But you should start to see something about the year 2035." The study's conclusions were to be published at the end of October (*Toronto Star*, September 24).

Toxic Wastes

Records obtained under the US Freedom of Information Act from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) showed a tenfold increase since 1980 in bids by US companies to dump toxic wastes in Canada, said Ron Gotts,

director of the waste management division of the Ontario Environment Ministry. From January 1987 to April 1987, Ontario imported from the US over eighteen million kilograms of hazardous wastes, and exported to the US about seven million kilograms. Wendy Grieder, international activities specialist with the EPA, said that US companies often preferred to have hazardous waste treated at Canadian plants, which were in many cases closer to the producer of the waste and cheaper because of the weaker Canadian dollar. Ontario monitored all requests for disposal of hazardous waste, and the movement of wastes destined for recycling plants. Mr. Gotts said that the recyclable wastes were monitored because "recycling can sometimes be a cloak for other activities . . . That's how you end up with PCBs in oil." Pollution Probe executive director Colin Isaacs said that the monitoring system for hazardous waste imports was as thorough as it could be, adding, "I would prefer it come into Canada and be properly destroyed and properly disposed of than stay in the United States and go into a landfill site that is leaking. And believe me, plenty of US landfill sites are leaking" (*Globe and Mail*, September 16).

Potash

In late August the US Department of Commerce handed down a preliminary ruling that Canadian potash producers were dumping potash — used in the manufacture of fertilizer — in the US and said that duties of up to 85.2 percent should be imposed. The US producers of potash had sought a 43-percent duty on the US\$340 million worth of Canadian potash sold to the US annually by five major Canadian producers. An official at the Canadian embassy in Washington called the ruling "outrageous . . . We're mad as hell." He said the Canadian potash accounted for more than 80 percent of the US market, while the US producers who had filed the complaint had only 3 percent. Saskatchewan Trade Minister Robert Andrew said, "The whole industry is at risk. There's certainly a risk that some mines would be forced to close down. And if the mines are closed for any significant period of time, they could be rendered useless." He added that the preliminary duty would make the price of Canadian potash "prohibitive" for US customers . . . They would have to buy potash from the Russians. It's absolute insanity." Saskatchewan sold 60 percent of its potash to the US, and the duty was "a large, large question for our economy," he added (*Globe and Mail*, August 22).

International Trade Minister Pat Carney expressed disappointment over the ruling. "We had argued strongly in February [1986] that the case should not have been initiated. We continue to question whether the two US companies [Lundberg Industries Ltd. and New Mexico Potash Corp., both of New Mexico] bringing the petition have legitimate standing in this case." The Minister stressed that Canadian companies were not required to pay any anti-dumping duties as a result of the decision, although they would have to post bonds equal to the estimated amount of the dumping margin. She also indicated that the federal government "will be reviewing the [US] decision particu-