

an appeal by the province of Ontario, various environmental groups and eight northeastern states (See "International Canada" for February and March 1987). Lawyers for the EPA had urged the Supreme Court not to hear the case, noting that the US and Canadian governments were involved in extensive studies on how best to address the acid rain problem, and that the US had committed US\$2.5 billion in public money and the same in private funds to develop acid rain-control technology (*Ottawa Citizen*, June 8). In Toronto, Ontario Environment Minister Jim Bradley said that the decision came as no surprise. "It is disappointing, but we have a lot of allies in the United States who are prepared to assist us in putting forth our point of view." He said that the decision showed that the Canadian government should not speak optimistically about a possible bilateral acid rain agreement with the US: "The US is not serious about it, at least not the administration" (*Globe and Mail*, June 9).

On June 11 a bill was introduced in the US House of Representatives which was almost identical to a 1986 bill which did not make its way through congress. The legislation would order significant cuts in acid rain-causing emissions from coal-burning power plants and factory boilers, and cars and trucks. Minnesota Democrat Gerry Sikorski, who sponsored the legislation, said that while the US congress was preparing to act immediately on acid rain, US President Ronald Reagan would likely continue to stall and pass the acid rain dispute to his successor after the 1988 presidential election. "The problem is not whether we're going to stop acid rain," Mr. Sikorski said. "The question is whether we're going to do it stupidly, and wait until we've destroyed our lungs and our lakes, farms and forests and part of our economy and a good part of our environment. . . or whether we're going to do it, as the scientists have been encouraging us to do it, in time to save some of those resources." The bill would reduce sulphur dioxide emissions from coal-burning plants and factories by about 40 percent in two stages ending in 1997, and nitrogen oxide from plants, factories, cars and trucks by about 20 percent over the same period. Mr. Sikorski had eight co-sponsors on the bill, which would have several sub-committee and committee hurdles to overcome before it would reach the floor of the House (*Globe and Mail*, June 12).

The *Globe and Mail* reported on June 17 that the Halifax annual meeting of the premiers of five eastern provinces and the governors of six New England states had unanimously adopted three resolutions related to acid rain. The first called on Ottawa and Washington for "an immediate program to reduce the long-range transport of air pollutants and acid deposition." The second asked that the EPA and Environment Canada "increase support for comprehensive air-quality monitoring in forested areas." And the third called for all eleven leaders to notify each other whenever a new project could have an environmental impact on neighboring states or provinces. The agenda for the meeting had focussed on sharing information about high technology, but the resolutions were made because "environmental concerns will just not go away," said Vermont governor Madeleine Kunin.

Members of a special parliamentary committee on acid rain said on June 24, after a Washington meeting with

US congressmen and officials, that they did not want Canadian negotiators to be so flexible in trying to reach an acid rain accord with the US as to allow long delays in reducing chemical emissions in the US. Committee chairman Stan Darling (PC — Parry Sound-Muskoka) and Liberal environment critic Charles Caccia (Davenport) said they wanted a 1994 deadline on both sides of the border. "There is definitely no intention to accept the notion of flexibility in this business. It is too important and too serious and too urgent," said Mr. Caccia. Mr. Darling said, "We're going to try to hammer out the best deal we can and we're going to be very strong in stating that we want the target date to be 1994. The June 25 *Globe and Mail* report stated that a Canadian government official had said that Canada had presented a flexible position at the May negotiating session that would allow the US a longer timetable for reductions than Canada's own 1994 target.

On June 29 the *Globe and Mail* reported that the US congress had, the previous week, agreed to spend only US\$350 million over the following three years — as opposed to the US\$2.5 billion requested by US President Ronald Reagan — on research into ways of burning coal more cleanly. Richard Ayers, a lawyer with the US Natural Resources Defence Council, said that the vote "illustrates the erroneous tactics pursued by the Canadian government" in agreeing to Mr. Reagan's desire for increasing research into clean-coal technology instead of limiting acid rain-causing emissions. "This is good news for those who want a real acid rain control bill," said Mr. Ayers, since members of the House of Representatives who favored legislated targets to reduce emissions had no intention of agreeing to Mr. Reagan's financing request, which they considered a stalling tactic to avoid making real reductions in acid rain. His group and other environmental groups in Canada and the US saw the vote as the opening salvo in a major political battle shaping up in the US congress not only for acid rain controls, but also for clean coal projects and improved ozone safeguards. Canadian officials in Washington were reported to have agreed that acid rain legislation had a better chance of success in the US congress if it were promoted in concert with the other two elements. "It's only the beginning of the debate," said one Canadian official of the vote. During the same week, the report said, the next political moves on the US congress would be made when a key US senate environmental subcommittee was to draft a bill partly aimed at cutting sulphur dioxide emissions by twelve million tons — a reduction of more than 40 percent — by the mid-1990s (*Globe and Mail*, June 29).

Meanwhile, on July 7 the *Toronto Star* reported that the UN Environment Program and the World Health Organization had issued a joint report concluding that some 600 million city dwellers worldwide were endangered by acid rain, while another 1 billion people were exposed to high pollution levels "that result from coal, wood, oil combustion and automobile traffic dust." The report, *Global Pollution and Health*, was "well-documented" and "just the tip of the iceberg," according to the agencies that produced it.

Finally, on July 23 a spokesman for a coalition of US industrial, political and environmental interests said in Washington that "An acid rain program needs both a carrot