

the NAPAP report "a report that was paid for by the US administration . . . a political report." External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said he agreed that the report was a political one, saying, "It pretends to be a scientific report. We are challenging its scientific basis."

Meanwhile, a 7-year study of the Turkey Lake, Ontario, watershed (north of Sault Ste. Marie) by the National Water Research Institute of Burlington, Ontario, showed that lakes could recover from acid rain damage in a matter of years if the emissions causing the acid rain damage were halted or reduced. Dean Jeffries, head of the study, which was to continue through 1990, said the study "supplies solid information that the system can repair itself if we treat it right. As a scientist I feel we have more than enough information to justify going ahead with emission controls." The return of fish and less acidic levels in the seven lakes of the watershed proved there was a direct relationship between the amount of acid rain and the quality of the lakes, Dr. Jeffries said, as the results showed an improvement in water quality directly following a period of decreased industrial sulphur dioxide emissions in the early 1980s. The results supported other research near Sudbury and Kenora, Ontario, he added (*Ottawa Citizen*, September 18).

Environment Minister Tom McMillan's attack on the US task force report was met with equanimity by the EPA. Bill Long, an EPA spokesman, said on September 18 that Mr. McMillan's criticism of the report was consistent with Canada's position that the US was over-emphasizing the need for more scientific study before acting to reduce acid rain-causing emissions. Mr. Long said the report was only one of several elements that would be drawn together to determine US policy on acid rain, and that "the people who put the report together are reputable scientists . . . What is discouraging is that many people are making pronouncements without having studied it."

Michael Perley, spokesman for the Canadian Coalition on Acid Rain, called the US task force report "distorted, incomplete and flawed," saying that it dealt only with surface water impact and failed to mention human health problems arising from acid rain, or other issues such as damage to buildings. Mr. Perley blamed the Canadian government for not making a "coherent effort" to explain Canada's worries about acid rain to the American public (*Ottawa Citizen*, September 19). However, a letter to the editor published in the September 20 *Toronto Star* from a minister-counsellor for public affairs at the Canadian embassy in Washington denied this allegation. The letter outlined activities undertaken by the embassy — public speaking engagements, public information programs, consular activities throughout the US — and maintained, "What else but these activities . . . would have prompted Michigan's congressman John Dingell [a well-known opponent of acid rain emission reduction plans] to complain publicly about this embassy's energetic campaigning on acid rain? (As recently as [August 1987 Mr. Dingell] wrote to the ambassador asking the embassy to desist from its lobbying of congress on this issue). Why else would Maine's Democratic senator George Mitchell, a strong proponent of acid rain controls, tell a tripartite group of Canadian MPs last

June 24 that the only progress on acid rain made with the [US President Ronald] Reagan administration has been as a result of Canada?"

A few days later Ambassador Allan Gottlieb's deputy told a gathering of US business people in Buffalo, New York, that Canada would keep working to solve the problem of acid rain, despite the recent US task force report. "The report makes a lot of assumptions that don't stand up," Paul Heinbecker said. "Unless the US acts to reduce acid rain, we Canadians will still have an acid problem. The *status quo* is not an option for us." Mr. Heinbecker pointed out that the report claimed that only 10 percent of Adirondack lakes had a pH of 5, a level fatal to most fish and animal life; but most research indicated that fish began to die when the water's pH fell from 7 to 6, he said, and, by making the danger limit more restrictive, the authors of the report had made it appear that fewer lakes were involved in acid rain damage (*Toronto Star*, September 24).

The *New York Times* reported on September 22 that researchers involved in the study believed that the report's executive summary was inaccurate and misleading. They said it appeared to be aimed more at supporting the opposition of Mr. Reagan's administration to expensive pollution controls than at clarifying scientific knowledge, the *Times* report said.

During the same week, a study called *Acid Rain vs Canada's Heritage* — funded by Environment Canada, and written by architect and "historic" building expert Martin Weaver for the US EPA — found that acid rain pollution was doing "drastic" damage to buildings by eating away at stones and metal work "to the point of collapse." The study found that "the key ingredients causing [building] deterioration [were] oxides of sulphur and nitrogen," the main elements of acid rain. Mr. Weaver cited one historic building, Montreal City Hall, where acid rain pollution "has seriously affected some of the most exposed stones to the point of failure and collapse." An Environment Canada official confirmed that the report was being prepared for release, and was intended as a guide for purchasers of building materials (*Toronto Star*, September 24).

A 7-year study of another Canadian lake — this one of Plastic Lake in the Muskoka region of Ontario — indicated that acid rain had a definite cumulative effect, according to the head researcher for the project, Peter Dillon. The study was conducted by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment from 1979 until the end of 1986, and was "probably the most intensive study in Canada, if not in the world," Mr. Dillon said. "There's no question Plastic Lake is acidifying . . . The chemical changes are very profound. We've proven sulphuric acid is directly responsible for the acidification . . . The lake isn't dead yet. In fact, it will never be completely biologically dead, in that there'll never be any biological life in it. But it's already biologically different. Some species are already extinct in the lake." Mr. Dillon added that the US task force report released earlier in September had been based on the status of lakes at a given point in time and had made no effort to look at whether the condition of lakes had changed over the years (*Ottawa Citizen*, September 28).