

take Canada's demand for a trade dispute settling mechanism as a ploy that Canada would abandon as an agreement neared. On the other hand, US officials, the report said, had accused the Canadians of naiveté for believing that the US congress would agree to exempting Canada, the biggest trading partner of the US, from their trade remedy laws.

By the end of September — although Ms Carney had said that she and Mr. Wilson had made "a lot of progress" in their Washington session (*Toronto Star*, September 29), and the federal Cabinet agreed that "consultations" would continue between the two countries at the "political level" (*Ottawa Citizen*, September 30) — no new round of negotiations aimed at a free trade agreement had begun. Mr. Clark told CBC television's *The Journal* on September 29 that "we're not very optimistic about this leading to anything, but it might" (External Affairs transcript), while the Prime Minister told the Commons on the same day, "Whether it's five days, five minutes or five hours, the bottom line remains the same. This deal shall be in the national interest of Canada or there shall be no deal at all," and NDP trade critic Stephen Langdon told the Commons, "I think it's going to cost us as a country even if we go back into negotiations; we'll go back with a sense of weakness instead of with a sense of strength."

Acid Rain

In early September the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) accused Canada and other countries — including the US, Italy and most of the countries of eastern Europe — of being "unwilling or unable" to stop acid rain pollution because it refused to sign a West German sponsored international pollution control treaty. Negotiated in Europe and called by the WWF "the world's only functioning air-pollution control agreement," the treaty called for a 30-percent reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions, which came mostly from automobiles (*Toronto Star*, September 6).

On September 9 officials from the US Treasury Department and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) told the US House of Representatives ways and means committee that a plan offered by Republican representative Judd Gregg to combat acid rain by taxing pollutants emitted by large factories and power plants was premature. The proposal would impose a variable rate tax on emissions of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Witnesses representing major manufacturers and the electricity and coal-mining industries also opposed the tax proposal, saying that the US congress should postpone action on any acid rain control legislation until the completion of a 10-year US federal study begun in 1980, and the development of new and cheaper technologies for burning coal more cleanly (*Globe and Mail*, September 10).

On September 16 Quebec Environment Minister Clifford Lincoln told an international conference on the ozone layer (See Multilateral Relations — UN, below), "I rejoice that the Americans now admit that the way to deal with [environmental] problems . . . is to set specific target dates and clear objectives. This is very much a reverse of the position they've taken on the acid rain issue . . . I find it very paradoxical that [regarding ozone] they say they have

to have target dates, and on the acid rain issue they say, let's research it first. If they want to be consistent, why don't they say, let's research the ozone problem for another ten years before we act . . . All we can do is try, using every possible argument, to press the point home and show them we're really getting fed up. We can't just watch the maple trees and lakes die." The *Ottawa Citizen* reported on September 17 that Lee Thomas, director of the EPA, said that ozone depletion and acid rain were two separate issues, and that there was no contradiction in the US policies toward each of them.

The National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program (NAPAP), a US congressional task force established in 1980, released a report — overdue by two years — on September 17 which concluded that only a small fraction of US lakes and streams had been damaged by acid rain, and that current research suggested "that there will not be an abrupt change in aquatic systems, crops or forests at present levels of air pollution." Courtney Riordan, research director of the EPA, acknowledged that the so-called "steady state" theory had not been proved, but he added that "the consensus of the [scientific community] is that it is likely to be so." Richard Ayres, a lawyer for the Natural Resources Defence Council, said, "This is the Pollyanna-in-blinders approach," and accused the task force of ignoring studies inconsistent with the US administration's position. The "steady state" theory had been disproved by Canadian scientists, he said, who had documented increasing acidity in one long-studied lake despite an actual reduction in acid rain over the period of the study (*Ottawa Citizen*, September 17).

Environment Minister Tom McMillan reacted to the report of the task force by saying that there was no lack of scientific understanding of the acid rain problem in the US, but that "what is missing is the political will by some Americans to do what is necessary to reduce, on a targeted and scheduled basis, a dangerous pollutant that is wreaking havoc, not only in that country but in Canada as well." Earlier, the Minister had told a major international wilderness conference in Denver, Colorado, "The chilling fact is that if countries with such close historical ties [as the US and Canada] cannot make progress on an issue like acid rain with its terrible consequences for both countries, what hope is there for progress on environmental issues among nations less bound by links of friendship? . . . [The acid rain issue] is a litmus test of whether Canadian-US relations are merely an accident of geography or an exercise in genuine cooperation in areas of common concern" (*Globe and Mail*, September 18). On the same day, the Minister released the text of a letter he had sent to Lee Thomas of the EPA, and said that the report "is not science, it's voodoo science." Mr. McMillan announced a doubling of his department's budget for acid rain communications programs, and a personal speaking campaign to the US (*Ottawa Citizen*, September 18).

In the Commons on September 18 Liberal environment critic Charles Caccia (Davenport) accused the government of "a series of public relations stunts and nothing more than that" in its acid rain policies, and called