

what are the causes of the acid rain phenomenon, and how best to deal with those causes. The President has increased acid rain research funding by over seventy percent from fiscal year 1981 to fiscal year 1983—a total of over sixty-four million dollars from fiscal year 1980 through fiscal year 1983—a very strong commitment to finding the answer to this problem. We are also actively working with Canada under the auspices of the US-Canada Memorandum of Intent on Transboundary Air Pollution. The joint US-Canadian work groups formed under the memorandum are completing compilation of technical and scientific data on transboundary air pollution. We know that there's something happening out there. We have very little information as to why it's happening and how it's happening. There are those who would advocate that we go to immediate control on acid rain. I think that's rather like jumping off a three-meter diving board without checking to see if there's any water in the pool. Any additional regulatory control program would require large expenditures of funds that must be borne by the American people. . . .” (US Embassy [Ottawa] text, August 13).

In previous months, Canada had been critical of the Reagan Administration's approach to environmental problems shared between the US and Canada. In a speech to environmentalists at the Vermont Natural Resources Council on September 12, Environment Minister John Roberts again criticized the US Administration for “foot-dragging” in seeking a solution to acid rain problems, saying it was “seriously clouding Canadian-American relations.” He called Anne Gorsuch's call for more acid rain research “incredible.” “Over three thousand scientific studies have already been done and we have already lost many lakes to acid rain and tens of thousands more are in danger.” Because of the US attitude, he said, he has come to question the usefulness of continuing negotiations between the two countries. He said, “Canadians and the people of Vermont are not interested in lip-service and fine statements. We want action before it's too late” (*The Citizen*, September 13).

### **Electricity Exports**

The Canadian Cabinet approved in late August the export of electrical power generated by the Point Lepreau nuclear reactor in New Brunswick to the United States. The August 31 decision allowed for the first time the export of power from a nuclear reactor alone. Cabinet approval followed a National Energy Board approval in April for the New Brunswick Electric Power Commission to sell power from the Candu reactor to three US utilities.

“Selling electrical power to the US will earn foreign exchange and contribute positively to Canada's balance of payments,” Energy Minister Marc Lalonde said (*The Citizen*, September 1). At the same time, the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility and MP Mark Rose (NDP, Mission-Port Moody) condemned the export of nuclear power, claiming that Canadians were taking all of the environmental and financial risks (*The Citizen*, September 1). The Point Lepreau plant had been troubled by controversy since construction began in 1975.

### **Joint BC and Alberta Natural Gas Exports**

The Energy Ministers from British Columbia and Alberta announced September 24 that their provinces had decided to create a joint body to sell natural gas in the US. The committee will act as a sales agent for both provinces and steer gas sales through the US regulatory process. This combined approach was designed to increase natural gas sales to the US and was prompted by the increasing volume of natural gas available in Canada for export, the *Globe and Mail* reported September 25. The announcement also followed a report by the US Economic Regulatory Administration which stated that US consumers will need additional Canadian gas supplies over the next decade (*Calgary Herald*, August 24).

### **Offshore Injury Claims Bill**

A US bill approved August 19 by a US congressional committee would, if passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate, prevent Canadians from filing compensation claims in the US for injury or death on US-owned offshore oil rigs operating in Canadian waters. The bill was introduced before the *Ocean Ranger* disaster, in which sixty-seven Canadians were killed, but if passed, would not affect claims arising from the February 1982 sinking of the oil rig. The bill's prime sponsor, New York Democrat Mario Biaggi, had argued that non-Americans often have legal recourse or compensation programs in their own countries or the countries where the rigs are operating. Representative Biaggi asserted that “it is not unfair to require these workers to seek remedies in these other nations before bringing suit in the United States” (*Globe and Mail*, August 20). A Newfoundland MLA had argued against the bill in Washington last February. Also opposed were US seamen's unions, which had said that the bill would encourage the hiring of non-Americans for drilling operations outside US waters (*Globe and Mail*, August 20).

### **Georges Bank Claims**

Canada filed its first written arguments with the International Court of Justice September 27 in the case involving the maritime boundary in the Gulf of Maine area. A dispute between Canada and the United States arose in 1977 when both countries proclaimed two-hundred nautical-mile fishery zones in the area. The US also officially stated its case in a “Memorial” to the International Court September 27, asserting a claim to all of the Georges Bank. In Canada's “Memorial,” it claimed almost half of Georges Bank.

A Government of Canada news release (September 27) stated that, “The basic Canadian argument is that the equi-distance line claimed by Canada represents an equitable solution that takes account of all relevant factors. By agreement between the two countries, however, their respective Memorials and other written pleadings are not to be made public until the opening of the oral proceedings in this case. These proceedings will be held in The Hague, possibly in late 1983 or early 1984. At least one further exchange of written pleadings will take place before that time.”

### **US Purchase of Aircraft**

It was announced September 1 that the Canadian Commercial Corporation, which contracts with foreign gov-