

to add, however, that Canadian concerns had generally been very positive and had greatly strengthened the position of Americans fighting for remedial action.

The next stop was at the Water Treatment Plant, one of eight in the U.S. using granular carbon to remove toxic chemicals. The history of the plant had been very rocky: the first units had failed quickly and only after extensive redesign and repair was the plant coming back into operation. The Plant Manager, whose fortunes had also fluctuated, reported that Canada had been "up in arms" about the delays in plant operation because it was the largest toxic producer on the Niagara River. "Canada wants the plant to work better and faster." He went on to say that, though serious problems remained, there had been tremendous progress in water treatment in the past 15 years. He could recall a time when toxic fumes were so concentrated in the old water treatment plants that employees had to be evacuated periodically.

The final stop on the tour was at the Niagara River gorge to examine several places in the rockface from which toxic-laced water seeped down into the Niagara River. Delegates were immediately struck by the sight and smell of slimy water running from the limestone cliffs. Mr. Buecki said that the porous nature of the limestone in the area made the danger of leakage especially acute. This, in turn, explained Canadian concerns about continued pollution of the river and lack of confidence about present remedial measures.

Prior to resuming the Committee III agenda on Saturday morning, delegates briefly exchanged impressions of the toxic waste tour. A Canadian M.P. said that it had been the sight of a thousand homes boarded up that most impressed him and made him realize that "our American neighbours are concerned". The Democratic Congressmen from Minnesota reminded Canadian delegates that they had seen only "the tip of the toxic waste iceberg" in the U.S. He said that there were hundreds of sites across the country being fed by a flood of chemicals that came onto the market each year. It was for this reason that the Superfund had been created in 1980, with funds collected from the 600 main producers of toxic wastes in the U.S. Consideration was now being given to increasing fees so that more of the dangerous sites could be contained. A Canadian M.P. from British Columbia said that he and other delegates had been impressed by some of the U.S. efforts but disturbed by the fact that the least monitoring and clean up was being done at sites right on the Niagara River. An American delegate explained that those sites were privately owned and further legal action would be required to compel clean up. He observed that corrective action was sometimes delayed by lack of agreement on the best means of remedying the problem.

Acid Rain

The discussion of acid rain was begun by a Canadian M.P. who stressed the seriousness of the problem and that Canada was being hard hit by acid rain which originated mainly with sulphur emissions in the United States. He remarked that everytime Canada complained to the U.S. "we are criticized for not doing enough in our own country". He said that, while it may have been fair criticism at one time, Canada was now making progress on a number of fronts; a federal-provincial commitment to reduce sulphur emissions by 50 per cent in the next decade, stricter automobile emission standards by 1988, \$150 million dollar expenditure on reduced smelter emission, \$25 million expenditure on R&D and a plan to make cleaner, more efficient use of coal. He also noted that the Parliamentary Committee on Acid Rain had been re-established. The Member went on to say that these and other steps were necessary because the problem was growing worse. "We are in danger of losing thousands of our lakes and we cannot afford to." He said that he hoped to get this message across to political colleagues in the U.S. because action had to happen in Congress. Finally, he drew to the delegates' attention several aspects of acid rain damage that are generally ignored—damage to the forests, human health and historic buildings. He concluded his statement by remarking: "I know the American people want action. Now its up to you fellows".

A Congressman from Massachusetts responded that acid rain was also a major issue in his state. He said that he generally agreed with what had just been said and expressed the wish that some of his mid-West colleagues had been present to hear the statement. He was pleased that Canada was moving on the issue "because it takes away one of the other guy's arguments". He pointed out that New England was also moving ahead with remedial action though the region was the source of only 12 percent of its acid rain. He agreed that the U.S. public was becoming much more aware of the problem and that those adversely affected were willing to pay for cleanup measures. He doubted, however, that the people in the mid-West were willing to bear a large part of the costs. He warned that the problem might actually grow worse as many U.S. electric generating plants were converted from oil to coal.

The Congressman went on to say it was clear that there would be little progress on acid rain until and unless the U.S. had a stringent national program. In this regard he drew particular attention to the Congressional debate over re-authorization of the *Clean Air Act* which had expired last year. He informed Canadian delegates of proposals to include acid rain provisions in a new *Clean Air Act*, but noted strong opposition from the mid-West. A U.S. Senator joined the discussion at the point. He remarked that his region of the country used low sulphur coal and had installed scrubbers on its power plants. "We feel that we have paid our dues." He went on to say that