

I cite these examples not to patriotically parade our accomplishments, but to illustrate what can be accomplished through the joint efforts of scientists, industry and government where there is a determination to make an impact on a situation which can only get worse if left unchecked.

To that third group -- those who propound the view that economic and energy considerations make significant controls unfeasible -- I would submit that significant emission reductions, if wisely applied, need not detract from economic and energy goals. Nor should the legitimate costs of production be passed off to another party -- in this case another country. This is spurious in economic terms and irresponsible in the spirit of international legal considerations.

With respect to coal conversion, there is considerable economic benefit to be derived from a switch to coal from imported oil. In effect, this benefit is sufficiently attractive that we can more than afford the cost of ensuring that resulting damage to the environment be minimized to the extent possible.

It will be obvious in this that we are dealing with a phenomenon that will not evaporate or otherwise disappear. The realities of energy supply and demand make it inevitable that even at present emission levels the situation will deteriorate even further than it has. With the growth in both our countries of coal-burning, energy generation, further inaction will prove to be disastrous. Yet even the fact that we possess the technology which can permit us to live with a higher level of coal consumption at much lower emission levels will not save us unless we are convinced of the need to apply the rule of law in order to eliminate the problem arising from the inequity in the present distribution of the costs of acid rain, as well as to combat the damage acid rain inflicts on both our countries.

It can be argued, of course, that legislators will respond only to the expressed concerns of their constituents, and that while there is a very high level of concern and sensitivity in Canada about acid rain, there is a relatively low level of concern in the United States. But this point of view overlooks some present-day realities and ignores the nature of our historical relationship.

For one thing, media reports and conferences such as this clearly demonstrate accelerating interest in the United States. I understand this reflects a growing awareness of the potential for extensive environmental damage in such areas of the United States as New England, the North Central region, parts of the Rocky Mountain region and the Appalachian area. And so,