

The Jason Report also included two findings that are of special significance to you here in Georgia. It stated that the southeastern states contribute a significant and growing share of the acid rain coming into the northeast. It also found that the largest percentage increase in acidity in the past 30 years has been here in the southeast, where in the period between 1960 and 1978 alone, the emissions of both SO₂ and NO_x had approximately doubled.

I agree that we don't yet have all the facts about acid rain. We may never. If we wanted, we could study the problem from now till doomsday. Are we still justified in beginning to take control action?

Definitely. If we shilly-shally and procrastinate because of a so-called lack of knowledge, we would be like a surgeon telling a patient with a fatal cancer that he couldn't operate, because ten more years of research were needed to find out the cause of the disease.

**Greater burden
for Canadians**

I don't think it is fair to argue, as has been done, that Canadians are unwilling to do their share to clean up the acid rain situation. We are willing to pay our own way, and more. The cost to the United States of a 50 per cent reduction in emissions from thermal plants east of the Mississippi would be \$2.5 to \$3 billion by 1990, leading to an average increase in utility rates of about two per cent. This percentage increase may be reduced by advances in technology. In Canada, given our population differential — we have about one-tenth the population you do — the burden on individual Canadians would be three to four times as great as on Americans, and we would gladly shoulder it.

In Canada we are deeply disappointed with the state of negotiations between my country and the United States government on acid rain. The foot-dragging and interference in the development of scientific information has reached frustrating proportions. The Administration's rejection of our proposal to reduce sulphur dioxide emissions in eastern North America by 50 per cent by 1990, and a clear indication that it may be some considerable period of time before it will be able even to begin to discuss control actions, is a bitter pill for us to swallow.

The latest obstacles, which occurred less than two weeks ago at a negotiating session in Ottawa, are forcing us to an agonizing reappraisal of the usefulness of continuing discussions.

**Different
conclusions**

Our emission-reduction proposal was drawn from the same science that U.S. negotiators used to draw diametrically opposed conclusions. On a *per capita* basis our proposal is more costly to Canadians than to Americans. We are willing to put our money where our mouth is. I can only conclude that the values and factors influencing Canadian decision making are considerably different from those in the U.S.
