

perception of a clean, healthy, enjoyable outdoor world. Shipments of forest products from eastern Canada amounted to \$14.6 billion in 1981. Together these revenues accounted for about 8 per cent of the gross national product for the entire country. One in ten working Canadians owes his or her job directly or indirectly to the forest products sector. This makes it proportionately far more important than, for example, the automobile industry in either country. No one has yet begun to calculate the inevitable decline in land values and loss of stable population, especially in important tourist areas, that would accompany destruction of local fishing, but it would surely happen. It is this, the enormous long-term economic risk and related social dislocation that makes acid rain an issue of critical importance for Canadians as it does for Minnesotans.

And what would it cost to bring emissions down by 50 per cent in Canada? Naturally it depends to a degree on the kind of scenario that is worked out. But our best estimates for a 50 per cent reduction in sulphur dioxide emissions in eastern Canada suggest an initial capital investment of just over \$3 billion. This gives rise to operating and amortization costs of about \$1 billion per year, or about \$41 *per capita*. By comparison, the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment has calculated that a 50 per cent reduction in the eastern United States would cost between \$2.5 and \$4.75 billion per year or \$9 to \$20 *per capita*. Bearing in mind that such costs would be brought on gradually over a period of years. I fail to see how we could do other than conclude that the costs are not only necessary but eminently affordable. The alternative is to play economic Russian Roulette with the lakes, streams and forests that are sensitive to acidification.

I know that Minnesota has been at the forefront of calling for action to deal with acid rain as well as in carrying out research. I salute you for your important pioneering role. I know that some of the early research in acid rain was done in your state by EPA's Duluth laboratory and that much important data collection and interpretation is now being conducted by the state's pollution control agency. Their just released report makes sobering reading. I know that you have proposed state legislation designed to do the only thing that really counts: to reduce emissions of the pollutants that lead to acid rain. I know that Minnesota and Ontario are enlarging their co-operative activity in this field. Such co-ordination of research activities and information exchange is very important in this rapidly evolving field and is to be encouraged.

In Canada we have also taken some first steps. I know this is of interest to you because perhaps one fifth of Minnesota's acid rain comes from my country. We have amended our Clean Air Act to give the federal government unquestioned authority to control transboundary pollution. The Inco smelter is under order to bring emissions down to 1950 tons per day, and Ontario Hydro is proceeding with a 43 per cent  $so_2/no_x$  reduction to be completed by 1990. We are now working toward a unilateral 25 per cent sulphur dioxide emission reduction plan for eastern Canada. We remain committed to doubling that percentage when the United States indicates its willingness to move with us. We hope that day will come soon.

The debate over acid rain should not be viewed as an isolated or anomalous event. It is a part of the continuing evolution of our societies as we throw off old comfortable habits and grope toward putting ourselves on a sustainable footing. It is a strand in the fabric of environmental responsibility that the people of both our countries accept and support.