

Over ten years ago both Canada and the United States strengthened their laws to clean the air in our cities. We have both made tremendous progress. The air in our cities is purer. However, some of our industries stopped local air pollution by building taller stacks as well as controlling their emissions. These taller stacks are spreading current emissions far and wide. Thus part of the answer to one problem has become part or cause of another problem – acid rain. It is time for both countries to look at laws and regulations. It is time to revise our legislation in a manner conducive not only to maintaining and improving local air quality but to reducing long range transport of air pollutants. Continuing only to focus our attention on local air quality will do little or nothing for acid rain.

Solutions differ

The things we will each have to do to solve the acid rain problem will be quite different. The relative importance of emissions from various source sectors in our two countries dictates this. In eastern Canada almost 50 per cent of our SO₂ emissions come from non-ferrous smelters and less than 20 per cent from utilities. In the eastern U.S. about two thirds of your SO₂ emissions come from utilities.

Canada is already doing a lot to curtail acid rain. Of course, we must do a lot more, and we are prepared to do so. In February of this year my provincial colleagues and I committed ourselves to reduce sulphate deposition to 20 kilograms a hectare a year by 1990. We agreed that this could be accomplished by a 50 per cent reduction in SO₂ emissions in Canada east of the Saskatchewan-Manitoba border and in the United States east of the Mississippi. The Canadian delegation to the February 24 Canada/U.S. negotiating session offered to undertake this 50 per cent reduction by 1990 contingent on parallel action in the United States. The contingency factor was introduced to encourage the U.S. to initiate control programs.

I know that Mark Twain said that "nothing so needs reforming as other people's habits", and I don't wish to be sanctimonious.

I will be the first to admit that Canada does not have clean hands when it comes to acid rain. Yet in Canada as a whole, 50 per cent of our acid rain originates in the United States, and in the regions of particular concern, such as the tourist and recreation areas of Ontario, as much as 75 per cent of the acid rain comes from the United States. We receive far more acid rain than we export. We are far more vulnerable to it because of the circumstances of both our economy and our geography.

Extensive damage caused

On the Canadian Shield, the area most sensitive to acid rain, tourism is a \$700 million a year business. Tourists don't like to fish in dead lakes. In Eastern Canada, damage to buildings and other structures caused by corrosion from acid rain is conservatively estimated at \$500 million annually. Our fresh water fisheries resource potentially at risk from acid rain has an approximate value of, say, \$1 billion. And our eastern forest products industry – which is genuinely and seriously threatened by acid rain, make no mistake – is a \$12 billion industry. Remember to increase the