

revenue to Canada, does the Minister honestly think that is a good return to taxpayers and the resource industry?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined to conclude that people whose jobs depend on the plants referred to by the Hon. Member do not consider that expenditure a tragic waste of tax dollars. It keeps their jobs.

Mr. Darling: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is aware of my grave concern for the environment. Yesterday I asked a question with regard to acid rain. A serious contributor to acid rain is nitrous oxide emissions from automobiles. We know that is very detrimental to our forests. The Minister is also aware that Canada is three times as lenient as the United States in this regard. The Minister hopes to sell a much stronger acid rain program in the United States.

I know the Minister will have to talk to his counterpart in Transport, but is he prepared to recommend to Cabinet that Canadian emissions must be brought in line in order that we will have a strong card when talking to our American colleagues. Has the Minister given consideration to that? Could this not be put in force for the 1985 models? A great many Canadian-built cars meet the American standard emissions because they are exported to the United States and sold there. This involves a cost of about \$200 per vehicle, but that could be included in the selling price. It could be available for the 1985 cars rather than four or five years down the road.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Chair will allow the Minister to reply to the question, but I remind Hon. Members that questions and comments must be germane to the previous speaker's remarks and not introduce a totally new topic. However, I give the Hon. Member the benefit of the doubt. It may be that the Chair did not listen as attentively as it should have to the Minister's remarks, but in my opinion this is a different subject.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I would hate to be perceived as contradicting you. The Hon. Member has a point when he links the issue of nitrogen dioxide, NOx, with damage to forest growth. In that respect he could be understood. I thank him for his eloquent plea. I made good note of what he said. My answer is yes, I am proceeding in this direction. It is a long road. Limitations cannot be imposed in a very short time. The time frame will have to be more than two years. I hope the efforts I am making on this subject will come to fruition soon. I will make an announcement at the appropriate time.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, before I make my contribution to the debate, I want to ask the Minister a question. On several occasions over the last week in Question Period and yesterday in debate he was asked about the forest agreements with the Provinces and about the auction that is to take place this Thursday. Can the Minister confirm or deny that his two colleagues, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) from Manitoba and the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston), will attempt in this auction to lop off the Manitoba agreement the sum of \$50 million because the benefits of that money cannot be forecast? They are unpredict-

Supply

able. They are nebulous. Trees only mature in 60 years. If you make a direct grant to a pulp mill or saw mill, it creates jobs right away.

Can the Minister confirm or deny that is the type of competition he is facing in this auction and how is he responding to it? Is the Manitoba agreement going to be deprived of \$50 million? When will that agreement be signed? What does the Minister have to say about it, particularly since he made such a strong commitment yesterday and on previous days that he will make his best efforts to ensure that these funds will not be depleted?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, as much as I would like to be forthcoming to my colleagues in this House, and I consider myself very deeply rooted on the floor of this House as a House of Commons man, I have to draw to the attention of the Hon. Member that I am bound by an oath of office whereby I cannot divulge matters that are before Cabinet. While I fully understand his desire to know, I hope he will understand my inability to give him a straightforward answer.

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, in speaking about and bringing before the House the meetings with CCREM, the Minister brought back memories. I would like to pose a question to the Minister. As far as I remember, the Ministers of Agriculture were not often represented at CCREM meetings. The forestry industry involves production, conservation, marketing and employment. It is a renewable industry similar to agriculture. Some of us wonder why it is not related to a much greater degree to the agriculture sector of the economy of Canada.

I remember a suggestion that forestry should be combined as a ministry with agriculture so that one might consider a ministry of agriculture and forestry. This was given consideration at the provincial level. I want to ask the Minister, in his responsibility for forestry, about his contacts and liaison with the Department of Agriculture. Are they constant and extensive in the area of joint research, marketing and the many other areas where the two industries have a common heritage and common objectives, because they are both renewable industries? They both deal with renewable resources as opposed to the non-renewable resources that we deal with in the nation.

● (1240)

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member is making an excellent point. Perhaps I should say that my contacts with agricultural representatives are not as frequent as perhaps they should be in light of the point raised by the Hon. Member, and I will keep that point in mind. I certainly have frequent exchanges and conversations with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) but the basic conversion of interest is a question which the Hon. Member has outlined very well and which I will keep in mind in my future work.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I shall follow up the question I posed to the Minister. My sources tell me that \$50 million will be lopped off the agreement that he is about to sign with Manitoba. That \$50 million