

Supply

definite action on acid rain. Therefore I can't, as Prime Minister, go back merely with a commitment to make a report". So he laid down the law. On behalf of the people of Canada he said that rather than having only a report we must do something decisive. We got something decisive: we got a further study.

Over 3,000 studies have been done on the problem of acid rain, but the decisive new leadership that we have in Canada now on the important problem of acid rain tells the Americans that we need 3,001 studies. He went even further. He said: "You appoint an envoy on your side, Ronnie, and we'll appoint one on ours. Of course, we will not give them any mandate to take effective action and we won't give them any budget. We will pay them a dollar a year and they will get a lot of media attention. A year from now they can come back and tell us how much worse the problem has gotten because nothing was done. Then we'll have a look at it again".

I would like to say to the Government of Canada that the people of Canada are fed up with this kind of action. Our buildings are literally decaying. Our beautiful lakes are dying. Our forests are being mutilated and our health is threatened. In the face of this they propose another study with an envoy added who will make a report. What an envoy they have selected for Canada, "Mr. Decisiveness" himself, Bill Davis. I want to say something about—

An Hon. Member: Look at his election results.

Mr. Broadbent: We on this side of the House measure success not simply by election results but in terms of principles that people fight for.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Remember the Constitution, Mr. Principle.

Mr. Broadbent: There are a lot of indifferent and uncaring jerks who have been elected around the world. That is not our definition of success.

Let us consider Mr. Davis' record on acid rain. This is the man who is going to stand up in Washington for Canada's interests on acid rain. First consider Ontario Hydro, Mr. Speaker. It is the third largest producer of acid rain in North America. Four years ago Ontario Hydro had a level of emissions reaching 600,000 tonnes. The Ministry of the Environment ordered it to cut this deplorable level of emissions to 300,000 tonnes by 1990. How did this Ontario Crown corporation responsible to Bill Davis' Government respond? Hydro said that it would instal the scrubbers necessary to make this possible, but then decided not to. Consequently, Hydro's production of emissions actually increased last year by an additional 4,000 tonnes. There is a wonderful record of a Crown corporation under the responsibility of Bill Davis!

• (1115)

Let us consider Inco in the Province of Ontario. Inco happens to be the largest producer of acid rain in North America. In 1970, Inco was producing 5,200 tonnes of sulphur dioxide per day. This was increasing health damage to people

in this province and indeed in the United States. It was destroying our forests and polluting our lakes with those emissions day after day. What did the Ontario Government do under Bill Davis, that man of decisive action and commitment who is now going to speak to the United States Government on behalf of Canadians? The Government set out its standard in 1970 with the objective that the level of emissions should be reduced to 750 tonnes by 1978. In 1980, two years beyond the target set by the Government, it was producing three times the amount of the level of 2,500 tonnes set by the Conservatives. The Government had approved that level as a maximum, which was to be lowered to 1,950 tonnes by 1983.

The present performance of Inco seems to have made some progress if one considers it on an annual basis and compares it to recent years. However, if we consider the fact that there have been cut-backs in production as a result of massive lay-offs, the limited gains, that are nowhere near the standards set by the Government, virtually disappear.

I have said publicly that there are a number of things that Mr. Davis, as Premier, has done that have been good for the Province of Ontario. However, I suggest to the Hon. Member opposite who raised questions that Mr. Davis is the last person in the world to be fighting on our behalf about problems with acid rain, in this province or anywhere else.

I regret that the Prime Minister, who has talked about the importance of Parliament, could not be here on such a decisively important occasion following the summit. He spent a wonderful 48 hours parading in Quebec City. This debate flows directly from that summit and will involve the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) and the Liberals as well as our Party. He ought to have been here for this important occasion.

Rather than set up another study calling for another report on acid rain, with an envoy whose credentials are not the best, to put it euphemistically, the Prime Minister ought to have told President Reagan that since Canada is prepared to put up a certain amount of money for this study, the Americans should contribute the same proportionate amount.

While I praise the Government for its decision to deal with acid rain, I am talking about bilateral relations. As I said the other day, the Prime Minister has decided to be a kid brother to Ronald Reagan instead of a good neighbour. He should have told the President of the United States that since his country has produced half of the acid rain problem that exists in Canada, the very least it should do as a nation is put up proportionately what Canada has put up to address this problem. In other words, he should have said that the United States ought to have put up somewhere between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion to show the people of Canada that they want to be a good neighbour to Canadians. Such a message by the Prime Minister would have been a demonstration of some kind of Canadian leadership—not to demand more of the Americans but to demand proportionately what we are prepared to do ourselves.