Supply

motion, because our hands would be tied and we would not have any elbow room to negotiate with the Americans.

[English]

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague who just completed his speech if he would elaborate for a moment on the position taken and views expressed by the Ontario Association of Anglers and Hunters. It might be very important for us to learn about them and he was not able to elaborate on them in his speech.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, on the day the Prime Minister returned I asked him about the agreement and reminded the House that the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, an association which monitors this situation very carefully and has for a long time, concluded that the agreement brought back from Washington is a good public relations campaign. It described it as being another stall tactic and the federation said that we are no further ahead.

The great pity about so much of the debate today is that we are concentrating on the record of four or five years ago and are saying that nothing happened then. The point is that this motion indicates that time is moving on and the problem is getting more and more serious. We did have an opportunity to bring our case to Washington and to get something more than what we got, but we came back with something that was described by the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters as being very little more than public relations or windown dressing.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in what the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner) said because I know that he is sincere in his concern for this issue and has been for a number of years, as have members of all Parties. I know that he will not be surprised when I indicate to him that I would be astonished if there were anyone in the House of Commons who did not want to have an agreement with the Americans to eliminate the emissions of acid rain, at least to the point where we would be effectively diminishing the damage that is being done to our waterways and possibly our forests.

I tend to agree with the Hon. Member that we should all be able to express the same objectives. What I do find astonishing, listening to not only the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) but the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior, is that one would think that we were debating today in the American House of Representatives or Senate. I think Hon. Members had better realize that what we have to debate today is what we can do to influence an administration that up until now has been extremely intransigent on this issue. I would leave that comment for now because I will enlarge upon it later.

I would like to indicate to the Hon. Member and to the Hon. Member for Davenport, who is honourably known to me, that I would hope that for the rest of this debate Hon. Members would try to zero in a little bit on what it is we can do in this Chamber, and would not concern themselves too extensively with what was done or what was not done in the past.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my good friend that the point he made is a relevant one. At the beginning of my speech I did make reference to that point. What I want the House to do is to join together in sending a collective message to the United States Congress and the United States administration telling of our strong united feeling regarding the need for a timetable for the reduction of emissions. Of course we cannot debate on behalf of the Americans a problem that we have recognized as being serious, but we can send a message to them.

When I read the motion of the Hon. Member for Davenport and decided to enter the debate, I thought that the motion was relatively fair. It did not condemn the Government but it did say that this is how we in Canada feel and we believe that these steps ought to be taken. I believe that a motion, either this one or one similar to it, really ought to be passed unanimously by the House of Commons, and that our friends in Washington ought to know that it is the feeling of all Members of Parliament. That is what we did when we wrote the report on acid rain, and my hon. friend was a very important and valuable member of that subcommittee.

a (1520)

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member indicated that fishermen, forestry workers and so on were greatly concerned about this matter. How is the timeline affecting these industries or particular areas? Is there a basic understanding of the maximum effect or how greatly these industries will be affected in the future? Is there some kind of timeline to which the Hon. Member could refer?

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, the only one I have readily available is a careful analysis which was done for the tourist industry. It indicated that within the next 14 years, by the end of this century, we can expect that some 600 tourist lodges and hunting and fishing camps will have to close down, directly because of the effects of acid rain. If we take that as a clue, it seems to me that we have a good guideline. What we really have is just a decade and a half to solve the problem. However, a decade and a half is much too long because by then much of the damage will be irreversible and we will have paid an extraordinary price for our negligence.

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, the other day maple syrup producers visited Ottawa and suggested that there was already a 20 per cent reduction in the amount of syrup produced. Does the Hon. Member have any idea of how much the production of timber is being reduced and how long it will take before the next 20 per cent disappears, for instance?

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members need to realize that we are dealing with an accelerating problem. In other words, over a period of 10 years there has been a 20 per cent reduction in the production of maple syrup. We can be sure that in the next decade it will not be just another 20 per cent, it will accelerate. Probably in another decade, or certainly in a decade and a half, there will be no production at all. What is applicable to maple syrup certainly applies to other aspects of