

Four-fifths of all Canadians live in areas of high acid rain. And there is the possibility that 90,000 jobs could be lost in the very near future as a direct result of acid rain. In the region of the country which I represent, where the tourist industry is so important, we could see 600 lodges and fishing camps close down between now and the end of this century in a period of only 14 years.

We have talked about forests and we have talked about our streams. We have talked about human health. We also know that damage to our buildings is costing us almost hundreds of millions of dollars every year. Over the weekend I read with great interest an article written by Martin Weaver entitled "The Rain that Eats our Cities". The article was published in the *Canadian Heritage* magazine in the February-March, 1985, issue. Along with the article there appeared an illustration of a knife passing through the once tough granite walls of the *Palais de justice* in Quebec City. The caption underneath read: "Acid rain, by triggering chemical reactions is reducing this stone to the consistency of cheese".

The Hon. Member for Davenport has quite correctly described the agreement which the Prime Minister brought back from Washington as a hollow victory. We did not get very much. We got a little more research, but we did not get what we wanted. We want what the parliamentary report in the last Parliament wanted. We want a timetable for implementing reductions of sulphuric and nitrogen emissions.

The *Globe* of Boston made the comment that President Reagan, the consummate manager when he wants to be, knows that the way to stifle an unwanted program is to call for a fresh study. There is nothing wrong with research, but that is not the approach we need at this time. Research will have to go on, of course, but something much more is needed. The same editorial pointed out that in the face of mounting evidence that waterways, lakes, forests, fields, buildings and people are increasingly the victims of human abuse of the environment, we need targets and we need goals for the reduction of sulphuric dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions. There is in fact a Bill before the U.S. Senate that would do just that. It is a Bill put forward by a leading senator from one of the New England states which proposes that sulphur emissions be reduced by 12 million tons per year and that nitrogen emissions be reduced by 3 million tons per year. That senator wants this to be achieved by federally mandated standards paid for by electric utility fees. That is encouraging. However, one commentator from Canada, knowledgeable about Canada-U.S. relations and about how the U.S. Congress functions, made the comment that by throwing its weight behind the tepid Reagan research plan, Canada may actually be helping to kill any possibility that Congress will bring in a Bill reducing emissions. The columnist went on to say that the Prime Minister has allowed the President to lead him down a blind alley.

● (1510)

The Boston *Globe* expressed puzzlement that Canada's Prime Minister could be jubilant at the President's endorse-

### Supply

ment of the Lewis-Davis report on acid rain. The editorial called it no more than a minimal effort and said that it was no call for jubilation at all. It said that what the President fails to appreciate is that loss of life in lakes, ponds and streams and damage to valuable forests must be reduced quickly. In other words, we do not have time for more research and for nothing but research. That is the bottom line of the motion that was put before us by the Hon. Member for Davenport. Any effort at all to cut down on emissions of sulphur and nitrogen oxides is worth while, but what we got from the President was a bit of motion.

The *Globe* article went on to say that the Canadian Prime Minister will have to prod the President often to get him to take the next small step of implementation. I ask you, Sir, can you or any of us in the House imagine the Prime Minister prodding the U.S. President? I doubt that very much. I think he stands too much in awe of the President to do that at all.

One very prominent U.S. Senator from a border state expressed surprise, when the agreement was announced, that the President had given so little and had offered to Canada such a minimal amount. He went on to say that he was surprised that the Canadian Prime Minister let him get away with it.

The provincial coordinator of the Fish and Wildlife Services for the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner) but the 20-minute period has now expired.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Questions and comments. The Hon. Member for Laval (Mr. Ricard).

**Mr. Ricard:** This morning, Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) concerning the meeting of the Prime Minister with President Reagan on acid rain.

Mr. Speaker, I also heard the Hon. Member for Davenport say that in 1980, under Mr. Carter, an agreement had been signed, but that subsequently it had been quite impossible to discuss the matter with the Reagan administration.

I have just been listening to my colleague who made a similar statement.

Mr. Speaker, one can readily understand why there were no negotiations with Mr. Reagan: Mr. Reagan and Mr. Trudeau simply did not get along. When Mr. Mulroney came on the scene recently, Mr. Reagan himself said: "At long last the Trudeau era is over, we shall be able to discuss with the Canadians."

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Opposition cannot teach us anything new with respect to negotiations on acid rain. I also believe we must be very careful not to adopt such a