

to demonstrate promising new technologies at non-ferrous smelters have already begun. The Government is spending more than \$50 million researching new, cleaner methods of burning coal in Atlantic Canada. The lessons learned from the projects will help industry across Canada meet emission reduction targets.

Sir, last year, before the Quebec Summit, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) told Canadians that we would have to put our own House in order before we could expect the Americans to move themselves on the acid rain question. That is precisely what happened. In the process the moral authority that we Canadians bring to the table when we negotiate the issue with our American friends has been greatly strengthened. Less than a week ago the Prime Minister secured President Reagan's powerful and unequivocal endorsement of the findings and conclusions of the special envoys' report. If Members opposite devoted a little less time trying to tell themselves that the report will have little effect, perhaps they would have a little more time to grasp its importance.

• (1240)

Let me summarize, since I have about two minutes left, what that agreement means. It means that the President of the United States has acknowledged that acid rain is a trans-boundary problem with serious implications for both countries. He has acknowledged the underlying scientific arguments. He has committed the United States to developing a bilateral accord—read it, it's on page 4 of the Envoy's report. He has committed the United States to establishing the bilateral machinery necessary to achieve such an accord. He committed the United States to implementing a technology demonstration program in the United States which is expected to result in near-term reductions in U.S. emissions affecting Canada. He committed himself and the American people to placing acid rain on the agenda of future summits.

In other words, he has committed himself to a process which will ensure that the acid rain question will not be removed from the bilateral agenda until the question itself is resolved.

I stress that these are solid accomplishments. They are not the whole solution, but a major part of the solution. These are solid specific gains in the fight against acid rain. I would urge the Hon. Member and his colleagues to read what the Prime Minister of Canada said to the U.S. people through the media immediately after the conclusion of his meeting with Mr. Reagan. He told them that "the acid rain issue has been kicked around, debated to death in Canada and elsewhere. We think that we have a reasonable plan in place to solve it, not perfect, but well on the way to an effective resolution. And that is what we're going to do."

Sir, I conclude on this note: Yesterday *The New York Times* described the Prime Minister's success on acid rain with the United States President in Washington as "the turning point on acid rain".

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Supply

**Mr. McMillan:** It is a turning point not because the problem has been resolved, but because both countries now finally have placed themselves firmly on a course to resolving the issue. In that sense it is not the end of the road; it is the beginning of the road, but it is an important beginning. I urge all Members of the House on all sides, in the words of the President of the United States himself in a different context, "to stay the course".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Althouse:** Having listened quite carefully to the Minister's excellent speech I wonder with reference to the motion that is before the House today, which essentially calls for recognition that it is something that we would all agree to, that in the opinion of the House Canada should negotiate a treaty with the Government of the United States to cut acid rain-causing emissions from sources within the United States. It goes on to spell out the amounts of these reductions that we should aim for. Is the Minister prepared to support this particular motion and this particular outline of intention which is put before the House today?

**Mr. McMillan:** I think it would be premature for any Member of this House to make a decision on the relevant motion before he or she has heard all the points of view expressed on all sides of the House on the substantive question. For me to stand on my feet and say that I am going to take a hard and fast position on a motion in connection with which the debate has only begun would be the height of arrogance.

**Mr. Althouse:** Perhaps I could rephrase the question then. Does he, as a Member of this House, believe that we should be negotiating a treaty with the United States to reduce acid rain emissions as this motion says?

**Mr. McMillan:** Yes, we are in fact negotiating with the Americans towards the achievement of an accord. I draw to his attention the relevant sentence on page 4 of the Drew Lewis, William Davis envoys' report, which both the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States have endorsed. It that says what remains is to borrow from the precedent of bilateral progress over the years on various environmental questions and "build upon those foundations a bilateral accord which will jointly address a common problem in the best tradition of the U.S.-Canadian environmental relations."

In accepting the envoys' report we implicitly accept the principle upon which the Hon. Member has based his questions.

**Mr. Caccia:** May I ask the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) whether he has ever seen a copy of the May, 1984 report that deals with the modernization of non-ferrous smelters, which is available to him and which will provide him with an important component on Canada's plan of action in reducing our own emissions, considering his statement earlier that there was no planning before September, 1984? Would