to acceptable, benign, environmental levels, thus providing for better relations with our neighbours to the south. I am confident that neither the provincial nor federal legislatures wish to have incidents such as the Trail smelter case of 1930 recur. I quote briefly from the most recent issue of the *Environmental Law Reporter:*

● (1540)

The first formal recognition of the atmosphere as a resource requiring international protection was the 1962 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests, which prohibited nuclear testing "if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits" of the state conducting the explosion. Since then a broad range of programs involving research, monitoring, and the tentative development of international air pollution guidelines have been undertaken to promote international protection of the atmosphere. In particular, the European Economic Community, the United Nations, and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development have been active in this regard.

I go on and quote again:

Several international organizations have attempted to formulate general principles concerning the responsibility of states for the extraterritorial damages caused by pollution. Probably the most influential of international statements on this subject is the 1972 Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, which provides that:

Principle 21

States have, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, the sovereign right to exploit their own resources pursuant to their own environmental policies, and the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other states or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

Principle 22

States shall co-operate to develop further the international law regarding liability and compensation for the victims of pollution and other environmental damage caused by activities within the jurisdiction or control of such States to areas beyond their jurisdiction.

I believe the amendment to the Canadian Clean Air Act today goes some distance in moving toward those two principles. Let me quote again:

Also pertinent is an earlier application of this doctrine in the course of resolving a United States-Canada air pollution dispute during the 1920s and 1930s. Fumes from a smelter at Trail, British Columbia were causing damage in adjacent areas of the State of Washington. As part of an extended United States-Canada dialogue on the dispute, a tribunal was created to rule on several of the key issues. In a widely quoted dictum the tribunal stated that:

"No state has a right to use or permit the use of its territory in such a manner as to cause injury by fumes in or to the territory of another or the persons or property therein, when the case is of serious consequence and the injury is established by clear and convincing evidence."

Significantly, the tribunal required both payment of damages and the establishment of a regime to abate and monitor pollution from the smelter.

Certainly I hope that is the direction we are going to move following the speedy passage of this bill.

Let me now deal briefly with just how serious the acid transport and precipitation problem is to both Canada and our neighbour, the United States.

Many areas of Canada and the United States now experience precipitation, as pointed out by my colleague, the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. McMillan), from 25 to, at times, 400 times more acidic than natural rainfall.

The minister is on record as estimating required abatement costs of at least $400 million per year over the next few years. Experts appearing earlier this year before a committee of this House estimated costs in Europe to range between 2 per cent and 3 per cent of their gross national product just in terms of damage to crops, natural resources, buildings, cars and so on.

The difficulties of low-level acid pollution are exacerbated by many factors; for example, various acid compounds can be deposited over the years and accumulate, causing serious environmental and often irresolvable damage, as we see in respect of many of our lakes in Canada.

A case in point is acid precipitation in Canada during the winter months. The acid is released cumulatively from the snow into creeks where sudden high acidic levels damage fish eggs, smolts and aquatic organisms, and now we find as well, bird and mammalian life.

In Canada sulphur dioxide is largely produced by the smelting of sulphite ores, whereas in the United States it is produced by the burning of fossil fuels in electrical generating plants. In both countries nitrogen oxides are produced by the combustion of fossil fuels, primarily in the transportation sector. In Canada sulphur dioxide is produced at a rate of about five million tons per year, whereas in the United States it is about 25 million tons per year. In Canada nitrous oxide is now being produced at the rate of about two million tons per year, whereas in the United States it is now about 22 million tons per year.

The Canada-U.S. research consultation group, which recently released its report, estimates that both SO_2 and NO_2 emissions will increase dramatically in the future if we do not soon do something about it. With thousands of lakes now dead in Canada, and that is throughout Canada—for example, even in my riding of Skeena there is a serious acid rain problem in the Terrace area from smelters in that area, so it is a broad geographic problem in Canada and is very graphically becoming a global one—and with tens of thousands of lakes dying, and we are now just starting to get an accurate record in respect of trees, crops, buildings and health—this is again a relatively unknown hazard to us at this point—it is surely time to move on this legislation and also on strong financial budgetary moves to keep our environment healthy and industrial development benign.

In my view, I do not think it is good enough for us to know how much it costs to make the effects of acid rain and nitrous oxide benign in our environment. I think it is incumbent upon legislatures and on the Parliament of this country to deal effectively with it, either by introducing legislation such as "user-pay" so that the producer has to absorb the majority of those costs or, if necessary, to do a complete economic evaluation and move forward in the budget to provide the funds necessary to scrub those very dangerous and harmful oxides from the stacks prior to their being emitted into the atmosphere.