

[Translation]

**Mr. Lewis:** I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 82—TREATY TO CUT ACID RAIN-CAUSING EMISSIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** Before putting the motion standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), since this is the final allotted day the House will go through the usual procedure to consider and dispose of the Supply Bills. In view of recent practices do Hon. Members agree that the Supply Bills be distributed now?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government of Canada should, before the next Canada-U.S. summit, negotiate a treaty with the Government of the United States to cut acid rain-causing emissions from sources within the United States, which cause damage to our economy because such emissions are transported across the Canada-United States border.

That this treaty should be in the spirit of international co-operation exhibited by the Helsinki Protocol of July, 1985, already subscribed to by the Government of Canada and should include:

- the reduction by 1994 of transboundary fluxes of sulphur dioxide by at least 50 per cent by 1994, using 1980 as the base year;
- a specific timetable of emission reductions in order to meet the 1994 deadline;
- a specification that such reductions will be applied to sources of sulphur dioxide emissions which will yield the greatest benefits to Canada; and

That failure to enter into urgent negotiations for such a treaty would demonstrate a blindness to the long-term economic interests of both countries, considering the damage caused by acid rain to human health and to forests, lakes, streams, fisheries, agriculture, wildlife, the maple sugar industry and to buildings, monuments and structures.

He said: Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Angus:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I may have missed it but did you call Petitions?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes.

**Mr. Angus:** I am sorry, I did not hear you.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** I did not hear it either.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am in the hands of the House. Is that a request?

**An Hon. Member:** We all heard you.

### Supply

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia).

**Mr. Caccia:** Mr. Speaker, this motion, as you just read it, is a constructive motion. It protects Canada's interests. It puts forward a policy option which, I submit to you and Members in this House, is far better than the one pursued by the present Government. It is based on two principles. The first is that we have to clean up our act, and we have done so. As you will recall, in March, 1984, we agreed with the provinces that we had to go it alone. When that understanding was brought about, the then Minister of the Environment for the Province of Ontario, Andy Brandt, while being interviewed, made it poignantly clear by saying we have cut our umbilical cord with the Americans and we will have to start to demonstrate our political will.

● (1120)

In cleaning up our act we also started to solicit and elicit the support of the international community. That is why in the same month of March, 1984, we invited nine European nations to Ottawa. We then signed an understanding, a commitment, saying that we would cut emissions, independently from each other, by at least 30 per cent by 1993. In doing so we implicitly said that this is an international issue, that there are global interrelationships in dealing with this issue because of the damage that is caused by one nation to another by the transboundary movement of this type of pollution. There are also continental interrelationships, and it was for that reason that we invited to that conference as an observer in March, 1984 a representative from the Environmental Protection Agency.

We decided to go it alone, we cut the umbilical cord and we started cleaning up our act. We did so assuming an economic cost that eventually we hoped and trusted would also be taken up by our neighbours in this very important form of pollution clean-up, which in the long-term turns out to be an investment for future generations and their ability to operate economically, as they have to, within a clean environment.

Canada as a sovereign country has the right to the protection of our national resources, including the right of not being dumped upon. The same right, of course, applies to our neighbours, namely, their right not to be dumped upon by our pollution when it crosses boundaries and falls on their soil.

To put things into perspective, the United States generates some 26 million tonnes of sulphur annually of which at least 5 million enters Canada. We generate four and a half million tonnes a year. It is against this background that I say to you that we should not be gratified by President Reagan making what would seem to be great concessions in recognizing what turns out to be the necessity to carry out further research. God knows, we have research coming out of our ears.

The damage to our resources, be they water, forest, fisheries, agriculture, the farmers whose income depends on the revenue from the sale of maple syrup, is increasing and is becoming staggering. The issue here is the prevention of