

Adjournment Debate

That is why I am very disappointed in the process. I admit I was critical of it to begin with, but I still held out the hope that somehow, in a mysterious way, some good might come out of what was basically, in my view, a bad idea. But that has not been the case as far as I am concerned.

I read in *The Toronto Star* the other day that the Government is considering delaying the introduction of the new emissions standards for Canadian automobiles. These emissions standards would bring us up to the same standards which apply in the United States of America. In this case, it is not a further undermining of the Canadian position, it is an undermining of Canada's ability to ask the United States to act with respect to its acid rain.

I hope the Parliamentary Secretary, who will be responding for the Minister, will take this opportunity to say that the report with respect to the Government contemplating a delay in the implementation of the new emission standards is a false report and that things will be proceeding on time.

I think it is important for us to realize that the envoys' report does not represent the kind of progress which some people opposite say it does. The Hon. Member for St. Catharines (Mr. Reid) earlier today, I believe, said that this is the first time an American administration had ever admitted that acid rain is a transboundary pollution problem. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. There was a memorandum of intent in 1980 which recognized that fact. What we are talking about is progress within the context of the Reagan administration. Canada's ambassador to Washington, Mr. Gottlieb, said that we finally moved the Americans off the dime. We finally moved the Reagan administration off the dime if Mr. Reagan accepts the report, and even if he accepts the report he still will be comfortable in his position that no action need be taken because the report he will be accepting recommends no action.

So I say that the envoy process has been a failure, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to see the Government trying to exaggerate it. I think it would be better off to say: "It didn't work so let's try something else". It should not try to kid the Canadian people, the environmental community and all of us who are concerned about acid rain by trying to make much of what has turned out to be very, very little.

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to clarify the Canadian position for the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie). I believe there could be no better testimony of the Canadian position than the action the Government has taken, as identified in March of last year. Subsequently, arrangements have been made with the provinces. Not all of them are finally complete but in Ontario, for example, things have really been done in a substantive way to meet our target of reducing the reductions by 50 per cent by 1994. We made a commitment and it was kept.

● (1810)

To answer the specific question regarding vehicle emissions, there is no substantive change in position. I can tell him that

clearly. The one thing which was brought out recently in the news had to do with model years and how that might affect the introduction, if you like, of the emission controls. They were to be established in 1987 for the 1988 model year. However, the automobile manufacturers were concerned that those 1987 vehicles would be left with the emission controls which were not up to the standard we had intended. This would have happened because production of most 1988 models will start in September of 1987. Therefore, there may be a change in that date by several months to allow the manufacturer to finish with that model year. Therefore, there is no substantive change.

Mr. Blaikie: But all 1988 models will have to—

Mr. Gurbin: Exactly. Now, to come quickly to the envoy situation, I guess all of us would have preferred an absolutely final agreement. I think what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) had to say does say it best. He is quoted as advocating the need to develop a bilateral accord on acid rain. What we have with our envoy report is—yes, the 50 per cent that the Hon. Member talked about—a clear identification by the American administration of a real problem. I would have to argue with him as to whether or not there is any substance to it in terms of \$1 billion or \$5 billion. That, I think even he will admit, remains to be seen.

If this approach is agreed to there is the question of how industry will embrace it. If the American administration contributes \$2.5 billion in the short term, and I do not know the exact time frame, that will represent a fairly substantial addressing of the problem. It will certainly not all involve research. It involves development of technology, just as our smelters here are developing technology, and INCO is an example of that. Apparently many American industrialists are at the stage now where they must make decisions on new plants and revitalization of their industry. They will take advantage of this program and they have asked for that type of support. There is a substantial dollar figure attached to this at a time of great restraint in both the U.S. and Canada.

Finally, I guess all of us could stand here and say this is less than we wanted. However, we have done our homework here in Canada. We have at the very minimum a significant step in being able to approach the final stage of a bilateral accord which will fully address the acid rain problem in Canada.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION—MORATORIUM ON FORECLOSURES

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, on September 23 I put this question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise):

Last week he announced he was placing a moratorium on the foreclosures of farms by the Farm Credit Corporation which are running at approximately 14 per week. We have learned today that the American dollar will be devalued which will further depress commodity prices. Would the Minister tell the House when he is going to bring in assistance to farmers in order to arrest the situation of foreclosures on farms? Introducing a moratorium does not really help the farmers. I wonder if the Minister could make that clear.