Oral Questions

that is why *The Green Plan* will complete the work we are doing.

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement which the minister knows was signed, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the Fisheries Act and the recommendations of the international joint commission since 1972 have all raised the issue of the Great Lakes and whether there is really going to be a future for the Great Lakes. The minister in his discussion paper on the environment says we need more discussion.

Why more discussion, I ask the minister? We need some action. The International Joint Commission has made clear recommendations, and has said that the government has not acted in face of the evidence. What commitment does the minister give to act on the Great Lakes pollution now? He knows that \$25 million a year will not be sufficient. What plan does he have for the Great Lakes?

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, two years ago this government strengthened the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement providing for all the new measures I just mentioned. The Green Plan, the consultation document, proposes to build up the basis of the regulation process whereby we will regulate major industries such as metal mines and smelters, power–generating plants, hazardous waste facilities, textile factories, petroleum refineries, chemical pollution plants and steel plants. We will enact national standards under CEPA. This is very ambitious, very tough and I would like the Opposition to support us when the time comes to enact those measures.

[Translation]

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, my last question is directed also to the Minister of the Environment. Now that negotiations have started again with the Americans on acid rain, it is finally possible to believe that progress will be made. Is the Government going at last to face up to its responsibilities? Will the Government make the funds available to implement an action plan concerning acid rain? Funds must be

[English]

—available for implementing a program on acid rain. Is the government prepared to do this now?

[Translation]

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, we all know that one of the main reasons the United States has finally decided to adopt those measures and which are now before the U.S. Congress is that Canada showed leadership and set up a program aimed at reducing its own emissions by 50 per cent. We are all aware that at least \$500 million have been spent on that program. I suggest we should be proud of our efforts. We must now make sure that in the other three provinces which are not involved in the reduction plan, we can control the emissions and implement an action plan to complete this whole effort. But we have achieved the essential, because we know, on the basis of scientific reports, that with the measures already implemented and which will be completed by 1994, 14,000 Canadian lakes which had died because of sulfur oxyde will live again. As Easter Sunday is approaching, I think we should be satisfied and congragulate one another for the progress already made concerning acid rain.

[English]

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment knows very well that under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act only 44 chemicals out of 30,000 are to be dealt with. The Minister of the Environment also knows that while \$125 million may sound like a large sum here, it is inadequate to deal with the problem.

Since the Commission raised a very crucial question yesterday with regard to the health of millions of Canadians and Americans, what are the new measures that the minister intends to put into place to deal with this emergency?

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. member has mentioned the 44 substances priority list. It is important to put this into perspective because the figures can be distorted if they are not put into perspective. It means, in reality, that there is a regrouping of hundreds and hundreds of substances within those 44 priority substances. Those substances happen to be the main ones, the most toxic and dangerous ones. It means that when