

Adjournment Debate

released. A few days before the release of this man, which was automatic under the current law, the Parole Board had commented in writing to the Correctional Services of Canada that this was "a dangerous release".

The solution is not further elimination of mandatory supervision but more flexible use of the Parole Board's judgment with respect to the release of individual offenders. Dangerous criminals should be kept incarcerated until they have served their full sentence. I trust that Bill C-67 will be brought before the House in the very near future.

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS—ACID RAIN—UNITED STATES' EMISSIONS. (B) PRIME MINISTER'S DISCUSSIONS WITH UNITED STATES PRESIDENT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, on March 19 in the House, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) stated:

The Prime Minister has achieved a real triumph on behalf of Canadians and I suggest that... the Hon. Member should join other Canadians across the country in rejoicing over a major Canadian accomplishment.

The Minister was referring to the question of acid rain and the last summit.

Let us compare this major accomplishment with what was said in the House on March 11, 1981, five years ago, when President Reagan expressed his concern about transboundary pollution. At that time he said:

We want to continue to work co-operatively to understand and control the air and water pollution that respects no borders.

The reference at that time puts President Reagan ahead of where he found himself in 1986 at the last summit.

In addition, let us look for a moment to the recommendation in the envoys' report in which there is no promise to cut so much as one milligram of sulphur emissions. However, on page 29 of the report there is a hope that the Commercial Demonstration Program will result in some "near-term reductions in U.S. air emissions" which affect the Canadian environment.

With our hopes pinned on the Commercial Demonstration Program, let us take a closer look at page 29 of the report. It states that the Government should provide half the funding, some \$2.5 billion, for projects which industry recommend for which it is prepared to contribute the other half of the funding. So what Canada has agreed to is a program which amounts to zero if the polluters who have consistently resisted controls do not provide the funds for commercial demonstration projects. Therein lies the substance of the Minister's optimism that some near-term reductions in sulphur dioxide emissions may then result.

At the very least we might have hoped that the envoys' report, or the commitment made by President Reagan, would have included a process for negotiating some sort of a clean air treaty, as was proposed in the 1980 Memorandum of Intent. We were told by the Minister to look at page 4 of the envoys' report. Indeed, page 4 makes a reference to the need for a

bilateral accord. However, it is not contained in the recommendations but rather as a piece of background information. Nowhere in the envoys' report is there a specific call for action or a process described to negotiate a clean air agreement between the two countries. In this respect, it falls short of even regaining the position of August 1980.

● (1815)

With these points in mind, I would put this question to the Minister through the Parliamentary Secretary: Is it really a major accomplishment, as he described it in the House, or is it more like the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) himself described it in *The Globe and Mail* of March 2, 1986, as being not such a big deal?

We heard the Minister of the Environment make a new statement over television on Sunday during *Question Period*. At that time, he said:

We're going to have to have, in both Canada and the United States—specific targets for substantial reductions in acid rain causing emissions. We're going to have to have schedules to achieve the target and we're going to have to have specific commitments of cash for both purposes—We have a summit a year from now, in Canada, in which acid rain will be put on the agenda again.

The Minister went on to say that at the next summit, the discussion will focus on the questions of targets, schedules and commitments of cash. Yet the Prime Minister is reported on March 22 to have said that he had asked Mr. Reagan to cut U.S. emissions of acid rain pollution, but he cannot persuade the unpersuadable. That is a fairly realistic statement. Why then is the Minister of the Environment committing himself while the Prime Minister, the only person who attended the meeting, believes President Reagan to be unpersuadable? Is the Minister just raising false hopes for political purposes?

Much has been said about the Government reaching a new phase in Canada-U.S. relations on acid rain, but is it really so? If you look at the record, Mr. Speaker, and there is not much time to do that, you will realize that in addition to the Memorandum of Intent of August 1980; in addition to President Reagan's statement of March 1981 that he wants to continue to work co-operatively to understand and control the water and air pollution that respects no borders; in addition to formal negotiations that began under the terms and conditions of the Memorandum of Intent of June 1981; in addition to the March 1984 formation of the 30% Club as an international initiative to cut acid rain; and in addition to the March 1984 agreements with the provinces renewed in June 1984, a lot of action has taken place. However, now we have to look clearly at what the Minister of the Environment said on Sunday when he spoke about emission controls that will be put on the table at the next summit when the Prime Minister and President Reagan will meet again. It is of course necessary to bring the Parliamentary Secretary and the Minister down to earth with historical facts, but will the Parliamentary Secretary now tell us what precisely is the schedule of cuts in sulphur emissions in the U.S. to which the Minister referred during the television program on Sunday?