

### Supply

Quality Agreement for toxic substances in the Niagara River. These two recommendations are in keeping with the supporting and detailed material attached as annexes to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, but they are only annexes. Annex 1 specifies water quality objectives for certain toxic chemicals in the Great Lakes, and Annex 12 refers to persistent toxic substances and mentions specifically:

The intent of programs specified in this Annex is to virtually eliminate the input of persistent toxic substances—

I will come back to this later when I will touch briefly on the concept of zero discharge.

The point here is that you have another group of scientists, in this case all Canadians, who pursue very firmly the necessity, and raise it in the public's mind, that we should have a toxic substances control plan for the Niagara River and that the objectives in water quality should be stated in the agreement.

Moving on again to another document, the 1985 Report on Great Lakes Water Quality. In this we find some 21 recommendations. They all converge into one conclusion, at least they strike me as converging, on the necessity of definitely reviewing and where possible renegotiating certain aspects of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. I will read only recommendation No. 1, which has been brought to the attention of the public by media. Subsequent reports make the 1985 report significant and valuable. Reading from page 9, recommendation No. 1 is as follows:

The Great Lakes jurisdictions explicitly recognize the effects of air emissions on water quality in general, and on Great Lakes water quality in particular, in the formulation of air quality statutes, regulations and standards.

This statement in a way is vindicating some of the statements and even a publication issued by Environment Canada under the title *Storm Warnings* which the Minister has decided not to circulate because he feels that he has, in his judgment, a better knowledge of what the public should read and should not read. I would like the Minister to read this specific recommendation and reflect on it in depth. He would probably then reverse his decision because this very same matter is raised in a report that predates the publication of that brochure entitled *Storm Warnings*.

Another reason for a review or renegotiation, depending upon which of the two would be more effective, is the very important and complex but indispensable question of compliance of the United States and Canadian regulatory system with the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. Nothing can be said that is adequate to stress the importance of this compliance, which is so essential for the working of the agreement. It is complex. It touches on several jurisdictions but it has to be done eight or nine years following the signing of the 1978 agreement. Therefore, the compliance aspect is extremely important. I would like to stress this in the strongest possible terms, even in the very short time available to me for the Government's consideration and action.

It is true that the November, 1984 cuts by the Government in toxicology research with the Guelph Centre and the

Canadian Wildlife Service do not make our position stronger. Surely an intimate knowledge of the agreement *per se*, the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, would make a difference, I submit, in the pursuit of a good plan for Canada, for Ontario, for Quebec and for any other province that in the long term would benefit from and would support it.

In this respect I have to put some starch into the collar of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) because I have the impression that he has not done his homework.

I will read for the record, and for him, a passage or two from the agreement itself which was signed on November 22, 1978. In Article II the first Purpose reads as follows:

The discharge of toxic substances in toxic amounts be prohibited and the discharge of any or all persistent toxic substances be virtually eliminated.

This is a principle signed by both parties in the agreement. I am sure that the Minister takes seriously the Canadian commitment to that agreement and that he will hold the Americans bound. Yet in statements that he makes inside and outside of the House he conveys that somehow we should be grateful to the American jurisdiction, namely, EPA, for its even taking into consideration that something better be done in this area. It is as if it were a great favour due to us because of our smiles and statements of servile obedience to the dictator that perhaps have been given to the Minister by the Secretary of State for External Affairs for External Affairs (Mr. Clark), meaning that we must be nice at all costs. This is not the case, Mr. Speaker. The Minister must understand that there is an agreement which both nations have signed. Canada takes its commitment seriously and the Minister has the duty to ensure that the other party to the agreement also takes its commitment seriously.

• (1220)

There are other specific objectives contained in this agreement. I will briefly touch upon Article IV which says:

The Specific Objectives adopted pursuant to this Article represent the minimum levels of water quality desired in the boundary waters of the Great Lakes System and are not intended to preclude the establishment of more stringent requirements.

The Minister would do well to do his homework and become intimately acquainted with the wording and clauses contained in this agreement. If he does not do his homework, he cannot speak effectively for Canada. In the last week he has performed in a shaky manner. He has produced a shaky press release which I must bring to your attention.

In the third paragraph on page 1 reference is made to the understanding which has been agreed upon by the administrator of the EPA and the Minister of the Environment. It says that they, namely, the Minister and the administrator, suggested—note the word “suggested”—that a 50 per cent reduction of certain—note the word “certain”—toxic chemicals, taking into account applicable water quality and drinking water standards may be achievable—note “may be achievable”—by 1995 or sooner. We have the words “suggested”, “certain”, and “may be”. What does this kind of press