

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages the Government's response to the following eight petitions: Nos. 331-341 to 331-348 inclusive.

* * *

STRIKING

PRESENTATION OF THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the thirty-fifth report of the Striking Committee, in both official languages.

[Editor's Note: For above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

* * *

[English]

PETITION

USE OF PENSION INCOME IN CALCULATION OF UI BENEFITS

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to present a petition signed by a number of people in Kamloops, British Columbia. They are very concerned about the recent decision of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald) that would see workers' pension benefits being deducted from their unemployment insurance benefits, effectively eliminating the benefit to workers of the pension package. They ask the Government to change its mind, to ensure that all retired employees keep their pension benefits and receive their unemployment insurance benefits without deduction of pension income.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Supply

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 82—GREAT LAKES WATER QUALITY AGREEMENT—INCLUSION OF TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTROL PROGRAMS

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

That this House urges that the Government of Canada insist that the Government of the United States regard the fulfilment of responsibilities under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement as an obligation, rather than a concession, and further urges the Government of Canada to renegotiate the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement to include toxic substance control programs to restore water quality in the Niagara, St. Clair and St. Lawrence Rivers for the benefit of millions of Canadians and Americans and that such negotiations should lead to the adoption of the zero discharge principle already embodied in Annex 12 of the Agreement.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it was in 1982, when Charles Ross, a former commissioner of the International Joint Commission, proposed in reference to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, which had been renewed in 1978, a national process and conference modelled on the 1972 Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. The committee consisted of scientists representing the National Research Council of the United States and the Royal Society of Canada. It endorsed this proposal for a conference on the Great Lakes which would focus attention upon the importance of the Great Lakes as a resource and upon the severity of the problems facing it.

● (1210)

Therefore, in December last year the joint committee of the Royal Society of Canada and the National Research Council of the United States recommended that the parties to the agreement, namely, Canada and the United States, hold a binational conference on the Great Lakes and that they establish a preparatory committee to develop a draft statement of principles and a draft action plan to be acted on formally at the conference to be held before the end of the present decade.

You may be wondering why I put this statement on the record, Mr. Speaker. The statement when it was produced last December was urging Parliament to take the recommendation into account very seriously, and is one of the reasons that I, on behalf of my Party, am putting forward this motion today. There is a need to renegotiate or at least review the agreement with the U.S. on the Great Lakes water quality.

In November, 1984, there was an interesting document produced by the Niagara River Toxic Committee in which Canadian members of the committee recommended that there be a toxic substances control plan for the Niagara River. This was the result of intensive studies. In addition to that, water quality objectives should be stated in the Great Lakes Water