

*Adjournment Debate**[Translation]*

I think the decision by the department of the Environment not to proceed with the injunction against the Rafferty-Alameda project is proof enough that the government has no environmental policy. It all started with the former minister of the Environment, Lucien Bouchard, who was not prepared to take decisions about major environmental issues. Now that he has joined another political party, he does a complete about-turn. But it all started with a bad minister of the Environment, M. Bouchard, and it continues with another bad minister of the Environment, M. de Cotret.

It is incredible, after everything he said in this House last week, that is the real test of his leadership would be the Rafferty-Alameda project, that he should eventually decide to do nothing. And provided that he procrastinates long enough, he knows that the project will be completed.

Mr. Speaker, we know that, on environmental matters, Canadians are much ahead of the government. In the case of acid rain, for example, why did we not get the opportunity to sign a bilateral agreement with the Americans?

We know that in the Eastern townships, some sugar-bushes are losing their trees to acid rain not from Canada, but from the United States. We also know that acid rain has no passport and that the only way to deal with this problem is to set here in Canada federal standards similar to the ones provided in the U.S. Clean Air Act. At the same time, we must absolutely get a bilateral agreement to set international standards on this important environmental issue. Otherwise, it would only be false rhetoric by Mr. Bouchard and his successor, the new minister, Mr. de Cotret.

[English]

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the question raised by the hon. member for Hamilton East concerning acid rain control legislation in the United States.

The Government of Canada was very happy to see both the United States Senate and the House of Representatives pass a comprehensive package of amendments to the U.S. Clean Air Act this past weekend.

The legislation that has been passed by the Congress and the House of Representatives required a 10 million ton reduction of emissions and caps emissions at the reduced level. The legislation also contains comprehensive provisions and monitoring compliance with these requirements.

I would like to remind the members that Canada's legislative interests in the U.S. acid rain controls has always focused on the need to reduce the amount of acid rain pollution from U.S. sources that crosses our border each year. In this regard, Environment Canada has used its computer models to show that an American control program similar to the one adopted by the American Congress and the House of Representatives, which would meet Canada's environmental need to the trans-boundary flows reduced to no more than 2 million tonnes annually.

The trading provisions contained in the legislation should actually benefit Canada, since the lowest cost emission reductions can be obtained in the Ohio River Valley, which is the region that most heavily impacts on Canada. In addition, many of the power plants in the valley export their electricity to other regions. This means that the emission trading provisions could result in increased emission reductions in the valley because of the straight economics of trading into the valley and by virtue of governors attempting to pass pollution control costs to out of state customers.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more that I could say. The passage of this legislation should allow Canada and the U.S. to negotiate to conclude the bilateral agreement on trans-boundary air pollution by the end of this year.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): A motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.24 p.m.