

Supply

I would like to make two points on the informational aspect. I would like to know if he understands that this plan, the negotiation that has occurred between Canada and the United States, which the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) in Canada has related by way of communiqué, has committed us, both the Americans and Canada, to providing the necessary information that is not available to Ontario, not available to the United States, but which is necessary to establish the loadings, targets and the timetables to reach the objectives we have committed ourselves to of 50 per cent. That is the first point.

Second, since he is familiar with events happening in Ontario and at the Ontario Government level, I wonder if he could tell us whether he will use his position as Member of Parliament for Davenport to reach an agreement to actually clean things up? Will he use his good office and his contacts with the Minister of the Environment of Ontario to see if he will release the necessary information to the Americans? The information is necessary for us, in co-operation with them, to clean up the St. Clair River.

Mr. Caccia: I find both questions extremely naive, to say the least. I do not know whether the Parliamentary Secretary realizes who is in Government. He is in Government and his Minister is in Government. I get my information from clippings in *The Star*. If the clipping is incorrect the Parliamentary Secretary has the time to correct the substance of the clipping. I do not mind at all. To expect me to operate as a mediator on his behalf, or on his Minister's behalf, or to obtain information for him is naive, I am not any more familiar than he is with what happens in Ontario. That is not the point. The point is that his Party is in Government. His Party has the responsibility to deliver. His Party, through the former Minister of the Environment in May, 1985, made a very strong statement at that time. I was happy to hear that because it showed that the predecessor to the present Minister was very keen to work out with Washington in May, 1985, a strong agreement. I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary remembers that.

Here we are a year later reinventing the wheel, talking about technical documentation, something that I thought was agreed upon a year ago, or that perhaps emerged last October when the head of EPA came to Ottawa. We have been kept completely in the dark. We do not know the contents of that particular plan, which I understand has been made public south of the border.

We can only go by what we know; a statement in May of 1985, a visit to Ottawa in October of 1985, then questioning the Minister in March, 1986, his commitment to excavation and destruction, and that is all.

If he sees in me the capacity of an alternate Government to obtain documentation and to negotiate on his behalf, I thank him for the high esteem that he has for me, but I am afraid he is overestimating my powers.

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, what I was trying to do for the Member of Davenport (Mr. Caccia) is give him solid, clear

information so that he might function from the same reasonable and accurate base that we are functioning from here. The necessary technical data for how much toxic material is going into the Niagara River and how much is totally going out is, indeed, part of the plan. We have a very rigid, close time frame in order to accomplish those determinations. What I am doing is telling the Member from Davenport that that is precisely a part of the plan. It is a very specific part of the plan and it is information that is not theirs.

I am also telling him that part of the reason it has been so difficult during this period of time, and part of the reason it has been so difficult from October until now in order for the Minister of the Environment in Canada to take the necessary leadership that he has taken now in coming to an agreement, is that if on the Ontario Government—and clearly he has political liaisons there and I think no one would argue that, himself included—the Minister of the Environment in Ontario wants to be even-handed and co-operate, as is necessary to clean up the problem, he is going to have to be open with all of us and provide the necessary information that is available only to him so we can get the job done. I am really giving him two pieces of information. I am letting him know that we, for our part, and the Minister of the Environment in all of his actions, have encouraged the co-operation of Ontario and look forward to their co-operation in any way possible in order to achieve a successful conclusion.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary seems unaware of the fact that the data on what goes into the river is already contained in a detailed study by the Niagara River Toxics Committee of October, 1984. It is a thick volume with detailed charts, containing all the emissions, industry by industry. It is right there. The data is coming out of our ears, as far as that is concerned. He can find it on pages 10 to 15 of the summary of that report, namely, the Niagara River Toxics Committee report of October, 1984.

As to the leadership of the Minister of the Environment, this is where I have difficulty in understanding what he means when leadership entails going public on a disagreement among Canadian Ministers of the Environment. What kind of leadership is that, I ask him? Does he consider that leadership?

Second, does he consider it leadership to go around, as the Minister does, trying to create the impression that in Washington they are doing us an enormous service, favour almost, by doing whatever he implies in this press release, rather than having the strength given to him by virtue of an international agreement. That is where the leadership would be. It is not this subservient attitude by which we thank Washington for paying attention to Canadians when there are so many problems with the environment in the United States. There is an agreement, with a very clearly defined set of principles. That is the basis on which the Minister of the Environment should be working, rather than creating the impression with the Press Gallery, as he did yesterday, that we should be grateful.