

terms—that the federal delegation of environmental enforcement amounts to a virtual abdication of responsibility for enforcement and has promoted discrepancies in the nature of enforcement responses across Canada.

In essence, what the council is saying is that our enforcement approach is lacking and weak because we tend to yield, or we tend to be shy or hesitant, with respect to the provinces doing it for us, or being seen as doing it in place of the provinces, or even to be seen as interfering, stepping into provincial jurisdiction.

That is a very serious matter which was brought to light by the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council. In conclusion, the report expressed the opinion that some current trends such as the delegation of administrative powers to provincial authorities, and excessive fears of federal-provincial conflicts, are having a negative effect on the implementation of Environment Canada's legislating mandate and undermines the confidence of Canadians in the Department. These are hard words. Canadians would like to have confidence in Environment Canada. It would be a great pity if the stiff fines of up to \$1 million envisaged in the Bill remain a dead letter. This may be so because of the fear of federal-provincial legislation, or because the provinces are not equipped to enforce the regulations in the Bill, if it is decided that a certain province should do it instead of the federal Government, or because of other reasons that emerge.

• (1820)

The fact is that tough national standards recommended by the World Commission on Environment and Development are the essence of the answers to the problems that we have in the environment. With this Bill I am afraid that the Government is going in the opposite direction to the recommendations made by the World Commission on Environment and Development by delegating, as it seems to be delegating as a result of this Bill, this responsibility to the provinces. Some provinces will have weaker enforcement capacity. Some provinces will have none. We will have a checkerboard enforcement rather than a national standard that is strong, determined and controlled from the centre.

We then come to the famous \$37 million which has been allocated to three agencies over five years to cover the costs of enforcing this legislation. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what can one do over five years with \$37 million when one has to distribute it between three different agencies or departments? One can do very little if one is serious about the implementation of this Bill. That is why I said earlier that the interpretation of this Bill, the version given to us by the Parliamentary Secretary, sounded a bit to me like Alice in Wonderland. I say that because the financial resources are not there to do the job. Some \$37 million over five years between three agencies will not do the job of dealing with 60,000 chemicals that are out there in the universe which surrounds us. In addition to that, there is the matter of dealing with the 1,000 chemicals that are

Canadian Environmental Protection Act

produced every year and enter the market-place. This is a phenomenal task that we face.

It is interesting to study some of the observations put on paper by a professor from McMaster University in Hamilton. I refer to Professor Ross Hume Hall who was also a member of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council. He expresses despair in an article produced in the spring of this year about the approach in this Bill which he calls the single-chemical approach. By that he means that each product will be examined by the Department according to a procedure that has been well established by the Department of National Health and Welfare and administered under the Food and Drugs Act.

He feels that this approach will not be able to cope with the sheer weight of the 60,000 existing industrial chemicals. He says that to illustrate the absurdity of trying to regulate industrial chemicals in this manner, one should make a quick calculation. The bureaucratic team of the Contaminants Control Branch consists of 19 persons. It took them 10 years to assess five chemicals. Thus by a quick calculation of multiplying 10 by 19, which results in 190, it took that many person-years to come up with five regulations. He comes to the conclusion that Environment Canada's 10,000 employees, from janitors to the Deputy Minister, could write 260 regulations per year. That would not allow the branch to keep up with the 1,000 new chemicals that enter the market every year, let alone the other 60,000. It is an analysis that is compelling because it is based on experience gained thus far which questions the validity in the year 1987 of approaching the situation by way of a single-chemical analysis which is by its very nature a slow process and very heavy in terms of the requirements of scientists. It leaves out so many chemicals before they can be tackled in this manner.

I express the hope that this analysis by Professor Ross Hume Hall can be rebutted by the Department. I hope that it can be demonstrated that the laboratory technology of today allows bureaucrats to proceed at a much faster pace and that this assumption will not become a reality.

It is important to find ways of implementing this Bill in a manner that will tackle the real world out there and not force future generations of politicians 10 or 20 years from now to come to the conclusion that with Bill C-74 we actually applied the same formula and the same methodology that was applied in 1976 when the first contaminants legislation was debated and approved in the House. I hope that it will not be seen that we were not able in the intervening years between 1976 and 1986 to come up with a better methodology to deal with a very complex chemical world out there.

I conclude by saying that in committee we will put forward amendments. We hope that the Government because of its strength will come forward with amendments based on what I am sure will be a well-reasoned debate. It is one that wants to look after the interests of Canadians at large. It wants to ensure that future generations of Canadians will not suffer the consequences of chemicals allowed in the environment that