

*Canadian Environmental Protection Act*

fairly strong; the regulations will allow the polluters to get away with environmental murder.

As the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) has pointed out, if things such as pesticides, the nuclear industry, and motor vehicle emissions are exempt from the Act in the first place, then there will be no regulations under the Environmental Protection Act pertaining to these substances, and that obviously means that there will be no appeal mechanism for members of the public who have very major concerns with pesticides and the other substances I mentioned earlier.

I would like to amplify on that for a few seconds, because it seems to me—

**Mr. Lewis:** Amplify? What's that? Expand.

**Mr. Murphy:** The Deputy Government House Leader wants me to expand rather than to amplify, so I will lower my voice and will speak longer, at his request.

If we have a piece of legislation, the main purpose of which is to protect the environment, the legislation should have an over-all effect. It should cover all bases. Let me give an example of that.

In 1983, the industries that fell under federal legislation for occupational health and safety reported to 17 different Departments and agencies. If there was an accident at a work site or a problem related to health and safety at the work site, one of 17 different agencies or Departments would be involved. Obviously, that created an administrative nightmare and meant that there were areas for which there was no proper enforcement.

In 1984, we changed the Canada Labour Code and put most of those 17 different Departments or agencies under one roof. When it came to occupational health and safety, most of the industries fell under the Labour Code and it was up to the Department of Labour to ensure that the Labour Code was being enforced. That is not happening with Bill C-74.

We are not seeing the Department of the Environment taking over major responsibility for the environment. We are not seeing all the various pieces of legislation and categories of pollution being put under the Department of the Environment, and that is what is causing the problems to which I have referred.

After this legislation is passed and after the regulations, whatever they may be, are finally put in place, those people who are concerned about the environment will not automatically go to the Department of the Environment. They will not know to which Department they will have to speak, whether they will have to speak to nuclear regulatory boards, to one of the government Departments, to Energy, Mines and Resources, to the Department of Agriculture or to the Department of the Environment.

If it is the environment that is being threatened and if people have legitimate concerns about what pesticides or other

contaminants are doing to their environment, they should know that one Department has over-all responsibility for pollution, whatever the cause. That does not exist in this legislation, and that is one of the major problems with it.

Quite often we talk about trying to simplify laws. We talk about making it easier for the average concerned citizen to know where to go with his complaints. In many areas we have tried to achieve that simplicity but, when it comes to the environment, Bill C-74 still allows a number of other different government agencies to have their own fiefdoms. This means that concerned citizens will have to bring in expensive lawyers and go through a very complicated process just to try to clean up the environment in their own neighbourhoods, and that is unacceptable.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that questions and comments are now terminated. Debate.

**Mr. Pat Binns (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to move at this point:

That the House continue to sit through the lunch hour for the purpose of continuing consideration of third reading of Bill C-74, an Act respecting the protection of the environment and of human life and health.

• (1220)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Will those Members who object to the motion please rise in their places?

*And fewer than 15 Members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Fewer than 15 Members having risen, pursuant to Standing Order 9(4)(b), the motion is adopted.

Motion agreed to.

**Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Bill to which many of us looked forward. When the Minister described Bill C-74 as probably the most progressive environmental Act in the western world, he certainly did not take into consideration the many things which he neglected to put into this Bill. All we really have is a continuation of the identification of toxic substances and an unchanged Ocean Dumping Act combined in one Bill.

The Brundtland Commission, which reported in 1987, caught the vision and imagination of all Canadians and all people internationally. One of the recommendations in the report *Our Common Future* was that national Governments should establish clear environmental goals and enforce environmental laws, regulations, incentives, and standards on industrial enterprises. This should normally be done at the national level with local Governments being empowered to exceed but not to lower national norms.

After that report was published there was a great surge in the opinion polls in this country. Canadians want to protect the environment not only for today but for the future. If this Parliament is to leave any kind of credible legacy for the