

and 1985, there were another 48 acts or threats of violence by terrorist groups in Canada against other countries.

• (1805)

The report went on, as you will remember, Madam Speaker, to outline the legal framework in which we operate with respect to terrorists. It outlined the organization which was in place to try to deal with terrorists. It had some comments on the role the media should be playing with respect to terrorists and, on top of that, it dealt at considerable length with the whole issue of our Immigration Act, procedures and policies. It expressed the concern that those policies had been developed prior to the rise of international terrorists. It expressed concern as well that the system was now buckling under the weight of the numbers of people coming to this country, perhaps as applicants for landed immigrant status, perhaps as refugee claimants, or perhaps just as visitors. It pointed out that in 1986 some 80 million people entered Canada and there was in fact no way to identify these people properly, block the entry of terrorists, detain them or deport them.

Since that time we have had Bill C-84 and Bill C-55. I see that the Parliamentary Secretary is here tonight and I would like to ask him if those two Bills meet the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Terrorism. If they do meet those recommendations, why is the Senate holding up the passage of those two Bills? If in fact they have met the exact recommendations the Senate made to the people of Canada with respect to immigration procedures dealing with terrorists and potential terrorists entering this country, why is it holding up the passage of those Bills?

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to be back in the House and to respond to the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway). I would like to give a little history. First, let me deal with the Air-India situation. Investigations are proceeding. At the point in which evidence is gathered that will enable prosecution, I think the Hon. Member can rest assured that the Government will move as quickly and thoroughly as possible to do what can be done to right that very grievous wrong which was perpetrated on so many innocent people.

The Hon. Member may or may not realize that in June of 1986 the House of Commons committee on immigration presented a unanimous all-Party report which certainly expressed our concern about the security issue. It was a departmental report that was subsequently caused to be put together interdepartmentally really, to look at the security concerns related to immigration. The Senate in the meantime conducted its investigation into the issue of terrorism.

The two reports have really led to the two pieces of legislation, at least in part. The Government introduced in May of 1987—which was really rather quick for the Government; it was about 10 months time—Bill C-55, which dealt with part of the problem that had surfaced to that point. In August, after

releasing the Senate report, the Government responded very quickly indeed with a piece of legislation tabled in the House shortly after we came back on August 11. Those Bills are in the Senate.

The Hon. Member asked why they are not proceeding quickly through the Senate. I think he might have to ask the Senators. Certainly, Members of the House, the elected people of this country, have expressed their concern not only with the issues which are dealt with in the two pieces of legislation, but we have also had the ruling of the Speaker that the matters are urgent. Time is going on. Months are passing in the other place and so far it has not returned the Bills or approved the Bills.

The problem which was identified through both investigations had many facets and features to it, but today, under current legislation, until the Act is changed, we have no assurance that we can in fact detain people whose identities are unknown or who are suspected of being terrorists. The thrust of the two Bills would give the Government the powers to do that, always safeguarding the rights of the individual in terms of the provision of council, moving to use the federal court system instead of the CSIS body to make final determination so that it is done under Canadian law.

• (1810)

Much more could be said, Madam Speaker, and perhaps we could have a debate on another day.

HEALTH—ACID RAIN—HEALTH HAZARD QUERY/REQUEST FOR STRICTER POLLUTION EMISSION STANDARDS

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, usually when we talk about the effects of acid rain, we talk about the physical environment and the destruction of lakes, rivers, farms, maple forests, buildings, and monuments in our cities.

Recently I raised a question with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) respecting the health consequences of acid rain. There are basically two types of health consequences. One is the immediate, and those are consequences which are largely in the respiratory system and the effect, for example, on asthmatic children. There have been some studies which show that lung functioning is not as good in children who live in areas with a large amount of acid rain, compared to children who live in areas with very little acid rain. This is certainly cause for concern.

There have been some American studies recently published in the newspapers respecting acid rain pollution killing 4,000 people. There was reference to death rates for different forms of cancer. For example, breast cancer and colon cancer may be affected by acid rain. We do not know the exact numbers for Canada, that is an estimate of 4,000. In the United States there have been estimates of up to 50,000 premature deaths a year. That is very serious.