

*Canadian Environmental Protection Act*

research project, we have looked at the United States budgets from time to time and have found out and disclosed to this House that some of the funds which were promised were not there.

There is still a lot to be done in that area. There are toxic chemicals buried in the ground at various locations in Canada which seep and leak into our rivers. Something has to be done to either remove these contaminants and bury them somewhere else or to improve the sites where they are buried so they stop seeping into our rivers and lakes. I am not trying to downgrade what has been done. I am just saying this does just a narrow part of the job. Let us call a spade a spade, because that is what it is.

**Mrs. Browes:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the comments of the Hon. Member. I am sorry to hear him being so negative about this very important subject. We have an opportunity now to really do something positive. I am pleased to see that the Hon. Member is willing to pass this legislation quickly, and we look forward to getting it passed quickly. However, just to set the record straight, with the negative aspects referred to by the Hon. Member, let me give Members a few of the positive points.

The Canadian Environmental Protection Act has components such as authority to control the introduction into Canadian commerce of chemical and other substances that are new to Canada, anything that is coming on-stream, and the authority to obtain information and require testing on both new substances and substances already existing in Canadian commerce. We have some 100,000 chemicals in use today. We want to be able to get information on them to the Canadian people and to control it. The Act has provisions allowing control of all aspects of the life cycle of toxic chemicals from the development, through the manufacture, the importation, transportation, distribution, storage and use, the release to the environment as emissions at various stages of the life cycle and their ultimate disposal as waste.

We also have the authority to establish regulations; we have the authority to establish guidelines. Indeed, this Bill is very good news for Canadians. I would think the Hon. Member of the Liberal Party would see this very much as good news legislation. I would like to characterize his comments as the "DNN"—done nothing network, really and truly, as we listen to the Liberal Party speaking about environmental issues and look at that Party's record, which is indeed very dismal. I think we should look at the Liberal Party as the "DNN", done nothing network".

[Translation]

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** I have no objection to the description the Parliamentary Secretary has given of the Bill. That is in fact what is included in the legislation. And this is why we will support it. However, she should understand that when, after more than three years in power, a government for the first time brings in legislation on environment matters, such a legislation is too narrow in scope. Even if it is good, we

cannot be completely satisfied with the Government's performance, and its action on environment matters. Since after three years in power this is their first environment legislation before Parliament, it gives Opposition parties an opportunity to review the whole environment situation in Canada. And this is where the Government's performance is less than brilliant.

I will therefore recognize the merit of this Bill to that extent, and I know the Parliamentary Secretary probably has worked on the drafting of the Bill. If she did, I commend her—she is then worth her salt and the extra pay she is getting as Parliamentary Secretary. But let us not be carried away, let us not blow this Bill out of its true proportions. We will support it for what it is, not for what it should be.

● (1250)

[English]

**Mr. Gagnon:** Mr. Speaker, will the Hon. Member comment on the prohibition of commercial manufacturing and processing uses of dodecachloropentacyclo decane, chlorobiphenyls, polybrominated biphenyls and, of course, the famous polychlorinated terphenyls?

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, it is an extremely interesting question. I do not know if my colleague has a degree in chemistry or if he knows the meaning of these words. While I know what BPCs are, I must admit that I do not know some of these other chemicals. When a Bill contains thousands of chemicals, obviously we do not know many of them. Therefore, I cannot do much more than laugh at the question.

[Translation]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Portneuf (Mr. Ferland).

**Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in today's debate on Bill C-74. I was somewhat disappointed by the reaction of the previous speaker, the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), and like him I simply cannot pretend to be an expert on all toxic products. Mr. Speaker, what disappointed me in the remarks of the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques—he who represents a highly urbanized riding, who, if memory serves me right, has been a Member of Parliament for at least twelve-odd years, if not more, who belonged to a government which way back could have taken preventive measures to curb environmental pollution—is the fact that he now berates this Government and our Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) for failing to introduce Bill C-74 before today, a measure which is the outcome of consultations. Perhaps I might point out something which my colleague from Saint-Jacques would certainly remember: his Party had never been overly enthusiastic about consulting interest groups or the public at large to find out whether the Government should come up with a legislative measure to meet real needs.