

Canada Shipping Act

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Mr. Hnatyshyn moved that Bill C-75, an Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, the Maritime Code Act and the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Angus: I rise on a point of order. Looking at the clock, Mr. Speaker, would you allow us to call it six o'clock? It is a very important Bill and it would be inappropriate for the Opposition to have to split the time between two days. I would ask you to give consideration to this request, Sir.

Mr. Ouellet: I would like to address this point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

I understand that the Minister, at the explicit request of the Quebec Premier, will be meeting next Monday with the Quebec Minister of Transport who has precise objections to make to Bill C-75. I find it rather surprising that without any notice the Government has suddenly introduced a bill and, certainly, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to look at the clock and say it is 6 o'clock.

[English]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) who is a respected parliamentarian would not want to inject an unfortunate partisan note in this matter. As the Hon. Member will know and as Members will know, at the request of the Opposition I was quite prepared to put third reading debate over for two weeks in order to make sure that the committee was back and Members were available.

Mr. Ouellet: We would have liked two years.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: There is a *quid pro quo* for my putting it over. I thought we would have an expeditious debate at third reading stage. On the other hand, it being almost six o'clock, on the basis that this in no way interferes with the adjournment proceedings, I think we can accommodate that request to call it 6 o'clock. I am quite prepared to put third reading debate over until next week when I know the matter will receive expeditious treatment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent to call it six o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS—TOXIC RAIN—PROVISIONS OF
FORTHCOMING LEGISLATION

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, I keep moving around at the behest of the House Leader, I believe. On April 28 I put a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Gurbin). In part it reads:

Would the Parliamentary Secretary advise the House whether the new proposed Environmental Contaminants Act will deal with this problem and effectively eliminate the health threat posed to Canadians by this toxic rain?

That question on April 28 was prompted by a report that had been published shortly before that time, a report of a study that had been made by the Canadian Environmental Law Research Foundation and by the United States Environmental Law Institute. That study contained a number of very significant and interesting facts and figures.

First, it indicated that both Canada and the United States are threatened by toxic rain or, if you will, by toxic rain fallout. Toxic rain was identified as the worst type of pollution, worse than acid rain. Acid rain has been considered all across North America and Europe as an extremely potent form of pollution. It was identified as well that toxic rain contains some 1,000 different chemicals produced industrially, including chemicals such as dioxin and PCBs. In addition to that, the report identified that these industrial emissions mixed with water vapour form polluted clouds which then condense in the form of rain or snow. They fall to earth, into lakes, rivers and streams as well as into the fields and communities around us. In fact, some 46,000 tonnes a year of this toxic rain and the pollutants in toxic rain come down on Lake Ontario alone.

This toxic rain is what we were talking about when we dealt with the great industrial emission disaster in India a short time ago, the Bhopal disaster in which industrial emissions condensed and caused such devastation in India. There was loss of life and injuries not only to the present generation, but to future generations as well. It was indicated in the study that toxic rain threatened not only our drinking water, but also our food. It accumulates in human tissue and is one of the great causes of respiratory problems in human beings.

This is not the first time that we have heard about toxic rain, Mr. Speaker. We are not as familiar with toxic rain as we are with acid rain. We are very familiar with the problem of acid rain. It is caused by two types of industrial pollutants: sulphuric dioxide and various nitrogen oxides. Those particular forms of pollutants that we have been able to identify come from specific sources. They come from smelters such as those in northern Ontario at Inco and Falconbridge, northern