

*Canadian Environmental Protection Act*

Protection Act". An unsuspecting or politically unsophisticated person looking at the title of that Bill might suspect or be led to think that it was going to provide a regulatory framework that was going to give some type of total protection for the environment. When we look at the Bill we see that this is very far from being the case.

The only real emphasis of the Bill is to regulate the introduction of toxic substances into the environment. This is important, but it is far from being the total comprehensive protection of the environment that Canadians need and want the Government to provide through legislation.

For example, the Bill does nothing to deal with the destruction of the environment through logging practices, or the deforestation that occurs, or the soil erosion, and the erosion that pollutes our streams and lakes as a result. It does nothing to protect the environment from the loss of farmland through salinization, over use of pesticides, or urbanization. It does nothing about the clean-up of toxic waste sites. It does nothing about acid rain. The Government has made a lot of noise about acid rain, but it has done very little about it.

This Bill has no power to deal with questions such as pesticides, because they are regulated by the Department of Agriculture and where one Department has regulations that are already in place, Bill C-74 is not effective. It does nothing about polluting forms of energy use. It does nothing about the nuclear industry. There is a whole constellation of problems relating to the environment that are not dealt with by this Bill.

Perhaps I could give one example on Vancouver Island that is very important, that is, the introduction of a new chemical called TCMTB as a replacement for the old PCP type anti-sap stain that was used in treating lumber. Since this new chemical TCMTB was introduced on December 7—Pearl Harbour Day—there have been more than 75 first-aid or medical cases reported to the end of April at Harmac Mill near Nanaimo.

• (1550)

Workers at that mill have complained about nausea, about sore throats, about nose bleeds, sinus problems, and headaches. In some cases, they have suffered from nose bleeds lasting for as long as two weeks. As a result, the workers themselves have asked that a study be carried out on this chemical.

The Workers Compensation Board of British Columbia uses as a guide the level set by Agriculture Canada, that being .5 parts of TCMTB per milligram per cubic metre, and at a level of less than half of that amount, the workers at the pulp mill in question are suffering from severe health problems.

It has become obvious that the Department of Agriculture passed the regulations in respect of the use of this chemical without having had any long term studies in place and completed.

I saw the need to replace the old PCP anti-sap stain type of chemical, given the obvious detrimental effects of that chemical on the environment and on human health, and it

rushed through regulations in respect of the use of TCMTB without having conducted adequate studies as to its effects.

When questions regarding the use of this chemical were released in the B.C. Legislature by Dale Lovick, the NDP member for Nanaimo, he was told that there was to be a study conducted by the University of British Columbia on its short term health effects. However, when Mr. Lovick called UBC, he was told that the study was not scheduled to begin until the summer, the reason being that there were not a sufficient number of mills using TCMTB.

Here we have a chemical which is widely suspected, on Vancouver Island, as causing severe health problems for workers, a chemical which needs to be studied, and the entity which is to conduct the study saying that it cannot begin the study until it is in wider use. That is the kind of perverted logic that we face. Here we have a situation where we cannot begin to study the harmful effects on human beings flowing from the use of a given chemical because that chemical is not in wide enough use.

Once the study begins, it will take three to four months to collect the data, and another three to four months for analysis of the data, which means that the results of the study will not be available before the end of the year. In the context of the health of Canadian workers, this is simply not good enough. In raising the example that I do, I simply want to make the point that Bill C-74, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, would have absolutely no jurisdiction over this particular chemical, given that it is a chemical that is already regulated by the Department of Agriculture. In fact, Bill C-74 is not much more than an updated version of the Environmental Contaminants Act.

When one looks at the pretentious title, the "Canadian Environmental Protection Act", one suspects that it must have been named and baptized by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) himself. It smacks of his typical exaggeration. He is not able to talk of a light bulb without speaking of it as a huge hydroelectric project. He is not able to talk of a minor Bill that does something that is important and significant without giving it this great pretentious title. Of course, the Minister himself, in speaking of this Bill as being one of the "toughest environmental Bills introduced anywhere in the world", suffers from the same kind of pretention.

Bill C-74 has a declaration and a preamble, most of which is acceptable. But, a declaration and a preamble setting out general goals and desirable objectives is not what Canadians want and need; what the Canadian people want is an environmental bill of rights, a bill of rights which will recognize the right of Canadians to a clean and safe environment, and one which will have sufficient teeth that they can insist that the environment be clean and be safe.

The preamble talks about objectives and guidelines. Yet, the Bill itself does not give the Minister the power to either set standards or to enforce standards. When we talk about the environment, what we want is not simply a recitation of