

the workplace labels must be affixed to the containers listing the chemicals. Within that workplace there must be information sheets explaining the dangers of the various chemicals, what safety measures can be used and if there is an accident, what action should be taken. This was very useful legislation which resulted from negotiations among the unions, the corporations, and the provinces. We approved of this legislation. However, the same exemptions were there—pesticides, agricultural products, tobacco, and a number of other products which affect workers.

It became obvious to us that that was an example the Government wanted to follow in many areas. In Bill C-74 we see the same process. The Government says that we do not have to deal with pesticides, even though they are known to be a danger to the environment of this nation, in the Environmental Protection Act because they can be dealt with through some other Act of Parliament. We do not have to deal with emissions for motor vehicles because they, too, can be dealt with through some other Act of Parliament.

Pesticides and most vehicle emissions have been a major problem to the environment of Canada. If we keep excluding them from a Bill which is supposed to be protecting our environment, then we are forgetting the whole purpose of the Environmental Protection Act. We do not have one Act which is supreme when it comes to dealing with the environment.

When it came to the workplace hazardous material legislation we compromised. We said that the Government could pass the legislation and that it could exclude all these areas from having to provide information about what is dangerous in the workplace. However, we insisted upon a parliamentary review of each and every one of those exceptions within a two-year period. After a bit of bargaining the Government agreed to the compromise. This was done to make sure the Government would take some action within the next two-year period. Industries excluded from the workplace hazardous material legislation will automatically report to a committee of the House of Commons within a year from now.

This creates some motivation for industries and government Departments affected to provide protection for their workers. The compromise was very substantial and important, but we did not achieve the same type of compromise in this legislation. We have no guarantee in the Environmental Protection Bill that pesticides, motor vehicle emissions, and a number of other areas that are excluded by Bill C-74, will ever provide the protection to the environment that is needed. The very fact that the complaint procedure listed in Bill C-74 will not apply to pesticides or motor vehicle emissions means that the public does not have the same protection from environmental contaminants coming from these sources. We have no guarantee that the appropriate Act of Parliament to control pesticides, to control emissions from motor vehicles, et cetera, will ever be changed to provide similar protection for the Canadian environment and our population.

Canadian Environmental Protection Act

This is the type of perverted logic which makes people very skeptical of this legislation. We are seeing major areas of environmental pollution exempted and no indication that the Government will act in these areas in a short period of time. One must then question the sincerity of the Government. I really must question what lies behind this legislation.

• (1210)

In his final remarks the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) talked about the need for an environmental bill of rights. When we pass Bill C-74 we will be failing to meet that request of many Canadians who believe that we must have an adequate bill of rights to protect our environment. We must ensure that people who have a complaint about major polluters, or even about minor polluters, can take advantage of some due process that would see that their complaints are studied and that there is some appeal mechanism if they feel that officials or industries have ignored their concerns.

We know that this legislation can be a step in the right direction. Regulations can be drafted to protect the environment. We know that there could be adequate legislation on those excluded industries and products, but that did not happen. I see that you are signalling that my time is up, Mr. Speaker, but I find those to be the major flaws in the legislation that I really must wonder if the Government is attempting to pass legislation that looks good but, in a year or two, will not any better protect the environment.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks of the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) about the large areas of concern that have been excluded from the effect of this Bill, and I would like him to comment a little further on the process which he touched on, the process for determining by which members of the public may raise issues about the regulations.

Is it the case that through that process they may raise issues or questions or that they are excluded from raising questions about the limitations of the Bill in regard to auto emissions, in regard to pesticides, in regard to nuclear wastes, or in regard to acid rain, or is there any kind of mechanism provided by which those issues can be raised by interested members of the public through this Bill?

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, that is a very valid question. As I said, this legislation takes a number of small steps which are important. One of them is that it establishes boards of review to be created if there are petitions or if individuals are dissatisfied with some of the regulations that are put in place under the Bill. That is a step in the right direction. It does not guarantee that there will be an adequate review, but it provides a process for reviewing some of the regulations that will be put in place.

As I stated earlier, I really believe that quite often, regulations are even more important than the legislation itself. If we have weak regulations, it does not matter if the legislation is