

*Canadian Environmental Protection Act*

On the other hand, the Bill prohibits the export of substances that are prohibited for use in Canada, or rather it does not prevent their export—it would prevent the use of those substances, and that is good. But it would not prevent us from exporting them. Morally, that is a major omission. If those substances are too dangerous to be used in Canada, why allow manufacturers or distributors to export them either to Third World countries or to our neighbours down South, the Americans, to punish them because we are not satisfied with the free trade negotiations? That flaw in the legislations I find amazing, because if those substances are too dangerous and must not be used in Canada, we should also ban their export in my view. If it is not good for us, it is not good for the others either.

[English]

I do not want to drag this debate out too long. This Bill has to be passed quickly. In conclusion, let us call a spade a spade. This Bill deals well with a narrow aspect of pollution. Let us vote for it because it does that. However, let us not start pretending that it will clean up the environment, because it will not. In the long run it will control polluters better so that we will have less pollution from toxic chemicals, and that is good.

Let us pass this Bill quickly so that we can be back on our feet in this House pressing the Government for a genuine Environmental Protection Act and for the money which must accompany it in order to start removing some of the pollutants from our environment. That is the reason we will not be dragging our feet with this Bill. We wish it a speedy passage through this House so that we can see what the Government will be bringing in as the second piece of environmental legislation during this term.

• (1240)

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my hon. friend with respect to this Bill and its speedy passage. I was concerned, however, that he may have left the impression—and I am sure he did not really want to leave that impression—that this was the only action with respect to the environment the Government has taken in the past three years it has been in office. There is no question but that this legislation deals only with one aspect of environmental problems. It deals with the present and future. It does not deal with the clean-up aspect. However, my hon. friend is well aware that there have been other actions taken by the Government in the past three years with respect to the clean-up aspect of environmental problems. I know he would not want the public to be left with the wrong impression.

For instance, I know the Hon. Member would want me to remind him, and the public of Canada, about the program the Government undertook starting in March of 1985, a program to reduce acid rain by 50 per cent of its 1980 levels by 1994. That program included, as you know, Mr. Speaker, a commitment of funds—\$150 million for emission controls at smelters, \$25 million for technology development, \$70 million for a cleaner use of coal, \$18 million per year for research and

monitoring efforts, and an effort to increase the use of low-sulphur western coal. My hon. friend knows that there are discussions presently going on between the Premier of the Province of Ontario (Mr. Peterson), the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), and their representatives, with respect to increasing the immediate use of low-sulphur western coal in the Province of Ontario, particularly for Ontario Hydro, which will generate thousands of jobs in western Canada as well as in eastern Canada and at the same time cut acid rain emissions.

Those are some of the things which have been going on. The Hon. Member knows as well that on September 1 of this year, just a few days ago, new automobile emissions standards were put into effect to reduce acid rain emissions. He knows as well that last spring there was an agreement reached between the federal Government and the Province of Ontario, the Government of the State of New York and the American federal Government with respect to the reduction of pollution and toxic chemicals going into the Niagara River and the monitoring of it. He knows as well that the Government has put in place during its term of office new regulations to restrict and regulate the transportation of dangerous goods by rail.

The Hon. Member is well aware, therefore, as are the Canadian public, that there have been a good many other initiatives taken in the area of the environment and environmental control by this Government. I know he would want to give the Government credit for those things.

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, the litany of things listed by the Hon. Member again are not measures which would clean up anything. I am not against, for example, all the measures on acid rain which were started before 1984 by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), a previous Minister of the Environment. I agree with the figures mentioned by the Hon. Member. I think they square with reality. This will reduce future emissions of acid rain. That is fine. But that is not the point I was making.

The point I was making is that there is nothing in this Bill, and nothing in the measures which have been taken by the Government so far, that clean up the environment. It is good to bring in measures so that there will be less future emissions, but that does not remove the blob in the St. Clair River. It does not solve my problem of not being able to swim in the St. Lawrence River which borders my riding. Canadians want these contaminants in the environment removed and the Government has done absolutely nothing in that respect.

The measures mentioned by my colleague, the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway), are all measures that deal with future contaminants in that they will be better controlled. That is good. I am not saying we should not do that. I think we should do more of it. I think we should increase, for example, our pressure on the Americans, because so far all this Government has been able to accomplish is a recognition by the President of the United States that the problem is there. That is not much. Having regard to one