

Canadian Environmental Protection Act

me inform my colleague that one of those nuclear submarines will pay for it. Why are their priorities so skewed that they will place greater priority on a nuclear submarine than on clean air and clean water? Who do we think they are?

Mr. King: We live in a real world.

Mr. Benjamin: We have no right to give greater priority to a nuclear submarine than to clean air and clean water. I ask my hon. friend to get up and say who he thinks he is, with that kind of priority. Where has he been? He sounds like the Tory of the 1930s and 1880s: "Where are you going to get the money?"

Mr. King: I didn't ask that. That is your question.

Mr. James: Where were you on property rights the other day?

Mr. Benjamin: My hon. friend's property is not worth a damn when it's being polluted with acid rain. It is not worth a darn when the land is no longer any good and the forests are gone. It is in his best interests to make sure that his property is safe and preserved through national environmental laws and standards that achieve what must be done before the end of this century.

Ms. Dewar: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member talks vehemently and passionately about the environment. Yet we hear questions about where we will get the money.

I want to ask him a question about his own province. When talking about generating the necessary power that we need in society, particularly in industrialized areas, the Hon. Member says that it can be provided by non-polluting, low sulphur coal from Saskatchewan. Is this not something that would generate the economy not only in Saskatchewan but in central Canada and the West? While we are trying to protect our environment, we should also try to provide economic development. Has the Hon. Member considered the implications of developing the low sulphur coal in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question. Many of those huge machines that dig coal in Saskatchewan are made in central Canada. If Ontario Hydro used the lignite coal from Saskatchewan, we would probably require another 12 machines. These are monstrous machines that will lift 25 to 50 tonne loads in one scoop.

Furthermore, if they began using low sulphur coal in central Canada for hydro generation and other industrial uses, I suspect that Stelco and Algoma could convert some of their remaining coal-fired furnaces. That would reduce the acid rain fall-out from Canada, which would reduce the amount of money that must be spent by Ontario and the federal Government to clean up the air. That is an example of the multiplier effect.

It creates employment not only in the coal mining industry but in manufacturing and transportation. Of course, there would have to be some conversion of power plants in Ontario back to low sulphur coal.

Incidentally, the use of low sulphur coal would result in less money being spent on scrubbers. The cost of installing the latest technology in plants using high sulphur coal is substantially higher, which Ontario Hydro, hydro users and the Ontario Government will have to pay.

It seems to make sound business sense, sound economic sense, and sound environmental sense. I am amused when socialists have to tell those Tories about sound business practice. I would not let them manage a chicken coop when it comes to environmental matters.

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, I want to change the area of discussion somewhat. One of the weaknesses of the Bill is that it exempts the Pest Control Act from the new environmental protection law. That concerns us on the Prairies because it has the effect of completely neutering the control of agricultural chemicals in the food supply.

Researchers have concluded that 86 per cent of non-occupational exposure comes from food, 11 per cent from drinking water and 3 per cent from air. This legislation does not take into consideration the whole question of how chemicals get into the food chain and cause problems.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I call it six o'clock, may I note that the Hon. Member will have four minutes remaining for questions and comments when debate resumes on Bill C-74.

It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.