

anomalous that federal jurisdiction should be limited by a legal requirement of provincial consultation in areas of clear federal jurisdiction.

The centre also states that for similar reasons it expresses serious reservations about amendments which require consultation not only with the federal-provincial advisory committee prior to the making of federal regulations but also an opportunity to render its advice. Apart from the delay factor involved, this requirement again imposes a degree of provincial control over the federal law-making power which appears most inappropriate. The provincial advisory committee should be established in its more appropriate advisory role.

As a final comment in this matter, the Environmental Law Centre queries why the requirements of legally entrenching federal-provincial co-operation are being proposed only for federal laws for the protection of the environment. If the true objective is to avoid unnecessary duplication and to embellish a co-operative approach in regulation-making, then similar provisions should, as a matter of course, be included in all provincial laws. I think it made a very good point on that. One wonders why the Government did not take such a significant brief into consideration when we were proposing amendments at the time of the committee hearings.

• (1300)

We have argued many times in favour of a high degree of federal-provincial consultation. However, to have legally binding provincial power over the federal Government in areas of federal jurisdiction, we feel lends an aura of deference to provincial authority that is far too excessive in the field of regulatory control. One wonders if this is indicative of the Conservative penchant for deregulation entirely, and perhaps this is a way of getting not national standards on the environment but a highly deregulated regime across the country.

I had hoped to go on, but owing to another engagement, which I believe that you perhaps also have, Mr. Speaker, I will not be able to go on any further.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is as follows. Mr. McMillan moved that Bill C-74, an Act respecting the protection of the environment and of human life and health, be now read a third time and passed, and on the motion of Mr. Hawkes:

That this question be now put.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

S. O. 21

Ms. Jewett: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion (Mr. Hawkes) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being after one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1.03 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

CHLOROFUOROCARBONS—USE IN MILK AND MEAT CARTONS

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, Allied Signal and Du Pont Canada are the only producers of chlorofluorocarbons in Canada. These are chemicals used in refrigerators, air conditioners, some aerosol sprays, foam products, and electronics.

CFCs released into the atmosphere contribute to the depletion of the ozone layer and the greenhouse effect, increasing the incidence of skin cancer. Friends of the Earth approached grocery chains urging an end to the use of egg cartons and vegetable and meat trays made with CFCs. So far, Provigo of Montreal is the only chain committed to phasing out such products. For refrigerators and air conditioners, Du Pont and Allied are considering a new compound called HFC-134A.

While all this goes on, the Government of Canada remains silent, offering Canadian consumers no leadership on this important matter. Yet it is urgent that Canadians realize how vital it is to stop purchasing and using products containing CFCs. A rejection of such products by consumers would tell manufacturers and retailers that the public wants harmless alternatives. Chlorofluorocarbons has become a bad word.