

the clause that would put the onus on the polluters to pay for what they did to the environment.

At least he should try to reinstate clauses that he recognizes are important. I suggest that if he allows this Bill to pass in its present form his credibility as a Minister and his Government's record are clearly on the line.

Ms. McLaughlin: Mr. Speaker, my comment particularly concerns the question of a national standard. That is an extremely important concern that has not been at all strengthened in the legislation, even after the committee review process.

Originally, Clause 37(4) included consultation with provinces and territories. Certainly as one who has spoken often on the need for consultation with the territories and provinces, I do not now speak against that. However, I support my hon. friend in his assertion that there is a need for a national standard because pollutants and pollution do not know provincial and territorial boundaries. There must be at least a minimum national standard in which Canadians can feel confidence if they happen to live in an area where pollution may be occurring.

The Brundtland Commission report, *Our Common Future*, certainly had a great impact on Canadian thinking. It received great support from the Government and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan). I want to quote the following brief sentence from that report: "National governments should establish clear environmental goals and enforce environmental laws, regulations, incentives and standards on industrial enterprises. This should normally be done at the national level with local governments being empowered to exceed but not to lower national norms".

That is what we are saying about this Bill. The new Clause 33, which addressed this issue of consultation, and the inclusion of Clause 6 concerning the federal-provincial advisory committee not only do not enact a national standard, but even more strongly turn it over to the advisory committee. I would like to ask my colleague what his comments are, since the Minister gave such favourable responses in this House to the Brundtland Commission report, which did just what my colleague has suggested by stating there must be national standards which at least advocate a minimum standard.

● (1640)

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question and comments of the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin) who, obviously, because of the region she has the honour of representing, is perhaps as sensitive, if not more sensitive, to environmental concerns, than other Members of Parliament. She is quite correct when she says environmental hazards, pollution and acid rain know no political provincial boundaries. In fact, they know no national boundaries. That is why the opposition Parties, both the New Democratic Party and the

Canadian Environmental Protection Act

Liberal Party, were obviously pushing for more from this administration *vis-à-vis* its good friend the President of the United States. We have to try to clean up our environment from our own perspective, but we also have to begin to educate President Reagan that 50 per cent of the pollution, if not more, and the sulphur emissions with respect to acid rain, come across our borders from the United States of America. Therefore, the Hon. Member's comment about knowing no boundaries is very apropos.

On the question of the Brundtland Commission, I completely concur with my hon. friend that the Brundtland Commission report enjoyed a very positive and enthusiastic reception. Indeed, I had the opportunity of being in the forum of the United Nations when Madam Brundtland tabled her report before the United Nations and, in fact, before the world. There was a tremendously spontaneous and enthusiastic support and reception from various Ministers who were in attendance on this very auspicious day in New York. Perhaps that day heralded a new era *vis-à-vis* the concern about our environment by the international community.

On the question of national standards, I am saddened by the equivalency provisions adopted by the Minister, for example, the ability of the provincial Government to be consulted as a mandatory step before the federal Government can take action. I believe we have weakened the spirit of the Brundtland Commission report, which is to try to have an international code of environmental ethics. When we talk about our own backyard, that is what we are talking about. We are saying we should have a national standard, an ethical definition of what it means to protect our environment.

I believe we cannot simply have a part of the region, or one province, more progressive on environmental concerns than another province. I have a stake in this country. I own the Rockies just as British Columbians own the Rockies. British Columbians own Algonquin Park, just as much as Ontarians do. Therefore, if we accept that we are 25 million shareholders in this one beautiful country, you can see it is in the interests of all of us to have one standard that protects the environment in all regions of the country.

It should be our duty not only as legislators, but as citizens, to protect the environment wherever we live. It is simply unconscionable that I would say I am glad I live in the Province of Ontario where we protect our environment and I really do not care about the Provinces of British Columbia or Saskatchewan. We cannot take that attitude. We have to believe there is one environment, that it is our country, and there should be one law that guides our environmental standards. This Bill does not provide that mechanism. I would hope that the Minister recognizes that because even though the Bill is at third reading, it is still not too late to change it for the better in a way that will protect and nurture environmental protection laws for years to come.