

Dr. Leonard Hamilton, head of environmental assessment at the Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York, suggests now that acid rain may be killing 5,000 Canadians per year.

This legislation before us will make source control possible, so let us look at a few costs. The United States Environmental Protection Agency estimates the cost of a limestone scrubbing system for a new 500 megawatt power plant, which would remove 90 per cent of the sulphur from 3.5 per cent sulphur content coal, at only \$135 per kilowatt, or \$67.5 million for the entire plant. That is not exorbitantly high for the sort of protection at which we are looking.

The Canadian Environmental Law Association recently estimated that a retrofit for a similar plant would cost about 30 per cent more.

In concluding, three scenarios have been proposed by consultants to Environment Canada for existing plants, and taking this up to 1990. The "lax" scenario which would see 45 per cent reduction of sulphur dioxide would cost \$1.3 billion; the "moderate" one which would see 55 per cent reduction in sulphur dioxide would cost \$1.5 billion; and the "strict", which would reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 87 per cent, would cost some \$2 billion. In looking at it, as my hon. colleague, the member for Hillsborough has pointed out, the United States is dumping approximately five times as much long-range transported air pollution on us as we do on them, in terms of it being between four and five million tons per year coming north from the United States and about one million tons of pollutants going from Canada south. In eastern Canada about one half of the SO<sub>2</sub> deposited there is coming from the United States.

However, in giving final support and speedy approval to this bill, let us consider that it is the first step in moving toward a healthy global policy, and that the next step is that we hear from the minister an allocation of funds to clean up our "collective polluting act" in Canada. We have long awaited a response from our neighbours to the south but hope they will soon do the same.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

\* \* \*

● (1550)

## CANADA OIL AND GAS ACT

### MEASURE RESPECTING OIL AND GAS INTERESTS

The House resumed, from Thursday, December 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-48, to regulate oil and gas interests in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** When debate was interrupted, the hon. member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) had the floor. Is he prepared to continue?

### Canada Oil and Gas Act

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand that I have a little less than ten minutes.

When I was speaking earlier on this matter I was engaged in what might be described as a general castigation of the rather inane policies of the government contained in the legislation before us, but for a few minutes I would like to zero in on an area which has not really been addressed by other speakers on this bill. That area covers certain legal concerns I have about the bill.

The first is that if any prosecution is to take place under this legislation, and if any appeal from an administrative decision by the minister or one of the people he might appoint to a position of authority is taken, that appeal goes to the Federal Court of Canada. In fact, with respect to all matters under this legislation, the Federal Court of Canada is the court of competent jurisdiction. I would like to know the reason for the change because, prior to this legislation, oil and gas rights in the territories have been deeded pursuant to regulation made under the Territorial Lands Act. In that respect I believe the court of competent jurisdiction is the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories and, were an offence to be committed in Yukon, the case would be heard before the Supreme Court of the Yukon Territory. I am rather suspicious of the motives behind this change in the bill.

Why would the government want to transfer that jurisdiction from the territorial courts to the Federal Court of Canada? Why does the government want people to come down to argue cases in Toronto, when those cases should be heard in Frobisher Bay, Inuvik or Whitehorse?

**An hon. Member:** Good point.

**Mr. Nickerson:** I am glad somebody agrees with me.

I think the people of the territories should be in a position to see justice being done in these matters, and I hope that concern can be reviewed.

With respect to my second legal point, I refer to clause 57 and the ensuing clauses concerning various punishments. This is the offences and prosecutions section of the bill. If Your Honour will permit me, I would like to read clause 57(1) because this is the most important of those clauses. Clause 57(1) states the following:

Every person who contravenes or fails to comply with any provision of this act or the regulations or any final decision, declaration, determination, direction—

Whatever that means, and whoever it is who will give that direction.

—or order that applies to him under this act is guilty of an offence and is liable

(a) on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, or to both; or

(b) on conviction on indictment, to a fine not exceeding one million dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years—

Of course, again the option is for the court to impose both sanctions.

Where an offence is continued for more than one day, those fines apply with respect to every day, so in effect we are talking about a \$1 million per day fine.