work—or crazy quilt—of equivalency agreements requiring an army of federal-provincial negotiators.

No wonder some have referred to this as the "Meech Laking" of the environment.

Then there is the question of auditing and monitoring. Turning to Senator Robertson again, on page 3387 of the *Senate Debates*, she stated:

> First, equivalency agreements are not fixed in stone. If an individual jurisdiction fails to adhere to the letter and the spirit of the agreement, the agreement will be cancelled with six months' notice. Federal inspectors will then be on the job to ensure full compliance with all regulations under the federal act.

In addition to negotiating these thousands of equivalency agreements, the federal government is going to audit them and monitor them and report on them once a year. It is going to do all of this with 50 person years and a budget of $5 million. That comes to five person years per province.

How will it work out, I wonder. Will two people negotiate the hundreds of equivalency agreements required for a particular province and will the remaining three monitor and audit their performance, or will four people negotiate the agreements and the fifth monitor and audit?

My point is that with Bill C-74 we are getting a morass of federal-provincial agreements that will take forever to negotiate and will be impossible to monitor or audit with the limited staff available.

While the federal government is going to devote 50 person years and $5 million towards enforcement and monitoring, the Ontario government alone is currently spending $34 million and has 619 person years devoted to the task. Realistically, we have to ask: How many new substances can the federal government hope to cope with in a year under this legislation? How many individual agreements per province and per regulation can we realistically expect to see? How is the federal government really going to audit the performance of the provinces? How, indeed, is the federal government going to audit its own performance?

Turning to the question of the rights of citizens, on May 17 Senator Robertson commented on the desirability of an environmental bill of rights. Quite correctly, she noted that this bill permits any citizen to file a request in writing with the minister to add a substance to the priority substances list and that any two Canadians can petition the minister to investigate alleged infractions. But she did not mention that under Bill C-74 the Minister of the Environment is the only person in Canada able to apply to a court for an injunction to prevent or stop a potential violation of the bill.

Clause 135 of the bill reads:

> Where, on the application of the Minister, it appears to a court of competent jurisdiction that a person has done or is about to do or is likely to do any act or thing constituting or directed toward the commission of an offence under this Act, the court may issue an injunction ordering any person named in the application
>
> (*a*) to refrain from doing any act or thing that it appears to the court may constitute or be directed toward the commission of an offence under this Act; or
>
> (*b*) to do any act or thing that it appears to the court may prevent the commission of an offence under this Act.

On November 25, 1987, the minister, speaking for the legislative committee in the other place, said:

> I think it is terribly important that some of the enforcement clout of a bill involve the citizen.

If this were the case, and if any citizen were allowed to seek an injunction, we would, in fact, have a significant element in an environmental bill of rights. I believe that clause 135 of the bill should be changed accordingly. If we really believe that every citizen should be concerned about the environment, it seems only appropriate that any citizen should have the ability to seek an injunction to prevent an infraction before it occurs.

In conclusion, I should like to quote once again from Senator Robertson's speech on page 3387 of the *Debates of the Senate*, where she says:

> The Canadian environment is no longer pristine. Arctic haze hangs over the vast tundra regions and acid rain is killing our lakes and threatening our forests. Industrial pollution has spoiled our major rivers and is impairing water quality. Unenlightened agricultural practices are depleting and eroding valuable farmlands, and wildlife is in retreat as vital habitats are destroyed.

Unfortunately, the new elements of Bill C-74 do nothing to clean up any of these problems. Bill C-74 is a slow and cumbersome process of classifying and handling new toxic materials and it constitutes a very modest step in environmental regulation. I believe that the minister himself has come to realize this. Senators will recall that in December of 1986 he referred to CEPA as "the toughest pollution legislation in the western hemisphere." Then, on April 9, 1987, he said:

> Let us make the Environmental Protection Act as strong as we can now, while acknowledging our limitations and those imposed on us by a system that is far from ideal.

Finally, at a press conference in June of 1987 he referred to it modestly as "a first step toward cleaning up the environment."

Honourable senators, there are many other questions that a committee of this chamber will want to examine in relation to Bill C-74. They are too numerous to go into here, but, in particular, I would like to draw to the attention of senators the concern of the Cree Band from northern Quebec as it relates to their category 1A lands. I wish to serve notice that I will be providing to the committee that deals with this legislation a copy of their brief.

**Hon. Brenda M. Robertson:** Honourable senators—

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I wish to inform the Senate that, if Senator Robertson speaks now, her