

### *Transportation of Dangerous Goods*

addressed by that consulting firm and referred to the appropriate committee of this House. I believe it should be the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. Then we would have the opportunity to address ourselves to some of the concerns which have been quite correctly raised by the hon. member.

It seems to us that that is the appropriate method to deal with this difficulty and that it would be dangerous to pass this present provision which, as we have indicated, could lead us in a direction where we do not know where we are going.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has expired. I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

● (2000)

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### TRANSPORTATION OF DANGEROUS GOODS ACT

#### MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport)** moved that Bill C-25, to promote public safety in the transportation of dangerous goods, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and honoured tonight to have the opportunity to introduce the second reading debate on Bill C-25, an act to promote public safety in the transportation of dangerous goods.

In introducing this bill it seems to me I would be remiss if I did not make some reference to the recent derailment of a train in Mississauga carrying flammable and toxic substances on the Remembrance Day weekend, and also to the obvious role of the provinces in connection with this very unfortunate event. However, I think that for a variety of reasons it must be made clear that this bill is not being presented tonight as a reaction to that disaster.

When I first considered how the accident would affect this legislation and my presentation of it, I thought that in addition to reviewing the draft of the act, I might be faced with the task of rewriting the speech which had been prepared in readiness for this debate, to take into account the numerous questions that had been raised following the Mississauga incident, not only in the House but by the media, by the citizens of

[Mr. Berger.]

Mississauga and the surrounding district, and the fallout that arises as a result of such a disaster.

After considering these elements carefully and, on reflection, I decided to say almost exactly what I had intended to say at the outset when the bill would have been introduced in the normal manner if a disaster had not occurred. To do otherwise, in my view, would be misleading in a way that could only serve in the long run to undermine the care and expertise that have gone into the preparation of this legislative measure.

I must reiterate that a tremendous amount of work has gone into this legislation, having regard to the ramifications of federal and provincial jurisdictions and the importance of attempting to define a piece of legislation with accompanying regulations that are workable and enforceable.

To appear to be introducing emergency measures in haste after a near catastrophe would be to detract from the fact that Bill C-25 has been discussed and negotiated with the provinces, dissected by industry, and drafted and redrafted over a period of several years. It might equally detract from the fact that the bill has always been on the government's list of priorities for legislative action. In saying this, I do not suggest that the questions which have been raised by the derailment at Mississauga have not been valid ones. Indeed, I want to commend all hon. members of the House, and particularly my good friend, the hon. member for Stormont-Dundas (Mr. Lumley), who has pursued this particular issue with a great amount of vigour. His questions have been sincere; I know that he has pursued this issue with sincerity and has gained the respect which I know he commands from all sides of the House. In that connection I am sure he will be glad to know that today the CTC has introduced an interim safety measure, an order requiring that railways separate tank cars of flammable compressed gases from those containing toxic gases. The order provides for a buffer of at least five general freight cars, or about 250 feet, which would now be required between the dangerous commodities.

● (2010)

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mazankowski:** I am pleased that the CTC has seen fit to issue that interim order. I know my friends across the way and my colleagues on this side of the House are fully in support of the measure which has been taken.

As well, I might add that I am satisfied the bill with which we are dealing this evening responds to many of the concerns expressed by the provinces and the industry. I can assure hon. members that as far as the provinces are concerned—and I am sure as far as industry is concerned—this bill will have their full support.

It was as long ago as 1973 that the need for legislation governing the transportation of dangerous goods was recognized by the federal government. At that time the minister of transport was the Hon. Jean Marchand. I had occasion to see him in the corridor earlier this evening. I indicated to him that some of the pioneer work he had undertaken at that time, in