

Government Orders

It does not talk about import. It merely talks about exporting whereas the old statute talked about the exporting and the importing of toxic substances or hazardous waste.

It is interesting to note that in other sections of the new bill it refers to the export and import of a hazardous waste under section 43, but for that clause 37(2) it only talks about the export of toxic waste and not the import of toxic waste.

Again I bring that to the attention of the parliamentary secretary, who I am sure when reading the full contents of the bill tonight and which the House leader of the New Democratic Party has read each and every sentence of, he might want to reflect upon my comments and see whether or not it could be changed accordingly.

Madam Speaker, I have to be very candid. I have not studied this statute from cover to cover. These are some of the things I have found to be somewhat glaring and want to bring to your attention. I am sure the Speaker would want me to do that.

Under the Immigration Act, I wish to point out that again there is a change. The relevant portions of section 46.01 states that a person who claims to be a convention refugee is not eligible to have the claim determined by a refugee division if the case of the claimant who is the subject of an inquiry caused pursuant to section 23(4)(a) if the claimant came to Canada from a country other than a country of the claimant's nationality.

Well, they have changed that. They now say "persons of which the claimant is a member would be given a lawful authority to be in".

For those of us who are not concerned with the technicalities of certain legislation it may not mean all that much to us. For those who are administering the act, I suggest that is a departure of some magnitude that I believe is worthy of our examination and review.

There are a number of other things I have seen that could perhaps be better drafted or that I would suggest might be better drafted but I am not going to bore the Chamber with my interpretations of how these technical amendments ought to be written.

If there is unanimous consent, I might want to proceed if I was asked to in a friendly way.

Let me just bring one more item to your attention. In the maritimes where I come from there is a word that I do not know if it is used in Ontario or Quebec called "sneaky". I am not suggesting that the government is sneaky. These are technical amendments and I do not think the Prime Minister, when he was in Paris, London and Brussels and all over the world has been reading. There is a little section in here that refers to the Labour Adjustments Benefits Act, section 92.

When I was flipping through this, I thought to myself, there was an election in 1988, almost three years ago and I thought I heard somebody promise during the election campaign that there would be adjustment policies for Canadian workers wherever they may reside in this great country. That was promised not once, not twice, by every member who sits in the federal cabinet and everyone who supported the free trade agreement as put forward by the government. What does this amendment say? Does it provide that they are going to set up a new fund? It does not do that. It says:

92. Subsection 29(2) of the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(2) Subsections 94(13) to (21) of the Unemployment Insurance Act apply, with such modifications as the circumstances require, in respect of the administration and enforcement of this Act.

• (1450)

An hon. member: Sneaky.

Mr. Dingwall: Madam Speaker, I do not want to use that word but I have to tell you that people outside this Chamber are saying it. That is what they are saying, that the government once again is being sneaky.

I do not want to recount for members who are in the Chamber today or for those who may be viewing on television, and I am sure that they are probably not large numbers, but less than four years ago this government opposite campaigned on major labour adjustment programs for Canadians. We have seen in this country, in the province of Ontario alone, thousands of jobs which have gone down the drain as a result of the policies of this government as they relate to trade in the free trade agreement.