

ment had planned to locate right in the middle of a town. The plan was to build an enormous stack, burn waste and in the process cover the community with all kinds of toxic substances. The project was cancelled because people got involved. They held public meetings, they had consultations, and they managed to make their point.

It is possible to improve the consultation and co-operation that takes place as part of an environmental assessment process. In my riding, I had problems with interprovincial transport, with trucks usually bound for Quebec, from one of Ontario's industrial areas. These trucks use the Queensway-Dalhousie-Besserer-Cumberland-King Edward corridor and cross the Macdonald-Cartier bridge on their way to deliver their goods to one of the pulp and paper mills or one of the organizations or industries on the Quebec side. The different levels of government must be able to agree on solutions for the shipment of materials and other goods that can be dangerous, toxic, et cetera. The municipal, regional, provincial and federal governments must be able to agree that we face a serious environmental problem. One accident is all it would take.

Every day in my riding, between 2,200 and 2,500 trucks use the route I just described between the Queensway and the Macdonald-Cartier Bridge right in the national capital, Ottawa. Between 2,200 and 2,500 trucks a day means that about four heavy trucks spill pollutants, make noise and are a safety hazard and they can have accidents. One unfortunate incident and people will scream murder. They will say that we were negligent.

If I understood right, this Bill C-13 gives us an opportunity to work together, to decide together, to ask the various levels of government to agree on solutions and alternatives, for example so that future generations do not have to bear the financial burden of cleaning up when we here today can take the required regulatory action to ban pollutants.

Some claim that the bill before us gives too much discretionary authority to the minister and that it even protects the government from legal challenge. To be sure, Bill C-13 will change some of the things that some governments and agencies do. It may even change the behaviour of the federal government itself, which is not above reproach on this issue.

I remember that in 1987, in this House, the Bank of Canada was found guilty of negligence in choosing an

illegal carrier to dispose of its toxic wastes. We will remember that. As a result of this negligence, the selected carrier dumped 45 gallons of paints, varsol and other solvents down a sewer on Power Road in Gloucester. As we know, this sewer is connected to the Green Creek Pollution Control Plant, which empties into the Ottawa River. The departments of Transport and Supply and Services were also accused of breaking the law by dumping toxic waste and chemicals in the Ottawa River.

Listen to what happened later. Instead of accepting the courts' verdict that the federal government was guilty, the federal government went to court claiming that the provincial law and provincial legislation in general did not apply to the federal government. That was in 1987; that was not centuries ago, but barely four or five years back.

It is important for us in the federal government not only to preach by example but also to implement environmentally friendly measures. We must regulate but also implement administrative measures to choose wisely in awarding contracts so that departments do not do things like what happened in 1987.

Similarly, Public Works Canada, an important government department, should involve my constituents so that they can express themselves and consider not only the environmental dangers but also the public welfare when it decides to do certain things like sell land. In Carson Grove, which is located in my riding, not far from here to the east, Public Works plans to sell and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation is actually selling land for housing development or other purposes without knowing what impact the future use of this land will have.

• (1630)

If Bill C-13 is passed, departments and agencies such as these will be subject to a strict screening regarding the purpose of the project and its environmental effects, if the minister so decides.

Take the Vanier Parkway, in my riding. Many people oppose a project to make it connect the Queensway to the Macdonald-Cartier bridge to ease the interprovincial traffic. For years now, twenty years for sure, this matter comes to a head at every election. Someone raised the question of whether we should extend, complete the Vanier thoroughfare. For one thing, it is a parkway, not a thoroughfare. Second, the land was sold to the regional