

Therefore there is a necessity to ensure that by passing Motion No. 21 on page X we do pass a motion that fits into the text of the bill. Since this is not possible at the present time, it may be desirable on your part, Mr. Speaker, to suspend for a moment the discussion on Motion No. 21 and proceed perhaps with Motion No. 22 until this matter is clarified.

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): Mr. Speaker, I was just going to remind the House Motions Nos. 21, 22 and 30 have been grouped. I note the hon. member for Davenport has not yet taken an opportunity to speak on the combination of Motions Nos. 21, 22 and 30. If he were to choose to do that now, while he is addressing Motions Nos. 22 and 30 I would seek to get clarification on the point he has raised and, with the co-operation of the House, permit him to continue his remarks after I have achieved that explanation if that would be in concurrence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is agreed that I will recognize the hon. member for Davenport on debate on Motions Nos. 22 and 30?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to overburden the parliamentary secretary, but I would prefer it if he were to introduce Motions Nos. 22 and 30 and give us a brief outline of the reasons of the government. Then perhaps we may not even have to comment or people may want to comment, but a presentation on his part would facilitate the task.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I could ask him to do that. I notice that the hon. member for Skeena was rising to speak.

I will recognize the hon. parliamentary secretary on debate.

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): I rise on a matter of clarification. If you will recall, Mr. Speaker, you have grouped the three motions together. Indeed the three motions are very much interrelated and I have present an introduction of the three of them together.

That is why I was suggesting the hon. member might want to speak on Motions Nos. 22 and 30. We are indeed debating all three motions simultaneously.

Government Orders

I know my hon. friend for Skeena is quite prepared to speak to the motions themselves. Perhaps, when he has done that, I would have the clarification which the hon. member for Davenport is seeking and he then may wish to speak or not.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to keep my remarks to transboundary matters in relation to Motions Nos. 22 and 30.

The issue of environmental assessment in terms of transboundary issues and how we handle them is obviously extremely important. We have a few historic instruments to guide us. We have the International Joint Commission which has dealt principally with transboundary water and some air issues with the United States.

We face a growing body of issues. For example, when one looks at the Canadian Arctic in terms of airborne toxics, in terms of the ozone difficulties, global warming, pollution of the oceans, and the transmission of all kinds of toxics into that environment, it becomes quite clear that we require a very clear series of sections to deal with transboundary environmental effects. We also require some fairly strong and precise legislation to allow us to deal with projects taking place in other countries that might involve Canadian technology or funds or expertise, or projects that might consequentially have an impact back on to Canada.

The legislation, as we are just learning now, has some technical flaws in it which may or may not be capable of being remedied this afternoon. However, as I was noting in some correspondence I just had from the Canadian Environmental Law Association, there continue to be some chronic problems that really do need to be addressed. I would hope that the parliamentary secretary or the minister can find an opportunity to deal with these questions. Even in relation to Motions Nos. 21, 22 and 30 with which we are dealing, we come back once again whether we are talking about the mediation process or the review panel process to the whole question of enforceability.