



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 232 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, May 27, 1999**

---

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

All parliamentary publications are available on the  
“Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire” at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, May 27, 1999

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1005)

[*English*]

## POINTS OF ORDER

### ESTIMATES

**The Speaker:** I have notice of a point of order that I want to take before we go into Routine Proceedings. Normally I would hear it under motions, but I will hear it as a point of order.

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. My colleagues and I consider this to be an important matter regarding adjudication by the Chair.

This morning's notice paper contains a notice which I gave yesterday pursuant to Standing Order 81(4) to extend consideration of the estimates of the Department of Human Resources Development beyond the normal date of expiration.

Normally the Leader of the Opposition would give such a notice and tomorrow it would be deemed adopted by the House. However, the Leader of the Opposition has neglected his obligation to use all means to hold the government to account by giving to all members of the House an opportunity to pose questions of the government with respect to billions of dollars of expenditures for authorization.

• (1010)

In the instance of the employment insurance program there are significant issues which I know all members of my party, and I suspect all members of the House, would like to be given the opportunity to address. I know there is no direct precedence in this matter to guide you, Mr. Speaker.

I readily acknowledge that the standing order specifically names the Leader of the Opposition as the member who is entitled to give this notice. However, the closest analogous situation may be found in the the citation 924 at page 257 of Beauchesne's sixth edition. In the case of a conflict among the opposition leaders over the use of an allotted day the Speaker has intervened where there is a breakdown of the informal House leadership machinery.

I believe some analogous precedent can be drawn here. In this instance the failure of the opposition and the Leader of the Opposition places every member of the House at a disadvantage. All of us on both sides of the House have operated under the assumption that this debate of the estimates would continue, at least for this one department, past the May 31 deadline because of the expectation that the Leader of the Opposition would move his motion under Standing Order 81(4).

There are urgent questions which all members want answered with respect to the granting of supply in the Department of Human Resources Development. I humbly submit we should not be denied this opportunity, simply because the Leader of the Opposition has failed in his duty to have the entire House given this opportunity.

The Leader of the Opposition was not prepared to let the House of Commons do its work in this important area. This party is prepared and we are asking, Mr. Speaker, that you grant this discretion. Given the abrogation of the responsibility to the whole House by the Leader of the Opposition, I ask that you permit this party and myself as House leader of this party to give this notice which would be considered under Standing Order 84(4) of the standing orders.

I submit that it is within your discretion, Mr. Speaker, to transfer that power which is normally reserved solely for the Leader of the Opposition to another opposition party which has gone through the normal procedures that would be followed in this matter. We have made the effort to do that and to follow the precedent and procedure that are set. I would ask that the Chair to adjudicate on this matter and I thank the Chair for its indulgence.

**Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I was not really prepared for this point of order, but in terms of the statements by the leader of the fifth party of the House all I can say with respect to Standing Order 81(4) is that it is in the opinion of the House leader for the Conservative Party.

*Routine Proceedings*

What the Speaker has heard this morning is politics and just politics. I would caution the Speaker that what we could be looking at is that every pet project of every opposition party in the House could suddenly become subject to challenge under this section.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that Standing Order 81(4)(a) says that the Leader of the Opposition may give notice. Given that this is optional and the Leader of the Opposition may give notice, it could also be that he may not give notice.

One is a direct corollary of the other. This is not rocket science. It is easy for anyone to understand that if it is optional to do something, it is equally optional not to do the precise thing in question, in this case giving notice to extend the consideration of the estimates.

Perhaps it is the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition that the estimates are just fine the way they are and he wholeheartedly supports them. We will find that out on June 9 when we get to that stage. Meanwhile it is strictly optional on the part of the Leader of the Opposition to do whatever he or she likes with regard to proposing or not proposing such an extension. He is fully within his right to do or not to do just that.

• (1015)

By extension, it has been alleged that because the Speaker has discretionary authority on the determination of which party will have the use of an opposition day during the supply cycle, in the event of a dispute that provides authority for the Speaker to intervene in this case.

There are a number of differences. First, in the case of supply, authority is invested with the Speaker to make the determination. In the case of Standing Order No. 81(4)(a), there is not the discretionary power granted to the Chair. The standing order is quite clear. I do not believe it was ever the intent of the standing order to make it such that the Speaker could overrule the standing order. The speaker obviously interprets the standing order and always does so in a very judicious and excellent manner. However, this is a different proposition altogether.

Members may have legitimate grievances, but there are three supply days left in this cycle. I am sure that during those supply days we will have the opportunity to listen to the grievances of the people as expressed through the normal supply cycle process.

Finally, of course, the government is accountable every day at question period and always provides excellent answers to both the hon. member across and all of his colleagues.

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, I find this to be a serious point. With your indulgence, I would like to inform myself more. I am aware of the standing order as pointed out by all three parties that have intervened in this.

I just want to look a little further at the citation the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough takes from Beauchesne's

sixth edition. I am going to reserve judgment and I will come back to the House and make a decision on this.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to four petitions.

\* \* \*

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the annual report of the Chief of the Defence Staff for 1998-99, entitled "Into the New Millennium".

\* \* \*

### AUTOMOTIVE POLLUTION REDUCTION ACT

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-514, an act to protect human health and the environment by reducing automotive pollution.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table a bill aimed at protecting human health and the environment by reducing automotive pollution. This bill is governed by the precautionary principle according to which the lack of scientific certainty must not be used as a reason to delay appropriate measures if there is a risk of serious or irreparable harm to human health or the environment.

• (1020)

[English]

The bill will prohibit the production or import for use or sale in Canada, or offer for sale in Canada, of any gasoline that has an oxygen content of less than 2.7% by weight or any diesel fuel that has an oxygen content of less than 5.25% by weight, or any gasoline that contains the additive MMT. This would take effect on July 1, 2003.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

## PETITIONS

### PESTICIDES

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by 26 citizens of my riding which reads as follows: "We, the undersigned residents of Canada, call upon" —

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It is out of order for the hon. member to read petitions to the House. In compliance with the rules, he may give a brief summary of the petition. I would invite him to do that rather than read the petition which, as he knows, is contrary to the rules.

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln:** Mr. Speaker, this petition calls upon parliament to enact an immediate moratorium on the cosmetic use of chemical pesticides until such time as their use has been scientifically proven to be safe and the long term consequences of the applications are known.

[Translation]

### HOUSING IN NUNAVIK

**Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the Inuit community of Kangiqsualujuaq, in Nunavik.

According to the petitioners, from 16 to 24 people live in three bedroom housing units during the winter. The Inuit find housing arrangements in Nunavik to be extremely disturbing. The situation is deemed to be absolutely intolerable. It contributes to the high incidence of tuberculosis, infectious diseases and social problems.

The federal government must fulfil its obligations under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement regarding housing in Nunavik.

[English]

### KOSOVO

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of a number of my constituents expressing concern about Canada's continued role in the NATO bombing of Kosovo and asking the government to reconsider its policy.

### MARRIAGE

**Mr. Cliff Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present a petition on behalf of Canadian citizens living in my home town of Onoway.

These petitioners pray that parliament preserve the institution of marriage as it has always been known and understood in Canada. I agree with the petitioners.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I know the hon. member knows the rules demand that he not express his support or opposition to a petition

## Routine Proceedings

he presents but to merely present the petition. I know he will want to comply with the rules in that regard.

### ANIMAL RIGHTS

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from citizens of Peterborough concerned about cruelty to animals.

The petitioners point out that there is mounting evidence of a link between animal abuse and domestic violence and violence against people in general, and that the Criminal Code regards animals as property and offences against them are little more than property offences.

The petitioners call upon parliament to work toward swift and effective action to modernize Canada's laws dealing with crimes against animals and that the penalties for such actions be made strict enough to act as a deterrent against such behaviour.

### IRAQ

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from citizens of Peterborough who point out that the people of Iraq have suffered untold hardship in the wake of the gulf war, and that far from helping to destroy the repressive government of Saddam Hussein, these actions, including the sanctions, have actually strengthened that regime and destroyed any useful opposition to it.

The petitioners call upon parliament to strongly appeal to the United Nations, the United States and Britain for a rejection of any further military action against Iraq, and call for a serious attempt at peace negotiations with Iraq and its neighbours. In order to build a stable and sustainable society in Iraq, that excluding an embargo on military materials, all other sanctions be lifted.

The petitioners urge that Canada vastly increase its efforts to provide food, medicine and infrastructure support in Iraq.

\* \* \*

• (1025)

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 159 could be made an order for return, the return would be tabled immediately.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 159—**Mrs. Michelle Dockrill:**

What is the total direct federal government funding to organizations and projects in the Nova Scotia Regional Municipalities of Cape Breton, the Town of Port Hawkesbury, and the counties of Inverness, Richmond, and Victoria?

*Government Orders*

Return tabled.

[English]

**Mr. Peter Adams:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999

The House resumed from May 12 consideration of Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 1.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I wish to inform the House that there have been some changes to the voting pattern for the report stage of Bill C-32. The details concerning these changes are available at the table.

[Translation]

I also want to point out that Motion No. 216, which was included in Group No. 5, has been transferred to Group No. 2 for the purpose of the debate.

[English]

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the continuation of the debate today on Bill C-32.

I want to begin by saying what it is that we are discussing here in the House of Commons today. The background to Bill C-32, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, is an act respecting pollution and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development. It is a reintroduction of Bill C-74 which died with the dissolution of parliament prior to the June 1997 federal election. It consists of some 12 parts and 8 divisions with a total of 353 clauses that include regulations on such things as toxic substances, exports and imports of hazardous waste, biotechnology, ocean dumping, vehicle emissions, fuels and fuel additives, international air pollution, enforcement and other environmentally related matters.

It is also noteworthy to tell the House and others that Bill C-32 underwent one of the lengthiest reviews in recent parliamentary

history setting several records. The committee, chaired by the hon. member for Davenport, held some 59 meetings, 37 of which were on clause by clause review. More than 560 amendments were drafted for consideration, exceeding some other bills. In terms of our particular party and the member for Churchill River, the New Democratic Party submitted over 100 amendments at committee.

The committee determined that the health and environmental association of the bill was too weak. It accepted the notion that there was a pro-industry bias to require little action to act for environmental protection. The underlying theme was a complete devolution of the powers of the environment minister to any other federal department or government jurisdiction.

The committee review presented an interesting dynamic. The New Democratic Party, the Conservatives, the Bloc and several Liberal members pursued a mandate to improve environmental protection. The Reform support for the Liberal government agenda carried the majority of close votes on proposed amendments.

The bill, as amended by committee and referred to the House, is supportable. Although not perfect, there have been additions to ensure that the precautionary principle provides the basis for environmental protection and that the environment minister's ability to act to protect the environment and human health is retained. However, the NDP has very serious concerns that the government's report stage amendments could reverse committee improvements that strengthen Bill C-32.

I am aware that we are on Group No. 1 amendments. I will now turn to those and quickly outline the New Democratic Party's concerns in that area.

Group No. 1 removes the phase-out of the worst of toxic substances. It removes the achievement of virtual elimination. It weakens the committee effort to strengthen precautionary principle with government efforts to return cost effective restriction before taking protective measures.

We support Motions Nos. 26 and 83 which recognize precautionary principle to be added for legal clarity. We moved Motion No. 61 for improved inherent toxicity interpretation which removes restrictions to amounts or quantities.

• (1030)

The NDP supports the principles of pollution prevention and polluter pays. We recognize the balance between the environment and the economy, in other words sustainable development. We think that it can be a difficult task. We are not against industry. We are against polluters who place our environment and our human health at risk.

The links between chemical exposures and human health are proven beyond a shadow of a doubt. The links between the contamination of the environment and the damage and degradation to Canada's biodiversity, including wildlife, are proven.

The Great Lakes, an area, Mr. Speaker, that I know you grew up on the shores of and so did I, became one of this planet's infamous laboratories in this regard. We remember only too well the near loss of eagles from damaged eggs, the near loss of the ability to reproduce. Mothers depended on fish from these lakes and passed the contamination on to their children and it will be passed on to their children. It is not anyone's fault; it is the fault of the previous unknown, the unproven.

In the far north, mothers in Canada's arctic have PCBs and a variety of chemicals contained in their breast milk. Another generation faces known consequences, including learning disabilities, shortened attention spans and an increase in behavioural problems. Again, it is not their fault. It is the fault of industrial practices from this century carried by the winds and waters for thousands of miles. It is the environment that is contaminated.

Wildlife studies demonstrate these effects are passed between generations. The adverse impacts continue throughout the next offspring, the next and the next.

The fault lies with those polluters who allowed and continue to allow the poisoning of our environment that supports life, including humans as a species. The fault lies with the manufacturers of these chemicals that poison our shared environment. It is a disgrace that there are toxic manufacturers that continue to make and ship those poisons to countries without laws or protections against the criminals.

The fault also lies with legislators, those elected representatives, politicians who could have acted and should have acted to protect their fellow citizens, the environment, the fate and the future of their children and tomorrow's children. The fault lies with those parliamentarians who ignore history, ignore the facts, ignore the science, and avoid the leadership and vision to protect the common good and our children.

On the Group No. 1 amendments specifically, I draw attention to a series of motions proposed therein that will continue to poison our environment and our lives. The House Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development went through one of the most comprehensive legislative reviews in Canada's history.

We believe that the amended legislation can protect the environment and give the dedicated scientists and citizens who wish to protect our environment and human health the tools to do the job.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

**The Deputy Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the proceedings but I think we will have to suspend the sitting for a few moments. The bells will ring to summon members back to the Chamber.

*Government Orders*

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 10.33 a.m.)

• (1050)

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 10.51 a.m.

**Mr. Dick Proctor:** Mr. Speaker, I will wrap up my speech on the Group No. 1 amendments to the CEPA legislation. The New Democratic Party supports Bill C-32 as amended by the committee. We believe the amended legislation can protect the environment and give the dedicated scientists and citizens who wish to protect our environment and human health the tools to do that job.

However, a series of motions in this group removes the phase-out of the worst toxic substances. In the opinion of the NDP, Motions Nos. 1 and 2 set the stage for the Reform Party and the Liberal cabinet to appease their polluter friends and remove the need to phase-out the most persistent and bioaccumulative substances. We have to ask about the guiding principle.

Why do we not recognize that we must remove these toxic threats which continue to poison Canadians and our environment? The Reform Party and the Liberal cabinet only seem to be interested to "virtually eliminate" these substances, but the toxics will still be manufactured and used. They will still be emitted into the environment. There is still the threat of a spill or an accident and these are the most persistent and insidious chemicals that we know of.

The industry said when we were attempting to remove lead from gasoline that it would be a crisis. We were able to do that. There are a number of other things that we have been able to do over time that the producers of these products said would be a catastrophe. They said that they would go out of business if we did that. They screamed foul and they started a fear campaign. In the case of lead they said that there would be no more cars on the roads if we did not leave lead in gasoline and there were a number of other hysterical concerns.

We spend 45 minutes each day at question period when Liberal cabinet ministers, one after another, stand to condemn the Reform Party for all things that are wrong with this country and all things that are wrong with that party. As far as I am concerned, they spend the other 23 hours and 15 minutes doing the business of the Reform Party in producing very bad legislation for this country, and this is but one example.

• (1055)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

*Government Orders*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The first question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The vote on the motion is deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The vote on the motion is deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 26. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 83.

The next question is on Motion No. 61. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 62. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 63 and 68.

The next question is on Motion No. 71. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 84. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

*Government Orders*

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion defeated.

(Motion No. 84 negatived)

**The Deputy Speaker:** The next question is on Motion No. 85. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

• (1100)

The next question is on Motion No. 87. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The vote on the motion is deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 89. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed that the motion is defeated?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion No. 89 negatived)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion defeated. The recorded division on this motion would also apply to Motions Nos. 93, 96, 108 and 111. I therefore declare all four of those motions defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 90. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion, the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on Motion No. 90 is deferred. The division will also apply to Motions Nos. 94, 97, 109 and 112.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 101. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed that the motion is defeated?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion No. 101 negatived)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 101 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 115. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on Motion No. 115 stands deferred.

*Government Orders*

The next question is on Motion No. 117. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 117 defeated.

(Motion No. 117 negatived)

**The Deputy Speaker:** The next question is on Motion No. 122. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on Motion No. 122 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 128. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion is deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 130. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion is deferred.

• (1105 )

The next question is on Motion No. 132. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 135.

The next question is on Motion No. 206. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

That concludes the divisions on Group No. 1. I will now propose the motions in Group No. 2 to the House.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-32, in the preamble, be amended by deleting lines 28 to 32 on page 1. Motion No. 5

That Bill C-32, in the preamble, be amended by deleting lines 17 to 22 on page 2. Motion No. 11

*Government Orders*

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 34 on page 3 with the following:

“(d) act in cooperation with”

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 3 and 4 on page 4.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 23 on page 4 with the following:

“(l) act in keeping with the intent”

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-32, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 18 and 19 on page 11 with the following:

“6. (1) For the purpose of taking cooperative”

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-32, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 4 on page 14 with the following:

“(b) agree to amendments of the agreement.”

[English]

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-32, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing, in the French version, lines 13 to 17 on page 14 with the following:

«article ne peuvent limiter l'accomplissement d'un acte que le ministre estime nécessaire pour l'application et l'exécution de la présente loi, notamment une inspection ou une enquête.»

● (1110)

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-32, in Clause 9, be amended by deleting lines 19 to 24 on page 14.

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-32, in Clause 10, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 41 to 44 on page 14 and lines 1 to 12 on page 15 with the following:

“the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, may make an order declaring that the provisions of a regulation made under the provisions of subsections (1) and (2) do not apply in an area under the jurisdiction of the government where the Minister and the government have entered into an agreement in that respect.”

(b) by replacing, in the French version, line 12 on page 15 with the following:

«l'accord prévu au paragraphe»

(c) by replacing, in the French version, line 25 on page 15 with the following:

«(7) Une fois l'accord conclu.»

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-32, in Clause 44, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 26 with the following:

“44. (1) The Minister shall, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned,”

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-32, in Clause 45, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 28 with the following:

“45. The Minister of Health shall, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned,”

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-32, in Clause 46, be amended by replacing line 40 on page 28 with the following:

“publish, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, in the Canada Gazette and in any other”

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-32, in Clause 47, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 30 with the following:

“47. (1) The Minister shall, with the agreement of provincial governments, issue and apply guidelines”

[English]

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-32, in Clause 47, be amended by adding after line 16 on page 31 the following:

“(3) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with subsection (2), the Minister may act under subsection (1) if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-32, in Clause 48, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 31 with the following:

“48. The Minister shall, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, establish a national”

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-32, in Clause 54, be amended by replacing line 16 on page 33 with the following:

“quality of the environment, the Minister shall, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned,”

[English]

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 51

That Bill C-32, in Clause 54, be amended by adding after line 18 on page 34 the following:

“(3.1) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with subsection (3), the Minister may act under subsection (1)

*Government Orders*

if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-32, in Clause 55, be amended by replacing line 27 on page 34 with the following:

“this Act, the Minister of Health shall, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, issue”

[English]

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-32, in Clause 62, be amended by replacing, in the French version, line 1 on page 38 with the following:

«62. (1) Le ministre établit, en tenant compte notam-»

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 57

That Bill C-32, in Clause 62, be amended by replacing line 1 on page 38 with the following:

“62. (1) The Minister shall, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, and with particular”

[English]

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-32, in Clause 62, be amended by adding after line 15 on page 38 the following:

“(3) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with subsection (2), the Minister may act under subsection (1) if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 59

That Bill C-32, in Clause 63, be amended by replacing line 16 on page 38 with the following:

“63. (1) The Minister may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, and for the purposes”

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-32, in Clause 63, be amended by replacing line 23 on page 38 with the following:

“(2) The Minister may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, establish a program to”

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-32, in Clause 67, be amended by replacing line 37 on page 40 with the following:

“recommendation of the Ministers and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make regu-”

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-32, in Clause 69, be amended by replacing line 26 on page 42 with the following:

“the case may be, may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, issue guidelines for the”

• (1115)

[English]

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-32, in Clause 76, be amended by adding after line 42 on page 46 the following:

“(2.1) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with subsection (2), the Minister may act under subsection (1) if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-32, in Clause 76, be amended by replacing line 7 on page 47 with the following:

“(5) The Ministers may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, amend the Priority”

Motion No. 105

That Bill C-32, in Clause 89, be amended by replacing line 8 on page 61 with the following:

“89. (1) The Governor in Council may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, on the”

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-32, in Clause 90, be amended by replacing line 36 on page 62 with the following:

“the Ministers and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make an order adding the”

Motion No. 107

That Bill C-32, in Clause 90, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 63 with the following:

“sary, on the recommendation of the Ministers and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned,”

Motion No. 116

That Bill C-32, in Clause 93, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 65 with the following:

“mendation of the Ministers and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make regulations”

Motion No. 119

*Government Orders*

That Bill C-32, in Clause 93, be amended by replacing line 31 on page 67 with the following:

“in Council and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, the regulation regulates an aspect”

Motion No. 120

That Bill C-32, in Clause 94, be amended by replacing line 8 on page 68 with the following:

“the Minister may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make an interim order in re-”

Motion No. 121

That Bill C-32, in Clause 94, be amended by replacing line 27 on page 68 with the following:

“the significant danger and obtained the agreement of the provincial governments concerned; and”

Motion No. 125

That Bill C-32, in Clause 97, be amended by replacing line 38 on page 71 with the following:

“97. The Governor in Council may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make”

Motion No. 129

That Bill C-32, in Clause 100, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 74 with the following:

“order, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned,”

Motion No. 133

That Bill C-32, in Clause 102, be amended by replacing line 7 on page 75 with the following:

“the recommendation of the Ministers and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make”

Motion No. 146

That Bill C-32, in Clause 114, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 85 with the following:

“the recommendation of the Ministers and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make”

Motion No. 147

That Bill C-32, in Clause 115, be amended by replacing line 34 on page 86 with the following:

“dation of the Ministers and with the provincial governments concerned, make regulations”

Motion No. 155

That Bill C-32, in Clause 118, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 88 with the following:

“recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make regu-”

Motion No. 156

That Bill C-32, in Clause 119, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 88 with the following:

“may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, in writing, direct a manufacturer or”

Motion No. 159

That Bill C-32, in Clause 121, be amended by replacing line 10 on page 90 with the following:

“tion with any other affected minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, issue”

Motion No. 160

That Bill C-32, in Clause 121, be amended by replacing line 16 on page 90 with the following:

“(a) shall consult with the govern-”

● (1120)

[*English*]

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 161

That Bill C-32, in Clause 121, be amended by adding after line 32 on page 90 the following:

“(3) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with paragraph (2)(a), the Minister may act under subsection (1) if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 167

That Bill C-32, in Clause 135, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 101 with the following:

“the recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make”

Motion No. 169

That Bill C-32, in Clause 135, be amended by replacing line 32 on page 101 with the following:

“recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, by order,”

Motion No. 171

That Bill C-32, in Clause 140, be amended by replacing line 38 on page 103 with the following:

“the recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make”

Motion No. 172

That Bill C-32, in Clause 140, be amended by replacing line 39 on page 104 with the following:

“(2) The Governor in Council may, with the agreement of the governments of the provinces concerned, make a”

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 173

That Bill C-32, in Clause 140, be amended by adding after line 24 on page 105 the following:

“(5) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with subsection (4), the Minister may recommend a regulation to the Governor in Council under subsection (1) if the offer to consult is not accepted by

*Government Orders*

the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:**

Motion No. 174

That Bill C-32, in Clause 145, be amended by replacing line 22 on page 106 with the following:

“the recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make”

• (1125)

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:**

Motion No. 176

That Bill C-32, in Clause 145, be amended by adding after line 11 on page 107 the following:

“(3) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with subsection (2), the Minister may recommend a regulation to the Governor in Council under subsection (1) if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:**

Motion No. 181

That Bill C-32, in Clause 156, be amended by replacing line 11 on page 113 with the following:

“error in Council may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, by order, grant an”

Motion No. 183

That Bill C-32, in Clause 160, be amended by replacing line 11 on page 117 with the following:

“the recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make”

Motion No. 189

That Bill C-32, in Clause 173, be amended by replacing line 9 on page 126 with the following:

“173. (1) The Minister may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make an interim”

Motion No. 195

That Bill C-32, in Clause 177, be amended by replacing line 39 on page 128 with the following:

“recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make regu-”

Motion No. 197

That Bill C-32, in Clause 183, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 133 with the following:

“183. (1) The Minister may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make an interim”

Motion No. 203

That Bill C-32, in Clause 191, be amended by replacing line 18 on page 137 with the following:

“recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make regu-”

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:**

Motion No. 204

That Bill C-32, in Clause 197, be amended

(a) by replacing line 18 on page 139 with the following:

“197. (1) In carrying out the responsibilities”

(b) by adding after line 28 on page 139 the following:

“(2) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with subsection (1), the Minister may act under section 196 if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:**

Motion No. 205

That Bill C-32, in Clause 197, be amended by replacing line 20 on page 139 with the following:

“consult with the government of a”

Motion No. 207

That Bill C-32, in Clause 200, be amended by replacing line 22 on page 141 with the following:

“the recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned and after”

Motion No. 208

That Bill C-32, in Clause 204, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 146 with the following:

“204. (1) The Minister may, with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, establish, in”

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:**

Motion No. 209

That Bill C-32, in Clause 208, be amended by replacing line 10 on page 149 with the following:

“agency of the Government of Canada, or a Crown corporation as defined in subsection 83(1) of the Financial Administration Act.”

Motion No. 210

That Bill C-32, in Clause 208, be amended by adding after line 10 on page 149 the following:

“(3) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with paragraph (2)(a), the Minister may act under subsection (1) if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a territory or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:**

Motion No. 211

That Bill C-32, in Clause 209, be amended by replacing line 12 on page 149 with the following:

*Government Orders*

“the recommendation of the Minister and with the agreement of the provincial governments concerned, make”

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 212

That Bill C-32, in Clause 209, be amended by replacing line 12 on page 152 with the following:

“agency of the Government of Canada, or a Crown corporation as defined in subsection 83(1) of the Financial Administration Act.”

Motion No. 213

That Bill C-32, in Clause 209, be amended by adding after line 12 on page 152 the following:

“(4) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with paragraph (3)(a), the Minister may recommend a regulation to the Governor in Council under this section if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a territory or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

Motion No. 215

That Bill C-32, in Clause 218, be amended by replacing, in the French version, lines 12 to 15 on page 161 with the following:

«d'imprimé ou toute autre forme intelligible;

c) emporter tout imprimé ou sortie de données pour examen ou reproduction;

d) utiliser ou faire utiliser le matériel de»

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 216

That Bill C-32, in Clause 210, be amended by replacing line 15 on page 152 with the following:

“this Act or any other Act of Parliament or an Act of the legislature of a province, or”

**Hon. Marcel Massé (for the Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 225

That Bill C-32, in Clause 323, be amended (a) by replacing line 16 on page 209 with the following:

“323. (1) In carrying out the responsibilities”

(b) by adding after line 27 on page 209 the following:

“(2) At any time after the 60th day following the day on which the Minister offers to consult in accordance with subsection (1), the Minister may act under section 322 if the offer to consult is not accepted by the government of a province or members of the Committee who are representatives of aboriginal governments.”

• (1130)

[English]

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in addressing the Group

No. 2 motions before me I thought that perhaps a little description might help those who are watching.

Most of the Group No. 2 amendments focus on federal-provincial issues. Eleven government motions put in place a 60 day limit for other governments to accept our offer of consultation. Over 40 Bloc Québécois motions seek to provide a provincial veto against any federal action. Four government motions ensure French-English concurrence and two government motions enable consultation with crown corporations.

With regard to the 60 day limit on the offer to consult, the Government of Canada is committed to working co-operatively with provincial, territorial and aboriginal governments to protect the environment and health of Canadians.

One of the ways in which Bill C-32 will help promote co-operation is through provisions that require an offer to consult to other governments on proposed measures. For legitimate reasons other governments may not always be interested in consulting with the federal government on a proposed measure. In these cases we do not want the requirements to offer to consult to create unnecessary delays.

For this reason the government has introduced amendments that would allow the Minister of the Environment to proceed with a proposed measure if after 60 days other governments have not taken up that offer. This does not limit the amount of time for consultation, only the offer.

With regard to the Bloc Québécois amendments, they would seek to remove provisions of Bill C-32 to recognize the national dimension of CEPA, the environmental protection act, and the federal government's leadership role in protecting the environment and health of all Canadians.

[Translation]

We know that political borders offer no protection against pollution. We also know that one government acting alone cannot meet today's environmental challenge.

[English]

In Canada, history has shown us that environmental success is linked to co-operation among governments, whether it is tackling acid rain or protecting the earth's ozone layer. Bill C-32 recognizes that co-operation is essential. The Bloc Québécois motions, however, suggest that co-operation is a one-way street. It wants provincial governments to have a veto to prevent federal government action to protect the environment and health of Canadians.

[Translation]

The Bloc Québécois wants to strip the bill of its power to make defence of the environment a national responsibility.

*Government Orders*

It wants to strip the bill of its power to promote federal government commitments to provide national leadership in environmental matters.

[*English*]

These Bloc Quebecois motions are out of step with the reality of the environmental challenges that we all face. All governments have a role to play. In its 1997 decision, the supreme court upheld the federal government's jurisdiction to control toxic substances in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Rightfully, the court pointed out that environmental protection required the involvement of all levels of government. This is what Canadians expect, and what they deserve.

Bill C-32 provides the federal government with new tools to assist it in doing its part to protect the environment. This is legislation that will benefit all Canadians.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with Group No. 2 amendments that, as the parliamentary secretary has said, deal mainly with the delegation of authority between provincial and federal governments.

These amendments have all been proposed by the Bloc and the government. Reform has no amendments within this group. However, we would also like to comment.

The Bloc amendments proposed by the member for Jonquière basically propose to give provincial governments a veto throughout the legislation. Reform has regularly been the first party to defend the interests of the provinces and when we are talking about federal interference, which these amendments would create, we certainly cannot support them. In environmental issues we have long called for the rationalization of laws between the provinces and the federal government. However, there has to be a working relationship. The provinces should not have a veto.

• (1135)

When the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development studied the roles of the federal and provincial governments regarding the environment, it concluded that it did not have sufficient information to sort out whether there was an overlap, where there was an overlap and where the changes were needed. In fact, the committee called for greater study on the harmonization as it went forward.

It is interesting that this week the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development tabled a report which included a section on federal-provincial relations. The commissioner found that there was limited reference to environmental protection in the objectives. There were no stated requirements to assess the impact of agreements. Affected industries still face regulatory inconsistencies. There was no requirement for audit. There was no detailed accounting of federal funds transferred and there were weak reporting guidelines.

The commissioner also called for clear goals to protect the environment at minimal expense to the taxpayer, mechanisms to hold responsible parties accountable, regular reporting to parliament, analysis of risks before entering into an agreement, a federal back-up plan and a clear understanding of which government is responsible for what issues.

Clearly there is room for improvement in federal-provincial relationships and we will continue to call on the government to ensure that environmental laws are harmonized in the best interests of the environment as well as good government, both provincially and federally. However, the amendments put forward by the Bloc are not in the interests of federal-provincial harmonization. They are clearly an attempt to undermine the authority of Bill C-32, the act we are talking about today.

Reform supports the role of the federal government in establishing national standards for the environment in areas of federal jurisdiction, yet Bloc Motion No. 4 proposes to eliminate federal commitment to continue to demonstrate national leadership in establishing environmental standards, ecosystem objectives and environmental quality guidelines and codes of practice. We cannot in good faith support such an amendment.

The Canadian Environmental Protection Act falls largely under federal jurisdiction, yet it also provides for provincial consultation and co-operation throughout the bill. However, as I have stated before, many of the Bloc amendments attempt to remove or weaken all references regarding the federal role in the environment, particularly when it deals with the administration of toxic substances.

Motion No. 43, for example, requires the agreement of the provinces when the minister gives notice requiring information for the purposes of conducting research, creating data inventories, issuing guidelines or assessing or reporting on the state of the environment. Although the co-operation of the provinces is highly desirable, this amendment is clearly unnecessary and is an attempt to undermine the bill. Many of the Bloc amendments are similar in nature.

Clearly it is important that the federal government work in co-operation with the provinces on environmental matters. However, we do not support the federal government overriding areas of provincial jurisdiction or making international agreements, such as the Kyoto protocol, without the consultation and consent of the

*Government Orders*

provinces. Those are decisions that require the consent of all the provinces before an agreement is signed, not after.

We are all aware that the environment is a shared responsibility and environmental issues must be dealt with in co-operation and good faith, respecting the interests and jurisdictions of both governments. Obviously governments must work together in the interests of the environment. However, many of the amendments put forward by the Bloc are not in the interests of provincial co-operation. They are simply roadblocks to prevent the bill from realizing its goals, which are to protect the environment.

Often Bloc amendments propose provincial consent in areas that are clearly science based decisions. Such decisions should not be political. For example, Motion No. 81 proposes that the minister obtain the permission of provincial governments when amending the priority substances list and Motion No. 107 requires the ministers to have provincial consent when eliminating substances from the toxic substances list. Clearly these decisions should be science based. Decisions to remove substances from the priority substances list should be based on clear evidence that the listing of that substance is no longer necessary for the health of Canadians and our environment. Such decisions should be based on sound environmental practices and science, not politics. Science should be the determining factor.

• (1140)

We cannot support many of the proposed amendments put forward by the member for Jonquière as they would simply render the bill unworkable and weaken it. However, we find that Bloc Motions Nos. 160 and 205 merit support, so we will support them. These two amendments strengthen co-operation between governments by not just proposing that the minister offer to consult with the provinces, but that the minister consult with concerned provincial governments. These amendments apply to clause 197 when the minister issues guidelines respecting the prevention of, preparedness for and response to an environmental emergency, and for restoring any part of the environment damaged by or during an emergency.

There are 11 reasonable government motions which we will be supporting. These motions basically set up clear timelines for consultation. They propose a 60 day timeline for governments to take up federal offers of consultation. After 60 days the minister may act in accordance with section 2 of the legislation if the offer to consult is not accepted by any government or committee. This amendment gives the government clear guidelines with which to respond to the minister and allows the minister to move forward when talks are at a bypass.

In our view Group No. 2 would be weakened by many of the Bloc amendments which we will not be supporting. However, we will be supporting some of the government amendments that are

timely. As there is such a grab bag we will take a piecemeal approach at the time of voting.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this morning to address the motions in Group No. 2. As hon. members can see, I have introduced 49 amendments in Group No. 2, for which I apologize.

This is a very important group. The government has much to say about co-operation with the provinces. It says all manner of things in various forums. It needs to do something to prove that there is some connection between its words and reality.

I and the members of the Bloc Québécois feel that the words of this government have not rung true right from the start. As the member for Jonquière, as I said when I first spoke on Bill C-32, I wish to indicate how disappointed I was when we analyzed this bill in committee. That disappointment carries over to third reading.

In my opinion, this government is living in a bubble. This government is in a bubble that protects it from reality. What the parliamentary secretary has just said on behalf of her government is not accurate. She said that Canadians expect this government to play the lead role where the environment is concerned. That is not what we are hearing.

What we are hearing is that there need to be agreements between this government and the provincial governments in order to administer this act as well as possible. Where I come from, if something happens to the environment, it is the province that must act. In fact, the first level of government required to act is the municipality.

I do not understand why we have to have national standards. What does it mean to have national standards? It means having a global vision of an entity. It does not mean having the truth, it means working in co-operation with other levels of government in order to make enlightened decisions. It is not, as the Parliamentary Secretary said, a veto for the provinces. It is the opposite. It is a right to partnership between the federal government and the provinces.

• (1145)

I have heard all sorts of things since my arrival here nearly two years ago. The government claims to be in partnership with this or that. I have never seen the government try to operate this way.

We have just had a flagrant example with Bill C-78, which the government has just passed. Bill C-78 and the one before us today amount to the same time. This bill will enable the government to say to people "We are the big boss". Where I come from, the big boss is the public, because we work co-operatively.

*Government Orders*

I am extremely disappointed, but not surprised, that the Reform Party wants the federal government to run everything.

I would like to quote something the environment commissioner said in the report he tabled this month. He noted that federal-provincial agreements on the environment were not perfect and needed to be improved, but they were an improvement over unilateral action by Ottawa in this area, given the benefits of eliminating overlap and the establishment of a single window.

This is the fact of the matter. This is why the Bloc wanted to have its amendments passed and put it into effect. I note that this government has plugged its ears well and that it wants nothing to do with the other levels of government.

I am very disappointed with the government's position, and this is why the Bloc Quebecois will oppose this bill.

[English]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Discussions have taken place with representatives of all parties and in order to facilitate debate on report stage of Bill C-32, I believe you would find consent for the following order. I move:

That during the report stage debate on Bill C-32, all report stage motions be deemed read by the Chair and duly moved and seconded.

And that all motions be deemed put to the House, a recorded division be deemed requested and deferred to the end of the said debate.

**Mr. John Herron:** Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party will concur with the whip of the government on that point as long as all the Progressive Conservative amendments are voted on at the same time.

**The Deputy Speaker:** For clarification, is the hon. member for Fundy—Royal asking that the amendments that were defeated this morning be treated as not having been defeated and be placed on the list? Could he clarify that point for the House?

**Mr. John Herron:** Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the point.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed that the motions that were defeated earlier this day when the questions were put to the House, be deemed to have been put in such a way that a division was required and the division was deferred until the conclusion of the report stage?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The House has heard the proposal of the chief government whip. Is the proposal also agreed to?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Deputy Speaker:** On behalf of all Chair occupants, I want to thank the members of the House for their co-operation in this regard.

**Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to speak to Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and good human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

• (1150)

I would like to speak on the issue of children's health and the impact of pesticides and pollution on the lives of our children.

I was interested in the eco-summit which was held here two weeks ago. It was a very interesting, worthwhile and provocative event that was put on at the House of Commons to draw attention to environmental issues.

Entertainer Raffi opened the summit and I think everyone was expecting him to break into a song like *Baby Beluga*. However, he was there for a much more serious reason. He was there to talk about a child centred world and the importance of the starting place for absolutely any of our decisions being new life and the children who we have and are guarding for the future.

He talked about the radical idea of making each and every one of our decisions from the perspective of the child and the health and well-being of the child. He felt that all of our actions, legislations, laws and all the creativity that we have should be focused on children and geared toward children. As we all know, we have much to answer to our children.

I am sure all of us have had our children asking why the water is so dirty, why all the fish are dying, why there are no more rain forests, why half of their classmates have breathing problems and why some of them have asthma. They have all of these whys about the environment. They also want to know why we, the adults who are supposedly the guardians of this globe, are not protecting the environment.

Native people speak about the idea of making decisions for seven generations. Nothing should be put out there that has not been thought through for at least seven generations. I love the idea of using all of our collective wisdom to make decisions which will not bring shame, disgust or recriminations from our children, our children's children or our great-grandchildren's children, or even worse, that will not bring illness or death.

What a concept that we could be making decisions in the House, which is exactly where it all starts, that could bring illness to our own children and the children of our children. I do not think there is anything that quite gets me more in the gut and in the heart than contemplating that thought.

*Government Orders*

All of these questions bring about enormous shame and sorrow but they must obviously go much further than that. They cannot just stop with a sense of shame, sorrow and powerlessness. We cannot just turn off the radio at night when we hear David Suzuki speaking eloquently and with enormous detailed research about the fact that we are at the eleventh hour with the globe in terms of the health of our environment. We cannot just close that out. We have to listen to the people who are doing the work on the environment and we have to listen to the danger signs.

At the eco-summit Raffi talked about the fact that there is no baby born now on the globe who is free of the impact of toxic chemicals which just float around in our water, our food and our air. Pollution does not discriminate. It begins to work on tiny lungs as soon as they take their first breath. We know it even works on them while they are still in the mother's womb.

Wealth, power and influence in gated communities do not protect people against a polluted environment. We cannot protect ourselves in any way from this issue other than by doing something about it.

At this point I would like to look at some startling statistics which came out last week. They concern the impact of pesticide residues on Canadian produce, on the apples our children eat at the day cares and on all the food we are eating. Children have a much smaller system and they are more vulnerable in terms of the buildup of pesticides. The amount of pesticides left on fresh fruit and vegetables has grown in Canada. According to unpublished government statistics obtained through the Access to Information Act, pesticides have more than doubled since 1994.

• (1155)

Studies indicate that produce grown commercially in Canada now have pesticide residues at nearly the same rate as imported produce. If we have grown them ourselves or have purchased them at the local store we take some comfort in thinking that if we wash them everything will be all right. For some reason we are trying to deny the fact that we are not personally ingesting enormous amounts of pesticides. We seem to be able to let this problem build in our lives without addressing it head on.

The report by Eli Neidert and Glenn Havelock of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency dated November 6, 1998 states:

The evidence clearly indicates that both the contamination rates and violation rates for domestic and imported produce are moving closer together.

Studies show that nearly a quarter of Canadian produce randomly tested bears traces of pesticides, even after inedible skins are peeled off. Although the report states that just 1.2% of domestic produce showed residues at illegal levels, the violation rate is triple what it was at the beginning of the decade.

Kathryn Boothby, communications manager of the Pesticide Producers and Marketers' Crop Protection Institute of Canada, cautioned against becoming needlessly alarmed about pesticides, saying that consumers should take into account the well-documented health benefits of eating fresh fruits and vegetables.

After having read that, I had to ask myself what the spokesperson was saying. The good news is that an apple a day keeps the doctors away but the bad news is that pesticides will almost surely kill us at some point if we live long enough. I could not believe that she actually said that. If I would have had a phone nearby I would have called her for a reality check on what she was saying about the food we eat.

Julia Langer speaks well on that issue. She is a pesticide expert at the World Wildlife Fund Canada and a member of the federal government's Pest Management Advisory Council. She said that the trend toward the widespread findings are extremely disturbing. She also said that it should be a wake-up call to change pest management practices so we can move the trend in the opposite direction.

The chemical present in fresh Canadian and foreign grown produce includes carcinogens, suspected neurotoxins and compounds known to cross the placental barrier and affect growing fetuses. These also include long banned chemicals such as breakdown components of DDT and several others so dangerous that they merit a place on the international dirty dozen list. Although they are not registered for use in Canada, they are nevertheless legal in the food Canadians eat, as long as they are not present in quantities above 0.1 parts per million.

In closing, I will simply make an enormous plea for us to stop everything and try to get back to the basics. As Raffi said at the eco-summit the other night, let us think about our children. Let us think about the poisons going into our environment. Let us talk about a decent environment bill that is going to start reversing the pollution and the devastation that we have wrought on our globe. I will push for that at every turn in terms of the amendments that the New Democratic Party are putting forward to the CEPA bill.

• (1200)

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the motions in this group, particularly those proposed by the Bloc Quebecois, would weaken national leadership, they would weaken national concerns and they would prevent national regulations from applying in Quebec. These motions would mean a step backward and ought to be defeated.

There are other amendments which represent a step backward because they will have a negative impact on public health. Take for instance inherent toxicity, about which we spent a lot of time in committee. Here the public health is threatened because the

*Government Orders*

proposed amendment takes from the minister a needed measure to accelerate the process of preventing pollution or eliminating a substance from entering the environment. True, there is pollution prevention planning in the legislation but it is very weak. Actually it has virtually no teeth because the pollution prevention plans are not enforceable.

We are therefore very concerned about what is being proposed. In the words of someone who has worked as a consultant and as an environmental lawyer as well on this very legislation "This proposed amendment is very significant and would gut the bill of the significant direction taken in this clause toward inherent toxicity". This is a very bad move in terms of protecting public health.

There is the issue of virtual elimination on which we also worked very hard in committee. The government came forward with an amendment which we were glad to work on but now at report stage we see that changes are being proposed. There is a shift in focus from achieving near zero pollution to a process which is unclear and vague, a process which gives no clear mandate to reach zero pollution. I am sad to say that the long term is being sacrificed in favour of the short term.

Then there is the issue of the precautionary principle. One of the many problems that the committee dealt with was the absence of a strong administrative duty on the part of the government to apply this principle. The precautionary approach means that we should not wait for damage to the environment or human health to occur before acting.

There are many definitions of the precautionary approach. The version chosen to appear in the preamble was unfortunately one of the weakest ones available because it would place a straitjacket by imposing cost effective considerations. We worked very hard in improving that.

The proposed version now of the precautionary principle is not the only one available. Canada and other nations have signed on to many other versions in environmental agreements involving fishery, biodiversity and ocean dumping. In fact the London Dumping Convention of 1972 as renewed in 1996 including Canada has a much stronger version without mentioning cost effectiveness. Therefore the idea of the pollution prevention and of the precautionary principle should not be distorted and burdened by the obstacles posed by cost effectiveness.

Another amendment that is in the category of undesirables is the one that came forward in relation to nutrients. This amendment comes like a bolt from the blue so to speak. It is brand new. It was not mentioned or proposed in committee. It was not proposed by any witness before the committee. It is hard to see why it has appeared at the eleventh hour of the debate on this bill.

The effect of the amendment if passed would be that the Minister of the Environment could no longer prevent pollution in water by certain nutrients. The Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food instead could say "I have the power to prevent pollution by nutrients in water". Cabinet would then decide if the power of the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food would be sufficient and the Minister of the Environment, who has a strong mandate to protect the environment, would no longer have a role to play. This motion as well weakens the bill.

I have just elaborated on a few rather important amendments which if they were passed would transform this bill, I must say and with regret, from a weak law into a paper tiger. The net effect of these changes as they are being proposed in some of these groups particularly by the government will make Bill C-32 an exercise in distorted phrases. Perhaps they are skilfully crafted sentences made for the purpose of convincing the public in an almost Orwellian fashion in an attempt to create an impression of strength when in reality the emperor has no clothes.

• (1205 )

If certain amendments of the kind I have touched upon are passed into law, a few lobbyists will prove to have been more powerful than the permanent members of the standing committee. I am referring to those who toiled on the subject of toxic substances for over five years.

If certain amendments of the kind I have described this morning are passed, the public and its health will be poorly protected from toxic substances. The meaning of pollution prevention will be seriously discredited. Unfortunately, I must also add that a key electoral promise will not have been kept.

Those of us who feel very strongly about this bill, are standing for a very simple and straightforward principle: that Canadians can have health protection at the same time as sound investments. There is no conflict between making into reality the fact that we can have at the same time a healthy economy and a healthy environment.

With that thought in mind, I will let the House know that when it comes to the vote on certain motions, it is my intention to vote with regret against my government. I think the motivation is very clear. It is one that puts the public health ahead of investments. It is one that motivates for the reduction of health costs in the long term.

It is one that is also attempting to bring closer the commitments we made to the Canadian public in two electoral campaigns, namely that we would not just deal with the releases into the environment of toxic substances; we went much further in our commitment and said that we would deal with the gradual elimina-

*Government Orders*

tion of the use of toxic substances. In that respect, this bill is a far cry from what we promised in the 1993 campaign. I am referring to page 66 of the red book where it is very clearly explained and set out.

I think what unites us in this room today is a different interpretation of what it means to fight for the public interest. I imagine that all my colleagues will agree with me that this is what is motivating us. The approach I am developing may be one with a particular emphasis on the long term, with a particular emphasis on giving precedence to the public health with the strong belief that Canadians can all have in this very fortunate country health protection and sound investments without having to sacrifice one for the other.

**Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to Bill C-32 and this group of amendments following the comments by the member for Davenport. He indicated how unhappy he is with the bill and that he will even be voting against his own government.

• (1210)

The process we have gone through to date has been a very lengthy one. Many members have commented on that. This group of amendments has almost 70 amendments with 16 of the amendments coming from the government. We have had 59 meetings on this bill. The bill was at committee for a year. A total of 560 amendments have come forward on this bill. Even at report stage when it comes back to the House the government is still making amendments. It makes us wonder how much effort went into the original drafting of the bill if at this point in the process we are still dealing with government amendments and members of the government are still unhappy with it.

There are two main issues being dealt with in these amendments. Most of the amendments were brought forward by the member for Jonquière who spoke previously and deal with provincial sovereignty. It is not surprising since she is a member of a separatist party.

The other issue is the environment minister is dealing with the time period during which the minister offers to consult with affected stakeholders. This was something we dealt with at committee to some degree, to put some time limitations on some of the decisions so that the actions can move forward in a reasonable manner, and that people involved have a chance to be consulted and work together.

The issue of provincial sovereignty is of course a dear one to Reformers and to our party. In many ways the Reform Party can find its roots in this issue. The party began in the late 1980s born out of frustration with Ottawa. Canadians frustrated with being ignored by the federal government decided that the time was right to start a party that was dedicated to the equality of all provinces, a party that would favour no province over the other.

One of the founding principles of the party affirmed Reform's commitment to Canada as one nation indivisible, and to our vision of Canada as a balanced federation of equal provinces and citizens. The balance we speak of even at that level we have to extend to environmental issues because it is a very precise balance that needs to be created between government regulation, industry and Canadians. If we go too hard one way or the other, that balance is disrupted and it will harm the environment. It is key that we continue to seek the balance we need to create a better environment for all of us.

This balanced federation would take away the arsenal of centralizing powers that lie in the hands of the cabinet and redistribute legislative authority to the level of government that is able to govern most effectively in each area. We feel the federal government has become too intrusive in provincial affairs. The long arm of the federal government stretches across the country and leaves no citizen untouched.

Federal transfer cuts to health and education programs drastically affect Canadians all across the country. Outrageous tax rates discriminate against single income families and they chase away our best and brightest graduates and drive down our productivity. If that is not enough, projects like the millennium scholarship fund even further antagonize the provinces. It is things like this that have earned Ottawa the enmity of the provinces.

The Bloc is a fruit of that situation. That political party from Quebec has made it known that it favours the outright decentralization of nearly every federal responsibility. The Bloc opposes any kind of federal government intervention in the provinces. Having said that, we support decentralizing government as well but we believe that the amendments presented here today go too far.

We recognize that in a country as vast and diverse as Canada there is a need for the federal government to establish and maintain national standards in areas of clear federal jurisdiction. Our blue book says that the Reform Party supports a rationalization of federal and provincial environmental laws and the development of regional and national environmental standards where appropriate.

We believe that the federal government has a role to play in these issues. Because the Constitution does not explicitly assign environmental jurisdiction to either federal or provincial governments, this has been a source of friction in the past. However recent developments have gone a long way in clarifying this constitutional vagueness.

In the 1997 Supreme Court of Canada case of *R. v Hydro Quebec*, the court ruled unanimously that the protection of the environment was a constitutionally valid criminal law objective which is a clear jurisdiction of the federal government. However, because environmental issues transcend boundaries, the federal government must not use this decision as a *carte blanche* to ride roughshod over the provinces.

*Government Orders*

• (1215)

Federal-provincial co-operation such as the kind proposed under the 1998 harmonization accord is essential to ensure that the health and well-being of Canadians come first. Again it comes down to balance, balancing the harmonization accord. In order for it to work there has to be proper balance between the federal and provincial governments.

The Reform Party is an enthusiastic supporter of provincial consultation, but the amendments put forward by the Bloc go beyond what is reasonable. The Bloc no doubt believes that the federal government is overstepping its jurisdictional boundaries in the administration and application of the bill. Requiring the minister to obtain the consent of the provinces at every turn will render the bill unworkable. We feel it has gone too far and we need to get back to a point where consultation with the provinces is meaningful and there will be some clear results.

It is clear that the provinces must be involved in the process as Environment Canada simply does not have the capability to take full responsibility for the implementation of the act. This is something that came forward during the debate. Environment Canada has fallen down substantially and has not directed the proper resources to enforcement. This is something that needs to be addressed and put back into its priorities. That has been the situation this week in the cause for environmental protection.

Some members on the other side are always eagerly ready to accuse me and my colleagues within the Reform Party of having no regard for the well-being of the environment. This is simply not true.

These are the same members who supported the cutbacks in the past few budgets presented by the finance minister. These members have supported the budgets in which these cutbacks were implemented.

Are they not supporting the government that was condemned by the environment commissioner just this week for putting the health of Canadians at risk by not properly managing toxic substances? Are they not supporting the government that has refused to introduce endangered species legislation?

I could continue, but suffice to say it is not the Reform Party these members should be concerned about but the Liberal Party. As was expressed previously by another member, their problem lies within their own party.

I assure the House that Reform has a very clear position on the enforcement of environmental protection. Our blue book policy clearly supports the principle that the polluter should pay for its

pollution controls, that this be stringently enforced in an unbiased manner, and that the penalties be severe enough so polluters will not consider them a licence to pollute. We also support fines and jail sentences for officers and executives of companies that violate environmental laws.

However it is always better to use the carrot over the stick. Although the law must have the capacity to enforce its regulations, it will be more effective if it can deter individuals from breaking the law in the first place. Co-operation will always accomplish more than confrontation.

I will briefly discuss the Group No. 2 amendments brought forward by the minister. In the preamble to Bill C-32 the government recognizes the importance of working together with the provinces, territories and aboriginal groups to achieve the highest level of environmental quality for all Canadians and ultimately to contribute to sustainable development.

Throughout the bill the federal government shows its respect for the provinces, territories and aboriginal groups by making offers to consult. The bill creates advisory committees made up of representatives from these affected groups.

We as a party put forward one amendment. The representatives of the provinces instead of being picked by the minister should be appointed by the provinces. We feel that would give a balance to the process and bring in some more expertise to handle the issue.

Public consultation is critical to the legitimacy of the bill. Our party is founded on the principle of grassroots participation. Ensuring the grassroots have an opportunity to influence public policy is very important. For too long grassroots have been trampled as one government after another ignored their concerns. The bill hinges on the proper balance.

• (1220)

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak to the Group No. 2 amendments to Bill C-32. My comments will not be all that long. I want to talk about the concept that predominates a number of the amendments which have been put forward primarily by the Bloc and by the government.

This section captures the Bloc position that the ministers must get provincial approval before making any regulations or issuing any guidelines throughout the act. The government also has a few amendments in this section but they deal predominately with the offer to consult being open to the provinces for 60 days before the government must act, which would bring closure to the offer.

*Government Orders*

We do not always get agreement with the provinces to act so the federal government must retain the powers to act in order to ensure that human health and the environment are protected. Essentially that is the origin of it.

I understand where my colleague from the Bloc Québécois is actually coming from. It is that the federal government fails to recognize on a routine basis that in order to get anything implemented within this great country ultimately we need the provinces on side. At the end of the day they are usually the governing body which has to implement a number of the decisions that take place with respect to the federal government.

The concern the Bloc has put forward is indeed justified. I would like to cite two examples of the origin of this concern. We all remember the draconian cuts to the Canada health and social transfer that took place by the federal government to pay for health care, education and social assistance.

These unprecedented cuts to our priority programs were done without any consultation, without any input from the provinces. The provinces did not have the opportunity to say that they would pay a very severe price and, more important, that the citizens who live in the provinces would pay a very severe price if these actions were taken. The provinces did not have any input into the actions of the federal government.

I trust the House remembers the debate which led up to the Kyoto protocol in December 1997. In that situation all 10 provinces met essentially for the first time to coalesce and build a position with respect to what target and timelines they should establish and agree to at the Kyoto protocol.

The provinces stepped forward and gave a unified position on November 12, 1997. The following morning we read in the *Globe and Mail* that what was agreed to the previous night was not necessarily the position the federal government when it goes to Kyoto. This slapped the provinces square in the face. Then when the government went to Kyoto the final position it adopted was drastically different from what it had agreed to on November 12 in Regina, Saskatchewan.

If Bloc Québécois members are concerned that the federal government will not consult their provincial partners in making these decisions, if they are paranoid that the federal government will take unilateral positions in this regard, I think that paranoia is justified.

The Progressive Conservative Party believes that although the responsibility for the environment is that of federal and provincial jurisdictions, we must make no mistake about it. The federal government needs to take the leadership role in that regard.

The intent in terms of what the Bloc has proposed, and I think the government has come to a reasonable compromise on this point as

well, is that the government must offer to consult. It must seek input for the provinces to advise the government in terms of what direction it may want to take in an environmental intervention.

There was a lot of discussion on the part of the member for Lac-Saint-Louis. I think it is a very prudent situation. The offer to consult was left open for 60 days. The door is wide open for 60 days. Once talks begin that would naturally be continued. If the provinces do not take the federal government up on the offer over a two month period on a major environmental intervention, the federal government has the responsibility to show leadership.

• (1225 )

We will not support the Bloc's amendments in that regard only because we think the government has a better direction. The Bloc tabled these amendments and we are discussing them in the House. Whether it is environmental issues or the Canada health and social transfer, the government fails to realize that our country is a partnership, a confederation of all provinces. The provinces have a valuable role in implementing our laws. They deserve to have their rightful place at the table and to give input.

The spirit of the Bloc's amendments are dead-on and justified. However, the government in this circumstance has ensured that it must offer to consult with its provincial partners and keep it open for a period of 60 days. If the provinces do not engage in it ultimately the federal government will have to take the leadership role it rightfully must have.

We will be participating further in the debate as we deal with the other amendments.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I will vote against the amendments proposed by the Bloc Québécois, because it seems to me there is already an equivalency clause in the bill that allows every province to show that its legislation is equivalent to that of the federal government, in which case the federal act does not apply. To go further than that would only water down the legislation more than it already is, and heaven knows it is already rather weak.

I want to quickly go over the issues relating to this legislation. This act is being targeted, on the one hand, by people who want to water it down even more for the benefit of the provinces and, on the other hand, by groups representing the industry.

The other day, I mentioned about 12 of these groups. The major industry associations in Canada wrote long letters to the Canadian government. They said, among other things, that if this bill is passed as it stood after being reviewed by the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development:

*Government Orders*

[English]

We would have to shut down wood burning stoves and municipal incinerators in Newfoundland fishing villages.

[Translation]

The president of Alcan, Mr. Bougie, wrote a letter to the Prime Minister saying that should the bill be passed as it stood after being reviewed by the committee, it could force the closure of all aluminum smelters in Canada.

[English]

The fearmongering has been intense. I will quote from an article in the *National Post* of a few days ago by Mrs. Justyna Laurie-Lean, vice-president of the Mining Association of Canada. She says that the bill, as it is now, still leaves a lot of concerns.

[Translation]

And this in spite of the amendments that were passed, that were proposed and that benefit the industry.

[English]

And that is with a bill we were never particularly enthusiastic about. We don't see this as having won. We see this as having lost a lot of ground and regained an inch.

[Translation]

There is an article in the newspaper, not by Mrs. Lean, which says:

[English]

Industry's biggest complaint centres on language within the proposed legislation that sets out an explicit government obligation to protect the environment and human health. Earlier versions of the bill called on the government to endeavour to protect the environment.

[Translation]

In fact, this was one of the amendments that we proposed in committee. It said that, instead of merely endeavouring to protect the environment and human health, the government should have an obligation to protect the environment and human health. Industry is not pleased with this. It is still not satisfied after all the amendments that were proposed for its benefit and that reflect what it asked for, in spite of the act.

• (1230)

[English]

There is no conflict, as some of my colleagues have said, between the environment and business, the environment and the economy. Quite a few years ago, in 1975, the firm 3M started a process which they called "3P: pollution prevention pays". They can show over the years that they reduced pollution from their plants by 771 tonnes of effluents, that they saved money and in fact added to their profit line by over \$800 million U.S. The same is true of Volvo. The same is true of Anheuser-Busch. The same is

true of United Technologies and of several firms across the globe. The same is true of the Baum industrial association in Germany. The same is true of The Natural Step in Sweden. The same is true of many big corporations in Canada and I agree that many of them, Noranda, Dow and others, have made great steps forward.

We do not take any quarrel with industry. It is very much to the contrary. At the same time, what we say is that this bill is essential for the protection of the environment and human health.

I will quote from a document which gives statistics on the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States and its record regarding toxics and toxic waste:

In March '99, the EPA released a series of reports on its successes in the fiscal year 1998. Enforcement is at near record highs: 226 new criminal cases and 411 civil cases were launched in 1998. \$92.8 million U.S. in criminal fines and \$91.8 million in civil penalties were assessed, plus \$230 million in Superfund settlements. In addition, EPA reports that its enforcement actions have led to substantial pollution reductions.

Unfortunately, I do not have time to cite them.

Compare this to what is happening with our devolution. The federal government devolves to the provinces, which in turn devolve to industrial associations and others. When we cut back our budgets on environmental protection, the provinces cut back even more substantially their budgets.

In the report of the commissioner that my colleague from Jonquière cited, it is worth noting that in Quebec, which has 40% of all pulp and paper mills in Canada, totalling 61 mills, there were 12 mills deficient in 1995, 13 mills in 1996 and 20 mills in 1997. There was one prosecution. Corrective action was supposed to have been taken, yet Environment Canada was unable to provide us with any corrective plans.

The commissioner says that Environment Canada should exercise its enforcement authority where appropriate. He cites further that in regard to devolution to Saskatchewan and Alberta under the fisheries act, which is administered by the Department of the Environment, parliament has no information on the results achieved by the Saskatchewan and Alberta fisheries act administrative agreement. He further says that the CEPA annual reports required by this legislation, which we are talking about today, have not been deposited for two years.

What we need to do is beef up our legislation, not weaken it. What we need to do is beef up our regulations, not weaken them. I think this bill, with the amendments that have been presented, weaken an already weak bill. To we who believe very strongly in environmental protection, we felt that Bill C-32, when it reached the committee, was a compromise in itself. Now it has been further compromised and further diluted. The Bloc and others want to dilute it further.

*Government Orders*

I suggest that we need to reverse all of these amendments that will weaken the provisions of key elements of the law, such as inherent toxicity, the precautionary principle, virtual elimination and others that my colleagues have referred to. We need to strengthen the pollution prevention plan. We need to make the bill stronger, not weaker. If any country needs good environmental protection at this time, it is Canada. The EPA in the United States goes much further than Canada in the enforcement and regulation of toxics and toxic waste.

• (1235)

Canada devolves to industry and listens every time there is a threat of closure. We shake in our boots and we weaken our laws. We dilute it further when we pass it on to the provinces, which in turn pass it on to somebody else. The fox is in charge of the chicken coop.

I suggest to this House that we should defeat all of the amendments which will weaken the key provisions of this bill, especially those relating to inherent toxicity, virtual elimination, the precautionary principle and the dilution of the powers of both the ministers of the environment and health, as well as the federal government. I would be happy to support the bill if this situation was rectified, but, if not, I have very strong reservations.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to take part in the debate at report stage of Bill C-32.

First of all, this tactic by the Liberal government looks to me like another move towards excessive centralization. The Liberals' approach is to do what they said they would in the September 1997 throne speech. They are relentlessly interfering in areas of provincial jurisdiction. In so doing, they are revealing their incompetence when it comes to the national environment.

Let us take a brief look at the history of this bill, which started out as Bill C-77, died on the Order Paper during the Liberals' first term of office, and returned in 1998 as Bill C-32.

This is a bill that was not too bad originally but that turned into a disaster when it was referred to the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development. The bill was studied over the course of 60 sittings, a precedent in the history of parliament. During the clause by clause study, 580 amendments were introduced.

The committee passed 160 of them. Had it passed constructive amendments, those consistent with the Canadian Constitution, Canada's Constitution, their efforts could have been called productive. But all these amendments and efforts produced was a completely unrealistic bill full of holes.

I have no idea where the Liberals get their concept of environment. Is it a virtual environment? One thing is sure, and that is that it is difficult to enforce it in real life in Quebec and in Canada.

The government wants harmonization with the provinces. Under the initial version of Bill C-32, the government was going to act. The word act implies action and taking decisions. When we got to committee, the Liberals said they were unable to act, but would make an effort to do so.

I am extremely worried when I see this government wanting to make an effort to do something to harmonize with the provinces. I have a very vivid recollection of the sad business of the social union. The Canadian government made an effort to reach agreement with the ten provinces.

• (1240)

We know what happened: the coalition fell apart, only Quebec stood its ground. The same thing is happening now with Bill C-32.

The government found another way of delaying things in that it now wants to create an advisory committee. Again I have to express my concern in that regard. If we look at this government's way of consulting, I sometimes wonder if it even takes the time to read the briefing notes. We only have to look at what happened with regard to agriculture.

From September to December, all the interested parties were heard in preparation for the upcoming WTO negotiations. I do not know if there is a communication problem between the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of International Trade, but the whole process was started again from scratch. They have trouble reading and understanding.

When the government talks about establishing a national advisory committee, it scares me. Let us take a closer look at what this committee will do. It will advise the two federal ministers on regulations to be made, on the management of toxic substances and on other matters of mutual interest.

The provinces will advise the federal minister—listen carefully—through the national advisory committee. A tradition exists, but, once again, it has been broken by this government. As we saw in the case of the millennium scholarship fund, the government wants to designate public servants or someone from the private sector to negotiate with elected representatives.

Usually in politics, regardless of the level, negotiations take place among elected officials. They speak to each other. But this government has a way of setting up new levels. It has a hard time understanding. Its operations are so complex and complicated we can understand that it is establishing another committee.

*Government Orders*

With this committee, then, this government will have another tool with which to totally ignore Quebec and provincial responsibility for the environment.

Pollution prevention becomes a national objective. The new legislation also creates a national centre. The farther we go in Bill C-32 the more we see the word national, and the more we see provincial responsibilities shrink. This is why the Bloc Quebecois opposes Bill C-32 and asks the government if it really wants a partnership.

The representatives of this government have a hard time consulting, listening and negotiating. They do not know the meaning of partnership. They know it will only be pseudo partnership. But the truth is this is a centralizing government, that ceaselessly meddles in provincial jurisdictions, whether it be the environment, education or health. Since this government's return to office, that is since the 1997 election, all its actions have focused on centralizing, have served to trample on the provinces.

This is an arrogant government. It ignores the reality. It has difficulty reading and understanding the Canadian Constitution. I am at times tempted to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give the Liberals a copy of the Canadian Constitution so they may truly see which areas are under provincial jurisdiction and which are under federal.

I want to make it clear that my colleagues and I will hound this government so that it understands Bill C-32 is unacceptable and constitutes another intrusion into areas of provincial jurisdiction. We will do everything to defend this jurisdiction, Quebec and the environment.

• (1245)

[*English*]

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on May 12 I rose in the House to address the first group of amendments at report stage of Bill C-32. At that time I said that not only were we dealing with a set of amendments but we were dealing with a fundamental decision on the direction which we as parliamentarians will take the country with regard to environmental health and protection.

As parliamentarians we are entrusted to make decisions that affect the health and well-being of Canadians. We as parliamentarians must protect the health and well-being of Canadians.

I emphasize to the House that Bill C-32 is an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development. The primary function of the bill is to use pollution prevention measures to protect the environment and human health. This is seen as a way of contributing to sustainable development and should not be confused as a sustainable development bill.

Pollution prevention is a stated policy of the government. There were a few small changes made in committee to encourage the practice of pollution prevention approaches. However, certain amendments before the House would result in shifting the bill away from a pollution prevention approach, for example the amendments that would add cost effective to the definition of precautionary principle.

The bill currently reads in the administrative duties section that the Government of Canada shall exercise its powers in a manner that protects the environment and human health and shall apply the precautionary principle that in threats of serious or irreversible damage lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation and promote and reinforce enforceable pollution prevention approaches.

The new amendment would change this section to include cost effective measures to prevent pollution. This weakens the bill in encouraging effective pollution prevention. It provides more hurdles to be overcome in order to move on measures to protect the environment and human health, and it is redundant.

The federal regulatory process management standards compliance guidelines clearly demand that regulatory protection occurs at low cost to both the private sector and the government. The regulatory development process each department undergoes must include a cost benefit analysis to demonstrate that regulatory benefits are greater than their cost.

A business impact test or equivalent analysis must be undertaken to assess the effect of the regulatory proposal on Canadian business. This amendment is redundant and it is unnecessary for cost effective to be inserted into the definition of the precautionary principle.

Even though business and industry have the assurance of a cost benefit analysis and the business impact test through the regulatory process guidelines of treasury board, certain individual lobbyists have mounted an unprecedented assault against the bill. As my hon. colleague has already mentioned, a number of very worthy and innovative companies in Canada and across the globe are doing very well with progressive environmental management systems.

One of the most important arguments industrial lobbyists seem to be putting forward is that this is an internationally accepted version of the precautionary principle and that it should include cost effectiveness. This is not true. There is no right or wrong definition of the precautionary principle. In fact there is no definition at all. Instead there are many articulations of the principle. Because it is an evolving concept it is an approach and therefore not static or rigid.

It should also be said that sovereign governments should be free to articulate the precautionary principle as strongly as they like.

*Government Orders*

The precautionary principle emerged in Germany and was translated as a precaution or foresight principle. It was enunciated as early as 1976 by the federal Government of Germany.

Environmental policy is not fully accomplished by warding off imminent hazards and the elimination of the damage that has occurred. Precautionary environmental policy requires that natural resources are protected and that demands on them are made with care.

• (1250)

In 1991 the parties to the London dumping convention, and Canada was one of them, produced a resolution entitled "The Application of a Precautionary Approach". Environmental protection was within the framework of the London dumping convention. It read that the London dumping convention shall:

—be guided by a precautionary approach to environmental protection whereby appropriate preventive measures are taken when there is reason to believe that substances or energy introduced in the marine environment are likely to cause harm even when there is no conclusive evidence to prove a causal relation between inputs and their effects.

There are many examples that the federal government has undertaken that act in a precautionary way which does not have to include cost effectiveness. I inform the House that the Nova Scotia environment act is the first statute in Canada to expressly adopt the precautionary principle. Section 2(b)(ii) states:

The precautionary principle will be used in decision making so that where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, the lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.

I note that Nova Scotia does not include cost effective in its definition.

Most appalling was that I was told by a group of industrial lobbyists that given the amount of change made in committee the focus of the bill had become unacceptable to them because the bill called upon the government to protect the environment and human health.

I thought my ears had betrayed me, but, as my hon. and distinguished colleague just pointed out, the *National Post* ran an article in which it said that industry's biggest complaint centred on language within the proposed legislation that set out an explicit government obligation to protect the environment and human health. Earlier versions of the bill called on the government to endeavour to protect the environment.

These people do not speak for business in Canada. They speak for a small minority of Canadians. They certainly do not speak for the public interest. We are not dealing with merely a set of amendments before the House but rather a fundamental direction of how we will manage environmental toxins and how we will protect the health of Canadians.

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I will expand on what my hon. colleague said earlier about children's health and how crucial it is for us to take the responsibility as parliamentarians to make sure the environment and our health are the highest priorities.

We cannot sleep at night and wake up in the morning without giving thanks to what was given to us, the gifts of the Creator such as our children and grandchildren. For us to hold the title of noble ancestors we need generations that will follow us. If we make mistakes now and do not clean up our act we will not be noble ancestors. We will be like dinosaurs.

Future generations might try to find some fossil fuel in our humble organisms some ions into the future. In the meantime our job is to take care of our future, our children and our health.

I must highlight the comments of hon. members in the Bloc who put a spotlight on jurisdictional issues in the environment. They were quick to look at the rights of the provincial jurisdictions and to have first right opportunities, but we have to take responsibility for the entire nation of Canada. We cannot do it in a balkanized situation or look at it individually.

• (1255)

We have many good examples coming from the province of Quebec and from other provinces, but equally there are bad examples coming from certain provinces. I would highlight the province of Ontario, in which the national capital is located. The present provincial government has been a guiding light in proving what can go wrong with provincial responsibilities on environment.

The issue of environmental jurisdictions has not been clarified under the Constitution. The constitutional responsibilities of environment are assumed under peace, order and good government, under the concept of governing the country. Under the good government concept environment is a responsibility, but the provinces are quick to jump. The resource transfer act has also devolved environmental responsibility with the resources of the country.

The issue of the environment in the Constitution requires evolution. We will have to address it at some point in time. We need a strong national position on the protection of the environment. This is where CEPA plays a major role. We need federal and national measures. We need standards and enforcement measures which protect the future of the country and future generations.

As part of the ongoing saga of the Liberal cabinet and its leaders and its ministers, one of the guiding lights has been the harmonization in making agreements with the provinces to deal with environmental issues. However industry and business representatives wanted one-stop shopping. They wanted to go to Walmart to purchase all their pharmaceuticals, dry goods, a McDonald's burger, food, shoes and a new jacket under one roof.

*Government Orders*

Unfortunately that is not the way federalism has worked in the history of the country. We respect federal and provincial jurisdictions and give duly required applications, assessments and reviews under certain jurisdictions.

The industry wants one-stop shopping and to accommodate this the CCME, of which the environment minister is the lead minister, created the harmonization accord to look at overlaps which deal with environmental regulations.

Just this past week Mr. Emmett, Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, stated that the harmonization initiatives were well intended but were not working. Nobody is implementing these issues. Nobody is looking at what overlaps need to be addressed.

The witnesses the committee heard from indicated that there were major gaps among municipal, provincial and federal governments with regard to environmental responsibilities. One example to get the harmonization accord going was to get federal-provincial committees in place to design management agreements. They were never established. The actions suggested by the finance minister and the Prime Minister in press releases were all well and good but were nothing but intentions.

The program review by the Liberal government and the finance minister gutted environmental departments. Provincial governments have been affected by transfer payment cuts by the federal government, which resulted in further cuts affecting environmental departments at the provincial level. The federal cuts and provincial cuts are diminishing the environmental protection of the country as a whole. This has to be addressed immediately.

The commissioner confirmed our committee findings last year that the harmonization accord must not go forward without additional resources and a clear goal. It cannot be done for fiscal responsibilities.

Part of the fiscal measures have come about under CEPA. The government and the minister proposed in the draft of the precautionary principle that cost effective measures would play a major role. When looking at the protection of our environment we have to be cost conscious.

• (1300)

This issue was deleted by committee process, that under the precautionary principle if there is a lack of scientific evidence, that measures will be taken to protect our environment and our health. I guess under industry's lobby and highlighting the Reform Party as well, the Liberal cabinet has condoned amendments to bring back cost effective when taking measures to protect our environment and our health. That is totally contrary to the essence of the title of the bill. It is totally contrary to what Canadians expect as the government's responsibility. This is the time for us to prevent

pollution, not to control and manage pollution. This is the time to prevent pollution.

The lack of enforcement is the other issue. This will come into play in future budgets. I want all Canadians to realize that there is an existing CEPA. There is a Canadian Environmental Protection Act in place and in effect as we speak.

Bill C-32 is the new bill. Under this new bill there are additional responsibilities for enforcement officers. There are additional responsibilities for enforcement. There are additional responsibilities in tracking and listing the toxic substances of this country. All these additional responsibilities are added to the environment minister's department but there are no new resources given for enforcement.

Well and fine, the government says it has \$40 million to review the assessment of 23,000 toxic substances under the lists, but that is just doing the homework. That is just filling in the lists and putting them in filing cabinets in the right place where they should be. To enforce this on industries, on communities and make sure that the polluters are abiding by these laws there are no new additional resources.

There are new responsibilities but no resources. The whole guiding light of the minister has been on finances. In saying program review, it should have been financial review. Programs should have a special review in terms of what the ability, the service and the intention of each department is. Inevitably it has been a financial review to find out in which departments the government can make cutbacks to come out of the deficit and go toward a surplus situation.

I want to highlight as well that provincial responsibilities have not been followed through especially in Ontario. The Harris provincial government has proven that under its own program review. It has made cutbacks in its inspections and in its environmental assessments.

At one time we said that the industrial revolution really capitalized under the United States and Canada was a pristine, clean and environmentally conscious country. Now we hear that Ontario is running first, second and third, running for first place as the highest polluter in North America. That is a sad situation.

We must look in our own backyard. We cannot take our hinterland, our wilderness, our wildlife, our ecosystem, our biodiversity and our children's health for granted. We must work at what we do today. We must clean up our house, throw away our garbage, respect the food we eat, the water we drink and respect all the good things that are given to us. If we have disrespect, that disrespect will come around and it is what we will end up with. It may not affect us because our life cycle is a lot shorter, but the children to come have a future to look forward to and that is our responsibility.

*Government Orders*

In some provinces the financial responsibilities have certainly been backfilled in terms of housing and environmental responsibilities and highway repairs. In these responsibilities there has been an effort in some provinces and territories but there are bad apples to be taken care of.

It is a federal responsibility to ensure that all Canadians are protected under CEPA.

• (1305)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration today is part of a continuum. Tirelessly, unrelentingly, this government pursues the same two objectives with each bill it introduces: first of all, nibbling away at the constitutional powers of the provinces, and second, making money.

Bill C-32 is a wonderful illustration and demonstration, as if one were needed, of this dual obsessive propensity of the Liberals to make political hay by centralizing within their hands as much power and money as possible, with an absolute disdain for the interests of the people.

I will start by speaking of the intrusion into the constitutional powers of the provinces.

Everyone knows that the environment is a shared federal and provincial jurisdiction. Starting right with the preamble to the bill, the division of powers relating to the environment is as follows: Ottawa has the power to decide, the provinces the power to implement. Am I exaggerating? Let the hon. members listen to the following. This is taken from the preamble:

Whereas the Government of Canada will continue to demonstrate national leadership in establishing environmental standards—

Here we go again with the same old Trojan Horse of national standards.

Members are still not convinced? Let us continue, with clause 2, which reads “the federal government must endeavour”—I repeat, endeavour—“to act in cooperation with governments to protect the environment”. Endeavour, not act, just try to act. We can trust the government not to go out of its way to endeavour to co-operate with the provinces. We want to get rid of this too convenient term, endeavour.

These two examples illustrate the federal government’s firm resolve to confine the provinces to the humble role of carrying out its orders.

My second point is that the bill will be used to increase government revenues, at the expense of the public interest.

To illustrate my point, I will now read clause 185:

(1) No person shall import, export or convey in transit a hazardous waste or hazardous recyclable material, or prescribed non-hazardous waste for final disposal, except

(a) after notifying the Minister and paying the prescribed fee;

Who will pay the prescribed fee? The Canadian company that imports the waste to process it.

Do not tell us that it is appropriate, for reasons of safety, to raise barriers against the transborder movement of hazardous waste in Canada, and that it is the reason for this provision. The industry that processes the waste is an important factor. It plays a critical role in the protection of the environment.

Obviously, the survival of the industry depends on the volume of waste it processes. The efficiency and performance of the Sablex plant, in Blainville, not to mention the attention it pays to safety, are recognized worldwide by those concerned. This company processes and must process waste from the United States to ensure its profitability. Its profitability will be jeopardized if it must add fees paid at the border to its other charges.

Increasing the financial burden borne by the hazardous waste industry will obviously lead to an increase in the rates the industry charges its customers. Higher rates mean a higher risk certain unscrupulous businesses that generate this kind of waste will avoid having them processed by dumping them God knows where.

Therefore fees on waste imported for processing is working against the environment. It is unconscionable and makes no sense to find such a provision in a bill on, precisely, environmental protection.

One could understand that fees be levied on waste bound, let us say, for a province where the movement of these substances is not governed by legislation—I do not even know if such a province exists—which would make it desirable to curtail their importation. But this is certainly not the case in Quebec where we have such legislation.

• (1310)

Our amendment to clause 185 therefore does not seek to eliminate these fees, but to exempt from them these substances bound for a province where such legislation exists. The amendment reads as follows:

(1.1) The Governor in Council shall, by order, exempt from the application of subsection (1)—

That is exempt from the fees.

—any person who imports into, exports to or conveys in transit to a province substances described in subsection (1) where an Act of the legislature of the province is in force that governs the movement of such substances—

*Government Orders*

I have no doubt my colleagues from every party recognize the advisability of the amendment introduced by my colleague for Jonquière, our party's environment critic.

**Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today we are speaking about Bill C-32, which deals with protection of the environment.

When I speak of the environment, I always think of the aboriginal saying that we do not inherit the planet from our parents, but rather we borrow it from our children. Any discussion of the environment and its protection is an attempt to create links with others, not just today but in the future as well. The harm we do to the planet now will have repercussions during our children's lives. I think it is always important to keep this in mind.

Governments can come up with as many wonderful bills as they want to protect it, but they must always start with individual citizens. There must be good public awareness and education regarding protection of the environment.

There are very specific examples in my riding, including the zone known as ZIP. Many people from the community and from various sectors have joined forces to clean up a tiny river. This is just one example, but it gives me great hope to know that, although this river was polluted in the past, I may one day be able to swim in it, thanks to the efforts of these individuals. Five years ago, this would have been completely unthinkable, and today I can look forward to this area in my riding being cleaned up.

I have begun on a very positive and enthusiastic note, but there is a long way to go. When I look at everything going on in the world today with regard to the environment, I think our planet is sick and we must continue to work hard to set environmental rules that will help us protect the environment.

We hear more and more about the globalization of economies, a subject I am very interested in. Businesses and large corporations that have to decide in which country they will locate are often attracted by tax benefits. However, we have to look at the environmental benefits that some countries might offer large corporations. For short term gains and for job creation, some governments in the world could be tempted to relax their environmental regulations, and if there is one area where globalization already exists, it is certainly the environment.

The members who spoke this morning are all well intentioned and they probably agree with what I just said about protecting the environment. The reason I am speaking to Bill C-32 today is to discuss the approach we will use to protect the environment.

I was a little bit surprised today to hear members, even on the government side, express concern about this bill not being tough enough. I find it interesting. As I said earlier, it is always a challenge, with regard to the environment, to reconcile economic

interests with environmental interests, in other words, to try to have a long term vision.

I will now try to summarize Bill C-32. With this bill, pollution prevention will become a national objective. This bill replaces the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. It contains provisions to implement pollution prevention, new procedures for the investigation and assessment of substances and new requirements with respect to substances that the Department of the Environment and the Department of Health have determined to be toxic.

• (1315)

The list of these substances is very extensive. The bill provides new powers for investigators and new mechanisms to deal with offences. It also specifies criteria for courts to consider for sentencing.

In addition, like the provinces and territories, aboriginal governments are provided the right of representation on the national advisory committee. And therein lies the problem.

Environment is said to be a federal-provincial matter. We are used to rise in this House to decry the behaviour of the current federal government, which wants to keep all the powers for itself and leave the provinces only with a advisory role.

To want to protect human health, to want to protect the environment is quite worthy. But today, I am opposed to the way the government wants to proceed. And this is why the Bloc Québécois had to put some amendments forward.

Earlier, I gave very concrete examples of what some of my constituents did to set up community projects in order to protect the environment. Environmental protection starts at the grassroots level to hopefully reach the highest levels of government.

We, in the Bloc Québécois, believe that the governments closest to the people are in the best position to make environmental regulations that meet the needs of the citizens. I think this is true. The closer one is to the people, the better one can meet their needs. This only makes sense.

I regret that, in this bill, the government is ignoring the provinces, as in many other pieces of legislation. Once again, there is the temptation to centralize power in this country. Then they wonder why political parties or individuals in Quebec, or even elsewhere in Canada, are anxious for independence. These are challenges here to which we must respond.

The Bloc Québécois amendments introduced by my hon. colleague for Jonquière, whose riding next to mine, propose deletion of the part of the preamble which sets out national environmental standards and national codes of practice relating to ecosystems and

*Government Orders*

environmental quality. Since the environment is not a solely federal jurisdiction, this is unacceptable to us.

We also wish to delete the references in the preamble to the presence of toxic substances, which is treated as a matter of national interest. Once again, the federal government is looking for an excuse to meddle in the environment from coast to coast.

We are therefore calling upon the government to amend the preamble so that Quebec may speak for itself internationally when its interests are at stake. This amendment fits in with Quebec's determination to speak for itself internationally when its interests are at stake, particularly in the areas of culture, education, health and the environment.

Among the amendments proposed for paragraph 2(1)(d), we wish to delete the words endeavour to in reference to the federal government's acting in co-operation with the provinces. This strikes me as a strange agreement, when the federal is described as having to endeavour to do something. This is a somewhat relative term. I believe everyone has his own definition of how much effort this entails.

Having regularly witnessed the federal government's behaviour, I wonder how much effort this government will put into endeavouring to co-operate with the provinces. Will mere consultations be considered an appropriate effort? I doubt it.

We are asking the government to delete the provision in clause 2(1)(g) on the establishment of nationally consistent standards of environmental quality, because such standards adversely affect our specificity.

In the case of clause 2(1)(l), we are proposing that the term endeavour be deleted, again to make sure the federal government will act in the spirit of the intergovernmental agreements reached with the provinces regarding the environment.

• (1320)

This amendment would not leave any possibility for this government to shirk its responsibility.

I could go on and on, but I think and hope that all the members of this House share the same goal, which is to set adequate rules to protect the environment.

The Bloc Québécois' opposition today, expressed through constructive additions and amendments, is simply about how the environmental reality will be dealt with through consultations and committees, in which the provinces, which are closer to the public, will have their say, being fully aware of what is really going on.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise

today to take part in the report stage debate on Bill C-32, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999.

This bill is a clear example of this federal government's contempt for the Canadian federal system. If we look at the respective responsibilities set out in the Constitution with regard to environmental matters, the federal government has chosen to ignore provincial responsibilities and, ironically enough, it is Quebec sovereignists who are forced to take a stand and defend the Constitution.

It is important to make things clear. With regard to the environment, people's first reaction is to say that environmental measures are necessary to protect the quality of our environment. However, it is also our responsibility to make sure that this is done by the right level of government.

In a model that respected Canadian federalism, the federal government would have fulfilled part of its responsibilities in co-operation with the provinces. It would have developed a consensus with them so that any federal legislation to be adopted in this area would be in line with the provinces' actions. It would have allowed any province that wanted to assume full responsibility to do so. And if other provinces wanted to delegate this responsibility to the federal government, they could have done so as well. But this is not what is happening.

The federal government has decided to interfere in an area where Quebec has already assumed some responsibility. This will create duplication again. What Quebecers dislike the most is that both governments are operating in the same field. This has major economic repercussions.

In the pulp and paper industry, for example, or in any industrial sector, just imagine what it will be like for businesses to submit two reports in order to comply with federal and provincial legislation. This involves additional costs. There is even an adverse effect that environmental groups have not perhaps thought of. Businesses will develop an aversion to all environmental protection measures, not necessarily because they are bad measures individually, but because their businesses will have been hampered by the presence of both levels of government in the same sectors.

That is why the Bloc Québécois has moved a series of amendments today. The member for Jonquière is consistent with what Quebec has defended for many years in order to ensure respect for its jurisdiction, but also in order to ensure that the economic stakeholders can operate in the context of the maximum productivity and effectiveness consistent with adequate environmental regulations.

The federal government has upset the apple cart by deciding to charge right in without considering the effects on the economy as a whole.

It is handling the reduction of greenhouse gases the same way. Regulations already exist. We will find ourselves in a maze of

*Government Orders*

contradicting regulations. Five or ten years from now, we may find ourselves in the same situation we were in recently, short of our international commitments because, instead of doing something about those aspects of environmental policy that are indeed its business, the federal government preferred to meddle in other jurisdictions.

• (1325)

Report stage gives the government a fine opportunity to accept the Bloc's amendments and to act not as a unitary, centralizing state but as a real federal state respecting the jurisdictions of all partners. It could then take into account what already exists at the provincial level and ensure that there is no duplication.

Environmental groups feel that, when promoting a clean environment and trying to bring industries to accept reasonable standards, there has to be a consensus within the community. But if there is one consensus, it is that too much government is not a good thing.

In any area, one level of government is enough, if we want to have a good relationship and partnership with companies. Two levels of government need not be involved in the protection of the environment, especially if this means that regulations would be developed behind closed doors and that businesses would have to make representations at both levels to ensure that the decisions made are appropriate.

Some argued, for example, that there would be a double safety net, but in the final analysis, this could be dangerous. Would it not be simpler to clearly define who should do what? Then we could hold the responsible level of government accountable for the results it has achieved instead of having the two levels of government accusing each other of adversely affecting results by their respective actions or by imposing an inefficient system.

The aim of the amendments we introduced is to have this legislation conform to the Canadian federal system and respect the responsibilities of the provinces. Thus, having assumed a certain leadership, provinces which have regulations will be able to continue to implement them, improve them, make them comprehensive and thus avoid what has happened in the other sectors, namely the useless overlap of federal and provincial governments.

It is rather surprising that, after all these years of criticism of overlap, we discover that in many sectors, the federal government is once again firing up its steamroller to make Canada a single model, despite the many failures it has met in the past.

Let us look at fish management policies for a moment. It was under federal government jurisdiction, but through standard application, through the—

**Ms. Paddy Torsney:** Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. I think the member has a prop. This is contrary to the standing orders of the House of Commons. He has something under his papers.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, I saw nothing, except the hon. member's notes. If he has a prop, I am sure he will not show it.

**Mr. Paul Crête:** Mr. Speaker, it is my day planner.

We are here to deal with the Environmental Protection Act because the federal government decided to intervene in a sector that is not under its jurisdiction, to increase overlap.

I was using fisheries as an example, a sector where the federal government had intervened with catastrophic results. Today, we no longer know what fish stocks there are. This has certainly caused a disruption in major fishing communities in Canada.

There are lessons to be drawn from an example such as this one and from many others so the federal government will pay attention to our amendments and agree to incorporate them in the bill to make it more acceptable and in keeping with the Canadian Constitution.

• (1330)

I find it quite unbelievable that we have to defend this point of view. The federal government is acting precisely as if there were only one jurisdiction in Canada, a central, single government, as if it could decide for all of the provincial governments. They would be seen as mere administrations and not entities responsible to those who elected them. This is how things would be done throughout the country.

We have to keep reminding the government that it does not have full responsibility in each and every area of jurisdiction. They should be humble enough to accept this and to agree to redevelop a consensus model with the provinces, even though it could take a little more time to build something solid. At some point, we need to get interesting results at the international level.

Let me conclude by saying that, if the federal government wants to show that it fully respects everyone's areas of jurisdiction, first, it should accept our amendments. Second, it should invite provincial premiers to take part in international environmental summits to present the results they have so far, instead of maintaining that, as the only government, it has complete and full responsibility in this matter, which is not true. The government is violating the very constitution it claims to protect.

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and great concern that I stand today to speak to a very important bill, Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

*Government Orders*

I am very much aware of environmental issues, having been the Bloc Québécois' environment critic from 1995 to 1997. I am therefore very much interested in environmental issues debated in the House.

All the more so that in the last Parliament and especially in 1995, I had the opportunity to participate, as a member of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, in the review of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, also called CEPA.

After hearing the witnesses who came before the committee, I and other members were appalled by the seriousness of issues raised by witnesses and by the urgent need to develop realistic and viable solutions to fix the CEPA.

The problems in the act are of several types. One has only to think of the double safety net, duplication of responsibilities with provinces and the constant tendency of this government to centralize all powers and deal with provinces as second class entities.

Thus it is for those reasons, among others, that the Bloc Québécois felt compelled to table a dissenting opinion in the report entitled *It's About Our Health: Pollution Prevention*.

As the old saying goes, it's six of one and half a dozen of the other. It is as though we are still in 1995 debating Bill C-74 that died on the order paper during the last Parliament. What a glaring example of the do-nothing attitude of this federal government. It is appalling.

Let us look more closely at Bill C-32 and we will see why it is so inappropriate and centralizing. You can count on me to demonstrate it.

What it is important to know about this bill is that it replaces the Environmental Protection Act. With Bill C-32 preventing pollution becomes a national objective, as if the provinces and Quebec were incapable of protecting their environment.

When I think of the Kyoto treaty, there is room for doubt about the federal government's policies and great national intentions. We shall get back to that a bit later.

The main objective of Bill C-32 is to replace the federal-provincial CEPA committee with a new national advisory committee. This will advise the federal government on drawing up regulations, managing toxic substances, and other issues of mutual interest.

Second, Bill C-32 puts in place a framework of action which assigns the ability to require planning of pollution prevention in connection with the substances declared toxic according to CEPA.

• (1335)

Thus pollution prevention also becomes a national objective, as does the creation of a national pollution prevention information clearing-house.

As well, where biotechnology is concerned, the bill establishes a federal safety net, as well as the authority to implement regulations aimed at the safe use of biotechnology.

As for protection of our water, the bill is aimed at protecting the marine environment from pollution sources on land or in the atmosphere. Bill C-32 will beef up the authority of CEPA concerning the regulation of fuels and fuel additives.

The bill will give the government the authority to establish national fuels marks. To protect the atmosphere, Bill C-32 provides for the establishment of national marks for emissions meeting the standards. It contains provisions to limit emissions from motor vehicles in general, including pleasure craft, construction equipment, farm machinery, snow blowers and lawn mowers. Also, the bill gives the federal government more control over the transborder movement of hazardous and non-hazardous waste, including household garbage.

As my second last point, I will say that aboriginal peoples are represented on a national advisory committee, as the provinces and the territories. They will have the same rights and responsibilities as provincial and territorial governments.

Finally, there will be a greater input from and greater protection of members of the public acting as whistleblowers regarding violations of the CEPA.

The Liberals have often used the environment as the perfect example of progressive, open and decentralized federalism. If I may, I will quote the Prime Minister of Canada, from the February 27, 1996 throne speech:

The federal government will propose to the provinces a much strengthened process to work in partnership, focussing on such priorities as... environmental management—

The bill talks about a national committee, national goals, a national centre, a federal net, and so on and so forth. What became of the provinces in this bill?

Let us be clear: Although in theory Bill C-32 recognizes that responsibility for the environment is shared between the federal government and the provinces, in practice it delegates no powers to them, including Quebec, and this runs counter to real environmental harmonization between the various levels of government. Bill C-32 aims at strengthening the federal government's preponderance in the field of environmental protection.

*Government Orders*

Therefore, it is easy to understand why the Quebec minister of the environment has always refused to sign the January 29, 1998 environmental harmonization agreement of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment.

The purpose of that agreement was to improve the protection of the environment in the context of sustainable development, while respecting the jurisdictions of each government. The Bloc Québécois has always supported harmonization between the federal and provincial governments when it would serve to eliminate administrative and legislative overlap and duplication between two levels of government.

Considering the contents of the environmental harmonization agreement and of Bill C-32, it is crystal clear that the federal government does not want to acknowledge its own constitution, which states that the environment is an exclusive or primary jurisdiction of the provinces.

How can this government claim to be in a better position than the provinces to protect the environment of Quebecers? Let us see what the federal government has done to our environment following the Kyoto agreement. Let us also look at what Quebec has done to eliminate greenhouse gases, by comparison to the federal government.

At the Rio summit in 1992, 154 countries, including Canada, signed the UN framework agreement on climatic change, thereby undertaking to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions at the 1990 levels by the year 2000. Seen at the time as a leader and champion in eliminating greenhouse gases, Canada has now lost all credibility.

• (1340)

Even Canada's environment ambassador, John Fraser, quite rightly had very harsh words for this government and its greenhouse gas policies; he accused it of lacking conviction and leadership. This is a disaster.

By the year 2000, Canada's greenhouse gas emissions will have increased by 13%. How are we to explain this, when the federal Liberal government made a commitment in Rio to stabilize its emissions during this decade and then progressively reduce them? Let us talk about this reduction: 3% up until 2010. That is how concerned this government is about the environment. Not.

It is therefore obvious that the federal government wants to use Bill C-32 to substantially increase its environmental powers when, under the Constitution, environment is a jurisdiction that is shared by various levels of government.

Through its paternalistic and centralizing attitude, this government is trying to relegate the provinces to a back seat. For all these reasons, the Bloc Québécois has no choice but to vote against the bill.

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to order made earlier this day, the questions on the motions in Group No. 2 are deemed put, and the recorded divisions are deemed requested and deemed deferred.

The House will now proceed to the debate on the motions in Group No. 3.

[Translation]

Pursuant to order adopted earlier today, the motions in Group No. 3 are deemed to have been moved and seconded. This group contains Motions Nos. 6, 7, 137 to 139, and 148 to 150.

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I need some clarification. Are we not voting on the motions in Group No. 2 at this time?

**The Deputy Speaker:** No. Because of the order adopted earlier today, it has been decided that all motions are deemed to have been moved, and that a recorded division is deemed to have been demanded and deferred.

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-32, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 45 to 48 on page 2 and lines 1 and 2 on page 3 with the following:

“iversity through pollution prevention and the control and management of toxic substances;”

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-32, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 46 to 48 on page 2 and line 1 on page 3 with the following:

“trol and management of the risk of any adverse effects of the use and release of toxic substances, pollutants and wastes, and the virtual elimination of persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances;

Whereas the Government of Canada recognizes the need to protect the environment, including its biological diversity, and human health, by ensuring the safe and effective use of biotechnology;”

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 137

That Bill C-32, in Clause 106, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 40 to 42 on page 78 with the following:

“(7) For the purposes of the administration of this section, the Governor in Council is responsible for”

*Government Orders*

(b) by replacing lines 3 and 4 on page 79 with the following:

“(a) if the Governor in Council determines that the”

(c) by replacing lines 8 and 9 on page 79 with the following:

“made under that Act, the Governor in Council”

(d) by replacing lines 13 and 14 on page 79 with the following:

“(b) if the Governor in Council determines that the”

(e) by replacing, in the English version, lines 18 and 19 on page 79 with the following:

“ule 4, the Governor in council may by order delete”

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 138

That Bill C-32, in Clause 106, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 45 on page 78 and lines 1 to 21 on page 79 with the following:

“(7) For the purposes of the administration of this section, the Governor in Council has the exclusive responsibility for determining whether or not the requirements referred to in paragraph (6)(a) are met by or under an Act of Parliament referred to in that paragraph, or regulations made under that Act, and

(a) if the Governor in Council determines that the requirements referred to in paragraph (6)(a) are met by or under an Act of Parliament referred to in that paragraph, or regulations made under that Act, the Governor in Council may by order add to Schedule 4 the name of that Act or those regulations, as the case may be, and the fact that an Act or regulations are listed in Schedule 4 is conclusive proof that the requirements referred to in paragraph (6)(a) are met; and

(b) if the Governor in Council determines that the requirements referred to in paragraph (6)(a) are no longer met by or under an Act of Parliament, or regulations, listed in Schedule 4, the Governor in Council may by order delete from Schedule 4 the name of that Act or those regulations, as the case may be.”

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC)** moved:

Motion No. 139

That Bill C-32, in Clause 106, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 41 to 45 on page 78 and lines 1 to 4 on page 79 with the following:

“this section, the Ministers and the minister responsible for the other Act referred to in paragraph (6)(a) are responsible for determining whether or not the requirements referred to in that paragraph are met by that other Act or regulations made under that Act, and (a) if the Ministers and that other minister determine that the”

(b) by replacing lines 8 and 9 on page 79 with the following:

“made under that Act, the Ministers and that other minister”

(c) by replacing, in the English version, lines 13 and 14 on page 79 with the following:

“(b) if the Ministers and that other minister determine that the”

(d) by replacing, in the English version, lines 18 and 19 on page 79 with the following:

“ule 4, the Ministers and that other minister may by order delete”

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 148

That Bill C-32, in Clause 115, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 17 on page 87 with the following:

“Parliament in a manner that provides, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, sufficient protection to the environment and human health.”

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 149

That Bill C-32, in Clause 115, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 17 on page 87 with the following:

“Parliament in a manner that, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, provides sufficient protection to the environment and human health.”

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC)** moved:

Motion No. 150

That Bill C-32, in Clause 115, be amended by replacing lines 6 and 7 on page 87 with the following:

“Parliament that, in the opinion of the Ministers and the minister responsible for the other Act,”

[English]

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Group No. 3 amendments deal primarily with biotechnology. As a result of the amendments that were made by the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development during the clause by clause process, the preamble now references products of biotechnology.

For greater clarity, government Motion No. 7 retains this reference but places it in a separate statement within the preamble. This provision recognizes the need to protect the environment by providing for the safe and effective use of products of biotechnology.

A couple of other motions focus on avoiding duplication when it comes to biotechnology. Assessment and control of products of biotechnology fall under several laws, including CEPA, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

Bill C-32 includes provisions to ensure that actions taken under other laws are not duplicated by CEPA. It operates on the principle that other laws must provide sufficient protection for the environment and human health. Government motions to amend the biotechnology part of Bill C-32 are consistent with this approach of using CEPA to ensure the protection of the environment and human health.

With regard to the opposition motions, let me say that all ministers in the government have responsibility for the environ-

*Government Orders*

ment. A key point, however, is that CEPA sets the standard for biotechnology. Other acts must assess for toxicity to determine if new products of biotechnology have the potential to harm the environment or human health. Several pieces of federal legislation govern products of biotechnology and expertise is shared across several departments. As such, it only makes sense to put decision making related to the use of CEPA in the hands of the governor in council.

• (1345)

Ironically, PC motions in this area seek to adopt a decision making model that was deleted by the standing committee because of the concern that it might create unnecessary delays or prevent action. I urge all members of the House to support the motions in Group No. 3 that are government motions and to vote against the PC motions that will come before us sometime next week.

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to the preamble is also of some importance. It ought to be elaborated on in a more balanced way because the insertion of the word risk in the preamble certainly raises some important and difficult questions.

This is an amendment that was not discussed in committee. It is a very recent initiative. It did not receive the full discussion that an amendment of this importance ought to receive considering that whatever is included in the preamble provides guidance for those who will interpret the legislation no matter what the name of the legislation may be.

There are some who say that the insertion of the word risk would strengthen this clause of the preamble because it would call for action where there are potential adverse effects or risks and not just actual adverse effects. That may well be so, but there is also another interpretation which should encourage us to be cautious before supporting this kind of amendment.

It is quite possible because of the element of surprise attached to this motion that it was proposed by industry without a proper discussion in committee, as I said. It is quite possible that by including the word risk in the preamble the government would not be able to act quickly to eliminate harmful substances. It is therefore an initiative that is part of a broader offensive so to speak, by lobbyists that represent a specific sector but who do not take into account the main thrust and purpose of this bill which is to prevent pollution and to protect human health.

Risk assessment is part of the government policy. It is elaborated on in the toxic substances management policy. In that policy, risk assessment is dealt with in a quite satisfactory manner. It is a policy that the government adopted in 1995. I am afraid that by inserting this terminology in the preamble the effectiveness of the toxic substances management policy would be superseded or weakened by this initiative.

As has probably been understood by the thrust of this debate, we want to strengthen and enhance pollution prevention. We want to use this piece of legislation as the only strong piece of legislation that actually protects human health from toxic substances. There is none other available in the arsenal of legislation the federal government has passed on behalf of Canadians.

• (1350)

It is a motion that somehow puts aside the long deliberations and discussions that took place in committee as was mentioned earlier by an hon. member. It is rather disturbing considering that this bill was in committee for such a long time that an amendment is put forward here that was not the subject of deliberations in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will share the sense of dismay and disappointment at this kind of procedure. After all we have a well organized system under the roof of this parliament. We send bills to committee for deliberation, examination, study and possible improvements. That is what we did.

As parliamentarians from all parties, we do not look favourably to those initiatives whereby an amendment is proposed out of the blue so to speak, which may have some serious implications. Also the jury is not in yet because this bill is not yet in place. This in a way bypasses the system. It is a practice that ought to be discouraged, Mr. Speaker, and it is my duty to bring it to your attention.

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this group of amendments. I hope I can hold the bill; it is not a prop, I just want to use it to highlight the clause on which I want to focus.

In Bill C-32 the preamble states the whole spirit and intent of the bill. When we deal with the Group No. 3 amendments that have come forward, I would like to highlight that with Motions Nos. 6 and 7 there is a kind of tag team between the Reform Party and the Liberal cabinet on behalf of the minister. They have brought forward two amendments that are quite detrimental to the protection of our environment and our health in the future.

The motion deals with a preamble that states in part:

Whereas the Government of Canada will endeavour to remove threats to biological diversity through pollution prevention, the control and management of any adverse effects of the use and release of toxic substances, products of biotechnology, pollutants and other wastes, and the virtual elimination of persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances;

Reform is releasing and completely taking away the whole aspect of virtual elimination of these toxic substances and highlighting the topic of control and management of pollution.

I would like to inform the House of another preamble. These go hand in hand. Obviously the minister and the Reform members

who brought these motions forward together have had some guidance from somebody. In a previous motion, the government acknowledges the need to phase out the generation and use of the most persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances and the need to control and manage pollutants and waste that were released in the environment.

What I am saying is that this bill and the government should be phasing out pollutants that are toxic and harmful to our health and our environment. We have to phase these out. I beg that members of all parties would listen to this. We need to take pollution out of our environment, not to control and manage it.

• (1355)

The two motions brought forward by the Reform and the minister are that we continue to control and manage pollution. Let us stop doing that. Let us look at phasing out the pollution, getting the poison out of our air, land and water and making a safe environment for the future.

This group of amendments is not a surprise. Through the committee process we tackled hard and strong to strengthen Bill C-32. These two amendments focus on the preamble. I highlight that for all members in the House and for Canadians listening to make sure that everyone is aware that these amendments could be a detriment to the existing structure of the CEPA.

The other issue that comes into play in this grouping is biodiversity and the whole issue of biotechnology. The products of biotechnology are highlighted in this group of amendments. The amendments ask that the exclusive responsibility of biotechnology and the products of biotechnology in the country be given to the governor in council. This removes the responsibilities that the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food have in terms of duties and roles under the act and gives them to the governor in council.

Biotechnology was highlighted in today's media on the issue of cloning. Recently we have seen the evidence of cloning and genetic engineering. We now find that the cloned sheep Dolly has genes and cells that are a detriment and have been deteriorating right from when she was first cloned. Future generations of hers will not exist after the sixth generation. There is scientific evidence that her cells will diminish to the point that she will not be able to reproduce.

That is the essence of the human health and environmental concerns. Mr. Speaker, I see you are indicating my time is up so I will continue my speech later.

**The Speaker:** Yes, my colleague, it seems like an appropriate time. You still have five minutes and you will have the floor when we return to debate. Now we will proceed to Statements by Members.

*S. O. 31*

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### FRED SABATINE

**Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Cambridge's only known surviving first world war veteran, Mr. Fred Sabatine, will be celebrating his 100th birthday on May 28.

Mr. Sabatine enlisted at the age of 15 and served with the 43rd Battalion of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in France and Belgium. He fought at the Battle of Vimy Ridge, regarded by many historians as a defining event in the making of our nation, and went on to earn the British War and Victory medals.

Mr. Sabatine experienced all the horrors and hardships associated with the Great War, including direct exposure to mustard gas which damaged his lungs. The sacrifices made for Canada's freedom by Mr. Sabatine's generation are beyond description.

I am honoured and privileged to express my deepest thanks on behalf of all Canadians to Mr. Sabatine and wish him a happy birthday. God bless you, Fred.

\* \* \*

### ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government has raised taxes 60 times and has increased revenues by \$40 billion yet at the same time it has cut millions from the RCMP budget.

Now there are only five vessels patrolling the entire coast of B.C. Patrol vessels in my riding are only operating every second week.

In Port Alberni two RCMP officers are leaving the detachment and will not be replaced. Special projects have been terminated. The three man drug squad has been put into general policing.

Last year all overtime was suspended. A drug squad that was working on a big case put in so much overtime that they had to shut them down for over four months because they could not pay the overtime. Informants are being paid with cigarettes and IOUs. Now the sources have dried up because there is simply no more money.

• (1400)

Clearly it is time for the government to make the RCMP a priority and restore RCMP funding.

## S. O. 31

[Translation]

## GUARANTEED MINIMUM INCOME

**Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in his latest work, *Passage obligé: Passeport pour l'ère nouvelle*, Charles Sirois writes the following about a minimum guaranteed income.

“What if the social safety net were replaced by a protective net, one that were not intended for a specific category of citizens but for everyone without distinction? This protection would take the form of a guaranteed minimum income.

Every person aged 18 and over, rich or poor, male or female, young or old, would receive on an annual basis a sum of money corresponding to the strict minimum necessary for food and housing.

The collective wealth to which all workers and all consumers contribute, and which the government keeps in its coffers, would no longer be used to assist certain classes of citizens.

Couples would share in this guaranteed minimum income, as would students over the age of 18, and seniors as well.”

This is the true formula for abolishing poverty in Canada.

\* \* \*

[English]

## CANADA'S WALK OF FAME

**Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, allow me to join all Canadians in congratulating the newest inductees to Canada's Walk of Fame, whose stars will be unveiled today during a special ceremony in Toronto. Each one of these celebrated Canadians has made a significant national and international contribution in entertainment, culture and sport.

Canada's Walk of Fame is a recognition not of a single achievement, but of an entire body of work. These stars represent many of the facets of our cultural life: the evolution of cinema from the silent films of Mary Pickford to the futuristic images created by our David Cronenberg; music ranging from the 1960s protest anthems of Buffy Sainte-Marie to the rock anthems of Rush. They remind us of the thrill of seeing Rocket Richard flash across the ice, or of experiencing Céline Dion in concert. From the intimate family moments we have shared watching Wayne and Shuster and “our pet” Juliette to the enjoyment of the film characters created by Hume Cronyn and Lou Jacobi, each star is a shining example of the talent and creativity of our great country.

Four more stars will be awarded this year by public nomination. I encourage all Canadians to participate in selecting the most

famous Canadians who have inspired them through telling our stories, sharing our hopes and adding sparkle to our lives.

\* \* \*

## CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD

**Mr. Tony Valeri (Stoney Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate this year's recipients of the Grimsby and District Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year awards.

Reverend Jim Dowden has been involved in a wide variety of volunteer tasks and is perhaps best known through his recent work with Grimsby's hospital action committee where Jim's vision and endurance were well illustrated.

Jim's ability to enrich the fabric of the community no matter what he does sets a high standard for community service. His leadership combines vision and compassion and he is a most deserving recipient of the Citizen of the Year award.

Michelle Alfieri has been named the junior citizen of the year for her contribution to a variety of worthwhile causes, including the Canadian Cancer Society and the West Lincoln Memorial Hospital. Michelle has juggled her volunteer work with an active sports schedule and a part time job. All this while maintaining a grade point average of 90%. She has received early acceptance from McMaster University where she plans to study biochemical engineering and medicine.

My best wishes to the recipients.

\* \* \*

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Portage—Lisgar, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, right now in southwestern Manitoba farmers are experiencing the devastating flood runoff from torrential rains at the worst possible time.

Already faced with low commodity prices and an unworkable federal aid program, they are seeing their seeding plans deteriorate as more than two million acres are in danger of not being planted. That could put the survival of many farms in serious jeopardy.

Last week I toured some of the affected areas and I was astounded at the seriousness of the situation. Estimates are that 3,000 farmers are affected. In fact, nine municipalities have been declared disaster areas.

If exceptionally warm, dry weather does not occur in the next couple of weeks, the government had better be prepared to step in and help these farmers through this crisis, which threatens to be as devastating as the Red River flood.

*S. O. 31*

## MANUFACTURING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CENTRE

**Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, just a few hours ago an important announcement was made in my riding of Whitby—Ajax.

The announcement details an innovative training centre and a number of facility upgrades that are designed to help ease the critical shortage of highly skilled information technology and technical workers in Canada. To put this announcement into context, it has been estimated that the shortage of IT workers in Canada is between 15,000 and 30,000.

The facility announced this morning will be known as the Manufacturing and Information Technology Centre and it will be located at Durham College.

• (1405)

It is also highly noteworthy that Durham College will carry out this project with significant intellectual and equipment contributions from Bell Canada, General Motors, IBM and Nortel Networks.

Durham region is a major player on the manufacturing scene in Canada and around the world. This area also has the second fastest growing population in Canada and the second highest per capita income of the 20 census metropolitan areas in the country.

The importance of MITC for Canada as well as my—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

## SENIOR CITIZENS' WEEK

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Senior Citizens' Week I wish to pay tribute during this International Year of Older Persons to all those seniors who are so generously involved in our society.

An excellent example of their social involvement is the recent statement by FADOQ, the Fédération de l'âge d'or du Québec, in favour of the legalization of marijuana for health and medical purposes. This support was evidence of their open-mindedness and compassion.

I will take advantage of this opportunity to draw attention to the fourth global conference on ageing, to be held in Montreal from September 5 to 9. Organized by the International Federation on Ageing, this conference will bring together more than 2,000 seniors, caregivers, decision-makers and associations serving or representing older adults.

The themes addressed at the conference will, without a doubt, cast new light on the day to day lives of older persons.

\* \* \*

## BOMBARDIER INC.

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, good economic news at the start of the week as we learned that Bombardier will provide, at a cost of \$655 million Canadian, 192 commuter trains to the Metropolitan Transportation Authorities—Long Island Rail Road, which wants to replace its rolling stock.

In addition, the contract obtained by this Canadian company is worth celebrating. It includes options for the production of 800 additional cars to meet the needs of two rail transportation agencies of the Metropolitan Transportation Authorities, the Long Island Rail Road and the Metro-North Railroad.

If all the options are exercised, the contract will be worth a total of \$2.7 billion.

Here is an example of the Quebec economic model. A business from home showing leadership on the international market, just—

**The Speaker:** The member for Surrey North.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

## NATIONAL DRUG STRATEGY

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in just seven hours from now Canada's first national anti-drug rally will take place in Abbotsford, British Columbia. I wish I could be there but Bill C-79 on victims' rights requires my attention here tomorrow.

The rally will focus national attention on the need for federal, provincial and municipal governments support for health care for those addicted to drugs, for more commitment to drug education and for a real national drug strategy that works on the street.

The question is why in 1999 do we need to be taking this action? Where has the government been over the last six years? What will it take to get this Liberal government to care more about drug addicts than their patronage friends?

With the help of former Canadian heavyweight champion George Chuvalo, we will begin to answer the question: "Drugs, are we ready to fight?" Tonight in Abbotsford thousands of people will be ready to say yes.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

## JULIE PAYETTE

**Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a Quebec woman has spectacularly realized a life dream.

*S. O. 31*

Julie Payette, one of our own, took off on time, at 6 hours 49 minutes and 42 seconds, in the space shuttle on an important scientific mission. We were thrilled to watch her this morning readying for such an outstanding trip. We watched the successful take off with bated breath.

It took courage, skill and patience for Julie to be where she is today. We will follow her moment by moment throughout this trip, of such importance to her, of course, and Canada and Quebec.

Julie has already conveyed to young Canadians her perseverance and tenacity in achieving an objective of a lifetime.

Today, a new star appeared in the firmament. Well done, Julie.

\* \* \*

[English]

**EDUCATION**

**Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, just blocks from here, cuts to special education funding have driven mothers to the desperate act of offering to sell their kidneys to stop a \$20 million cut to their kids' education. Even the family of an American diplomat in Ottawa has warned colleagues away from our capital because of these special education cuts.

The social union agreement is supposed to allow for national standards. Cases like this show that the agreement is nothing more than empty words for these mothers and for other vulnerable Canadians.

The time has come for action. The government says nice things about children with special needs but does nothing. Persons with disabilities are guaranteed equality of citizenship under the charter of rights and freedoms. Why is it that the government always waits for desperate acts or court challenges before providing services that all Canadians are entitled to?

• (1410)

Parents should not have to offer their kidneys to force federal and provincial governments to act.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ASTRONAUT JULIE PAYETTE**

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, like many Quebecers, it was with much pride and emotion that I watched the *Discovery* head skyward with Quebec's first female astronaut, Julie Payette, on board.

Space has fed the imaginations of many adolescents. Like many others, I dreamed of seeing a launch.

By taking her place on board *Discovery* today, the astronaut from Quebec is not just realizing her dream, but is ensuring that her name will go down in history.

Over the next ten days, Julie will help to assemble the international space station. This morning, I relived the strong emotions of—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam.

\* \* \*

[English]

**WESTERN TASK FORCE**

**Mr. Lou Sekora (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to take strong exception to the ridiculous remarks directed to me yesterday in the House by a member of the Reform Party. The member criticized myself and the Prime Minister's western task force that visited British Columbia and referred to me as a task force yesman.

During the task force's tour of B.C., we received almost 100 presentations from a wide variety of community groups and organizations. If listening to the concerns of these groups is being a yesman then I plead guilty.

Instead of criticizing my efforts, the members of the Reform Party should spend more time in their ridings so I do not get so many calls from different mayors and council members from their ridings to say yes again so I can help them again.

\* \* \*

**GOLDMAN ENVIRONMENTAL AWARD**

**Mr. Charlie Power (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to acknowledge the significant achievement of an extraordinary Newfoundlander. Mr. Bernard Martin is a fourth generation fisherman whose determined efforts in marine conservation have been rewarded with distinguished international recognition.

Mr. Martin was recently presented with the prestigious Goldman Environmental Prize at a ceremony in San Francisco. The international award was designed to recognize grassroots heroes in environmental conservation. It was awarded to only six recipients worldwide and Bernard Martin was the winner for North America. A resident of the fishing community of Petty Harbour, he is the first Newfoundlander ever to receive this great honour.

On behalf of Mr. Martin's family and friends, we congratulate him on his award. I know that Bernard, in his quiet, confident and committed manner is probably somewhat embarrassed by all this attention. On behalf of all members I want to tell him that Canada is proud of his accomplishments. He has every right to be proud of his commitment, his contribution and his well-deserved recognition.

*Oral Questions***CYSTIC FIBROSIS MONTH**

**Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that May is Cystic Fibrosis Month.

Cystic fibrosis is a genetic disease affecting the respiratory and digestive systems. The most devastating damage takes place in the lungs. Everyone with cystic fibrosis dies of lung disease. There is no known cure. Approximately one in every twenty-five hundred children born in Canada have this deadly disease.

Since 1960, the Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, a national voluntary health organization, has worked to improve the lives of Canadians who are affected by this fatal disorder.

Please join me in congratulating the Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation in extending best wishes for a successful Cystic Fibrosis Month.

\* \* \*

**BALL HOCKEY**

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, last night saw a ball hockey rematch between the parliamentary press gallery giants of journalism and the proud Reform cross-checkers. Having soundly defeated the yellow journalists in our previous encounter, a confident Reform squad stepped onto the playing surface with nothing short of a second media defeat carved into the blades of our sticks.

Alas, it was not to be. The members of the fourth estate displayed creativity, teamwork and balance, traits not normally associated with their trade, as they defeated the Reform warriors to set up a third and deciding rubber match.

So the stage now has been set for a showdown game to decide who will be the true parliamentary champions of Canada's favourite pastime. This display of Canadian culture will not require any grants, subsidies or protectionist polices from the heritage minister. It just requires a flat playing service, lots of guts, sticks and plenty of balls. The Reformers are ready. We just hope the giants of journalism will answer the call.

---

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

• (1415)

[English]

**KOSOVO**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Slobodan Milosevic was indicted today for war crimes. There is no doubt that his program of ethnic cleansing warrants legal punishment from the international community. However, the timing of

this indictment raises serious concerns about the impact this will have on the peace process.

I would like to ask somebody in the government if they are concerned that this move will drive Milosevic even farther from the bargaining table.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government welcomes the decision of the international tribunal to bring an indictment against Mr. Milosevic. We have long believed there is substantial evidence that would justify such an indictment.

At the same time we certainly want to find a diplomatic solution through the United Nations. These discussions continue. We are talking with the Russians. We are talking with the President of Finland.

To have a UN resolution does not depend on the assent of Mr. Milosevic. Certainly we are continuing to follow a track which will hopefully end with a diplomatic solution.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in fact Russia has been very hesitant to side with NATO in this whole conflict, but it has played a key role in trying to bring a negotiated end to this crisis.

The timing of the indictment has not only annoyed the Russians. It has also made it very difficult for them to negotiate and help broker peace. Potentially hundreds of thousands of lives hang in the balance here.

Is the government not concerned that the timing of the particular indictment may make things worse rather than better?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, the tribunal is at arm's length from governments. It was the decision of the tribunal as to when and how to bring this indictment.

At the same time the Yugoslav government, which is more than Mr. Milosevic, knows the five conditions of the NATO countries. Certainly the opportunity is there and continues for the Yugoslav government to accept the conditions, which would mean a halt to the bombing and the setting up of circumstances, hopefully under the auspices of the United Nations, to help the Kosovars get back to their homes.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the NATO campaign is at a critical juncture right now. We know that the U.S. and Britain are talking about a ground war. The Russians are very concerned about the continued use of air strikes.

Now Milosevic has been indicted for war crimes. We believe that he should be charged but we are concerned about the timing. Saving the peace process is paramount in this whole exercise.

I ask the defence minister how he will negotiate with an indicted war criminal to make this situation better.

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, any discussions will take place with the Yugoslav government as a whole.

The Reform Party cannot have it both ways. In the same breath the spokeswoman for the Reform Party says she supports the indictment and at the same time she seems to say she does not want the indictment. Let her make up her mind as to where she and her party stand on this matter.

\* \* \*

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister knows that it is an issue of timing.

As we speak tensions are also increasing in another part of the world between two nuclear powers, India and Pakistan. There are reports that after a day of military clashes along the border Pakistan has shot down an Indian air force jet.

Has the government called for an emergency session of the security council to address this growing crisis?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are reviewing the situation. We will have more to say about it very shortly.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this is not a very reassuring reaction from the government. We all know that the sanctions imposed by the government have damaged our influence in the region. Nevertheless these two countries remain Commonwealth partners and deserve our best diplomatic efforts.

Unfortunately once again the government is choosing to be reactive instead of proactive in this area. It comes after the U.S. has had many high level meetings. Even China has been in the negotiations. Yet Canada has been silent for the past year in an area in which it should have been very active.

What further actions is the government planning to take to bring these two sides together? Do we have any influence left in these Commonwealth countries?

**Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not true at all that we have not done anything.

I just returned from a trip to south Asia with his colleague. I raised all these issues with both the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan, particularly on Kashmir.

• (1420)

We asked them to tone down the tension in the region. We hope both countries will find a political solution to the problem in Kashmir. We told them that a military solution is not an answer for a peaceful solution.

[Translation]

**PUBLISHING INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, now that the dust is settling on the agreement signed with the United States concerning Bill C-55, we realize that the government dropped the cultural exemption negotiated by the previous government under the free trade agreement.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister realize that the Liberal government's contribution to free trade will have been to weaken the position of Canada, Quebec and all countries who are arguing for cultural exemption in the context of international trade?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the agreement announced yesterday protects the culture of all Canadians.

I wonder why the leader of the Bloc Québécois does not have words of praise for this great victory for the Canadian government and all Canadians.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, let the Deputy Prime Minister talk of a great victory. The fact is—and the government can play the ostrich all it wants—this is an important breach with respect to the cultural exemption.

In fact, an adviser to President Clinton said that there was nothing about culture in the agreement. It concerns trade and nothing else.

Is the government aware that it has just reduced culture to the same level as other commodities, thus dropping the cultural exemption?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, obviously we do not see culture as just another commodity to be traded.

We have a special position, which was recognized for the first time by the U.S. government. It is important for Canada and for all other countries in the world.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the government may be proud of this agreement with the United States about American magazines, but the fact is that it puts magazines on the same footing as any other commercial good, as an adviser to President Clinton rightly pointed out.

By caving in before having exhausted all possible recourses, what signal did Canada send to the United States, just before the next round of WTO negotiations?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, following the ruling made by the World Trade Organization, the Americans had unrestricted access to the Canadian advertising market. Under this agreement, that access is now limited to 18%.

*Oral Questions*

The Americans have recognized for the first time that if they want to exceed that percentage, publishers will have to offer a primarily Canadian content. This is a significant change on the part of our friends south of the border.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, does the federal government not realize that, from now on, the Americans will use the precedent set in the publishing industry to open the whole cultural sector to free trade?

Is the government not worried about that, and does it not realize that it opened the door to this?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if we opened a door, it has to do with the fact that the Americans are now recognizing for the first time the legitimacy of demanding a mostly Canadian content, something they had refused to recognize until now.

In that sense, the agreement reached between our two countries is a victory for us, because we convinced the Americans to recognize the legitimacy of Canadian content in our cultural industries.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Twice in the last few minutes we have heard the phrase majority Canadian content. Yet we also read that American negotiators are talking about substantial Canadian content.

Which is the case? Is it majority Canadian content, the Canadian version, or is it substantial Canadian content, the American version? If it is not the American version, would he please rise and tell the Americans, through this place, that is not the case?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no disagreement. It is majority Canadian content as was explained yesterday in the draft regulations, which will flow from the legislation, that were made public with the announcement of the agreement.

I refer the hon. member to the draft regulations that were published wherein it is explicitly said that the net benefit will include, inter alia, undertakings by foreign investors that result in a majority of original editorial content for the Canadian market in each issue of each periodical title.

• (1425)

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this is something that should be made clearer to the Americans than it obviously has been already.

I want to ask a question of the Deputy Prime Minister. Yesterday the Prime Minister said that this was the first time that Americans

had recognized our right to protect our culture. Is it not also the case, or at least has the Prime Minister not claimed in the past when he signed NAFTA and the WTO that Canadians had a right to protect their own culture?

The Americans presumably recognized this in the NAFTA and the WTO, so why is the Prime Minister making this specious claim that there is something new about this, or was it not the case that cultural protection—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Deputy Prime Minister.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that the World Trade Organization ruling did not uphold the Canadian position. If it had been left to stand by itself there could have been no protection for Canadian content and Canadian culture at all.

By having this agreement we have a real victory. We are protecting Canadian culture. We are protecting Canadian content, which would not have been the case if the WTO ruling had stood by itself. We have also strengthened whatever there was in the NAFTA agreement as well. This is a victory for Canada and Canadians. This is a victory for Canadian culture.

**Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC):** Mr. Speaker, on February 9 I specifically asked both the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Minister for International Trade whether Bill C-55 was an ironclad piece of legislation that could survive any possible U.S. challenge at the WTO and NAFTA. Based on their assurances we agreed to support this piece of legislation.

Could the Minister of Canadian Heritage explain why she would succumb to U.S. threats when she knows Canada could defend itself against U.S. retaliation?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we did not succumb to U.S. threats. What we have said all along is that we were open to proposals from our neighbours to the south if our interests coincided.

Indeed we have had any number of meetings to that effect. The last time we met we agreed to some terms which will protect our magazine industry, ensure its future. At the same time we got our neighbours to the south to agree for the first time to the importance of a majority Canadian content. That is what we have obtained.

**Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House the Minister of Finance said that there was funding available in the budget to help the Canadian magazine industry.

Could the minister tell us where this money is coming from? Was it already earmarked for that purpose because the government knew well in advance that it would cave in to U.S. demands? Was this whole piece of legislation simply a bargaining tool?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member would know if he were to talk to anyone who does responsible budgeting, which he may not, in fact any government would make provisions for this kind of matter.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I expect the TD Bank will be off the finance minister's Christmas card list. Of course it probably already was after that little rival comment.

TD is now saying that real personal disposable incomes are 26% below the United States right now, 5% lower than they were a decade ago.

Will the minister admit that after six years in power it is pretty clear that his policies have failed Canadians?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite the opposite as anyone who has read the TD study would demonstrate.

The fact is that from 1990 to 1992 this country went through one of the deepest recessions we have ever seen, much deeper than the United States. In 1993 when we took office with a deficit rising, interest rates rising, unemployment rising, it is very clear that Canada suffered from severe trauma.

What has in fact happened since we have taken office is that those numbers have turned for the better. Our unemployment is down. Our interest rates are down. Our economic growth is up. The situation has turned around and most economists would recognize that.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, just two days after we passed the medical marijuana motion and already we are getting answers like this.

The TD Bank says that the reason incomes are so low is that job creation is too slow. The reason that job creation is too slow is because taxes are far too high.

• (1430)

How many reports do we have to have? How many business leaders have to tell us that taxes are too high before the government will start to act to give Canadians a tax break?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as is evident again from reading the TD study, the problem arose out of the recession that I talked about from 1990 to 1992 and a whole series of policies that were put in place by the previous government which in fact led to a very poor 1990 to 1994.

Given the fact that the Reform Party is criticizing that period, why is it so eager to hop into bed with the Tory party which gave us those economic policies? Why the united alternative?

[Translation]

**PUBLISHING INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in addition to creating a dramatic rift in the area of cultural exemptions, the agreement signed this week between Canada and the United States testifies to the federal government's total lack of planning and threatens the Canadian publishing industry.

Does the government realize that, far from saving Canadian publishers, it has betrayed them thereby potentially costing them \$300 million in losses annually? How does the government intend to compensate the publishers for these losses, which it has caused?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we acknowledge that an adjustment will be made when the agreement comes into effect. cabinet and the Prime Minister have given the Minister of Canadian Heritage the authority to discuss, with industry representatives, the terms of an offer of some kind to compensate for these measures they will have absorb.

These discussions began yesterday morning and should conclude very quickly so that everything may be submitted to cabinet soon.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, does the government realize that the agreement it signed with the Americans puts half the advertising revenues of magazines at risk? At stake is 50% of the market, or \$300 million, which the Canadian publishers will no longer have.

Does the government intend to compensate all of this considerable loss or will it abandon Canadian publishers?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is totally false. The American advantage as the result of the WTO decision was its unlimited access to the Canadian advertising market. This access has been reduced to 18% after three years. The figure of \$300 million given by my colleague opposite is totally false.

There will be an impact, we acknowledge this. We will attenuate this impact and the way we will do so will be negotiated and discussed with industry representatives. A report will be submitted to cabinet once the discussions have been concluded. The members opposite will know the—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** Order please. The hon. member for Peace River.

[English]

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's business sector has been promised major subsidy reduction in the

*Oral Questions*

next round of trade negotiations and Canadian trade officials are working hard to deliver. However, yesterday's offer of subsidies to the magazine industry is a contradiction to that position.

Has the trade minister not seriously compromised the work of his trade negotiators through his actions?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister for International Trade, I want to say that both he and the Minister of Canadian Heritage have done a wonderful job in bringing this matter together.

Because of my previous incarnation in this portfolio I know something about this matter. I must say that they have done a wonderful job in dealing with this trade dispute. For the first time there is a recognition of Canadian culture and our right to protect it. Resolving this problem will not have the kind of implications and ramifications for international trade that the opposition seems to think it will.

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that is gunboat diplomacy or what is happening here.

If trade negotiators are successful worldwide in reducing subsidies, is that not going to put this whole policy of the Liberal government on magazine subsidies under great risk? Is it not offering something that it cannot deliver, just as it did in the original Bill C-55?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Trade is at this very moment in Budapest having discussions with some 20 other countries as they prepare for the third round of WTO negotiations starting in Seattle this fall. Certainly that issue and how to deal with the issue of subsidies is part of the ongoing discussions in terms of international trade.

• (1435)

Let me say that what has been decided upon here will in no way disrupt the Canadian position with respect to trade and subsidies. In fact, it is a very good resolution.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the government has made a commitment to help Canadian publishers with a program, the costs of which, I might point out, are unknown even to it. The government contends that it has the assurance of the Americans that they would not contest this policy under NAFTA, the WTO or American trade legislation.

My question is for the Minister of National Defence, who seems to be the closest to this matter. Can he tell us under what legal principle the American government would not be obliged to submit to WTO or NAFTA regulatory authorities any complaints from

American publishers who felt that their rights were being infringed upon by Bill C-55?

[*English*]

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the WTO encourages countries that have disputes such as the one we had with the United States to get together to settle their differences. This was a difference between our two countries which has now been settled. It has no other ramifications that should interest the WTO. I believe that this particular issue has been resolved and resolved in a very good way.

In fact an article in the Toronto *Star*, if I can mention a publication from my home city, stated that a negotiated settlement was the only realistic—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Repentigny.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, that is very reassuring for Canadian publishers.

Speaking of reassurance, what assurance does the Minister of National Defence have that none of the other WTO member countries will ever contest his compensation program when one of them considers there is unfair competition with its own publishers who export their magazines to Canada?

[*English*]

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of ramifications that would affect other countries. Certainly the kind of policy direction we have set in trying to protect Canadian culture is a very good one and one that I think will be very beneficial to both American publications and our own, as well as any other country's.

\* \* \*

**DONATIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES**

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In 1996 and 1997 three federal agencies, the harbour commissions of the Fraser River, Oshawa and Thunder Bay, donated \$5,780.94 to the Liberal Party. The members of those three commissions were all, naturally, ministerial appointees.

Does the minister think that was a proper use of public funds?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as minister responsible for the Canada Elections Act, I am pleased to answer this question.

On March 5 of this year the government issued directives that crown corporations—and I am speaking only of crown corporations—were not to make contributions to political parties. At least two parties had received them. Ours gave the money back. I invite others to do the same. No answer has come to that effect yet.

*Oral Questions*

In regard to the Fraser Valley Commission, that is not a crown corporation. Again, the Liberal Party and another party in the House have also received funds. I am presently examining the situation and it is under review.

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we are very aware that these federal agencies are not crown corporations, which is the whole crux of this matter. We want to know if these federal agencies will be subject to the edict that was issued with respect to crown corporations. Does this ruling of the House leader apply to them? Does it apply to the commissions and the port authorities? When can we expect the money to be paid back to the public treasury by the Liberal Party?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me answer both parts of the question.

I already indicated that the issue is under review. Whenever a decision comes, if a decision is made to return the moneys, I invite the hon. member across to answer the question himself in regard to his own party.

\* \* \*

• (1440)

[Translation]

**TAINTED BLOOD**

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, between 1981 and 1986, the Minister of Finance was a board member of the parent company of Connaught, which was involved in the tainted blood scandal.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Is this responsibility as a board member not, by itself, sufficiently compromising to require the Minister of Finance not to be involved in determining the rights of the tainted blood victims?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this matter has been referred in principle to the ethics commissioner, who has said that a response will be forthcoming.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton West—Mississauga, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, June 4 will commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre. Can the Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific please tell this House if Canada has taken any steps to improve the human rights situation in China?

**Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada continues to be very concerned about the human rights problem in China. We have raised this issue with

the highest authority of the Chinese government whenever we could. At the same time, we have tried to engage the Chinese government in judicial reforms and, as well, we have tried to help it reform its institutions.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to those who die and suffer for democracy in China.

\* \* \*

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, last week convicted sex offender Clifford Howdle went absent without leave while on day parole in my riding. For 36 hours he terrorized people in the area, committing 17 offences which included three rapes and a kidnapping. In spite of the fact that the police opposed day parole for Howdle because he posed a danger to society, he was released.

My question is for the solicitor general. Why was Clifford Howdle granted day parole?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I take this grave matter very seriously. I have directed the Chairman of the National Parole Board and the Commissioner of Correctional Services Canada to conduct a joint national investigation into this tragedy. The investigation will be co-chaired by three former policemen from Lethbridge, Alberta.

**Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as if the Howdle case was not enough to destroy all faith in the day parole system, another case came to light. In January Frank Laliberte raped a young woman while on day parole. Residents of Prince Albert were assured that Clifford Howdle was an isolated case and we now know that is not true.

What guarantees can the solicitor general give my constituents that there are not more unidentified day parole rapists in their midst?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, this is a very serious matter. I have directed the Chairman of the National Parole Board and the Commissioner of Correctional Services Canada to have a national investigation to get to the bottom of exactly what did happen in this very serious situation.

\* \* \*

**SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in regard to the shipbuilding industry the Prime Minister wrote: "The challenge for governments, firms, workers and other interested parties is to exploit all available . . . opportunities", which begs the question of why the industry minister does not want to reconvene a meeting of all

*Oral Questions*

stakeholders to come up with a comprehensive industrial strategy for shipbuilding in this country.

I wish to give the government the opportunity to speak directly to many of the workers who are with us today. Why does this country not have an industrial strategy for a comprehensive program of shipbuilding?

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to discuss this subject with the member many times. I should point out that the government has a shipbuilding policy. We have met with shipbuilders from coast to coast.

Please understand that we have an accelerated capital allowance for shipbuilding, specifically a 25% duty on most ships imported from NAFTA countries.

Both the Department of Foreign Affairs and Industry Canada have been working with shipbuilding to try to get more markets. However, let us understand that shipbuilding across the world has a very high overcapacity, and the member should understand that.

\* \* \*

• (1445)

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the fire alarm in this building earlier today may well have been sparked by the incendiary letter from the dean of the Senate to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Senator Sparrow said that AIDA is inadequate to alleviate the disaster affecting farmers and states what this party has been saying for months about AIDA including the refusal to recognize the problem, implying rural Saskatchewan residents are ignorant, lazy and/or inefficient. The senator states that if the government chooses not to support rural Saskatchewan then just say so.

How does the minister respond to these stinging criticisms of AIDA from a member of his own parliamentary caucus?

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from the other place refers to people from his own province in the way in which he does but I certainly do not. I respect the farmers in Saskatchewan and all across Canada. I worked with them to put the program in place. I continue to encourage them to fill out the forms and get them in. We will deal with them as quickly as we possibly can.

\* \* \*

**SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY**

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, today the Prime Minister received 150,000 cards of support for a new national shipbuilding policy from shipbuilders across Canada.

When he was in opposition the Prime Minister stated in a letter to the Marine Workers Federation "It is safe to say that most people recognize that something needs to be done to create a much more competitive shipbuilding industry".

We all know that the Prime Minister has a habit of saying one thing in opposition but a different thing when he is in power. We want to know what will the government do to bring in a competitive shipbuilding policy?

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that the shipbuilding policy for Canada has been effective in the past.

Members should know that the Export Development Corporation made changes a year ago with the shipbuilding industry. They should also know that the Export Development Corporation is presently looking at a review of projects worth more than \$730 million. That is work being done by our trade, by our people, to help the shipbuilding industry.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are a little tired of hearing about this whole ship.

American shipbuilding companies are offering work to Canadian shipbuilders because they are the best trained in the world. These men do not want to leave Canada. However, until the government changes the current policy, more and more of our shipbuilders will be forced out of Canada.

Why will the government not make changes to the current shipbuilding policy and stop forcing Canadian shipbuilders and their families out of their own country?

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that the procurement for Canada at all times is in favour of the shipbuilders across Canada. Whether it be national defence, Transport Canada or the coast guard, or any other departments or agencies, we continue to work with the shipbuilding industry. We make sure that any buy or refit of ships is done with the Canadian shipbuilding industry.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, recently, we have heard here and there that the government is not doing enough research on toxic substances and the management of these substances in Canada.

*Oral Questions*

Could the Minister of the Environment tell us what she intends to do to ensure that the federal government is active in the management of toxic substances and related research?

[English]

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say that earlier this afternoon the Minister of Health and myself were able to announce the first tranche of projects approved under our toxic management research initiative, \$10.9 million to 81 projects across the country that many hundreds of scientists will be implicated in.

This will help the government to better understand the effects of toxic substances on our environment and human health. It is a very important initiative looking at persistent organic pollutants, endocrine disrupting substances, metals in the environment and urban air quality.

\* \* \*

• (1450)

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights tabled its report and draft legislation entitled “Toward the Elimination of Impaired Driving”.

The justice minister has said that impaired driving is a huge concern to her and she places a very high priority on it. Will the government take steps to introduce immediately legislation that will reflect the standing committee’s report on impaired driving? Will it do it today?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that that very subject is one which is before the House leaders at the present time.

We on our side of the House are prepared to use every device available to us to give accelerated approval to this initiative. It is our hope that all parties across the way will do the same.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**SHIPBUILDING**

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, after putting several questions in the House and getting no answers or only evasive answers from various ministers, I wrote to the Prime Minister on December 22, asking him for a shipbuilding policy. Now, six months later, the Prime Minister still has not replied.

Considering that, today, a coalition of unions representing the shipbuilding industry delivered 150,000 postcards demanding a true federal shipbuilding policy, what is this government waiting for to finally take action?

[English]

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, may I repeat what I said before for the member. I again emphasize Canada’s shipbuilding policies. An accelerated capital cost allowance which many organizations do not have; a 25% duty on most ships imported from non-NAFTA countries; a domestic procurement on a competitive basis for all government shipbuilding and ship repair needs. Through the Export Development Corporation changes have been made and we are still looking at changes for the future.

These are the shipbuilding policies of the government. They are there for the benefit of shipbuilders from coast to coast.

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of the homeless.

Aboriginal people make up a large component of the homeless population in major cities. Many aboriginal people go to the cities to escape the terrible poverty conditions on reserves caused by Liberal government neglect. Now the government is abandoning aboriginal people off reserves by downloading the urban native housing program to the provinces. Social housing downloads lead to higher rents and homelessness.

Will the Liberal government reverse its disastrous download or will it betray urban aboriginal people like it has betrayed aboriginal people on reserves?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is committed to honour all its commitments on native urban housing.

We will continue to honour the transfer of social housing to the provinces. That will eliminate duplication and will create the opportunity to have more housing.

The member should know that more than 50% of urban native housing for more than a decade has been managed by the provinces.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Mr. Speaker, let me give the Minister of the Environment a little history lesson. When acid rain was taking its toll on Canadian rivers and lakes, we got our own environmental house in order and then took on the American one and delivered this nation an acid rain protocol in 1987.

*Oral Questions*

To advance the mercury file we need the same kind of true leadership and decisive action. Mercury is a known killer, yet Canada presented a divided opinion during recent negotiations for a United Nations heavy metals protocol. Internal squabbling has halted any real action to tackle the problem.

When can Canadians expect to see some leadership or some management from the department on mercury or on any environmental issue?

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat the statement I made a little while ago announcing 81 projects under our toxic substance research initiative which will include research on mercury and other metals in the environment.

Canada was the first country in the world to ratify a UN ECE protocol on heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants in the atmosphere.

The government is taking a leadership role worldwide on these very important issues. I think we should—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton.

\* \* \*

• (1455)

**SMALL BUSINESS**

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the last budget provided tax relief for small businesses that were spending money to become Y2K compliant. Unfortunately these businesses must do so by June 30, when in fact many cannot get trained individuals until after that date. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance if he will extend the June 30 deadline so those who want to can take advantage of this tax provision.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member from Sarnia has shown a great interest in this matter. I will certainly take his question as representation. As he knows, the industry committee is looking into this matter. I await its report with great eagerness.

\* \* \*

**TRADE**

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this government's own competition expert has criticized this government's abusive anti-dumping duties. He says that they restrict competition, jack up prices and hurt the welfare of all Canadians. Because of this criticism, Canada's trade tribunal has now been told to start paying attention to the impact these duties are having on average Canadians.

When will the revenue minister review the trade tribunal's past decisions and reverse those that the Competition Bureau says will hurt the welfare of all Canadians?

**Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we work very closely with the industries on areas where there is dumping. Of course we have to depend on the industries to provide the information. There is an international tribunal that makes those decisions as to whether dumping does exist or not. We follow the law and we follow the ruling of the tribunal.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BILL C-435**

**Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on September 24, I introduced Bill C-435, which seeks to have the \$1,000 note withdrawn so as to curb the laundering of money in Canada.

This measure is supported, among others, by the Canadian Police Association and the Fédération des policiers du Québec.

My question is for the solicitor general. If he does not want to make life easier for organized crime, why does he not immediately order the withdrawal of the \$1,000 note in Canada?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite just referred to a private member's bill.

He is well aware that private member's bills are usually, if not always, subject to a free vote in the House of Commons. I am surprised that he would ask a minister to comment on a private member's bill.

\* \* \*

[English]

**TAXATION**

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. The Toronto Dominion Bank released a study yesterday that said that personal incomes in this country are now 26% lower than in the United States. It also said that much of the damage was done due to government layoffs and cutbacks between 1993 and 1997 which cost us 180,000 jobs. Guess who was Minister of Finance during those years?

Besides cutting taxes for his wealthy friends and his buddies like Conrad Black, what is the Minister of Finance going to do to help increase the disposable income of the ordinary Canadian in this country? I know he is very close to Conrad Black but what about—

*Business of the House*

**The Speaker:** I ask the hon. member to be very judicious in his choice of words, please. The hon. Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, no doubt it was most unfortunate that there were cutbacks in the public sector. These were required in order to get government finances in order. It is important to note what was also referred to by the TD, that it was not only at the federal government level but at the provincial government level, including British Columbia and Saskatchewan, governments the hon. member knows well.

\* \* \*

**SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY**

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the premiers of this country spoke in favour of a new national shipbuilding policy at the conference of first ministers in August 1997, yet this government has refused to address their demands. Today shipyard workers across Canada are calling upon this government to take action. It is only a matter of time before the premiers come knocking on the Prime Minister's door demanding the same.

Why does the Prime Minister not pre-empt the attack of the premiers and after his upcoming cabinet shuffle sit down with his new Minister of Industry and implement the needed tax incentives and loan guarantees to get Canadian shipyard workers back to work?

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me repeat the fact that we do have a shipbuilding policy. As everybody knows, the global capacity is at a very high level. The member opposite knows that Canada is not going to get into a subsidy war and get this government and country in a deficit position as his government did which got us where we were in 1993. We are not going to do that. We are going to keep encouraging countries not to subsidize and to have fair competition around the world.

\* \* \*

• (1500)

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government House leader made a very clear and distinct inference that my party had accepted money from a federal agency, not a crown corporation but a federal agency. He was very specific.

I would like to ask the government House leader if he would table the document—

**The Speaker:** This is debate and not a point of order.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government House leader what he will add to the thin soup agenda of the House for the remainder of this week and next week.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his excellent question.

Today we will continue with the report stage of Bill C-32, the environment bill. The legislation, as back-up in the event that we would complete the consideration of Bill C-32 this afternoon, which I am sure is very likely, would be Bill C-54 respecting electronic commerce. Tomorrow we will consider report and third reading stages of Bill C-79, the victims bill, and Bill C-64, the expositions bill.

Next Monday and Tuesday, if we have not completed Bill C-32 today, we will complete Bill C-32 at report stage on Monday and at third reading on Tuesday.

Next Wednesday, June 2, we will put Bill C-54, the electronic commerce bill, at the top of the order paper. This is our intention, in the hope of disposing of this very important government initiative.

Thursday, June 3, shall be an allotted day.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, given the announcement yesterday with respect to the changes in Bill C-55, does the leader of the government in the House expect that Bill C-55 will be coming back to the House before the summer recess? Could he make clear what the government's intention is with respect to Bill C-55?

**Hon. Don Boudria:** Madam Speaker, because the bill is before the other place an amendment to the bill in question would be made there before it is referred back to this place.

The bill is still before the other place. I do not foresee that it will be back here before another week. I intend to discuss this item with opposition House leaders at the earliest opportunity, probably Tuesday of next week.

All things being equal, hopefully the bill will be back in the House toward the end of next week or shortly thereafter.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1505)

[*English*]

### CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 3.

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):** Madam Speaker, before we were interrupted for question period I was about to allude to a letter from a citizen. I wanted to highlight the concerns of citizens across the country, especially the youth. I heard from many students and received many letters. A satellite link-up was created last year as part of the millennium project in Ottawa. Students from coast to coast had an opportunity to converse with the Prime Minister.

The first concern that was raised about the future of our country dealt with the environment. Our children know that we have to take care of the future needs, the water, the soil, the land, the food, the vegetables and the fruits we eat.

Farming is a major industry in terms of agri-food. Family farms and organic farmers are very dependent on economic survival. They have been inundated by an industrial revolution in the area of better produce and better yields, but chemicals have been a mainstay of this research and development.

Science has proven that some of the food life cycles and the ecosystem are in danger. In the long term it is a detriment to our children. Children are nurtured at a young age. They are dependent on their mothers for nutrition and are vulnerable in terms of what we feed them.

The long term effect takes time. As adults we are introduced to new chemicals. Our defence system is well in tact. However, when children are exposed to them toxins can be released into their bodies which affect their organs and neurological system.

The letter highlighted the inability of the government to protect us. It referred to how the government reacted to the issue of MMT as a manganese additive to gasoline last summer. The environment minister and the health minister actually endorsed manganese. The Ethyl Corporation filed a lawsuit. Its country has banned MMT but Canada seems to be a freewheeling region in North America. It engages in scientific research to explore these additives without

### *Government Orders*

our being able to protect ourselves. It is actually infringing on our sovereign right to protect our environment and our health.

Bill C-32 concerns the Canadian sovereign right to protect our environmental health and ecosystem. The grouping we are now talking about concerns provincial and federal responsibilities. I highlight for the minister and her cabinet that an example was given to us in the Kyoto protocol. The European Community is not only self-combining its economic source, social and cultural entities and currency. It is also looking at itself as an ecosystem. At Kyoto it brought forward the eco-European bubble concept.

Canada has to look at itself as a bubble. Whatever we do in Ottawa, whatever we do in Ontario, affects Quebec. Quebec affects the maritimes. The maritimes affect Vancouver, the whole Arctic and its vulnerability. The Arctic does not get a direct impact from industrial economic events but it gets the environmental impacts of everything we do in the development of industry.

I ask Canadians and parliamentarians in the House to make sure that Bill C-32 protects the future health of our children and the future of our environment.

• (1510)

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, for those people who have just tuned in, we are debating Bill C-32, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. There were over 560 amendments in committee and another 235 that have come before the House at report stage. The bill has had more amendments than any other bill in many years.

We are speaking to Group No. 3 amendments. There are eight amendments in this group. They deal largely with residual powers and the use of toxic substances. The Reform Party put forward three of the eight amendments. There is a fair bit of overlap between our amendments and those proposed by both the government and the Conservative Party.

Our Motion No. 6 deals specifically with concern over reference in the bill to the use of toxic substances. It ensures that the focus in the bill is on management rather than on the use of toxic substances. The focus of the federal government has consistently been on managing toxic substances rather than on their use.

It is important to note that it is the improper management and release of toxic substances which result in adverse effects on human health and environment. This is a cause for public concern and government action, not the use of these substances.

I can use lead as an example. Lead is on the toxic substances list. When it is used improperly, such as in gasoline, in paint and in lead shot used to kill birds, management needs to ensure those practices do not happen. Lead in keels of sailboats, in weights for divers or in car batteries is perfectly safe. It is the management of these substances that this legislation should deal with.

*Government Orders*

Concerning use separately from the improper release or exposure to toxic substances derogates from the risk based principles which are the foundation of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. The preamble was amended in committee to change the focus and the direction of the act.

Our amendment returns the preamble to the original language proposed by the government when Bill C-32 was tabled in the House. We believe that the act should retain the government's clear policy to control releases.

Motion No. 6 will ensure that the approach contained within Bill C-32 is consistent with toxic management strategies already incorporated and pursued by the international community in its risk reduction activities.

The government amendment, Motion No. 7, only partially addresses the same section and touches on concerns regarding the use rather than the management of toxic substances. Our amendments, Motions Nos. 137 and 149, both deal with concerns regarding residual powers.

Our Motions Nos. 149 and 137 propose to empower the governor in council so that it can ensure parliament provides sufficient protection of the environment and human health. When Bill C-32 was originally tabled by the government it contained proposals which established that matters of co-ordination between different departments were to be determined by cabinet. These amendments were accepted by the standing committee in all sections of the bill except for two, sections 106 and 115 which deal with biotechnology.

The committee amended these sections so that the environment minister, and where appropriate the health minister, could determine matters of co-ordination. Our amendments propose to return the section originally proposed by the government when Bill C-32 was tabled in the House. This is consistent with the other sections within the bill.

We propose that the governor in council or cabinet, rather than the Minister of the Environment or Minister of Health, should determine whether there is overlap between departments and ensure that interdepartmental overlap and duplication are avoided in clauses 106 and 115. Clearly if the weight of significant decisions falls on cabinet throughout the bill, it should also consistently deal with areas of biotechnology.

We are pleased to see that the government clearly supports our amendments as it not only proposed the original section that we support but tabled Motion Nos. 138 and 148 which are almost identical to our Motions Nos. 137 and 149.

• (1515)

Our amendments address concerns that were brought to us by many parties. We listened and we acted on these concerns and introduced our amendments. Unfortunately, the Conservative

party has missed the mark on its Motion No. 139, which similarly attempts to amend the same clause that Reform does in our Motion No. 137.

However, the member for Fundy—Royal has proposed to retain reference to the ministers rather than cabinet as most of us agree is far more suited to this degree of decision making. Therefore, we will not be supporting the amendments of the Progressive Conservative Party.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that our amendments aim to ensure that Canadians have clear, effective legislation to prevent pollution and protect the environment and the human health of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise once again today to speak to Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

My remarks will be directed primarily at the motions in Group No. 3, which concern the preamble and toxic substances such as lead.

I add my voice to that of the member for Davenport in criticizing this government and expressing my indignation at the way it has treated and is treating the environment committee by tabling significant amendments today in the House. These amendments should have been introduced in committee to give us an opportunity to thoroughly study them.

Throughout the environment committee's proceedings, we analyzed more than 500 amendments over the past few weeks. The government did not hesitate to introduce amendments at the last minute. They were rushed through the committee. They should have been thoroughly studied by the committee.

I am extremely disappointed that the Minister of the Environment affords such cavalier treatment to a committee comprising representatives of all parties in this House: the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party, the Reform Party, the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party.

We analyzed everything that was introduced in the environment committee, but clearly this government does not have enough respect for the people there to ensure that this legislation contains an element of common sense and provides for some carryover into the future.

We cannot analyze an environment act every year. This law will be in effect in Canada for the next 10 years. We will move into the next century with this law, and we have to admit that this government chose not to give the environment committee the means, the time or the authority to study the significant amendments it has tabled today in the House.

*Government Orders*

When we do not have time to study something, it is better to abstain or to vote against it.

I wish to point out that the Bloc Québécois will be voting as a whole against all the amendments by the Reform Party and the Liberal Party in Group No. 3.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak again to another set of amendments on Bill C-32. We talked a bit this morning about Group No. 2 and we are now on Group No. 3. The list is quite a bit shorter than the one we talked about this morning, but there are some very important issues in this grouping. Some of the amendments in this grouping could effectively change the bill and its effectiveness. I will just go through some of these.

• (1520)

These two groups of amendments deal basically with the use of toxic substances and the residual powers of the federal government.

I would like to speak first to the use of toxic substances and the amendments put forward by my colleague from Nanaimo—Alberni. This amendment, which, as stated earlier, is supported by the minister, would return the original wording back to the preamble.

The preamble to this new CEPA begins with outlining the commitment that the protection of the environment is essential to the well-being of Canada, while acknowledging that the primary purpose of this bill is to contribute to sustainable development through pollution prevention. That pretty well sums up the bill in its entirety and takes into account the health and the continuation of sustainable development, things that are so important without which we would have little else.

The preamble contains 14 separate commitments and goals of the government. Three of these commitments or goals would be reworded versions of four of the six statements found in the preamble of the current act, while the remaining goals and commitments would deal with the new concepts and priorities such as: first, the goal of achieving sustainable development and an acknowledgement of the need to integrate environmental, economic and social factors in all decisions by the government and private sector. That issue is one on which we seem to differ from party to party in the House as to what weight we should place on each one of them.

I personally feel that if we leave out the economic and social factors, then we are leaving out an important fact. If we do not have any economic or social factors to look at, then some of the pressure that would be brought to bear on individuals to act is not there. When some people fight to have economic and social factors taken

out of the equation, they are actually working against a healthy environment.

Second, a commitment to implementing pollution prevention as a natural goal and as the priority approach to environmental protection.

Third, a recognition of the importance of an ecosystem approach.

Fourth, a commitment to implementing the precautionary principle as defined by the universally accepted Rio definition. It is very important that the definition that is being used is the one being used universally in the world. We heard some comments earlier that is a flexible definition to be decided on by each country, but we must be very careful that we stay close to what the rest of the world is doing.

Fifth, a recognition of the responsibility of users and producers with respect to toxic substances, pollutants and wastes, and the adoption of the polluter pays principle.

Sixth, a recognition that all levels of government have authority to protect the environment and that they face environmental problems that can benefit from co-operative resolution. Once again we mention co-operation instead of confrontation and the proper balance between the governing authorities.

Seventh, a recognition that science and traditional aboriginal knowledge has an integral role in the environmental and human health decision making process and that environmental or health risks and social, economic and technical matters are to be considered in that process. My hon. friend from Churchill River talked at length about this in committee and certainly brought this issue to light. The fact that it is here, we should give him some credit for that.

Last, an endeavour to remove threats to biological diversity through pollution prevention and the control and management of toxic substances.

Because of amendments made in committee, some of the original intentions have been changed. When the bill was first proposed, out of the 560 amendments that came forward, our party chose to put forward 22. That indicated that we were basically pleased with the balance that had been struck by the original Bill C-32. We felt that some of the amendments that took place after altered considerably the original intention of the bill.

Most of the amendments made were fairly agreeable and did not go against the spirit of the bill. However, the amendment to the last commitment of the government has the potential to significantly alter the government's focus. Until now, the government's focus has consistently been on managing the release of toxic substances, not how they were used. That is what the bill should do.

*Government Orders*

• (1525)

There is a list of some 23,000 substances used by Canadian industry and manufacturing. The use of these substances to create something is one thing, but we have to ensure that they are not released into the atmosphere to harm the environment. As long as their use is not doing that, we should not be too focused on managing or restricting the use of these substances.

This focus is shared by much of the international community and for good reason. Monitoring the use of all substances would be such a monumental task that the department would be overwhelmed by these new demands. As it stands right now, the department cannot even enforce many of its own rules as they exist today.

In committee we heard evidence that enforcement is sorely lacking in this country. It would be irresponsible for parliament to impose an additional burden such as this. It is not the use of toxic substances that is cause for public concern and government attention but their improper management and releases causing adverse effects.

The government's responsibility to monitor releases should be maintained by returning the original wording of the bill. That is what our amendment would do. To consider use separately from release derogates from the risk based principles that are intended to be the foundation of the bill.

The last motions I want to speak to are Motions Nos. 138 and 149 which deal with the residual powers of the federal government, a subject debated at length at the environment committee on almost all issues.

These motions which were first introduced by the true champions of the people, the Reform Party, are nearly identical to the ones introduced by the government. I want to thank the minister and her government for backing up what the Reform Party says, and I want to assure her that any time she needs some more advice on this bill we would be happy to help.

Motion No. 138 amends clause 106, section 7 by requiring that the opinion of the governor in council first be sought before any decisions are made. That would bring in the other ministries because this bill affects everybody in Canada and around the world. When decisions are made that affect a wide scope, the other responsible areas of the ministers should be considered.

Environmental decisions affect everybody from farmers and ranchers to health officials. Because these decisions have such far-reaching implications, it is important that all perspectives are properly heard. Bringing these matters to the cabinet table will ensure that all the affected stakeholders will have an opportunity to make their views known and influence the decision making process.

Motion No. 149 amends clause 115, which is actually the second part of a two clause cluster that deals with regulations. The

preceding clause, clause 114, would empower the governor in council on the recommendation of the minister responsible to make regulations relating to living organisms.

These regulations covered a variety of different categories ranging from organisms for research to organisms for export. Section 115 would further empower the governor in council, once again on the recommendation of the ministers of health and environment, to make regulations for implementing an international agreement respecting living organisms and respecting their effective and safe use in pollution prevention.

The second clause of section 115, the section to which Reform has proposed an amendment, would prevent the governor in council from making such regulations where the same aspect of any living organism was regulated by or under any other act of parliament.

The issue comes back again to broadening out the base of decision making and bringing into play the other ministries involved. It considers the scope of the bill to deal with the control of substances so they cannot be released. It does not deal with their abolition or if they are being handled properly.

These amendments are important and we feel that they alone can change the entire scope of the bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendments in Group No. 3 now before the House.

• (1530)

The first motion in the group was introduced by the Reform Party and seeks to amend a provision in the preamble. Once again the Reform Party chose to side with industry, which wants everything that goes against its vision of environmental and health protection to be watered down.

The wording of the preamble which is the subject of the Reform Party motion reads as follows:

[*English*]

Whereas the Government of Canada will endeavour to remove threats to biological diversity through pollution prevention, the control and management of any adverse effects of the use and release of toxic substances, products of biotechnology, pollutants and other wastes, and the virtual elimination of persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances;

[*Translation*]

It is thanks to the work of the committee that the words products of biotechnology, pollutants and other wastes were added to the

*Government Orders*

bill. The Reform Party would like to change the wording to completely eliminate the notions of products of biotechnology, pollutants and other wastes, and the virtual elimination of persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances.

I wonder why the Reform Party is so adamant on siding with industry, which is asking that the bill, which was already watered down when it came to the committee, be further watered down. After weeks and weeks of work by the committee, we were able to strengthen a web of provisions that, originally, had no teeth to speak of.

There is a consensus that, following the work by the five parties, during which scores of amendments were discussed and some of the important ones will be accepted, the bill as it stands is a compromise. It is a far cry from what we and the environmentalists would have liked, but we believe it is a reasonable compromise under the circumstances.

What has happened today is that the Reform Party has systematically sided with industry to water down the amendments adopted by the committee.

[*English*]

In the same group of motions the government would split this preamble in two. It would introduce the notion of the control and management of the risk of any adverse effects of the use and release of toxic substances. There are some among our researchers who feel that using the word "risk" improves the clause from the environmental point of view because it makes the proof lesser than the proof of adverse effects themselves.

However, the question is asked: If this were so, why in those weeks and weeks of discussion within the committee was this notion not brought about? Why now? Why does it happen under the prompting of industry that this should be introduced?

The other side will say that risk is much more subjective than the effects themselves. People can decide what is risk and what is not risk and evade the very notion of the adverse effects. It is one more notion to add to a disposition that seemed to us to be quite clear in its effect to start with after it had been amended in committee.

• (1535)

I would suggest that we reject both of these amendments which will lessen the importance of this clause in the preamble. There are some who would say that it is only a preamble and a preamble is not part of the operative part of the law. However, it sets a sense of direction as to what we are trying to do.

What I find in a great bulk of the amendments that have been brought forward, except for those in Group No. 2 that we discussed, which put a timeline on consultation, and except for a few that have

been proposed by my colleague from the New Democratic Party who sat with us in committee, is that they tend to lessen the power of the act as it stands today.

The sad part is that in the key elements of the legislation, which have been repeated time and again, inherent toxicity, virtual elimination and the precautionary principle, and the powers of the two ministers, the sponsors of the legislation, the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Health, to act autonomously in all of these respects, the amendments that have been brought in dilute those very powers.

None of the elements which are crucial to the legislation have been reinforced. On the contrary, they have been lessened, they have been weakened and they have been diluted. For these reasons—Group No. 3 amendments concerning the provision of the preamble that I discussed, all of the clauses that come up in Group No. 1, some in Group No. 2 and others in other groupings—we feel that this legislation does not stand the scrutiny of the House.

I hope that together we will defeat the amendments that tend to weaken this bill so that the bill will remain the way it is; a fair, reasonable, effective compromise which was achieved as a result of the work of many members of the House. It was diligent work, painstaking work, which led to much compromise and consensus.

It is on that basis that I would support the bill, about which otherwise I have strong reservations.

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to have the opportunity to rise in the House today to speak to the amendments in Group No. 3 to Bill C-32, which will amend the the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

As I already mentioned when discussing Group No. 1 amendments, the bill that was sent to committee included clause 2.2 which called for the avoidance of duplication and overlap in legislation and regulation in areas that involved the protection of the environment and human health.

The clause proposed to resolve any potential duplication by having the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health and the minister responsible for the other act "jointly decide whether measures that can be taken under the other act are appropriate and sufficient to address the matter", and that matter has to be that of human health and the protection of the environment. This clause, however, was removed from the act during the committee stage of review in favour of introducing separate and more specific clauses in appropriate sections of the bill where the potential for overlap and duplication existed.

The new clauses shifted the power to decide which law would prevail to cabinet from the three ministers, except in the case of biotechnology where the Minister of Health and the Minister of the Environment would take a decision.

*Government Orders*

The government is trying to make all sections refer to cabinet for this decision making process. Its proposed motion to amend was already defeated in committee in the biotechnology section. In fact, even Reform voted against this particular proposal.

The essence of what we are talking about, as mentioned by the member for Lac-Saint-Louis, is that most of these amendments would water down the strength of the bill.

• (1540)

The amendments that we have tabled within this section address the applicable situations. Instead of having all decisions referred to the governor in council, which we know to be cabinet, we are advocating that the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health and the other applicable minister decide whether measures can be taken under the other act with respect to protecting human health and the environment in addressing the matter at hand.

In this era of political accountability more often than not the folks who live in the ridings want to know who is accountable for the decisions we make. What the Progressive Conservative Party is advocating is to maintain the same intent that we had with respect to clause 2.2.

I have a lot of respect for the Minister of Human Resources Development, who has personally helped me out on an individual basis. I know that he works hard in his particular portfolio, but I know he does not spend a lot of time on the environment. Therefore, I am advocating that the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health and the other applicable minister, whether it be the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food or any other minister, should actually have the capacity to make a decision and be held accountable. If the wrong decision is made, or perhaps the correct decision, those ministers will be the accountable ministers who come into play, as opposed to sending it to cabinet where other concerns may water down the influence with respect to health and the environment.

I am troubled that perhaps in some circumstances there may be some industrial concerns or some agricultural concerns. For the most part, 99.9 times out of 100, ministers want to ensure that we look after human health and the environment as well. However, I am concerned that at times political pressure might water down the influence of the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Health.

I am particularly concerned that the budget of the Department of the Environment has been cut by well over a third since this government took office in 1993. The weight which the Department of the Environment has in cabinet today versus what it once had during the Jean Charest and the Tom MacMillan era may not be the same in terms of making sure that human health and the environment are protected.

It is also interesting to note that members of the Reform Party in committee supported the change that removed the old section 2.2.

They also voted to amend the clause to read as it currently does in the biotech section. They supported amending the clause to read that the Minister of Environment and, where appropriate, the Minister of Health would make a decision. Now they seem to have changed their minds. They propose restoring the section to its original state.

Reform went along with this during the deliberations at committee because they believe in more political accountability, as do many members of parliament. The Progressive Conservative Party does as well. That is why they supported that initiative. They have now reverted to the preference of having it done by the governor in council for other reasons. This is more of a concern of Reform members not wanting to empower the ministers of health and the environment to be accountable and to make that the first priority above all others. I think we owe that to all citizens who live in this country and to future generations as well.

The Progressive Conservative Party believes that its proposal would provide the public with an accountability mechanism for the ministers who make the decision as to which act better provides sufficient protection for the environment and human health. We also believe that our amendments provide an appropriate and necessary balance for the decision making process.

That is the issue I want to put forth with respect to the amendments that we have tabled in Group No. 3. It comes down to the issue of, if there is another act that comes into play, we definitely want to avoid duplication. We definitely want to avoid excess regulation. We want to do it in a capacity where health and the environment are the leads and the ministers will consult to ensure that the other minister has a fair say, as opposed to sending it to cabinet where we do not know who makes the decisions, why a decision was made and what matters were actually taken into play.

• (1545)

The bill is co-sponsored by the Minister of Health and the Minister of the Environment. They should be the quarterbacks. They should be the people who actually lead this omnibus bill, this pioneering bill, to quote the member for Davenport.

The Canadian Environmental Protection Act is the principle legislation that controls the use of toxins within our environment. We should ensure that those two ministers take the lead and consult their teammates, the appropriate ministers. Sending it to cabinet tears apart the political accountability that all citizens of the country want to have from their government.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, here we are again. This is the third and even the fourth time I speak on this bill.

*Government Orders*

I am pleased to speak on the third group of motions with respect to Bill C-32, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

Normally, one should expect a bill on environmental protection to emphasize the sacred trust of sustainable development. Needless to say that, today, nobody wants to go back to the days of unchecked development with an utter lack of respect for the environment and our nourishing earth.

However, we do not want to go to the other extreme and let our concern for environmental protection become a barrier to development.

That is one of the reasons why we object to the motions in Group No. 3 moved by the hon. members for Fundy—Royal and Nanaimo—Alberni, and the environment minister. In one case, I think we would go back to the days of unchecked development without much respect for the environment and, in the other, we would go to the other extreme, which might hinder development.

Since we are debating the motions in Group No. 3 at report stage of the bill, and there are eight groups of motions in all, I think it is important to note that this bill is quite different from the original one that was introduced in the House.

As a matter of fact, in committee only, the clause by clause examination of the bill required 60 sittings. Moreover, 580 amendments have been prepared on this bill and 160 of them have been adopted in committee.

I join my hon. colleagues from Davenport and Jonquière in decrying what I would call the contempt the government is showing for the work done in committees, since it is moving, at report stage, a whole new series of amendments which will further redesign and revamp a bill that has already been greatly tinkered with.

Unfortunately, this bill no longer makes any sense. Its original purpose has been lost in the countless amendments that have been moved. I think the committee might well have set a new record for the length of its clause by clause study of this bill.

At the outset, it is important to mention that we oppose the very paternalistic approach of the federal government, which claims that we need two security nets to better protect the environment.

The duplication the government is providing for in this environmental protection legislation will only help to establish additional environmental protection standards that will undermine economic development. These new standards will create more red tape, which means more headaches for all businesses and manufacturers throughout Canada and Quebec, who will now have to meet not one but two sets of environmental standards.

• (1550)

Besides, despite the fact that the environment is, under the Canadian Constitution the Liberals claim to hold so dear, supposed to be a shared jurisdiction, this bill shows that the government wants to make provincial governments its vassals in terms of decision making. This is totally unacceptable.

The bill even goes further. It goes so far to say that even if there were to be agreements between the federal government and provinces on certain environmental issues, the federal Ministers of Health and of the Environment, in their infinite wisdom, could ignore the agreements negotiated between the two levels of government.

As I said earlier, this is a totally unacceptable paternalism. Once again, "Ottawa knows best". We can in no way approve such an attitude.

The new series of environmental standards the federal government could implement through this Environmental Protection Act will place Quebec in a difficult situation compared to other Canadian provinces. I will explain why.

If Ministers of Health and of the Environment decided, in their infinite wisdom, to implement a number of uniform standards to reduce toxic emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, throughout Canada, without taking into account the progress already made by each province, this would place Quebec in a very difficult position.

As we know, provinces like Alberta have been very negligent in recent years in terms of toxic emissions, of greenhouse gas emissions, while other provinces like Quebec have been much more vigilant in the last 10 to 15 years. The latter have implemented very strict environmental protection measures, with the result that in Quebec emissions may have been reduced by 10, 15, 20 or 25% in recent years.

If the federal government in its infinite wisdom—since it always knows more than anyone else about all issues relating to the environment—were to decide that we need to make an additional 5%, 6% or 7% reduction to industrial emissions, to toxic emissions in the atmosphere, under the agreements negotiated at Kyoto, on a uniform basis across Canada, this would be easily complied with by Alberta, where the emissions have increased in recent years. It would, however, be very difficult for Quebec, which has already reduced toxic emissions by 10%, 15%, 20% or 25%. The job has already been done.

In our respective political parties, in the companies or community organizations with which we may have been affiliated, we all know that the first \$1,000 are very easy to collect in a fundraising campaign. It is the next \$1,000 that are hard. This is a harder objective to attain.

*Government Orders*

Under the circumstances, the powers the federal government is taking onto itself for applying standards across Canada are liable to place the most environmentally active provinces, the most disciplined ones, in a terribly difficult position.

I need not point out to hon. members once again that we are totally opposed to the motions in Group No. 3. We are opposed to this bill, and we are, of course, going to oppose it with all the energy we can muster.

[English]

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on the Group No. 3 amendments to Bill C-32 which deal with animate products of biotechnology.

• (1555)

The essence of the Group No. 3 motions is to remove the powers of the Department of the Environment and the Department of Health to give the governor in council the exclusive responsibility for decisions on animate projects of biotechnology. At a time when Canadians are asking more and more questions about the unknown factors of biotech and asking for further information and transparency, Motion No. 138 of the Liberal cabinet puts decisions on environment and health effectively behind closed doors, the governor in council doors.

When a lot of folks listening hear the term governor in council, I am sure they are wondering what it means. It is the executive arm of government. It is in effect cabinet. If this piece of legislation goes through, neither the Minister of the Environment nor the Minister of Health will be responsible for this area but rather it will be the governor in council. The entire cabinet will be responsible. There is an old saying that when everybody is in charge, no one is in charge. That is the fear we have with the particular piece of legislation before us this afternoon.

Canadians today are watching and listening to the news from around the world about a variety of biotechnology issues such as food labelling, biotech crops, genetics and cloning. They do not necessarily understand everything but they are certainly listening. They require some answers and they deserve some answers. I submit that only through public debate can misunderstanding and fear be addressed.

Throughout the world we are witnessing an exponential growth in the technology field. At the same time the international alarm bells are ringing and some people are even beginning to wonder if we are in fact going too far too fast in this area.

Canadians witnessed the recent debacle related to bovine growth hormone and the silencing of scientists at the health protection branch. Their concerns are shared by many across the country. The science and studies necessary to protect Canadians are based on cost recovery far too often. Cost recovery for whom? For industrial

clients. As the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis asked earlier today in the debate, is the fox guarding the henhouse?

Canadians want to know how the promoter, this government, can also regulate against any possible harmful effects. The KPMG analysis done for the health protection branch mentions the need to consider the various industry and client interests. There is concern that there may be a conflict of interest bias, and Canadians certainly deserve an open and clear process.

There are calls for the government to rebalance the scale, to step back from the ardent proponent and remember that a balance is necessary to be struck on the side of public health and safety. The decision making must return to science, away from the political arena and backroom deals.

All of us as children spent some time on a teeter-totter. Some of us in political life still spend time on teeter-totters. What I remember about them is that the centre point of a teeter-totter is the fulcrum. If there is too much weight on one side it becomes unbalanced.

What is happening now on the teeter-totter of biotechnology is that we have industry and government on one side and the consumers are up in the air literally and figuratively on this issue. We need to have the government in the middle, in the fulcrum, so that there is a reasonable balance between industry and certain protection and assurances for the consumer.

Cross-pollination from modified crops to other crops has occurred and the question is could this cause problems. The process must be an open one. Can we expect the Liberal government to take a precautionary approach and err on the side of protection? A series of Liberal motions to weaken dramatically the precautionary principles suggests to us that we cannot.

Canadian farmers are becoming concerned about the issue. The potential loss of producer markets in Europe, and I will talk about those in a few minutes, presents additional concerns as well.

We certainly cannot lose sight of the success Canadian agriculture has achieved around the globe with specialty crops. We think of winter wheat, in particular, and the food delivered to less fortunate tables.

I am our caucus critic on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food. We all had the opportunity to travel to Washington this past February and had a good week of discussions on the future of agriculture.

• (1600)

One of the things that I recall from those discussions is that with 80 million new mouths to feed each and every year for the next 20 years food production will need to double throughout the world over the next 50 years, by the year 2050. It cannot be done, as it has been done in the past, by more irrigation and more development of

arable lands. We simply do not have the capability. We recognize and scientists generally recognize that agricultural biotech will be the future for the millions of new mouths to be fed over the next half century.

We must ensure however that the best process for scientific review, analysis and monitoring is in place. It has to be based on science not on science fiction. Why can Canada not have the best, most open, highest scientific standards that ensure product safety for the environment and human health? An increasing number of Canadians are calling for food labelling to provide informed choices in their decision making.

I said I was going to talk very quickly about Europe. I want to note that following European labelling regulations, restaurants and fast food outlets in Britain have been ordered by the government to tell consumers if their meals contain genetically modified products. "People who are supplying food, whether it is in a shop or a restaurant, are really duty bound to know as much as they can about where the food came from before they offer it to the public", said the food safety minister, Minister Rooker.

Genetically modified food is a hot political topic in Britain. The government says that it is confident genetically modified food is safe, but opinion polls show most consumers are anxious remembering similar early assurances before the mad cow crisis of a few years ago.

On this topic, recently the *Western Producer* had an editorial entitled "GMO familiarity may breed comfort". I want to read a little of that editorial into my comments. It states:

One of the biggest debates surrounding genetically modified foods is whether they should carry an identifying label. In Europe in recent months, the issue has come to a head and the European Commission has instituted rules for labelling GMO foods.

There is a climate of growing public distrust in Europe. Denmark, Britain and France have all called a partial halt to GMO approvals, while Austria, Luxembourg and France have slapped unilateral bans on certain new crop strains.

The companies that have created genetically modified seeds are generally against mandatory labelling.

They say that if there is no real nutritional or health difference between altered and regular food, why should GMO products be singled out? It could be viewed not as information but as a warning.

As I have noted, and the editorial notes:

Many consumer groups say that for the public to make an informed decision, products must be labelled.

Last year *AgBioForum*, a quarterly on-line magazine devoted to agricultural biotechnology, tackled the issue.

The contributors, mainly academics at Canadian and American universities, argue that labelling, especially if voluntary, could build acceptance for agricultural technology.

To conclude the editorial, it further states:

### *Government Orders*

Companies with products made from GMO foods might do well to institute voluntary labelling. Although they might take some heat in the short-term, in the long-term they will familiarize the population with the benefits of the science.

And the process should become easier as researchers move from the first wave of bio-tech crops, which were directed at giving farmers more options, to products directed at consumer needs like lower fat levels and higher protein.

To wrap up, how can well-informed consumer decisions be made if the entire process is clouded and under a veil of secrecy? Shutting out environment and health ministers and placing critical decisions behind closed doors with the governor in council sends a wrong message to Canadians. What is this government trying to hide? Why limit the safety net in the decision making process if everything is above board?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise for the second time to address Bill C-32, which replaces the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, commonly referred to as CEPA in environmental and parliamentary parlance.

• (1605)

Our position on Bill C-32 and on the legislation passed by this parliament, and the position developed by Quebec are not new. My Bloc Québécois colleagues stated it a number of times since the beginning of this debate: we are clearly opposed to this bill.

It is important to explain why we are opposed to Bill C-32. Let us not forget the stand taken many times in the past by the Quebec government regarding the protection of the environment.

Let us not forget January 29, 1998. Let us not forget that important date for Quebec, when the Quebec government, through its Minister of the Environment, Claude Bégin, decided not to sign the proposed environmental harmonization agreement. It was supposed, in principle—and I emphasize the word "principle"—to reduce duplication and overlap, and to respect the exclusive or primary jurisdictions of the provinces under the Canadian Constitution.

I am referring to the spirit of harmonization because essentially the content of that agreement was far from respecting the principle stated a few months earlier by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment.

Through its government, Quebec has said loud and clear that it will sign the environmental harmonization agreement the day this agreement will actually permit—not only in principle but in actual fact—the elimination of overlap and duplication, and include the recognition of Quebec's exclusive or at least primary jurisdiction in the areas assigned to the provinces under the Constitution.

*Government Orders*

It is important to remember these facts because they explain the Bloc Québécois' position on Bill C-23. If the federal government had respected the spirit of the harmonization agreement, we might have supported Bill C-23, but the problem is that every time an environment minister sets out to renew the Canadian Environmental Protection Act in this parliament, he takes the opportunity to interfere in areas of provincial responsibility and increase duplication and overlap.

The renewal of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act did not start yesterday. On December 15, 1995, the Liberal government proposed revising the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. The proposal by the Minister of the Environment at the time was the government's response to the fifth report of the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development entitled "It's About our Health—Towards Pollution Prevention".

This report set out the broad lines of a proposal to renew the federal government's main legislative measure on environmental protection.

At the time, the Bloc Québécois, which opposed the bill, denounced the fact that most of the recommendations supported the centralizing tendency of the federal government in environmental protection matters. As my colleague for Verchères—Les-Patriotes mentioned, the Bloc Québécois refutes the theory of the double safety net and contends that the environment would be better served if responsibility for its protection were given to one level of government only.

• (1610)

The Bloc Québécois firmly believes that the provinces, including Quebec, have greater knowledge of the specifics of their natural environment and are in a position to arouse the interest and encourage the participation of local residents, are more open to the claims of environmental groups, are able to conclude significant agreements with national and international partners and have indicated their desire to find solutions to environmental challenges and to contribute actively to sustainable development.

Our vision is shared by many experts studying how federations work. As Barry Rabe, a researcher from the United States, stated in the 1997 Fall issue of the scientific magazine *Canadian Public Administration*, and I quote:

For the most part, literature on environmental federalism shows decentralization in an extremely favourable light.

Bill C-32 is not part of a decentralizing approach. It renews the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, which has been so vigorously opposed by the various governments of Quebec. In the last parliament, the Liberal government attempted to get the previous version of this bill passed, but gave up the attempt in light of the huge outcry, which could have jeopardized the upcoming elections.

As the House will recall, Bill C-74 died on the Order Paper during the last session. But CEPA provides for a five-year review, which is already overdue, as the government backslides and introduces another bill holding to the national vision that still does not sit well with members of the National Assembly.

With this bill, pollution prevention becomes a national goal. This is the second whereas in the preamble. The government wants to renew the Canadian Environmental Protection Act by amending certain technical provisions, but keeping the essence of the centralizing vision of environmental protection.

The bill contains provisions dealing primarily with pollution prevention, the establishment of new methods of reviewing and evaluating substances, and the creation of obligations with respect to substances that the environment and health ministers consider toxic.

The list of these substances is extensive. There are new powers and new dispute regulation mechanisms for investigators. This bill gives investigators new powers. But it does not give them new resources for doing their work. That is what is ironic. We are given a stronger, more robust CEPA, an act with more teeth, but the Minister of Finance is still refusing additional funds to enable officials to take action.

It is a no go. We cannot protect the environment without resources. Now is the time to realize this. In a few weeks, I will have an opportunity to perhaps meet again with my former colleagues in the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development, and say no to Bill C-32, because it is still predicated on centralization, which Quebec cannot accept.

**Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this afternoon to speak to Bill C-32. However, I am sad at the same time, because we need only think—and I know whereof I speak—of the federal government's miserable performance at managing the environment for many years now.

I can give you striking examples from my riding. I was a municipal councillor for four terms over a period of 14 years, and God knows how many times we had to deal with the federal government, on the matter of the erosion of river banks for example.

• (1615)

In the town where I served as councillor, there are four beaches and I can name them for you: going from west to east there are the Monagan, Ferguson, Routhier and Lévesque beaches.

They are fine beaches and have a fine shoreline. People worked very hard building houses, clearing an area where they could enjoy life and resorts would flourish. Through dredging and other

*Government Orders*

operations by the federal government, by rockfilling, they affected the tide. It destroyed roads, infrastructures and houses.

There is another fact I remember very clearly. In the fall 1994, I asked for a meeting with officials from Environment Canada and representatives of the Sept-Îles airport, which was held at the airport. At that point, I warned the airport authorities that the product used to de-ice airport runways was noxious and contaminating the soil. There were serious consequences.

The airport is on a cliff. The Routhier and Lévesque beaches lie just below. I warned them that they were polluting the water table. Four years later, after various tests were done, the Department of Transport acknowledged that, by using the material they spread on the runways to de-ice them, they had polluted the soil, that they were responsible. They contaminated the water table, they contaminated the sources of drinking water the public had invested in, had created.

For the last two years, the solution has been to provide people with bottled water. I personally asked questions in the House to hurry the Minister of Transport into finding an appropriate solution. Indeed, the solution is quite simply to extend the Sept-Îles pipeline to bring drinking water from downtown to that population.

I have met with Health Canada officials and a medical officer of the Quebec health ministry, who have told me that the most dangerous thing is not to drink water, since our body can eliminate it. Actually, the most dangerous thing is to take a shower or a bath in contaminated water because skin pores cannot eliminate it. Mothers are forced to bath their babies in bottled water, which is totally ridiculous.

We ask the Minister of Transport and the Minister of the Environment to take action. Public health is at stake. This is an environmental issue. It seems as though this government could not care less about the health of people, allowing issues as important as this one to go unresolved.

Here is another example. During the night of March 22 to 23, an ore carrier, the *Gordon C. Leitch*, collided with a wharf at Havre-Saint-Pierre and spilled more than 40,000 tons of fuel in the waters of one of the most prized attractions of my riding, the Mingan Archipelago National Park Reserve.

Hundreds of birds were contaminated and nearly 80% had to be put down. New traces of fuel are now showing up as ice melts. Incalculable damage has been caused to this extremely fragile ecosystem.

• (1620)

Ridiculous as it may seem, the environment minister never made any commitment to the people of the Minganie area concerning

what she could do or should have done most urgently, despite the representations and letters from the people. She had the responsibility to reassure the residents of the archipelago, these pioneers who have worked so hard over the years. She should have done something then to protect the archipelago in which they have put so much work because it is a unique tourist attraction.

When we talk about the people in the Minganie area, we talk about the Mingan archipelago. We also talk about the people in Havre-Saint-Pierre, Sheldrake, Rivière-Saint-Jean, Rivière-au-Tonnerre, Baie-Johan-Beetz, Aguanish, and Natashquan.

All these people have been working very hard to develop this archipelago of which they are so proud, and which is also an economic asset because it is a great tourist attraction. The minister never did anything. She never bothered taking serious measures to solve the problem and clean up the oil slick that was spilled on that night in March.

Let me remind the House that the Bloc Québécois moved the following motions at report stage. One was to remove the paragraph in the preamble dealing with the establishment of national environmental standards, and environmental quality guidelines and codes of practice. Without those changes, since the environment is not an exclusively federal jurisdiction, this sub-clause was unacceptable to us.

We also want to remove the paragraph of the preamble where reference is made to the presence of toxic substances, which is a matter of national interest. Once again, the federal government is looking for an excuse to meddle in the environment from coast to coast.

The Bloc Québécois is therefore calling upon the federal government to amend the preamble so that Quebec may speak for itself internationally when its interests are at stake, particularly in the areas of culture, education, health and the environment. The federal government boasts about recognizing Quebec's distinct nature. It should let us speak for ourselves when our interests are at stake.

In clause 2, we wish to delete the words "endeavour to" in reference to the federal government's acting in co-operation with the provinces. In our opinion, the federal government must always act in co-operation with the provinces, and with their approval. The use of "endeavour to" gives the federal government a loophole we do not wish it to have.

We are calling on the federal government to do away with the matter of uniform environmental standards from coast to coast, because this ignores our specific situation. Here again, we want the words "endeavour to" deleted in order to have assurance that the federal government will act within the spirit of the intergovernmental agreements on the environment concluded with the provinces. This amendment eliminates the federal loophole.

*Government Orders*

Finally, I would point out that we are proposing the same amendment several times, requiring the federal government to obtain provincial approval when assigning the power to adopt regulations and implement legislation. The federal government must obtain provincial approval when adopting regulations relating to the environment.

For all of these reasons, the Bloc Québécois, including the member for Manicouagan of course, will be voting against Bill C-32.

• (1625)

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the motions Group No. 3, which deal with toxic substances.

One could certainly talk at length about what is going on with toxic substances at the federal level. However, before trying to give teeth to this bill, I think we should first look at what the federal government has done in the past regarding toxic substances.

We need only think of the *Irving Whale*, the wreck that lay on the ocean floor off the Magdalen Islands for years before the federal government finally decided to raise it. However, 90% of the PCBs on board seeped out and nothing was done to recover them.

The government did not do everything it should have. It was very important to raise the wreck because there was a major risk that all the oil could have been spilled. Everything was done so fast and without any consideration for the possibility that the BPCs could seep out that eventually 90% of these substances were spilled. We do not know the extent of the damages, nor the middle and long term effects, and nothing is being done to correct the situation. As far as the government is concerned, the problem has been dealt with and that is the end of the matter.

However, there could be a very significant impact on marine wildlife, shellfish and fish in that region, and 10 years from now we will be told "Yes, there are problems. We will have to conduct more studies and stop fishing. There are problems with marine wildlife in that region". Once again, this will be because the government has not taken its responsibilities.

There is also the famous Irving Oil Limited, which, as members know, is a very powerful company in Canada. In fact, it does not even pay taxes here, because of a promise made by children to their parents. That company is responsible for the *Irving Whale* disaster, and the government could easily have made sure that Irving foot the bill, instead of making the taxpayers pay once again.

This is just one case involving toxic substances where the government did not go as far as it should have. This will come back to haunt us in the years to come. There will be problems because of these PCBs that remained at the bottom of the ocean. We will then

realize that something should have been done, but it will be too late.

Another important issue relating to toxic substances is the use of MMT. The government tabled a bill to ban the use of MMT in gasoline. At the time, we fought against that legislation and asked the government to conduct a very simple study to determine whether MMT is indeed a toxic substance. There is still no evidence to that effect. On the contrary, there is evidence that using MMT in gas is a good thing and that, in some way, it protects the environment.

Until a solution is found, we will be faced with the same problem. We would love to get rid of greenhouse gases and everything else that is toxic. But right now there is no proof that MMT is a toxic substance.

We therefore asked the government to do a study. It has not been done. Once again, our recommendations have been ignored. Now I hear that the government wants to reintroduce the same bill to ban MMT. My impression is that something is getting in the way, because precious time is being wasted. Let us do things properly, as they were done in the case of the *Irving Whale* and MMT, commission a public or private study, it does not matter which, and convince people—and convince me—that MMT is a toxic substance and we will react accordingly.

But this has still not been done. In fact, the company recently won a court case and is still allowed to use MMT.

• (1630)

All this is costing a lot of money. And to what end? To indulge in petty politics, keep a few friends of the party happy, make the government look good?

This is not how the environment works. I am sorry, but the environment is our future, the future of our children and of our grandchildren. The government must invest in that future now, and it must do so in a concrete and logical way, consistent with what is now taking place in the provinces. We already have environmental legislation.

Another example is that of environmental assessments. This bill was passed in the House during our last term of office. It is still very contentious. There is a case before the courts involving Quebec and the federal government.

Quebec has the BAPE, which is an agency that does environmental assessments and ensures that any proposals meet Quebec's environmental standards.

Now, the federal government is duplicating and overlapping what is already being done in Quebec. For example, an entrepreneur who wishes to develop a project of some sort has to submit to

a battery of studies. He has to apply to the BAPE and hope he meets the necessary standards. If the federal government then steps in and says that it is not happy and the process must start all over again, costs are doubled. An entrepreneur will probably go under, or close to it, because these things can take years to resolve. Environmental lawyers will have an opportunity to make a lot of money.

I can assure members that with the entire bill before us now, if provincial jurisdictions are not respected, serious problems will occur. The only thing the government will be able to brag about is that it gave environmental lawyers the opportunity to make a lot of money.

Common sense must prevail in all this. I agree that the environment absolutely must be protected, but I also agree that common sense must prevail. Agreements must be made between the federal government and the provinces, because there are some provinces that are doing their part. Perhaps there are some that are not, but I do not want Quebec to be penalized because the federal government has decided to put everyone in the same boat.

I am sorry, but this is not the way things work. We brought forward some amendments. I would ask the government to consider them carefully, to ensure that somewhere there will be some harmonization, some agreement.

Finally, instead of quarrelling about which level is responsible for the environment, I say that everyone should be responsible for it in a normal fashion, in an appropriate manner, without constantly quarrelling and going before the supreme court, before the Quebec court, for decisions that will take years and that will not help the environment in the least. Quite the contrary, this will delay all the work that should be done now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Pursuant to the order made earlier today, motions in Group No. 3 are deemed put, the recorded divisions are deemed demanded and deemed deferred.

The House will now move on to the motions in Group No. 4.

[*English*]

Pursuant to order made earlier this day the motions in Group No. 4 are deemed moved and seconded. This group contains Motions Nos. 8, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24 and 47.

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 21 on page 3 with the following:

“postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environ-”

### *Government Orders*

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 21 on page 3 with the following:

“postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environ-”

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 3 with the following:

“(a.1) take cost-effective preventive and remedial mea-”

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 37 on page 4 with the following:

“coordinated and cost-effective manner; and

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 11 to 14 on page 5 with the following:

“(2) For the purposes of paragraphs (1)(m) and (n), if this Act does not provide for the avoidance of duplication where measures can be taken under this Act and under another Act of Parliament to address a matter affecting the environment or human health, the Minister, the Minister of Health where appropriate, and the minister responsible for the other Act will jointly determine whether the measures that can be taken under the other Act are appropriate and sufficient to address the matter.”

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-32, in Clause 3, be amended by adding after line 40 on page 5 the following:

“aboriginal people” includes the Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples of Canada.”

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-32, in Clause 3, be amended by adding after line 9 on page 9 the following:

“hormone disrupting substance” means a substance having the ability to disrupt the synthesis, secretion, transport, binding, action or elimination of natural hormones in an organism, or its progeny, that are responsible for the maintenance of homeostasis, reproduction, development or behaviour of the organism.”

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-32, in Clause 3, be amended by adding after line 23 on page 9 the following:

“recyclable material” means any material or aggregate of materials that, at any particular time and place, has use or value.”

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-32, in Clause 3, be amended by adding after line 41 on page 10 the following:

“waste” means any solid, liquid or gaseous material or materials or a combination of them, discarded or intended to be discarded as useless and valueless, but excludes recyclable material.”

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-32, in Clause 47, be amended by replacing line 36 on page 30 with the following:

“respecting the cost-effective use of the powers provided for”

*Government Orders*

• (1635)

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in an effort to direct my comments specifically to this group, I would like to identify that the government amendments in this section are restricted to administrative duties.

Specifically, the government response to the standing committee report on CEPA committed to using the version of the precautionary principle agreed to by Canada and the nations of the world during the 1992 United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro.

Motion No. 8 by the government seeks to ensure that the statement of the precautionary principle in the administrative duty section is consistent with the Rio version. The government has put precautionary principle into the body of the legislation, strengthening our government's commitment to take precautionary measures and putting the environment and health of Canadians first, even in the face of scientific uncertainty.

Specific to the other motions that are in this group, the Reform motions seek to reverse the standing committee amendments that deleted cost effective elsewhere in the bill. The government would like to see those remain deleted. Furthermore, we are not in support of the Reform Party's motion to restore the residual clause 2(2), which is one of the motions before us.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this House one more time today. I am very happy. It is not very often that I speak so often in one day.

Bill C-32 is very important. It is very important for Quebec because we have our own environmental legislation. We have been a leader in this area, and the federal government now wants to appropriate the good things we have done in Quebec.

In Group No. 4, Motions Nos. 8 and 10 deal with cost-effective measures. We had a lengthy debate on the word cost-effective in the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development, and we noted that it was not clearly defined. We decided to take it out. Now I see that Motions Nos. 8 and 10 propose that the word be reintroduced.

I do not know if people did their job in the standing committee, to at least try to have this bill make some sense. We see today that the motions brought forward by the government, the Reform Party, the New Democratic Party and the Progressive Conservative Party deal with things that were already done by the standing committee.

These things were debated, maybe not from the same point of view, since the same amendments could not be brought forward in the House, but from a similar one.

The closer we get to the end of consideration of this bill, the more I realize this issue is not being taken very seriously.

With this bill, the federal government is again trying to interfere in areas under provincial jurisdiction. As my colleague was saying earlier, let us leave these things in the hands of those who have jurisdiction over them.

• (1640)

I think the government wants to undermine the authority of the provincial governments, which have developed some expertise through agreements with municipalities, industries, individuals and environmental groups. They have ensured that some progress can finally be made in terms of the environment.

Why take a step backward when we can move forward? With this bill, the government not only takes a step backward, but it prevents the environment from being the focus of concern for the current and future generations.

What we have before us today is not a progressive, but rather a regressive piece of legislation. It is regressive in its concrete measures, in its vision for the future and in the bad image it gives the world of Canada, because of our poor performance. Nothing in this bill will help us become visionary environmental leaders.

We made some commitments in Kyoto. I do not think the government has been able to meet them, quite the opposite, in fact. With the bill before the House, we will fall behind in our commitments. Why? Because, for the time being, there is no co-ordination between the various departments dealing in one way or another with the environment in Canada, like Health Canada and Environment Canada, for instance. As the commissioner of the environment said, we are once again quarrelling.

And what happens when people quarrel? They are unable to move forward. I do not believe this bill will be beneficial to endangered species, water and other matters of interest to our generation and future generations. We should be concerned about that.

Today, we witnessed a historic event: a woman from Quebec went up into space. This bill, however, won't make history. I believe we could have done better.

The Bloc Québécois wanted to move things ahead. However, this government is not doing what it should. It says it will invest millions of dollars here and there for studies and so on. This is not what people want. They do not want studies, they want action, but this government does not know the meaning of the word. We always hear the same old story.

This government is like a dog chasing its tail. This is unfortunate because nowadays no one can ignore environmental issues. This government was elected to run the country, and it is not doing its

*Government Orders*

duty. It does not act, whether it be on the issue of importing or exporting toxic substances or on any other environmental issue. It is as if they had hit the wall. They seem to be living in a virtual world. Everything that deals with the environment seems to be nebulous. We have to tell them that all environmental issues are actually part of our everyday life.

I would not like to be in their shoes tomorrow when people tell them "What did you do? You had the power to make decisions for our children and our grand-children but you did nothing". We cannot look back. We must look to the future. We can build on past experience, but we cannot go back in time.

I believe very strongly in the future, but this government has no hope. It has no hope now and will have none in the future. As the hon. member for Davenport said, it is important.

• (1645)

It is very important for me, for the hon. member for Davenport, and for the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis. For us in the Bloc Québécois, it is very important. I realize we missed the boat. When we miss the boat, it is very hard to move forward.

I hope the government will think it over before the bill is put to a vote, and consider the amendments introduced by the Bloc Québécois and those by the Reform Party. Some, not many, are forward-looking.

I ask government members to search their soul and take a positive view of the Bloc Québécois' amendments. I ask them to see to it that this bill benefits future generations.

[English]

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on the subject of the precautionary principle there are many definitions. We can ask ourselves within the context of this discussion why we need a strong rather than a weak definition of the precautionary principle.

The answer comes by way of yesterday's report provided by the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, Brian Emmett. He writes that Canada is not properly monitoring and draws the attention of parliament in his report to the fact that Canada is not managing pesticides and toxic chemicals. He goes on to cite poor data collection, interministerial squabbling, cuts to science spending and pollution monitoring.

Cuts to science spending have been corrected in recent days by an announcement by the minister. However, there is a widespread feeling among senior scientists in government employment. They

are alarmed at the government's declining ability to detect toxic substances and prevent their harmful effects.

In committee we recommended cleanup plans for industry based on a strong precautionary principle paving the way for the environment minister who would deem toxic chemicals to be inherently dangerous and implement controls without waiting for definite scientific proof of harm. Unfortunately the government under pressure from the Canadian Chemical Producers Association has diluted that requirement by ensuring by way of this amendment that the minister would have to have evidence of long term harm before acting and has burdened the minister with this additional cost effectiveness feature.

We can ask ourselves why we need a strong rather than a weak definition of this precautionary principle. Again we find the answer in yesterday's report by the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development when he writes that government departments "with shared responsibility for dealing with toxic chemicals not only do not co-operate, but in some cases have radically different views on what to do". He points out that Environment Canada, fisheries and oceans, and health are often at odds with Industry Canada and the Department of Natural Resources. He states:

In many cases, departments are deeply divided on the risks posed by toxic substances and this has led to considerable conflict. . . In many cases, conflicts between departments have surpassed a healthy level of debate and have led to strained relations, indecision and inaction.

Therefore, because of the problems pointed out by Mr. Emmett, it becomes evident that what is needed is a strong precautionary principle that would help in improving the existing situation.

• (1650)

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I rise in the House today to congratulate the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Health on the recent announcement of the first phase of research projects under the Government of Canada's \$40 million toxic substance research initiative. The TSRI is a joint Environment Canada and Health Canada initiative to fund scientific research into the links between toxic substances, human illness and environmental damage.

Building science capacity within federal departments is an important first step in improving the government's ability to make effective decisions to address urgent environmental and health issues. Without an adequate science capacity it becomes increasingly difficult to detect, understand and prevent the harmful effects of toxic substances on Canadians and their environment.

Protecting and strengthening science capacity is fundamental to making good environmental and health decisions as science itself evolves and changes. New information and research continually

*Government Orders*

informs and improves our understanding of how ecosystems operate, of how toxic substances interact and impair health functioning of ecosystems and what is required for remediation, rehabilitation and restoration of these ecosystems.

However, lack of full scientific certainty must not immobilize us. It must not impair our ability to act. The precautionary principle means that we act in a cautionary way to ensure the protection of the environment and human health where threats of serious or irreversible harm exists.

Having 23,000 chemicals in use in Canada without proper evaluation is hardly cautionary. The member for Davenport has pointed out why we need a strong precautionary principle. This has been a longstanding public policy issue.

As early as 1950 Rachel Carson outlined in her book *Silent Spring* the U.S. Food and Drug Administration had declared that it was extremely likely that the potential hazard of DDT had been underestimated. By 1951 residues had been recovered from human milk samples tested by Food and Drug Administration scientists. This meant that breast-feeding human infants received a small but regular addition to the load of toxic chemicals building up in their bodies.

She went on to write that at that time it was believed that chemicals of that type freely crossed the barrier of the placenta. 1951 was also the year that my mother became pregnant and I was born in the spring of 1952. It took until 1978, the year that my daughter was born, before DDT was banned in Canada, six years after it was banned in the U.S. An entire generation had to pass from the time that evidence of harm existed before real action was taken. This is hardly a precautionary approach. And today, 21 years after being banned in Canada, DDT is still present in our environment and in our body tissues.

Thousands of tonnes are produced each year. It is used to stop the spread of malaria in some parts of the world. This is only one chemical story among thousands of others.

The post World War II baby boom generation has been exposed to more pesticide residues in childhood diets than any other generation before or since. However, the most significant results of this exposure will not be seen in the baby boom generation but in the next generation with our children and perhaps in many generations to follow.

Many health and environmental witnesses, for example the Canadian Institute of Child Health, the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada and the World Wildlife Fund, pointed out to the committee that children are particularly vulnerable.

From before conception chemicals work to harm a fetus as fathers are subjected to toxics that can damage sperm. The fetus lives, grows and develops inside mothers who have been exposed

to chemicals that can impair key body systems and functions. Even the purest food, breast milk, contains residues of harmful substances.

The sad irony is that the most pristine places on the planet are not immune. Women in the far north, people not responsible for the creation or use of these contaminants, have higher levels for example of PCBs in their breast milk than mothers in the south.

• (1655 )

As the president of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Sheila Watt-Clouthier said last summer at the international POPs negotiating meeting in Montreal, "As we put our babies to our breasts, we feed them a noxious chemical cocktail that foreshadows neurological disorders, cancer, kidney failure, reproductive dysfunction. This should be a wake-up call to the world".

Children interact with the environment in very different ways from adults. They eat dirt. Considering that we grow our food in dirt, this is not such a bad thing except when that dirt comes from a lawn recently sprayed by pesticides. Relative to their size and body weight, children breathe, eat and drink far more than adults. They breathe two times more air, eat three to four times more food and drink two and a half times more water. Their pathways of exposure to environmental pollutants are different from adults and the same level of chemicals in the environment can have much more dramatic effects on a growing child.

The incidence of some cancers may be affected by lifestyle allowing adults to reduce their risks by changing their lifestyle. However, as Sandra Steingraber points out in *Living Downstream*, "the lifestyle of toddlers has not changed much over the past half century. Young children do not smoke, drink alcohol, or hold stressful jobs". Moreover, for the vast majority of cancers we cannot point to a cause in children or adults, but evidence is suggesting that increasing cancer rates are correlated with the tremendous rise in our use of chemicals.

We know these problems exist. They have been documented for decades. Few would argue that the environment and human health are top priorities for Canadians. In fact, Canadians view environment as the number one determinant of health. We must set environmental priorities as if children mattered. More than ever our children and their children require us to act in a cautionary manner and if we are to err, we should err on the side of protecting their health.

If this bill is really about pollution prevention and health protection, then we as parliamentarians must act in a precautionary manner. The addition of cost effective to this section of the bill would add an unnecessary barrier to act when a serious or irreversible threat exists.

I urge members of the House to defeat this amendment.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, we are not surprised at the way the Liberal government is now presenting Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

How is the government laying out Bill C-32? True to itself, it is once again taking the way of duplication.

In theory, Bill C-32 recognizes that the environment is a responsibility that is shared between the federal government and the provinces, but in fact, it does not devolve any power to Quebec or other provinces, it flies in the face of a true harmonization with all levels of government in environmental matters. The intent of Bill C-32 is to strengthen the primacy of the federal government as far as environmental protection is concerned.

This scenario is typical of the behaviour of the Liberal Party of Canada since its re-election in September 1997. It also fits in nicely with the speech from the throne that was read at the time to outline the policies of the Liberal Party of Canada and the present government.

Just as it happened in education and health care, the federal government is once again intruding in an area of shared jurisdiction.

• (1700)

When one looks at Bill C-32, one understands why our party decided to propose so many amendments. We worked very hard in committee. There were 60 sittings, many amendments were put forward and about 160 were adopted. That explains why there are now huge inconsistencies in the bill and many provisions that do not square any more.

There must be a large number of lawyers hoping that the bill will pass. There are so many clauses where the wording is not clear and where there are inconsistencies between what was initially proposed and what the clauses read now that we will see a battle such as we have never seen between the federal government and the provinces.

Our party has put forward a series of amendments aimed at correcting these inconsistencies and getting the federal government to understand the intents of a real environmental policy. A real environmental policy is not developed with centralisation tactics like the ones we have been seeing since this bill was introduced, but rather with harmonisation and consultation.

As I was saying earlier today, this government is trying to show us that it is consulting, listening and negotiating but, basically, it is always true to what it promised and to what it has been saying and what it has been doing for two years.

So, what are we to do? We are here to fight for Quebec's interests and the interests of Quebec's environment. Therefore we have to work hard. In clause 2, the federal government used the phrase "endeavour to act" instead of just "act". I am concerned when I look at what has been happening in the last two years when the federal government says it is endeavouring to do something. I would much prefer to hear the word act, which means that something is actually being done.

When the government says that it is endeavouring to do something, this is a way for it to shirk its responsibilities and above all to meddle in areas under provincial jurisdiction.

It was also decided to create an advisory committee to manage environmental issues. The members opposite are really good at coming up with all sorts of committees. In the last two years, we have witnessed the establishment of the Canada Revenue Agency, and more recently that of another board whose objective will literally be to grab \$30 billion dollars out of the pockets of retired public servants, members of the RCMP and armed forces personnel.

I am a bit scared when I hear that a committee will be struck. What scares me most is when I hear that this committee will advise the two federal ministers and that it will take the federal minister's place to hear the provinces' claims.

With this new measure, the federal government will be able to do as it pleases, as usual, while pretending to be waiting for an answer from the provinces or consulting, and adopt really centralizing directives. If Bill C-32 is passed as amended by the committee after many sittings, Quebec and the other Canadian provinces will end up losing some of their jurisdiction.

It is difficult to believe the government when it talks about harmonization because, in the last two years, it has always been confrontational, in its dealings with the provinces.

The federal government is acting this way because of the upcoming WTO negotiations.

• (1705)

It must try to prove that Canada is a powerful country, but it is not. It is a divided country where there are many squabbles, because some people do not respect the constitution and constantly interfere in provincial jurisdictions. This will give Canada a very bad image when the WTO negotiations start next December. Let us face it, the other countries at the table will know what is going on in Canada.

The government tries by any means at its disposal to grab as much power as it can so as to get the most for Canada in the negotiations. However, before dealing on the international level, it should respect its own constitution, respect the provinces and above all consult them before submitting legislation like Bill C-32, which is now before the House.

*Government Orders*

Have we not talked enough about Bill C-32? It has been a long time since another bill was debated for so long: 60 sittings, 580 amendments proposed, 160 of which were adopted. As a result, the bill we have in front of us is completely different from the first draft. The only thing that stayed the same is that it promotes confrontation instead of harmonization. We also know that there were no consultations but the same old very strong tendency of the federal government to impose its views on the provinces, particularly Quebec.

This is why I once again ask the government and the hon. members across the way to take the time to read the amendments brought forward today and to realize that they are so important that, if they were adopted and included in Bill C-32, we would have a bill harmonizing relations between the federal government and the provinces. I very much hope that this will happen.

[English]

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to address the Group No. 4 amendments to Bill C-32, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

I compliment my colleagues in the NDP on their motions which propose to add a definition of endocrine disrupters to the definition section of the bill. These substances are referred to in the information gathering section of the bill but are not in the definition section where it would permit the government to more directly identify harmful substances which are hormone disrupting substances that have very negative implications with respect to human health.

For those individuals who are not that familiar with hormone disrupting substances I would like to share some of my concerns. These substances have the capacity to affect the nervous system or immune system particularly of children yet to be born or in the early years of development.

The world wildlife fund, physician organizations and learning organizations have pointed out that substances such as DDT have hormone disrupting tendencies or capacities which have very negative implications on the development of children, their capacity to learn, their nervous system, their immune system and their hormone system. This NDP amendment is worthy of the support of the House.

I also applaud the efforts of numerous individuals within the committee who have advanced this subject. The original Bill C-32 which came to committee had no reference to hormone disrupting substances.

• (1710)

Through the collaboration of my Conservative colleagues, the member for Jonquière, the NDP environment critic from Churchill, the member for York North, the member for Lac-Saint-Louis and

others, we were able to turn up the political tinderbox to ensure the information gathering component of the bill.

Canada is already a world leader in terms of studying the hormone disrupting substances on which the bill now has the capacity to gather information. Eventually we will be able to use that research to ensure that we are protecting human health in that regard.

We had a definition that was very similar to the definition in the NDP amendment. Some individuals would have us believe that there is an internationally accepted definition with respect to endocrine disrupting substances. That is not quite true. In fact the NDP definition that was passed under the information gathering section is essentially a melange, a blend of what the U.S. EPA actually approved and the Weybridge definition. Departmental officials with Environment Canada think this is a very workable definition for us to utilize.

Going back to the other definition known as the Weybridge definition, some individuals would advocate it as being the most internationally accepted definition. It is one that many countries have been exposed to, but by no means is there any consensus. The definition we have right now is supported by some environmental NGOs concerned about human health, so that is the definition we should go into as well.

There is another amendment which the Conservative Party will be supporting. Again I am referring to my colleagues in the NDP and their definition with respect to aboriginal peoples which is taken directly from the Constitution. We support that amendment as well.

We are looking at clarifying some definitions with respect to recyclable materials, endocrine disrupting substances and aboriginal people as outlined in the Constitution.

Those are the amendments I wanted to highlight in Group No. 4. Those are the ones we will be supporting. Again I applaud the efforts of my colleague from Churchill.

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I wanted to have the opportunity to speak to Group No. 4, a portion of distinct amendments that are coming into play.

I refer to a statement that was made during clause by clause consideration. After listening to the witnesses that had come forth and presented in honesty their reflections on Bill C-32 as it was originally drafted, we had the task of going through the bill clause by clause. The only thought that came to mind was that we were dealing with a document that resembled pulp fiction. It had good covers. It had a colourful preamble. It had a good title. However the inside of the bill had no powers.

We had cost effective measures that were highlighted in terms of the precautionary principle. We had powers that were diminished

*Government Orders*

by the minister. We had pollution prevention. Virtual elimination was certainly the highlight of the elimination task of the bill. It seemed like we were continuing to pollute the environment and to be a major disruption to our human health.

Along the way and through committee we were able to work with all the party members who were in attendance and thoroughly put their minds, their thoughts and their consciences to work. We came up with Bill C-32 which resembled the needs of Canadians and was balanced on the sustainable development model of the environment, the economy and social well-being. All of these balances were reflected.

• (1715)

What we have with the amendments that have come forward, and a lot of them are highlighted in Group No. 4, is that the government is basing them on cost effectiveness. That is a major detriment to what we have to do. If we are going to take measures to protect our health and our environment we cannot qualify them on cost effectiveness. It is reprehensible that it would be considered at this point. The Liberal cabinet is very adamant about this. We would like to challenge the cabinet to put a price tag on human health and on the protection of our children. That is basically what is happening here. Once we use the terminology of cost effectiveness we put a price tag on the measures and their effects.

There was a very brave Liberal member who in the clause by clause review brought forward the elimination of cost effectiveness. In the parliamentary process, the democratic process, we voted and we all agreed that cost effectiveness should not be part of the precautionary principle terminology and it was voted out. Democracy ruled. Now the Liberal cabinet is not satisfied with that process. It has not respected the democratic process and has come back to the House, with its power and strength in numbers, to try to bring back cost effectiveness.

I challenge members to vote their conscience for the well-being of their families and the well-being of their children and to vote in favour of a strong environmental bill.

Attaching conditions to protective measures is certainly something that was highlighted throughout the deliberations.

I have some examples that I would like to share with members. Recently we heard about Frederick Street in Sydney, Nova Scotia, where toxic ooze began to leak into backyards. It made headlines a year ago. It was on a railway bed. This toxic ooze was included on the priority substances list. Arsenic and other chemicals were in this concoction which was leaking.

What was cost effective? Cost effective was to leave the kids and put a little plastic fence around the area, which was very cheap. It cost maybe \$50 for the fence and \$10 to hire somebody to put it up. For \$60 there was a fence. That was the cost effective measure for environmental protection to keep the kids away from the ooze.

Then this spring the ooze was showing up in their basements. As they were dusting off their bicycles to enjoy the weather, with winter gone, these kids found this ooze on the basement floors and walls of their Frederick Street homes. What is cost effective? It was a major embarrassment. The environment minister has now made some assurances that the federal government will roll up its sleeves to attack this problem. Is it going to take atrocities to knock us on our heads before we smarten up and take action?

Basically we have to get past this pulp fiction issue. We cannot make plans, have good intentions and put up a neon sign saying we are open for business when we have nothing to sell. We have to have substance. We have to have the human resources and the financial resources to act and enforce the laws in this bill.

I would like to continue to speak about the cost effectiveness issue which is a major detriment in terms of Group No. 5. However, I would like to speak about the definitions which are included in Group No. 4.

We have included a definition that covers hormone disrupting substances. It is a major accomplishment in the country and in the world to have this definition included in the bill. It was included in part 3 of CEPA. It is a clause which deals with information gathering. We are adding the hormone disrupting definition at the beginning of the bill so that it plays and resonates throughout the whole bill. If the minister decides, beyond the information that she will be gathering, to make regulations to that effect, there will be a definition in place and we will not have to look for a new one. This bill will have some of the homework done before the minister takes action.

• (1720)

This definition did not have the support and the collaboration of the ministers. The parliamentary secretary played a role. A colleague of mine filled in on the day, a very successful day, when we managed to get this definition. A lot of people remember that historic moment. I believe that everybody deserves a pat on the back for making this happen. It was a win situation for all of us.

Witnesses from the World Wildlife Fund helped to bring forward this definition and they should be congratulated as well. It has been approved by academic, scientific and professional health circles throughout the world. In terms of gender benders we are on the right track and this definition needs to be included.

Included in this group is the definition of aboriginal people. We overlooked this situation. There was a well intentioned inclusion of the aboriginal ecological knowledge of this country where the significance and importance of aboriginal knowledge was recognized.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Cree*]

*Government Orders**[English]*

A lot of peoples and tribes have lived here for many generations, many decades before us, and they have a tremendous knowledge of the ecological and biological diversity of this country. If we do not tap that knowledge and give it a weight which is equal to scientific knowledge we will be missing a great wealth of knowledge.

Aboriginal people should be defined as the Indian, Metis and Innu peoples of Canada. That should put us well on track for a good definition.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, in the few minutes that we have left, I would first like to address the precautionary principle, which is the issue in this group of amendments.

Frankly, I must admit there are reasons for the position taken by the government. In its response to the committee report, entitled "This is About Our Health", the government clearly explained that it would introduce the precautionary principle according to the Rio definition. This definition includes the notion of cost effectiveness. This is what the government had decided to do.

At the same time, there is another way of looking at this amendment. When we got to committee, the member for Davenport introduced an amendment concerning the administrative duties section of the bill, which aimed at ignoring the notion of cost effectiveness.

*[English]*

I think it was a pity to reintroduce this notion of cost effectiveness. The committee had a chance to debate it fairly. All sides had a look at it, voted on it and the amendment presented by my colleague for Davenport was voted in. It was in the bill. There was no earthly reason that it should have been changed again. The real definition, admittedly, was part of the government's response, but it is not sacrosanct.

In several international instruments which the government has signed definitions do not include the cost effectiveness notion. In fact, in our oceans act the precautionary principle is written this way:

Whereas Canada promotes the wide application of the precautionary approach to the conservation, management and exploitation of marine resources in order to protect these resources and preserve the marine environment;

• (1725 )

There is no notion there of cost effectiveness. This is a law of our own government.

It was a real pity that we lost a wonderful chance to improve on the Rio definition. That is what the environment and the protection of human health is about. There is an evolution happening. The concepts that we knew in 1992, which might have been the subject of a compromise in Rio, will not be there forever. If they evolve for the better, toward better protection of the environment and human health, then why not? Why go back in time? Why sacrifice a gain, something which is positive, that was gained within our committee?

*[Translation]*

In the last minutes that I have left, I would have liked to touch on an issue that was raised by several speakers from the Bloc Québécois. They are using all the debates to blame the federal government. Everything goes well in Quebec and everything goes badly at the federal level. Everything that goes badly is the federal government's fault. The same old song.

I heard some speakers tell us why their laws were forward-looking, how everything was going well in Quebec. Well, I would like to remind them of a couple of things.

First of all, over the last two years, the environmental groups themselves have blamed the Quebec government for its failure in the environmental area. Very recently, the Quebec premier, a former environment minister, suspended the application of part of Quebec's environmental legislation, the *Loi des impacts environnementaux*, which is absolutely perfect. He suspended its application to have a Hydro Quebec power line built pursuant to an order in council. The issue was brought to court and Quebec's case was dismissed.

What did Quebec do? It passed a special law to continue building the line, even though the court had said it should abide by its own environmental legislation.

It is totally farfetched to say that there is disproportionate centralization on the part of the federal government. Canada is the most decentralized country in the world.

I want to remind Bloc Québécois members that 24 federal regulations related to the Environmental Protection Act and the Fisheries Act have been transferred to the provinces, three of them to Quebec. In Quebec, those regulations cover 61 plants, more plants than all the others together.

The commissioner's report, which members of the Bloc Québécois so abundantly quoted earlier, shows that, of those 61 plants, 20 in 1995, 20% were at fault in 1996 and fully a third of them did not comply in 1997. What did Quebec do? It sent warning letters. There was only one prosecution.

The federal government is not always at fault. I am quite ready to admit that, as democrats, we can sometimes condemn others, but there is a lot to be said here.

[English]

I would like to thank all members who worked so diligently on this bill, the officials of the ministry, the parliamentary secretary and others. All we want is to better the quality of life of the people we are here to serve. I have certain reservations about this bill. They are few in number; however, four or five are key.

I hope that somehow between now and the final passage of this bill we will find some wisdom together to rectify what we feel are the inherent flaws in this bill so that all of us can join together to vote for it. That would, by far, be my fondest wish.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[English]

### REFORM OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The House resumed from April 19 consideration of the motion.

**Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the hon. member for raising the issue of conflict prevention and how international organizations can be reformed to play a more effective role in this regard.

We are all aware of the radical changes that the world has experienced since the end of the cold war. While the threat to the global community's security posed by the cold war has been removed, the number and intensity of violent conflicts has escalated over the last decade. In recent years conflicts have taken an enormous toll on many countries in Africa particularly, which has seen its progress seriously undermined by debilitating wars.

### *Private Members' Business*

The face of war has also been transformed by the large majority of conflicts now taking place within the borders of states, rather than between states. Many of these intra-state conflicts have had a devastating impact within the country and on the region as a whole. Civilians account for the majority of victims of such conflicts and are often targeted by belligerent forces. Indeed, many of the threats to the security of the individual are the direct or indirect result of conflict, very often of the intra-state variety.

Despite the indisputable importance of conflict prevention to the people of the world, the international community does indeed find itself short of adequate tools to manage conflict and to consolidate peace processes. Global and regional institutions, most of which were created in the years immediately following the end of the second world war, have been slow to adapt to the realities and demands of a rapidly evolving global environment.

It would be misleading, however, to conclude that the shortcomings of the international community's capacity to play a more effective role in preventing conflicts, or indeed responding to an early stage of emerging conflict, is due solely to the flaws in the structure of mandates of international organizations. In many cases, the missing ingredient prevents timely and effective intervention and that indeed is the political will and the willingness of members of the international community to commit the required resources.

Canada believes that a dynamic and responsive United Nations should be at the centre of the international community's efforts to prevent conflict. Many components of the United Nations have a contribution to make in building a global community less prone to conflict.

The security council has a central and irreplaceable role to play in the maintenance of peace and security. During our current term as a member of the security council, Canada is determined to press the council to assume its proper leadership role which it has frequently abdicated in recent years.

Furthermore, the government believes that the council must re-examine the traditional interpretation of its mandate. We have advocated that the security council needs to broaden its horizons to addressing emerging threats. A credible and relevant security council must be quickly apprised of emerging intra-state conflicts and seek ways to prevent them from occurring.

We reject the argument that the security council should limit its attention to traditionally defined conflicts between states. The human security consequences of intra-state conflicts and the potential of such conflicts to destabilize adjacent countries demand preventive action by the international community. The security council is the appropriate forum that should be assuming the lead in such action.

During our presidency of the security council in February, Canada convened and chaired a special debate on the protection of

*Private Members' Business*

civilians in armed conflict. In addressing this debate, the Minister of Foreign Affairs called for “vigorous, comprehensive and sustained action” by the council to address the tragic brutalization of civilians which characterizes so many of these contemporary conflicts. He identified four challenges facing the council. These include the prevention of conflict, the respect for international humanitarian and human rights law, the pursuit of those who would violate humanitarian norms and standards and, finally, the issue of the instruments of war.

I am pleased that the security council agreed to ask the secretary-general to prepare a report, due this September, which will identify concrete measures that can be taken to improve the protection of civilians in armed conflict. We see this as one step in an ongoing process which will provide an improved level of protection to the vulnerable.

• (1735)

Canada has also stated clearly to the United Nations membership our view that the security council must not focus on solving the problems of one region while remaining indifferent to the problems of others. Political will and leadership, including the large and powerful members of the international community, are needed in order that the security council may play its proper role in preventing and resolving conflict.

In addition to our efforts to encourage the security council to assume greater responsibility in preventing conflict, Canada is active in many other ways to enhance our own and the international community's capacity and effectiveness in this regard. Of particular significance is the Canadian peacebuilding initiative launched in 1996 which is designed to improve the coordination of Canadian peacebuilding activities, both government and NGO, and to strengthen Canada's contribution to international peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding is the effort to strengthen the prospects for internal peace and decrease the likelihood of violent conflict. It is rapidly becoming an essential element of the UN's involvement in conflict-torn societies. We will meet these new challenges by strengthening the UN's capacity to prevent conflict, respond rapidly when conflict erupts and to provide post-conflict peacebuilding instruments.

Making peace, maintaining peace and building sustainable peace must be understood not as three separate elements but as three vital and interdependent components of the same mission; that of eliminating violent conflict and building lasting peace in all societies.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate that the government appreciates the interest of the hon. member in the issue of conflict prevention. The government shares the view that the global community must find ways to enhance its ability to prevent conflict, including international organizations. More effective conflict prevention is clearly essential to assuring the human security of people in many parts of the world.

Canada is working actively and energetically at the United Nations and in other forums with a wide range of states that share our commitment to developing an improved conflict prevention capacity of the global community.

The motion under consideration contains the proposal that the government should convene an international meeting to develop a multilateral plan to reform international organizations to enhance their conflict prevention capabilities. This is a timely suggestion. However, the fact is that there are ongoing efforts, both formal and informal, involving a broad range of countries that are aimed precisely at the objective contained in the hon. member's motion. Canada is at the forefront of those efforts and is determined to find ways to improve the international community's conflict prevention capabilities.

The complexity of the issues involved and the divergent approaches of members of the global community would suggest that meaningful progress toward enhanced conflict prevention capacity of international organizations will likely be incremental rather than revolutionary. Launching a new process to promote an end that is already being pursued as a priority by Canada and many other countries in different forums is not likely to add value. In fact, it could detract resources and focus from ongoing efforts despite the best intentions of those who would propose such initiatives.

For this reason, the government is not convinced that the adoption of this motion would be conducive to advancing the worthy objective of improving the international community's conflict prevention capability.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today to the motion from the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. I would like to read it back into the record. It states:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should convene a meeting of “like-minded nations” in order to develop a multilateral plan of action to reform international organizations (e.g. International Monetary Fund, World Bank, United Nations) so that they can identify the precursors of conflict and establish multilateral conflict-prevention initiatives.

• (1740)

It should be easy to support the motion because it talks in general terms about the need for reform. As speaker after speaker will admit, there is a crying need for reform in each of the multilateral organizations mentioned in the motion. The theme is common within the organizations themselves as they seek to change their mandate in this post-cold war era. They are searching for answers and a consensus from the international community and the leaders in the international community on where to go from here.

The 21st century does not look like it is going to be the century of peace and prosperity. If anything, this post-cold war era has been an era of increasing regional conflicts that require the thoughtful intervention of world leaders and community leaders before the conflicts erupt into violence.

*Private Members' Business*

The member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca has a bit of a track record in this area that should be noted as people consider this. It was his initiative, long before it was a topical or faddish thing to do, to support the abolition of landmines. It was his initiative, both nationally here in Canada and internationally as a medical doctor and dealing with the aftermath and fallout of the landmine situation, which started the ball rolling in many countries as people decided to come together.

How did they come together? They came together in a meeting of like-minded nations—the same sort of initiative the member has put forward here—to talk about ways to do away with that curse on mankind that is the landmine.

Long before Princess Diana got on board and the government grabbed this initiative and ran with it, the member from Juan de Fuca had started the idea in many people's minds that this could be achievable. Some of the same protests that I hear from the government side about it being hard to do and that it has already tried to do it here, there and everywhere, we found that when we got together in what became the Canada initiative, we could change the world. We did, we have and we should be thankful for that.

The motion deals with, as some would say, a good theoretical discussion, but it is far more than a theoretical idea. It is an idea whose time has come. When the government chooses to disengage from the debate or says that it is already doing all it can, we see, as we saw today in Pakistan, what happens when we disengage too much.

We have disengaged from India and Pakistan because of our anger over what they have done on the nuclear front. We now hear that a couple of planes have apparently been shot down in the area between these two nations. One has to wonder what the precursors were to the conflict. One has to wonder what was in the tea leaves. If only we had an active international organization of like-minded nations that saw the precursors to the violence, to list them and to find ways to mitigate them by working through the reform of international organizations.

Every night on the news we see the situation in the Balkans. We hear people, who seem to be coming out of the woodwork, saying, "For 10 years we have told you this was coming. You could see it". All the evidence was in place and all the signs were there, but none of the international organizations chose to read the signs and react in any meaningful way.

• (1745 )

Now we are reaping the whirlwind. That goes for the Balkans, the India-Pakistan situation and most of the continent of Africa. People come back with horrible eye witness accounts. They say that it has been going on and building for a number of years and

that if we had just looked at the signs we would have seen the disaster that was coming.

When disaster struck in Rwanda people literally cried on television. They said they told the United Nations there were signs that big genocidal problems were brewing and that it had better do something. The United Nations is just not geared react. It reacts after there is a war, a conflict or a genocide taking place, but it does not have the precursors in place, as this motion says, to deal with a situation before it erupts in violence.

That is why the motion is so timely. It is interesting that we have had a series of motions in this session dealing with either peace-keeping initiatives or conflict prevention initiatives such as this one. I guess it is a sign of the times. It is the sign of the need that many backbenchers see even if the government does not. Backbenchers see the urgency of finding ways to deal with the changing international situation.

As I mentioned earlier that situation is not less tense because of the end of the cold war. All that has done is allowed a series of smaller but hugely important regional conflicts to take root and to fester unchecked until they erupt in violence.

When people are considering the importance of this issue they should go through the House of Commons list of why this motion should be considered important. Why should it be votable, for example? Is it something of international significance? The answer in this case is an obvious yes. The government says it is doing all it can do or should do so we should not worry about it.

The truth is the international organizations have said this is something they have to grapple with. In the case of Pakistan-India we have spent billions of dollars in aid but have not spent at least a small portion of that on making sure we have identified the precursors to conflict, finding ways to reduce those conflicts and finding ways through the World Bank, the IMF and the United Nations to help reduce the tension levels rather than just saying the answer must be more money. Money is not the answer in these situations. It is to identify a whole series of indicators and then deal with them through international organizations.

First, the motion meets the criteria of being of international significance. Second, it is important because it is on the cutting edge of foreign policy. I mentioned that there has been a series of initiatives from both sides of the House on foreign policy issues.

This initiative does not conflict with the government's agenda. It dovetails nicely into what I believe Canadians would like us to do in the House, that is to work co-operatively not only in this place but internationally to move forward this peacekeeping, peacemaking and war preventing measure.

Third, it capitalizes on something that Canadians too often take for granted, our good international reputation. It would send a

*Private Members' Business*

signal to the international community and the people who watch these debates and are keenly interested in our foreign affairs that we have taken this matter seriously, that we will make it a priority and that we are willing to work co-operatively with like minded nations to make sure that peace is not just a theory but a reality in the 21st century.

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I too am very pleased to take part in the debate on this private member's motion which deals with the need to develop a multilateral plan of action to reform international organizations such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

• (1750)

The crisis we are facing today is defining how history will remember this era as one of interstate conflict with grave humanitarian implications. Whereas the first half of the 20th century was characterized by wars between states, today this concept seems to be moving toward obsolescence. Countries with deep seated pluralist traditions are now facing dissent from within their borders as a result of intensifying extremist tendencies.

Strident voices and belligerent actions replace peaceful cohabitation. Victims of these so-called modern conflicts are more often than not civilians and this situation denotes increasing violations of basic human rights. While the principle of state sovereignty restricts external intervention, the international community should never justify an action through the mindless invocation of this principle.

[Translation]

There is one thing we should never forget about the sacrosanct principle of national sovereignty, and that is that a nation's sovereignty counts for nothing if it does not exist for the much greater good of the sovereignty of its population.

The roll call of these new-style conflicts is a long one. The names of a few countries will suffice: Algeria, Sierra Leone, Rwanda. They will forever be associated with the atrocities of which they were the theatres and their populations the actors, the spectators and the victims. While our attention is turned elsewhere, some of these crises continue to rage. But no example is more striking by its immediacy and its scale than the crisis in Kosovo.

What will be remembered of this very sad chapter in the history of humanity? Milosevic's intractability, the horrendous atrocities that are taking place and a very small part of which have been discovered so far or the obvious ineffectuality of the international community. While it is true that people are not insensitive to what is happening in Kosovo and that many have shown a generosity that has been of a great help to the refugees, we are left with no choice but to conclude that the NATO strikes have been ineffective.

[English]

The international community has seen its efforts reduced to naught by the stubborn and single minded perseverance of Milosevic. If the primary goal of the operation allied force includes facilitating the timely return of refugees to their homes, the intensity of the air attacks brings into question their utility. The reintegration of refugees into their homeland becomes more and more difficult the longer the attacks rain down on a country steadily being reduced to rubble. Peace must be negotiated even if this process has to go forward with a leader accused of numerous crimes against humanity.

As the crisis drags on, the realization that there are only two remaining options is crystallizing: we can perpetuate violence or we can choose to negotiate. The last few weeks of NATO's air campaign have demonstrated the futility of the former option. Negotiation is the only viable way to achieve a resolution to the conflict and a lasting peace.

My intervention today is not designed to focus on the atrocities being committed in the former Yugoslavia but rather to identify and denounce the general inefficiency of international organizations that deal with the types of situations which have been clearly evidenced by the crisis in Kosovo.

The architecture of international organizations needs a profound revision as their current form highlights their irrelevance. The relative lethargy of the United Nations can be partly explained in light of the organization's subordinations to the political whims of the security council. In order to address the UN's paralysis, a system whereby a member state's monetary contributions are respected must be devised and implemented. I must say parenthetically that the United States needs to know this and know this well.

[Translation]

By its very structure, the UN is obsolete. We can be pleased with the great work that the UN has accomplished for peace and development in these last fifty years, but we must not forget that more could have been done. To ensure it remains effective, the UN must adapt to the new realities. It was built on the respect of the sovereignty of nations. This principle still holds as long as a nation's sovereignty exists for the good of its people.

• (1755)

This is why, in the face of blatant and repeated human rights violations in a country, the international community has a duty to overlook the notion of sovereignty and to react in order to correct the situation.

The actions taken by NATO, which circumvented the UN security council, clearly show the obsolescence of the two organi-

*Private Members' Business*

zations. Even though NATO leaders, including Canada, are prestigious members of the United Nations, this did not prevent them from bypassing the UN. On the other hand, the UN did not respond to such action. How can we tolerate such a blatant lack of co-operation?

I believe it is Canada's responsibility to take a leadership role in the face of such obsolescence. We avoid consuming outdated products. We update our old software. We offer retirement packages to tired workers to make room for younger blood. Similarly, it is our duty to review the role of our major organizations.

[English]

Whereas our international organizations were born out of the crucible of the second world war and designed to deal with the post-1945 era, it is plainly evident that the contemporary international security environment has changed dramatically since.

As previously mentioned the very nature of wars has evolved considerably. Today we face significant crises in both development and the environment. Poverty continues to grow and foreign aid has taken on the guise of public relations gestures instead of bona fide humanitarian assistance.

Both World Bank and the International Monetary Fund actions leave much to be desired in form and function. Loans from these organizations have served to put into debt the poorest countries on earth, to the point where they can never hope to escape from their debt traps. This situation is akin to sacrificing future generations and represents the antithesis of sustainability. Poor countries have become loan dependent, a state of affairs perpetuated by the western world and the actions of international financial organizations.

Numerous development projects have proved hopelessly inappropriate, dealing with short term results at the expense of the long term viability and sustainability of the populace. Truly sustainable practices and development must aim to enfranchise their brothers and sisters throughout the developing world and must result in a significant form of international organizations.

We must restructure and rework international environmental policies. If these policies are to be effective they must be applied and implemented globally. By their very nature international environmental policies necessitate a strong guiding role for international organizations. As such the inherent inefficiencies displayed by international organizations in dealing with environmental concerns and issues must be addressed by the reform of these institutions.

The time has come to convene a global summit with the aim of reforming international organizations, rewriting the international code of conduct in order that our organizations not only reflect contemporary realities but also new more efficient modes of actions to deal with the challenges of today and tomorrow.

[Translation]

While it is critical to correct the current situation, the solution must not be risky. It must constantly be adjusted to the changing realities of our world. This is why it will be essential to introduce a motion to review major international organizations every decade.

[English]

We must work toward establishing international institutions that prioritize human needs and rights. The sovereignty of states must be tempered by the primacy of human rights. Thus the flagrant abuse of this paramount principle can and should be met by swift and meaningful intervention by the international community.

I thank the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca for this very important and useful motion.

**Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC):** Madam Speaker, I begin by thanking the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca for this thought provoking and important motion. It is a very timely motion because we live in a period of immense change. There are tremendous challenges facing Canada in a global environment.

Traditionally Canada has played a very important role as a middle power, a role that far exceeds our size as a nation, our population and our ability to influence affairs. Our chain of events in global events has been significant.

• (1800)

I would argue that over the past several years, particularly since 1993, there has been a decline in the role we have played particularly in the defence of human security and in the traditional linkage that has existed between foreign policy in Canada and human rights which has existed for some time. I would argue that there has been a significant de-linkage since 1993. More focus has been placed on trade missions than on actual foreign policy in a very positive sense.

Since the end of the cold war the evolution of human security has increased its pace significantly. There have been over 100 conflicts since the end of the cold war. Most of these have been interstate conflicts. The member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca has said there are approximately 40 current conflicts. Many of these conflicts are between governments and their own people. In that type of environment the evolution and recognition of human security becomes increasingly important.

The evolution of human security certainly did not begin at the cessation of the cold war. Some would point to the birth of the UN in 1948 and also to the Bretton Woods institutions that began in 1945 as the modern genesis of the notion of human security. From their very beginning the World Bank's and the UN's basic principles and mandates have recognized human security.

*Private Members' Business*

The mission of the World Bank is "to help people help themselves and their environment by providing resources, sharing knowledge, building capacity, and forging partnerships in the private and public sectors; to fight poverty with passion and professionalism for lasting results". These basic tenets of the World Bank are focused more on human security than national security.

The United Nations charter initially said "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small".

The focus from the beginning with the UN and the World Bank has been on human security and it certainly should be. The IMF is more focused on the financial side of things in providing and ensuring that nation states have the ability through financial systems and economies to actually provide successful economies for their people.

Globalization is playing a key role in the evolution of human security as well. Technology and telecommunications play a role in bringing the atrocities of war home to people in nations like Canada and creating political and public pressure for us to become involved in conflicts such as in Kosovo. There has been an interesting incidence whereby we have seen NATO, developed as a defence alliance for the cold war, actually playing a key role in the defence of human security.

Some would argue that the role NATO is playing in Kosovo should be played by the UN. In fact, it is the failure of the member states in the UN to agree and to come to some sort of common goal relative to the conflict in Kosovo. The UN is not playing that role but NATO has been able to play a very important role and one that many of us share.

The role that Canada has played in the landmines treaty with the UN countries is further evidence of the evolution of human security.

The issue of institutional reform for the Bretton Woods institutions and for the UN and other institutions, including the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which are involved in economic development and human security issues is very important and timely because there is a tremendous amount of redundancy between these organizations. There is also a significant institutional reform needed individually and collectively and an increased level of co-operation. There has not been in the past enough co-operation and communication between these institutions. As a result sometimes the goals have been muddled. Certainly the effort to achieve those goals has been even more confusing.

• (1805)

One of the difficulties with the UN is that it is very difficult to gain agreement from the member states on some common goals.

Recently I believe China had some difficulty with supporting the UN peacekeepers in Macedonia because Macedonia has had a position in the past of co-operation with Taiwan.

The U.S. support for the UN has varied over time. The payment of dues by the U.S. to the UN has been a perennial issue. Even though the President of the U.S. may be supportive of the UN in a general sense, Congress sometimes is less so. If we read some of the comments of Senator Helms in that regard, we can see very clearly that one of the reasons many Americans are opposed to supporting the UN and paying the U.S. dues to the UN is simply that the U.S. does not agree with any devolution of the role of the U.S. as a national power or as a superpower and feel that supporting the UN will in some way reduce its power in a global sense. There are member states like the U.S. that are in some ways reflecting what is a pre cold war mentality in a post cold war environment.

I want to speak briefly about the IMF. Many people are critical of the IMF. I think some of the criticisms are legitimate, but by and large a lot of the criticisms I hear are not accurate. The IMF in spite of some of its failures has had some very significant successes. If we go back to 1995 and look at the bailout of Mexico for instance, that is an example where quick action by the IMF and the U.S. and the \$40 billion bailout did help prevent a meltdown in Mexico and Latin America that would have played a significant and deleterious role in those economies.

It is questionable whether IMF support has helped in Southeast Asia. Again there were some criticisms of the IMF, both in the Southeast Asia crisis and in the ruble crisis in Russia last fall and late last summer. Many of the criticisms of the IMF have been based on the rather stringent conditions the IMF set on lending to those countries. I would argue that some of those conditions are very reasonable. Some of the conditions for instance in Russia have been that Russia gains a functional payment system, a functional tax system. These are reasonable demands.

The IMF conditions are significant to the debt issue. The debt issue in developing nations is extremely important. There are initiatives to retire the debts of some of the developing nations that are suffering under egregious debt loads at this time and are simply unable to provide the infrastructure they need in the long term in terms of education and health care and at the same time meet these conditions.

The World Bank has undergone some significant reform under Wolfensohn. It is the type of reform that I would like to see. I believe that this type of meeting, this type of initiative is very important.

In closing, in the long term I would like to see more focus on initiatives like microcredit, issues like early childhood intervention in some of these countries, and some of the pre-emptive measures that actually seek to focus on the causes as opposed to dealing with the conflicts once they have come about.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1810)

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, first I would like to congratulate my colleague for putting this motion before parliament. Certainly it has triggered quite a bit of debate and interest. It is quite timely to speak about issues of importance not only to our country but to the world as a whole.

I do have some problems with the motion because it mixes two different animals. I wish it had focused on only one element, either the United Nations or the international financial institution. We would have had a more meaningful debate.

I am going to talk a bit about the economic situation around the world and what Canada is doing as a nation both on the bilateral level and on the multilateral level in order to push forward the agenda of reform, not only for international financial institutions but also for international financial stability.

As one would say, if something is rumbling in my tummy it is time for something good to eat. If a nation is not doing well economically and if the people of a nation do not have enough food on the table, that to a large extent could create not only an economic destabilizing factor but also a political destabilizing factor. It is extremely important to have good economic stability in a society in order to have good political stability.

Canada on that front has done a tremendous amount of work. For the record I would like to indicate some of the initiatives this government has taken when dealing with poor countries and their debts.

Over \$53 million has been contributed to the most indebted countries trust funds. The government has given an additional \$33 million of which \$21 million has been earmarked for use by the African Development Bank and \$1 million for Guyana. The government has written off a large portion of its outstanding official assistance debt to the poorest countries. To date we have forgiven over \$1.2 billion in overseas development assistance debt.

In 1992 the previous government announced a major debt conversion initiative for Latin America involving up to \$145 million of CIDA as well as ODA debt into local currency to help finance environment and development projects. So far about six countries have taken advantage of it, such as Colombia, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru and Costa Rica. An agreement has been reached with the Dominican Republic and should be signed sometime in the near future.

On the multilateral level the government outlined at the 1995 G-7 meeting in Halifax a six point plan. One is to ensure appropriate monetary policy through the G-7 central banks, paying close attention and giving appropriate weight to the risk of a future slowdown in the global economy. The second is expeditious action to strengthen national financial systems and international oversight. Third is development of a practical guide or road map for

safe capital liberalization in developing countries. Fourth is the agreement to work urgently toward a better mechanism to involve private sector investors in the resolution of a financial crisis, including the possibility of an emergency standstill clause. Finally, there is greater attention to the needs of the poorest countries to ensure they receive the resources and support they need to reduce poverty and begin growing.

Let me stress one point out of this six point plan, the strengthening of the financial systems around the world. Very few countries around the world put out financial statements indicating the financial affairs of their nation.

• (1815)

There is no international standard. Different countries report in different ways on the state of the nation when it comes to the financial end of things. To that extent, Canada is one of the best countries in the world when it comes to issuing its annual financial statements, which makes it one of the most transparent economies in the world.

One of the first things that we have to do as a society, as a government and as a parliament is to work at the bilateral level to encourage and assist countries, in particular third world countries, to start developing proper financial statements so that at the end of the year the people of that country, whether private sector, public sector or taxpayers as a whole, will be able to see how the government is spending its money. Then corruption could be reduced and eventually eliminated.

There are many countries around the world that do not issue financial statements. As a result, nobody knows what those countries have in terms of revenues or expenditures. That is a major scandal internationally. It is one of the leading causes for a lot of the problems and economic troubles around the world.

There are some countries in Asia-Pacific that have not issued financial statements for the past seven years. Some countries have not had financial statements from their governments for the past 15 or 20 years. Others are working on 1991 financial statements. Those very same countries have gone through very difficult and troubling economic times.

Before one talks about reform of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, one really has to address the fundamental issue of transparency around the world when it comes to the proper reporting of governments with annual financial statements.

If it was up to me, frankly, I would synchronize and eliminate some of the organizations. I would fold them into the World Trade Organization so that we would have one economic power around the world that would govern. I would bring in the International Monetary Fund as a part of that economic organization. I would bring in the World Bank, the OECD, APEC, the G-8 and every

*Private Members' Business*

other organization under the economic umbrella of the World Trade Organization. Once that was done, and it would take quite a bit of time, then I would talk about making the World Trade Organization a part of the United Nations. Then we would have a body that would govern both politically on the one hand and economically on the other.

Simply having a meeting to bring a bunch of politicians together, most of the time, is extremely counterproductive and will not give us the results we want.

I want to thank my hon. colleague for bringing this issue before the House because it has given us a chance to put our views on the record. It triggered a very interesting debate and I hope we will have a chance to further debate issues such as this in the future.

I would say that everything starts at home and I want to take this opportunity to commend the Department of Finance and the Government of Canada for being so proactive, not only here at the local level in Canada but at the international level, in bringing about reforms to international financial institutions and also in assisting countries to bring about transparency, economic development and prosperity for their people, for our people and for the world as a whole.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

### CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999

BILL C-32—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is my duty to inform this House that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the report stage and the third reading stage of Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice that a minister of the crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stages.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1820)

[English]

### REFORM OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

**Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it is very distressing to me to hear that the government is once again going to invoke closure or time allocation to limit our debate on another bill in the House. I find it abhorrent that this government continues this practice.

I am also sorry that the hon. member who last spoke has left because he reconfirmed something that I have thought for the last six years, that this government has no ability to walk and chew gum at the same time. He talked about fuzzing up the issue and bringing in too many things to consider at any one time. I would like to think that it is only the Liberals who do not have the ability to look at a much broader vision of how the world can work together and how Canada can participate in working with other countries to resolve some of the situations in which we find ourselves.

I would like to speak to private member's Motion No. 338 that my hon. colleague and seatmate, the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, has submitted to the House. I do not feel that he is placing the government in a difficult position at all. All he is asking is that the government convene a meeting of like-minded nations to develop foreign policy, to develop a concept to prevent conflict around the world and to step in before it becomes war. When the signs are there that it is inevitable, the nations of the world could figure out how to determine what the signals are, what we should be looking for and then what our response to those signals should be.

I cannot understand how government members can see any reason for not supporting the motion. I do not understand it.

We have many world organizations—NATO, the United Nations, the IMF—which have the jurisdiction or the ability to talk to nations about various issues, to sit down and try to come to some resolution, but it is not working.

There are many reasons it is not working. We all have identified and even the organizations themselves have identified the need to reform these organizations. It would not hurt to have like-minded nations sit down to talk about how things could be changed and to reform the various institutions of which we are a part.

We have the situation now where NATO is in the former Yugoslavia. There are criticisms that NATO stepped in when it

should not have, that it should have been the United Nations. However, the United Nations was not prepared to move. Even if it had moved, it is after the fact. Conflict has broken out. It should have looked at the evidence, at the situation and at the signals that this was going to happen and it should have stepped in many years ago to try to resolve the issues.

The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca has written a number of papers on this issue. He has looked at it very deeply and has come up with a number of ways in which these issues could be sorted out and various responses that could be developed.

I want to share with the House some of the issues that he feels could be dealt with. He has listed a number of things which indicate that there could be difficulties which could lead to crises and he reports on the ways that we could respond to them. For example: to have diplomatic initiatives to diffuse the tensions between ethnic groups and encourage peacekeeping initiatives between these rival groups; to introduce positive information to counter the negative information that is being spread; to have an international arms registry that deals with specific arms, which would go a long way to adding a measure of transparency and accountability where there are military organizations.

• (1825 )

The member feels that one of the most important ways is to bring in the international financial institutions, especially the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Why I would agree with my hon. colleague that these are important is because so often in world crisis situations the provinces with the wealth, the developed nations, are asked to enter into a conflict in terms of a military or peacekeeping venture, as we have seen with Kosovo, but when the conflict is over they are asked to be the primary supporters in the post-conflict restructuring.

I would suggest that perhaps through these international financial institutions we could have the ability to extend that lever or carrot to those nations that have conflict so perhaps they could find more peaceful resolutions and be rewarded with financial support for resolving those issues that are bringing this conflict to a head.

When countries enter a conflict and show a lack of response to their citizens by not recognizing the human rights of their citizens, those nations should be sanctioned by those international monetary organizations. They should not be funded for the building up of arms or for the setting up of governments that do not respect human rights.

I appreciate that our western civilization puts a lot of emphasis on individual rights and that the European tradition is perhaps not

### *Private Members' Business*

geared that way, that the European and Asian traditions are geared more to collective rights as opposed to individual rights. However, I think there is a respect worldwide for the need to recognize human rights. No nation, whether it believes in collective rights or individual rights, has the right to kill, to hold in captivity or to expel their minorities or their citizens who they have problems and difficulties with.

Even though there might be a different approach to individual or collective rights, as an international community we have to use the ability we have, either through foreign aid or loans through the International Monetary Fund, to reward those countries that are developing in a humane way and treating their citizens with respect and sanction those that are not. That is a powerful tool.

A meeting of like minds is all the motion is suggesting. It is suggesting that Canada initiate a meeting with nations that can start to collectively put their minds together on how to identify nations that are reaching a position of conflict or are getting into a situation that may go beyond what is considered to be acceptable behaviour or treatment. It is to get these nations to start thinking on how we can avoid such situations. It is to consider what kind of sanctions or methods we can use to intervene in those cases.

My colleague deserves a lot of credit for being far-reaching in his outlook on international affairs and for not being afraid to consider what others would think might be impossible. I would like to join my hon. colleague from Fraser Valley in saying that my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca chose once before to reach out on, what other people thought was impossible, the landmine issue. He showed them that it can work.

I would like to commend the member for those efforts with the landmine issue. I would like to commend him for making us think that something else that looks impossible might be possible if we put our minds together.

I hope the Liberals will see fit to support the motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 6.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.30 p.m.)





# CONTENTS

Thursday, May 27, 1999

## Points of Order

### Estimates

Mr. MacKay .....	15351
Mr. Duncan .....	15351
Mr. Boudria .....	15352
The Speaker .....	15352

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Adams .....	15352
-----------------	-------

### National Defence

Mr. Bertrand .....	15352
--------------------	-------

### Automotive Pollution Reduction Act

Bill C-514. Introduction and First Reading .....	15352
Mr. Lincoln .....	15352
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	15352

### Petitions

#### Pesticides

Mr. Lincoln .....	15353
-------------------	-------

#### Housing in Nunavik

Mr. St-Julien .....	15353
---------------------	-------

#### Kosovo

Ms. Bulte .....	15353
-----------------	-------

#### Marriage

Mr. Breitreuz (Yellowhead) .....	15353
----------------------------------	-------

#### Animal Rights

Mr. Adams .....	15353
-----------------	-------

#### Iraq

Mr. Adams .....	15353
-----------------	-------

### Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Adams .....	15353
-----------------	-------

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999

Bill C-32. Report stage .....	15354
The Deputy Speaker .....	15354
Mr. Proctor .....	15354

#### Suspension of Sitting

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 10.33 a.m.) ..	15355
---	-------

#### Sitting Resumed

The House resumed at 10.51 a.m. ....	15355
--------------------------------------	-------

Mr. Proctor .....	15355
-------------------	-------

Division on Motion No. 1 deferred .....	15356
---	-------

Division on Motion No. 13 deferred .....	15356
--	-------

Division on Motion No. 26 deferred .....	15356
--	-------

Division on Motion No. 61 deferred .....	15356
--	-------

Division on Motion No. 62 deferred .....	15356
--	-------

Division on Motion No. 71 deferred .....	15356
--	-------

(Motion No. 84 negated) .....	15357
-------------------------------	-------

Division on Motion No. 85 deferred .....	15357
--	-------

Division on Motion No. 87 deferred .....	15357
--	-------

(Motion No. 89 negated) .....	15357
-------------------------------	-------

Division on Motion No. 90 deferred .....	15357
--	-------

(Motion No. 101 negated) .....	15357
--------------------------------	-------

Division on Motion No. 115 deferred .....	15357
---	-------

(Motion No. 117 negated) .....	15358
--------------------------------	-------

Division on Motion No. 122 deferred .....	15358
---	-------

Division on Motion No. 128 deferred. ....	15358
---	-------

Division on Motion No. 130 deferred. ....	15358
---	-------

Division on Motion No. 132 deferred .....	15358
---	-------

Division on Motion No. 206 deferred .....	15358
---	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15358
-------------------------	-------

Motions Nos. 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 25, 30 .....	15358
---	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15359
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 31 .....	15359
---------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15359
-------------------------	-------

Motions Nos. 32, 33, 39, 42, 43 and 46 .....	15359
--	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15359
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 48 .....	15359
---------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15359
-------------------------	-------

Motions Nos. 49 and 50 .....	15359
------------------------------	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15359
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 51 .....	15359
---------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15360
-------------------------	-------

Motion No. 52 .....	15360
---------------------	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15360
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 56 .....	15360
---------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15360
-------------------------	-------

Motion No. 57 .....	15360
---------------------	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15360
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 58 .....	15360
---------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15360
-------------------------	-------

Motions Nos. 59, 60, 69, 74 .....	15360
-----------------------------------	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15360
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 80 .....	15360
---------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15360
-------------------------	-------

Motions Nos. 81, 105, 106, 107, 116, 119, 120, 121, 125, 129, 133, 146, 147, 155, 156, 159, 160 .....	15360
--	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15361
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 161 .....	15361
----------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15361
-------------------------	-------

Motions Nos. 167, 169, 171, 172 .....	15361
---------------------------------------	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15361
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 173 .....	15361
----------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15362
-------------------------	-------

Motion No. 174 .....	15362
----------------------	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15362
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 176 .....	15362
----------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15362
-------------------------	-------

Motions Nos 181, 183, 189, 195, 197, 203 .....	15362
--	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15362
-----------------	-------

Motion No. 204 .....	15362
----------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15362
-------------------------	-------

Motions Nos. 205, 207, 208 .....	15362
----------------------------------	-------

Mr. Massé .....	15362
-----------------	-------

Motions Nos. 209, 210 .....	15362
-----------------------------	-------

Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15362
Motion No. 211 .....	15362
Mr. Massé .....	15363
Motions Nos. 212, 213, 215 .....	15363
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15363
Motion No. 216 .....	15363
Mr. Massé .....	15363
Motion No. 225 .....	15363
Ms. Torsney .....	15363
Mr. Gilmour .....	15364
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15365
Mr. Kilger .....	15366
Motion .....	15366
Mr. Herron .....	15366
(Motion agreed to) .....	15366
Ms. Lill .....	15366
Mr. Caccia .....	15367
Mr. Casson .....	15369
Mr. Herron .....	15370
Mr. Lincoln .....	15371
Mr. Desrochers .....	15373
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	15374
Mr. Laliberte .....	15375
Mr. Mercier .....	15377
Mr. Tremblay .....	15378
Mr. Crête .....	15379
Ms. Torsney .....	15380
Mr. Crête .....	15380
Mrs. Guay .....	15380
Divisions deemed demanded and deferred .....	15382
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	15382
Mr. Gilmour .....	15382
Motion No. 6 .....	15382
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	15382
Motion No. 7 .....	15382
Mr. Gilmour .....	15382
Motion No. 137 .....	15382
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	15383
Motion No. 138 .....	15383
Mr. Herron .....	15383
Motion No. 139 .....	15383
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	15383
Motion No. 148 .....	15383
Mr. Gilmour .....	15383
Motion No. 149 .....	15383
Mr. Herron .....	15383
Motion No. 150 .....	15383
Ms. Torsney .....	15383
Mr. Caccia .....	15384
Mr. Laliberte .....	15384

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Fred Sabatine</b>	
Mr. Perić .....	15385
<b>Royal Canadian Mounted Police</b>	
Mr. Gilmour .....	15385
<b>Guaranteed Minimum Income</b>	
Mr. St-Julien .....	15386
<b>Canada's Walk of Fame</b>	
Ms. Bennett .....	15386

<b>Citizen of the Year Award</b>	
Mr. Valeri .....	15386
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Hoepfner .....	15386
<b>Manufacturing and Information Technology Centre</b>	
Mrs. Longfield .....	15387
<b>Senior Citizens' Week</b>	
Mr. Dumas .....	15387
<b>Bombardier Inc.</b>	
Mr. Discepola .....	15387
<b>National Drug Strategy</b>	
Mr. Cadman .....	15387
<b>Julie Payette</b>	
Mr. Coderre .....	15387
<b>Education</b>	
Ms. Lill .....	15388
<b>Astronaut Julie Payette</b>	
Mr. Desrochers .....	15388
<b>Western Task Force</b>	
Mr. Sekora .....	15388
<b>Goldman Environmental Award</b>	
Mr. Power .....	15388
<b>Cystic Fibrosis Month</b>	
Mrs. Redman .....	15389
<b>Ball Hockey</b>	
Mr. Solberg .....	15389

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

<b>Kosovo</b>	
Miss Grey .....	15389
Mr. Gray .....	15389
Miss Grey .....	15389
Mr. Gray .....	15389
Miss Grey .....	15389
Mr. Gray .....	15390
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Mr. Strahl .....	15390
Mr. Gray .....	15390
Mr. Strahl .....	15390
Mr. Chan .....	15390
<b>Publishing Industry</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	15390
Mr. Gray .....	15390
Mr. Duceppe .....	15390
Mr. Gray .....	15390
Mr. Gauthier .....	15390
Mr. Bélanger .....	15390
Mr. Gauthier .....	15391
Mr. Bélanger .....	15391
Mr. Blaikie .....	15391
Mr. Bélanger .....	15391
Mr. Blaikie .....	15391
Mr. Gray .....	15391
Mr. Muise .....	15391

Mr. Bélanger .....	15391
Mr. Muise .....	15391
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15392
<b>The Economy</b>	
Mr. Solberg .....	15392
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15392
Mr. Solberg .....	15392
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15392
<b>Publishing Industry</b>	
Mr. Loubier .....	15392
Mr. Bélanger .....	15392
Mr. Loubier .....	15392
Mr. Bélanger .....	15392
Mr. Penson .....	15392
Mr. Eggleton .....	15393
Mr. Penson .....	15393
Mr. Eggleton .....	15393
Mr. Sauvageau .....	15393
Mr. Eggleton .....	15393
Mr. Sauvageau .....	15393
Mr. Eggleton .....	15393
<b>Donations to Political Parties</b>	
Mr. Morrison .....	15393
Mr. Boudria .....	15393
Mr. Morrison .....	15394
Mr. Boudria .....	15394
<b>Tainted Blood</b>	
Mrs. Picard .....	15394
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15394
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Ms. Beaumier .....	15394
Mr. Chan .....	15394
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Konrad .....	15394
Mr. MacAulay .....	15394
Mr. Konrad .....	15394
Mr. MacAulay .....	15394
<b>Shipbuilding Industry</b>	
Mr. Stoffer .....	15394
Mr. Lastewka .....	15395
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Proctor .....	15395
Mr. Vanclief .....	15395
<b>Shipbuilding Industry</b>	
Mrs. Wayne .....	15395
Mr. Lastewka .....	15395
Mrs. Wayne .....	15395
Mr. Lastewka .....	15395
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Charbonneau .....	15395
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	15396
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Harris .....	15396
Mr. Boudria .....	15396
<b>Shipbuilding</b>	
Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière) .....	15396
Mr. Lastewka .....	15396

<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Ms. Desjarlais .....	15396
Mr. Gagliano .....	15396
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Herron .....	15396
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	15397
<b>Small Business</b>	
Mr. Gallaway .....	15397
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15397
<b>Trade</b>	
Mr. Jaffer .....	15397
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	15397
<b>Bill C-435</b>	
Mr. Marceau .....	15397
Mr. Boudria .....	15397
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Nystrom .....	15397
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15398
<b>Shipbuilding Industry</b>	
Mr. Herron .....	15398
Mr. Lastewka .....	15398
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Oral Question Period</b>	
Mr. Morrison .....	15398
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. Grewal .....	15398
Mr. Boudria .....	15398
Mr. Blaikie .....	15398
Mr. Boudria .....	15398

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999</b>	
Bill C-32. Report stage .....	15399
Mr. Laliberte .....	15399
Mr. Gilmour .....	15399
Ms. Girard—Bujold .....	15400
Mr. Casson .....	15401
Mr. Lincoln .....	15402
Mr. Herron .....	15403
Mr. Bergeron .....	15404
Mr. Proctor .....	15406
Mr. Bigras .....	15407
Mr. Fourmier .....	15408
Mrs. Guay .....	15410
(Division deemed demanded and deferred) .....	15411
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	15411
Motion No. 8 .....	15411
Mr. Gilmour .....	15411
Motions Nos. 9, 10, 16, 18 .....	15411
Mr. Laliberte .....	15411
Motions Nos. 19, 22, 23 and 24 .....	15411
Mr. Gilmour .....	15411
Motion No. 47 .....	15411
Ms. Torsney .....	15412
Ms. Girard—Bujold .....	15412
Mr. Caccia .....	15413
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	15413
Mr. Desrochers .....	15415
Mr. Herron .....	15416

Mr. Laliberte .....	15416
Mr. Lincoln .....	15418

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Reform of International Organizations**

Motion .....	15419
Ms. Carroll .....	15419
Mr. Strahl .....	15420
Mr. Proctor .....	15422
Mr. Brison .....	15423
Mr. Harb .....	15425

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999  
Bill C-32—Notice of Time Allocation Motion**

Mr. Boudria .....	15426
-------------------	-------

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Reform of International Organizations**

Motion .....	15426
Ms. Meredith .....	15426

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**03159442**

**Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canadian Government Publishing,  
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,  
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,  
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,  
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**

**On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**