

reduce automotive emissions in this country, studies have suggested, by the following amounts: In the case of carbon dioxide by 5.9 per cent; in the case of carbon monoxide by 25 per cent; in the case of volatile organic compounds by 8.5 per cent; in the case of nitrous oxide by 5.7 per cent; and in the case of urban ozone, so serious to our ozone layer, by 5.3 per cent.

I think that is something which is an important accomplishment to aim to achieve.

Second, and I say this as someone who represents a constituency with a significant number of farmers producing both corn and wheat, we would produce for people in my constituency and for people in many agricultural producing constituencies across the country an important new market for the output from corn and wheat which is grown in this country. It is even conceivable that we could see 20 per cent of the grains produced in this country going into ethanol production to be used to produce these 10 per cent blended ethanol gasolines, which would be so much better for the environment.

We have something here which would be better for the environment, something which would be better for farmers, and something I am convinced, as a representative of a constituency that produces automotive vehicles, which our automotive companies would be able to adjust to very, very easily.

These kinds of requirements have been in place in California for a significant period of time. The car manufacturing companies have found it possible to adjust. There would not be a problem in this country for our automotive producers to make a similar adjustment.

• (2040)

I suggest strongly that this House look positively at this piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation for which the member from Lambton deserves considerable credit for bringing before this House. He has worked very hard to bring before all of us in the House a great deal of information with respect to the health benefits and the economic benefits associated with this legislation.

I think all of us should accept this piece of legislation as something which takes us in the right direction, something which therefore gives us a positive movement

forward which we can analyse in committee, perfect in committee, and deal with any problems that might exist in terms of timing in committee. I think therefore that it is a good piece of legislation.

I would hope for instance that the previous speaker would look at this piece of legislation as he looked at the legislation from my former colleague in this House, the former member for Broadview—Greenwood, Lynn McDonald, and see that in fact it makes sense for him too to support this piece of legislation because it has the same kinds of positive benefits that the piece of legislation from Lynn McDonald had in the previous Parliament.

Hon. William C. Winegard (Guelph—Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the previous speaker that indeed we should look positively at the concepts involved in this bill. There is no question that it would certainly help my agricultural community if we could promote the use of more and more ethanol in gasoline mixtures.

I am certainly quite prepared to look at banning MMT, methylcyclopentadienyl manganese tricarbonyl, which as we know may indeed have some health effects although the Royal Society's commission did not determine that that was so.

I would like to see, as I said earlier, the use of more ethanol in gasoline mixtures. My concern about the bill is that it assumes a simple, quick change that I do not believe is easy to bring about. It is not I believe in the best interest of Canadians in the short run to move very quickly to what the hon. member wants.

Is my time up?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Yes.

Mr. Winegard: That is the longest speech I have been able to make in this House for quite a while.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

It being 8.42 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 93, the time provided for debate has expired.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

An hon. member: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.