

*Health and the Environment*

existence upon receipt of notice of objection? The way the bill reads now it seems to say that only if it is demonstrated that it needs to be brought into existence then appropriate action will be taken.

The complexity of the problem of contaminants commends to me the amendment that was proposed yesterday that this bill be referred for further study rather than be proceeded with as it stands. I do not think the bill was well thought out—there are these two references to the board in two different places, for example. Aside from anything else I think the bill is untidy. We should look at it again—decontaminate it, if you like, and come back with a decontaminated anticontaminants act. How would that suit? Unfortunately this piece of legislation is typical of many, and of the action or inaction which characterizes the government.

When thinking of pollution and contamination I think again of the maritime carriage of goods. From almost the first day I came to parliament as a member I have been urging that action be taken to make sure that the dangers in the maritime carriage of certain goods are avoided. Of course, my interest was in tankers, and it still is. But very little has been done, Madam Speaker, and there are so many things that could be done by regulation. The power already exists. There probably are already regulations in the hands of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) concerning the proper conduct of vessels through dangerous waters.

As I have said many times, an example is in the Straits of Juan de Fuca. It would be the simplest thing in the world to avoid the problems of contamination there if we were to arrange with our American neighbours, who are just as interested in this, a starboard in and starboard out passage with a "no ship water" in between, so that ships coming in will ply to the south and ships going out will ply to the north, thus avoiding the risk of collision. I do not know why it has taken so long to get these measures through, but we do not seem to be making much headway.

We could require that ships coming into our waters carry certain equipment. At one stage there was talk of double skinning tankers, but the requirement seems to have been withdrawn and I wonder if we are going to stand idly by. Why should we not insist that tankers entering our waters be constructed in this way? There are all sorts of things we could do. We could insist that the space between skins be filled with sop up material so that if there is an accident—and accidents can still happen even with double skinning—the ship is carrying something like sphagnum moss or peat moss, or some other clean-up material. The Department of Transport could draw up regulations for submission to the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments if necessary.

● (1530)

Let me refer also to some self-contained container equipment. The device which I have heard of is fairly simple and can be carried on any ship. It is rather like an admiral's barge, with a couple of tanks fitted at the back. It will provide its own boom. As I understand it, if there is a spill it can be contained almost immediately. Over the side goes the admiral's barge, the boom being created by a

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

mixture of chemicals, and the spill is contained. Of course, one must also use peat moss to mop up the spill.

The government has at its disposal a whole army of people who have worked on such problems. I do not know why it does not accept some of their ideas and use them, instead of proposing legislation like this which, I suggest, is not carefully drafted.

I support my colleague's amendment which asks that this matter be referred to a committee for further study. We do not object to what the bill attempts to do, although in legislative terms this is not a good bill. It contains a good notion. It starts off on the right foot, but somewhere on the way gets lost and does not do what I think it should. I will not put words into the minister's mouth; perhaps she would like to see this matter approached differently. We are prepared to help her with that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner):** Order, please. Last evening the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) proposed an amendment to the bill we are now debating, Bill C-25. At that time the Chair sought the agreement of the hon. member and the House to continue the debate and to reserve judgment on the acceptability of the amendment from a procedural standpoint. The Chair now thanks all hon. members for the co-operation extended to it in this matter. Unless others wish to speak further to the point of order which has been raised, the Chair is prepared to rule on the amendment.

As all hon. members are aware, the possibilities of amending a motion at the second reading stage of a bill are extremely limited because of the very nature and wording of the motion itself, namely, that a given bill be now read a second time and referred to some specified committee.

It is my impression that the hon. member has put forward an amendment which he deems to be a reasoned amendment, as referred to in citation 386 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition.

In the time available to me I have had occasion to review precedents dealing with reasoned amendments over the years which proposed to refer the subject matter of a bill to a standing committee. In no case have I been able to find that it was possible to refer the subject matter of a bill while at the same time also proposing that a standing committee undertake special studies which may, or may not, have been covered by the provisions of the bill itself.

In this regard I need only refer hon. members to prior rulings which the Chair has given, and which are to be found at page 2378 of *Hansard* for January 13, 1971, and again in the *Journals* for May 14, 1971, at pages 563 and 564, and also in the *Journals* for May 20, 1971, page 569.

It seems to me that the hon. gentleman may propose the reference of the subject matter of a bill to a standing committee, but if he wishes to propose the reference of certain substantive proposals which may or may not be in the bill, it seems to me that he must give notice of his proposals in order that they may come forward in the ordinary course.

In support of my thinking in this regard I again refer hon. members of the House to the provisions of citation