

*Hazardous Materials Information Review Act*

In June of 1984, Parliament passed changes to the Canada Labour Code. The Code and most of its regulations did not come into effect until March of 1986. In fact, some regulations affecting health and safety in the aviation and rail industries did not come into effect until March of 1987, almost three full years later.

Clearly, with this track record, the House must act quickly. The House has agreed to act quickly on this legislation but we must have a guarantee that the Government itself and its Departments will also act quickly. We do not want to pass this legislation today with the partners to the consensus believing that it will come into effect one year from now but find out that it will not come into effect for two or three years.

There are two other changes to the legislation that I believe are necessary. One, this legislation allows for a large list of exemptions. According to the Bill, Part I does not apply in respect of the advertising, sale or importation of any explosive within the meaning of the Explosives Act; cosmetic, device, drug or food within the meaning of the Food and Drugs Act; control product within the meaning of the Pest Control Products Act; or prescribed substance within the meaning of the Atomic Energy Control Act. That is one clause which contains a long list of goods and products which will be exempt. To further complicate that, Clause 12 of the same Bill lists these same exemptions and adds a number of others including hazardous waste; product, material or substance included in Part II of Schedule I and packaged as a consumer product; wood or product made of wood; tobacco or product made of tobacco; or manufactured article.

The reason we were given for having these exemptions in the Bill was that the Government had good intentions. It believed that the Departments concerned would get around to having legislation in place affecting this and hoped that the legislation would be similar or equivalent to the legislation we are passing in the House at this time. Again, going on past experience, I do not believe that we as legislators should take that chance.

The federal Government is saying that it will not force federal government Departments or Crown corporations to live up to the same legislative requirements the private sector will be required to live up to for most goods that fall under provincial legislation. I question a federal Government that does not force its own Crown corporations to live up to the same legislation it expects the private sector to live up to.

Again, referring to—I know that workplace safety may not be interesting to some Tory Members but I wish they would keep quiet.

**Mr. Lewis:** I object to the guy behind you reading the newspaper.

**Mr. Parry:** I'm very quiet.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** We still have another Bill or so to deal with before the House adjourns at 10 o'clock. I would hope that we would complete this day in a nice, friendly manner. The Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) has the floor.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I have been very co-operative on this Bill and I said that there would be only one speaker from our Party. If there is only one speaker, that speaker had better be heard or that speaker had better be someone other than myself.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Stop threatening and grow up. You make an arrangement and a commitment, stick with it.

• (2120)

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I said this legislation is important. I find it absolutely repugnant that when this House is dealing with occupational health and safety legislation for the first time in three years, given the record of death, injury and occupational disease, that the House is not paying attention. On both occasions when legislation on this subject has been brought forward, we made arrangements not to prolong debate. I suggest that those Members who want to stay in the Chamber should either listen or keep quiet. Their other option is to leave. This is important legislation. We have done all we can to make sure it is passed. We gave it pre-study despite the fact the Government could not get it into the House until June 23. We have expressed concern about the fact the legislation has flaws but we have the commitment to do we all we can to make sure it is passed in all its stages. I said I wanted a chance to explain the amendments I thought were necessary and I expect to have that right and I hope to get the co-operation of Members of all Parties in this House.

When I was interrupted I was discussing past difficulties we have had with Crown corporations and others being exempt from the legislation. I explained that we expect that those Crown corporations should be covered in the same way the private sector has agreed to be covered. I have pointed out that the history of some Crown corporations does not increase my belief that they will live up to the spirit of the legislation so I believe it is important that, if not today then some time in the future, those Crown corporations should be covered by the legislation. Let me give an example.

When Atomic Energy of Canada was faced with workers protesting sex discrimination because women workers were allowed lower radiation exposure levels than men, AECL did not lower the limits for men, it raised the limits for women. Not only that, despite the fact that they set the limit in the first place, they insisted on doing it behind closed doors. It took a number of questions in this House to the then Minister responsible, Jean Chrétien, to allow the Canadian Labour Congress to make its presentation to the AECB to be made in a public session. With that kind of record I do not believe they should be exempt from the legislation.