

Private Members' Business

this bill says, folks, you are out of business and everybody is violating the law whether the marketplace has any in place at all. So the scientific community better produce the research and produce the product. If there is no product, there will be a shortage.

I have a problem with that. What happens to the entire Canadian scene if the product line has not yet been developed but you are supposed to use it? How do you go about maintaining an economy if you do not have the resources to do it and you are going to be fined if you do not obey the law? There is a slight problem here.

I say to the member I would vote for this if it could be done. He can say that this is an opposition bill and that we are voting against it because it is an opposition bill. Well I want to say to my friend, the member who introduced the bill, those of us who have been here since a few years before the last election—I know he had a bit of a hiatus there, a little vacation—some of us have voted for opposition bills.

I voted for Bill C-204 which was an opposition bill put forward by a member of the New Democratic Party who is now on vacation from this place. She brought forward that bill. I voted for it as did a lot of government members. It passed and it is the law today. Sometimes it is honoured in the breach, but it is the law. So I say to him that I would vote for it if it would do the trick.

I know there is another bill coming forward to protect firemen sponsored by a New Democratic member. I want to tell the hon. member that I intend to vote for that bill if it comes forward to a vote. I think that is a good piece of legislation. If he smiles and laughs that I am going to vote for it because it is an opposition bill, forget it. It is not right. It is not true.

I will not vote for this because the goal is not an attainable goal. Also the technology, as sincerely as the provincial governments and the federal government and the industries have tried to achieve this goal they have not done it yet. Surely we cannot impose a fine of \$100,000 on people for using the product that is now illegal but there is nothing on the market that is legal to replace it.

I say to him if he would do it, if he would draft a bill like this that would be consonant with the findings of science up to this point, the calendar, the progression, the time line that research can do, that technology can produce I would vote for it, because who can argue with the purpose of it. All of us here look forward to the day when our atmosphere will return to the kind of purity that we at one time enjoyed.

We want to see the emissions reduced. I want the hon. member to know that if we can find the technology and the legislation to back it up, we will do it. I will support it and both of our purposes will be met and all of us will be happier for it.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): I think this is one of those rare occasions on which we have a bill before us which actually can succeed in dealing with a potentially serious health question.

At the same time it can assist part of our economy that needs assistance, the farm sector. Frankly, it does not have serious problematic consequences for our existing automotive industry in this country nor indeed even in the end for our present petrochemical and petroleum refining industries. I think that what we have here is in fact a piece of legislation which, if we look at it in completely literal form and we say well, yes, this would require us to replace our present system of gasoline in six month's time, might appear to be too extreme. But that is not what we are being asked to do at this point. What we are being asked to do is, frankly, to look at this and ask ourselves do we in principle agree with the direction in which this piece of legislation is going; does it make sense to send it to committee; and, can we in committee bring before us some of the experts who might improve some of the technical elements of the bill?

• (2035)

For myself, there are two major reasons why I think this bill makes sense. The first is that environmentally this would create for us a situation significantly better than the situation which we presently have in which MMT is used in gasoline and the connection between MMT and various neurological disorders certainly is suggested by much of the work which has been done scientifically.

If we were to move in the direction this bill suggests we would see ourselves replacing MMT with ethanol. If we were to bring forward a regular unleaded but MMT-free gasoline with a 10 per cent ethanol blending, that would