

pollutants or contaminants I think of those who make the biggest fuss. There are many who make a great many noises about the problems of the contamination of our atmosphere and the litter that we see in our communities.

Mr. Paproski: I think of Liberals.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): We can think of those too. When we pass a picnic ground, for example, or a playground and even, deplorably enough, as we walk down the street or outside the Houses of Parliament within the precincts of the hill, we see litter. I feel that in the course of time, if we are to be honest with ourselves, in deploring the pollution that is assailing us each of us must remember that we are the polluters.

The young, who claim that we are not doing anything about it, are perhaps some of those who scatter cigarette packages in every direction, as well as candy bar wrappers and malted milk cartons, and contaminate and pollute our atmosphere. What prompts me to make these comments is my belief that really effective anti pollution measures will have to await profound changes in attitude. Changes as profound as the ones I have in mind do not come about as a result of legislation, but until attitudes are changed through education and proper example, we must legislate. We have to indicate, as the legislators in this country, that we are aware that there are some things that can and must be controlled.

My colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), in his intervention yesterday made reference to the suspicion—that is the actual word in the bill—that is in the minds of either the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) or the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) that substances of a noxious nature are being or are about to be released into our environment, and the action that they may take at that time.

I suggest that it is already known that there are contaminants that should be included in a schedule to this bill. As we all know there is reference to a schedule, and presumably a schedule will be drawn up in the course of time and will contain the names of substances likely to contaminate our atmosphere, our land or our water.

We have just listened to a debate on the importance of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments. I suggest that schedules might very well be included among statutory instruments. As we proceed with examination of this bill we will hear about regulations, which also may have to be examined by the committee. Having been an administrator of governmental regulations during part of my life, I know how binding they can be on an administrator. There is always a danger that regulations can be so binding that they prevent the full expression of a person who is, for example, applying for a passport. This is one of the regulations that can foul people up on occasion.

I had occasion only this morning to make some inquiries about a passport application, wondering why one cannot send one's passport application from the city of Victoria to Vancouver. The regulation is that the applicant must apply in person, or through a travel agent. Regulations of this sort can be very binding and inflexible. Therefore I suggest that we should have some sort of notion or a set of criteria within this legislation on the basis of which regu-

Health and the Environment

lations and schedules will be drawn up later. I have no idea, for example, whether there is any intention to include in these schedules or regulations known contaminants.

Unfortunately we have a long history of releasing substances into the air and into the water. We know about them and we are aware of them. We know their nature. We are not yet quite sure how to control them and still carry on with our industrial life. It would be my hope that these substances with some sort of cumulative effect would be included in the schedule or in the regulations.

There is, of course, the other matter, not only of the type of substance but the level of what has been called toxicity or noxicity, the level of contamination that is released by the abuse of a particular substance in our environment, air, land or water. A great deal of research has been done in this area. I know that our National Research Council has been working on one or the other aspect of this for years. We are given no indication in this legislation that that wealth of research material will be at the disposal of those who are drawing up the regulations and the schedule.

I have mentioned the problem of inserting too many regulations, and have suggested that we could probably get around it in this bill by including somewhere a set of criteria on the basis of which the regulations could be drafted.

● (1520)

I am also concerned about developments in technology which might permit certain things—now thought to be contaminants if used in the industrial process—which are forbidden under regulations or because they are in the schedule, to be removed from the schedule if technology can satisfy the employer or developer of a process that they would not have a noxious effect. There is no evidence that it is going to be easy to have some of these contaminants decontaminated, if I might coin an expression, in order to get them off the schedule. We have the danger of the schedule being in the hands of people who are used to making regulations that are inflexible. Scientific proof could be brought forward to justify the removal of contaminants from the schedule in cases where it is warranted.

One element of this bill delights me. In an earlier debate I indicated that I found the overriding nature of the legislation then before us to be quite dangerous. I should like to congratulate the minister and the drafters of the bill now before us because in clause 5(1) we find a requirement to consult with the provinces. This is not going to be a matter of overriding whatever the provinces want, as was the case in the previous bill; here the requirement is that the provinces shall be consulted in those areas where they may have jurisdiction.

I am somewhat confused by a couple of references to the establishment of the Environmental Contaminants Board of Review, mention of which reference is made in clause 6 and clause 7(5). I am not sure whether the board will come into existence through the application of clause 6 or of clause 7. Although I acknowledge the need for such a board, why not just make provision in the bill that it be brought into existence, rather than that it be brought into