

*Standards Council of Canada*

do not think even this government could do that. While we think we have God on our side, I think he is still in control.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I must say I had a notice of motion on the subject of the metric system suggesting that we should at least, as a government, offer leadership by printing all our requests, our purchase orders, our standards and so on in the traditional system with the metric equivalent in parenthesis alongside so that we might slowly get used to comparing the two. It is a matter of comparison. When we say \$2.50 and an Englishman says three pounds, two shillings and twopence; he knows what he means without figuring anything out. It is a familiarity which one develops. If we could start developing this kind of familiarity at the earliest possible stage, the transformation would be simple; it would be cheap and we could get along with it. We might even get to be a bi-measurement people as well as a bi-cultural and bi-lingual people.

There is another area. I do not say it has been overlooked but it is one which I have not heard discussed this afternoon. It concerns the importance of our relationships with the ISO. and other international standards bodies. I am sure it has not been overlooked. I think, probably, I was absent when it was discussed. I think this function of the SCC. will be of prime importance. Referring to my earlier remarks about a shrinking world, and how we are doing business in all parts of the world, I think it is terribly important that we should have close working relationships. I have been impressed with the Europeans in this respect. There is one firm in particular I can think of which deals with polyvinylchloride pipe. This is a very small facet of the whole economy but it is terribly important; it may sound highly technical to you, Mr. Speaker, but it is bread and butter to me. In any event, everybody who is involved in this field of work knows everybody else engaged in it personally; they know what they are talking about, they know what the standards are, and the standards are being continually upgraded because Jim Pepper in London knows Herr Schmidt in Switzerland, and Schmidt has developed a darned good system. They upgrade the standard all along. The British have their own, the French have their own and the Americans have their own and each one works a little differently.

I do not think there is any standard to fall into here. But we have to develop one which  
[Mr. Danson.]

suits our particular needs and I think the co-ordination of our efforts is important. It is not only the CSA. I sat endlessly on Canadian government specification board meetings, again in the private sector working closely with government, to develop standards applicable to government and useful to government. This was work which government could not possibly have done on its own. I am going back 15 or 20 years, when I come to think of it. We were travelling to Ottawa and sitting in meetings at the National Research Council for hours and hours on end, day after day, stretching over months and months with no compensation, to help develop a government standard that we knew a little about and a few other people knew a little about. We pooled our knowledge to develop a good standard. There was nothing in it for us. Ultimately we got an opportunity to quote on some government business. My experience in quoting on government business is this: quoting on it is O.K., it is when you get it that you are in trouble.

**An hon. Member:** Who is going to pay for it?

**Mr. Danson:** I hope the private sector will still contribute in this way and that the standards council will be the co-ordinating body.

I cannot help thinking of the National Building Code. I do not know quite where it will fit in. It seems that one of our failures in this field has been our failure to get the municipalities to accept the National Building Code in its entirety, because there are variations. There is not the co-operation which is necessary and the building code applies in too few important areas.

I believe that since the institution of these hearings the CSA has tried to expand its facilities and broaden its entire approach. I think this is fine. This is possibly what the intent is. If this is what the SCC does, it will be great. It saves the government from getting into something else. A fine organization that is working well can broaden its scope with the encouragement of the government. But I think it has been limited. I think the work of the CSA has been broad and productive, but I think there have been areas which have been missed. I think we shall make certain that there are fewer of these gaps in the future because we shall have a co-ordinating group.

As I understand it, this is not to be a huge group or a terribly expensive group. As a