

HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS BILL**SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED**

The Senate resumed from Thursday, January 23, the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Carter, for the second reading of Bill S-26, to prohibit the advertising, sale and importation of hazardous products.

Hon. Edgar Fournier: Honourable senators, tonight seems to be the night for disillusionment and confusion. I must say that I, too, am confused at the moment. However, I was pleased that this bill, an act to prohibit the advertising, sale and importation of hazardous products, was sponsored by a senator from the Maritimes.

We in the Atlantic provinces have very much in common. We start to work very young. Education for us is a ticket to expatriation. Deception is part of our life. Poverty is our standard of living, the sea and forest our paradise. We sell our best food—salmon, lobsters and oysters—to central Canada. We are satisfied by eating cod fish and sardines. We are understanding and easy to please. We respect our opponents' opinions. We are the jacks-of-all-trades, masters of none. We can "bug" anything—and Senator Carter has shown that ability by "bugging" Bill S-26 on Bill S-22!

The honourable senator did a very fine job of explaining the former Bill S-22, and I might say that Bill S-26 is quite similar. In his remarks he mentioned confusion, and at one point admitted that he himself was also confused. I can understand that very well, because Bill S-26 is complex and needs a great deal of explanation as it now stands. At least, it does to me.

Apparently there is some problem or confusion with respect to the differences of meaning between the words "hazardous substance" and "hazardous products". I cannot see any difference there myself. To me it could be anything from a rotten egg to a contaminated Christmas turkey. Therefore, I say that these things should be clearly defined.

There is also the problem of defining the duties of an inspector, a problem which this bill seems to have inherited from Bill S-22. With that bill there were long definitions, there was lots of talk, and a lot of water went over the dam in an attempt to define the duties of an inspector. The inspector probably should be a scientist in order to understand these hazardous products and be able to define their contents, and so on. This question is still not settled with Bill S-26.

At one point it was mentioned that there was need of a great deal of consultation with and advice from scientific experts before regulations could be established to govern these hazardous products. Here again we have the situation in which we are going to vote for a bill, the regulations of which will not be known until some indefinite time in the future. I certainly do not agree with that idea. When we pass a bill it should have the regulations in it. We should be able to see them when we have the bill before us, because, not knowing what the regulations will be, we do not have the whole picture. The regulations could quite easily change the whole picture, the whole face of the bill. When we have a bill like this in the future, let us have the regulations with it. I make that very strong recommendation.

There is not much that I can add to what I have said, but I say again that I praise the honourable Senator Carter for the fine job he has done in explaining the bill. I say that sincerely.

One point which interests me more than all the others is the question of glue as a hazardous product. We often hear about school children sniffing glue. This bill apparently will do something about that situation—at least, we think it will do something about it. However, I am quite sure that it will not be effective. We have already had LSD and marijuana; we have had alcoholism—and you remember the days of prohibition. We have had all kinds of rules and regulations to control these things, LSD, marijuana and alcohol, and yet where do we stand today? The only thing we have done in this country is to have jacked up the price of these drugs to a level which makes them virtually unobtainable, and the dope addicts who need them will do anything to obtain them, no matter what the cost. So that is all the regulations have accomplished. They have not solved the problem.

I understand that in Canada today there are between 65,000 and 70,000 people, most of them young but some older people as well, building airplane models using model aircraft glue. It is quite a hobby and has become more so recently. You can multiply those figures by ten to get the numbers in the United States. Now why should we punish all these young people just for the benefit of a few who will get the glue anyway, because it will have to be on the market somewhere. So here we are going to punish 65,000 or 70,000 young boys in our clubs in our society by