

*S. O. 29*

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 29

##### NATIONAL SECURITY

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 29 I ask leave to propose a motion to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the crisis in public confidence in the Government's ability to assure national security and to maintain a satisfactory security and intelligence service. This comes at a particularly sensitive time, that is, immediately before the Commonwealth heads of government meeting.

If I could refer to an earlier phase of your own career, Mr. Speaker, in which you participated, along with me and others in this House, in the creation of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, I can be certain that you will have the same sensitivity that I do to the importance of that agency being properly launched and properly supported by the Government and to the very critical nature of the work that it does.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) has brought to the attention of the Chair an application for an emergency debate under Standing Order 29. As he has stated, and as is stated in the letter which he most properly delivered to the Chair earlier this morning, the motion is to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the crisis in public confidence in the Government's ability to assure national security and maintain a satisfactory security and intelligence service, which, as he has pointed out, comes at a particularly sensitive time, that is, immediately before the Commonwealth heads of government meeting.

The Hon. Member for York Centre referred, probably quite improperly, to debates in which the Chair had taken part with regard to the security service. I, of course, have to put out of my mind completely, in terms of this ruling, those debates and any position that I took in them.

I can say to the Hon. Member for York Centre that I view the application seriously. However, at least for today, it is the disposition of the Chair to say that perhaps it is not quite appropriate to get into it in an emergency debate. As always on important matters, I will hear the Hon. Member or other Hon. Members again if it is appropriate to do so.

I thank the Hon. member for bringing this matter to the attention of the Chair and to the attention of the House. The matter is serious. The Chair views it as such, but, as I say, the application for an emergency debate is declined at this time.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

#### MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Wednesday, September 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. McMillan that Bill C-74, an Act respecting the protection of the environment and of human life and health, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, since this is my first opportunity as the newly appointed critic in the area of the environment for the New Democratic caucus, I would like to begin by setting out some general views as to how I am going to approach environmental questions.

I say very frankly that I am a committed environmentalist. I feel compassionately about the question of the environment. Not only do I like to hike, canoe, and cross country ski, I am a former member of the board of Energy Probe and was, therefore, active on environmental issues before becoming a parliamentarian. I also have a strong religious commitment to the environment. I have beliefs which require human beings to look at the world as one which we do not own, one in which we live, work, and have certain rights, but where we have obligations to future generations. We are stewards of the earth and not the owners able to do with it what we wish.

I do not think this or other governments have paid adequate attention to our obligations to future generations. I do not think we should approach the question of resources as purely commercial commodities for sale. I am scandalized when Conservative Members get up and brag about deregulation in gas sales to the United States on the grounds that this will mean more sales, saying that we have a surplus. I do not believe that we can have a surplus of a non-renewable resource.

I think we should be changing our vocabulary. We should not be talking about producing resources which are non-renewable. We extract them, we may sell them, we may use them, but we also have responsibilities and will have to answer for them one day.

Philosophically I am very much a conservative on the environment. I believe that resources must be conserved. It is not that I think economic considerations should be dismissed, but we must look at the long-term economic considerations. It is not only business and sales for today which must be