

acoustics and, second, the matter of video screens. I wish to comment generally that the consideration which should be given when approaching this subject should be much wider and deeper.

With respect to acoustics, I am not opposed to having this Bill cover the subject of sound waves and excessive sound. I have worked in industry. I have also been an alderman in a downtown area of a large city. I know that in the modern world, loud noise is becoming a serious problem. I do not believe it was, perhaps, in my parent's or grandparent's time, but in our time it is, and it has to be controlled. The instruments for controlling loud noise are not yet well developed and must be worked on.

I believe this legislation, if properly used, does not have to have the bad results which the previous speaker fears. It could, but it does not have to. What is needed is to develop precise criteria, test equipment and techniques as they are brought into the market. Rather than waiting for 10, 20 or 30 years of complaints, we must make it politically necessary to do something in a hurry. It is the same with video screens, televisions or microwave ovens, which might have bad effects on genetics and on the reproductive prospects of our people. I may be biased in favour of children. I have ten grandchildren. I am concerned when I hear of the long-range and often unpredictable effects of radiation. I would like to see us provide the framework for controlling and, if necessary, restricting devices found to have harmful genetic effects. That is one of the amendments before us today. It does not necessarily automatically ban new equipment. It does suggest that we have to develop precise criteria for the use of new equipment for processes and we have to test them early, not after we have found a whole generation or two generations of genetic defects.

● (1550)

This brings me to a point I am very much concerned with. As I say, having worked in industry and having represented the residents of an extremely busy and intense downtown district for almost nine years, I find that we are always being told that we cannot hinder progress. It would hurt the economy if we stopped these new processes or restricted these new kinds of equipment. Let them go ahead and maybe they will not hurt anyone. Who knows? Let us wait another ten years or 50 years to see whether asbestos is going to hurt anyone. That was the attitude more than a generation ago when asbestos was known by those responsible to be harmful. Let us not apply the "miner's canary" technique to our children. A canary was carried down in the mine by the miner so that if it fell over, the miner knew he should get out of there because there was poison gas in the mine and it would get him soon after the canary. Our children are delicate. Let us not wait until they are harmed before we test and, where necessary, let us restrict and correct the equipment to be used.

That will cost money, Mr. Speaker. Whether it is the federal or provincial Government the ultimate reason given for neglecting these new health hazards is that they do not have enough inspectors or the inspectors do not have enough equip-

Radiation Emitting Devices Act

ment. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have and use the wonderful labour saving devices which modern science enables us to create, if we are going to have one person do the work of 100 through these new machines, then we have an opportunity to find useful work for the other 99. A few of them can economically be put to work testing the new substances, the thousands of new and poisonous chemicals in industry, the many new potential radiation hazards we have from new equipment. They can be tested. We can hire the technicians and the inspectors, and we can buy the equipment to do the testing.

I hope this Bill will provide a framework for doing that. It will still be up to governments to decide to spend the money to enforce this legislation in an intelligent way, and I hope that will be done. I hope that whatever discussions there may be in committee, they will not shut off that possibility but will, rather, open it up.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, the Government will undoubtedly be pleased to hear that I can confirm there is a disposition on this side to deal with this Bill by the appointed time and have it sent on its merry way to the proper committee.

Having read the Bill, I approve in general of the legislation. The principle of the Bill is to widen slightly the definition of radiation emitting devices, not in the way that the Hon. Member for Ontario (Mr. Fennell) read it, because we do have difficulties with very broad interpretations. But if the principle is to widen it somewhat to deal with new types of equipment coming on the market, then we will be pleased to see this Bill go into committee for further study.

Reference has been made to radiation associated with products like microwave ovens and televisions. Television has been with us a long while and I believe the amount of radiation emitted from the average colour TV set has been reduced considerably over the last little while. But we still have something to worry about with children who spend a lot of time sitting very close to television sets.

There is a question about the harmful effects that cathode ray tubes from video screens might have, especially on pregnant female operators. I would imagine that this is why we have included in the amendments to this Bill the term "genetic injury", whereas previously we had confined ourselves to death and personal injury. I think there is considerably more research needed into the dangers associated with these types of radiation emitting devices. Certainly it will be difficult to determine the long-run genetic effects of low levels of radiation to which people might be subjected over an extended period of time. We might want to look at transferring some of these radiation emitting devices, not those of the X-ray or gamma-ray type, but those types that emit alpha particles and beta particles presently covered, I believe, under the Atomic Energy Control Act. These are becoming numerous because they are not only used in atomic energy production but are showing up quite frequently in many walks of industrial life. Given that, it might be more appropriate to deal with some types of alpha and beta radiation emitting devices under this