

say "suspects"; it goes on to say, "suspects a substance is entering". He stopped there again. Perhaps I am mistaken, but I did not hear the hon. member read these words:

... suspects that a substance is entering or is likely to enter ...

● (2150)

One must read clause 3 in its entirety. The clause deals with suspicions. What is a suspicion but a thought or idea? How can any act arise unless it is preceded by a thought? The hand which acts moves because of a thought, because of an idea, perhaps because of a suspicion which has emanated first from the mind. How can one act before an idea occurs, before a suspicion arises? I suggest that the hon. member plays on words, deals largely in semantics.

**Mr. Fraser:** Madam Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Young:** Madam Speaker, I prefer to finish my remarks. Perhaps after I have finished the hon. member can ask his question. The hon. member equates the word "suspects" with the word "knows." He attempts to equate words which are not synonymous. The bill does not say that the minister may act if she knows; she may act if she suspects. I am pleased to note that the bill uses the word "suspects." This means that the minister, on the smallest hint, on the smallest suggestion, on the slightest idea that environmental contamination can take place, can initiate action.

I am also pleased with the umbrella approach this legislation adopts. Under that approach we are to solve these difficulties in a spirit of co-operation. There is to be co-operation between the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of the Environment; between the federal government and the provincial governments; between the government and industry. This legislation will give us the chance to check products and substances in the developmental stages, before they enter into mass circulation. If I may use an analogy, I suggest that this legislation will help to prevent, in the environment, the sort of thing which happened when thalidomide was introduced on the market. I cannot see how this legislation is objectionable because it casts upon industry the responsibility for vetting new products.

**Mr. Fraser:** That provision is not there.

**Mr. Young:** The cost of investigating a new product will be borne by industry. We are continuing our philosophy, namely, that those who produce the product shall pay the cost of analysing it and shall show how we are to avoid risk. We are talking about man-made chemical substances, things which are not found by themselves in nature and are poisonous and harmful to our natural environment. We are talking about substances which, once released into the environment, are not degradable, do not break down and return to a natural state. These new substances are produced almost daily.

No one knows the long-term environmental effect of these substances. No one knows how they will affect environmental balance. The spin-off from space technology, from warfare and defence production and from our need to find synthetic substitutes for dwindling natural resources has resulted in enormous development in our

### *Health and the Environment*

chemical-type industries. Hundreds of these artificial, chemical compounds play a part in our daily lives and we do not yet know what the ultimate effect of even the most seemingly innocuous of these substances will be.

When we note that compounds which are seemingly helpful and socially pleasant to use—compounds such as contained in a can of underarm deodorant spray which make it possible for us to rub shoulders with our neighbours without being self-conscious, without being offending or being offended—may be dangerous, may be creating harmful side effects in our atmosphere, should we not ask ourselves if there are not many more items which are capable of being equally destructive? If these small items are so dangerous, what about the larger ones? What about those substances which are building up and accumulating until we shall once again be caught up in a giant battle to undo wrongs we have brought upon ourselves.

I suggest, in concluding, that if we thought the clean-up of Lake Erie was a giant task, one of enormous cost, the task of cleaning up our atmosphere on a global environmental basis will be much greater unless this legislation is passed. Can we even begin to comprehend the size of the task? Would we even begin to be able to do that kind of job; or, more importantly, will we be too late? I consider it a great privilege, on behalf of my constituents, to support this legislation. I suggest to all hon. members that this is not just good legislation; it is an absolute must.

**Mr. Fraser:** Madam Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? I suggest that the hon. member's sentiments about the necessity for protecting the environment are exactly the same as mine. The hon. member suggested that I dwelt too much on the word "suspect". May I ask him this: can he point to any part of this bill which makes it mandatory for industry to tell the government, in advance, that it is manufacturing or producing a certain harmful substance? Until such provision is included in the bill, the government will labour under a severe disadvantage as, according to the present wording of the bill, the government can only act once it finds out something is harmful. As the hon. member suggested, it can only act once it is possessed of a thought, of a suspicion that something is wrong. Can the hon. member point to any part of the bill which requires industry to tell the government that it is producing a substance which is harmful? Where does it say industry must impart this information before the government suspects something is wrong? That is the question.

**Mr. Young:** Madam Speaker, without attempting to use a debating ploy, I suggest that we are dealing with the bill on second reading and will have ample opportunity to deal with it in detail when it is considered clause by clause in committee. Secondly, may I attempt to answer the hon. member's question by asking him this question: how could the hon. member act, if he were charged with the administration of this legislation, without first thinking, first suspecting, first being possessed of an idea?

**Mr. Fraser:** Madam Speaker, I will be pleased to answer the question—

**Some hon. Members:** Ten o'clock.