

Canadian Pollution Awareness Week

Mr. Anderson: In rising on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I endorse the views of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Goode) did indicate that he did not intend to speak to the bill, and Your Honour recognized another member who can speak for only 20 minutes. When the hon. member has concluded his remarks, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta can say a word or two.

An hon. Member: He cannot.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, he can.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think hon. members would wish to proceed with the debate. If there is any confusion, there at least is none in the Chair's mind. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Goode) moved the second reading of this bill, and my impression was that he did not wish to speak. Having moved second reading of the bill, he resumed his seat. The Parliamentary Secretary was recognized by the Chair, and he now has the floor. I do not think we should hold up the debate by speculation as to whom the Chair should have recognized.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Peddle: Mr. Speaker, I move that the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Goode) be now heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta may be recognized only if there is unanimous consent of the House that he be heard.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to accede to such unanimous agreement if it permits me to have the floor on an appropriate, later occasion and if I am not deemed to have already spoken on this matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With unanimous consent, the Chair will recognize the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There was a definite negative voice on the other side in respect of granting the Parliamentary Secretary the right to speak.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I take it there is not unanimous consent. The Chair feels the debate should proceed.

An hon. Member: It is unanimous.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair hesitates to prolong the time taken on the point of order. The question is whether there is unanimous consent that the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta be now recognized and that the

[Mr. McGrath.]

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney) be recognized later in this debate. Is there such unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Corbin) refused to give his consent.

Mr. Corbin: Mind your own business.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair did not hear any negation of unanimous consent; therefore, the Chair will recognize the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tom H. Goode (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a long speech prepared, but I have a feeling that my colleagues not only on this side but on the other side of the House are prepared, after token objection, to let the bill go to the committee. If that is the case, I shall sit down and allow the Parliamentary Secretary to continue his speech.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Talk it out.

Mr. Mahoney: —I am glad we gave the hon. member an opportunity to make his speech. It would be a poor world had we not done so. I do not think anyone recalls what I said prior to the procedural discussion on this matter, so perhaps I should start from scratch. The question of pollution is one in respect of which a benefit can redound to our country and society as a result of the fullest public knowledge of all aspects of the problem. In this respect I would place it in the same category as foreign investment. We are likely to achieve nothing if we attack pollution from an emotional base, because in this way the wrong answers could be obtained which would be very serious indeed both in the long and short run.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I think we can accept as a fact that our physical environment is not as good as it used to be. In addition, we can probably all agree that it is not as good as it should be. General acceptance of these facts has been a great triumph in terms of the environment and the necessary prerequisite to the successful fight against pollution. I would also put it to the House as a fact, one not generally accepted, that our environment is a unified system and that one of our greatest problems is our habit—indeed, not only a habit but almost a diligent pursuit—of compartmentalization and specialization. This is common to many areas of life: when we approach the environment we are prone to slice it into separate uses, special technologies and different administrative units. This fragmented approach neglects the intimate relationships among the fundamental elements of our environment, yet pollution of one of these frequently results from the mismanagement of one of the others and even from efforts to control the pollution of another.