Health and the Environment

386 in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition and to the decisions of the Chair, to which I have also made reference.

All this having been considered, I must conclude that the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver South goes too far and attempts to do too much to be procedurally correct at this stage of the bill. It is therefore with regret that I must advise the hon. member that his amendment is not in order and cannot at this time be accepted by the Chair.

Mr. Fraser: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling and regret if the form of the motion I proposed last night has caused Your Honour and others undue concern. However, as hon. members will realize, there was a definite purpose to what was done. We, on my side of the House, feel that the matter ought to be studied further, and that is why I moved the motion asking that the subject matter of the bill to be referred to the committee. I now ask for permission to move a second motion, and hope that it will meet with your acceptance.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): As hon. members know, the hon. member for Vancouver South has already spoken on this stage of the bill. He now wishes to propose another amendment which he deems to be in order. He may only do that by leave of the House. Is it agreed that he be allowed to present his amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): No, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): There is not agreement.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pity that the parliamentary secretary did not see fit to agree to some perfectly civilized procedure. It is therefore with great pleasure that I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco):

That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

this bill be not now read a second time but the subject matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

The tradition, since I have been a member, is that members shall co-operate readily with each other.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, although I am not aware of the significance of the amendment just moved, I think the NDP will find it possible to support this bill. As it may be advisable for the committee to make recommendations to the minister in this area, I will wait to hear what other members of my party, who have been more closely connected with the subject than I, have say about it before making any commitment.

This bill deals with substances which may be created in the future. Certainly we are dealing with a subject which is behond the technical competence of members of parliament. We are considering the regulation of substances which advanced technology will make available. That being so, perhaps the minister is inclined to accept the general suggestions which have been made. Their import is not to water down the legislation, but rather to expand

it. I understand that hon, members want to expand the requirements of the bill.

**(1540)** 

I recently received a number of letters from young people concerning pollution and contaminants, a subject about which I do not know very much. Surprisingly, when you inquire from departments of government concerned with this, you find they do not know anything about it either. I would like to refer to this country's educational system which tells young people that the world will burn up in a very short time if something is not done about the contaminants and aerosol spray cans which, it is claimed, will break down the ozone belt that protects the world from the full pressure of ultra violet rays.

The CBC provides a good deal of balance. Last night an English scientist appeared on one of its programs. He has written extensively about the rapid coming of a new ice age. The CBC balanced that with a weather report from western Canada which indicated that part of the country is experiencing unseasonally and totally unexpected wild weather conditions. The grass is still growing, and cattle are still grazing on ranges which at this time of the year have normally been covered by snow for at least a month.

On one hand the scientists are saying that an ice age is upon us. On the other hand people are saying they do not understand why a part of the country is experiencing unseasonable weather which they appreciate, but do not comprehend. This surprises me. Obviously we have some technical knowledge about weather. Canada probably has better technical knowledge with regard to forecasting weather than most countries. We are a leader in this field. For that reason it should not be too difficult to understand whether the weather in western Canada is exceptional, phenomenal or freakish, or whether the doctor in England is correct in indicating that our temperature is dropping 10 degrees a year and Canada will soon be covered with ice.

Mr. Allard: In one hundred years.

Mr. Peters: All right, 100 years. Maybe the 10 years should be 100. It is only a matter of degree.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peters: If there is going to be an ice age, it does not matter if it comes 50 years from now, or 5,000. I am only indicating that there appears to be a trend of a long term nature, that has suddenly accelerated. The world was very simple when man built his first fire. That small fire probably polluted the air, but it did not make any difference. Since then we have increased pollution phenomenally every year, and this will continue. That is why I have some sympathy for the idea of expanding this bill which is probably the scientists' answer to some of the problems that are now facing us. It should also give us some information about providing protection in those areas where no protection is available. This is very important to my part of the country.

Very shortly in the Sudbury basin, and probably within a radius of 200 miles of Sudbury, we will be developing cancer producing gases and radiation. The people of that area have been exposed to lethal doses of radiation and