## Supply

I lost my temper the next day, and I make no apologies for it. In my first question I asked the Minister of Transport flat out whether he was considering a moratorium on the transportation of PCBs until such time as the regulations came into effect on July 1. Regardless of what you think of the merits of the question, if you check the tape of that you will find that it was asked in a very calm way. You will see that the Minister of Transport came back at me as though I had charged him with some heinous crime, when all I had asked him to do was to consider a moratorium. The theatrics began with the Minister of Transport who went on to talk about the Aeronautics Act and things that the NDP had done. All I asked him was whether he would consider a moratorium.

Before you go around making charges about who emotionalized what and who exaggerated what, check the record. It was not until the next day, when we could not get the Government to take seriously what was happening and to do then some of the things that it has done now, such as order an inquiry and issue interim protective directions, that we began to shout, yell, and express the legitimate outrage that opposition Members and Canadians in general felt about the rather relaxed attitude that the Government initially took forward this event. The Member's own Minister got up and said that it was just a question of provincial jurisdiction and he asked why were we even bothering to ask the question. Before you go around charging people with being emotional, check and see how the debate developed. While you are at it, answer the question about the study into the effects of PCBs which was cancelled.

**Mr. Gurbin:** Mr. Speaker, I think the context of that moratorium question was really important. I was here for that question. If the Hon. Member will read *Hansard*, he will know that if he had defined it as PCBs, probably the Minister of Transport—

Mr. Blaikie: Do you want the Hansard? It says PCBs. Read Hansard.

Mr. Gurbin: The context in which the Minister was being asked—

Mr. Blaikie: It does so. Read it.

**Mr. Gurbin:** The context in which I know that the Minister had to deal with the question was the cancellation of the transportation of all "dangerous goods". That was certainly the context in which it was coming forward. That would have meant that your farmers—

Mr. Blaikie: You haven't read Hansard.

**Mr. Gurbin:** —could not have planted their crops. That would have meant that you would not have been able to carry on normal commerce in the whole country.

Mr. Blaikie: Read the record. Read Hansard.

Mr. Gurbin: I had the sense, from watching-

Mr. Blaikie: You're not telling the truth.

**Mr. Gurbin:** In answer to the second part of the question, I am pleased to bring a little additional information to the House. With regard to the PCBs, an epidemiological study is being set up by Dr. Friesen. His staff telephones are manned at all times, and all persons who even think that they might have been in contact with PCBs are being asked to complete a questionnaire. They will follow up on any health problems that may in fact emerge. Records of all information of this epidemiological study will be kept over a long period of time.

My second point is with regard to chlorobiphenyl regulations which are now prepared and before Cabinet. Regulation No. 2 will accelerate the removal of PCBs from service in the existing allowed uses. These are uses that were allowed under the previous administration. They are 1977 regulations under the Environmental Contaminants Act. The regulations will do this by prohibiting the sale of PCB equipment where the concentration of PCBs in any liquid contained in the equipment is greater than a certain part per million.

Regulation No. 3 will further control the dispersal of PCBs in the environment by placing quantity and concentration limits on the wilful release of PCBs into the environment during commerical, manufacturing, and processing activities. As all Members know, Mr. Speaker, the actual use of PCBs, in any additional manner, was banned in 1977.

Finally, to answer the last part of the question, on behalf of the Minister of the Environment and the Government I am happy to make the commitment that we will continue to fund, with a commitment for five years, any research program that requires a particular type of activity on the part of the federal Government. We will fund those research programs. We have not in fact taken away our ability to do the kinds of research which we think is necessary.

Mr. Blaikie: What about the study that was cancelled?

Mr. Gurbin: In relation to other studies-

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret but the Hon. Member's time has expired. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Parry).

**Mr. John Parry (Kenora-Rainy River):** From the debate this afternoon and this morning the origin of the motion before the House today is very obvious. In that sense I, as the Member for Kenora-Rainy River where this spill occurred, am somewhat of two minds on how to view this attention. On the one hand, I would like to see the House offer a full examination of all forms of environmental contamination and of the record of the present Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Blais-Grenier). On the other hand, I am naturally very interested in having a full discussion and getting facts on the record concerning the spill of polychlorinated biphenyls in my riding. It is my belief that a spill like this, which has commanded national attention, should command national attention. That is a statement and a judgment which I think requires some qualification.