

herbicide, or we could talk about any chemical. The point is that we have legislation on the books, yet nothing is being done.

● (1250)

We have polychlorinated biphenyls stored throughout the country in various locations. Some of them are safe. Others are in vacated mines on private property. We can go back over the years and look at occurrences. For example, there was a high water situation and the fluid in a transformer spilled into a river. What action was taken right after that occurrence? I recall the situation involving the Exploits River just a couple of years ago. It involved provincial jurisdiction. However, what happened to the studies that were conducted after that incident occurred?

Let us look at the application of chemicals over large territories and at what scientists and environmentalists are recommending. Let us look at amino-carb. The officials of the Minister of the Environment recommended its use to provincial administrations. They recommended it to the Government of Ontario instead of fenitrothion. The Minister of the Environment has the responsibility right now to contact the Government of Ontario and impress upon it the importance of following the advice of the people in her Department. Very shortly, in three weeks' time, in Newfoundland they will be using amino-carb, BT and fenitrothion. In New Brunswick they will be using amino-carb, fenitrothion and BT. In Quebec they will be using BT and a small amount of fenitrothion. In the Province of Ontario, yet to be announced, just before the election, because of the problems with jack pine budworm, anywhere from 800,000 to one million hectares will be sprayed aerially with fenitrothion only.

Let us look at the list of herbicides which will be used. Certain parts of the country still use 2, 4, 5-T which is banned in other parts of the country, or Roundup or Velpar or gavlton. These are toxic chemicals. Of course the question is: How toxic are these chemicals?

A report was completed for the Minister of the Environment on what was the suspected cause of cancerous tumours in fish in Lake Ontario. That was the only place where it was actually investigated to any degree. Now we have to wait until the American Society of Limnologists has its meeting from June 19 to June 21 to find out the results of that particular study.

The point is that we cannot act only in the short term because we do not know what will be the long-term effects. We have to follow through. We cannot have, for example, a team down in Lake Ontario trying to find out what happened to the fish and not follow through on in next year, the year after and the year after that, to find out what is happening in the environment and to the fish. As the Minister of the Environment knows, she cannot cancel programs, as she did. She cannot lay off scientists, as she did, working in western Canada on what was causing the death of ducks as far as the use of a particular chemical was concerned.

There is a lesson to be learned in this debate. The Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Transport and all Cabinet

Supply

Ministers should pay more attention to what is needed in the long term. They should stress the importance of the research being conducted by scientists in the Department of the Environment and in the Department of National Health and Welfare, even to the point of involving the Department of National Health and Welfare in some of the studies being conducted in the Department of the Environment.

In conclusion, in his press release on directions for the transportation of PCBs, the Minister of Transport did not go far enough. Why did he not make it mandatory to have another vehicle travelling behind a truck carrying hazardous materials along the highway? That is an obvious solution. If you move a house down a highway you have a truck in front and one behind. It is that simple. The Minister of Transport has to act under the legislation which exists, legislation which was watered down substantially from that of the previous Liberal administration.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the motion of the Official Opposition condemning the Government for its handling of environmental issues. What is at stake here and has been at stake for the last week with respect to the PCB spill in northwestern Ontario is the extent to which the federal Government, and I would suggest many provincial Governments, are out of sync with the way ordinary Canadians feel about the need to protect them and their environment from the consequences of introducing, either accidentally or deliberately, the many hazardous substances which are now being introduced into the environment as a result of the way in which we live and as a result of what we tolerate, whether it is the way in which dangerous goods have been transported to date or whether it is many other industrial activities that have been allowed to go on. What is at stake is the extent to which Governments are out of sync with the moral outrage which people feel about these kinds of things.

Having been home this past weekend—and unfortunately I was unable to arrive in time for the beginning of this debate—I discovered that people have a sense of outrage that these things are allowed to go on. Unfortunately their outrage does not last as long as I would like it to last. It flares up around a particular event and then diminishes between accidents. We see people being much more conscious of these things after a Mississauga or a McGregor event or after this last spill. Yet, there is a general level of awareness or a desire on the part of Canadians for Governments to ensure that these kinds of things do not happen and that other things which do not attract the attention of a spill do not happen. That level of awareness is increasing every day. I think it is cause for reflection on our values as a society and upon the values of bureaucracy, administration and politics, for that matter, that we can have so much moral outrage funnelled over the years into various known crimes, that is to say, matters pertaining to the Criminal Code. Whether it is the campaign to return capital punishment or whatever, those kinds of things attract moral outrage, and properly so. I am not saying that they should not attract moral outrage, but it seems to me that the