

would like to point out that one of the first and most effective actions of the new Liberal Government in Ontario has been to introduce a spills Bill which, for the first time, will allow companies, unions, workers and the public to have a handle on just what kind of toxic chemicals are being dealt with in industry across Ontario, information which was not only kept secret by the previous Conservative Government, but over which it chose to distribute its own products, its own toxic wines in our liquor stores.

The Liberal Government in Ontario has made it a number one priority not only to introduce the spills Bill but to act on legislation originally recommended by the then Leader of the Liberal Party, now Chairman of the Science Council, Stuart Smith. The Liberal Party has been on the record on this issue in Ontario for many years and finally has had an opportunity to put forth legislation which will make a change in the Province of Ontario.

At the same time, what has been the federal Government's response? Looking specifically at the question of acid rain, we see that the federal Government in its own intuitive nature has decided to appoint a dollar a year man, who is overpaid at that, in the person of the former Premier of Ontario. While this person was the Premier of the Province of Ontario—and I see the Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) here, the issue crosses Party lines and concerns all Members—he was responsible for the sulphur dioxide emissions from Ontario Hydro, a Crown corporation. Ontario Hydro is one of the heaviest contributors to the acid rain problem in the Province of Ontario. The Premier chose to turn his back on the problem to protect Ontario Hydro and encouraged the belching of sulphur dioxide into the air by refusing to demand that stacks be properly equipped with scrubbers to prevent further emissions and further continuation of acid rain falling on the Ontario environment. But what does this person get as a reward for his decision to allow Ontario Hydro to pollute not only our air but also to create acid rain in the thousands of pounds? He is appointed the federal Government's envoy to the United States to deal with the American Government on the issue. He is to convince the Americans, in particular the President, who is reluctant to recognize that there is a problem that acid rain is an international problem demanding international solutions and a specific commitment on both sides of the Great Lakes.

I would suggest that his powers of persuasion will be rather muted in light of his own record when Premier of the Province of Ontario. He had an opportunity to do something but did nothing and sat aside without calling Ontario Hydro to task for polluting the air and for the acid rain problems which were directly the result of sulphur dioxide emissions from coal-fired generating stations which Ontario Hydro continues to use.

A number of questions have been raised by constituents, by mothers breast-feeding their children, by older men and women who feel they might be particularly vulnerable when the water quality is not as it could be. What we have seen from the Government, notwithstanding the rhetoric, the press conferences, the mutual meetings between Canada and the United

States, which looked very positive at first blush, is a Government, a Minister of the Environment, and the Minister's predecessor, that have stood by and done nothing while the slasher in the person of the Deputy Prime Minister as well as the President of the Treasury Board have torn the guts out of the long-term environmental studies and long-term environmental programs which would have allowed us to come to grips with the problem.

If the current Minister were serious about his mandate, one of the first things he should do is to seek in the next Budget an immediate reinstatement of the herring-gull program. This would give the people on the Great Lakes an indication of just what is happening to the quality of water, something all of us hold very dear.

Without that assurance, Mr. Speaker, and with the Government's continual refusal to take its own responsibility when it comes to research, research that could be done by the Guelph Toxicology Centre, we are sacrificing the long-term interests and the long-term health of our citizens for short-term economic deficit slashing and short-term private sector gain.

We have only to look at the so-called advice that was given by the Deputy Prime Minister in his addendum to the Wilson Economic Statement of November 9, 1984, when he examined the kinds of research to be funded by the Government. He said that he wanted fewer researchers, and more specific, immediate results from that research.

If that were the mandate given to those involved in developing the Salk vaccine, it is possible we would never have had the vaccine simply because the bottom line did not show up in the first year, the second year, the third year or the fourth year.

The analogy could be made, albeit somewhat removed, in the context of the Government's decision to privatize and sell off to a foreign corporation the de Havilland corporation at all costs. Again, you see a sort of private sector mentality. "Let us give up our responsibility in the area of aerospace development". It is the same as the Government saying it is prepared to give up its leadership role in the examination of water quality in the Great Lakes. What about the question of toxicology which would have been a basis for investigation through the Guelph Toxicology Centre?

Unfortunately, I think the Government is falling behind the people in its consideration of what people are prepared to pay for. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada are prepared to fund, not only at current levels but more generously, programs which deal with the environment and research which can lead us to making this place liveable for our children.

The Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon) called the environment a garbage dump. I think that analogy bears some study. Not only do we have municipalities across Canada that are not in a position to deal with their own solid waste other than to dump it directly into major rivers, but we also have toxic chemicals being disposed of illegally in many cases and in a fashion which can leech into the ground and affect directly