

Supply

provided me with industries operating on the United States side of the Niagara River—which have been identified. The major pollutants in the Niagara River, the area upon which I concentrated primarily, have been clearly identified.

The most significant point sources of priority pollutants of the Environmental Protection Agency are the following: Buffalo Sewer Authority; Niagara Falls, New York Waste Authority; Bethlehem Steel; Niagara Mohawk Power; Atlas Steels, Ontario; Olin Corporation; Spaulding Fibre; the Town of Tonawanda, New York; the Town of Amherst, New York; and Donner-Hanna Coke, New York. In the area about which I am speaking, the primary producers of pollutants are almost entirely on the U.S. side.

If we are to have this matter cleared up, we have to treat it as a criminal matter. It is not an offence against the social fabric of society; it is a criminal matter. If people know that what they are putting into the rivers and lakes of the country is likely to make it impossible for that water to be used by plant, human or marine life, then they are committing an offence of a criminal nature. Having had it pointed out, there can be no acceptable explanation or excuse for continuing it. It is that simple.

Once it is pointed out to a company, a town or a city that it is polluting to the point where the water quality is being destroyed in such a way as to make it virtually impossible to recover from it, and peoples' lives are being placed in danger as a result, it has to be treated as a criminal matter. If that company, town or city continues to do it, it must face criminal charges. I speak for myself in that regard. That is my opinion of it, that is how I feel about it, and that is how strongly I take the position.

I do not think that slapping a weak fine on someone will make any difference, and begging them to change their wicked ways will not solve the problem. Therefore, I say to the Parliamentary Secretary that I recognize certain industries and municipalities are worse offenders than others. They should be told to stop now and, if they continue, that their principals will go to jail if found guilty. If they have no other way to remove the pollutant, they have either to decide not to use the product any longer or to find an appropriate way to store it until some satisfactory method is found to treat it.

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the forthrightness of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) in treating my first question in a serious manner, as it was a serious question. My second question is also a serious one and relates to available technology. I will not give my comments in the form of a long preamble, but I wonder whether the Hon. Member would describe his impression of available technologies. In his mind, what are the differences between extraction and the present proposal of the United States, which is being monitored in a way that will prove whether or not there is effectiveness and what has to be done?

It would be helpful for those of us on this side of the House to understand his sense of the situation. I would not necessarily

blame him if in my opinion it was not accurate, but I would like to know what he thinks about extraction versus the proposal which he described as a straw, a proposal which really has a lot more to do with leachates than the simple sucking about which he spoke.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, let me put it into context. I am speaking about the proven method of extraction; going in, digging it out, and removing it from the areas of greatest environmental concern. That can be done in a relatively short period of time. It will require a considerable amount of time, effort, and work to do it. I accept that. However, if we accept a method which has yet to be proven or yet to be developed satisfactorily, it will take 30 years to 50 years, by Mr. Thomas' own admission, to achieve the result he anticipates could be achieved if it works.

My view is that we do not have 30 years to 50 years to wait for the clean-up which must take place. I well appreciate that the leaching operation, during the period about which we are talking, from an excavation point of view will be difficult to contain; of course it will. However, it will be more difficult or equally difficult to contain it in the other operation, and it will go on for much longer in the other operation if it takes some 30 years to 50 years to solve it.

In terms of existing dumps, it is my opinion that the excavation method is the only method which can be proven to work right now and can be proceeded with immediately. This must be kept in mind.

With regard to the future, I have held for years that no one should be allowed to introduce a new method of manufacturing which requires some form of disposal of industrial waste without producing concurrently the method to be used to dispose of the waste. If one wants to produce a new coolant, lubricant, or a new liquid into a process—it does not have to be a liquid, but that has been the major problem—one must produce at the same time the way one intends to deal with what is left over after it has been used. I believe that would go a long way toward solving the future problem. As far as the problem we have right now, I just cannot wait for Mr. Thomas to work it all out.

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, if I were to clean up the Niagara River with the help of Hon. Members of the House and the Canadian people, my first suggestion would be to start right here in the House of Commons by clearing the air and by introducing Hon. Members opposite to a much needed dose of realism. The issue of toxic clean-up is too complex and the consequences too serious to allow for *naïveté*, much less for grandstanding and for playing to the galleries—especially to the Press Gallery.

Let us deal in facts. The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement was first signed in 1972 and was revised in 1978. It covers all boundary waters, including the Niagara River, which lie within the Great Lakes system from Duluth, Minnesota, to Cornwall, Ontario.