

has begun investigating the ground-water contamination in the St. Clair area. This effort will be stepped up and in the next few years will focus on the Sarnia area.

Did the Hon. Member understand from the Minister's speech, which I quoted this morning, that we intend to implement the environmental bill of rights and the stronger measures in the Environmental Contaminants Act which he suggests? We do take the matter seriously including, despite other comments, the question of dioxins. There is no question that there may be no safe level of anything. We learned this about radioactivity; it may well hold true for many chemicals. There is no question about that, but there is a question about the politicizing of it in the way that has been done by some members of the Opposition.

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make two comments. Politicizing an issue, as it has turned out in this case, has the effect of making an issue come alive and making an issue ultimately lead to action. I certainly make no apologies for attempting to highlight this issue at each stage throughout the last six months. It has been important that such highlighting has taken place, not for my sake, but for the sake of the constituents whom I represent. They are the people who are downriver from this pollution; frankly they are the people I am here to protect.

In respect of the specifics of the Minister's comments at the press conference, yes, I have the press release. Frankly it is the press release which disturbs me because it simply makes reference to three points out of a total of 24 recommendations. If in accepting the report the Minister also accepts that he will attempt to implement, in conjunction with the Government of Ontario, each of the recommendations in the report, I do not have problems; I have a sense of security. However, there are detailed recommendations in the report, as I am certain the Parliamentary Secretary knows, which are in fact quite expensive. I refer to recommendation No. 8 on page 28 which reads as follows:

To ascertain the extent of possible ground-water contamination in the Sarnia area, studies are required to

- (i) Define the ground-water flow pattern in the freshwater aquifer.
- (ii) Assess water quality in the freshwater aquifer and seepage discharge to the St. Clair River.
- (iii) Determine the hydraulic head relationships between the freshwater aquifer, the rock layers above the Detroit River Group, the deep well disposal zone and the caverns and the Salina formation.

To put a recommendation of that sort into effect is an expensive commitment. I recognize that, and I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary recognizes it as well. Nevertheless, it is a commitment which scientific experts at the meeting yesterday in Windsor said was absolutely crucial if we were to get to the bottom of the whole problem. Once more I make the point to the Parliamentary Secretary, and through him to the Minister, that we have so far had a sense of respect for the Minister, but that respect has to be earned continually. It is an unfortunate thing about politics. People are always asking: "What did you do for me today?" The Minister, the Parliamentary Secretary and the Government have to make a commitment to

put financial resources behind the kinds of studies which will give us the answers. This voluminous and quite excellent report agreed that studies had to be set upon to give us answers.

● (1750)

**Mr. Gurbin:** I think if the Hon. Member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy) will refer to the "blues" he will find that the hydrological studies were one of the three specific things I mentioned. I cannot tell him the full extent of that. I understand that they are extensive. We are committing ourselves for at least two years, most particularly, because of the material we found in the CN tunnel, and it can only come from the ground-water. Unquestionably, the Minister understands what he is talking about. He has committed our resources to that. I cannot tell him how much that is or what that means in total. In so far as possible the Minister has committed the Government to undertaking whatever recommendations are necessary to achieve a satisfactory end.

**Mr. Langdon:** I have just a final comment, Mr. Speaker. I am certainly very, very pleased to hear that. That, in fact, was the question which I asked yesterday at this session in Windsor at which Environment Canada people were present. But I think what the Minister should aim at doing, and what will certainly give a sense of security to people, not just in Windsor but in each of those communities that has experienced dioxins in their water, is for the Minister to get up and make a statement indicating in financial terms the kind of allocation that is being made, with what urgency that undertaking is being made and, therefore, how quickly we can expect to see comprehensive and effective results brought about in what for us, frankly, has been a pretty traumatic experience of continual new pieces of news that potentially affect our environment and our people potentially very greatly.

**Mr. Winegard:** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon) because I think he has hit the nail on the head on many of the issues facing us today, because he is interested in research, and because the issue has been raised in this House on several occasions over the past few months. I would like to comment upon what the Canadian Centre for Toxicology can do in terms of this significant problem. When the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) was here this morning he talked about the problems of identification and control measurement, which we know are very difficult, and which take us into areas of high technology in which we have not been before.

More important, the Minister talked about advice to groups, and the kind of information that is required, the kind of thing the Hon. Member has just been talking about. One of the best things that ever happened to the Canadian Centre for Toxicology was when this Government said no in November of 1984, because that centre then went to work, and instead of producing a centre that was going to be operated primarily by government, it went back to private industry and said, "You have to help even more than you had planned to do". I watched those plans grow over the years. When it moves off the ground, this is going to be a good, trim, hard-hitting