

Water Resources

same way two versions of the same act. Yet, I do not think the French text means the same thing as the English text.

However, I did not rise on a point of order to discuss the syntax or the structure of the French or English wording. I can see that the two versions are at variance, and that is why I think that the hon. member for Lotbinière is probably right in rising on a point of order. But I do not believe that this is the right time or the right place to do so. This is now the debate on second reading, the purpose of which is to refer the bill to the appropriate committee.

I would suggest that such representations should be made during a committee meeting, in the presence of the department's legal advisers. Then, clarification of the meaning of the text can be given. At any rate, today we are not preparing to adopt the bill as a whole. There are other points which might have to be debated. However, I feel that this kind of point of order should be made to the proper committee.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, what my colleague has just said is substantially what I myself wanted to say. Obviously, there has been a mistake in the translation. Before I took the floor a while ago, a government member told me that he intended to bring up, during a committee meeting, the question raised by the member for Lotbinière. Whether this is in order or not, it is perhaps not the main point which, I suggest, is that the correction be made, because there is an unexplainable error in the translation.

● (3:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, just a word on the point of order. I think it is very well taken, because the whole fundamental objective of the bill is in question. Perhaps the wording of the main operative section of the bill is not affected, but certainly the difference between the two proposals that are mentioned in the preamble is of substance in the French version. Therefore, I concur in the decision to consider this matter further. I just add that I am very glad to see a number of Liberal members jumping up to speak when they can do so in the safety of not having to talk about the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) rising on the point of order?

Mr. Orlikow: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I might indicate, as I have already, that I shall be very pleased to reflect over the weekend upon the point of order raised by the hon. member.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make some comments on this bill. Today is January 16, and when the minister made his speech on November 20 he said:

I begin the debate on this bill with a great sense of urgency, and with the knowledge that what we say and do here over the next few weeks will affect the lives of all Canadians for decades to come. We must act, and we must act today, to rehabilitate, to protect and to develop our priceless national heritage and our most important single natural resource, our water.

That was said on November 20. Then the bill disappeared from the face of the earth and we did not get it back until almost two months later. So much for the extent of urgency that the minister expressed. The minister was in his usual fine form and we got everything from poetry to philosophy—

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I might point out that the bill would have been passed long ago if the opposition had not wasted so much time obstructing matters that could have been passed much more quickly and much more effectively—

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. I suggest to the minister—

An hon. Member: He is just polluting the atmosphere.

Mr. Orlikow: —and to the House leader who has been expressing his views outside the House about the iniquities of members on this side holding up the business of the House, that if being a Member of Parliament is a full-time job we should have been back here shortly after Labour Day, rather than October 22. We lost six weeks when we could have been discussing matters of importance. We do not need any lecture on that matter from members of the government side.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Orlikow: Members on the other side call "order." They should have objected when the minister was speaking. The minister gave a very eloquent speech and dealt with the reasons why we need to act in the field of water pollution. At pages 1048 and 1049 of *Hansard* he summarized the things which this