

Broadcasting of House of Commons Debates sort of editing system and people would be appointed to edit-out everything except that which was really worthwhile. Who would determine what was really worth while for my constituents, for somebody in eastern Canada or somebody in the maritimes? How would they determine this? Who would these editors be? One hon. member opposite is claiming in newspapers across the country that he does not get the opportunity to speak in this House. He is a former mayor of Toronto. I suppose that if the proceedings of the House were televised, he would make a grandstand effort to get his words on television. Yet now he has every opportunity to put his words on *Hansard*, for all to read. He may freely criticize the government for its attitude to the cities, and we can read his speeches in *Hansard*. But he does not do that too often.

Look at the question of costs. Hon. members are concerned about inflation and rising costs. What a tremendous cost there would be if we were to televise the whole proceedings of this House. How many cameras would be necessary? How many people would be employed? How many people across the country would listen? Who would have the time to sit down all day and watch the proceedings?

Mr. Whelan: After one week, 2 per cent.

Mr. Horner: I do not know whether it would be 2 per cent or 3 per cent, but I believe most of the electorate voted for their member, sent him to Ottawa and placed their trust in him to do what was best for them.

Mr. Allmand: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) rose to speak, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) brought to your attention that the hon. member had already spoken in the debate and you said he had been the last speaker on the previous occasion. On checking *Hansard* I note that he spoke on Monday, February 16, and he adjourned the debate that night; but when the debate was taken up the subsequent day, which was last Friday, he did not start to speak first. I bring this matter to Your Honour's attention because it seems to me this may be a new precedent—a person calling it ten o'clock, being interrupted by three other speakers and recommencing the debate at another time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. Does the House wish that I call it ten o'clock?

[Mr. Horner.]

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I understand the point of order raised by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand). The hon. member for Crowfoot was the last speaker, not on the Friday but on the previous day of the debate, when he adjourned the debate. I thought that due to the fact that the hon. member was absent last Friday, he should be allowed to continue his remarks.

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I call it ten o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

POLLUTION—NON-PHOSPHATE DETERGENT RESEARCH

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, almost a month ago I raised the point that housewives across the country, through the daily use of detergents are forced to contribute heavily and unwillingly to water pollution in Canada, and I asked if the government was considering asking the National Research Council to initiate an emergency research program to develop a non-phosphate, non-pollutive detergent. That was on January 28, nearly a month ago. A lot of water has gone under the bridge and over the dam since then—and a great deal of it polluted.

The situation has now changed because in the meantime we have had full details of a non-phosphate detergent which exists, which has been tried out and which has been given very wide publicity. In fact, I believe the program "W5" last night was seen by people from coast to coast and the result will probably be that in addition to the 500 letters I received in my office during the last week, I will receive another inundation of mail this week on the same subject. My consolation is to know that a great many members on the government side of the House are also receiving a flood of the same type of mail. I am glad that consumers are concerned enough to send this mail to us.