

can generally take off one good crop and if we are lucky get up to two tons of hay per acre.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been rambling a little bit and I hope that I have not abused your goodwill in taking too much latitude in my remarks. But I thought it was most important that I set the stage as to how this diversion ties in with pollution and how, in turn, it is related to many of the important resources in the Shuswap-Thompson area of my riding.

What are we to do at this point? I am convinced, as I know many of my constituents are, that nothing should be done to fulfil the water needs of the Okanagan until a comprehensive study is made of their needs. In this connection, I should like to endorse the first recommendation that was made by the Shuswap-Thompson River Research and Development Association in their brief to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. It reads:

That no major projects such as the proposed Shuswap-Okanagan Diversion shall be carried out before complete comprehensive river basin studies have been carried out over the affected regions—including ecological studies of recognized scope and depth and widely ranging cost-benefits analysis covering all available alternatives and that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry for Canada shall take immediate, strong action to make this mandatory in all salmon spawning waters to stop the piecemeal destruction of salmon spawning and rearing habitat.

I understand that discussions are now going on between the water resources people in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the water resources branch of the provincial government in British Columbia on the terms of reference and conditions for such a study. I hope that the minister will soon announce that the agreement has been consummated with the province of British Columbia. I hope, too, that some of the things the comprehensive study would determine or estimate are: First, the short and long term agricultural requirements for water in the Shuswap, Thompson and Okanagan areas. Second, the short and long term industrial water requirements of these areas. Third, a definition of the parameters of any water pollution problem in the area with suggestions for its control.

I know time is limited and that other members would like to make some remarks. I am glad to have had the opportunity to make these few remarks.

Alleged Lack of Action to Combat Pollution

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): There are only five minutes left, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: You could have had longer.

Another hon. Member: We will sit all day tomorrow if you like.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could we have order, please.

Mr. Comeau: Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have dealt with the environmental crisis facing man, but perhaps I can summarize it by saying that man is living through an environmental crisis of his own making. My interest in pollution stems from the fact that I am a member of the Fisheries Committee, and certainly, like all members, am concerned about the problem. Sources of pollution of our waters, both above and below ground are wide and varied. Increasing population and industrial production lead to ever increasing pollution dangers in the face of a more or less fixed distribution of fresh water supplies.

Pollution has been around for a long time. The Romans were worried about it and made attempts at controlling it. We have a big country with a lot of water and a lot of air. But anyone who has smelled the river outside this building or has travelled down the Gardiner expressway on a still morning or who makes his living providing the country with herring from Placentia Bay knows what pollution is about. We cannot afford to sit back in confidence. We should count ourselves lucky that we have no Los Angeles where carbon dioxide levels are 10 per cent higher than normal. We cannot afford to be complacent. There are many areas I could mention. Many have already been discussed.

Let us, however, take a brief look at fishing. Forest spraying in New Brunswick has led to observations of fish mortality from 50 per cent to 98 per cent. Pollution has seriously affected shellfish beds. It is estimated that 25 per cent of clam and oyster beds have been closed as a result of pollution which has made them unfit for consumption. It becomes a vicious circle. Pollution leads to higher costs for everyone. Fish processing plants have been forced to bring in water from far out to sea because of local pollution. The Atlantic Development Board has subsidized operations such as this.

Let us look at a related problem, that of the fresh water fisheries. There are many lines