

Another point that certainly warrants comment is the fact that Mr. Train asked for the minister's views on several proposals now before the United States Congress to increase the outflow of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago. Our party views with apprehension any suggestion of increased Canadian flows to any river in the United States. It means a further export of Canadian water before any discussions are entered into. I was pleased to hear the minister say that the Canadian public would probably not look upon it with favour. I agree with him. Parliament and the people of Canada must jealously guard this great natural resource and ensure that we do not make any more mistakes such as we made with the Columbia River treaty when we gave away a tremendous power potential for peanuts.

• (1420)

There is another point in connection with the clean-up of the Great Lakes. The minister used the term, "slippage in the timetable." I suggest to the minister this is not the only timetable where some slippage has taken place. We have had some slippage in our timetables as far as environmental problems in Canada are concerned. I suggest to the minister that we very carefully examine not only the water pollution problems in the Great Lakes but the problems relating to air pollution. There is a vast amount of air pollution drifting into Canada and an exchange of pollution in the international boundary area. This must be taken into consideration and some satisfactory solution worked out at a very early date.

I wish to make some comment on the Skagit. I come from British Columbia and, as the minister indicated, we do not want the Skagit Valley flooded. I think it has been made clear to the American authorities that under no consideration will we go along with the raising of the Ross Dam and the flooding of the Skagit Valley. I urge the minister and the government to take a much firmer stand and to tell the American authorities that under no consideration are we going to allow the dam to be raised and a further chunk of Canadian territory flooded.

I welcome the minister's statement. I hope we will have further clarification of what he has said today.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for informing us of his conversations with Mr. Train, the American government representative, about the Canadian environment.

Mr. Speaker, before making any comments, I should like to point out to the minister that I was given the English version of his statement at 1:45, and that when I came to the House at two o'clock I was sent a polite note that reads as follows:

We regret to inform you that the French translation of this statement has not reached us in time for us to let you have a copy.

Please rest assured that we will take steps to prevent any recurrence of such a delay.

And I have just been given the French version at 2:15.

Mr. Speaker, an Official Languages Act has been passed in Canada by the federal parliament and I consider that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) should instruct all his ministers to issue their statements in both official

Family Allowances

languages. If a statement is in French, there should be an English translation to accompany the French text, and vice versa. In this way, there would be no problem about two official languages. Before we speak about the environment, we should deal with the matter of the two official languages. I therefore suggest that the right hon. Prime Minister instruct his ministers to that effect. I have nothing against either of the two languages, on the contrary, I should like to see them both respected, first of all in parliament, because it is we who passed the act.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the environment on our east and west coasts and in the Great Lakes, and also to air pollution, I consider that it is in the interests of both the United States and Canada to come to fair, not "lion's-share" agreements by which the Americans would take their responsibilities, and Canadians would follow suit in order to protect the environment in our country and, incidentally, in the United States.

I feel that studies, discussions and talks which took place during these past few days specifically tend to halt pollution of Canadian territorial waters, of the Great Lakes as well as of the air. I urge the government to pursue the debate, not indefinitely and to no purpose, but in a manner likely to solve the problem and allow to depollute water and air and thus protect our population.

[English]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I raise a question of privilege at this time because I have just been informed that members of the press gallery have been excluded from the government lobby. I just want to say I hope no attempt will be made by anybody to prevent members of our party from having the privilege of meeting members of the gallery in our lobby. We have found that the opportunity available to members of the gallery to meet members of our caucus in the lobby has not been abused, and we certainly do not intend to raise any objection to their continued access to our lobby.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

FAMILY ALLOWANCES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity to request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion.

Since the inception of family allowance payments in 1945 the consumer price index has more than doubled to its present level of 145.7 per cent and as a result the mothers of this country have lost the race between population and inflation. As an interim measure to tide us over until a better system could be developed, family allowances have not only failed to close the gap between 1945 buying power and present buying power but have also failed to increase in step with the constant escalation in the cost of living. So it is obvious that motherhood has lost