

should be done about the matter quickly. The government should immediately institute research to find out the extent of the danger, if any, resulting from many substances that are suspected of causing permanent damage to the soil and water, substances such as detergents, pesticides and the like. The National Research Council is already doing some of this work and should be commissioned to do a great deal more.

As I recall it, a few years ago at the United Nations, Canada led a project to collect samples of radioactive fallout, to analyse samples of air, soil, water and basic foods. We even offered to do this for any other country that wanted us to do it. The necessary facilities were ready. I am sure that these facilities could be revived to test samples of soil, water and basic foods to determine what damage, if any, is being done by chemical wastes and detergents. I suggest that a program be got under way immediately.

The same thing is necessary with respect to the Great Lakes. The pollution of Lake Erie has been the subject of much comment. Some of the stories one hears have been slightly exaggerated, but only a few days ago I and my colleague from Halifax-Dartmouth were checking on a research station on Lake Erie. We were told that on one side of Long Point Island the water is quite drinkable, but on the bay side it does not test very well.

According to information supplied by the research station at Burlington, scientists have concluded that both Lake Erie and Lake Ontario can be saved if action is taken at once. The estimated cost of arresting pollution and giving the lakes a new lease of life is something in the order of \$2 billion. This result can be achieved at that cost if work is started now, and within five years Lake Erie could be saved. Fortunately, Lake Ontario is not in quite as bad a shape as Lake Erie, but if there is much delay it may be impossible to save both lakes. These were the points that I wanted to make this evening, and as I know other hon. members wish to take part in the debate I shall sit down now.

**Mr. Len Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of participating in this debate which is mainly on pollution. This is a very timely topic all over Canada, and it is one that is very important in my riding. Pollution is a perplexing problem and one that in many ways is also very frustrating. It is frustrating in the jurisdictional sense in that the provinces have some powers and the federal government has

#### *Alleged Lack of Action to Combat Pollution*

some powers, but there is a great lack of co-ordination in attacking the problem. I hope that we will see a new major direction provided for the good of all Canadians as a result of the introduction of the Canada water act. The people in my riding will be watching this legislation with a great deal of interest. I am not going to speak tonight on the topic in the broad sense as I wish to deal mainly with a particular problem in my own riding. This is the proposed diversion of water from the Shuswap-Thompson River system into the Okanagan system, with all its implications for water pollution.

This is a very great issue in the Shuswap-Thompson areas. Never before have I seen the people in those areas get so worked up about a matter as they have about this one. And I say this is great because too often the silent majority will sit back and watch while an important issue is dealt with by the vociferous minority. This is public concern has been largely led by a group called the Shuswap-Thompson River Research and Development Association. I would like to compliment this group for the very fine work they have done and the very positive and objective stand that they have taken on this diversion issue.

As an example of the interest that the people have in this matter, no less than 15 groups made presentations on the subject when the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestries visited Salmon Arm and Kamloops on its recent swing out west. Some of the committee members said that never before had they seen such public concern about water pollution. Our main concern is not that our area is badly polluted and that we want to control pollution; it is more that the area is not polluted and that we want to keep it that way. The issue of the diversion started a few years ago when many of the people in the Okanagan became most concerned about their need for a greater future supply of water. Later, as a result of action in that area, an ARDA report was instigated and prepared by the provincial government of British Columbia. In essence, that report stated that it was physically possible to divert water from the Shuswap system into the Okanagan. This proposed plan would supposedly alleviate the water needs of the people of the Okanagan and ensure them of a supply for the future. Further, because of pollution problems in the Okanagan, it was also hoped that the increased water supply would flush out some of the pollution.