

Water Resources

has also been stated that Lake Superior, Lake Michigan and Lake St. Clair are in danger of becoming much like Lake Erie.

It behooves us to take immediate action in this House. Just recently I saw an article entitled "Lake Ontario Program" which appeared in a periodical I obtained. I believe it is interesting and indicates how much Lake Ontario is polluted. It states:

To preserve the usefulness of Lake Ontario and other waters in an 18,000-square-mile area of upper New York State is the objective of a program now being conducted by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

That is in the United States. It continues:

The threat comes from municipalities and industries—mainly pulp and paper mills, food processing plants, and chemical plants. While requiring enormous amounts of water, these industries at the same time are discharging wastes which in quantity and complexity inevitably damage water quality and make further use of the waterways difficult if not impossible.

More than 40 pulp and paper mills are operating on tributaries to Lake Ontario. The food processing plants—more than 240 in number—freeze, can, grind, package or otherwise process meat, dairy products, fruit, vegetables, beet-sugar, and wines. Chemicals and allied products are manufactured in about 20 large plants, mainly in the Lockport, Syracuse, and Rochester areas.

Few of the pulp and paper mills treat any of their process wastes. The discharged material is extremely demanding on the oxygen resources of a stream. Deposits of one to two feet of fibrous pulp material, to cite one example, have been found as far as two miles downstream from some of the mills on the Black River.

He points out that wastes from chemical plants are toxic to fish. This indicates the enormity of the problem with regard to Lake Ontario. This is a report by a federal commission of the United States. I am sure we could indict ourselves with regard to the pollutants from factories and the human waste which enter Lake Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue tomorrow morning. 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.

CRIMINAL CODE—PROCLAMATION OF REMAINDER OF AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BREATHALYZER

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):
Mr. Speaker, on November 19 of last year the

[Mr. Gilbert,]

government proclaimed a portion of the omnibus Criminal Code amendment dealing with the breathalyzer provisions, but it adopted the curious course of specifically omitting in the proclamation one subparagraph, one clause and one paragraph of the breathalyzer provisions. The government omitted in each instance a portion which dealt with the right of an accused to receive, in an approved container, a sample of the breath that had put him behind jail bars.

My curiosity was aroused when I found this out, for several reasons. The first was that in the debate and the disputation which led up to this provision being put into the Criminal Code, many lawyers had a doubt about the breathalyzer clause because, after all, people were being asked to incriminate themselves out of their own mouths. However, the Members of the Bar felt the sting of their criticism blunted because there were these three safeguards in respect of the breathalyzer test. It puzzled me that the government should take this step, flying in the face of the Bar. I was puzzled because I had never heard of a proclamation in this form.

● (10:00 p.m.)

I note that it has been accepted over the years that certain sections of acts can be proclaimed, and indeed have been proclaimed, without the whole body of the act being proclaimed at one time. But I have never heard of a package within an act being proclaimed and little snippets and pieces of that package being cut out and held-up until a future proclamation.

My understanding that this was a very unusual course was reinforced when I spoke to two members of the class of 1940 in the House, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). In their vast parliamentary experience—and nobody is their equal in that regard—they could not recall such a course being adopted. So I think it is a very fitting and proper subject to be raised. If my research leads me further into it, and I think it is serious enough, I suppose a motion will have to be presented to the House so that we can in some way obtain the opinion of the House on the unusual course taken by the government. What particularly hurts about this action is that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), a man sworn to uphold the laws of Canada, should adopt a wholly new approach