

*Water Resources Programs*

excellent and quite detailed paper on the various forms of pollution in France.

I should like to read only three small paragraphs of his speech which show that we are facing the same problems and that fortunately, in Canada, we are somewhat in the vanguard by including this clause in our bill. And now I quote:

It was advisable to insist on the operative provisions of the 1964 act which represents the first attempt toward a truly preventive and comprehensive policy and provides a framework for the various pieces of legislation to be adopted subsequently in order to fight pollution in fresh waters.

Thus, France signed the agreement worked out in 1968 by the European Council on the biodegradability of detergents and an order in council now being prepared will be designed to prohibit the sale and distribution of products with a bio-degradability level under 80 per cent.

It is a long term work which requires progressive measures due to their financial and economic impact: what matters for the future is surely that the framework for action be clearly laid down and the realizations well under way.

Mr. Speaker, bio-degradability is not pollution. We have learned that this phenomenon only constitutes the approach to the problem. Since they have begun to concern themselves with these things in France, we were very happy to have the opportunity to go and visit that country and discuss this problem with our colleagues from the National Assembly.

[*English*]

This is all I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker. I appeal to the government to accept these new proposed subsections which will further strengthen the provisions which the government has incorporated in clause 18. We are glad to have clause 18 in the bill, but we wish that the government would strengthen its start by favouring the adoption of proposed subsections (b) and (c), which we think will take us further along the line which the Canadian people have shown they want to follow.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been some discussions concerning the possibility of continuing the debate on this bill right up until six o'clock in view of the fact that tonight will be given over to another matter. I rise to say that on our part we agree to this proposal, but I thought if we were going to do this it would be useful if the decision were made now so that hon. members would not be caught by surprise at five o'clock.

[*Mrs. MacInnis.*]

**Mr. Forest:** This is agreeable to us, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is therefore ordered that the private members' hour be set aside at five o'clock.

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, I first wish to congratulate the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (*Mrs. MacInnis*). Nobody can deny that she is one of the most doughty warriors on behalf of all housewives in Canada. I also wish to remark that we know more about water now than we ever knew. I recall that about eight years ago we were worried in this House that water was going to disappear. Water levels were going down in various areas, and we were thinking of transferring water from Hudson Bay to the southern part of the country.

The presentation made by the previous speaker was an excellent one, but it gave just one side of the story and this is what disturbs me. Can we be sure that nutrients act on their own and do not need a catalyst? This is one reason I feel that we have been in a bit of a hurry with this legislation. We know that nitrates and phosphates are nutrients, but we do not know all the processes that occur in the eutrophication of lakes and rivers, and we do not know everything about mercury pollution. We do not know whether a catalyst is necessary to the process of eutrophication.

Many of the chemists to whom I have talked are not sure on this point. I do not know why we did not invite the manufacturers of phosphates to present their case. Hon. members may say that they would present only their side of the picture, but that is all to the good. Surely, we are smart enough to understand that, but we would like to know what research they have done. Do we know for sure that algae and other plants feed on phosphates without the necessity of a catalyst? I wonder why we did not get all this information. I do not think there is anyone in this House who can tell me with certainty whether that is right or wrong.

This is why I have some doubts about the amendment, even though I feel I must support it. I think that the principle is right but there has not been enough research to be certain. This is why I say we should not be in too much of a hurry, and that probably the