

Science Council of Canada

field. The article, under the byline of Mr. John Leblanc, which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* for April 13 of this year, apparently concerns an interview with the director of the University of Toronto Great Lakes Institute, Dr. George B. Langford. The author describes Dr. Langford as a veteran educator and scientist with a six foot four physique, academic credentials as imposing, and a high degree of disrespect for most politicians.

According to the article Dr. Langford had come to the conclusion that not many people in Ottawa like him. I suggest, however, that the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury), other members of the government and members of the house, should not be prejudiced by their likes or dislikes in respect of words that may be uttered on such subjects as pollution and the need for expanded research by those who have the professional and technical qualifications to advise us. The article goes on to illustrate some of the remarks which, in the writer's view, may explain some of the dislike in Ottawa for Dr. Langford. Perhaps I may quote from the article:

Proliferating Canadian and American—federal, provincial, state and international agencies dealing with the lakes outdo Parkinson's Law. (The theory is that any given number of government employees will create enough work to keep themselves on the payroll).

Later on in the article, we find this:

His relations with most government bodies being somewhat strained, he is not surprised that his research organization's body of knowledge has not been called upon as an emerging water crisis becomes clear. On the other hand, he is not impressed by the current flurry of official action north and south of the international border.

"Now that they're finally waking up to the problem, they want to dash off on their own in all directions like Don Quixote's horse."

Action, it is true, is sprouting on many fronts. Until recently, there were about 77 bodies dealing with one aspect or another of the lakes. A few more are in the process of being created as the various governments initiate hurry-up campaigns to reverse, or at least restrain, the developing foulness of the lower Great Lakes.

I hope that the Science Council of Canada is not going to become simply another of these proliferating bodies to which reference is made in this article, but rather a body which may serve to co-ordinate and possibly reduce the number of bodies that are working, perhaps sometimes at cross purposes or at least without knowledge of what each one is doing, in connection with the various aspects of research work. If Dr. Langford's analysis of the situation in respect of the Great Lakes is correct, I suggest that it is, in itself a

[Mr. Barnett.]

rather weighty argument in support of the establishment of something along the lines of the proposed Science Council of Canada, provided it will be given freedom and authority and that action will be taken upon its recommendation to reduce this proliferation to which Dr. Langford refers.

I am not going to read all of the article, but I quote a portion which has some significant points which emphasize to me, at least, the importance of taking a forward step in the field of scientific research. Talking about the hurry-up action in the Great Lakes situation, the article says:

The action has been stimulated by a spreading awareness that the multiplying tonnages of human and industrial wastes pouring into the lower—and smaller—lakes are taxing the capacity of the waters to keep themselves refreshed—

Eutrophication—overloading with nutrients from shore discharges—has caused an unnatural mushrooming of low forms of life such as algae over more than a fourth of Lake Erie's area. Water quality has deteriorated, more desirable forms of fish have faded away and large sections of shore have been fouled. Lake Ontario and Lake Michigan have developed similar characteristics in spots.

Just what Canada will be doing about all this is not yet clear; new moves appear confined to doing more studies.

The article goes on to deal with some of the proposed actions in the United States. It is made clear that quantitatively at least the United States has been responsible for more pollution of the Great Lakes than we have in Canada so far. This is understandable in view of a comparison of our population and industrial development in the area.

Later, the author points out:

Federal Mines Minister Jean-Luc Pepin, who carries the central government's share of water responsibility, indicates that Ottawa's activities this year will consist of some sampling of Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River water. The Mines Department will spend \$1 million and the Health Department a lesser amount. The Ontario Water Resources Commission—a provincial agency—will conduct other sampling.

Then reference is made in the article to another matter which I think will be an increasingly important subject for public action. Certainly, I think it is related closely to at least the initial stages of the work of the Science Council. The article goes on to point out this:

Somewhat less tangible—and considerably further in the future—is a role that may be played by the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, a federal-provincial group set up several years ago with a secretariat in Montreal.

I feel that at some point in the discussion of this bill it might be useful if the Minister