

instances they have them on their program for survey work and indicate that if they had sufficient manpower this would have been done long ago.

Now, for a federal agency to simply move over into a province on top of the existing lines of communication, I think would be a little bit difficult. We have fairly close personal and formal association with the Ontario Water Resources Commission on many of these problems. I feel free in the discharge of my duties to telephone the senior personnel in the Ontario Water Resources to discuss some of these things, and find that this is quite an effective way of getting action. I have never yet been faced with the proposition that they were not interested; that it was my particular responsibility as a federal man. I think they are quite keen to co-operate and are quite effective in their means of co-operation.

Mr. HALES: Let us look back to what happened in Lake Erie. If the municipality and the province had taken precautions in the early stages we might not be in this position. Perhaps we, on the federal level, fell down in not seeing that the municipality and the province did their part.

Mr. PRINCE: Well, it is difficult in retrospect to know whether this would be the case. I do not think some of the factors involved in Great Lakes deterioration were fully understood or appreciated in the past. I am referring to some of the nutrient chemical things that in themselves are quite desirable; we buy them at so much per ton as fertilizers for agricultural use. We use modifications of them in soap powders and detergent materials. These things are not considered as harmful or noxious, until such time as they have reached concentrations at a very low level, but very specifically capable of causing these tremendous manifestations of algal growth.

Now, I do not think this sequence of events was fully understood in these large freshwater bodies. Technically, the process of putrefication has been understood in bodies of water, both marine and fresh, but I think the full appreciation of this as sort of an artificial pollution problem has not been so appreciated. If the municipalities had been alerted to what was known even ten or fifteen years ago, I doubt if they could have coped with the particular problem.

Furthermore, most of the treatment processes which are in use at the present time in the handling of municipal effluence are not capable of removing these soluble chemical nutrient materials. They are permitted to go through, not willfully, but in the natural course of chemical events; they are very soluble and are not precipitated and removed fully from the clear effluence that are returned to the streams, or to the lakes themselves directly, and they still continue to build up.

Mr. HALES: Now that the word "detergent" has been brought before the committee and we apparently know the dangers of pollution through the use of detergents, why are we not passing legislation to prevent the sale of detergents to solve the pollution problem at one of the sources which we apparently know? Why do we allow detergents such as these to be sold? I know this will be beyond your department.

Mr. PRINCE: I am not speaking from a political point of view at all, but I think that society has become wedded to the concept of cleanliness through the