

Water Resources

same materials were used in it as were successfully used in Sweden in non-phosphate detergents there. Dr. Solandt was very cool and sceptical in his response to this news. He admitted at a press conference some days later that because of his connection with ERCO his views on the subject might be, and I quote, "slightly biased". He admitted that this Swedish detergent did exist. He sounded a little dubious about it, but he admitted that it was in existence and working.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Solandt was not the first person to be cool about this discovery. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the firms making detergents had also been cool about it. On a CBC program "Weekend" around the middle of November, Brian Kelly was forthright in saying that the reluctance of the detergent companies to come to grips with the problem of harmful detergents arose from the existence of long-range contracts with ERCO. I believe this is precisely the case.

This then is the situation. A suitable replacement does exist; it has been researched and publicized by a pollution specialist at the University of Toronto. Now, I want to finish off the story of the Electric Reduction Company of Canada to date. Two months later, on January 13, 1970, the press reported that the Electric Reduction Company of Canada had been fined a total of \$40,000 and forbidden to make long-term contracts with either customers or suppliers after pleading guilty to three violations of the Combines Investigation Act. It had been convicted on charges of maintaining a monopoly against the public interest and the special prosecutor accused ERCO of tying up the two biggest detergent manufacturers, Procter and Gamble and Lever Brothers, with 10-year contracts to make it uneconomic for a new competitor to enter the market. The prosecutor also said that ERCO had paid between \$800,000 and \$900,000 as a bonus to acquire Dominion Fertilizer and thus eliminate competition. These are facts which we should bring out when we are talking about pollution and the need for action rather than indulge in the delightful poesy which the minister used to introduce this legislation.

These are hard facts. Now, we know why the big detergent companies were lax in looking for phosphate substitutes; it was because they had long-term contracts tying them securely to ERCO. Now, we know why the Chairman of the Science Council of Canada was so cool in his reception of the news that a non-phosphate detergent had been found.

We have heard a good deal in this House recently about the danger of conflict of interest. I suggest that this is an example of a more dangerous conflict of interest than even the ones we have heard mentioned in this House; it is as dangerous a conflict of interest as any which is likely to come to notice. Here we have a man who is the Chairman of the Science Council of Canada, a man who is supposed to be in a special position to look judicially at discoveries and inventions and improvements in science in order to make pronouncements upon them. At the same time, we learn, this man is the Vice-President of the company which makes all the phosphates which are used in detergents in Canada and which are responsible for between 50 and 70 per cent of the municipal sewage pollution flowing into lakes Erie and Ontario.

I think it is time we did something about this. How can a man who is supposed to be above influence and above conflict of interest, a man who as head of the Science Council of Canada makes decisions affecting science in this country, command the confidence of the Canadian people when at the same time he is the Vice-President of the firm which makes the phosphates which have polluted almost to the point of sterility Lakes Erie and Ontario? And this substance is being used in every city and small hamlet across Canada.

I want to say quietly and with deliberation that in my view it would be a good thing if the government were to look very seriously at this particular case of conflict of interest with a view to requesting the resignation of the Chairman of the Science Council of Canada and his replacement by somebody who is free from special interests. This is a matter of grave concern to the people of this country. Here is a situation where big industry is allied with big scientific institutions and big educational institutions—the University of Toronto is the largest university in this country, I believe—and allied also, as I firmly believe up to this point—with big government which has drafted this type of water legislation and tried to put it across as an act to ban pollution. When this happens I think it is time the people of this country sat up and took notice.

This is not a matter of party politics. It is a matter of whether we are likely to survive in our own environment. I have been reading books by scientists this winter, and I have reached the conclusion that many scientists today are worried as to whether the animal,