

Water Resources Programs

into Canada. My only disagreement with the hon. lady is as to the mechanics of the control.

• (4:10 p.m.)

We have had repeated discussions with the major manufacturers, and officials of my department and others have examined the question from every angle. We are convinced that the simplest procedure is to control manufacture and import. There are thousands of retail outlets in Canada but only a relative handful of manufacturers and importers. Control at the manufacturing stage would, therefore, be much simpler. Moreover, we do not believe that the manufacture of sufficiently effective cleaning agents without any phosphate content whatever by January 1, 1971 is a realistic possibility. For example, we are told that there is not sufficient phosphate-free detergent for automatic dishwashers yet available, and I seriously doubt that the manufacturers could produce enough of it to meet the demand by 1971.

The schedule which has been announced involves a restriction in the phosphate content of laundry detergents measured as phosphorus pentoxide to 20 per cent by August 1 this year, and a near total elimination of phosphates in cleaning agents and water conditioners by 1972. This, I remind the House, is in line with the recommendations of the Special International Joint Commission report that was tabled in this House on May 21, based on a six-year study by eminent scientists in Canada and the United States and checked against progress in Europe. I believe we can get no better advice than that, and it is the intention of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to follow this advice.

I said earlier there would be a near total ban in 1972, and this is because it is not entirely clear today that every ounce of phosphates should be removed from all cleaning agents and water conditioners. The hon. lady who introduced this particular amendment made reference to Sweden, and she may have left the impression with the House that in that country there has been a total ban of phosphates in detergents. Based on the latest information that we have, the Swedish formula allows 6 per cent phosphates without affecting the water courses of that nation.

A very small percentage of phosphates may be valuable, indeed, for special uses, and these insignificant amounts would not be harmful to our water bodies. We have extensive research studies underway presently on

this matter, and as soon as we have definitive results which will certainly be the case before 1972, we shall be more specific on this particular point. It is precisely because this is a highly technical subject involving many disciplines and a great deal of research and manufacturing capabilities that we should set the specific controls in the regulations and not in the bill itself.

I should like to assure the hon. lady, and if the minister were here he would give his assurance, that our resolve has not changed one whit in this matter. Indeed, as we hear more of this subject we become more convinced of the correctness of our action.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my view the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to section (11) of Standing Order 75 a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

On Wednesday, May 20, 1970, when Bill C-144 was being considered, reference was made to the admissibility, on procedural grounds, of motion No. 16 in relation to Bill C-144. It was understood at that time that an opportunity would be made available to hear representations from hon. members with regard to motion No. 16. If there are representations to be made, I am prepared to hear them now. Failing representations I am prepared to give a decision.

Motion No. 16, it seems to me, presents a difficult procedural problem in that not only has the motion been exceedingly well prepared but it presents a related and a comprehensive proposal that appears to be independent of any provision of the bill. That motion proposes a new and a substantive proposal which purports to provide the minister with wide authority over the physical construction or extension of any plant or works which may or are likely to result in the deposit of prohibited waste in waters. If I may so sug-