

*Water Resources Programs*

As the hon. member has said, the words are very clear. The wording says, "on a notice paper". It seems to me that the operative words in that section are "prior to the consideration of a report stage." The hon. member insisted on the words "a report stage" but I suggest the operation words, as I said, are "prior to the consideration of a report stage". To my mind, those words may not be interpreted to mean prior to and during the consideration of a report stage. This point of view is supported if reference is made to the operative words in the French version of that Standing Order, to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred. The operative phrase in the French version, which is very clear, is as follows: "avant l'étude concernant l'étape du rapport". I suggest to the hon. member that the Chair could not possibly put on those words in the French text, which is as official as the English text, the interpretation which he thinks might be placed on the English version of the Standing Order.

It is suggested that the explanatory note which follows Standing Order 75 confirms my opinion that only amendments of a clerical or of a consequential nature can be accepted after the report stage of a bill has been entered upon. Section (7) of the Standing Order waives the requirement of notice for consequential amendments. I suggest to hon. members that this is a most relevant consideration. May I also point out to hon. members that it would easily give rise to a chaotic situation if amendments or motions under Section (5) of Standing Order 75 could be proposed at any stage or at any point in a report stage when legislation is being considered.

As hon. members will notice, the Chair is required under Section 10 of Standing Order 70 to select and combine motions, and it would make the task practically impossible for the Chair if, after making combinations of motions and selecting them, the Chair were faced a few days later with a discussion on another series of similar motions. The Chair would then be required to un-select and un-combine motions which had been decided upon in agreement with hon. members prior to that moment. I suggest that the only logical way to interpret the Standing Order is the way I have stated. I recognize the objection raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that this should be made clearer. But that is a consideration that ought to be taken into account by the hon. members

who look at these things in the committee charged with that responsibility. For the moment, I regret that I must advise the hon. member for Kootenay West that his motion cannot be accepted.

The motion before the House is the one standing in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, our amendment, in support of which I now rise, is to clause 18 of the Canada Water bill. This clause states that no person shall manufacture for use or sale in Canada or import into Canada any cleaning agent or water conditioner that contains a prescribed nutrient in a concentration that is greater than the prescribed maximum concentration of that nutrient in that cleaner, agent, or water conditioner. We feel that that amendment is all right as far as it goes and we are quite prepared to go along with it except for this: we think that the bill requires some more safeguards, and as a result we are proposing an amendment to clause 18 in two parts. We are asking that clause 18 be renumbered to read clause 18(a), and that new subclause 18(b) shall read as follows:

After January 1, 1971, no person shall manufacture for use or sale in Canada any cleaning agent or water conditioner that contains any phosphates or other prescribed nutrients.

Our thinking here is that this matter ought to be taken in stages. We should like to make sure that after January 1 of next year, no one shall be manufacturing water cleaners, water softeners, conditioners or cleaning agents containing any phosphates whatsoever. We feel that the government's legislation is not nearly explicit enough in this regard. The minister has assured us that after August 1 of this year the government intends to cut down the nutrient content, in this case phosphates, of such cleaning agents to 20 per cent of the total and, after next year, that he intends to cut this content still further in an attempt to completely remove such substances from such cleaning agents. We feel that the government is not moving vigorously enough in this matter, so we have proposed a new subclause (b) that after January 1 of next year no manufacturer will be allowed to manufacture any water conditioner, cleaning agent, etc., that contains any phosphate at all.

The second part of our amendment, which would be new subclause (c), says that after January 1, 1972 no person shall sell in