

increase the earnings of all our inshore fishermen and lake fishermen by about 30 per cent. We can do this at a cost of \$5 million to the federal taxpayer and raise the income of 20,000 fishermen without killing any more fish than we do today.

The second piece of legislation to which I refer, and which was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, is the Canada wildlife act. A bill of this kind has never before been passed by parliament. True, Mr. Speaker, we have the Migratory Birds Convention Act, but we have never had legislation on our statute books dealing specifically with wildfowl and the establishment of wildlife sanctuaries.

This new legislation will require close co-operation with the provinces, all of which have important responsibilities in this area. This is one reason why I have consulted personally with all the provincial ministers who are concerned with wildlife, in general the ministers in charge of recreation and conservation. Without exception they have welcomed the government's initiative in this legislation. Also, they are high in their praise for the technical competence and managerial ability of the Canadian Wildlife Service. Under this legislation we will be able to obtain additional funds for the protection of individual species and for the acquisition of certain lands the ownership of which is essential if we are to manage our wildlife resources as we should.

The wildlife program we have in mind will cost the federal treasury something in the order of \$10 million but, again, as with the fisheries scheme, the benefits are likely to be several times the cost. Many millions of dollars already accrue to our federal and provincial treasuries through the sale of hunting licences and the like. Ducks Unlimited spends more than three million U.S. dollars a year on the preservation of waterfowl alone. Our own tourist industry benefits in a major way from programs of this kind.

This afternoon the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Nesdoly) rather facetiously referred to geese and grain. He talked about geese being crossed with boxcars to fly grain out of the country. Last year we did much to develop a facsimile of such a scheme in the crop depredation program. It is a \$1 million a year program, a joint program with the provinces. In effect, it feeds ducks and geese on their way north and south across the country. It feeds them at public expense and not the expense of the individual farmer. Lure crops are planted, and the prairie farmer is insured. Hence, my reference to geese and to their unique ability to pick up and move grain on the Prairies.

This brings me to the third piece of legislation in the Speech from the Throne with which I am concerned, the new environmental contaminants act. Here the emphasis will be on prevention rather than cure. We will be screening new man-made substances. New products like plastics and toxic chemicals will be the first to be vetted under the proposed law. They will be vetted essentially by the industries themselves. Of course, our specialists and engineers in Environment Canada will be drawing up the test procedures and protocols. They will be responsible for the guidelines, much as the officials in the Department of National Health and Welfare in the Food and Drugs Divi-

The Address—Mr. Davis

sion are responsible for tests that apply to food additives, drugs and pesticides. But industry, basically, will be called upon to do its own testing and our officials in government will be keeping an eye on industry's performance in this regard.

There may be some hon. members among us who see this screening process as offensive to the private sector. I cannot agree with them. Most chemical companies would welcome a firm policy in this area, a set of environmental guidelines or protocols which would help them sort out the kind of products they can sell with impunity. At present they run a considerable risk that one of their products may be on the market for a number of years before environmentalists point out its dangers.

We will be looking out for chemicals that have four common characteristics. The first are those that only slowly degrade or break down in nature. The second characteristic is that they are taken up by living things and are concentrated as they pass up through the natural food chain. Third, they are rapidly and widely dispersed, often found hundreds, if not thousands, of miles from their source; and fourth, having entered the environment they may be irrecoverable and even with the expenditure of large amounts of money they can never be brought under control. The names of some of the offending substances are familiar; they include heavy metals such as lead, cadmium and mercury, and chemicals like the polychlorinated biphenyls, or PCBs. Unfortunately, some of these substances are already present in alarming quantities in our biosphere. Since their sources are many, and since their use has become worldwide, international co-operation is often essential if we are to keep these environmental contaminants under control not only in Canada but elsewhere.

I might mention in passing that similar legislation is being considered in the United States and that a toxic substances act is being drafted in Washington. Our legislation will be broader in scope. It will deal not only with substances toxic or poisonous in nature, that is, poisonous to all living things, but also with other pollutants that tend to suffocate because of their bulk volume or concentration in a single place.

I have used the word protocol, Mr. Speaker. Environmental protocols are tests that establish the safety of a new product. We have developed several for checking out substances. NTA, a substitute for phosphates in detergents, is a case in point. The protocol here has been developed with the assistance of the Department of National Health and Welfare. Environment Canada is also working with the Department of Agriculture on pesticides. We are already working with industry, with various companies, on other important new industrial products. The idea of containment is fundamental to our approach to pollution. Either we prevent a product from being manufactured in the first place or we insist that it be recycled within the factory premises. If possible, nothing should get out that is toxic or suffocating. This makes sense, because it is terribly expensive to gather it up again. Such a toxic substance could do irreversible damage if it got loose.

As I have said in the House on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, our national pollutant abatement standards are