If the birds that normally eat the insects that they are trying to get rid of are being killed, the next year they are going to have to spray again, aren't they? The same numbers of birds are not being reborn. Of course, the federal Department of the Environment says: "Well, it doesn't really kill the birds. It kind of—well, they don't grow right after." There will be birds that have only one wing.

Because of the approval of the federal Department of the Environment, some provinces today are caught in an endless cycle of using toxic chemicals on all of our wilderness areas and forests to kill an insect that they cannot kill, but they are killing everything else.

Those two chemicals that I just mentioned fenitrothion and matacil, and 2-4-D, which is used in our right of ways to kill the plants and the trees, are relatively cheap. Also approved for use by the Department of the Environment is another substance which again could be sprayed called bacillus theringensus. The short name is BT. It was invented in Canada by a famous scientist in the Quebec region of the Canadian Forestry Service, a gentleman by the name of Dr. Schmirnoff. He invented it and that is being used today in many countries of the world where they want to rid of insects but they do not want to kill the natural predators.

I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, when you really get into this subject, you discover that some of the most interesting things were used to try to get rid of these pests in our wilderness areas. Why, one was invented at a university in eastern Canada, a particular substance that affected the normal cycle of reproduction of these particular insects. In other words, it was like a perfume that gave off the odour of a female budworm, in this case, and of course the males would then try to reproduce at the wrong time of the year. It did not work, but a lot of money was spent on it. I guess you could say that a lot of budworms were frustrated to death.

Many things were tried and the Canadian Forestry Service came up with this one solution called BT. But there is one drawback to it; it is expensive. It is not cheap like the fast fixes of the chemicals.

So, there is the Environmental Protection Act to protect the land and a chemical called 2-4-D sprayed from one area of Canada to the other to get rid of growth of plants. There is the Clean Air Act to protect us from things in the air and to protect our environment. Yet, we approve the toxic chemicals fenitrothion and matacil used from one part of Canada to the other in all of our wilderness area over our forests. There is not much left, is there? That covers the forests. There is a chemical sprayed from the air, from one end of this country to the other. There are the tree ways, the walkways, and the power lines. There is another chemical used to kill the trees there.

Then, we turn to the clean water act, or what we call the Fisheries Act. Keep in mind what is before the House today, the statement in the preamble of Bill C-78:

> —preventing the degradation of environmental quality and at the same time ensuring that economic development is compatible with the high value Canadians place on environmental quality.

We all know what a disaster we have in the waterways of Canada. Under the Fisheries Act, we use a section of the act when a pulp and paper mill puts a substance into the water. We can stop that substance from going into the water, because under the law we cannot disturb fish, and that is the hook that we have for the protection of the environment; namely, the fishing resource.

In the federal government, the Department of External Affairs has taken over the management of that environmental aspect of our development. As I have outlined to the House before, more foreign nations are given licences to plunder our resources on the bottom of the ocean within our 200-mile zone than are Canadians. Let me repeat that. Mr. Speaker, when you go out between 12 and 200 nautical miles, which is perhaps 230 or 240 road miles, that area of our coastline in eastern Canada has more licences granted to enormous factory vessels of 500 feet long and there are more vessels granted to foreign nations than there are licences granted to Canadians.

This year, we saw the Canadian licences cut back in the closure of fish plants in Nova Scotia and in Newfoundland. Today, more licences are granted to foreign nations than to Canadians in what we call the off-shore fishing resource of Canada. So far this year, 82 factory freezer trawler licences have been issued, mainly to Cuba, the Soviet Union and two other countries that were originally called East Germany and the German Democratic Republic. Some of these licences were never picked up.