

experimental purposes that had been listed as dead were also listed in the same set of records as having been mated at the identical time. Rats were also listed as having died twice and tumours and other adverse effects appeared to have been under-reported, the EPA said.

I could give other similar examples but I will not except to make the point that we cannot continue to rely on such undependable data from other countries. We do not have control over it and so cannot be sure that it is reliable by scientific standards or that it is sufficiently relevant to our own circumstances to be useful.

● (1540)

The government has recently admitted that hundreds of scientific studies done outside Canada and upon which the government itself has relied have been found to be useless because of fraudulent and careless laboratory work. I think the point has been made: we must have a scientific research and development strategy on pesticides which is our own and which is tailored-made to our distinctive conditions, problems, and goals. That is not to say that we should shut our windows or our doors to the rest of the world. Science is international. We belong to an international community. We should draw on the expertise, resources and data resulting from the accomplishments of scientists throughout the world. However, while doing that, we should also exercise a healthy degree of skepticism, which is the hallmark of the scientific mind, to ensure that our own scientific house is in order.

In my concluding remarks I would like to suggest such a strategy, a scientific approach to pesticides and pesticide control which will meet the problems I have identified. The strategy will ensure that we in Canada are sufficiently on top of the subject to protect our own environment and the health of our people. The first recommendation is that we greatly strengthen the research capability of the country, especially in the university sector. We need more research of both a basic kind and a mission-oriented kind. We need to expand our base line of knowledge relating to pesticides.

Second, by research done outside government itself should be more carefully monitored. Again, we must not rely exclusively on government research, but should also draw on research outside government. Still, we must ensure that research beyond the direct control of the government is done by people using the highest scientific standards.

Third, I think we must rely less than we now do on scientific study done outside the country, as I have suggested. To buttress our own resources and capability in this area, we should look very carefully at providing tax incentives and write-offs for industrial research and development.

Fourth, I think we should substantially strengthen our capacity to list pesticides which are already in use and to test these pesticides which are being proposed for entry into the market. Testing should be done prior to their entry, and not afterwards. Pesticides later identified to be troublesome, dangerous or environmentally harmful should be immediately pulled from use. We should not wait, as this government has

### *Pest Control Products Act*

done too often, until long after other countries have already abolished pesticides before we do as well. We should identify those pesticides which are harmful and immediately ban them from the marketplace.

Fifth, we should step up our public information capacity. We should get more information out to the users of pesticides, particularly in the farm community. They need to know an awful lot more than they now do about what particular pesticides they should use and should not use, and how pesticides can be used safely. The object should be to minimize inherent dangers in the use of pesticides. Pesticides will never be 100 per cent safe, but we should ensure, through public information and other avenues, that we maximize the benefits of pesticides and minimize their disadvantages.

May I conclude by lending my own support and, I think, the support of the Progressive Conservative Party for Bill C-45. I speak in favour of the bill in my capacity as the environment spokesman for the party. I am not quite sure why it was brought up to the top of the agenda at this time. Nevertheless, I welcome the fact that the government has given it that degree of priority. My hope is that the government will increase its consultations with the provinces to ensure that they are at one with Ottawa on the provisions of the bill. My party welcomes the fact that the legislation is being debated today. For my part, I urge all hon. members to give it speedy passage.

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

**Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I believe there has been an agreement outside of the House that this bill should be dealt with in all stages today. Accordingly, we should go into Committee of the Whole, rather than sending the bill to the standing committee. Therefore, I so move.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Mr. Fox on behalf of Mr. Whelan, seconded by Mr. Joyal, moved:

That Bill C-45, an act to amend the Pest Control Products Act be now read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to Committee of the Whole.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Francis in the chair.

**Mr. Deans:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if Your Honour might identify exactly who will answer on behalf of the minister in Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Good question!

**The Chairman:** The motion was moved by Mr. Fox, on behalf of Mr. Whelan, seconded by Mr. Joyal.

**Mr. Kempling:** It can't work.

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Further to that inquiry, I am just wondering whether we can proceed as agreed in the absence of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts),