

example of the differences in party philosophy. In this party we believe that if you invent a better mousetrap the world will beat a path to your door. You should be able to accumulate wealth and prosperity beyond your wildest dreams. We believe that someone who invents a better mousetrap should receive the full fruits of his labour. According to the philosophy of the party opposite, however, the builder of a better mousetrap would find hordes of bureaucrats at his door with legislation such as this Pest Control Products Act, asking him to fill in pieces of paper and to abide by reams of rules and regulations. The inventor would wish he had never heard of a mousetrap let alone make a better one.

A leg-hold trap could be included in the definition of pest control products, according to this bill, Mr. Speaker. I come from an area where many people make their living through the use of such traps. I know that in some parts of Canada people oppose this device. In the Territories we take the view that the provincial or territorial authorities should make the rules and regulations which govern trapping. Other people, however, believe that the Criminal Code should be amended to bar the use of that type of trap and others that are deemed to be inhumane. If it were the wish of Parliament that this be done, I would not argue that it lies within the jurisdiction of this body, but would insist that it be brought before the House of Commons and the Senate for debate.

This bill provides a way to get around the situation. The use of such traps could be outlawed by regulation. I do not think that is the proper way to address the question. It is my personal opinion that the leg-hold trap should not be banned. Many of my constituents have written to me on this subject at great length. They make a living from its use and have not found any alternative that is as effective. I would not like to see them lose their livelihood by a back door method such as that which might be allowed under the Pest Control Products Act.

• (1420)

What we are doing with the amendment before us is to make the provisions of the Pest Control Products Act binding on Her Majesty the Queen in right of both Canada and the provinces. I would like to hear from the spokesman on the government side what amount of consultation has taken place with the provinces on this matter. I agree wholeheartedly that various federal government departments should come under this act and be bound by it. There is a question of jurisdiction with the provinces. If I am satisfied that these consultations have taken place and that provincial governments agree that it should be binding on provincial government departments, then I would certainly have no objection to that. However, I would like to hear from the government side whether or not these consultations have taken place and concerning the position of the provinces with respect to this legislation.

I have another doubt concerning the act, in that we are really entering an area of joint responsibility, one of those grey areas where part of the legislative responsibility for pest control devices comes under the provincial government and

Pest Control Products Act

part comes under the federal government. It would seem legitimate to me that the federal government should deal with aspects of pest control devices and products, such as manufacture, interprovincial sales, and import and export of these products. However, the use of these products in a particular province or territory should be governed by provincial or territorial legislation, in my opinion. Most provinces and the territories have pretty good pesticide acts. Therefore, we must be careful, in reading through the act, that we are not trespassing on provincial grounds.

I have one other point to make with respect to this act. I wish that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) were here. I noticed that he was here just a few minutes ago. However, in reading through the Pest Control Products Act and its accompanying piece of legislation, the Pesticide Residue Compensation Act, one will see that the latter contains a provision which has a bearing on the problem with which we are seized in this House relating to urea formaldehyde foam. If someone suffers a loss under the Pesticide Residue Compensation Act with respect to the use of pesticides approved by the government under the Pest Control Products Act, that person will be entitled to compensation. That idea is established in law and has apparently been operating for some time under the auspices of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). I see very little difference between the use of the agricultural products we have here and the use of urea formaldehyde foam insulation as approved by CMHC, which reports to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cosgrove). It would seem to me that the same types of things have happened. The product has been approved by the government, and I we were to follow the philosophy contained within the Pesticide Residue Compensation Act, the user who suffers a loss should be entitled to compensation.

I think that I have done pretty well for Friday afternoon on a bill such as this, Mr. Speaker. I do not think I have kept the House waiting too long. We on this side do not wish to unduly prevent passage or slow it down. I thank Your Honour for your kind indulgence.

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I will not be long in discussing the merits or demerits of this piece of legislation. However, I felt it appropriate to get up and ask some questions. I hope the government is prepared to answer those questions.

This is an amendment to the Pest Control Products Act, an act which is apparently administered by the federal Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). First of all, I want to ask why this amendment is necessary. If it is necessary, why was the act not amended years ago? Why is the amendment so late in coming if, indeed, it is necessary?

The second question one must ask is what this amendment does. I would simply like to read the explanatory notes to indicate what it does. It states that:

This amendment would make the Pest Control Products Act and any regulations made there under applicable to Her Majesty and any agent of Her Majesty, thereby providing legal authority to control the use of pesticides by