

## ENVIRONMENTALLY SAFE ALTERNATIVES

The Government of Canada should study very closely industry plans for replacement and bridging technologies to ensure safety.

The stability of CFCs and PCBs meant they were at one time viewed as "ideal" chemicals. However, their threat to the environment is now clear. It is dangerous to introduce new synthetic chlorine compounds into the environment.

Greenpeace is concerned that the development of alternatives to chlorofluorocarbons is focused too narrowly on a range of substitute chemicals which are detrimental to the ozone layer and/or global climate and which have no natural cycle in the ecosystem.

HFCs are a group of stable synthetic compounds being touted as replacements for CFCs. Although their ozone depletion potential is placed at zero, virtually nothing is known about how these compounds will interfere with planetary processes over the long term.

Production of HFCs also involves groups of well known environmental toxins - chlorinated solvents. These have both an effect on the ozone layer and, being carcinogenic, present a serious environmental and health hazard.

HFCs are also unacceptable because of their contribution to the raising of global temperature commonly referred to as the "Greenhouse Effect".

Greenpeace cannot support the use of HFCs because there are unknown risks to the global ecosystem.

Industry leaders such as Dupont's Archie Dunham have demanded assurances that substitutes will be found acceptable for the long term and will not be judged inadequate in the future because of new environmental standards.<sup>1</sup>

Canada should move completely away from chlorine-based substitutes, as there are a range of serious toxic pollution problems associated with them quite apart from their ozone depleting and global warming potentials.

The solution to the CFC problem is in finding the best alternatives that are not synthetic.

---

1. Toronto Star March 6th, 1989