

to include acid rain as one of the non-negotiable items and that we are to make sure pesticides are included in that and the replacement of any polluting forms of energy with environmental benign sources. We want to ensure that we have the legislative ability to stop any nuclear damage to our environment. Certainly we want to stop the overuse of environmental packaging materials.

● (1240)

If the Government were sincere about environmental protection, there is no question in my mind that not only would this Bill be strengthened, but it would have originally been a strong Bill, one which says that the future of Canada's environment is important, that the environment will be part of the negotiations of any trade Bill which we would be part of with any country. Let us when we look at the weakness of this Bill and the great giveaway, which is what the U.S. trade deal is all about. There does not seem to be any kind of consistency in the words the Government uses when it says that it cares about the Canadian environment.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in what the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar) had to say about pesticides since that is, as she said, a widespread serious problem in Canada. She seems to have gone into it in very specific detail, more so than many of us have been able to, perhaps. I wonder if she would comment on an aspect of the problem as presented to me by someone who has some familiarity with government regulations. It was suggested that the general mistake of Governments—and I think this would apply to this Bill—is that when there is a problem such as pests they deal with it by allowing private industry to find some saleable product that will apparently get rid of the pests. If that saleable product, the pesticide, causes problems, then the Government tries to regulate the pesticide. In other words, the Government does not deal with the original problem, the pest. It does not look for the best way of doing whatever the pesticide was supposed to do. It does not look to see if there is a better chemical, or perhaps a better biological agent, to get rid of the pest until the pesticide has caused great damage. Then there is a desperate search to find an alternative because the control mechanism is inadequate.

I wonder if the Hon. Member can comment on whether this Bill improves on that approach, or does it fall into the category of simply attacking the attacker instead of attacking the original problem, the pest?

Ms. Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for a question that is certainly very important. I think what he is really addressing is our inability to deal with ecology. Ecology is the very delicate balance which exists within our environment. This Bill refuses to be inclusive as far as pesticides are concerned. It is refusing to protect the ecology that is so important to us.

The pests have been there and have been a concern for years but we can usually define some of those so-called pests as

having a role to play within the total environment. Surely what we should be defining is the role these pests play, and how we can counteract it so that it becomes a constructive and not a destructive role.

One of the good things about the Bill is that it gives us the ability to screen new substances before they are used in the environment. I certainly applaud that. However, when they talk about these new substances, they exclude the use of pesticides. I think we should recognize that in the past we have been ignorant of and have ignored our ecology, and this Bill does not address that. The Government is saying, after the fact, that it will spend much more money and perhaps never be successful in restoring the fine balance which was needed in the first place. One of our major concerns is that pesticides be included in the Bill.

Surely our approach to environmental control in legislation should be a preventative approach. It should be one which protects the ecology and one which ensures that the fine balance is always there. We should not try to remedy it after the fact. We should use that approach in our health care system. I am constantly frustrated by the fact that we allow diseases to happen and then spend billions of dollars trying to cure them. We should be looking in the first place at how we could prevent many of these diseases, maintaining a level of health. We should look at that as we look at our environment. I think a lot of research is being done now with respect to the disease AIDS to find some immunity or protection against it. Over the years we have been able to eliminate smallpox. I think that is the kind of thing we should look at when we talk about immunization. We could immunize our environment with respect to further pollution if we were willing to put forward the kind of law that says our environment is important to us.

We do not need a weak-kneed legislation that is afraid to include the things we know are very destructive to our ecology. The Canadian people have a right to have their legacy protected. I would hope that it would not be very long before the Canadian people are given that right, but obviously the only way they will get it is by throwing this Government out and voting in the kind of government which will implement legislation that really protects the environment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will entertain another question from the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap).

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain made the striking point that this legislation, if it goes through, might allow Canada and Canadian interests to be dangerously vulnerable to the so-called free trade agreement with the United States, if it becomes law. Her point of focus was Chapter 14, I believe, which concerns equal treatment in the sale of services.

Does she mean, for example, that if a certain pesticide or pesticide service in the United States does not meet Canadian health standards or Canadian environmental standards, and