

Mr. WHITE-STEVENS: Yes, sir.

Mr. ENNS: Is there any trend towards reducing the cost of pesticides? It seemed apparent from other witnesses that there is a tendency for the cost of these things to come down owing to better research, or wider promotion. Is this something we can look forward to with greater efficacy or benefit?

Mr. WHITE-STEVENS: I do not think there is any question about it. The history of virtually every new agricultural chemical has been one of increased economy and the reduced price to the ultimate user. A company which invests \$2½ million in its compound hopes at least to recuperate the investment in order to satisfy its stockholders. We are continually looking for ways to reduce our own cost and to pass such reductions along to the consumer. This has been the history of virtually every chemical compound, and certainly of insecticides and pesticides.

Mr. ENNS: Is there any indication on the part of the industry of the average safety levels which governments set? You mention something like one hundredfold as a safety measure. Governments sometimes are not always convinced that these are the only guides. Sometimes they are only best estimates, because in some situations a certain tolerance level may have been reached through inadequate research. Has the industry brought about any reduction in safety levels?

Mr. COOPER: In Canada we are not impatient. We like to work with the food and drug administration. We feel that they are doing an excellent job, and we are always ready to co-operate with them and to work along with them.

Mr. ENNS: You do ascertain whether or not the levels of residues are safe?

Mr. COOPER: We feel that in Canada we have one of the best organizations in the world so far as safety of foods is concerned, and concerning residues. The industry and Cyanamid are certainly not impatient. We feel these precautions must be taken. In Canada we have one other factor as far as the marketing of compounds is concerned. We in Canada take into consideration our Canadian farm methods, and farm improvements.

In many instances we will not market a compound in Canada if we feel it would not be handled safely by the consumer. I think we are perhaps one of the few countries that pay a great deal of attention to this factor.

Mr. ENNS: We have heard from other witnesses, with some concern to ourselves, concerning the ill effects arising from improper use of a product. This is actually not a complaint against the product itself, but it concerns the mishandling of it which produces such ill effects. One of the remedies suggested by other witnesses, and one which we are thinking of ourselves, is better labelling. I wonder if the difficulty with ill effects might be corrected by something which would direct the attention better to those ill effects, and by showing what improper use of the product would involve? Have you any quarrel with this sort of thing, where we might want to insist upon an improved or different sort of labelling on the product?

Mr. COOPER: I have no quarrel with that concept, but I have some reservation. Labelling is only a part of the problem, and probably one of the smaller parts. We spend about \$100,000 or more a year on safety measures, such as publications, educational projects, meetings, and so on. A lot of the misuse that occurs cannot be corrected by labelling alone. No matter what you put on the label, how are you going to get people to read it? This is the problem. I have found that labelling can be complete and detailed, yet the individual householder will not take the time to read the label. If we could find some method through education, then the use of labels could be improved, but this is not the whole answer from my standpoint.