

Mr. ENNS: Yet, you say there have been no ill effects from this, so in a way there is a tolerance is there not?

Mr. COONS: What I meant to say was that there was no evidence of an increasing resistance to pesticides. We have our inborn resistance in the first place, and there is no evidence this is increasing as a result of our past exposures to pesticides. Is that not the point you were referring to?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes. You mentioned that treatment by other drugs for various human ailments so far has not caused any chemical readjustment in the system by treatment for another ailment. What I am getting at is this: there is no collision, shall we say, between antibiotics, as far as you know, with the result that other harmful chemicals would be formed in combination with pesticide ingestion.

Mr. COON: So far we cannot make a very conclusive statement along this line. I did refer in my earlier comments to a number of cases in which experimental animals have shown that the administration of a drug of the type that is used in the treatment of disease will infer a resistance against some of the pesticides.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was not thinking of that.

Mr. COON: This is, however, some experimental work that is just coming to our knowledge at the present time and there has not been very much work yet on the toxicologic interaction between drugs and pesticides. This is an experimental area in which much more work should be done, and should be done soon.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have a final question. In your answers to previous questions you have mentioned licensing of users of these agricultural sprays and so forth. You have said that they should have a licence and you have even indicated that they should have a form of education which would qualify them for this work. A previous witness here suggested that licensed retail outlets of household type compounds could explain the harmful effects of these products which are on the market. Would you agree that could be controlled along with licensing? In other words, the witness of whom I am thinking suggested that these products should not be displayed and should not be picked off supermarket shelves, shall we say, to the extent that they are being displayed now in places where the only person the buyer sees is the check-out cashier, who has no knowledge of the poisonous additives in the product being paid for.

Mr. COON: I think it is going rather far to license the retail outlets of these garden bombs, as you might call them. The approach to this problem I think should be adequate labelling and warnings and, in the future, development of garden pesticides which are adequate for that type of use but are not hazardous to the human being and his pets.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is all I have to ask, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CÔTÉ (*Longueuil*): Is the danger greater for the person who uses the pesticide spray or for the consumer who eats foods which are contaminated by residues?

Mr. COON: I have seen many more reports of injury on the operational side, that is to say to people who are manufacturing and dealing with the formulation processes of pesticide sprays and to farm workers who go into fields or orchards which have been sprayed. These areas are the ones in which human beings become affected. I am not aware of any cases of poisoning in human beings as a result of pesticide residues on foods that are taken up by the consumer from the open market.