

Senator Desruisseaux: Not necessarily through his fault or carelessness.

Senator Cook: Does not section 5(1)(a) take care of that? If he kept doing it year after year he would not be taking steps to reduce the loss.

The Chairman: The only case in which compensation is to be provided—and, again, the amount is of course determined by the minister, and within a maximum and a minimum area by regulation—is that the product must be an adulterated product and he must have contracted or himself have used a pesticide, with no fault or carelessness on his part, which had the effect of producing that adulteration. He might do that once, but I find it difficult to see how he could fit into the conditions year after year, producing something that he knew was an adulterated product.

Senator Blois: Is it not a fact that some of these pesticides have different actions if dissolved in very hard versus soft water, or highly chlorinated water? I had some experience with this a few years ago. Can you answer that?

Mr. Jefferson: In general terms, the reaction of pesticide residues can be different under different conditions.

Senator Blois: That is what I was interested in, because I am quite certain that highly chlorinated water, with one chemical, will have a different effect and cause some of the pesticides to stick to food much longer than others.

Mr. Jefferson: This is an illustration of one of the difficulties in trying to anticipate absolutely what the results are going to be from the use of pesticides or the use of any other thing.

The Chairman: In that connection, senator, we are putting so many things in so many things—you have the chlorination of water, fluoride in water, that is supposed to be good for your teeth—that it is supposed to be certain, even by a long distance—and it must be osmosis—that if I take a shower and do not have any teeth, my teeth are still benefitting from the fluoride in the water. These are extraordinary times we live in. There is no question but that the degree of chlorination in the water varies in different parts of Canada, and I am sure in some parts of Canada at different times during the year. It may vary for a variety of reasons. How are you going to adjust the reactions of pesticides in all these

circumstances? The more you look at it, the more you realize there is a great element of good fortune in surviving so long.

Senator Walker: May I ask one question? You were very helpful in your suggestion. Perhaps the witness could now tell us what the department contemplates this would cost, if this bill is passed.

Mr. Jefferson: Yes, I did not get back to that question, sir. On an annual basis, probably the equivalent of about one man-year for administrative purposes in keeping the operation viable; and on that basis I suppose something like \$20,000, if you pay the individual a salary in the neighbourhood of \$10,000, and you have about \$10,000 of operational expenses associated with it. In terms of the amounts that might be paid out as compensation, it is anybody's guess, but I think it would be of the order of less than \$100,000.

The Chairman: In the year?

Mr. Jefferson: Yes, per year, and I hope that it would be nil, because we have in operation now, as I mentioned earlier, a co-ordinated working program to nip these residue situations before they become of significance in the market place. This is co-ordination between the provincial and federal agencies involved, surveillance of foods for residues and surveillance of the use of pesticides.

Senator Walker: If that is so, and you have it under control now and you hope it will be "nil"—there have only been five cases to date—Do you really need this bill?

Mr. Jefferson: There has been a great deal of demand for something of this nature and, as I mentioned earlier, it was felt that to have this kind of legislation in position would provide an assurance to farmers and producers that their interests were going to be protected when they followed official recommendations as to the use of pesticides. We are concerned that they do use pesticides properly, and to the extent required to produce inexpensive and wholesome food.

The Chairman: Is the committee prepared to accept the suggestion I made that we approve the bill with the exception of section 5, which we shall stand for the purpose of further consideration, in the light of the discussion that has gone on here this morning, as to whether any greater burden should be imposed on the farmer in respect of his