

future, it should be strengthening this Bill. If we had a strong Environmental Protection Act with the necessary legislative power, we would not have the major concerns which we have about what the environmental impacts of the Canada-U.S. trade agreement will be. There are some major concerns in that area.

I come from a riding where there are very deep concerns about industrial pollution of the environment. The industries are now taking steps to attempt to improve this situation. A major initiative by a group of citizens who call themselves the stakeholders, identified and put forward on the public agenda the need to protect Hamilton Harbour from further pollution and to restore it to the state it was in when our ancestors were enjoying it.

The federal Government should be commended for announcing a grant to clean up the Windermere Basin in conjunction with the province, the Hamilton—Wentworth region, and the United States. However, it gives me great grief that the environmental Act before us will not give us the legislative power to restrict types of pollution in the future. I say that with deep regret because there has been much debate in this country on the U.S. trade agreement. Yet there has been absolutely no commitment by the Government to protect the environment with any international trade agreements, and this gives me great concern.

We will, however, be supporting this Bill since it is at least a small step toward identifying more toxic substances and stopping them from being dumped into our environment. We have a vision for this country. It will not be long before there is a change in government. A New Democratic Government will protect the environment because it will believe in a country with total environmental protection. That will certainly have to come to pass before this dreadful trade agreement is implemented.

I have a study which was done by the Canadian Environmental Law Association which is very concerned. It says that the environmental implications of these changes are profound. We face significant restrictions on our options to develop conservation strategies for our resources. It must put fear into all Canadians to realize that we will have to supply the U.S. market in the same proportions, even in times of shortages. That means that we will have to continue to exploit our resources far beyond what our needs would be because we entered into this agreement.

If we look at what is happening with regard to the harmonization of agricultural technical regulations, we soon recognize that the provisions provide that technical regulations and standards for agricultural food, beverage, and certain related goods, are to be harmonized, defined as "made identical". The standards to be harmonized include animal quarantine restrictions, accreditation procedures for inspections, approval requirements for new goods and processes, and technical regulations, including levels of quality, performance, and safety or dimensions. Working groups will be established to

Canadian Environmental Protection Act

harmonize standards on various agricultural issues including veterinary drugs and fees; food, beverage, and colour additives; unavoidable contaminants, pesticides; and labelling and packaging of agricultural food, beverages, and certain related goods for human consumption.

The Government has consistently refused to include pesticides in this Bill. To identify that there will be a need to harmonize this with the trade agreement is very serious. In Canada we do not concede that a category of unavoidable contaminant is permissible in food products, and I hope that we never reach that stage. The Canadian Environmental Law Association has a very deep concern with the implications of what this regulation and harmonization for the regulation of pesticides are all about.

According to federal officials, between 1971 and 1981 total pesticide sales in Canada increased twelve-fold in current dollars, from \$57.3 million to \$698 million, and more than four-fold when adjusted according to Statistics Canada price of index pesticides. At least 10 million acres in 1975 were treated with herbicides on the Canadian Prairies. By 1978 this had increased to about 15.5 million acres. In 1976 alone Canada imported almost 117 million pounds of pesticides from the United States. Yet, at this time we are refusing to include pesticides as part of our Environmental Protection Act. One must question what the word "protection" means in the title of this Act.

We know that the use of pesticides involves the deliberate application to land and water of chemicals which are intended to be poisonous to selected organisms. Two categories of undesirable affects resulting from pesticide use have been identified. These are the development of the resistance in pest species and the impact on non-target species and organisms.

● (1230)

The United Nations Environment Program has stated that even when properly used chemical pesticides have a number of unavoidable side effects. These include three million bird deaths in New Brunswick during 1975 from aerial spraying of approximately seven million acres of forest with phosphamidon and penitrothion; the death of a farm worker in 1983 in British Columbia from pesticide poisoning; the possibility that 10 per cent of Alberta grain farmers may be experiencing pesticide poisoning every year; and the Canada-Ontario report on pollution of the St. Clair River, estimating that about 70 per cent of the 2.5 million kilograms of agricultural pesticides used annually on the lands draining into connecting channels of the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers are potentially environmentally hazardous.

In addition, the presence of agricultural pesticides and residues in food has also been identified in Ontario. It seems insane to exclude pesticides from an environmental protection Bill when we know these facts.

Currently in Canada our regulatory scheme for pesticides has received increased scrutiny with the publication of the Law