

Adjournment Debate

questions and wants a hundred specific answers. I will be specific on this point.

The wildlife toxicology fund now has 14 proposals before it; six of which have been accepted, one of which has been refused, and eight of which are in additional assessment areas. Those are additional active programs in areas of research which include the effects on agriculture and forest chemicals as well as the effects of toxic pollutants on wildlife, the monitoring of the success of measures to mitigate these effects, the development and implementation of techniques that use wildlife as indicators for toxic chemicals in the environment, and environmental pathways by which toxic substances may affect wildlife. That is just one specific example of what is working and what we are doing.

I would like to speak very specifically to the matter of inventory which the Member brought up in his comments. Canada is one of the few industrialized countries that has not had an inventory of toxic chemicals. We have had serious meetings in preparation for providing that inventory of over—

Mr. Caccia: That is a Liberal initiative.

Mr. Gurbin: It started and was not finished. It is something that has to be done. It is something that the Government will accomplish.

There were many other things which were started and talked about. The Member for Davenport was very careful to talk about Treasury approval year after year of funds which were never sure and about different programs that were never sure. He knows that the majority of those programs were concluded or incorporated into other programs. In fact, we have taken and will continue to take new initiatives following the three major assessments which are now underway. One is being done by ourselves and one is being done by the Science Council of Canada. An additional area of assessment is in our scientific research into toxic chemicals.

My time is up, Mr. Speaker, so I must stop, but I look forward to my next interchange with the Member for Davenport, and I wish him a merry Christmas.

TRADE—CANADA-UNITED STATES NEGOTIATIONS—
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING QUOTAS. (B) QUOTAS—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his warm round of applause. On December 2 I asked a very important question of the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) which he dealt with in a very light manner. That really surprised me because I have the utmost respect for the hon. gentleman. I asked him a very fundamental question on trade as it pertained to the shoe industry and to agriculture.

I asked the Minister if dairy programs would be sacrificed in free trade negotiations with the United States. To that he answered, of course, that the programs would not be sacrificed. Being the non-partisan person that you are, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that the only reasonable supplementary

question would be to ask the Minister how we could believe him when the Government lied about the quotas on shoes. Why should we believe that the Government will preserve the quotas in the dairy industry, as it said it would, when it also said the same thing about the shoe industry? I am sure you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Government did not live up to its promise in that regard. I will prove to you that it did not.

I have a story from the Canadian Press of May 4, 1984, which appeared in *Le Journal de Montréal*. It says:

A Conservative Government will not remove footwear or textiles quotas imposed by Canada, stated the Leader of the Conservative Party, Brian Mulroney, to the newspaper *La Tribune*.

"The quota policy will remain the same as it is", declared Mr. Mulroney, adding that he was not for free trade in those industries.

He added that he will not "bow" to the pressure that might come from countries of the Common Market or from the United States in order to reduce footwear and textile quotas.

● (1910)

What we received was in fact inconsistent with the truth. I bring this to your attention because the dairy farmers of my constituency are very concerned. They have been phoning me and asking if their quotas will disappear next. That is a very legitimate question.

In attempting to represent my constituents the best way I can—which I am sure all Members of the House would want me to do—I have sent a petition to every farmer in my riding which I will table in the House in the same manner that we have been tabling petitions lately. The purpose of this is to get a firm commitment from the Government and ensure that it will not bargain away the dairy programs, poultry programs and other market-sharing quota programs that we have in Canada.

I sent this petition, with a letter which I have in my hand now, to every farmer in my riding. I am asking that they sign a petition which states that the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mulroney) give his immediate personal assurance that no agricultural program will be sacrificed in the free-trade negotiations with the United States.

The farmers of Canada have to be reassured, not simply with empty words as we heard about the shoe quotas. We need the truth rather than more empty rhetoric. We have had enough of the Government making promises and breaching them.

The Tory Government breached another promise this afternoon when it failed to introduce lobbying legislation in the way the Prime Minister promised in his death-bed repentance speech of September 9.

We on this side of the House are fed up. The people of Canada are fed up, as demonstrated in the public opinion polls, with getting evasive answers from the Government. We need a commitment that what it says in the future will be the truth.

With respect to this issue, the Government should ensure that free-trade negotiations concerning agriculture will not endanger the existing programs. We need a firm commitment