

sury Board just made a comment, and I will overlook it because he was lost when he issued his financial statement. There were words in that financial statement that were not carried through in the cuts.

The reason I made the statement is that when you remove a service from such a vital area of input as the use of chemicals, not on the ground but in the air, and when you remove an input from the registration of a chemical that is being sprayed over an entire province and you remove a vital aspect in determining whether or not to use that chemical, how long you are going to use it, or what size the droplet will be, when you remove that vital information that nobody else is going to provide, then you are getting into an area that is very very dangerous.

If you look at Canadian history and examine what has happened over the years in this country, you see that there are people who have written books on the subject and articles that said that perhaps our mistake happened when we used chemicals in aerial sprays. Perhaps that is what happened. Perhaps we should be looking at what they do in Europe in controlled woodlots. Perhaps we should have bird nurseries instead of using chemicals. Perhaps there are other options that are open.

When one makes an across-the-board cut and says for public consumption, "I am not going to touch migratory birds and endangered species", the ordinary person says, "That's good. We all love endangered species. We all love migratory birds". In that way one gets away with the cut on the basis of immediate reaction from the public generally. Nobody looks at the long-term effects or the drastic effects that are in place. You are not looking at birds that were not endangered, you are looking at species that were not endangered, nor at migratory birds, and there is the whole point. Down the road, a future Government will come along and reinstate every one of those cuts. If things keep going the way they are, if the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret) keeps forcing Ministers to cut the budgets of their Departments *ad hoc*, if he keeps doing that in conjunction with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), the Government will not last beyond the next election.

● (1630)

Mr. Pat Binns (Cardigan): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to participate in the debate on this non-confidence motion before the House. Actually I am surprised that the Opposition has decided to condemn the Government for its negligent and irresponsible approach to protection and management of the environment. It would be shocking if that were true, if it had some basis in fact, but the resolution itself has no basis in fact. I should like to try to point that out during the next few minutes.

When we look at the environment and its protection, we have to look at more than just what is within the jurisdiction of one Minister or that Minister's Department. For example, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Government made a substantial and important move in appointing the Cabinet of the new Government and in appointing the Minister of State

Supply

for Forestry (Mr. Merrithew). The Minister of State for Forestry is perhaps as important to environmental issues as any other person aside from the Minister herself. For that reason, we see right off the bat that environmental issues have at least two strong supporters with Ministries in Cabinet at the present time. That is a pronounced and dramatic improvement in the situation. In fact, it is the first time in almost two decades that an independent portfolio has been created in the Government of Canada to take care of forestry. What could be more important to environmental matters than taking care of our forests and the natural habitat of much of Canada's wildlife?

The Opposition has gone on at some length in regard to the substantial cuts made to environmental programs. Yes, there have been changes in priorities and cuts have been made. However, let us take a look at the budgetary summaries. I think they speak for themselves. In the Minister's summary it was suggested that almost \$727 million will be spent by the Department of Environment in 1985-86. If we compare that figure with the one for last year, there is a \$15 million cut, but we have to determine how much \$15 million is in relation to the \$727 million. We will soon see that the decrease is a little over 2 per cent. That hardly reflects the kinds of accusations which opposition caucuses have been making in this debate today. If we take into account the toxicology support which the Government is providing at the present time, I am told that we will find that the budget for environmental matters is actually up 3.8 per cent.

I could be a little more specific in terms of some of the support which is being provided to groups and organizations and to various issues across the country, but it is important to realize that there are more issues in the environment than the ones noted so far by the Opposition. There is continued support at the same levels to groups such as the Canadian Association of Geographers, the International Geographic Union, and the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers. There is continued support at the same levels as those of the past for the Canadian Wildlife Federation and the Canadian Nature Federation. There is an increase in the budget for the Creston Valley Wildlife Management Authority. There is a new figure for the Wildlife Habitat Canada Foundation, a new injection of \$1.3 million, which the Opposition did not point out during the debate so far. There is another increase to the Fur Institute of Canada of \$500,000. If we continue through the Estimates we find an increase to the James Bay Agreement project, to the Red River Ring Dyking project and to the Qu'Appelle Valley project in Saskatchewan.

Perhaps we could look at the reductions. I suggest these have been omitted by the Opposition as well. If we look at the specifics—and perhaps I will not go into them—we will quickly see that the reductions probably reflect those programs introduced by the former Government in its last ditch attempts to be re-elected.

There are other contributions which I think are significant in terms of the over-all objectives of the Government. For instance, there is the contribution to the National and Provin-