

row, not by next year, but by the year 2000, ten years from now.

This is not some ridiculous claim but simply a claim based on the scientific evidence that if we do not do this by the year 2000 we will not be able to do it ever because the very lands that need to be set aside will have disappeared as a result of development and other means of transformation.

The government opposes this motion, Madam Speaker. Surely the government is concerned, as everyone is, about the disappearance of the tropical rain forests, whether it is in Brazil, Sarawak or wherever. The government's attitude to this motion is that it has no intention of setting an example. It has no intention of being able to speak to these other countries about what they are doing to the global environment from any sort of moral high ground at all.

In fact some of these countries which are the object of global concern have already set aside more land as wilderness area, or as untouchable area, than Canada has. And yet our governments and many Canadians, in a quite self-deluding way, imagine that we are the sort of environmental good guys in the world. We are not. We have clear cut more acreage in Ontario and British Columbia than we would ever want to admit to the rest of the world. And in Manitoba now, as the result of a deal called the Repap Deal, we have ceded a fifth of the province to some entrepreneur who will turn it into disposable diapers and various other unneeded paper products. That is where we are at environmentally and yet we propose to lecture the people of Sarawak or the people of Brazil.

I think we should lecture the people of Sarawak or Brazil. But in the same way that we felt in order to make a real case to the United States about acid rain we had to have an acid cleanup action program in our own country, we need to show that we are serious about preserving old growth forests, tropical forests, whatever the case may be, on Vancouver Island and in various other parts of Canada. We have not done that. The barbarism with respect to our forestry continues. We act as if it is still the 19th century. That is what is at stake here.

I cannot imagine a more devastating argument in international circles than to have some of these countries—they have embassies here, they will notice when this is raised in international fora—say that there was a motion to the effect that Canada comply with the

Government Orders

Brundtland Report recommendations on natural heritage by the year 2000 which was defeated in our parliament. Who are we talking to? Why should they listen to us? It was defeated by our own government. That is going to be embarrassing. It is going to be embarrassing for the government. It is going to be embarrassing for all Canadians.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): Assuming the government cares.

Mr. Blaikie: My colleague from Edmonton says "assuming the government cares". I do not think the government does care, frankly. I think it sees the environment as an issue to be managed in the interests of good public relations, sort of a political problem which, if taken seriously, would be at odds with their other beliefs about the nature of economic growth and the nature of the economy. And so the government does its best to bide its time and hope to get by with the least possible environmental protection, meanwhile saying the right things, speaking to the right conferences.

This is what we have and in a way this is the downside, if you like, of everyone being concerned about the environment. As someone who has been concerned about the environment for a long time, I welcome the fact that everybody is concerned about the environment. But it makes life more difficult in a way for the environment because when everybody is for the environment, it is more difficult to tell who is really for the environment and who has just got a public relations strategy. It becomes harder and harder to discern the false prophets from the true prophets. It becomes harder and harder to distinguish the environmentalists from the ad men. That is one of the things with which we are going to have to deal. It is a necessary stage, if you like. It comes with the fact that the environment is at the top of the polls. This means that every Tom, Dick, Harry or Susan is now going to be preaching about the environment.

• (1530)

I think the Canadian people have to do two things; they have to ask themselves who was raising matters of the environment in this House and elsewhere across the country when everybody on this side, whether they were on this side or when they were in opposition, still thought that it was kind of a funny thing to do. They still thought that it was a kind of peculiar, hippy-dippy, left over from the sixties kind of thing to do, for back-to-the-landers and other freaks. I will tell you who it was, it was the