

*Government Orders*

ment. Of course, the reverse argument was used on the government side. As a result, we did not have an opportunity in Parliament for members of Parliament to express themselves outside this whole notion of confidence and non-confidence. That was the purpose of the reform. Yet here today we have the Minister of the Environment getting up and doing exactly what the reform was intended to prevent. Having raised it on a point of order, the Minister of Justice and government House Leader gets up and says—and I can only interpret it this way—that at the political level, not the procedural level, this is now a matter of confidence for the government. Why would it be a matter of non-confidence in the government if a motion supporting the goals that it alleges itself to have were to pass?

• (1520)

I rest my case, Madam Speaker. I do not want to talk about the procedural point all day because there are other things to talk about. One of the other things to talk about, of course, is what over-all context the minister's behaviour ought to be placed in today. That over-all context is getting to be an over-all context and record of disappointment when it comes to the environment.

The member for Lac-Saint-Jean, the Minister of the Environment, came to this House with a great deal of expectation held by a great many people in all parties. When he was made the Minister of the Environment there were people on all sides of the House who thought that here is a guy who might make a difference, here is a guy close to the Prime Minister, a Quebec lieutenant or whatever, maybe he can make a real difference. Instead, what happened is he had to be taken to court twice in order for the federal government to live up to its responsibilities for environmental review vis-a-vis the Rafferty-Alameda Dam. He had to be taken to court twice.

He finally did the right thing, on the last possible day he could have done it, when 60 per cent of one of the dams was already completed. Is this the great environmental hope of the Conservative government?

With respect to the international centre for sustainable development which was promised in 1988 in Winnipeg by the Prime Minister during the election campaign, have we seen anything that would give us any reason to

believe that there was any sincerity in that promise at all?

I see the hon. member for Provencher is in the House. Maybe he would like to get up later and explain why we have not seen any sign at all in Winnipeg that this centre will actually ever be built. Instead, the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Environment will go about the globe announcing, at various environmental conferences where they get, believe it or not, awards, this international centre that they are building in Winnipeg about which they have done absolutely nothing.

How long will it be before the Canadian public wakes up? I think the Canadian public has woken up to the fact that when it comes to the environment these people are charlatans; these people are frauds; these people are tricksters; these people do not mean what they say when it comes to the environment.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blaikie:** Shoal Lake is another Manitoba-Ontario transboundary issue. We are getting it from both sides in Manitoba. We are getting arsenic in our drinking water from Ontario and we are having the Rafferty-Alameda Dam pollute the Souris River.

What do we get from the government? The hon. member for Brandon—Souris got up, when responding to me in a late show not too long ago, and said that this is not really a matter of federal jurisdiction. And I got a letter from the Minister of National Health and Welfare the other day saying that even if he passed a safe drinking water act it would still be up to the provinces.

This is leadership? Basically it is a do anything you like to the environment scenario. These guys won't do anything unless, of course, you have enough money and enough time—and thank God the Canadian Wildlife Federation did—to take them to court and make them live up to their own responsibilities.

What we have asked for in this motion is what the Brundtland Commission asked for. We have the Prime Minister dancing all around the globe saying he supports Brundtland. He even reminded me in the House one day that he got an award from Brundtland. Yet his government is unwilling to support a motion that calls upon it to live up to the Brundtland Commission report with respect to the setting aside of natural lands, not tomor-