

Supply

the challenge. That is what we are faced with today. How can we combine a positive sense of economic management and a proactive approach with respect to sustained environmental development?

Clearly, one of the things that I believe is critical is that we have to end what has increasingly become the artificial confrontation between economic activity on one side and environmental protection on the other. What troubled me particularly about the questions raised surrounding the award given to the Prime Minister, both to him personally and I assume also to Canada and Canadians for the particular concern we have about the environment, is that to make the false and continuing dichotomy between economic interests, business interests, industrial interests and those who are concerned with the environment does none of us good service.

I would like to quote one individual who has dedicated his adult life to fighting pollution and dealing with environmental issues. Colin Isaacs, the executive director of Pollution Probe, has recently recognized that there are in fact companies which previously were regarded as being primary offenders in the pollution problem but are now becoming part of the solution. He mentions specifically Loblaw's, Alcan and Dow Chemical. Hon. Members will know that Loblaw's has recently adopted an entire program of environmentally friendly products supported by Pollution Probe. It is interesting that Alcan, mentioned specifically by Isaacs, is the one Canadian company that is included in the international group that made the award to the Prime Minister.

We have to change how we get at these problems if we are ever to get beyond the kind of reactive, crisis-oriented approach which has for so long prevented us from becoming environmentally responsible. When one reads the Speech from the Throne and looks at the environmental imperative which is in fact a major priority for the Government and Parliament, there can be no doubt that there is a seriousness here that is without historic precedent. The formation of the round table is in itself significant in that it tries to bring together in a creative

fashion those who have both economic and environmental responsibility.

• (1650)

The Member from Oshawa has done a good service in allowing us to start this debate. I only wish he himself had engaged in it. We need to find practical, workable approaches both to economic and social advancement as well as to environmental enhancement. I trust that when we return, as we will increasingly to these matters, both the Member for Oshawa and other Members will provide more of a positive note. For the moment, I would have to say to the Member from Oshawa that I would only give him a C or C- for the way in which this critically important motion has been addressed by him, and for this particular opposition debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Scarborough West, and then the Hon. Member for Vancouver East.

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Hon. Member's speech, and particularly the title of his address which, I think, was Good Economics and Good Ecology Make Good Sense. I would suggest that it be subtitled, What Price Environmental Protection? I have grave difficulty in tying in a Budget and a deficit to the protection of the environment. Without being unduly dramatic, it really does not matter if the deficit is \$5 billion or \$500 billion if the air we breathe is filthy, if the lakes we swim in cannot be used. You cannot link the deficit to the protection of the environment. You cannot scrimp on the cleaning up of a country by trying to save dollars and cents, because there is no correlation between the environment, our health and that of future generations and saving money by reducing environmental protection policies.

We heard from the Member from Kent (Mr. Crawford). I would be very interested in the Hon. Member's comments as to why Members opposite have not done something with respect to the problems that he pointed out in his speech. Is it a matter of money? Is it because that Government considers it more important to save dollars than to save the environment?