[Translation]

STARRED QUESTIONS

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Forestry)): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 367?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Starred question No. 367.

Mr. Champagne: Considering the length of this reply, I would ask that it be printed in *Hansard* without being read.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

DEFICIT/NATIONAL DEBT

*Question No. 367-Mr. Duhamel:

- 1. What are the expected figures for the (*ita*ro) deficit (*itb*ro) national debt at the end of the present fiscal year and do these figures include unfunded pension liability for current or former government employees?
- 2. For the fiscal years 1982-83 and 1983-84, what were the figures for the (a) deficit (b) national debt?
- Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): 1. The budgetary deficit for 1990–91 could run between \$1 billion and \$1 1/2 billion higher than the February 1990 Budget forecast, but is still expected to be held under the \$30 billion mark. The national debt at the end of the present fiscal year is expected to be under \$388 billion. These figures include unfunded pension liabilities for current and former government employees.
- 2. For the fiscal years 1982–83 and 1983–84, the deficit figures were \$28,734 million and \$32,723 million respectively. The corresponding figures for the national debt at the end of these years were \$135,262 million and \$167,985 million. These are revised figures and include the accounting changes introduced in the 1989–90 Public Accounts of Canada wich responded to the concerns of the government, the Auditor General, the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and the Canadian Insti-

Routine Proceedings

tute of Chartered Accountants regarding the recording of liablilities for employee pensions.

[Translation]

Mr. Champagne: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES

Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Mr. Speaker, according to Standing Order 52, I ask for an emergency debate to discuss the consequences arising from the failure of the government's environmental policies.

[Translation]

Our common future demands environmental policies and actions that are clear and, above all, consistent. It is obvious this government has no idea of what is required to protect the environment. It is also obvious that the inherent risks of such a situation are so great that there is an urgent need to debate this question here in the House.

[English]

Specifically the House must deal with the government's complete and abject incompetence surrounding Rafferty-Alameda, the failure of the government to exercise its jurisdiction in the case of Point Aconi, in the case of Kemano in British Columbia and the general failure of the government to exercise environmental jurisdiction in terms of native rights and health.

What is particularly worrisome is the fact that day after day the minister has stood up and said that Bill C-78 is this government's basic answer to the tremendous problems facing the environment in this country.

Bill C-78 is a bill designed to give tremendous comfort to polluters across this country. The bill is a weakening of the general guidelines which will apply as a result of