

S. O. 31

world is going, to even bring up the word sustainable development, such is their fear of coming in to the 1990s.

Over the last five years, since 1984 when this government took over in power, what have we seen but dramatic cuts in research and development for alternative energy sources. Today, less than 10 per cent of all the research and development done on energy, is done in terms of renewable energy resources. Is there no understanding on the other side of the House with regard to the needs of economy and the needs of people?

What I am expressing is not simply a personal opinion. In a report card published this summer on those nations which make up the G-7, it was stated and I quote: "How does Canada, in relationship to sustainable development, score relative to other countries?" The result is, poorly. Over all, Canada was tied with Japan for fifth place out of seven. We were behind West Germany, France, the United States, and we were behind Margaret Thatcher's United Kingdom. The reason for this is as follows: "The reason for Canada's poor performance is that when it comes to translating high-sounding principles into domestic policies, regulation enforcement and funding, the federal government"—the government that the members opposite represent—"really falls down." In other words, we are good at espousing principles such as sustainable development, but we do not yet possess the national political will to translate such principles into effective domestic action.

That is the problem that we have faced in the country since 1984. This government has not had the political will or the leadership to bring this nation into the last decade of this century. How can the government be so short-sighted? Sustainable development applies to every single field of economic activity. It applies to agriculture. The Canadian farmer is struggling. Farm debt is—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member will have nine minutes remaining in his debate, plus 10 minutes of questions and comments.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[English]

CANADA POST

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester): Mr. Speaker, for over a year and a half the people living in the Atlantis Housing Complex at 143 Ryland Avenue in Bible Hill, Nova Scotia, have been fighting to get door-to-door mail delivery to their homes. All the units have separate sidewalks and similar service comes all the way up to their units and then past them to the next houses.

Because of a very small technicality, these people, many of whom are seniors, have been denied door-to-door service. In the last several months I have been in touch with officials at Canada Post many times regarding this issue. Although they have been accessible and co-operative, my constituents still do not have a satisfactory resolution to their problem.

This case is now under its final appeal and I urge the post office officials to apply common sense and extend this service to 143 Ryland Avenue.

* * *

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Bob Wood (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks we have heard a lot of talk about democracy and the supremacy of the will of the people. The GST debate is a case in point. It is no secret that the people of Canada overwhelmingly reject the GST. Over 80 per cent of all Canadians oppose this regressive tax, and the number continues to grow. In fact, from my riding of Nipissing alone, I have received well over 6,000 protest cards on the GST and how it will escalate the cost of such basic services as hydroelectricity.

Despite this opposition, the government is continuing to push ahead, regardless of what the people believe. Who is being undemocratic here when the will of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance can prevail over the will of millions of Canadians? How democratic is it when people with incomes of \$100,000 or more pay