

*Supply*

the hope that you would pass the exam with flying colours, or if you knew very little on the subject, quickly go off in the opposite direction and say as much as you could in the hope the professor would not look at it too carefully.

I have the feeling that that is what has happened here today. The motion presented to us by the Hon. Member for Oshawa states:

That this House condemns the Government for failing to ensure fairness and equality to all Canadians, and for failing to make protection of the environment a priority.

One must wonder, having listened to the last three or four hours of debate, what the Member for Oshawa had in mind.

As I sat here this morning listening to his remarks, I was more than a little surprised that from start to finish, and even in overtime which the Hon. Member for Oshawa was permitted, there was absolutely no mention of anything with respect to the environment, in spite of the fact that that was the one specific item in this brief motion. Rather, as the Hon. Member himself said, he was participating in this "historic budget debate".

We on the Government side have tried to respond as best we can to the dilemma placed before us by the Hon. Member for Oshawa. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bouchard) did what I think was the responsible thing and responded on behalf of the Government with respect to the Government's priorities on environmental issues. Then the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Vincent) and others, tried to deal with the matters raised by the Member for Oshawa.

I am not going to spend very long on the Hon. Member for Oshawa's remarks except to say that I am more than a little troubled by the thrust of his remarks. Apart from the fact that he did not speak to his own motion, and the public will have to decide about that, his discussions about turning back the clock reflect more a state of mind, I feel, within the New Democratic Party than any particular criticism he might have directed our way.

We have heard once again from the Member for Oshawa some prescriptions from the dead hand of yesterday's socialism. If this is his best response to a new Parliament, and the deepening crisis of the deficit and the public debt, this does not bode well for the future.

The Member for Oshawa went on at some length lamenting the impact that changes in the nature of taxation would have on the implications for Medicare, pensions, or promised day care programs. There seemed to be no acknowledgement whatsoever on the ultimate impact a loss of economic responsibility would have on our capacity and ability to fund any of these programs.

I cannot for the life of me understand why he would make the speech that he did without some responsible recognition of the fundamental importance of a sound economy and a sound economic management in order to meet all these social objectives so strongly registered by the Hon. Member for Oshawa.

There was a kind of a philosophy, if I may dare to say so, of: "Eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die". Or pay, pay, pay, spend, spend, spend and some day, somewhere, someone will find the resources necessary to cover all of this, even though our ability to do so will become increasingly limited as the debt grows faster than any other aspect of federal expenditures.

There is some slight hope, because the Member for Oshawa talked about creativity and community. In returning to academia, maybe he is going to give some thought as to how we can begin to look at the new problems that we are faced with, one of which he mentioned in his motion with respect to the threat of environmental destruction, but unfortunately did not refer to it in his remarks.

The Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) made a much more direct speech. I am sorry that she is not here at the moment but I would like to say that I am grateful she has registered some of the issues that she sees as being important with respect environmental questions. But I am very much troubled that she made a considerable point which was followed up in Question Period this afternoon by an attack on the award that is to be given to our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) today in Washington. I wonder what the message is in all this. This award, which is being given only for the second time by an agency that is part of the International Chamber of Commerce, is meant to acknowledge the kind of public and international leadership which in the first instance last year was shown by Prime Minister Brundtland of Norway, in her pioneering efforts with the World Commission on Development, and for the second time in international history by our Prime Minister.