

tax in the price of a product today, when he knows perfectly well there is.

\* \* \*

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. We talked earlier about the international agreement that was made in 1988 to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20 per cent by the year 2005. Everyone was going to give this serious consideration. The minister's own report released this weekend says: "Canada is the world's fourth largest producer of carbon dioxide on a per capita basis".

Clearly, Canada has a responsibility to show some leadership rather than simply saying "Yes, we will think globally, but we won't do anything locally."

Other countries have made the commitment to take some leadership on this issue and cut emissions now. They include countries like Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Will the minister commit himself and his government to set targets now for a 20 per cent CO<sub>2</sub> reduction by the year 2005?

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I think that we must straighten out the fact which has been expressed in the question. The Toronto conference in 1988 did not conclude with an agreement. It was an international conference which issued a report recommending that countries of the world make a commitment to reduce the emission of CO<sub>2</sub> by 20 per cent by the year 2005.

Since then all the countries of the world have been trying to define how it can be achieved. Canada is at the forefront of those countries.

While we were in Norway a few months ago we strongly supported and actually led a statement agreeing that we must stabilize the level of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by the year 2000 at the 1988 level. People know that Canada is probably one of the most advanced countries in this objective. Canada must make a commitment, but the only way to achieve a real result would be to do it through an international convention because Canada accounts for only 2 per cent of the CO<sub>2</sub> problem of the world.

### Oral Questions

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the same minister. The only way to do something is to do it, and that is what Canadians are asking of this government.

What this government has been good at is studying studies. In fact, after the 1988 conference and that recommendation, the former energy minister did commission a study from DPA Consulting to study CO<sub>2</sub> emission and targeting.

It its report to the government, DPA Consulting said that by setting that objective of a 20 per cent reduction by the year 2005 we could not only save the environment, we could save money, some \$100 billion in those years as a result of reducing carbon dioxide. That is \$4,000 for every man, woman and child.

It does not need to be studied yet again. It is quite clear that we have to do something now. When is he going to set targets? When is he going to meet this objective?

• (1430 )

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon member's question, when she puts forward the DPA consultants' report, I think it is important to take a look at what the Minister of the Environment has said about the 1988 conference which is absolutely correct.

What happened after 1988 was that energy ministers established a task force for the purpose of determining how we could meet or move toward that 20 per cent target from the point of view of the energy portfolios, provincially and territorially on the one hand, and federally on the other.

The DPA consultants' study was a study commissioned by the task force set up by provincial and federal energy ministers. At yesterday's meeting in Kananaskis the task force clearly reported to the ministers that it did not agree with the DPA consultants' study. It does not believe that that target can be met in the manner in which DPA has put it forward.

The task force gave us indications of how we could move toward the 20 per cent target. That is why the Minister of the Environment and others of us are going to get into the consultation, which is the route to go as opposed to one which is based simply on an illogical