

away, it will have a tough time finding a safe Conservative seat in the next federal election.

I spoke with Michel Clair, who is the former President of the Treasury Board of Quebec, and who is presently the President of *le Centre d'accueil du Québec*. He gave me some very distressing figures which would respond specifically to the question of my hon. colleague from Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. Michel Clair has said that the loss of transfer of payments will mean, first, \$300 million this year and \$600,000 next year, lost to Quebec. That is almost \$1 billion we are losing.

When the Minister of Finance says that there are no new taxes, there are new taxes. He also told me—I have seen this in recent reports in the papers—that what is occurring is that the Quebec government is going to have to make up the difference. Right now the manufacturers have addressed some of the responsible bureaucrats from the provincial Ministry of Finance to see if they cannot get a 6.5 per cent goods and services tax on a provincial basis in Quebec. Those are the taxes of the Wilson budget from the Mulroney government.

Another point I would like to make is that the number of people who are distressed and the overloaded emergency wards are terrible. It is unacceptable. This is going to get worse and not better, according to Michel Clair, because these people will either be turned away or will have to wait unduly across the province because the money is not there.

[Translation]

**Mr. Waddell:** Madam Speaker, I too would like to congratulate the hon. member for Chambly on his election and on his maiden speech. He said that the Wilson budget was a separatist budget, a budget that is not good for federalism and that is against the social contract. He also said that his constituents are against the GST. I want to tell him that my constituents on the west coast are also against this budget. I think that, finally, we have found something that unites our country.

[English]

In other words, we finally found something recently that unifies the country and that is the opposition to the GST.

### *The Budget*

I want to ask the hon. member a double-headed question. First, he issued alternatives such as a minimum corporate tax, lower interest rates and lower defence spending and I wonder if he had any other ones. Also, I wonder—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Unfortunately, the time for questions and comments is now over. There was a minute-and-a-half left. I thought the hon. member could use it, but the time has now expired.

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Madam Speaker, on this side of the House, we must ask why this budget, three years after the publication of the Brundtland report, ignores sustainable development. Why, since 1984, is the government retreating on environmental protection? Why does the Environment Department, including this year's increase, receive less than 1 per cent of the federal budget, slipping from fifteenth to sixteenth place on the list of allocations, department by department? That is a shameful record in contrast with the many declarations by this government on sustainable development, including that signed in 1989 by the Prime Minister in The Hague firmly committing Canada to the principle of sustainable development.

We heard about the cancellation of federal funding for the OSLO oil sands project. Why? To save money, not to save the environment. Because of the deficit, not because of global warming. In fact, the energy minister recently assured the oil industry that if oil prices go up, the federal government may again spend millions of taxpayers' money.

*The Calgary Herald* in a commentary a few days ago called for a realistic assessment of what Ottawa's pull-out means for the future of OSLO and oil sands developments. I quote:

—it changes the situation very little, if at all. Ottawa will continue to pay its share of the roughly \$140-million worth of engineering work that will take the project to blueprint stage sometime in 1991.

The Prime Minister signed the Hague Convention on Canada's behalf. Canada is committed to slowing down climate warming. Why then does he not stick to the promises he makes abroad on environmental issues and start reducing our dependence in future on fossil fuels? Why is the Government of Canada not capable, despite this tired and unimaginative regime, of delivering on what Canadians are demanding in poll after poll, namely, action to protect the environment and global climate, to implement sustainable development, to integrate the