

Supply

Therefore, it is clear that there is what I would term utter confusion at the helm of the Department of Energy. No one seems to be paying any attention to the Prime Minister's commitment to sustainable development, judging from the behaviour and the statements that I referred to a moment ago. The Minister of Energy, and perhaps Cabinet, seem to have failed to realize that energy policy is environmental policy at its best. It is of particular significance because of its impact on the environment.

Therefore, to give this motion extra teeth in terms of an environmentally-sustainable future, I propose some amendments that will bring energy to the very centre of the thrust of this particular motion. The motion before us calls on the Government to produce a plan to achieve a minimal discharge of deleterious substances into the environment. That is fine.

How can such a plan, desirable as it is and as urgent as the matter is, be successful without ecological tax reform and without powerful disincentives for those who do not comply? It seems to me that achieving minimal discharges for activities inside and, even more importantly, outside the scope of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, requires the establishment of enforceable national standards. Not guidelines, not codes, but standards. The ability to establish national standards was dropped at a time when the environmental protection Bill was in committee and went through the House last year. That was because of the virulence at that time of the Meech Lake virus. For this reason, paragraph 3 in the motion before us today needs to be strengthened.

In conclusion, the motion is a very good one. The following amendment is offered to strengthen the desirability for the House to support and to approve it.

Therefore, I move that the motion before us today be amended by adding, after the last line, the following:

(4) Each Department and Agency of the Government review its policies, programs, projects and budgets to determine their contribution to a sustainable future and the Government table, by June 5, 1990, the findings;

June 5, 1990 would be the beginning of Environment Week next year. Keeping in mind that anniversary, the motion further states:

(5) The Government table, by June 5, 1990, a strategy to reduce by at least 20 per cent Canada's carbon dioxide emissions by the year 2005 based on 1988 levels;

(6) The Government introduce, by September 30, 1989, amendments to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act to allow Canada to have enforceable national standards to prevent pollution.

Only with enforceable national standards will we be able to get somewhere in doing the cleanup and in maintaining the standards that we wish to achieve in our country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will consider the admissibility of the proposed amendments of the Hon. Member for Davenport and make a ruling shortly.

In the meantime, we will proceed to the question and comment period. The Hon. Member for Mississauga West.

• (1630)

Mr. Horner: We all agree with a lot of things that have been said by the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia). We know when we sit day after day and pass legislation that it is not worth a thing if we do not look after the environmental issues that face this country today. However, I think the Opposition is being simplistic about the whole situation. The Member from Davenport has since 1984 doggedly brought up environmental issues. For that, I congratulate him. Mr. Speaker, since you and I were elected in 1984, we have recognized his work in this field. But prior to that the Member for Davenport was the Minister of the Environment. I want to ask him a number of specific questions.

Why were there no specific emission control plans in place and Canadian actions to reduce emissions were contingent upon the United States taking action? Why was there no specific financial assistance to develop much needed new pollution control technology? Why was there no financial assistance available for industry to clean up major emission sources? Why was funding for vital acid rain research, monitoring and communications activities about to lapse? There were many things that were wrong then and that does not make it right now that action is not being taken fast enough. How can we put a time limit on as of June 5, the start of environment week next year, when emissions standards for new cars and trucks had not been tightened in almost 10 years?