

Government Orders

reallocation of resources and it will likely affect some transition for people in traditional occupations—real issues are going to surface that are going to have to be dealt with, as the member knows only too well. I think we have to make sure that we make progress, that we get beyond the kind of bleak record that occurred between 1930 and the 1960s.

On that score I hope we can develop. Maybe today's debate can be a springboard into a real strategy. We only have this decade, in my view, to do it and we need to have a very clear cut strategy to make that happen.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, in his speech the hon. member indicated that the government was unable to accept this motion because to do so would constitute a question of confidence in the government. There is a precedent that runs contrary to that.

On Friday, November 24, last year, in this House, the then hon. member for Oshawa, Mr. Broadbent, moved a motion concerning child poverty in Canada. That motion was moved on a supply day as the opposition motion on that day and at the end of debate on that day the motion was carried unanimously by the House.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare, who is here today, participated in that debate and supported the motion fully. I invite the hon. member for Rosedale to review the provisions of that day and come back to the House a little later and tell us that, in fact, the government agrees with this motion, the government does not regard it as a matter of confidence, and will adopt the motion so that the motion can be carried by the House.

• (1620)

Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, if I may reply just briefly. I remember that day very well. I remember there were several things about it that were significantly different, not the least of which is that I believe the motion was put in such a way as it did not create a similar situation. I think we have had a frank discussion here. The minister has said it and I have repeated it with respect to the 12 per cent. This is not something that we would feel comfortable in adopting, both in terms of its principle and in terms of its reality particularly with respect to the way in which we are going

to deal with the other key players which are the 10 provinces and two territories.

One has to be realistic about this. It is all well and good to try and take a sort of precedent, and that is all I would refer to in this instance, and try to incorporate it as a valid objection. In this instance, I think it is mixing apples and oranges, quite frankly.

Mr. Bird: Madam Speaker, I would like to add my comments in support of those expressed by the hon. member for Rosedale, that whether this is a confidence motion or whether it is not, I would vote against this motion on the basis of the commitment to a specific percentage of land and water resources of this country.

Mr. Blaikie: No specifics.

Mr. Bird: No. As a matter of fact I would like to read a paragraph from page 35 of the New Democratic Party document on the environment called "Towards a Sustainable Future", which I understand was authored by the hon. member for Skeena. It says, and I quote it in the context of my earlier words on sustainable development and the comprehensive approach we must take. He said in his document: A royal commission on our forests should be established by the federal government. A complete assessment of the effects of ozone depletion, the greenhouse effect, acid precipitation, soil degradation and forestry should be included in the mandate of such a royal commission.

Other issues that should be addressed include the designation of protection for ancient forests and watersheds, the most appropriate technologies for harvesting, the impacts of monocultural replanning, alternatives to chemical pesticides and the effects of harvesting methods and existing plant and animal species to name some of the major issues identified.

He went on to recommend that a royal commission be established and that the forestry company be required by law to practice sustainable forest management.

This motion is the second that I can recall in the past few months that the hon. member for Skeena has put in an effort to put a band-aid solution to the whole environmental question. He came up with a green stamp policy to move us toward sustainable development when in fact he knows that we spent months in our environ-