

Supply

That is a fairly reasonable projection when some economists are suggesting our economy will grow by 3.5 per cent to 4 per cent over the next few years.

I absolutely agree with the hon. member that we must be very careful not to increase the cost of programs and not to add new programs at a time when people are crying out for us to reduce the over-all cost of government and to get rid of the deficit and begin working on the debt.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, it is not an issue of innovation as the member for—

• (1830)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I would appreciate it if the hon. member would indicate to the Chair whether he will be splitting his time.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I understand there were indications we are splitting the time.

I submit that it is not a matter of innovation and flexibility as the hon. member for Winnipeg South has attempted to convince her audience to believe it is for debate here today.

If you review the performance of this government which this bill allows us to do today, in its request for funds the issue before us today is an issue of broken promises. It is an issue of broken faith. It is a matter of a government which preaches one way and acts in a completely different manner.

Let me give some examples to illustrate this. This government, when speaking abroad particularly, expresses great concern on certain issues. For instance on the issue of climate change, the Government of Canada in Bergen three years ago, in Geneva two years ago and in Rio last year, said that this question of climate change is a top priority.

As we speak here today, having made these grandiose statements abroad, there is no plan yet before us, no matter how the minister of state for the environment camouflaged today in Question Period her answers, on how Canada will stabilize let alone reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

Take biodiversity. Canada goes abroad and claims its full commitment to protect biodiversity. When the first issue comes up in Canada on the question of the protection of biodiversity, in the Clayoquot area on the

west coast, there is not one word from the ministerial benches of this government. Total silence.

Therefore the future of Clayoquot is seen by decisions by the provinces whereby the government knows very well that the Clayoquot forest could be made part of the Pacific Rim National Park and therefore an extension of an already existing federal presence in terms of protection of biodiversity.

Take the major flop in fisheries. We go abroad. We agree to hold conferences. But when it comes to cod and the protection of our fisheries offshore and beyond the 200-mile limit, all we can agree upon and all we can show a muscle on is to agree to have another conference.

Take forestry where we are more concerned about public relations in Europe than in improving our cutting practices. Take sustainable agriculture where the review on the reform of pesticides policies has been completely ignored by this government despite a very fine set of recommendations produced by a commission two years ago.

Take the question of aid to developing countries. One year ago in Rio this government pledged to increase its aid to .7 per cent of its gross national product. What does it do eight months later at home? It reduces aid. Not only does it reduce aid but it reduces aid to the poorest of the poorest countries; to Tanzania, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Madagascar, Burundi. Not only that but it also turns CIDA, the Canadian International Development Agency, into a self-serving commercial agency. What hypocrisy if you compare the statements of this government with its actions.

Let us turn our attention to the domestic scene.

• (1835)

The government professes its desire to strengthen Canadian unity and what does it do? It produces the ill-fated Meech Lake agreement. Not having learned from that experience, it produces the Charlottetown agreement. Thank God the majority of Canadians saw through that smoke and mirrors and shot it down in flames. This government at home promises jobs. How does that jibe with 11 per cent unemployment? How does it jibe with increasing numbers of young people coming out of our educational institutions? They are facing years of unemployment because there is not one opportunity to find a job because the government is cutting its programs. It is cutting employment opportuni-