Oral Questions

likely to die before their first birthday than those born into more privileged homes.

As the minister knows, one of the cures for child poverty recommended by the council, the government's own council, is a national child care program. Quite simply, why does the minister continue to deprive working parents and why is he postponing action on child poverty until the next election?

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a practice of asking questions which are virtually impenetrable or of making comments which are hard for any reasonable person to follow. What suggestion she proposes to make about corporate Canada and what relevance that has to the issue she raises remains to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. member about child care. Since we came to office, this government has substantially increased the amount of money spent on child care in Canada, well above the level that was provided by the Liberals. Indeed, contributions under CAP have been increasing at the rate of about 20 per cent per annum. At the present time, we are spending about \$1 billion on child care.

When members of the opposition, particularly the Liberal Party, talk about the need for child care, let them never forget that it was the Liberal senators who prevented Canada from having a child care program today.

CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, every summer, when the atmospheric temperature reaches 26 degrees centigrade and higher, the children of my riding of Parkdale—High Park flock to the Sunnyside beaches on Lake Ontario to swim, only to find that the waters are polluted with sewage and other pollutants.

Can the minister guarantee the children of Parkdale— High Park and all the children living along the beaches of Lake Ontario that the green plan will make the beaches of Lake Ontario swimmable this summer? Because if he cannot, how can the government call this report, Canada's Green Plan for a Healthy Environment?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is quite clear in the green plan that one of our goals is to make sure that our water, as well as our air and our land, is clear and healthy for Canadians. I mentioned in answer to a question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition a few minutes ago that I was very much hoping that we would be in a position to sign an accord with the U.S. to move forward on the de-pollution of the Great Lakes system and essentially, at that point, be able to have an approach for the whole ecosystem of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

Yes, we are moving ahead; yes, we are committed; yes, the money is there and yes, the agreement is forthcoming.

Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same minister. Destruction of rain forests, ocean pollution, emissions of CO₂ and CFCs contribute to global environmental destruction. The green plan does not set specific objectives to address global environmental issues.

Why does this so-called comprehensive green plan not demand that our publicly funded Export Development Corporation produce environmental assessments before dispersing or leveraging project funds which may have other environmental consequences?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer my hon. colleague opposite to pages 97 to 128 of the green plan where we do, in fact, address the questions of global warming and emissions of greenhouse gases.

Yes, this government has made commitments internationally on CFCs, and we have made commitments internationally on CO_2 . Those are very clear.

We are going to phase out CFCs totally by the year 1997, well ahead of most industrialized countries. We are going to stabilize CO₂ emissions by the year 2000 at 1990 levels. We are committed to further steps. We are committed to helping the LDCs in terms of research so that they can be at the table and this agreement can be a meaningful international agreement.