

and opponents of this landfill site and indeed the residents of all of Inverness County in limbo.

The people in Antigonish County, who are now seeking a landfill site or a way of disposing of their solid waste, may well have to wait a similar waiting period and suffer similar uncertainty with the same ministry regarding their plans to find a new disposal site for their municipal waste. This is causing a great deal of concern locally in my area.

This bill claims to eliminate this kind of problem by placing the power with the environment minister. The bill seems to mandate the environment minister only to initiate reviews, while the minister responsible for the project holds powers which include determining whether a full review is necessary, making the final decision, and overseeing the follow-up program. There does not seem to be any clear obligation for the environment minister's involvement in these latter stages.

This leads me to question the amount of control which the environment minister will actually have. The level assessment, final decision, and the follow-up program are instrumental to a review's authority. This severely weakens the impact of this legislation. Indeed, even Mr. Raymond Robinson, Executive Chairman of FEARO, admitted on October 4 to the committee pre-studying Bill C-78 that "having the minister responsible deciding what level of assessment his project should receive—is very much like having the fox in charge of the hen coop."

This is an aspect of the bill which I hope will be addressed and corrected during committee stage.

In addition, I have many concerns about the philosophy behind the bill and about the bill's effectiveness.

Although the government claims to support the principle of sustainable development, these two words are not mentioned anywhere in Bill C-78. The government attempts to explain this omission by saying that sustainable development is a concept that is very difficult to define precisely.

How can this government claim to support a principle which it admits it cannot define in its legislation? I believe this is a cop-out by the government.

### *Government Orders*

Sustainable development is, in fact, definable. The Brundtland Commission defined it. Even though Bill C-78's preamble quotes directly from the Brundtland report's definition of sustainable development, the government did not take the next logical step and use those two important words. This seems to indicate the government's weak commitment to the principle of sustainable development.

Instead, the government has chosen to achieve an appropriate balance between the economy and the environment and to make sure that the two are compatible.

The government appears to view the economy and the environment as being fundamentally at odds. This is a dichotomy which in reality is quite false. Sustainable development is a principle which sees one interest, that of the economy, flowing from and benefiting the other. That is to say, the environment and the economy must be interlinked and are not fundamentally at odds.

New models of development must be created since the old ones are just not working. As long as the government legislation that we have before us continues to reflect this archaic mind-set, that the environment and the economy are forces at odds with one another and must be reconciled, no real progress will ever be made in achieving a fully sustainable future.

• (1720 )

The regulations referred to in clause 55 of Bill C-78 constitute the heart and the guts of this legislation. They ultimately will decide the scope of the bill's implementation and the effectiveness of this legislation in practice. Unfortunately, these regulations have not yet been specified and, if they have, those specifications have not been released. As a result, I have serious reservations about a piece of legislation which has been introduced without our knowing how the key regulations governing its implementation will work.

Among these regulations, which are mentioned in Bill C-78, are various lists upon which the bill depends on for its very implementation. There is a mandatory study list which will include classes of projects having significant adverse environmental effects. These automatically fall under review.