

*Government Orders*

This bill assaults that environmental assessment review process. The panel tabled its findings in August 1990 and I will cite some of the findings when it asked that it not be proceeded with. The panel's rejection was based on numerous significant reasons. These include: potential impacts on marine ecosystems and agricultural micro-climates arising from delayed spring ice-out; risk of damage to near shore spawning grounds; limited knowledge of the Northumberland Strait ecosystem making it difficult to predict monitor mitigate impacts and determine appropriate compensation to fishermen; incompatibility of the project with sustainable development; inadequate consideration of cumulative impacts; difficulties in finding socially acceptable solutions for displaced ferry workers and fishermen; inadequate consideration of the environmental and ecological impacts on the island of predicted type of tourism growth and the need to resolve numerous land use issues in Prince Edward Island.

It was a comprehensive environmental review. That is what an environmental review is supposed to be on a generic bridge concept. My colleague from Skeena is quite correct in saying that the bridge concept, as we now see it, is a particular concept that has not been reviewed.

All sorts of reasons were brought forward. The panel in conclusion said; "There is a need for improved transportation service between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. After careful consideration, however, the panel concludes that the risk of harmful effects of the proposed bridge concept is unacceptable. The panel recommends, therefore, that the project not proceed".

So when the minister stated in the House today, very carefully, as did the Liberal member for Egmont, that there had been an environmental review—let me just get the minister's words on this—there had been a full environmental review. The full environmental review said: "Do not proceed". What is this government doing? It is proceeding. What is the Liberal Party doing? It is recommending that it be proceeded with. Is it any wonder that people are so sceptical of the political process when you see the way some politicians are willing

to act. If they do not like one answer they ask another panel and that is exactly what this government has done. The government did not like that answer so what it did was focus only on one narrow consideration of the environmental assessment review, the ice-out. The government found four so-called ice experts. I do not know the qualifications of these people. The people of Canada do not know these people's qualifications, but this government has based Bill C-110 and is proceeding with this project because of what was said by these so-called ice experts. It is no wonder that people are sceptical of the political process when politicians behave that way.

We had an environmental review process. It went through, the environmental panel said not to proceed. The government has found a way to circumvent that process and proceed and the Liberals are going along with it.

I wonder why that would be. Do you perhaps think that maybe there is politics involved here in this 1993 election year? Do you think perhaps that the Liberal Party, which has based its support in the maritime provinces, thinks there might be some political advantage to this? Do you think the government would perhaps want some of those seats as well? Who will pay the most?

Where does sustainable development fit in this scene? Where does concern for Canadian tax dollars fit in this scene when "it is up to the trough and snout your way through it" mentality, the megaproject mentality which both the government and the Liberal Party seem to be supporting. Where does sustainable development and all the rhetoric we heard in Rio fit in this?

The minister said there are 3,500 person-years involved. Who looks after the fish? Who looks after the lobster? Who looks after the climate and the ocean? That is the responsibility of Environment Canada. Environment Canada is on one side saying one thing and the Minister of Public Works is on the other side saying something else. It is no wonder the public is confused because there is not one single message. Politics are being played here.