

*Government Orders*

responsible authority to justify—I think we have to have stronger teeth. Sustainable development does bring in a stronger element. Looking at the definition and purposes clauses, at the definition of sustainable development, we should be making it stronger to protect the individuals rather than making it broader to protect the responsible authorities in that large area of what is a justifiable circumstance.

I listened to the parliamentary secretary as to the accountability of elected people. Accountability after the fact means nothing once the funding and the project are under way. Any area that allows an escape without some justification—I think these are very weak terms, “justified in the circumstances”—I cannot support.

I have to support my colleague, the member for Davenport, on his motion to change that. Instead of “can be justified in the circumstances”, it would read: “can be justified in the circumstances because the project contributes to the goal of achieving sustainable development”. Why not have a positive goal for the responsible authority rather than again putting on the unsuspecting public who will find in their backyard a project they did not know enough about?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Motions Nos. 19 and 29 in the name of the hon. member for Davenport were grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 19 will apply to Motion No. 29.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In my opinion the nays have it.

• (1650)

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. That means Motion No. 29 stands deferred also.

Motions Nos. 21, 22 and 30 standing in the name of the Minister of the Environment will be grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 30 will apply to Motions Nos. 21 and 22.

**Hon. Frank Oberle (for Minister of the Environment)** moved:

Motion No. 21.

That Bill C-13 be amended in Clause 46

(a) by striking out line 46 at page 29 and substituting the following therefor:

“end of the assessment;”;

(b) by striking out line 2 at page 30 and substituting the following therefor:

“is to be published; and

(e) meets any criteria established pursuant to paragraph 58(1)(h).”

Motion No. 22.

That Bill C-13 be amended in Clause 47

(a) by striking out lines 2 to 12 at page 31 and substituting the following therefor:

“lands.”;

(b) by striking out line 21 at page 31 and substituting the following therefor:

“Canada and outside federal lands that

(a) includes a consideration of the factors required to be considered under subsections 16(1) and (2);

(b) includes an opportunity for the public to participate in the assessment;

(c) includes a requirement that the report is to be submitted to the Minister at the end of the assessment;

(d) includes a requirement that the report is to be published; and

(e) meets any criteria established pursuant to paragraph 58(1)(h).”

Motion No. 30.

That Bill C-13 be amended in Clause 58

(a) by striking out lines 27 and 28 at page 42 and substituting the following therefor: