

This is what we have to think about and not keep being seduced by the growth phenomenon. Growth, at what cost? This is the kind of criticism that we have in our party of some of the initiatives that have gone forth in the last few weeks. I am talking particularly about Hibernia where of course there are jobs, and Newfoundland needs them. Newfoundland has long been an underdeveloped part of the country and the people of Newfoundland have suffered because of that. We in our party recognize that projects like Hibernia cannot proceed and jobs cannot be given at any cost.

This is what we are talking about: the test of sustainability. We have to be able to think about not just how we can grow but whether or not to grow is our best option.

I want to make it clear that I am not opposed to jobs. I also come from an island which has suffered from unemployment. I am quite sensitive to the kind of impact unemployment has on a community, the kind of social problems that it creates, the kind of emotional problems it gives people and how it degrades families. I am quite aware of that, but the challenge for us in drafting environmental legislation is to merge that socio-economic and environmental concern.

We can do it because sensitive, long-term thinking and environmental assessment legislation will create jobs. They will not be the same kind of jobs, but what we are talking about is a readjustment of values.

Why shouldn't the person working at a recycling plant be paid union scale? Why not? If our values are our environment and support for our communities, then why shouldn't that person be paid union scale? Why shouldn't he or she be earning \$18 an hour, sufficient money to be able to support a family?

This is why I am talking about environmental legislation being merged. Socio-economic and environmental concerns have to be merged, and that requires a redefinition of the environment to a more broad definition. We have to cover the economic and cultural environment as well as the biophysical environment.

Some existing environmental assessment legislation already incorporates such a definition. It is right here in the province of Ontario, the Environmental Assessment

Government Orders

Act. I am not saying that it is not flawed, but it incorporates that broad definition of socio-economic and environmental.

Environmental legislation which is initiated or revised today must have interim criteria. We know that the legislation which we bring forth in this House is only a step. Some of us are humble enough to know that we do not know everything. We know that it will be flawed, so interim criteria have to be there.

Some of those interim criteria are: protecting and enhancing the existing and future well-being of all people and recognizing the dependency of Canadians on the well-being of the biosphere and other people sharing it. One again I want to allude to our global responsibility. As a rich developed nation we have that responsibility. We also have to require undertakings to offer net positive biophysical and socio-economic improvements and net reductions in Canadian resource requirements and environmental impositions.

Mr. Speaker, I see you signalling that I have only one minute remaining. I will try to sum up. There is a hope for a change of mindset, and that is what is required: a merging of the economy and the environment.

I also want to reiterate that Canada is in a perfect position to be a leader in this area internationally. We have the means. We have the international reputation, overstated in my analysis but it is there. Let us use it to effect. We have to get good environmental legislation. We have to recognize that it is an interim move. We have to show a model to the world that we are serious about an environmental assessment review.

Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Mr. Speaker, we in this House respond to a number of publics: the very narrow one which exists on this Hill that we sometimes think is the whole world; the truly important one, the broader one to which we respond, the Canadian public; and then there is that constituency, in this particular case the environmental network, about which there has been concern and which in many ways is leading public opinion. The hon. member and I were recently at a meeting involving that particular constituency, the environmental network *per se*, and I wonder if she could give her comments on its reaction to this particular bill.