

Fraser delta area. They are operating on a no net loss basis.

I am sure the hon. member would not want the people across Canada to feel that the people on the Fraser River will allow developments which will interfere with the habitat. In fact, the wildlife, the fowl, the animal and fish habitat on the lower Fraser is increasing every year, not decreasing.

Mr. Karpoff: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am sure the hon. member who just spoke does not want to leave the impression that there is no deterioration. Have you been to Surrey? Have you seen the intermodal yard? Have you actually gone and looked at what has been done on the far shore?

An hon. member: That's not a point of order, that's a speech.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order! Does the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre want to respond to the comments made by the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin?

Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

That is an interesting point and perhaps the acrimony that broke out for a few minutes just shows how tender feelings are about the environment. I am sure the member feels concerned and yet feels he would do everything he can to encourage the minister through the parliamentary secretary to look after this issue in greater detail. I am sure the member would love to see that everyone in Canada appreciates just how open this process is and, given the fact that the member from the area does not understand this, perhaps the three of them can contribute to the environment a lot more wholesomely.

Mr. Raymond Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, a quick comment on the issue. The environmental assessment review process related to the P. J. Wooding ferrochromium undertaking in Port Hardy provided absolutely no intervener funding. The people who had to attempt to analyse this project had no money whatsoever. They were unable to hire anyone. They all

worked full time. There was no money for telephones, faxes, or anything else. Would the member not agree that this kind of a handicap is an enormous flaw, and a failure to guarantee intervener funding is an enormous flaw in the bill?

On the other side, the government was prepared, through western diversification, to provide Wooding with about \$10 million. B.C. Hydro was willing to put in several million dollars. On one side was an enormous amount of support and capital, and on the other side, were the concerned citizens who have to live with the mess down the road, absolutely nothing. This is a major flaw and an inequity in this bill that has to be remedied.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, very briefly please.

Mr. Walker: In ten seconds, Mr. Speaker. Its strategy is incomprehensible and the fact that it does not fund interveners is absolutely unreasonable.

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, I welcome second reading debate today on Bill C-78, which represents, at last, a small sign that this government is beginning to address environmental decision-making. New legislation in this area is badly needed and I hope that this bill, flawed as it is, will begin the discussion necessary to bring this legislation to fruition.

Presently, environmental assessments are governed by the EARP guidelines order. Bill C-78 represents a Tory election promise of 1984 to update this process. This promise had been conveniently been forgotten and now, due to public and court pressure, is finally being addressed.

• (1710)

There are some positive elements in the bill but there are many other aspects which are deeply flawed and I would like to address some of these today.

I am pleased that the bill introduces mediation, financial assistance to participants and a follow-up program into the environmental review process.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are several aspects of this legislation which give me great cause for concern. I wonder, for example, at the resistance of the government to mention the words "sustainable development"