

*Government Orders*

One of the local journalists, Sandy McDougall of the *Tri-City News* in my area of Coquitlam wrote that it is the small projects that are really the effective things that can be done for the environment and I agree.

That is why I have been taking this cause up in the House. When the government brings in a huge environment bill, or the government brings in a big green plan or huge \$10 million or \$20 million projects, I am saying deal with the small things. They have an environmental impact and they are worth looking at.

I wrote again to the present Minister of the Environment on February 11, 1992. I asked him to have another look at reinstating the funding for this environmental project. The mayor of Port Coquitlam and the council wrote on this project. Not only that, but also the Vancouver Port Authority wrote, the yachting people wrote, and so on. I am just looking here at a letter from the Centennial Sailing Club, for example, which said; "You have got to change your view about funding the debris control traps on the lower Fraser River because this is an important environmental issue".

Let me just conclude by saying that we have to have a further look at this bill. We have to keep looking to see whether it is working. We have to not only consider the big projects but also we have to consider the small projects. A good example is this debris trap. It costs \$180,000. That is a small amount in the context of all the money spent, but here is an effective environmental project, here is something worth looking at.

I urge the government to reinstate it as this bill passes this week. I understand the government might even be prepared to do that. If it does, I will be the first one to applaud it. I say to the government: Let us make this bill work; let us consider the small projects; and let us have a review of this bill as this amendment suggests.

• (1110)

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments on the three motions grouped together which are Motions Nos. 32, 33 and 34. Perhaps I could take the opportunity for the benefit of those who are watching or subsequently reading *Hansard*, the recordings of this

debate, to note that government Motion No. 34 calls for a new clause, clause 72, which reads:

(1) Five years after the coming into force of this section, a comprehensive review of the provisions and operation of this Act shall be undertaken by the Minister.

(2) The Minister shall, within one year after a review is undertaken pursuant to subsection (1) or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report on the review to Parliament including a statement of any changes the Minister recommends.

Very briefly, government Motion No. 34 is indeed an attempt to draw upon the suggestions of both Motions Nos. 32 and 33 and to provide for the type of subsequent review that many members, as they have already indicated, believe would be helpful. In other words, in very simple terms, there would indeed be a comprehensive review of the act after its operation, five years after it has come into force.

The minister would then report to Parliament, which of course is a public document, and as always the Standing Committee on the Environment would have the opportunity, if it wished, to place this report on its agenda, to invite the minister to appear as a witness before that committee and as a committee is empowered to do, to invite other witnesses if it so chose.

In a very real sense, the government has indeed attempted to draft what might be described as a suitable compromise, recognizing the merits of the arguments as presented in both cases, ensuring indeed that there will be a review after five years of the act being in operation, ensuring that that review will be made public and ensuring as well that the Standing Committee on the Environment, if it is so inclined, certainly will have the opportunity to have the minister bring that report before it for its examination and indeed, to ask other interested members of the public to appear as well.

In a sense Motion No. 34 is a reasonable compromise of Motions Nos. 32 and 33. I would hope therefore that the House would support Motion No. 34.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Motions Nos. 32 and 33 will be voted on separately and an affirmative vote on Motion No. 32 will obviate the need for a vote on Motion No. 34, while a negative vote on Motion No. 32