

Again, can we afford to leave that kind of flexibility in, or do we need to plug the loopholes that are in the bill? That is what these two particular amendments are attempting to do. They are attempting to plug the loopholes.

It is the responsibility of this House. If it works well, it will point out those loopholes. It will analyse them and it will try to make the bill work better in the future. Only by analysis of the legislation and by attempting to plug those loopholes will the legislation work well when we try to use it in the future.

We have spent a considerable amount of time in the last little while talking about the definition which is of the term which the member for Davenport has used. Can it be justified in the circumstances because the project contributes to the goal of achieving sustainable development?

The Brundtland commission established what it considered was worth while and was a good definition of "sustainable development". That terminology is being used all over the world and the definition of it is acceptable to most parts of the world. Madam Brundtland is presently in Brazil working toward the UNCED conference which comes later this year.

The process that we have to look at in this bill is to make sure that the loopholes which we recognized are plugged. I am sure that there are some that we have not recognized and will not recognize. That is all that the member for Davenport is trying to do with these amendments.

Consequently, I would suggest that we make Parliament work well in this particular case as far as environment is concerned and make sure that that loophole is plugged.

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for reminding us of the importance of speaking specifically to the amendments in question as, indeed, the hon. member for Davenport has once again done during his opening remarks.

This debate, particularly this last half hour or so, has been very far-ranging as you know. I would simply like to note in response to the hon. member for Richelieu and to reassure him that, indeed, the legislation including the

### *Government Orders*

amendments before us are clearly within the jurisdiction of the federal government. In fact, that point has already been established by the Supreme Court judgment on the Oldman dam.

There is no question about the legal jurisdiction of the federal government as proposed in this legislation. I would also note that there is a recognition of the importance of working in co-operation with the provinces in the legislation. I would make specific reference to the example of joint panels and to co-operation with the provinces in the area of the assessment process.

In addition, deadlines will be incorporated in the regulations and administrative arrangements with the provinces. Some of the hon. member's fears, I hope, will be put to rest by perhaps a more careful reading of the legislation and the proposed amendments.

Motions Nos. 19 and 29 which have been before us now for some time deal with an area to which the hon. member for Davenport has given careful consideration as indeed we did during the course of our committee hearings.

In fact, I would suggest that the results can be found in other amendments which have been incorporated into Bill C-13. They have already been ratified during the course of our deliberations and were in response to this type of concern that was raised during the course of our hearings by witnesses and by individual members.

One of the things that is important to stress is the fact that there is a clear responsibility given to the minister in this legislation to ensure that his decisions, and that of any responsible authority, indeed the very objective of the bill as a whole is designed to encourage sustainable development.

Perhaps for the interest of those who are watching I will read clause 4(b) under "Purposes".

The purposes of this Act are: 4.(b) to encourage responsible authorities to take actions that will promote sustainable development and thereby achieve or maintain a healthy environment in a healthy economy.

That indeed, is part of the purpose of the bill. It follows, although I do not have the benefit of legal training, that that which follows in the bill as a direct result is governed by the purposes of the bill. So this in a very real sense then is part of the foundation on which the bill is addressed.