

precisely and clearly to the goal of achieving sustainable development.

Therefore, I believe this motion will come up for a vote if the preceding motion, Motion No. 19, is given favourable consideration.

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Madam Speaker, I would like to focus my remarks today on Motions Nos. 19 and 29 as put forward by the member for Davenport. As the member articulated, this focuses our attention not just on the mitigating nature of this bill but also a positive interjection; that is, that it would contribute to sustainable development.

As this House knows, *Our Common Future*, the report of the UN environment program chaired by former Prime Minister Gro Brundtland, was put forth in the spring of 1987. Sustainable development was incorporated into our lexicon from that report. Often I hear that the term “sustainable development” is made up of antagonistic words: how can you be sustainable as well as having development? That is the challenge we have to face in our world, and that is why I think these amendments that have been put forth by the member for Davenport are a challenge to us in this bill. That is what we are trying to do in Canada and in the world. We are trying to allow for development but to make certain that future generations are not going to pay the price for what we have done in this generation.

It is a very positive contribution to the modification of this bill, and I look forward to hearing from the government members, if they oppose this, as to why they oppose this. It is a very important addition, and it does close a major loophole.

It is important because it challenges us on sustainable development, that whole definition of sustainable development that reverberates throughout the environmental community and the development community. I know it takes more than just a public relations exercise to convince people of a project's worthiness now, and that is why it is important to have the public process, to have the people who are going to be affected by a project involved in the assessment process. It is not just the

### *Government Orders*

projects that are going to occur in Canada; it is all of those projects that have any Canadian involvement.

My colleague from Port Moody —Coquitlam earlier today talked about a major project that is planned for the Narmada River in India, and our esteemed colleague in our party, former Justice Tom Berger, has a very important role in that project in deciding whether or not it will proceed. He has been contracted by the World Bank to assess the worthiness of that project, and he has to ask the question of himself, and ask the people who are affected by it, whether or not this is sustainable development. Is this just another megaproject that is going to benefit the wealthy and harm those who are less wealthy? There are plenty of those in India, as you well know, Madam Speaker.

The same goes for the Three Gorges Project in China, where the Canadian corporation Lavalin has a major role to play. So it is Canadian corporations internationally that are acting on these projects. We have to determine, because we have the responsibility in this House of Commons, whether our corporations are behaving in a sustainable manner, and not just in Canada but outside Canada.

To conclude, the motions put forth by the member for Davenport, Motions Nos. 19 and 29, are a positive contribution. I look forward to hearing from the government members and I invite their support. This is the very crux of it: whether or not we can achieve an environmental assessment review process that will allow for sustainable development. I am sure those in the development industries are wanting that as well, because they also have children and grandchildren to whom they want to pass on a healthier planet.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to support both of the proposed amendments by the member for Davenport. I think they are quite clear and I think they are quite clearly justifiable.

If one looks at the wording both in Motion No. 19, which says “can be justified in the circumstances because the project contributes to the goal of achieving sustainable development,” one also finds in Motion No. 29 the same wording. The member for Davenport, I think, has