

Supply

cannot not extinguish our claim to a healthy environment for money because, in the end, you cannot buy ozone. They are not making any more of them—like land, I suppose. You cannot buy a lot of these things. The very notion that this is somehow a matter of dollars and cents just shows how far back this government is when it comes to this kind of thinking.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has, very clearly, picked up on my point. What is occurring with the Rafferty dam appears to be a feeling by this government, and certainly by the Devine government, that it makes no difference what you do; build the darn thing and no matter what the damages are, you can always pay for it. In Bill C-78, clearly, when they talk about mitigation and they talk about minimal damages, they talk about compensation. In other words, they are enshrining in Bill C-78 that it does not make any difference what you do to the environment, but that it is possible to buy your way out of the damage. That is simply not acceptable in the 1990s, certainly not in a reawakened nation, the Canada of today.

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this evening to participate in this debate on the motion of the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle which reads:

That this House urge the Minister of the Environment to revoke the Rafferty—Alameda project licence and use all federal authority to prevent Saskatchewan from proceeding with project construction until an independent environmental assessment panel has completed its review.

This incident last week, where the review panel resigned in outrage over the conduct of the provincial government, is just another case in point of the holes that are shot through the environmental assessment review process. This motion gives us an opportunity to talk about the flaws in that environmental assessment review process. As many members mentioned this afternoon, there is another bill before the House, Bill C-78, which gives us some hope that this will change. However, as I want to connect my comments later, I think that C-78 is once again another false hope for that process.

As I said at the beginning, Rafferty—Alameda and the events of last week when the panel resigned is just one more indication of an environmental assessment process that is flawed. It is stacked upon the same sort of process that has or has not taken place around Point Aconi on

the Atlantic coast where a coal-fired, electric generation plant is going to go ahead without an environmental assessment process.

Another example of that is the whole Hibernia project. Once again, this is an enormous project with an enormous influx of our tax dollars and there is not an adequate environmental assessment review process. As many have pointed out this afternoon, this is just not acceptable. We, in our party, are very conscious of where tax dollars come from. They come from ordinary Canadians to a far greater degree than they should because the corporations are not paying their fair share. We want to protect those tax dollars. Those people have worked hard for their money. It should not be taken away to conduct or to fund projects that are not environmentally sustainable. All the projects that I have cited this afternoon, the Rafferty—Alameda, Point Aconi, the Hibernia, do not stand the test of sustainability. That is the test which any environmental assessment review process has to pass.

• (1750)

Not only is existing legislation which is supposed to be looking after that process inadequate, but Bill C-78 is also inadequate. It has lovely language in the briefing notes; wonderful things that are going to flow from this, that we are going to follow the Brundtland commission's report in looking for a sustainable future.

When you actually read the words of the proposed legislation, you see that this is not in fact the case. It just opens the door wider for the kind of abuses that have occurred in the past. This is just not acceptable. The Canadian taxpayers, the Canadian public, one and the same, are fed up with the kind of bureaucratic gobbledegook that has gone on, seeming to achieve something when in fact what they do is open the door wider for big business interests to conduct their business with impunity. This is not acceptable to the ordinary taxpayer, the one who is carrying far more of the burden than they should do in our country.

I also want to address my comments to the issue before us, the Rafferty—Alameda. We have an instance where the federal government has given over \$8 million compensation for the so-called inconvenience of this project. What has happened with that money? What is going to happen with that money now that Premier