

### *Government Orders*

The last amendment amending section 24 of the CEAA confirms the principle of one project, one assessment in the act. This aspect of the bill is very encouraging. It addresses the possibility of numerous environmental assessments being done by the various federal departments involved and now groups all that into one assessment.

One project, one assessment makes for logical reasoning as well as indicating some fiscal responsibility and some consideration as to more efficient implementation of the project's timetable. Instead of each department involved, for example, industry, transport, environment, et cetera doing its own assessment over a period of time a panel or committee is struck with representation from all departments to participate in one assessment.

This amendment should alleviate the concerns of business to require permits from several federal departments. Under this amendment instead of businesses facing multiple reviews they would be subject to only one federal assessment. Also this principle of one assessment should lower the cost compared to having to do several assessments. Another benefit would be to speed up the process of implementation of the actual plan. Participants would not have to wait for several months or years for all the assessments to come in.

An improvement on this process would be to bring provincial representation in on the same assessment committee. This harmonizing would prevent the possibility of federal and provincial assessments contradicting each other. It also provides for one assessment, not one at the federal level and one or more at the provincial level.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate two of my previous statements. First, our environment is of major importance to us and concerns relating to it should rank high in our decision making process. Second, Bill C-56 is definitely a small, progressive step forward in achieving this end.

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I was quite pleased to hear the hon. member's commitment to the environment. Anyone who lives in western Canada is well aware of the beauty that exists, but all of us know that the environment involves much more than beauty. It is home, it sustains us. Anyone who lives on this planet knows that without the land, the air and the water to sustain us we are nothing. I am very pleased to hear of the hon. member's commitment to matters of environmental concern.

My question deals with intervenor funding which is one of the amendments to the act. The member expressed support for intervenor funding and outlined her concerns about additional spending with regard to intervenor funding. While I believe there are probably arguments to be made in this regard, I would like to ask if the member has given any thought to the process of intervenor funding.

Who would she consider should examine the list of possible interveners? Who would suggest to the panel which interveners would be funded? Should a panel be struck to do this? Would the panel itself make this decision? Should the Minister of the Environment or perhaps the President of the Treasury Board be responsible for making this decision?

• (1815)

**Ms. Bridgman:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I agree with what he is saying. I can sympathize with his concerns.

When I was researching it myself it became very obvious that particular section of the bill was very vague from the actual process point of view. There does not seem to be any direction as to how that will actually transpire. I assume the results will be debated and discussed in committee.

**Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicated support for funding of interveners in the process. As the hon. member is well aware, her party is taking the position that it is opposed to the court challenges program.

Could the hon. member comment on what appears to be an apparent contradiction of supporting intervenor funding but not supporting the court challenges program which in effect is an intervenor process?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. There are two possible approaches. First, when that program is actually put in place so that we can have that input in the panel from the community it becomes a component of the whole program and should be incorporated in the budget of the total program. It is not an additional program in itself. It is not an add on. It is part of the whole program and should be budgeted accordingly in the overall program.

Second, we are back to good old Reform policy and ideals, that is grassroots input. We firmly believe it is essential for the people in the community affected by the project to have access to express themselves to the committee. Again it should be formalized or structured access. That could come up in the process of how the input would come about. The whole program should be budgeted in total.

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me considerable pride to take part in today's second reading debate on the act to amend the Canadian Environment Assessment Act, CEAA.

In coming years the decisions we take or the consequences of those we fail to take with respect to the environment will have a profound impact on the legacy we leave our children and our children's children. Will the Canada they inherit be the same Canada that for the past three years the United Nations has called the best place in the world to live? Or, will the Canada they inherit be one in which our natural environment, the source