

*Government Orders*

produced an excellent interim report that I think the government has ignored, to be very kind.

One of those items refers to the fact that the compliance component of the bill certainly is very lacking. There is absolute indifference to the concept of making various jurisdictions of government comply, particularly when they set up their own review mechanisms.

I think all members here are very familiar with the events surrounding the Rafferty-Alameda Dam, and they need not be raised again in this debate. It certainly tells you, Mr. Speaker, some of the problems we have to address. If we cannot do it in a bill that is here before the House right now, and if we cannot sit in the committee and allow for some of these suggestions to come through as amendments and toughen up this bill, when are we going to do it?

That committee presented its interim report only on October 11. That is not a long time ago. It includes members on both sides of the House. To read the report, one would be very surprised that this would be coming from a committee that has a majority of government members.

The last three recommendations are made on page 15. The committee wants to address the concept of compliance and enforcement, eliminating the may component from the minister's power and introducing a must and shall requirement component.

For example, in recommendation 15, the committee recommends that the Minister of the Environment have the responsibility and authority to develop policies, programs and regulations that span a full range of activities of the federal government, analogous to those of the Minister of Finance for financial and economic affairs.

In a subsequent recommendation, the committee asks for the establishment of an environmental audit function to ensure that all federal departments and agencies have implemented environmental assessment processes and to monitor the effectiveness of those environmental programs. It continues with setting and attaining targets for greenhouse gas emissions, as one component of what Canada must do with respect to addressing environmental issues.

Finally, the seventeenth recommendation is that all federal departments and agencies report on the direct and indirect impacts of their operations on global warming and set annual targets for reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

I refer to those three because I wanted to point to a particular area that the government might have addressed in its bill. It has not done that at all. One asks oneself if the government is putting up a bill in the absence of a context that the House's committees bring forward for consideration.

The very first thing that is missing in this bill is the definition of sustainable development. Presumably, the bill is designed to ensure that we have sustainable development. Second, it shows a lack of direction. Once we have removed the purpose, we removed its sense of direction. Yet, that committee recognizes, on behalf of the government, enormous obligations for Canada.

In its report, it cites the World Resources Institute Report of 1990 that ranks Canada on a per capita basis for emissions and air pollutants at fifth, even though it has only 0.5 per cent of the population of the world. The only nations that rank ahead of Canada in terms of emitting contaminants in the air are developing countries or countries in the oil producing area.

The government's own committee says it must address some of these problems because there is an obligation. This bill does allude to a sense of obligation that the government refers to itself and there is a parliamentary committee that says: "Look, here we are. We have produced a document that should begin the discussions for where we ought to be going." And what are we doing? We are going into second reading.

As the member for Skeena pointed out earlier, on a question of privilege, the whole process of legislation appears to be designed to avoid very constructive implementations of amendments or redrafting by the committee before the legislation is accepted in principle and before it is passed on to the legislative committee where the process dictates that there will be few amendments that will allow the principle of the bill to be altered.

I have alluded to the fact that Canadians and parliamentarians acknowledge that they are offenders in questions of the environment. That same report talks about deforestation and what Canadians can do on