

*Government Orders*

There is also an exclusion list which will contain projects or classes of projects which will automatically fall outside review.

As one of my colleagues stated previously, these provisions are big enough to drive a truck through. What about the Point Aconi project in Cape Breton? In which category does it fall? The federal fisheries minister has just decided it will not undergo a panel review. Would this project be included under the mandatory study list?

The Governor in Council will itself determine the contents of these two lists. It has yet to present them to Parliament or to the public. Once again, how can we properly assess this legislation without being advised as to the contents of these lists?

As well, these regulations can be changed without having to bring them before the House. That is another weakness in this bill.

We have been told that the government plans to lay before the legislative committee a list that would constitute the draft of these regulations. That is not good enough. This is a part of the legislation that determines how it will work and we should have an indication now of how these regulations will operate.

Why has the government not provided these details lists by now during public and parliamentary debate on second reading? The fact that the government cannot produce one in time for this debate does not bode well for the future. There seems to be a lot of internal lobbying going on, as various ministries presumably fight for their particular interests within Cabinet.

Although not part of the regulations, clause 5(b) presents another gaping hole through which projects may evade environmental review. Bill C-78 claims to ensure that all projects with federal involvement will be subject to an environmental review. Clause 5(b) excludes tax breaks aimed at particular projects as a reason to refer these projects to environmental review. A government may choose to provide tax incentives to projects, rather than devising financial subsidy packages so as to avoid environmental reviews on particular projects. This provision is a major flaw in the bill which, if the bill passes second reading, will have to be seriously amended.

The lack of specific regulations and the Governor in Council's complete discretion in formulating them brings to light another concern which I have about Bill C-78. In

this bill, environmental screening, mediation, or review panel reports are merely advisory. Bill C-78 gives the responsible minister, and apparently not the environmental minister, the power to accept or reject the recommendations of these reports.

Again, to quote Mr. Robinson of FEARO: "There is certainly no point in having a fairly elaborate process of assessment if indeed we are not going to pay attention to those decisions."

I find this disturbing, considering the track record of the present government regarding environmental matters.

**Mr. Kaplan:** It is disgraceful.

**Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** It sure is disgraceful.

**Mr. Marchi:** How disgraceful is it?

**Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** It is unspeakably disgraceful.

To assert that the government will take environmental reports and make the correction in light of public opinion is not certain in the least. It is obvious from the government's pursuit of the GST debate that public concerns mean nothing to the government between election campaigns.

Today, I have tried to outline some of my concerns regarding Bill C-78. The more I listen to this debate, the more I realize that the government should go back to the drawing-board before presenting this debate. It should present a more thorough set of regulations to accompany this bill and rethink many of the fundamental aspects of the bill. That is not to say that legislation is not required and the *status quo* is not acceptable. Legislation in this area is overdue and urgently needed.

The government has finally brought something forward, flawed as it is. I hope that this discussion will begin a process of coming to grips in Canada with a comprehensive and effective means of reviewing small and large environmental projects in a way that is effective and that allows for the full environmental consequences of projects to be taken into account.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, my comment and question to the previous speaker concerns the environmental review process and the ability to assess social impacts. I refer again to the case of the P. J. Wooding ferrochromium proposal in Port Hardy, British Columbia in which the government failed