

Government Orders

limitations and some restrictions regarding large amounts of discretionary power.

There is inadequate protection offered to native communities. The bill fails to give the environment minister sufficient authority *vis-à-vis* other ministers whose pet project endangers the environment. The bill does not give Parliament adequate authority over the creation or alteration of regulations. The bill is not specifically applicable to all relevant departments, agencies and their legislation.

In short, the bill is full of holes and the government's response to criticism in committee has been completely and utterly inadequate.

Under the circumstances we do not believe that the House of Commons ought to be asked to expedite the passage of the bill. We believe that the new Minister of the Environment ought to be asked to go back to the drawing board and produce a new bill.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dingwall: We do not want to be hoodwinked by some cheap political trick, trying to reinstate legislation which has fallen dead as a result of the government's own ineptitude and subsequent action with regard to proroguing this Parliament.

We have similar difficulties with other legislation in this motion. Some of my colleagues will be dealing in detail with these later in this debate. However, I want to outline some of them now. The former Bill C-26, the Railway Act amendments, which we in Atlantic Canada refer to as the At and East bill, is in my view and the view of my party just plain bad legislation. The bill will further endanger the rail transportation system in Atlantic Canada. It will cost jobs in Atlantic Canada and in southwestern Ontario as well. It will unduly increase the costs of livestock and poultry industries of Atlantic Canada and it will have a destructive effect on the export of Canadian flour.

Those are the reasons why we oppose both the substance of this particular bill and the procedural gymnastics of the government to try to reintroduce this bill through its motion.

The government puts this bill forward as a so-called expenditure reduction, but its disastrous impact on both the agricultural and transportation sector, especially in Atlantic Canada, will be so destructive to the economy

that in the long run it will only lead, in my view and in the view of my party, to greater costs.

The opposition cannot co-operate in the passage of bad legislation.

The former Bill C-58, the young offenders legislation, is also a bad bill that no reasonable opposition could be expected to expedite. This bill represents a terrible step backward, away from a concept of rehabilitation and back to a concept of not just punishment but even revenge. The bill does not address the conditions that lead young people to crime and has been judged by experts to be far more likely to reinforce rather than rehabilitate criminal tendencies. The legislation has been universally denounced as a nearly Dickensian retrogression.

The bill should not be advanced. The government should do the honourable thing and withdraw it.

The former Bill C-82 appears to be an administrative bill, but it is of great significance to the shipping industry. Its hasty passage through this House in the last session led to it being slowed down in the Senate.

The government refused to allow the House committee on the bill adequate time to consult the industry on such matters as ceilings on fees under the bill. The bill is also inadequate with reference to verification, audit and accountability; again another reason why this particular motion ought not to be proceeded with and ought not to be adjudicated in this particular House, not only on its substance but on the procedural gymnastics of the government opposite.

The government is now asking the House of Commons again to abandon its right to look into all of these issues. It wants us to leave these important questions to the Senate, its favourite upper chamber. This, I suggest, is a strange proposal coming to us from a well-known foe of the Senate, the government House leader. It is a proposal with which the opposition cannot and will not agree.

Finally, the motion deals with former Bill C-85 regarding the privatization of airports. Our concerns with the bill in the last session revolved around the protection of employee benefits, something that obviously members opposite do not seem to be too concerned about. But, when it affects workers and ordinary Canadians, we on this side are concerned as to what happens with those individuals. We are concerned with the protection of