Because of lack of time and because the arguments are so extensive, I jump to the conclusion of this piece by Ted Schrecker.

He concludes: "It is hard to escape the conclusion that it would be preferable were the government to scrap the legislation". After reviewing and examining all the contents of Bill C–78, he concludes it would be better to scrap the whole thing, start over again and deal with a real commitment to the environment.

The government had many opportunities, some of which even I presented to it, to deal with Bill C–78, to substantially amend it and to rewrite the bill so that we could deal with it in this House.

Prior to the prorogation of Parliament, after the suggestions of the Minister of the Environment I presented to the Department of the Environment and to the committee studying Bill C–78 my own 111 amendments, which I considered minimal to salvaging the existing bill.

The government has had many weeks to examine the amendments that I and others have put forward, but I would like to consider that it would at least look at the ones that I, a parliamentarian and a member of the study committee, put forward. These amendments could have created a very substantial and stronger bill.

Some of the changes included in the 111 amendments which I gave to the government are as simple as the establishment of a parliamentary auditor on sustainable development, and the inclusion of the words "sustainable development" in the preamble of the bill. That is something not very difficult to do, but it does not exist in the existing bill.

The government had the opportunity to present a brand new bill into this House, and it chose not to.

My amendments also wanted to include all areas of federal jurisdiction within the context of environmental assessments. That means expanding it to include Crown corporations and foreign aid programs of this government. My amendments also included the ability to order parties to comply with mediated agreements. There are all sorts of provisions in this legislation which call for mediated agreements, but there is no compliance required. What good is mediation if it can be ignored?

The legislation in front of us right now does not have any provisions to allow for a halt to any project should it be found to be environmentally damaging.

We can prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that a project will damage the environment, but unless the Minister of the Environment has the political will to move, the legislation does not provide any opportunity to halt the project or halt the damage being done or would be done to the environment. This is a major, a fatal flaw in the legislation that the government had an opportunity to correct and chose not to.

I am also suggesting we close a lot of the loopholes in the legislation that give broad discretion to the minister to exempt virtually anything he wants from the assessment and to include joint federal–provincial endeavours under the terms of the existing legislation.

I also wanted to see intervener funding included in this act because it talks about public participation, but public participation cannot occur unless the public has the funds to participate in that project.

Most important to me, I would like to greatly expand the aboriginal rights provisions in the context of environmental protection and ensure that they are written directly into the act so that there would be no guessing, no need for interpretation of what aboriginal rights means in terms of the application of environmental assessment to land not only held for the Indian people, but also land in which the Indian people themselves have an interest.

I would also like to ask the government to include, through my amendments, the power to force groups or developers to participate in the process and abide by the decisions. In other words, there are no provisions in this act that actually would force a developer to work through the environmental process. To me, that is very important in all of this.

I would be very interested to hear the Minister of the Environment or the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, who sat through most if not all of the committee hearings on this bill, come into the Chamber and argue in this debate why Bill C–78 has to be brought back in in its original form. I cannot believe that either the new Minister of the Environment or the parliamentary secretary could actually stand and defend the bill as it stands now.

The testimony has been overwhelmingly against the bill as it exists. The department is planning a significant number of amendments to this legislations which will