

Government Orders

the Oldman and Rafferty-Alameda decisions. If Bill C-78 is this government's response to the problems that we face in providing environmental protection, then indeed we are going to be in a sorry state.

On that basis and given the government's failure to respond to the problems and opportunities before it—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order please. I may remind the hon. member that it is incumbent on him to explain to the Chair why urgent consideration of this motion is required, instead of immediately addressing the substance of the debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, the urgency arises from the fact that there is a series of major projects which are in the process of going ahead.

As was very clear in the Rafferty-Alameda decision, the court said that the reason it would not grant the injunction was that so many of these projects had gone ahead that it made no sense to the court not to proceed. It gave as its second reason the government's incompetence in allowing these projects to go ahead.

That is the reason for the urgency. This applies at Rafferty. It is now about to apply in the case of Alameda. It applies in the case of Kemano and it applies in the case of Point Aconi. Ultimately it will apply in the case of James Bay where the Government of Quebec is threatening to go ahead and build the roads.

This is a matter of extreme urgency. If the debate is not held now, one must fear for the environment.

[*Translation*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question raised by the hon. member for LaSalle—Émard is a very important one, but it does not at this time meet all the criteria provided in the Standing Orders for an emergency debate. Consequently, I cannot accept this request for the time being.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIRPORT TRANSFER (MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS) ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Wednesday, November 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis that Bill C-85, an act to provide for certain matters respecting official languages, employees' pensions and labour relations in connection with the transfer of certain airports be read a second time and referred to a legislative committee.

• (1620)

Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill C-85 which is of great importance to a lot of Canadians, especially to those in big cities such as Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver and across this country.

The government is moving into a state where it wants to sell all our country's resources. This is very important when we talk about privatizing the airports. Terminal 3 in Toronto has been privatized and Huang Danczkay has a cash for life lottery. He is raking in the money every single day. The government said that we were not making any money at the airports, yet last year the Toronto airport made \$72 million. Who are we to believe?

Therefore the question is, should we go ahead and let this thing proceed or should we alter it? We of the Liberal Party have certain propositions that we would like to put forward and we have certain concerns.

One concern is safety. If what the government wants to do under Bill C-85 does proceed, would the safety of our passengers at major airports still be very vital?

An hon. member: There he goes again.

Mr. Karygiannis: My colleague from across the floor says, "there he goes again". Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague that in 1988 we had close misses at the Toronto airport. The government stepped in and said, "From 140 flights an hour, we are going to take it down to 70 flights an hour". Now they are ready to proceed to boost it up again. Also they are ready to build more runways.