

*Government Orders*

Let me emphasize that the Official Opposition has agreed to the reinstatement of certain bills at the stage at which they died. We did it unanimously, which was the way to do it. The traditional way in Parliament is to go to the opposition and say: "This bill died at prorogation, not because we did not want to have it, but because of the circumstances and would you please accept that it be re-introduced". We did; Bill C-73 is an example. Last week we were asked for unanimous consent and we gave it, but not for the five other bills under study at this time.

Instead of taking the opportunity to introduce better bills, bills which are more responsive, considerate and constructive, the government provided the opposition with absolutely no alternative but to oppose this motion No. 1, which is a grab bag of five bills which the government wants to reinstate.

One of them is Bill C-26. I want to go through the five bills because I think it is important.

Bill C-26, an Act to amend the Railway Act (grain and flour subsidies). As we have said in this House in debate, the bill will devastate economic things in the east. It will have an impact on parts of the agricultural and transportation industries and cost jobs in southwestern Ontario and in Atlantic Canada. We said that in this House. Was it adjusted? No.

Bill C-58, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code. Here we had an opportunity to make much needed changes to the legislation. We have approved and endorsed that. Instead of providing greater opportunities for the rehabilitation of our children, this bill steps away from it and that is hardly a sign of progress for our justice system. It is a cop-out.

Look at Bill C-78, an act to establish a federal environmental assessment process. Clearly the government wants to get this through, since it was promised by the previous minister. He is in the House right now and I salute him for what he ever did on the question of the environment. Unfortunately he was moved.

Many of us know on this side, and I remember when I spoke about it, that the bill was flawed and could be improved. The government did not improve it. It came back with the same bill; no improvements, nothing. With its numbers it is going to impose that on the House again. Bill C-78 is full of loopholes. It gives the govern-

ment total discretion to decide whether an environmental assessment process should be implemented.

There is a lack of guarantees for the Canadian public that every project under federal jurisdiction will undergo present or proper assessment. One clause of the bill gives the Governor in Council the power to make the regulations determining which projects will be assessed. When we were considering the bill in this House during the last session, we had no regulations to study to determine how strong or how weak they would be. Such a clause leaves the government open to political lobbying. Can we hope in such a case that those lobbying for environmental protection will prevail over those lobbying to have the project exempted from the assessment process?

That is the key to that bill. That is what we were saying in this House. Did they listen over there? Did the government amend the bill? Did they make the bill a little more sensitive? No, not a thing.

Finally, I want to talk about Bill C-85. Bill C-85 is a bill concerning the privatization of certain airports. The government wanted to give municipal authorities some control over these airports.

We mentioned in this House in debate—and I was the one who made the point—that the protection we were looking for was basically with one small aspect of that bill concerning protection of official languages.

We had serious concerns that the principle of institutional bilingualism may be compromised if and when local authorities take over the management of airports. It is a point that we wanted to make because we are worried that this government, not having too much direction, is possibly going to get rid of official languages and give it to the provinces or to other jurisdictions. The government wants to get rid of it like a hot potato. We said that we will try to convince it to look at this bill and do with Bill C-85 what we did with Air Canada, that is subject this group or these airports to the entire impact of the Official Languages Act.

The legislation in its form at this time provides that Part IV, Part VIII, Part IX and Part X of the Official Languages Act apply. These parts relate to communications with and services to the public, responsibilities and duties of Treasury Board in relation to the official