

Government Orders

However, I have now received representations, as I have just said, on behalf of the three House leaders requesting that the Chair render its decision this afternoon.

Accordingly, to accommodate this request, I will now render my decision. I will return later to explain the rationale behind it. I should say—and I think hon. members can understand this—that I am trying to accommodate certain necessities and I would hope that it would not become the practice to give a judgment and file the reasons later.

The Chair, of course, knows full well the effects of prorogation on the business then before the House. The Chair must also acknowledge, however, that the notion of reinstatement of business in the subsequent session is well established in our practice.

While this has hitherto been done by unanimous consent, the Chair can find no compelling reason to preclude proceeding by way of notice of motion, nor am I persuaded to reject the motion outright.

The theme of the motion is the reinstatement of certain bills. While the six bills are all distinct, the purpose of the motion is clearly to reinstate the bills at various stages. Therefore, the Chair has decided not to divide the motion for the purpose of debate.

That being said, however, the Chair does have some difficulty in accepting the argument that a member in casting a single vote, can adequately express his or her opinion on six distinct pieces of legislation.

Therefore, government Motion No. 1 will be dealt with in the following manner. There will be a single debate and five separate questions will be put, namely on the reinstatement of Bill C-26, Bill C-58, Bill C-78, Bill C-82 and Bill C-85. No question will be put on Bill C-73 as this matter has already been disposed of by the House. The enabling final paragraph of the motion will, as appropriate, form part of each question put.

* * *

AERONAUTICS ACT**MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Corbeil that Bill C-5, an act to amend the Aeronautics Act and to amend an act to amend the Aeronautics

Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words on this legislation, an act to amend the Aeronautics Act.

It will be very difficult to live up to the advance billing that has been provided for me by my colleague from Halifax West.

As my colleagues who have spoken earlier this afternoon have already mentioned, the Liberal opposition basically supports the legislation that is before us. Its main substantive provisions concern increasing fines for airline offences relating to the contravention of the airport noise restrictions and expand the power of the Minister of Transport to deal with airports' emergencies under certain circumstances.

The Liberal Party certainly supports the thrust of this legislation, which is to reduce noise pollution at our major airports and to increase airport safety. In fact, members on this side of the House, particularly those representing constituencies in and around Toronto, have called upon the government to take action to deal with the problem of airport noise arising from over-flights and the take off and landing of large jets at the Pearson International Airport.

I am informed that a task force study by the Liberal opposition called "The Report on the Pearson International Airport" cited some rather shocking statistics concerning the number of flights landing around the residences near Pearson International Airport. For example, 747 jets land and take off, waking up residents who live near the airport, at 3 a.m., 4 a.m. and 5 a.m. There are some 300,000 people are living in that area.

Certainly the problem of noise pollution and frequent flights over Pearson International Airport is a serious problem. It is good to see that the members of the opposition have been vigorously representing the concerns of their constituents faced with those difficulties.

In fact, what surprises me about the debate on this particular piece of legislation, in light of the motion introduced earlier by the government, is the fact that Bill C-5, which we support, was not included among the pieces of legislation that the government chose to include in its motion for reinstatement of outstanding legislation from the previous session.