

ministerial side, I would ask that the same treatment be allowed on the opposition side.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, it is Thursday and it is the usual time of the day when we ask the Deputy Government House Leader to outline the Business of the House for the next few days.

I wonder if I could make a special request of the Hon. Minister. Since we are all interested in the final vote on third reading of the trade deal, I wonder if he might give some thought to being specific as to the day that we might vote on that, to allow for ample notification of Members who are here today and, perhaps more important, Members who are in their constituencies, so that they can be sure to be here for that very important vote.

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome my hon. friend's interest in the vote, and I am sure that his Party will be here. Let me first of all outline exactly where we are headed. Today, we are going to continue with report stage consideration of Bill C-130, the free trade Bill. Tomorrow, we have suggested to the opposition Parties a combination of the following five Bills, whichever we can make the most progress on, and we will take them in the order which would result in the most progress: Bill C-146, the Tax Court of Canada Bill, perhaps at all stages; Bill C-143, the substance abuse centre Bill, at all stages; Bill C-123, the Indian Act amendments, report stage and third reading, that recently came back from committee; Bill C-150, Indian Act amendments on the death rule, at all stages; and Bill C-147, the human rights centre Bill, at all stages.

On Monday we will be resuming report stage consideration of Bill C-130 and, it being a long day, we would go until ten o'clock, pursuant to the House Order. Any divisions which are demanded at report stage, including the concurrence motion, would be deferred by a House Order to Tuesday, August 23, at 6 p.m.

Tuesday, for debate purposes, we would be calling, first of all, Bill C-144, the child care Bill, which we would like to send to committee. If it is in fact back from committee, we would be dealing with Bill C-139, the tax reform Bill at report stage.

I appreciate my hon. colleague's interest in the balance of the third reading debate on Bill C-130.

**Mr. Riis:** To facilitate Members' travel and to facilitate Members' voting on important matters, I simply want to ask the Deputy Government House Leader once again whether at this point it is impossible to say or to state on what day the actual third reading vote will take place. He does now have the

right to set aside any two days for debate, and I would like to suggest that if there is any way that he could indicate on which days that vote would take place, it would certainly facilitate individual Members organizing their own schedules.

**Mr. Lewis:** I think that at the present time I am stuck with my statement that we would like to give long days, and that would mean Thursday, Monday or Monday, Tuesday. As soon as that gels and I can give the House some idea, I think that it is in the interest of all Members to do that. I will certainly be here. It is either Thursday, Monday or Monday, Tuesday.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, I now have confirmation from the distinguished critic on Indian Affairs of the Liberal Party that it would be acceptable to him to begin with Bill C-150. Second, with respect to the comments made by the Deputy Government House Leader about the days for the third reading stage imposed on this House by the Order that was obtained by the Government the other day, I would like to discuss this with him during the course of the afternoon. I may have some suggestions that would assist him in deciding what to do.

**Mr. Speaker:** On a point of order, the Hon. Member for Lethbridge—Foothills.

\* \* \*

## POINT OF ORDER

### MONTREAL RAILWAY COMMUTER SERVICE—CLARIFICATION OF ANSWER

**Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to clarify my response to a question from the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) during Question Period on Tuesday of this week. While the Member is not present at the moment, I have spoken to him by telephone and he knows that I will be rising on this point of order.

I did not realize that the Member was referring to a commuter service, and I may therefore have inadvertently misled the House. As commuter services are not within the jurisdiction of the federal Government, CN is not required to apply to the NTA for the abandonment of the St. Hilaire service. I have referred to the NTA and to the processes which are required under that Act. This decision is purely a management or an operational one on the part of the railway, and it would be inappropriate for the federal Government to interfere. I would, however, point out to the Hon. Member that CN sustains an annual deficit of some \$1.3 million for this underutilized service.

Federal funds were available for the modernization of the Saint-Hilaire service through the Canada-Quebec agreement signed in 1981. The province decided not to modernize the service, as no satisfactory agreement could be reached with the concerned municipalities at that time.