

any reference to bankruptcy and so on, I said last week and told the truckers that I will make all the investigations I can. Again, this is a private sector operation. I will not do that and cannot do that at the present time.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions among the Parties and, notwithstanding any Standing Order, I think you will find unanimous consent to defer the recorded division at 4.45 p.m., presuming that one will be called for on third reading of Bill C-144, until 6 p.m. this evening. At that time we will have the vote on the report stage amendments to the Broadcasting Act. It makes more sense to call the Members together to vote at one time. We would then suspend the sitting from 4.45 p.m. until 5 p.m., and commence Private Members' Hour at that time.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I hope that will be made an order of the House. In the interest of having more Members speak, could we not agree to debate Bill C-144 until five o'clock, then proceed to Private Members' Hour as agreed? Members could then vote on Bills C-144 and C-136.

Mr. Lewis: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. In fact, in my remarks during debate on time allocation, I offered to sit through lunch today. When that was not taken up, I naturally did not think my hon. friend wanted the 15 minutes from 4.45 p.m. until 5 p.m. However, before he rises again, let me say that we naturally agree to go until five o'clock. Any recorded division requested at that time would be taken at 6 p.m.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, we are in agreement to the changes in the proceedings today. Also with respect to the House business question—

Mr. Lewis: There is no House business question.

Mr. Angus:—could I ask the Hon. Minister if there will be any response to our request for proceeding with the Election Expenses Act.

Mr. Speaker: I think I must respond to the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan and indicate that there does not seem to be any response, at least at this moment.

I am obliged to give precedence to a question of privilege. The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

Canada Child Care Act

PRIVILEGE

CADIN-PINETREE SITE DISPOSALS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. McInnes) is still in the House and I would like to raise this point while he is still here. The Minister responded to a question I asked concerning a letter that was sent by my office on July 7, 1988, regarding the cases of all CADIN-Pinetree site disposals.

I remind the Minister that not only did he receive my letter of July 7, 1988, the letter was even answered by the Department of Public Works. I have a copy of the reply of August 23, 1988, which I would be willing to table. The Minister seemingly answered a letter that he did not receive.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know whether it is a question of privilege, but it is an assertion of fact. I think we will take it as a representation and leave it there. It is not a question of privilege.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA CHILD CARE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Epp (Provencher) that Bill C-144, and Act to authorize payments by Canada toward the provision of child care services, and to amend the Canada Assistance Plan in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed; and on the amendment of Ms. Mitchell (p. 19454).

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): When the House rose at one o'clock, there were five minutes remaining in the question and comment period following the speech by the Hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Nicholson). The Hon. Member had the floor.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls): Madam Speaker, I want to comment on the subject of witnesses before the legislative committee on Bill C-144. The New Democratic Party cannot have it both ways on this issue. During the hearings of the special committee on child care, a committee which visited 31 cities and received representations from over 1,000 individuals, the NDP said the same thing at every city we visited and at every meeting here in Ottawa. They said that there had been enough talk on this subject. They said there had been enough discussion and enough study. The NDP said: "We want to cut this out. We want to see legislation".

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) responded to the recommendations of the special committee on child care and came forward with legislation. Immediately the