

their struggle for a passenger rail service that will serve them. The petition that I am presenting is on behalf of many of the constituents in the province of Saskatchewan. They ask Parliament for a passenger rail act giving VIA Rail a firm legislative mandate and to revise the costing arrangement for that railway to operate.

In conclusion, these Canadians insist on a passenger rail service which will allow them equitable and reasonable transportation service throughout Canada. This is our national transportation link and Canadians are not going to take its winding down lightly.

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 36 with a petition from people of Ontario, New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia and Saskatchewan who, as well as those whose petitions have been tabled earlier, are greatly concerned about the killing, if you like, of VIA Rail.

This group of people is telling the government that they are joining the efforts of Transport 2000 and of Rural Dignity of Canada in order to obtain justice and satisfaction to what they feel are legitimate demands, and that is the saving of the railway.

• (1140)

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and duty, on behalf of citizens from across Canada to present a number of petitions dealing with VIA Rail. These petitions are in a different form but they all call upon the government to live up to its original pledge to support VIA Rail and to provide the necessary resources to allow VIA to operate as a modern, effective transportation company.

[*Translation*]

TAX BENEFITS FOR NORTHERN AND ISOLATED AREAS

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, today, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to table a petition from Lebel-sur-Quévillon in the Abitibi area, concerning the recommendations of the Task Force on Tax Benefits for Northern and Isolated Areas.

Lebel-sur-Quévillon is without question an isolated area, and that is why your petitioners consider the Brunelle recommendation to be discriminatory, unfair and inefficient as it concerns the northern tax benefit

system. It does not encourage settlement in the north and offers no incentive to develop northern resources.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my duty to table five petitions from Canadian men and women who object to the government's proposal to impose a 7 per cent goods and services tax on Canadians.

According to your petitioners, this government's record on taxation is terrible. It has introduced 31 new taxes since it came to power in 1984 and raised taxes on manufactured products from 9 per cent to 13.5 per cent.

Your petitioners object to a new goods and services tax because they feel this is a tax Canadians will find very hard to pay, a tax that will put an additional burden on small businesses, cause inflation to rise and interest rates to rise very substantially, and probably increase unemployment to alarming levels.

Your petitioners ask the House of Commons to reject the government's proposed 7 per cent tax on goods and services.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present petitions signed by dozens of Canadians who, like the ones mentioned by my learned friend for Ottawa—Vanier, are opposed to the goods and services tax. They have signed these petitions which call upon Parliament to reject the goods and services tax as unfair, discriminatory and wasteful.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 228, 232 and 233.

[*Text*]

CN ADVERTISEMENTS IN THE MAGAZINES "SEAPORTS AND THE SHIPPING WORLD" AND "SAILINGS"

Question No. 228—**Mr. Milliken:**

Since the date of the appointment of Mr. Brian Gallery to the Board of Directors of CN, has CN placed advertisements in the magazines