

3. Are steps being taken by CNR to ensure that the service will be maintained in the future if Dart Container Lines leaves the port of Halifax and the volume of container traffic decreases and, if so, what are such steps?

4. Is the government aware of any action that can be taken by shippers or others to ensure that CNR does not decrease the frequency of the service and, if so, what is such action?

Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways and Transport Canada advise as follows: 1. No special trains are operated for this traffic. High speed freight trains scheduled on a six-day per week basis handle container and other time sensitive traffic. If necessary, additional scheduled trains are operated to handle excess traffic.

2. No special trains were operated for container traffic during the noted time period. The frequency of the scheduled trains was maintained.

3. Subject to demand, the present scheduled service will be maintained.

4. CN Rail mainline freight services are designed to accommodate traffic being offered in a timely and efficient manner. As long as shippers maintain the current level of traffic between Halifax and Montreal, CN Rail will not consider cutbacks in its freight service schedules. The government is not aware of any other action that can be taken to assure the current frequency of service if traffic volumes are not maintained.

[English]

Mr. Smith: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA OIL AND GAS ACT

MEASURES RESPECTING OIL AND GAS INTERESTS

The House resumed, from Thursday, October 22, consideration of Bill C-48, to regulate oil and gas interests in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, and Motion No. 17 (Mr. Waddell).

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order on a matter Your Honour may wish to consider over the weekend. I am referring specifically to the revised notes Your Honour prepared respecting motions to be put to the House in relation to Bill C-48. The practice, apparently, has been, under normal circumstances when questions have been grouped together, to put one of the motions and hold the balance over.

Canada Oil and Gas Act

The example I give is that the grouping was Motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and on. The ruling was that Motions Nos. 8, 9 and 10 seemed to offer alternatives and would be put to the House as follows: the question would be put on Motion No. 8; and affirmative vote makes it unnecessary for the House to decide on Motions Nos. 9 and 10; a negative vote necessitates the putting of the question on Motion No. 9.

I raise this point because at some subsequent date we will be taking the standing votes on a number of different motions related directly to Bill C-48. If we were to pursue the practice of receiving yeas and nays on only one of the votes, as we did last night, and not receiving yeas and nays on the subsequent votes, we would then be required, in the middle of taking the standing vote, to stop the process and to receive yeas and nays for subsequent votes which would, I put it to Your Honour, delay or at least extend the period of time for taking the vote, perhaps unnecessarily. It would also make it extremely difficult for the House leaders to sit down at some point between now and the day the recorded votes are taken and to decide on standing votes on some motions but perhaps not on others in order to expedite the business of the House.

I would like to ask if over the weekend Your Honour would consider as an alternative in matters such as this, where there is a large number of votes, that the yeas and nays be taken in every instance and that it then be recorded as to whether there is to be a standing vote subsequently. Then we would know for sure when we enter into our discussions which of the votes are to be recorded and which of the votes may in fact not need to be recorded, so that we can sort out the business of the House in a more expeditious way.

● (1220)

Madam Speaker: I am not sure that would expedite matters, but I am willing to look at the suggestion of the hon. member and study it. If the House leaders agree, we can perhaps study the procedure the hon. member is suggesting and comply with it, but it will have to be looked at very closely.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, last night I gave a preview of my speech. Now comes the speech. I called Bill C-48 a sleeper. By and large the press and the public of Canada have ignored this debate. They have been preoccupied with the Constitution and their own individual economic concerns, usurious interest rates when they have to renew their mortgages. I understand that. However, there is no point in assuring the political future of Canada through a new Constitution without ensuring an increase in domestic ownership of the energy sector of this country. That is the key for our future.

Today I want to begin the debate on the Canadianization parts of Bill C-48. These clauses of the bill lie at the heart of the National Energy Program. They are the ones under a barrage of unparalleled criticism from our American friends. I want to tell the government on behalf of our party, and indirectly the United States government, that the objectives of the National Energy Program will get our support, and I think public support, provided the legislation is tightened up to fully