that are supporting the battle against acid rain in the United States, that we will proceed now to a 50 per cent reduction?

I ask this question, Madam Speaker, because on September 8 of this year Representative Dingell of the House of Representatives wrote a letter to the EPA Administrator, Mr. Ruckelshaus. In that letter he asks questions about what Canada is prepared to do, what our base line data is, and what the costs will be. In other words, here is a member who is involved—

● (1500)

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is raising a very important question. My answer to him is that we have in Canada, as a result of an effort in joint federal-provincial co-operation, achieved a plan in Fredericton last month among environmental Ministers, provincial and federal. We have a plan, we are ready to move, and we want to move with the Americans in order to achieve our targets.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITION

MR. BOCKSTAEL—DEMOLITION OF PETRO-CANADA RESTAURANT

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael) on Wednesday, October 19, meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

[*English*]

POINT OF ORDER

MR. DEANS—S.O. 21 STATEMENT

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, during Statements by Members I was ruled out of order. I wonder if you would be kind enough to tell me which Speaker's ruling I was reflecting upon?

Madam Speaker: It seemed to me by what the Hon. Member was saying that he was indirectly reflecting on a ruling that I had made some days ago. However, if the Hon. Member feels that I have not been fair with him I will look at the blues. He has now sent me his complete statement. I shall look at it and if I have not been fair or if I have jumped to conclusions a little bit too soon, I will be only too glad to give the Hon. Member another chance to make that statement.

Business of the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I rise to ask the customary Thursday question of the Government House Leader, what he expects in the way of business for the remainder of this week and what he has in mind for next week.

While he is answering that question, would he also take the House into his confidence, if he can do so at this time, with respect to the contemplated date for prorogation and the contemplated date for a new session and Throne Speech?

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, on the latter part of the question, I will be in a better position to answer once Bill C-155 and Bill C-152 have received Royal Assent. Meanwhile, we are talking about a reasonable package and we hope that we will be able to get those two Bills through within the next few days so we can contemplate prorogation before the November break. We hope we will have the Speech from the Throne by mid-November. We must get Royal Assent on Bill C-155 and Bill C-152 first, and therefore the door is open for a Speech from the Throne, if need be, a bit later.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, as far as the business of the House for the next few days is concerned, today we intend to propose a motion to limit debate under Standing Order 82. Assuming that the motion is voted on today, Monday will be the first day of debate allocated for the report stage of Bill C-155. Tuesday will be the second day of debate on the same matter, while next Wednesday will be for private members' business and next Thursday we shall have third reading of Bill C-155.

If for some reason we are unable to dispose of the motion under Standing Order 82 today, and in any case if debate had started today, the order of the day for Monday morning shall be to resume debate on the motion under Standing Order 82, at 11 a.m. As far as the business of the House for tomorrow is concerned, I think the Hon. Member has changed his mind—he would not want it to be an Opposition day, I suppose, but I would like him to be clear about that.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: Madam Speaker, I have a point of order on House business. I wonder if I might be allowed to ask the Government House Leader, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, if the Government might be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 43 by adding immediately after line 34 at page 24 the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the rate a railway company may charge a shipper for the movement of grain for the period January 1, 1984 to July 31, 1986 shall not exceed the existing rates in effect on August 1, 1983".

This motion would preserve the existing statutory freight rate until such time as the Government has concluded its studies and the full impact assessment upon producers is fully analysed.