

might know exactly what business, what Bills will be before the House, so that our work in the House and our other parliamentary activities can be organized accordingly.

I think we saw an instance of this in the past week when it was difficult for us to schedule our work because the previous day we had to wait until 6 p.m. to find out the business of the House for the next day.

I would therefore ask—

[*English*]

Is it not possible for the Government House Leader, now that we have concluded this matter, to improve the notice that we get from the Government so that we can dispose of the business in a fair manner? It would be much more useful to us as an Opposition to know ahead of time what the legislative menu will be. It would be useful for the media and for the people of Canada to know that we are going to be looking at such and such a measure the following week, in two weeks or even a month. I cannot see why we could not agree to the Government's projected Order of business for the next two or three weeks. It would allow us to plan better and to work better and it would probably be more efficient and effective.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, am I to assume that we are through the resolution? Has it been adopted?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that because it is a matter of House business. Perhaps I could do so after we adopt the resolution?

Mr. Speaker: I think that there is a clear disposition in the House to proceed. It is my duty to put the question to the House.

Does the House agree to the amendment of the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski)?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Mazankowski) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion of the Deputy Prime Minister carry, as amended?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Mazankowski), as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski).

Mr. Benjamin: You are lucky Arnold Peters is not here.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: The Member is right, Mr. Speaker. It is a very interesting comment.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

National Transportation Act, 1986

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the point made by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) is certainly well taken. I remind him, however, that what we have been trying to do over the course of the last two or three weeks is to dispose of Opposition Days. If there is any disorder, he has only to point to himself because we have been trying to dispose of the 13 Opposition Days. I am sorry that the Member has not signalled to the press and to the people of Canada what topics the Opposition was going to choose for discussion. If there is any confusion, it is largely as a result of that and the Government's obligation and responsibility to fulfil it.

I do have some good news, Mr. Speaker. We have just emerged from a House Leaders' meeting. We have more or less mapped out the order of business for the rest of this week and next week on into Friday. I will be in a position to so indicate to the House when I am asked the usual question on Thursday.

Mr. Gauthier: Excellent.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier is a very tough and skilled negotiator, always very good-natured and always very constructive. I thank him for his remarks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The order of business following this resolution is Bill C-18. I think that all the Members who want to participate in that piece of legislation are here, including the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Would the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) speak with the Chair for a moment? I am sure all Hon. Members would be prepared to wait.

* * *

● (1640)

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT, 1986

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Because of the large number of motions in amendment set down for Bill C-18, an Act respecting national transportation, at report stage, some of which were put on notice as late as last evening, I have not yet had time to finalize my ruling on this Bill. For that reason, I would propose to the House that debate begin on those motions with which the Chair has no procedural difficulty, and I will deliver my ruling the next time the Bill is called. Is there such agreement?