

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**WAYS AND MEANS**

## TABLING OF NOTICE OF MOTION

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give notice of a Ways and Means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff, the Income Tax Act and other statutes of Canada.

I ask that an Order of the Day be designated to debate the motion.

\* \* \*

**ORDER IN COUNCIL**

## TABLING OF APPOINTMENTS AND REFERENCE

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of Order in Council appointments which were made by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to several petitions.

[Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.]

\* \* \*

**TRANSPORT**

## CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, earlier today I gave notice to the Table of my intention to move concurrence in the second report of the Standing Committee on Transport presented to this House on November 8, 1989.

I move that the second report of the Standing Committee on Transport, presented to the House on November 8, 1989, be concurred in.

Normally or traditionally in situations where a member of this House is moving concurrence in a report of a standing committee, particularly one that has received support from all parties, one would work out in advance with both the government members of that committee and the official opposition members of that committee the scheduling of this kind of debate. I regret that I was not able to do that because today is the first day of the House coming back from its Christmas recess.

I felt, in consultation with my colleagues, that the events of this preceding week necessitated debate in this House on the very important matters considered by the Standing Committee on Transport.

As members will realize, the second report of the standing committee dealt with VIA Rail and the future of rail passenger service. The committee held hearings in the fall after the Minister of Transport announced to a press conference the decimation of about 51 per cent of the rail passenger system in this country.

The committee met with a number of organizations which had specific concerns about the impact of those cuts, gave consideration to the matter and issued a report which was tabled in this House on Wednesday, November 8.

• (1510)

The committee examined a number of the areas of concern and made some recommendations. One of the recommendations was that the cuts not be proceeded with, that there needed to be further study and further consideration by the government. Since the government had put in place a Royal Commission on Passenger Transportation, which was also to be charged with the matter, the committee felt that it did not make sense to proceed with the cuts and then the study.

That is the rough background to the committee's report. I am sure the question in members' minds is: Why today?

Given the outpouring of support for VIA Rail that we saw in the final three or four days of its cross-Canada elimination—and there were not just hundreds of people but thousands of people who came out to indicate their support, whether it was at rallies or as individuals just being there by the tracks as the last Canadian went through—we have a responsibility once again to express to the Government of Canada our desire, even at this