

5. What is the cost per year charged to individual residents of Prescott for post office boxes and what are the reasons for this charge?

Hon. Michel Côté (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Canada Post): The Canada Post Corporation informs me as follows:

1. No street letter boxes have recently been removed from the Town of Prescott, Ontario.

(a), (b), (c) and (d) However, nine street letter boxes were removed from the Town of Prescott in December, 1983 as part of a continuous process of review which had resulted in the adoption in 1982 of an Ontario Region Cost Reduction Plan. Street letter boxes are not normally provided in communities not served by letter carriers.

2. Notices informing the public were placed on all boxes three weeks prior to removal.

3. Re-installation of boxes at this time would be inappropriate.

4. The residents of Prescott and its environs are served by one of the following modes of delivery: general delivery, lock box or rural route delivery. The three modes of delivery now employed are the most cost effective and are adequate ones to serve this and other similar communities.

5. The rate structure that the Corporation applied to post office box customers in Prescott is identical to that in the rest of Canada since a universal rate is in effect. The fee charged for a box is dependent on two factors: the size of the box rented, and the type of alternate service available to the customer renting the box.

The Corporation's rates are as follows:

Box Size	Dimensions of Box	Category of Customers	
		Customers with Access to Delivery by Letter Carrier, Rural Route, Group Box, and Mail Courier Service	All Other Customers
A	127mm • 87.3mm	\$25.40	\$ 6.74
B	127mm • 138mm	\$50.88	\$13.48
C	127mm • 290.5mm	\$76.32	\$20.22
D	266.6mm • 290.5mm	\$96.46	\$33.71

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker. I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Criminal Code

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING LOTTERIES

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved that Bill C-81, an Act to amend the Criminal Code (lotteries), be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations between the Parties and I think you will find a disposition to allow the following motion to be brought forward by unanimous consent, presented and passed without debate. The motion is as follows:

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Order of this House, when the Order of the Day for the second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-81, an Act to amend the Criminal Code (lotteries), is called and is disposed of this day, it shall stand referred to a Committee of the whole; and

Provided that not later than the end of the time provided for the consideration of Government Business this day, the Speaker shall interrupt, if necessary, any proceedings then before the House and shall put forthwith, and successively without further debate or amendment, all questions necessary to dispose of the then remaining stages of the said Bill.

• (1520)

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say on behalf of my colleagues that we will, of course, give the necessary unanimous consent. However, I must confess that I would prefer us to have arranged among ourselves that the Bill be disposed of during the course of the day. I do not think it is necessary all the time for us to formalize these arrangements in a motion. I hope that among the three House Leaders we will be able to reach some understanding to allow legislation to be dealt with, without the necessity of a motion being put to the House.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, my dilemma is simply this. The House Leader the Official Opposition (Mr. Gray) prefers that I give prior notice in writing with respect to understandings we reach as far as possible.

Mr. Deans: All right.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: On the other hand, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) prefers the more informal procedure. I am equally friendly with both House Leaders and I am going to try and be Solomon-like in this dilemma and try to do my best to get a consensus.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, since I feel somewhat aimed at in the remarks—

Mr. Deans: No.

Mr. Gauthier: —of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Hnatyshyn), I would point out that it is understandable that I cannot always be on top of all these issues because I do not attend the meetings of House Leaders. However, I am often called to give my agreement to these things. I do not do that