

*Business of the House*

passage of this legislation at second reading stage and in committee.

This initiative will benefit the industry without drawing on the public purse while still leaving the provinces an independent choice on the implementation of theatre locations and operations. The Bill will allow the federal Minister of Agriculture to set out the conditions which must be met before a permit will be granted for this form of pari-mutuel wagering.

The primary condition is contained within the legislation. Provinces must agree independently to license any teletheatre. Further conditions will be set out by the Minister in regulations. The regulations would be consistent with current provisions governing other types of pari-mutuel wagering.

Through the regulations, federal controls can be sensitive to different circumstances across the country. They will also permit flexibility in the requirements for teletheatres if regional circumstances alter.

The horse racing industry provides thousands of jobs in the rural areas of Canada. Because it does so, it is worth while for this House to remove any unnecessary obstacles to its continuing health. That is the intent of this Bill. Therefore, I request favourable consideration for the small modification in current rules proposed in this legislation.

**Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to give our consent to the passing of Bill C-7, a Bill that will legalize theatre-style wagering in horse races off the grounds of race courses. I would like to indicate to Hon. Members opposite that we are giving support to this Bill but we also wish to indicate that we are not setting a precedent and that as long as there are suggestions and Bills that come before the House that are reasonable and acceptable, we will support them. However, this is not a precedent and certainly may not always be the case, but we do give our support to the Bill.

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank my colleagues in the New Democratic Party caucus for allowing us on our Opposition day to spend a short period of time getting this Bill to the starting line. I also want to say that this is probably the first and last time I will expedite anything the Government brings forward in such a manner.

This is my cease-fire. On behalf of the 300 horsemen and women in the Sudbury Basin who are depending on this Bill, I would like to thank the Government and all Hon. Members of the House very much for expediting this Bill. Now the cease-fire is over.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Before putting the motion standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), since today is an allotted day, pursuant to special order, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider disposing of the Supply Bill in view of recent practices. Do Hon. Members agree that the Bill be distributed now?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The question I would like to put in connection with the Bill arises out of the interim supply notice that appears in the Order Paper. It appears that today the Government is asking that nine-twelfths of the funds required for the financial year ended March 31, 1990, be granted, and that is what will be in the Bill that is about to be distributed.

My question is for the Government House Leader as I presume he will answer it. Are the funds that were taken by the Government by special warrant of the Governor General contained in the reports that have been tabled in the House included in this Bill or are they in addition to it? In other words, does the Government consider that it already has one and a half months of supply based on the special warrants and is asking for an additional nine months of supply or are the funds that have already been taken included in the nine months that are being requested in the Bill that I believe we are about to see?

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I am reading from the notes that will be provided to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotrét). The question that is usually asked is whether or not the Bill is in substantially the same form as that passed in previous years. This time there is a change. It is the same except that it includes provisions associated with special Governor General warrants. The notation is also made that the proportions requested in the Bill are intended to provide for all necessary requirements for the Government of Canada up to October 31, 1989.