

training centre at Ville de Laval is continuing today, and did officials of the Canadian penitentiary service instruct employees at that institute yesterday to give misleading answers to the subcommittee of this House investigating the penitentiary service and the reasons for this failure to return to work?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not have an up to date report on that matter, but I will be pleased to get a report for the hon. member.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baldwin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This might be one of my last opportunities to ask the President of the Privy Council, as the government House leader, what his plans are for the House for the balance of this week, and next week, as the case may be.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, we would continue today with the debate on the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, followed by the immigration bill, followed by the amendments to the Criminal Code, and then the Olympic bill. I have changed the order of business slightly because it is my understanding that some members who might want to participate in debate on the Olympic bill will not be here tomorrow, including the Postmaster General whom I should like to see attending tomorrow a very important historical celebration in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Baldwin: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, as the government House leader said that we were to begin debate on what he called, I think, the amendment to the Criminal Code, is it intended to complete this bill before any other legislation is called?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, save and except the necessity of dealing with the Olympic bill at some point next week.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the business of the House, I wonder if the government House leader has had time to think of the suggestion which was made yesterday, namely, that before we deal with anything else we might call order No. 12, the report stage and third reading of the bill regarding crop insurance.

● (1510)

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I would say that if we could pass the bill without debate, I would call it as the first order of business today; but I have had no assurance that it would pass in those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a supplementary point of order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is, has the minister sought this assurance? He has it from this party.

Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Suspension

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member to give me an assurance, and the other House leaders, and I will call this bill if they say there will be no debate.

Some hon. Members: Up, up.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to say there is a time and a place for everything, and it is not the floor of this House at this time.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

AMENDMENT TO SUSPEND OPERATION OF ACT

The House resumed, from Wednesday, July 18, consideration of Bill C-208, to suspend the operation of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Blenkarn (page 5758).

Mr. Speaker: The "time and place" now is to call on the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain).

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, the difference of opinion varies, increases and multiplies, it seems, as we go through the procedures of this House. It multiplies a little more as we get further into the session. No debate in this House exemplifies more clearly the difference of opinion that can exist among members of the House than this bill which pertains to redistribution and the amendment in respect of time. The change proposed by the amending bill is not new to Canada; it is something which has been necessary before, and unquestionably it will be necessary again.

When Canada was initially developed on the basis of negotiation, there were differences among those parts of Canada now known as provinces when the Dominion of Canada was formed. Negotiations were held and a decision arrived at which was considered at that time to be a fair, contractual agreement in respect of seats. I have listened with interest to those who have said it is not fair to Canada that there should be a minimum number of seats for some provinces. It seems to me it would be better to have a minimum number of seats for more provinces in Canada, so they might at least be geographically more competently and effectively represented.

While it may be a very interesting theory, I am sure in some areas of Canada if one were to say, "Let us alter the fact that there is a minimum number of seats in certain provinces," it would create a hubbub and furor in the general nation of Canada which would not be in line with what we want: furthermore, when the suggestion is made I think we are asking the House of Commons to negate or to fail to honour the contractual agreement by which Canada was formed. That contractual agreement did not relate only to seats in parliament; it did on one occasion relate to the necessity of constructing a railroad: so to me and to