

MR. SHARP: Mr. Speaker, hopefully, I will have the agreement of the House to approve a motion which appears under notices of motions at page 13 of today's order paper as follows:

That, on Monday, April 5, 1976, the House shall continue to sit between 6.00 p.m. and 8.00 p.m.;

That, on Tuesday, April 6, 1976, the House shall not adjourn until the completion of the business provided for in this order;

That, on the aforementioned days, no private members business shall be taken up;

That, on the aforementioned days, the business taken up shall be the consideration of objections to reports of Electoral Boundaries Commissions;

That all objections to any given report be considered at the same time;

That the objections or groups of objections, as the case may be, be considered in the order in which the objection or first objection in the group, as the case may be, was laid upon the table; and

That during the consideration of any objection or group of objections, as the case may be, no member shall speak more than once, nor for more than twenty minutes.

At that time the then Hon. Member for Grenville-Carleton was the Opposition House Leader and he said:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader has discussed the matter with me and we are prepared to consent.

Consent was had on that occasion. I would also ask the Chair to look at page 12412 of *Hansard*, April 2, 1976 where again the point I make is quite clear.

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, the House Order used in 1976 provided for separate consideration of the objections to each report. This is the most important point, Sir, because the rules of the House hold that only one question may be before the House at any given time. Citation 411(3) of *Beauchesne*—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member. He is overwhelming in his eloquence and the Chair might be prepared, without offending the Hon. Member, to indicate that he has put a very persuasive case and does he need to put it further?

Mr. Nielsen: I just need 60 seconds, Sir. I want to cite to the Chair Citation 411(3) of *Beauchesne's* Fifth Edition which supports my contention that such matters have to be dealt with separately.

I suggest, Sir, that because no provision was made in the House Order yesterday to call the objections and reports separately, each objection to be considered today must be called individually and the debate then adjourned on each by 3 p.m. not only to meet the terms of the House Order passed yesterday but the established practice of this House. Furthermore, Sir, I am somewhat concerned about the procedure that was followed earlier this year with respect to the objections on which debate has already commenced, and therefore I would ask you to consider the acceptability of the procedures followed, particularly on March 18, 1983, when objections to the reports for the Provinces of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba were considered.

Thank you, Sir.

● (1230)

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with care to what the House Leader for the Opposition (Mr. Nielsen) has said

Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act

and I do believe that it is entirely proper to group together objections of this kind and to debate them in that way. That was the situation earlier this year when we examined the objections with regard to the reports of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions for other Provinces. Certainly that was the case on June 17, at which time we examined the reports of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions for Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan. Objections with regard to both of those reports were given at that time and debate was, as is provided in the House order for today, adjourned to a later date.

The purpose today, obviously, was to open debate on these matters so that all who wished to speak could speak today and to continue the debate at a later time. I suggest that the House order stands on its own. The House order is clear and the procedures are entirely in order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is in the hands of the House. To the best knowledge of the Chair, the House order does not specifically state that they must all be debated together. I would like to have a copy of the order, if I may. However, it seems to me that if the House wishes to consider items individually, seriatim, then that would be a normal and appropriate way of proceeding.

The House order reads as follows:

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That, on Friday September 16, 1983, upon reaching Orders of the Day, the House shall take up and consider the objections to the Reports of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions for the Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia and Newfoundland and for the Northwest Territories;

That, at 3.00 o'clock p.m., consideration of the objections shall be adjourned; and

That the reports of the Commissions be referred back to the Chief Electoral Officer when consideration of the objections is completed by the House.

The House order does not specify that they must all be discussed at once. The Chair is quite prepared, if that is the wish of the House, to accept the motions seriatim as proposed, and suggests that we get on with the debate. Are there any further comments?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, the understanding is, of course, that all of the reports are open and that all of the statements of objection are subject to debate. I think the House order is quite clear that debate will commence on all of these items and that it will resume at a later date with regard to all of these items.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has made a ruling that the House order states that they shall be considered in the course of the afternoon. It does not specify that all are to be debated at one time. That is not in the House order and unless there is unanimous agreement that that should be the case, the normal parliamentary procedure would be to consider the items seriatim. I suggest that we would need unanimous consent of the House to vary a normal agreement.

The House order, in the opinion of the Chair, does not specify that all items should be considered or be open for debate at the same time. Short of a specification in the order,