

Electoral Boundaries

or not a member truly has the capacity to represent his constituency with fairness to all. A member must be available to his constituents so that he can fully participate in bringing federal affairs before them. Likewise, the people of his constituency have a sense of feeling toward the federal government.

● (1650)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I have listened to what has been said and have had an opportunity of reading what was said in committee hearings. I share the objectives regarding flexibility and use of the 25 per cent. However, I still disagree with hon. members. I think they are tying a noose for themselves. In view of the disposition of the House, I am quite prepared to withdraw my amendment, with the consent of my seconder. All I say is simply that I am far from convinced, and I sincerely hope hon. members have not fashioned a noose for themselves, one worse than existed before.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is it agreed that the hon. member for Edmonton West is allowed to withdraw his amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West)) withdrawn.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, there have been discussions in regard to dealing with three bills having to do with a holiday. The three bills are C-208, standing in the name of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), C-240 standing in the name of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), and C-249 standing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

As a result of the discussions it has been proposed that Bill C-208, which had been reported back to the House by the justice committee in the last parliament, be given second reading and sent to the standing committee; that the subject matter of Bill C-240 standing in the name of the hon. member for Hillsborough, and Bill C-249 standing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre be discharged and their subject matters sent to the same standing committee, justice and legal affairs. The committee would then have all bills on this subject, listed as private members' public bills on the order paper, before it, and it can then discuss the matter and report back to the House, which report the House might want to consider at a later time.

Mr. Macquarrie: Madam Speaker, although I regret that the matter was not disposed of in the last parliament or earlier in this parliament, I am pleased to go along with that suggestion, and I hope we will have a fruitful discussion of the bill and action in this parliament.

[Mr. Malone.]

Mr. Schumacher: Madam Speaker, I am sorry to be a fly in the ointment, but regretfully I cannot go along with the proposal of my hon. friend, the parliamentary secretary. I do not know whether it is the wish of the House to proceed on the basis of time left for debate, but I cannot go along with the proposal. I guess a motion would have to be put before the House to debate any subject further.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Might I ask the hon. member whether he would indicate which part of the proposal he does not approve?

Mr. Schumacher: The part of the proposal I do not approve of concerns Bill C-208. I cannot say that I have the same objection to the bill of my hon. friend for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) because his is simply a concept and will not produce legislation, as I understand his proposal. Basically I am not in favour of a new holiday being created at this time of inflation; I do not think we can beat inflation unless we work. Perhaps we should be looking at it the other way, and should have an extra day during the year rather than one day less.

Mr. Reid: There does not seem to be any agreement to proceed in this way, Madam Speaker, so may I put another proposal before the House. I am rather embarrassed about this but there is a small bill standing in my name dealing with a proposed new bridge between Fort Francis, Ontario, and International Falls, Minnesota. When the bill was originally passed in this House in 1971 a five-year limit was put upon it. Unfortunately the U.S. Congress did not take action until recently, and the five-year limit is running out now. There is no time to build the bridge within the one year left under Canadian law. This bill would extend the period for another five years, and make consequential amendments which flow from the United States legislation. If there is agreement to take Bill C-367, it could be sent to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications for consideration and report.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

FORT-FALLS BRIDGE AUTHORITY ACT

MEASURE TO REMOVE REQUIREMENT FOR ACT OF U.S.
CONGRESS BEFORE COMMENCING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River) moved that Bill C-367, to amend the Fort-Falls Bridge Authority Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if there would be any point in suggesting—I trust that I have the ear of the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) as well as the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid)—that, instead of the proposal that was made, the subject matter