

know that we put the plight of veterans much higher than the necessity for closure on Bill C-83.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the announcement made by the government House leader is correct. We gladly agree.

[Translation]

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, we are in full agreement with the suggestion put forward to the House by the President of the Privy Council. This proves that when the government introduces good legislation to help the poor, especially those who require it most, we always go along.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Hon. members should understand that, despite the lateness of the hour, the House is still dealing with Routine Proceedings. If the House were to deal with this measure now and put the motion and have passage of the motion without debate, the necessary steps would have to be taken with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR ACT

#### MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR AND THEIR DEPENDANTS

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan) that Bill C-92, to provide for compensation for former prisoners of war and their dependants and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

## Electoral Boundaries

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

#### ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

##### MOTION RESPECTING COMPLETION OF DEBATE

**Mr. Speaker:** The House is now still engaged in the conclusion of Routine Proceedings, specifically, motions. Earlier this day the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) gave indication of his intention, with the consent of the House, to move a motion respecting the business of the House for Monday and Tuesday, namely, debate on the Electoral Boundaries Commission reports, at which time the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) raised a point of order.

The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

● (2140)

**Mr. Penner:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I seek your indulgence and that of all hon. members to raise a serious and pressing point of order with reference to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario which was tabled on February 27 by Your Honour in this House. I raise the point of order at this time because, in my view, it must be considered by Your Honour prior to the debate which is to take place on Monday and Tuesday of next week, if in fact that comes about.

My point of order is that this document cannot properly be tabled and considered because the commission has failed to comply with the reporting provisions of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. The Commission has not complied to the extent that it has not included reasons justifying the recommendations as required by the act I have mentioned.

I would draw your attention to section 2(1) of the act and the definition therein contained of the word "Recommendation" which states:

"Recommendation" with respect to a recommendation set forth in the report means a recommendation that is justified by a reason therefor.

It is the last phrase, Mr. Speaker, which I wish to stress, "a recommendation that is justified by a reason therefor." The section of the act I have quoted was a fairly recent amendment introduced in this House by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). It was a wise and useful amendment simply because when objections are filed, as they have been in large numbers, members quite naturally want to be relevant in debate, and in order to do so they must find specific reasons stated justifying the recommendations. Otherwise members have nothing before them upon which to base what should be cogent and pertinent comments.

Now, Sir, if I may, let me draw your attention to the Ontario report and let us see exactly in what way the commission has failed to abide by the terms of the act. On page three, we find Schedule B, purporting to be that part of the report complying with the requirement of the act as contained in the definition I have just read. The title of Schedule B is "Reasons for the Original Proposed Boundaries". Immediately we are confronted with error No. 1. The report which ought to be tabled by Your Honour is not that