

*Electoral Boundaries*

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I move:

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.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Cafik:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Actually, I would indicate at this time that I wish to raise a question of privilege on Monday and present argument, not about Your Honour's decision which I respect and acknowledge, but about important matters fundamental to this House and affecting all members of parliament, particularly those from the province of Ontario. I wish to enter that caveat now and reserve my right to argue the question of privilege on Monday next.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Standing Orders provide that the Chair must be given written or effective notice of such intention to raise a question of privilege. I cannot think of more effective notice than the kind of notice which the hon. member for Ontario has just given.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to do with the motion which the House just adopted. I think it would help if we could settle the order in which the various objections shall be considered. The motion provides, in part, that the objections or groups of objections, as the case may be, shall 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. That will be the general principle governing the debate. But there may be some confusion as to how that provision is to be interpreted. I should like to settle the question so as to avoid differences of opinion later.

The first of the objections tabled was with respect to Nova Scotia; then there were tabled, in the following order, objections respecting Alberta, the Northwest Territories, Ontario, British Columbia and Quebec. The House will remember that it has also taken under consideration some objections relating to Nova Scotia, Alberta and British Columbia. It is the opinion of the House leaders who have been consulted on the question that the order of consideration should be, first the Northwest Territories and then, in the following order, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Alberta, and British Columbia. I suggest that it would serve the purposes of the House and would result in orderly debate if that suggestion were to be made an order of the House.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, that is agreeable.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is so ordered.

\* \* \*

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,733, 3,846, 4,776, 4,965 and 4,968.

[Text]

#### RETENTION OF LAWYERS IN OKANAGAN BOUNDARY CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 3,733—**Mr. Whittaker:**

1. What were the names and addresses of all lawyers and law firms in the Constituency of Okanagan Boundary, British Columbia who performed services for the Department of Supply and Services during 1973 and 1974?

2. By year, what was the total amount paid to each?

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services):** 1. Nil.

2. Not applicable.

#### PEI—FISHING SECTOR

Question No. 3,846—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

With reference to the fishing sector of the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan, what criteria have been used by the Joint Advisory Board in (a) evaluating the overall effectiveness of the sectoral strategy in relation to the Plan objectives (b) determining the effectiveness of the various programmes and projects within the sector?

**Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: (a) The criterion used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the sectoral strategy in relation to the Plan's objectives is its contribution to Gross Provincial Product in relation to the dollars expended. (b) The various programs and projects are examined to ensure that their continuation will contribute to ultimate realization of the sector objective.

#### LEASE ON KOOTENAY INDIAN RESERVES—CRESTON RECLAMATION COMPANY

Question No. 4,776—**Mr. Brisco:**

Did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development ever give written or other permission to the Creston Reclamation Company of Creston, British Columbia, to grant, demise, transfer or set over or by any other act cause any term or interest to be granted, assigned or transferred to anyone, all that portion of Lower Kootenay Indian Reserve No. 10, surveyed as Lot 999, Group 1, which lies North and East of the right bank of Kootenay River; all of Lower Kootenay