

*Election Expenses***PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before proceeding further let me say that it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell)—Fisheries—Salmon fishing ban in Atlantic provinces—Settlement of fishermen's claims; the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Urban Affairs—Jericho defence land, Vancouver—Request for transfer to city; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Fisheries—Losses suffered by Atlantic area fishermen from storm—Government assistance.

It is the understanding of the Chair that the public bill to be discussed at this time, is that standing in the name of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald). Is the Chair correct in that assumption?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

ELECTION EXPENSES BILL

MEASURE TO REGULATE ELECTION EXPENSES

On the order:

Private members' public bills—Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of Bill C-28, an act to regulate election expenses—Miss MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid I cannot permit the motion to be moved at this time without at least dealing with a point of order, of which initial notice was given in January by Mr. Speaker when he mentioned that several bills which would be presented for second reading would need to be examined by the Chair and by the House and in connection with which points of order would be raised.

● (1700)

One of the bills with regard to which this caveat was given was the bill introduced by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald). I can tell the hon. member that what concerns the Chair, and what concerned Mr. Speaker at that time, are clauses 6, 7 and 9 which appear to constitute some form of charge upon the public revenue and which would, if this were so, clearly fall within the prohibition set out in Standing Orders 62 and 63.

I now invite the hon. member or any other hon. member who wishes to make presentations on this point to assist

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

the Chair, to do so. Otherwise it is my disposition to rule that the bill cannot be presented at this time.

Mr. Reid: If there is no disposition to argue the procedural point, and if Your Honour is about to rule the bill out of order, may I say I believe there is agreement that we return to the business we were discussing before five o'clock, namely, the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If that is agreeable, I will not even make a ruling. I have indicated the difficulty which is before the Chair. There may be cures for it in other directions. I do not wish to take the results of the hon. member's hard work and deal with them preemptorily here.

If it is agreed that the House resume the business which was interrupted at five o'clock, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

AMENDMENT TO SUSPEND OPERATION OF ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen that Bill C-208, to suspend the operation of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak for very long this afternoon because everyone to whom I have listened has presented different arguments and they all seem very good. There are one or two things on which I should like to comment. First, the system of redistribution. I think it is a good system. I remember that when the first maps came out many people in my province were not too happy about them. I presented my submission to the commission at its public hearings, as did others, and most of those submissions were acted upon. So I think I would prefer to see responsibility for future redistribution left in the hands of independent commissions rather than the hands of the House of Commons, because we would spend months talking about it, to judge from what we have heard already in this debate. One thing we need is a permanent voters' list. This might meet some of the difficulties which arise because of the time situation.

My main purpose in rising today is to support the interests of the people of British Columbia, who are the ones really affected, and affected adversely by the postponement of redistribution. In 1961, British Columbia, with a population of 1,600,000, was awarded 23 seats. If the bill before us passes, it might be 1975 or 1976 before redistribution takes place and by that time the population of British Columbia will have doubled. I agree that strict representation by population is not always the answer because there are some regions whose interests might be unfairly affected. Nevertheless, I cannot see why the