

Electoral Boundaries

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.

Ordinarily, this would not come before the House until tomorrow. I have had discussions with representatives of the other parties, however, and I wonder whether there would be unanimous consent to deal with it today. I make this suggestion because I announced in the business of the House that on Monday and Tuesday we would deal with these distribution objections; but until we have approved this order the business of the House is a bit uncertain.

● (1550)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the government House leader has discussed the matter with me and we are prepared to consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Beaudoin: D'accord.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise at this time on a point of order relating to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario which was laid before this House by Your Honour on February 27, 1976. I will explain why I am raising this point of order now. In view of the order referred to by the President of the Privy Council and the other House leaders relating to the debate which is to take place next week, and wishing to assure the President of the Privy Council and the other House leaders—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned here. If we attempt to depart from the traditional order of events, we may experience difficulty. Perhaps other hon. members will want to contribute to the point of order the hon. member for Thunder Bay wishes to raise. I do not know, as I would not gainsay such a possibility. As things now stand, the President of the Privy Council has proposed an order respecting Standing Order 75C. Questions remain on the order paper. If we depart from the proper order of business we could run into difficulty in attempting to dispose of the point of order now and in the hope that consent for the other matter may be given. I think the safest procedure would be to take matters as they come. I wonder if the House would care to provide some guidance on the point.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would hurt if the government House leader were permitted to put his motion and we dealt with the point of order after that. If the point of order is found to be valid, could it not be dealt with in connection with the report concerning Ontario? I understand the hon. member's posi-

[Mr. Sharp.]

tion. I do not think it would be amiss, procedurally, if we dealt with it in that way.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would it not be more appropriate for the point of order to be raised when the first Ontario objections are dealt with on Monday? Surely the point of order does not apply to the passing of this procedural motion. Surely it ought to be raised when we consider the Ontario report.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. All this shows the difficulties one can encounter when one tries to depart from the regular order of doing business.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, could we not deal with the matter this way: could we not go ahead with the motion proposing an allocation of time under Standing Order 75C? After that is disposed of, we could call this motion for the business on Monday and Tuesday. The point of order could be raised after the question is put, that is, after we have disposed of the motion under Standing Order 75C.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Questions on the order paper remain. I think we shall run into difficulty if we attempt to reorganize our program. We have called motions. The President of the Privy Council wishes to propose a motion pursuant to Standing Order 75C. Obviously, the simplest course is the direct one. We should proceed with the motion in its proper place in the proceedings of the day.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**TIME ALLOCATION MOTION FOR SECOND READING STAGE ON BILL C-83**

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-83, an Act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, four sitting days shall be allotted to the further consideration of the second reading stage of the said bill; and

That, on the fourth of the said days, at 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business in such sitting, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt any proceeding then before the House, if required for the purpose of this order, and, shall forthwith put, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary for the disposal of the second reading stage of the said bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-83 has now been before the House at the second reading stage on six days. There have been 29 members who have spoken in this debate and, quite clearly, many more also wish to put their views on the record.

The issues raised by this bill are great in number and in complexity. With such a bill there comes a time when general debate ceases to contribute to the resolution of such issues and a more detailed consideration is required. We on this side feel that that time is fast approaching with regard to Bill C-83. We feel that this bill should be referred to the standing committee in the very near future. In my discussions with my counterparts in the opposition I did not find, I think it is fair to say, disagreement with the proposition that the time to send the bill to committee was fast approaching. What we could not agree on, however,