

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): If I may deal with that, the Hon. Member is quite correct. Under the ruling made by the Deputy Speaker earlier, we are going to dispose of these objections riding by riding. At the end of the debate in the case of each and every riding, I would then indicate that the debate is adjourned on the subject matter of that riding. When the Hon. Member for Vaudreuil indicates that he would like to comment on the subject, in this case regarding Lachine, that is in order and it would be important that he have the opportunity to do so before the Chair declares the debate on that riding is adjourned.

If, then, the House is agreeable to calling it one o'clock, we would understand that at two o'clock debate will reopen and continue on the subject matter of the riding of Lachine. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Accordingly, I will call it one o'clock.

I see the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that we are dealing with objections on a provincial basis, not on a constituency basis. It was my understanding that we were dealing this morning with NWT. That was put aside for later consideration. We have been dealing with the Province of Quebec and I assume we will continue with that. It seems to me that we are going on a province by province basis because the objections are filed on that basis. I see you are shaking your head, Mr. Speaker, but it is my understanding that the way we should deal with these objections, on a provincewide basis and we will go on with whatever province is next on your list, Ontario or whatever. In other words, we will deal with them on a province wide basis. Everybody who wants to speak on the objections which they have on that province has that opportunity to do so. It does not preclude adjourning the debate for further consideration at another time. That seems to me to be the most orderly way to do it.

I think the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) just wants to know when the B.C. objections would be heard so he would have an opportunity to debate his objections at that time. I hope that is the basis on which we will proceed after lunch.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I want to make clear to the Hon. Member and to any other Hon. Member who may be either suffering from a misunderstanding or who may wish, indeed, that we would proceed in the fashion as described by the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) that in fact, we are not proceeding in that manner. That was determined in the ruling made by the Deputy Speaker previously in the Chair. My understanding is that Hon. Members understood me clearly and understood my predecessor clearly. We are going to proceed riding by riding without distinction of provincial boundaries. That is the ruling made already.

Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act

I will give Hon. Members an example of how we will proceed. The debate currently is on the riding of Lachine in the Province of Quebec. It will be followed by debate, although it is not clear from the format, on the riding of Glengarry-Pre-scott-Russell, in the Province of Ontario. That will be followed by a debate on the riding of Rimouski-Témiscouata, in the Province of Quebec. The following after that will again be Quebec. The following after that will be a riding in the Province of Newfoundland. It is clear to Members that they will be proceeding by ridings without reference to provincial boundaries.

I repeat again the debate will continue at two o'clock on the subject matter of the riding of Lachine.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, if I may contribute a little to this debate, what seems to be quite confusing to Members is this. I was under the impression that we would proceed province by province. I think we could certainly agree at least to proceed district by district within provinces, which will make more sense. If there are Members who want to make representation, at least they will be aware at a certain time in the day or at a time later that their province will be called. They will have to wait their turn if they want to speak about a certain district within a province.

• (1300)

I would just like to put on the record for supplementary consideration during the lunch hour that we will not jump from one region of Canada to another one. I put to my good friend with whom I co-operate all the time, the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), whether it would not be more orderly if we proceeded district by district but within each province of Canada.

I will not participate in the debate. I want to listen to it, though; I am very interested in listening to my colleagues. I made no representation; I only signed one for a colleague of mine in the Province of Quebec. I think we would proceed more orderly if we proceeded province by province, eliminate the possibility of debate within a province and then move on to another province. I have no strong feeling on that, but I wanted to submit it for consideration during the lunch hour.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a great deal of confusion here. That confusion is unnecessary because yesterday when the House order was put forward and given unanimous consent, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) was asked by the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) how we would proceed, and because the debate was on a Friday, there were Hon. Members who would not be here but who would want to participate in the debate. At that time the President of the Privy Council indicated precisely what was the meaning of the House order.

As reported on page 27151 of *Hansard*, the question by the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich was:

Madam Speaker, my point of order is about the debate on the objections to the electoral boundaries. The President of the Privy Council mentioned the objections from a variety of Provinces, including Quebec and British Columbia.