

Vancouver Airport

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I will try to escalate the answer.

MOTIONS TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26**INDIAN AFFAIRS****CLAIMS OF JAMES BAY AREA NATIVES AFFECTED BY HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT**

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 26 to move a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the lack of direct participation by the federal government in the claims of the James Bay Indian people affected by the James Bay hydroelectric project, the exposure of apparently conflicting cabinet positions, and what appears to be an abdication of the federal government's constitutional responsibilities to act on behalf of the Indians of James Bay at the insistence of the provincial government which created the development corporation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kingston and The Islands has filed the notice required by Standing Order 26. This has provided an opportunity to give serious consideration to the hon. member's proposed motion. The Standing Order requires the mover to state the matter proposed to be discussed. In this particular instance the hon. member proposes for debate, "the lack of direct participation by the federal government in the claims of the James Bay Indian people", and later, "what appears to be an abdication of the federal government's constitutional responsibilities".

With respect, the Chair must suggest to the hon. member that her proposed motion is essentially one of censure which the House would normally consider in circumstances provided by Standing Orders other than Standing Order 26. In other words, what is proposed for debate is a substantive motion which cannot claim the priority provided by Standing Order 26.

With much regret, I have to rule, therefore, that this motion cannot be put to the House.

* * *

AIRPORTS**VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL—EXPROPRIATION HEARINGS—SUPPLYING OF INFORMATION BY MINISTERS TO PERSONS AFFECTED**

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 26 I ask leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, that during the currency of public hearings under the Expropriation Act concerning the Cora Brown, Tapp Road and MacDonald

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Subdivisions, Sea Island, Vancouver International Airport, British Columbia, which must be resolved before March 4, 1973, ministers of the Crown have refused to provide those affected with the information they have requested, contrary to specific provisions of the Expropriation Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta proposes that the business of the House be set aside for the purpose of an emergency debate under the provisions of Standing Order 26. In support of his motion the hon. member has been kind enough to file with the Chair some very interesting and enlightening material, for which I thank him.

As hon. members know, it is only in very exceptional circumstances and on rare occasions that the provisions of Standing Order 26 are used for the purpose of setting aside the business proposed for consideration by the House, as previously announced by a spokesman for the government, and usually after consultation between the parties. Standing Order 26, as well as numerous precedents and rulings, determines the conditions required to accept such a motion.

One of the elements to be taken into account is whether the motion proposed for discussion is a new matter requiring immediate debate. It is essential to note that it is not the urgency of the matter which is relevant but the urgency of debate. If the matter is one on which there has been continuing discussion over a period of time, it can hardly be judged to meet this particular requirement.

In fact, in this instance the question was first raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South on January 15 last when he proposed to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. On the following day the same matter was raised again and this time it was discussed on the adjournment proceedings; indeed, priority was given to the hon. member for Vancouver South to raise this question on the adjournment proceedings on the basis of the then urgency of the matter. On January 19 the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta proposed a motion under Standing Order 43 which in effect dealt with the same question as he now proposes under Standing Order 26. Essentially the same question was raised on January 31 by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West when he proposed to move a motion under Standing Order 43 dealing with the expropriation proceedings at the Vancouver International Airport. On February 1 the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta again brought the matter before the House during the proceedings on the adjournment motion. Once more, on the 8th of February, the same question was raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition by way of a question to and reply from the hon. Minister of Transport.

It will thus be seen that over a period of approximately one month this very important and, I am sure, urgent matter has been brought to the attention of the House by concerned members.

The Chair also has to take into account the possibility of debate within a reasonable time. I would judge that the budget debate, which is one of the general debates during which such matters can be brought forward for debate, should provide an opportunity for the submission of addi-