

I know that the normal inclination of the Chair will be that where it is appropriate to expedite the passage of legislation, if there is any question in one's mind, one will make sure that the due process of consideration of the Bill will be given favourable attention as opposed to allowing diversionary or obstructionary tactics to interfere with the due process of the passage of legislation through the House.

I do not want to speak for another five minutes, but I think it would be appropriate for Your Honour to consider whether, in view of the precedents on the books at this time, that time should be counted.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker has been told in the past that he sometimes rules on these matters too quickly. I think in context I will take the matter under advisement, and I accept the fact that the Hon. Member was trying to speak right through to five o'clock.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to Your Honour when you said that you want to take the matter under advisement and render a decision later. Before rendering an appropriate decision, you may want to hear a little more. I would point out that there is a danger attached to the proposal made by the Hon. House Leader. Some day during a debate that may be extremely embarrassing to the Government. It may call the adjournment of the House and expect that to be counted as time in the debate. I would like you to have both sides of the story before making a final decision.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the Government House Leader, has a great sense of humour, but when it comes to making a great argument on a point of privilege, with all due respect, he has been less than convincing today. I respectfully suggest that he should not be allowed to have his argument stand in such a way as to mean that my silence on behalf of the Official Opposition can in any way be taken as assent to a very spurious argument.

The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) has made an excellent point. If the argument of the Government House Leader were accepted, it would be open to abuse by a Government which wished to choke off debate. That could never have been the intention of the rules or of any precedents with respect to this matter.

In conclusion, I would respectfully say that the argument of the Government House Leader is particularly specious and in bad odour on a day when government Members prevented or were unwilling to agree to a full and open debate on a very important matter, namely, the terms and conditions of the agreement on the North Warning System.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter into any discussion of this matter. I considered it to be such nonsense that I anticipated a ruling indicating that that was the case. Lest my silence, which would be my normal posture, were to be interpreted in any way as agreement with the Government House Leader, I want to say that the points raised both by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) and the Opposition House Leader, the Hon.

National Parks

Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray), are valid. In addition, I suggest that we would have been willing to have spent the last hour debating the treaties that this Government is denying the House of Commons and the people of Canada an opportunity to see and to understand.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There being nobody else on this point of order, I will recognize the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid) on a separate point of order.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, since the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) started his speech with an adjournment motion, may I assume that we can now begin our 10-minute questions and comments on his speech? Is that correct?

Mr. Speaker: Let me suggest that that matter will be dealt with when we return to the matter. It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

● (1700)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS— MOTIONS

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Could I seek the consent of the House to move to Item No. 167?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS

ADVISABILITY OF ESTABLISHING NATIONAL PARK AT SOUTH MORESBY, QUEEN CHARLOTTE ISLANDS

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of continuing negotiations with the British Columbia Government to find ways, in cooperation with the Native people, of creating a national park at South Moresby, in the Queen Charlotte Islands, as urged by UNESCO.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for having put the motion before the House. This motion in essence boils down to the desirability of the Government and the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Blais-Grenier) continuing negotiations with the British Columbia Government so that ways can be found to create a national park and possibly a national marine park at South Moresby.

South Moresby is truly one of the few remaining examples of the greatness that nature is capable of producing. It encompasses some 139 islands and includes 43 freshwater lakes. On those islands are found some flowering plants which are