

the South Moresby area of the Queen Charlotte Islands as a National Park Reserve". It goes on.

That particular motion was debated in this House. Some hon. members will remember there was such unanimity within the chamber on it that long before the day that had been allotted for the full debate was over, at the suggestion of the then hon. member for Winnipeg—Bird's Hill and the then Minister of the Environment for the Government of Canada, the motion was put to the House at that point and the motion was passed. Debate then continued, but it was a unique and unusual day; there is no question about that.

I must say that that motion did have an effect outside this Chamber. It had an effect in terms of the province of British Columbia, the province from which I come. Of course there was an effect.

Again, what the House did here was call upon the Government of British Columbia "to co-operate in setting aside". One could say that that did not call upon the legislative assembly. Perhaps not, but it is a very direct plea from this House to a legislative assembly in a province to do something.

I think I have to take the position that it is not an invasion into the jurisdiction of another legislature. There is a difference here which probably distinguishes the case from those set out in *Beauchesne's* or in *Erskine May* because this is a federal state, not a unitary state.

Third, it has clearly been done before not just once in a while but quite often. Some members who have been here for some time will remember that it has been customary. It has happened again and again that members have risen in the House and urged the government of the day, whatever government it might have been, to make a public statement on matters of great national importance, and invited the government of the day to put motions to this House in order to make such a statement.

The hon. member for Kamloops raises a point which causes me concern, and that is that this process, if abused, may very well cause some difficulties and some resentment in some places. That is of course a political question, not a procedural one, and it is not for me to rule on that, but I have listened carefully to the point.

### *Government Orders*

I also thank the hon. member for Kamloops for having given some indication to the Chair in advance that this point would be raised. It gave me a few minutes reflection in advance, which is always helpful and helpful to the House itself.

I see the hon. member's point. There may be political considerations that ought to be taken into account. I am always advised not to put my political hat on, so it is not for me to say, but procedurally I find that it is not appropriate to rule it out of order.

[*Translation*]

We also have an important statement from the hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead. He took a position in support of the point raised by the hon. member for Kamloops. I understand the hon. member's position, but I believe there is a difference between the precedents in *Beauchesne* and *Erskine May* and the situation before us today. However, I wish to thank the hon. member for his statement, which of course is still helpful to the Chair.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### CUSTOMS ACT

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-55, an act to amend the Customs Act, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Jelinek moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Madam Speaker, I will be very brief in making a few additional comments on Bill C-55, an act to amend the Customs Act, which will benefit many Canadian businesses, particularly the import sector of our economy.