

What recourse do I have? I should like the Committee to take that under consideration.

I did not raise this matter earlier because I did not want to take up the time of Private Members, but now that we are into this grievance session I raise it. It is a Bill that I have had for ten years or more and deals with our attitude toward children on television and how we use children as surrogates with regard to advertising. It would open up the whole area of Government policy with regard to television and how it deals with children's programming and that kind of thing. There was general interest in it throughout the country but it reflects my personal opinion.

I agreed to having the order withdrawn on condition that the subject matter be referred to the Committee. That was done and the order of the House was made. The Bill was referred to the Committee but the Committee has not dealt with it to date, and I would like to know what my position is.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I think it is obvious to the House that there is some measure of dissatisfaction with the procedure being followed with respect to Private Members' Public Bills, Motions and Notices of Motions. The Table has provided me with a copy of the ruling by the then Deputy Speaker Laniel dated December 5, 1977 in which he reviewed the practice. He indicated that in his view the House at that time had found satisfaction. I make reference to that ruling and the date because I think it will relate to my next suggestion.

It seems to me that if the Hon. Member for Edmonton West were simply to indicate, or make a motion perhaps seconded by such other Hon. Member as may feel the same way, that in view of the fact that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization is reviewing all of the Standing Orders and procedures of the House and that there is a strong feeling about this, the Standing Committee should examine this issue to the eventual satisfaction of Members. That might be a very direct and satisfactory way of putting the matter before the Standing Committee.

Mr. Lambert: With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, I would be attempting to put on a debatable motion and I do not think that I could. I have already intruded into the time of the Hon. Member who had the first item. I would agree that he be given an hour and that we just extend the time to so provide. I raised the point of order with regard to the drawing of Bills but I do not want to cut in on whoever is on the list for today. I shall write a very positive letter to the Chairman of the Committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It seems to me that the Hon. Member has resolved the point of the order. In that case perhaps we could proceed with the Bill standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell).

National Parks Act

NATIONAL PARKS ACT

AMENDMENT TO ESTABLISH PARK ON MORESBY ISLAND AND ADJACENT ISLANDS

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway) moved that Bill C-454, an Act respecting a national park on Moresby Island and its adjacent islands, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill involves the creation of a park on south Moresby Island, which is in the Queen Charlotte Islands off the northwest coast of British Columbia amid the rainswept fiords and rugged mountains in the former ancestral home of the Haida Indians. Hon. Members may recognize the geography if they recall some of the wonderful pictures of the last remaining Haida totem poles in a state of nature on the West Coast.

I have a problem with my Bill. I found out that another Bill has been presented in the British Columbia Legislature by Mr. Lea, an Opposition MLAS. It is Bill M-208, the Southern Moresby Wilderness Park Act. His Bill is more detailed than mine and the area is better defined. In my Bill I had some problems with the definition of the area and so on.

I would ask leave of the House to let my Bill stand. Mr. Lea may shortly be in a position to implement his Bill. For other reasons as well I should like to have a chance to redraw the boundaries in a better way in my Bill. Whether we do it federally or provincially, in the end we should retain this unique area in Canada. It is a world ecological site, along with the pyramids and things like that. We should retain it for the future.

I know that many Members have indicated support for the Bill but I would ask that it stand until I can deal with the changes I have outlined.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The House has heard the Hon. Member's motion. Is it agreed that Bill C-454 be withdrawn from debate for today and allowed to stand?

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, what I am concerned about is whether this should not be in the form of a resolution. A very considerable expenditure of funds is involved in the creation of a national park. The Hon. Member's idea is very commendable but I would have thought it would be presented in the form of a resolution that the Government of Canada give favourable consideration to the creation of such a national park. To that extent I would say that I think he would be wise to withdraw his Bill because I think it is entirely out of order.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member. He has been around the House a lot longer than I have and I appreciate his wisdom. I was hoping that I could achieve what I want by other methods, perhaps in the provincial area. I would ask the Hon. Member for Edmonton West if he would bear with me and agree to allow the Bill to stand. When I have another look at it I may want to withdraw it and put it in the