

*Viet Nam**[English]*

Is it the attitude of this member of the official opposition that it will be unfair for us to talk tonight? He said, in effect, "I will speak until five minutes to ten, and then you all shut up and we will vote". This coming from a member who sits in a party that always accuses us of arrogance, Mr. Speaker! I wonder what kind of arrogance these people display.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prud'homme: It is my feeling that your party feels that they know best. Hon. members from the NDP, our friends, introduced a subamendment. Because there is an amendment, obviously they must introduce a subamendment. Their amendment says "or withdraw". Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, our troops being under fire in Viet Nam and saying, "We must not withdraw". The cabinet, the government, the minister cannot withdraw because there is a resolution of the House that says, "If you want to withdraw you must have a debate in the House".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that the public might perhaps get the impression that we wanted to kill the debate. Members of the opposition would like to lay down the rules of debate in this House and decide until what time they can speak and whether we can speak or not. Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to that, because I believe that we have a right to speak as often as we want to if we think we must participate in this debate on such a horrible war, and we should also be grateful that our troops are the best ambassadors of charity, good faith and love. Mr. Speaker, I would wish—

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would simply like to ask the minister if he is prepared to bring this debate back tomorrow, so that it can be concluded. Is this unfortunate motion doomed to wither on the vine as a result of spineless government action, or is he prepared to bring it back so that we can vote on it?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a very useful debate today by all hon. members who have participated. It will of course, be for the House leaders to agree when it might be brought back again.

Mr. Prud'Homme: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is after ten o'clock. The hon. member is rising on a question of privilege, but the Chair has no authority to entertain questions of privilege or points of order after ten o'clock. My duty at this time would be to leave the chair and go home, and invite hon. members to take up their points of order and questions of

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

privilege at eleven o'clock tomorrow morning. If the hon. member has a question of privilege it will be entertained tomorrow at eleven o'clock, as will all points of order. At the moment we have very important business to attend to, the adjournment proceedings.

• (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

AIRPORTS—VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL—PROPOSED RUNWAY—DATE OF COMPLETION OF EXPROPRIATION HEARINGS

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) in the chamber tonight. I appreciate his presence. We have a problem in the area I represent. It is not his fault; he just having assumed the portfolio of Minister of Transport. The people of British Columbia believe that we need more and larger airports, and they are necessary. What the government must remember is that the people elect the government of this country. We are here to represent the people, and the views they express must be listened to.

I should like to review for the minister some of the problems that the people of Sea Island have encountered. They date back to October 11, 1967, when the member representing Burnaby-Richmond-Delta, Bob Prittie, received a letter from the then minister of transport which said, among other things:

I can also assure you that at the proper time we will advise all property owners concerned of our intention, our land acquisition program and approximately how long they can remain in possession. The program will be arranged to ensure all property owners will have ample time in which to relocate and we will do everything possible to ensure disturbance is kept to a minimum.

That was in 1967. I now move on to August, 1972. The minister of transport of that time wrote the following in a letter to the people:

Treasury Board has approved the expenditure of funds for the acquisition of the land and I am sure you will agree that in view of the timing for runway construction, expropriation is the most expedient and beneficial way of proceeding for all concerned.

I now come to a letter from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to the people of Sea Island, dated September 23, 1972. He also used the word "expedient" and said:

I am confident that the difficulties your Association has encountered will now be overcome and that expropriation can go forward in a fair and expedient manner.

It took only five years for the government to decide that it would become expedient. I now go back to May, 1972, and will read the report of what the hon. member representing the riding at that time said to the meeting of the residents of Sea Island: