

have to rule this amendment out of order and I will refer the hon. member to Article 437 which says:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

The main motion deals strictly with the environment.

I would also refer the hon. member to Article 482 which says:

On an allotted day during consideration of the business of supply, an amendment must not provide the basis for an entirely different debate than that proposed in the original motion.

That is exactly what we are getting into right now, so I will declare the amendment out of order and we will resume debate on this motion on the environment.

A point of order, the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, if I understand your ruling correctly, you are saying that it would be inappropriate for us to have an amendment which designates this as a matter of non-confidence because it is already not a matter of confidence. Is that how I am to understand your ruling, Madam Speaker, that—

An hon. member: The amendment is out of order because it is not needed as the Standing Orders already provide for it.

Some hon. members: Order, order!

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The reason which I have given the hon. member is that the amendment is not related directly to the main motion. He may want to reread Article 437 and I think it will make it very clear.

Resuming debate, the hon. member—on a point of order, the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona.

• (1600)

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, earlier Mr. Speaker refused to rule on a point of order that I made with respect to confidence and the nature of this motion. You have now made a ruling on an amendment which had to do with the language of confidence, making it clear that this motion was not a motion of non-confidence. I therefore want to ask you, Madam Speaker, what your interpreta-

Government Orders

tion is of the statement in the annotated Standing Orders on page 279 where it says:

In 1985 the Standing Orders were further amended by removing the "no-confidence" reference—.

What does that mean, Madam Speaker? Perhaps you could tell us for the erudition of myself and the hon. member for Rosedale. Perhaps that means something entirely different from what it appears to say. If it does, I would like to know about it.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The article which the hon. member just read simply means that Standing Orders were amended and different words were removed. As far as whether or not this motion is a confidence motion, the government decides if a motion coming from the opposition is a confidence motion or not. At this time it seems to the Chair that the government has chosen to see it as a confidence motion.

With regard to the amendment moved by the hon. member, it is out of order.

Mr. Blaikie: Perhaps now someone from the government will get up and say why this is a matter of confidence according to them instead of according to some archaic view of parliament that has no relationship to the Standing Orders. If the government wants to make this a matter of confidence, perhaps the member for Rosedale could say why the passing of a motion in compliance with government policy is a matter of confidence as far as the government is concerned and stop hiding behind his interpretation of rules that no longer exist.

S. O. 81—NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, I would be delighted to move to discuss the content of the motion because I think that is the essential issue here today. I would also be happy to indicate why we on this side of the House find difficulty in supporting the whole of this motion and that may be helpful to the member for Skeena, the member for Winnipeg Transcona and others on the opposite side.

We concur with the notion that we should take all necessary measures to complete the country's system of national parks. Clearly, as I said earlier, we have to gain a complete representation of the ecological zones and do that, I hope, by the end of the century. I would also say there are several reasons why we do not share the hon. member's proposition that we should set a figure as some