

National Parks Act

glaring inconsistencies with the Alberta act which I mentioned, the chattel securities registry act. Why have we got this? This bill can go to committee, and if I am not able to be there all the time I hope my colleagues will become aware of some of the doubts I have regarding the bill. I hope they will examine the bill and question the Minister of Justice and his officials most closely as to just what the government is trying to do in the bill concerning a matter over which they have absolutely no jurisdiction. The government should keep out of an area in which the provinces have been able to administer property and civil rights to the satisfaction of the Canadian public.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, as a member from the riding where Canada's second and third largest domestic and international air carriers are located, I felt I had to say a few words on this bill. CP Air, Canada's second national airline, and Pacific Western Airlines, which is the regional and international carrier of British Columbia and Alberta, both have head offices in my riding. I contacted them when I knew this bill was coming up, to see what their feelings were about it. They seemed to be very similar to those of most hon. members who have spoken today, namely, that it should be passed and that it is needed.

Therefore, I just wanted to rise in the House today to say that I support the bill because of the study I have done, and I appreciate the work of the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) in finally getting this bill before the House 25 years after the agreement was made. It surprised me to see that the Senate had to bring it in, but I suppose the hard work of the hon. member finally convinced the government that this bill should be placed before the House. I will resume my seat because I want the bill to be referred to the committee. I just wanted to say that it has my support.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS ACT

AMENDMENT DELINEATING GOVERNMENT'S POWER IN DISPOSING OF PUBLIC LANDS

Hon. C. M. Drury (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that Bill S-4, to amend the National Parks Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Len Marchand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, hon. members will have noted that Bill S-4,

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

before the House for second reading today, does not incorporate any major policy change in the National Parks Act. The chief purpose of this bill is to bring Kejimikujik and Forillon national parks into the schedule of national parks, and to authorize the governor in council to set aside by proclamation as national parks the lands comprising Kluane, Nahanni, Baffin Island, Pacific Rim, Pukaskwa, La Mauricie, Kouchibouguac, and Gros Morne.

The second important purpose of the bill is to allow future additions to existing national parks to be achieved by proclamation, thus avoiding the necessity of having to introduce new legislation for each such change. The other clauses amending the National Parks Act are basically administrative and updating.

The most important aspect of the bill, the provision of appropriate procedures for the establishment of ten new national parks, imparts significant and lasting benefits for all Canadians. But first I would like to bring the other provisions of this bill to Your Honour's attention. Clause 1 is an amendment to the definition of "public lands", necessary because the power of the government of Canada to dispose of lands in some of the national parks is limited by the terms of agreement between the government of Canada and the provinces in which the lands are situated.

The governor in council, by clause 2, is authorized to add to an existing national park, by proclamation, lands owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada with the agreement of the province concerned and, most importantly, provided that public notice has been given in the Canada *Gazette* at least 90 days before proclamation day. In its broad concept, clause 2 provides a procedural simplification for dealing with park boundary adjustments. Let me assure the House, however, that clause 2 does not authorize any deletions, however small, from parks. I should also like to emphasize that no new park can be established without the approval of parliament.

Clauses 3 and 4 will clarify the authority of the governor in council to make regulations to control traffic on highways in the national parks. They also permit the modernization of traffic control within the parks by providing for the voluntary payment of traffic fines in line with the practice of most provinces. At present a violator, if summoned, must appear before a magistrate. The proposed amendment also removes the present anomaly of a \$500 maximum fine for violation of any provision of the act or regulations without regard to the nature of the offence, by authorizing lower maximum fines to be fixed by specific regulations.

● (1540)

Clauses 5 and 7(1) delete from the schedule of the act the descriptions of Fort Beauséjour historic park and Fort Anne historic park so that they will no longer be included among the national parks of Canada and may be set apart by the governor in council as national historic parks.

By clause 6 the name of Prince Edward national park is changed to Prince Edward Island national park, the name in common usage, and 12 acres are added to that park. Clause 8 repeats the description of Terra Nova national park as set out in part IX of the schedule to the act, and substitutes therefor the description confirmed by the Surveyor General of Canada.