

National Parks Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: An affirmative vote on Motion No. 9 will obviate the need to vote on Motion No. 10. A negative vote on Motion No. 9 will necessitate a vote on Motion No. 10.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 9?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 9 (Mrs. Browes) agreed to.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Given your ruling and the fact that Motion No. 9 just passed, perhaps I missed something, but now what happens to the amendment to Motion No. 10 and what appeared to be a willingness of the House to adopt the proposal of the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman)?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I think we gave unanimous consent to the amendment being included as part of Motion No. 10 earlier this day, but the vote on Motion No. 9, following your ruling, obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 10. It is Motion No. 10 as amended that we are not voting on.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, in light of what the Parliamentary Secretary just said, it seems to me that you have to call Motion No. 10 because Motion No. 10 now incorporates Motion No. 9. That is what the Parliamentary Secretary indicated a moment ago. We concur with whatever is required to be done in order to support the motion put by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman). It seems to me that you will have to call Motion No. 10.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair knows that everyone is in favour of the motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman), Motion No. 10. However, because Motion No. 9 amends Clause 5 at the same line as Motion No. 10, Motion No. 10 could not carry. We could not carry both motions. That is why the Chair indicated that if Motion No. 9 carried, the Chair could not put Motion No. 10.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering then if there would be unanimous consent to take the vote on Motion No. 9 again so that we could force a vote on Motion No. 9 and perhaps give time for the Government to consult so that when it comes to the deferred vote on Monday, the Government might have had a change of heart and would actually vote against Motion No. 9.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, in the interests of progress and getting to another Bill this day, if we simply let things stand and if there are deferred divisions on Monday, there may be consultations and some way of working things out. However, at this point, the Government has indicated that Motion No. 9 is broader and should therefore be the motion which passes, and I think it has been passed.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of clarity and brevity, unless you consider the subamendment by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) as a subamendment to Motion No. 9, then you would call that subamendment an

amendment to Motion No. 9 and having then incorporated it into Motion No. 9, we will know that we have approved it. Is that acceptable to the Parliamentary Secretary?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared, with unanimous consent, to set that issue aside and continue on, giving us a chance to consult a little further, if that is agreeable.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will set aside the issue for now.

We will now deal with Motions Nos. 3 and 4 which will be debated together but voted upon separately.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport) moved:

Motion No. 3.

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 18 at page 2 the following:

"(2) Immediately following subsection 3.1(5) of the said Act the following is added:

"3.2.(1) The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister, designate a site containing a unique or rare natural feature of phenomenon, or a site of high scientific value and public interest, whose protection is feasible as a Canadian Landmark.

(2) The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister, establish criteria for the selection, administration and management of Canadian Landmarks."

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 18 at page 2 the following:

"(2) Immediately following subsection 3.1(5) of the said Act the following is added:

"4.(1) The Governor in Council may set apart any land the title to which is vested in Her Majesty, as a National Wilderness Park."

"(2) National Wilderness Parks shall be administered, managed and controlled in a manner consistent with sections 5(9) and 5(10) of this Act, and with preservation of the wilderness character of the Park as the only priority."

He said: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of brevity, I will explain only that it was Mr. Speaker, in his previous incarnation as Minister of the Environment in 1979, who approved in principle the Canadian Landmarks Program. This motion, therefore, takes into account the establishment of that program, and since authority at the present time does not exist in the present law, it seeks to introduce the powers for Cabinet, on recommendation of the Minister, to introduce the designation of Canadian landmarks in the future National Parks Act. In other words, we are taking one step further following a decision that was made by Mr. Speaker in 1979 by putting it in the Bill.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I too will be brief. I want to indicate my Party's support for Motions Nos. 3 and 4. Clearly, as the Hon. Member has said, it is the next logical step forward and it is regrettable that the Bill was not changed before now.