

*National Parks Act*

"hence", he used the word "hereafter". It might be splitting hairs to point out the difference. But the difficulty which I see, if there is something wrong with the amendment, is that it is too good in the sense that it has two good amendments. It has a perfectly acceptable, reasoned amendment which is the first part of the amendment proposed by the hon. member and, I suggest, a perfectly acceptable six months' hoist which is the last part of the amendment proposed.

If the hon. member amended his amendment in such a way as to choose one or the other part, either the reasoned amendment which would invite hon. members to vote against the principle of the bill in which the hon. member, as part of his suggested motion, submits reasons why we should be opposed to the principle of the bill, that would be one possible proposition to be voted upon by the House. The second one would be the six months' hoist which would, again, make it possible for the House to express its views in connection with the bill. There may be a surfeit of perfection in the hon. member's amendment in the sense that it contains two good amendments and I would like him to choose one or the other, either the reasoned amendment or the six months' hoist.

I have consulted the learned gentlemen at the table who assure me, after long reflection between six o'clock and eight o'clock, that they cannot recall a precedent where a six months' hoist had been tacked on to a reasoned amendment, or vice versa. I hesitate to make a change at this time on this long established practice and I hope the hon. member will indicate to the House in what way he would like the amendment to be proposed.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances my colleagues suggest to me, and I agree—the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), the seconder, accepts the suggestion—that we drop the wording with regard to the six months' hoist and leave the reasoned amendment.

With the general consent of the House, I ask that my amendment be terminated at the word "intent"; that instead of a comma there be a period; and that the balance of the wording be stricken from the proposed amendment. This would leave a reasoned amendment which would read as follows:

"this House holding the opinion that the bill is repugnant in principle to the members of this House as well as to the residents of Canada, in-

[Mr. Speaker.]

cluding those of the townsites of Banff and Jasper National Parks, the persons most nearly affected by the bill's purpose and intent."

**Mr. Speaker:** My suggestion would be that the hon. member continue the amendment to the words "of the bill", leaving out the words referring to the six months' hoist, and this amendment would be the one which in due course would be put to the House.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** The amendment would continue to read:

"and that therefore the government should reconsider the principle of the bill."

The words that follow would be stricken from the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the hon. member have the unanimous agreement of the House to amend the proposed amendment?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this House for 13 years, but this is the first time I have been associated with something that had a surfeit of perfection or was too good. I am afraid that my usual ruddy complexion will be further suffused because of the vicarious righteousness which I believe I have the right to feel.

I have had much enjoyment and satisfaction from hearing the speeches today of hon. members on this very important measure. Naturally, I was much impressed by the powerful argumentation of my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

I listened with appreciation to the reasonable and reasoned address of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), and I drew a certain form of enjoyment from listening to the address of the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney). I have not heard too many partisan speeches in recent weeks, and it was refreshing to hear such unadulterated partisanship. I think it is often difficult to make forensic bricks without intellectual straw, but I think he deserves credit for his try.

I have no way of knowing, of course, what he has in mind, whether he plans to contest a political post in the provincial realm in Alberta which I understand is vacant but I hope he does not have that aim, because if he has any notion of leaving this arena for a provincial one I imagine there would be tremendous pressure against this from the sup-