

National Parks Act

development in the corporation. The bill empowers the withdrawal of land or the inclusion of lands subject to the administration of the corporation.

I am not going into the history of recent frustrations and difficulties regarding leases and increases in rent, valuations I have seen which, frankly, were meaningless. This land was never priced at \$40,000 or \$60,000 per lot, which is the only way you can interpret the 6 per cent of the valuation and the annual rent that is demanded.

The parks administration have contributed not one cent to improvements. Somewhere along the line I received a letter from the minister explaining the rationale of the rental policy, and rents are not to be taken into account. I do not know who wrote this letter for the minister, but whoever it was did not have any idea of the rents for residential lots or properties in Jasper which were being demanded at the time.

One of the worst situations that could develop was when plebiscites were recently held both in Jasper and Banff. They were meaningless from the legal point of view, but what a vote of non-confidence they represented. These plebiscites were an attempt to find some way out of the parks system on the part of the townsites. There was a heavy turnout and the verdict was clearly against the administration. Cannot they read the signs? Are they blind to events? As I say, this corporation is given tremendous power. Notwithstanding the action that is now before the Supreme Court and the verdict thereon, I am wondering what will be the effect on the transference of leases, assignments of interest, powers of expropriation, and that sort of thing.

I am not able to determine from the bill whether the description of the parks of Banff and Jasper has in any way modified the boundaries. Since nothing is said about changing boundaries, in good faith I will assume that the boundaries have not been changed. There is an indication that the boundaries of Waterton National Park are to be changed and the park reduced in area. As I say, I am surprised that nothing is said in the bill about Wood Buffalo National Park. Why is it that this huge area of land both in the province of Alberta and in the Northwest Territories is not to be taken over by the corporation?

I have spoken at this length because I think that this bill is not going to accomplish any worth-while purpose with regard to lease-

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West)]

holders in the park, be they commercial or residential. Therefore, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson):

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "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, including those of the townsites of Banff and Jasper National Parks, the persons most nearly affected by the bill's purpose and intent, and that therefore the government should reconsider the principle of the bill, this bill be read a second time on a day six months hereafter."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should like to make one or two points, but basically I should like to take the amendment under advisement and discuss it with Mr. Speaker. I am a little troubled by its form. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) has already spoken, and therefore I do not think it is proper that he should second the motion. Perhaps with the consent of the mover I might add the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) as seconder.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the hon. member for Red Deer had likely spoken to an amendment that was previously before the House. I quite appreciate that if he has spoken on the main motion he is not in a position to second my amendment, and if that is the case I would agree to the hon. member for Hillsborough seconding it.

Since Your Honour has raised a point of order, may I say that my amendment is a reasoned amendment. It is, in effect, a six months' hoist, and this is permissible. I do not think that the preamble to the amendment will in any way affect its validity, or the main purpose of the amendment, namely that the bill be read six months from this date.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will certainly hear arguments on that point, but I must say at first blush I do have some misgivings about the preamble. Before making a ruling I will certainly hear arguments and discuss it with Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Honey: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Before Your Honour discusses the proposed motion with Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether you might hear argument on this point which you might convey to Mr. Speaker? Would that be in order?