

National Parks Act

people of three specific townsites. I respectfully submit that cannot be done by an individual amendment to any one paragraph or clause of the bill, and that therefore the amendment ought to be allowed.

Mr. Speaker: If there are no further submissions on the interesting point of order which has just been raised, I am in a position to make a ruling. As the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has noted, only very limited types of amendments can, according to our rules, be presented at the second reading stage. It may be that our rules should be changed.

● (9:40 p.m.)

As I look to my left and to my right I see a number of procedural experts who are prepared to accept the suggestion that it is difficult to make an amendment to a motion for second reading of a bill. As has been suggested by the hon. member for Oxford, the six months' hoist is perhaps one of the few possibilities which can be proposed by way of amendment.

Also, as hon. members know, a reasoned amendment can be proposed. As is well known, a reasoned amendment is one which opposes the principle of the bill for one reason or another. My understanding of the interesting amendment proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is that it does not in fact oppose the principle of the bill which is before the House, but rather attaches a condition to the adoption of the motion for second reading. It is perhaps a very difficult distinction to make to decide to what extent, or in what circumstances, an amendment opposes the principle of a bill. Hon. members have many possibilities in the course of debate on second reading of a bill to find reasons which are, in effect, substantially opposed to the principle of a bill and request that in the circumstances the bill should not now be read a second time.

My interpretation of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot is that it attaches a condition to the bill but does not oppose the principle of the bill now before the House. It is not essentially a reasoned amendment. Therefore, I find it very difficult to accept the hon. member's amendment. I hope in the course of this debate hon. members who are opposing second reading of the bill might find an amendment which could be proposed to the Chair that might be procedurally acceptable.

Mr. Horner: We are going to keep trying.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member says, "We are going to keep trying." I can understand that in the sense it should be reasonably easy to find an amendment which would make it possible for an hon. member to invite the House to oppose the principle of a bill.

Mr. Horner: There should not be taxation without representation.

Mr. Speaker: I am in agreement with the general principle that there should not be taxation without representation. That does not make the amendment acceptable from a procedural standpoint. The amendment is out of order.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief comments with regard to one or two ideas. Actually, one idea has been promoted by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis)—the idea of an underwater park in the Georgia Strait. I think this is an excellent idea. It is probably the most logical area off Canada's shores for an underwater park. This should be done now before the area is all fouled up with pollution, filled with oil derricks or before there is too much industry on the shore. The Minister of Fisheries wrote a letter to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) promoting this idea. I suggest the minister should send a letter to the Northern Affairs Committee suggesting that the committee discuss this idea. I would like to see the committee study it, possibly tour the area and conduct hearings to ascertain whether there is interest in such an idea.

Snorkeling and other water sports are becoming more and more in vogue. Since most of Canada is not warm enough a great deal of the year to have a park of this kind, I think the Georgia Strait is one of the few areas that could be utilized. I think it should be used for this purpose. I visited Tobago last October. While there I did some snorkeling and looked at the underwater reefs in the area. I found it to be a very enjoyable sport.

Mr. Whelan: You can't do that in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thomson: No, I can't do that in Saskatchewan. You might wonder why a Saskatchewan farmer would be interested in an idea of this kind. Possibly one of the reasons it appeals to me is that we do not have this type of entertainment close by. Certainly not many