

National Parks Act

Unquestionably there is dissatisfaction in these areas. I will not repeat what the hon. member for Rocky Mountain said in this House. He maintained that the people of the area ought to have been consulted and the government would have consulted them if it had not been so callous about their welfare. There will be demonstrations and more destruction. Some people across Canada say that you can only change the government's mind by demonstrating; only then will the government lift up its head and sniff the wind to see what ought to be done to soothe ruffled feathers.

There are indications that all is not well with the citizens of Banff and Jasper townsites. About a month ago there was a town meeting in Banff townsite. The people asked the present minister and the previous minister to go down there. They have been agitated down there since the question of 42-year leases was broached. And what has the government done? Has it put its ear to the ground and paid attention to complaints in those areas? No. It has brought down this legislation which sets up a Crown corporation, puts the parks under the responsibility of the corporation, and says in so many words that elected representatives in this House will not have much say about what goes on in the parks.

Passage of this bill will lead only to further chaos in the country. I warn the government, and I hope it heeds my warning, not to be irresponsible and not to display a callous attitude to principles which have been fought for over long periods of time. The government's callous and irresponsible attitude must lead to more destruction, more demonstration and greater upheaval. Surely we do not want that in this peace-loving, growing country. Considering the provisions of this legislation and that it will affect people living in Waterton, Banff and Jasper, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer:

That this bill be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House that the subject matter of this bill be first of all put to a referendum among the residents of the townsites of Banff, Jasper and Waterton Lakes.

I sincerely hope the government will accept the amendment because, as the bill stands the residents of the area have no right to any say in their own government. If the amendment were accepted, they would have that right. It is a precious right for which people have fought and died in wars for over 1,000 years. The amendment would give the people the

[Mr. Horner.]

right to choose whether they wish to accept this legislation. The government is not prepared to give them the right of self-government. It is not prepared to say, "We will give you some say in your future development."

The amendment would give them that choice, and I urge all hon. members to support it, particularly the Minister of Labour who was in the House a minute ago. He has gone now, but the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) is here. Some lovely fish are being caught in the national parks of this country. I know the minister firmly believes in the concept of people making their own choice and their own decisions in matters of self-government. The Minister of Labour enunciated that principle in Vancouver when he spoke about dock workers and longshoremen. Surely he must feel that the people of Waterton, Banff and Jasper townsites should have the right of some say in how they are to be governed and how their area is to develop.

The corporation to be set up will be run by a bunch of bureaucrats who will be inflexible and hard to deal with, especially on questions affecting tourism.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has proposed an amendment. The Chair has very serious reservations as to the procedural aspect of the amendment and would appreciate hearing the views of hon. members as to why this type of amendment should be accepted. If no hon. member wishes to speak on the matter, I shall make my ruling.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, at this stage of a bill the type of amendment that can be put forward is limited. We can put forward either what is known as the six months' hoist or a reasoned amendment. As I understand it, a reasoned amendment must be repugnant to the subject matter of the bill; it must be opposed to the bill. I think that the amendment we are considering is so opposed. Second, it must be the type of amendment that could not be made to any individual paragraph of the bill when the bill goes to committee.

I understand that this amendment meets the second requirement. One could not, by amending any individual paragraph of the bill when it is before the committee, accomplish what is proposed in this amendment. The amendment proposes that the bill be not now read a second time but that the House give consideration to referring the subject matter of the bill to a referendum of the