

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane), seconded by Mr. Brown, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

By unanimous consent, the Order was discharged and the said bill withdrawn.

By unanimous consent, at 5.43 o'clock p.m. the sitting was suspended until 8.00 o'clock p.m.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Côté (Longueuil),—That Bill C-152, An Act to amend the National Parks Act be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Thompson (Red Deer), proposed to move in amendment thereto,—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.

#### RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: As the honourable 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.

As I look to my left and to my right I see a considerable 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 honourable Member for Oxford, the six months hoist is perhaps one of the few possibilities which can be proposed by way of amendment.

Also, as honourable 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 honourable 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. Honourable Members have many possibilities in the course of a 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 honourable 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. Because of this I find it very difficult to accept the honourable Member's amendment. I hope in the course of this debate honourable Members who are opposing second reading of the bill might find an amendment which