

*Water Resources*

The amendment which the hon. member has put forward is perhaps not as clear in its terminology as it might be, but it seems to me that it might be objected to under the existing precedents with regard to amendments on second reading on several grounds.

In the first place, the hon. member seeks to oppose second reading of this bill and to refer it back for redrafting so as to add certain additional provisions to the bill which he feels have been omitted and which should be included.

Perhaps it might be useful for me to make a number of references to the relevant rules in May's 17th edition, page 527, dealing with the question of amendments at this stage of public business. The first of the rules is that the principle of relevancy applies to an amendment here as it does elsewhere and the amendment must not include in its scope other bills then standing for consideration in the House. No objection could be made to the amendment on that basis.

Perhaps of greater importance is the second of the two rules to which reference is made. I quote:

The amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee; nor is it permissible to propose merely the addition of words to the question, that the bill be now read a second time, as such words must, by implication, attach conditions to the second reading.

I suggest that the hon. member in his proposed amendment is at least in part suggesting certain propositions which it might be competent for him to move when the bill is before the committee or indeed at the report stage. To that extent, his amendment falls under the second of the two rules cited and for that reason the amendment should not be received.

The third of the rules would also appear to be relevant since, in effect, what the hon. member is doing is asserting a direct negative to the proposition that the bill before the House be read a second time. I quote this rule from page 528 of May's 17th edition:

An amendment, which amounts to no more than a direct negation of the principle of the bill, is open to objection.

I suggest that the best interpretation of what is a rather complicated amendment is that the hon. member is intending to negative altogether the proposition involved in the second reading and for that reason his

amendment falls under the third rule. What seems more likely is that he is negating the proposition in part and making certain suggestions as to possible inclusions in the bill, suggestions which could be carried out by the hon. member or other hon. members at a later date by way of an amendment at either the committee stage or by taking advantage of the report stage. For those reasons, I suggest the amendment not be received.

● (3:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, this amendment is presented in a form somewhat different from others which have been submitted in the past. It is designed, however, to be in harmony with the new rules under which we are operating.

I submit the amendment meets all the established criteria provided for an amendment on second reading. First, it declares principles adverse to and differing from the principles of the bill. I think this is obvious from the wording. In the second place, it opposes the progress of the bill. These are two of the essential criteria set out in citation 382 of Beauchesne at page 277. The amendment does not seek to change any words in the bill itself. It seeks, rather, to give reasons for opposing second reading until the bill is redrafted.

The amendment does not anticipate amendments which may be moved in committee. Such amendments would largely be amendments concerning detail. The amendment we are moving affects questions of principle involved in the bill as a whole. For these reasons, I contend that the amendment meets the criteria established by citation 389 of Beauchesne. It is a reasoned amendment in that it sets forth the basis upon which the bill is held to be unsatisfactory.

If it is thought—and this view has not been expressed by the President of the Privy Council—that the conclusion of the motion which asks that the bill be redrafted differs from the normal wording, I would say that the House is surely master of its own proceedings and may direct such redrafting if it is so inclined. The amendment would not be out of order for that reason.

The motion to which the reasoned amendment has been moved is that Bill C-144 be read the second time and referred to commit-