

*National Parks Act*

reasoned amendment. It perhaps departs from the form of a usual six months' hoist amendment. But there is no doubt, I submit to Your Honour, that in the initial portion of the amendment there is a reasoned opposition to the principle of the bill. Then the form merely indicates that on account of this the bill, as the amendment states, "be read a second time on a day six months hereafter".

Perhaps the wording is slightly infelicitous, but it is clearly stated and is not contrary to the repugnance expressed at the beginning of the amendment. It merely indicates the bill is repugnant and I suppose it could have gone on to say that it not now be read a second time. If that is considered to be the requirement, I think this defect can be readily cured by inserting the words, "that the bill be not read a second time but be read six months hence." That is the purport of it.

I must confess this bill is not my responsibility. I was prepared to speak and was asked to present this amendment. I have done so. If there is this minor technical difficulty, I think the amendment could be improved. With those remarks I shall leave the matter in Your Honour's hands.

**Mr. Honey:** Mr. Speaker, I will take only a very short time in giving Your Honour a couple of citations. I might mention initially that the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has headed his amendment, "Reasoned amendment at second reading". It seems to me, on reading it, that what the hon. member is attempting to do is apply the standard six months' hoist and dress it up with a great deal of verbiage in the preamble.

**An hon. Member:** Garbage.

**Mr. Honey:** My hon. friend says "garbage", I said "verbiage". In any event, there is a great deal of preamble. I should like to refer Your Honour to May's seventeenth edition, page 258. I shall read that authority:

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

The amendment of the hon. member for Edmonton West states clearly that "the bill is repugnant in principle to the members of this House". If, as the hon. member has argued, this amendment were a reasoned one, it would not appear to be acceptable on that point. On the other hand, it does not appear that the amendment is a reasoned amendment at all, because it has the appearance of giving

the bill a six months' hoist and would have the effect of killing the bill.

• (8:10 p.m.)

It may be that my hon. friend who moved the amendment wanted it to have this effect but did not want to say so in so many words. The only other citation is citation 202 (7) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which deals with the six months' hoist amendment and reads as follows:

An established form of amendment, such as the "six months" formula used to obtain the rejection of a bill is not capable of amendment.

That being the case, it would seem that the bill that is before us could be amended in many respects. The preamble could be amended, for instance. Of course, the wording of the amendment is not the standard wording which is accepted in this House and by the authorities as a regular six months' hoist amendment. Your Honour will notice that the amendment reads, "this bill be read a second time on a day six months hereafter." That is not the precise wording that is required by the authorities.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the Parliamentary Secretary and the hon. member for Edmonton West who have given some guidance to the Chair. I think they touched on the essential points which have to be considered by the Chair. The Parliamentary Secretary referred to citation 202 (7) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which reads as follows:

An established form of amendment, such as the "six months" formula used to obtain the rejection of a bill is not capable of amendment.

What I think should be retained of this citation is not necessarily that the formula is not capable of amendment, but rather the words used by the learned author "an established form of amendment". Obviously, he refers to the fact that this is a form which is long established and traditional in British parliamentary practice. This is further indicated in amendment No. 92 at page 396 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, entitled "The Six Months 'Hoist'", which reads:

The question being proposed "That Bill No. . . . intituled . . . be now read a second (or third) time;" Mr. . . . moves in amendment, seconded by Mr. . . .

"That the word 'now' be left, out, and the words 'this day six months' added at the end of the question."

I am not too scandalized because the hon. member for Edmonton West used a slightly different form; that instead of the word