

## Re: Hunting is banned!

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.agriculture.poultry/2004-11/0615.html>

---

**From:** Old Codger ([oldcodger\\_at\\_anyoldwhere.net](mailto:oldcodger_at_anyoldwhere.net))

**Date:** 11/27/04

Date: Sat, 27 Nov 2004 20:14:22 -0000

Rooney wrote:

> *On Sat, 27 Nov 2004 17:23:45 -0000, "Old Codger"*

> *<oldcodger@anyoldwhere.net> wrote:*

>

>> *Hunting*

>> *was not, imo, an appropriate subject on which to deploy the*

>> *parliament act.*

>>

>> --

>

> *Surely the act is appropriate \*any\* time the Lords twice reject what*

> *the Commons decide?*

IMO no. The purpose of the second chamber is to provide some balance against a government getting too extreme or out of line. The main idea is to make a government think again. If the second chamber cannot seriously check the commons and, except in very exceptional circumstances, prevent excesses there is no point in having it. Overriding the second chamber should be very much the exception and only when absolutely essential. IMO the hunting bill was a long way from being an essential piece of legislation. The previous use of the parliament act was to get a bill passed allowing alleged war criminals to be prosecuted in this country, John Major's government I think. Whilst that looks a more valid use, I doubt if that was really an essential piece of legislation at that time.

--

Old Codger

e-mail use reply to field

What matters in politics is not what happens, but what you can make people believe has happened. [Janet Daley 27/8/2003]