

Criminal Code

Routine Proceedings the numbers of the amendments which will be dealt with so that we will have this information before us when we start on Monday?

● (1:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: On the last point referred to by the hon. member, this was considered and we propose to put out a separate notice paper which hon. members should have ready on their desks for reference. It will indicate exactly what has happened to the amendments. So it will be much easier at the beginning of next week for hon. members to know which amendments have been accepted, which amendments will be discussed and what will be the disposition of them from a procedural standpoint. I wish to confirm the statement of the hon. member for Peace River that amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41, in accordance with section 10 of Standing Order 75, are marshalled and combined, so that a vote on the first one will dispose of all those other amendments. We could now go to No. 26.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with the amendments you have just mentioned. They all deal with the obligations of hospitals as institutions and with the obligations of medical practitioners, staff and other personnel who may be involved with abortions. No individual amendment deals with all three categories. I wish to refer particularly to the amendment that you are proposing to place before the house for discussion, which deals with the question of hospitals as institutions, and with the situation of medical practitioners. It seems to me that there is no objection to proceeding with that amendment as a basis for debate so long as an amendment may be moved that would deal with the position of hospital staff and other personnel.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, this will have to be considered when the hon. member suggests these changes to the house. It may be possible to move subamendments provided that they are in order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have only one question to put, to clarify something. I should like to know how we will go about the votes next week, should there be any?

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Mr. Speaker: We will come back to that in a moment.

I studied that difficulty, and as soon as we have decided, in the light of the procedure, whether the proposed amendments are in order or not, I shall suggest how they could be put to the vote.

[*English*]

I now refer to amendments Nos. 26 and 36, which are identical. May I suggest that the question be put on amendment No. 26. The disposition of amendment No. 26 would also apply to amendment No. 36.

[*Translation*]

With regard to amendment No. 28, the house accepted the change in wording a moment ago; it poses no problem and it can be dealt with normally by the house in due course.

[*English*]

It is suggested that consideration of amendment No. 38 should precede consideration of amendment No. 37, as previously suggested, and that consideration of amendment No. 19 should follow consideration of amendment No. 37.

[*Translation*]

A moment ago, the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) brought up the matter of the votes.

[*English*]

This matter has been studied and I should like to suggest to the house the following. Since amendments No. 21, 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41 are essentially similar, and since amendment No. 21 has been selected for discussion, it is suggested that the division on those amendments should take place after consideration of proposed amendment No. 21.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Also, there would be a division on amendment No. 15. So we would have two divisions at that point, the division on amendment No. 21, which would cover the amendments I have referred to, and the division on amendment No. 15.

The second divisions would take place in connection with amendments No. 24, 26, 27, and 28. These all relate to the same parts of clause 18. It is suggested that the divisions on