

Criminal Code

hon. members should be combined. I have serious doubts about No. 5, though I should like to hear argument from hon. members on the point; No. 6, as Nos. 3 and 4, is barely acceptable; Nos. 7 and 8 are acceptable but would have to be combined; Nos. 9 and 10 are also acceptable but would have to be combined and considered at the same time; and No. 11 is quite in order. This is the suggestion I should like to make to hon. members at this time.

Dealing first with amendment No. 1:

[Translation]

I wish to point out to the hon. members that this amendment is not in order because it does not tend to amend a section of the act, as provided in paragraph (5) of standing order 75. It is rather a reasoned amendment which should normally be moved on second reading of the bill.

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have moved amendment No. 1 with a view to regrouping the different subject-matters of the committee report under the following headings:

- (a) abortion,
- (b) homosexuality and indecent assault,
- (c) lottery and gaming—

and finally

- (d) the remaining clauses of the bill.

We know that Bill C-150 contains certain clauses that are acceptable to some members. On the other hand, others are unacceptable.

Therefore, I moved this amendment not for my personal satisfaction, but at the request of certain public bodies which have expressed their opinions before the committee, during public demonstrations or by submitting petitions.

Among the public bodies which have requested that Bill C-150 be divided, there is the Association of Catholic Parents of Quebec, the Saint-Jean-Baptiste Society of Montreal—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not believe the representations the hon. member may have received from public bodies can be taken into account when we have to decide whether an amendment is in order or not under the standing orders of the house. I wish to point out to the hon. member the reasons why an amendment such as this one is, in my opinion, out of order and if he thinks I am mistaken on the strict point of view of the procedure, I should like him to tell me in what way I am wrong.

[Mr. Speaker.]

I recognize the goodwill of the hon. member and the fact that he moved the amendment with good intent. But on the other hand, I point out to him again that this is not the type of amendment that can be moved at this stage of a bill.

The hon. member believes the bill could have been divided. He will recognize that proposal was made before. If it were possible to comply with such a request, it could certainly not be done at this stage of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude by saying that my ultimate objective in moving that amendment was to enable every member to vote as freely as possible on every one of the main subjects of Bill C-150.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, several members of the Ralliement créditiste met this morning in order to determine the position to be taken with regard to item 1.

The argument put forward now was discussed this morning and we almost asked you respectfully to delete this item.

However, several of my colleagues pointed out that we were faced with a great number of amendments and that consequently the study might be quite long if we did not take some kind of step to save time, while allowing for a serious and thorough consideration of this bill.

Therefore, we have decided to retain the first proposed amendment in order to combine the subjects, which would make it possible to undertake a quick, orderly and logical study rather than a rambling one.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that my arguments are not of a legal or parliamentary nature. It is mere common sense which led us to believe that if we could combine these amendments or the clauses of the bill, in order to study them in a logical, clear and serious fashion, then I think that your job and ours would be made much easier.

[English]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it we are now speaking to the point of order that has been raised.

Mr. Speaker: I am wondering whether it is necessary for the Minister of Justice to enter the fray at this point. I think the point is quite clear. The hon. members themselves recognize and do not seriously propose that the amendment is acceptable from a strictly procedural standpoint. In view of this, I would be prepared to rule on it now or in a