

Criminal Code

ed in the form of an amendment to the motion that is before the house; it is drafted in the form of an amendment to the bill itself.

Mr. Rondeau: No.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member says no, but even with the limited amount of French that I understand I can assert that it is. The amendment is to section 18 of the bill, and specifically to line 4 on page 43. Section 18, line 4, on page 43 of the bill is not before the house at this time. What is before the house is an amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont).

The other ground on which the amendment is faulty is that it violates the rule of relevancy. While an amendment may be in order at this stage, it must be relevant. I am thinking in particular of citations 202 and 203, and the various paragraphs of those citations, in Beauchesne's fourth edition.

I submit that the hon. member for Gatineau proposes merely to drop certain words. The hon. member who is now proposing an amendment is introducing a new concept, that of bringing medical science into the picture, and surely this is going beyond the substance of the motion he seeks to amend. Therefore, on those two grounds, I submit that while an amendment at this stage is in order, the present amendment itself is not in order.

● (9:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière has already expressed his views and hon. members know that the Chair can make a ruling when all the arguments have been submitted. However, I would not want to be unfair towards hon. members and if others want to express their views, I will gladly listen to them, in order to reach a fair and equitable decision.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, on the amendment just moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) it is obvious that it is not an amendment to the bill itself. The amendment proposed by the hon. member is an amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont). It relates not to the bill itself, but to clause 18, where the words "would be likely to" would be replaced by "according to medical science".

I think that this amendment automatically relates to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau and that it is fully relevant. I trust your judgment, Mr. Speaker, but this amendment is in accordance with standing order 75(8). As the debate, since this afternoon, has been on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau, we want to clarify the intention of the hon. member who merely deplored a factual situation about which the legislation is ambiguous.

As for the linguistic aspect, we wanted to clarify his thought by suggesting that the words "according to medical science" should replace "would be likely to".

For those reasons, I think that this amendment complies with the procedural rules.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Shefford repeated exactly the argument brought forward by the hon. member for Lotbinière. I do not see why we should listen over and over again to the same argument.

I must point out to the hon. member for Shefford, as I said earlier, that his proposed subamendment is not in order for at least one reason.

I suggest to the hon. member that this amendment is of the kind which could have been proposed under standing order 75, that is to say by giving notice of it before the motions are considered in the house. Once the motions have been proposed—there are 43 or 44 of them I think—the house must consider particular amendments or specific motions proposed by the members and only such motions can be the subject of a subamendment under Standing order 75(8).

What the hon. members can do now is to propose a subamendment to the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau, because they cannot introduce an amendment to change section 18 of the bill under consideration. I suggest to the member for Abitibi and to the other members that the motion of the member for Abitibi is in fact intended to amend clause 18 of Bill C-150 and not the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau.

In fact, the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau is so simple that it would be difficult I think to imagine an amendment which could be in order. Therefore under the circumstances, I find it impossible, even if I wanted to be as tolerant as the Rules allow me, to accept the subamendment proposed by the member for Abitibi.