

*Criminal Code*

selected in accordance with Standing Order 75 (10), and that consideration of amendment No. 21 would effectively dispose of amendments Nos. 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41. In other words, the suggestion is that these amendments are in order but they are essentially the same, and in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Order I suggest to hon. members that they should be marshalled and considered as one. Amendment No. 21 only should be put to the house, and the disposition of it eventually would apply to the others, Nos. 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41.

Again, amendments Nos. 26 and 36 are identical. I suggest that No. 26 be selected for consideration, and that consideration of this amendment No. 26 should dispose of amendment No. 36. We now go to No. 28.

• (12 noon)

[*Translation*]

Amendment No. 28 appears unacceptable in its present form because, if it were adopted, it would give two different definitions to the words "accredited hospital" as used in the bill. However, as this is merely a technical error, the house would no doubt allow the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) to change his amendment by deleting therefrom the words "or approved". Then, the amendment would remain the same in substance and this technical difficulty would disappear.

If the hon. member so wishes, I could ask the house to give unanimous consent to this minor change to the amendment. If this is done, the house could take the amendment into consideration when it is called.

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, the suggestion is agreeable to me.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house in agreement that the amendment be amended in this way?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is suggested that the consideration of amendment No. 38 precede the consideration of amendment No. 37. As previously suggested, amendment No. 19 would follow amendment No. 37.

Perhaps hon. members would wish the Chair to return to the suggestion made to the house concerning amendments 12, 14, 16 and 25. I have serious doubts about these amendments because to my way of thinking they are substantive amendments which should not be moved at this time. However, I shall hear arguments or opinions of hon. members who

may not be in agreement with the Chair on this point.

**Mr. Woolliams:** May I speak to the point of order. Mr. Speaker. As I understood it, I thought you questioned amendment No. 20. Yet you considered amendment No. 13 to be in order and permitted it. Am I correct in that regard?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is correct.

**Mr. Woolliams:** My argument may be premature, but I am prepared to submit that it is impossible to accept amendment No. 13 if amendment No. 20 is not accepted. These amendments should be read together. I am prepared to make that submission at the convenience of the Chair. My suggestion is that it would be illegal and impossible to allow amendment 13 to stand without amendment 20; they must be read together.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would think the hon. member is right on this point. Of course the decision of the Chair is only on procedural points and procedurally amendment 13 stands. The argument of the hon. member is that if amendment 20 is not put to the house amendment 13 does not make sense and may not be put to the house. Perhaps that should be considered. It is an interesting and important point. However, I would think we might start with the four amendments to which I have just referred, that is, amendments 12, 14, 16 and 25 which, as I suggested to the house a moment ago, would appear to be in the form of reasoned amendments. If there is no argument I think this should be the decision of the Chair.

I have not stretched a point at all in reaching this decision. Clearly in my view these are reasoned amendments declaratory of a principle. They are the type of amendment which ought to be moved normally on second reading but certainly not at this stage. Now we go to amendments 17, 18, 20 and 32 which in the view of the Chair would appear to go beyond the scope of the amending legislation now before the house. Again I would be pleased to hear the views of hon. members for the guidance of the Chair. I will, of course, take into account the arguments which may be submitted with regard to these four amendments.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak mainly to amendments 17 and 18. I say immediately that I find it difficult to argue against your suggestion with regard to amendment No. 17