

*Criminal Code*

[Translation]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the debate we objected to the proposal made by the government party because, in our humble opinion, it implied imposing some sort of closure or gag on the house.

Mr. Speaker, we want it known that we consider Bill C-150 of the greatest importance. That is why we should like, in all honesty, as parliamentarians, to participate actively in the debate, without holding up the work of course, but in an attempt to pass a law that meets as much as possible the wishes of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, we therefore feel that it would be very wise for the house to make a logical and detailed study of this bill. It would also be advisable for the house to deal with each amendment on the order paper, according to the normal procedure at the report stage in committee.

We agree with the proposed vote groupings, but we want the house to know that we intend to study each amendment fully, to make sure that the act will correspond to the wishes of the Canadian people.

[English]

**Mr. Woolliams:** With the greatest respect to other hon. members who have spoken, I would recommend to the house that Your Honour's suggestion seems to constitute the only logical way in which we can proceed in the absence of unanimous consent. As other hon. members have pointed out, there are some amendments which are identical. If we proceed from subject to subject, surely the amendments which are in order could be decided at one time rather than by an individual vote on each of them. I hope the house will accept Your Honour's recommendation.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** As I indicated earlier, we would have liked the house to agree to some orderly plan with regard to these amendments but if there is no consent it would appear that Your Honour has no option but to call the amendments in their numerical order.

However, I should like to support the two suggestions which Your Honour has made. One is that the voting, if there is to be voting, on any of the first 11 amendments might wait until we have finished dealing with those eleven. The other suggestion I wished to support was that Your Honour should tell us now which of the first 11

amendments you have questions about procedurally. Obviously, Your Honour does not wish to rule any amendments out of order before debate has taken place, if debate is desired, but I think it would be helpful if we knew at this point which of the first 11 amendments Your Honour has doubts about procedurally.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to indicate a few points likely to show the importance of studying all these amendments sensibly so as to avoid adopting them without due consideration.

All members, I suppose, have received yesterday a circular letter from the *Alliance pour la vie*.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I should like to remind the hon. member that he cannot discuss the substance of the amendments. The point is simply to advise the Chair on the interpretation of the rules. Besides, I can assure the hon. member that I am ready to make my ruling.

Under the rules the Chair has certain powers which I am ready to exercise. However, I am also ready to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and to indicate which amendments are acceptable, from a procedural point of view among those listed from 1 to 11.

[English]

I would therefore suggest that in my view amendment No. 1 is not acceptable. In fact, it is clearly out of order.

[Translation]

In my opinion, the first amendment proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) is out of order. However, if he wants to show me that the amendment should be accepted, from a procedural point of view, I will hear his arguments.

[English]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, could you not first give us all the amendments from 1 to 11 about which Your Honour has doubts? After that we might go back to No. 1. I think it would be useful for us to know the whole picture.

• (3:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** The amendments about which the Chair has doubts are No. 1 and No. 2. Nos. 3 and 4 I would be prepared to suggest to