

Criminal Code

colleague from Gatineau—I wondered whether the amendment went far enough and, to improve it, to complete it, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin):

That Bill C-150, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, etc., be amended by deleting, in clause 18, on line 4 on page 43, the words "or would be likely to" and inserting therefor the words "according to medical science".

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in moving this subamendment, is to improve this legislation even further and to recognize the importance of the associations, in order to express confidence in the decisions they will take on each application for abortion that is presented to them.

Mr. Speaker: I have here the amendment just proposed by the hon. member and I must say that I doubt very much that it is in order.

I am ready to make a decision on the spot if the hon. member so desires.

Some hon. members might want to express their point of view but I must remind them that the only thing they are allowed to do at this stage is to amend the amendment itself, but not to amend the clause that the amendment under consideration is trying to amend.

In other words, the hon. member is trying to go back to a previous stage of the debate or to go beyond the terms of the motion now before the house by amending the clause itself. This is clearly out of order.

If the hon. members want to make some comment, I shall listen to them before making a decision.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I am sure your remarks are quite timely, but, with your permission, I would like to present a few arguments which, in our opinion, justify the submission of this amendment to the amendment and make it in order.

First of all, we believe, Mr. Speaker, that under Standing Order 75(8), it is possibly, at this stage of the report of the committee, and I quote:

When the order of the day—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I remind the hon. member that it is not the matter put to the house for consideration at the moment. Nobody denies the hon. member the right to present a subamendment. I admit that the hon. member can, under the rules to which he has just referred to present a subamendment.

[Mr. Laprise.]

What I am telling him now is that the subamendment does not seem to be in order and that is the point on which I would like to hear his arguments.

Mr. Fortin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now come down to this specific question.

The subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) says this; and I quote:

—be amended by substituting the words "or would be likely to", by the words: "according to medical science".

So, there are two things. The deletion of the words "or would be likely to" and their replacement by the words "according to medical science".

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the amendment before the house moved by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) tended to delete the words "or would be likely to", but suggested nothing positive to replace them.

On the other hand, if the words "or would be likely to", are deleted, any sub-amendment must be related to the main amendment. That is why the hon. member for Abitibi thought perhaps of replacing the words: "or would be likely to" by the expression: "according to medical science".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the terms "according to medical science" are related to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau since it merely tends to make it more acceptable, and that it is directly related to the amendment, and not necessarily to the bill.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe, in accordance with the clause I was quoting, we have linked up the sub-amendment to the amendment so that it is acceptable.

[English]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I argued yesterday for the right of an hon. member to move an amendment with which I did not happen to agree. Tonight, however, I must argue against an amendment with which I do not agree. I think I can do it briefly.

It has already been established under Standing Order 75, paragraph (8), that an amendment to a motion that has been put down at the report stage is in order. However, I submit that this amendment is faulty on two grounds. In the first place, it is not draft-