

necessary or desirable, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the said Committee.

On motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Côté (Longueuil), it was ordered,—That the question of radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its Committees, including the legal, procedural, and technical aspects thereof, and the question of arrangements made for reporters for the electronic media in the Parliament Buildings, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

On motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Côté (Longueuil), it was ordered,—That the question of measures to be taken to ensure the security of the galleries of the House, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs;

#### RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: As honourable Members know, a considerable number of motions have been proposed for consideration of the House at this time. The Chair has closely studied all these motions. I should indicate to the House that I have reservations concerning three motions about which I suggest there might be procedural difficulties, Nos. 1, 2 and 19. No. 1 stands in the name of the honourable Member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and No. 2 is consequential thereon.

I am not sure whether the honourable Member for Calgary North wants to deal with the matter from a procedural standpoint at this time. I suggest to him that this is an attempt to introduce an amendment of substance by way of an amendment to the interpretation clause of the bill. This is contrary to the practice of the House. This is my preliminary observation which I would like to put for the consideration of the honourable Member for Calgary North. As I said, No. 2 is dependent on No. 1. If No. 1 cannot be put then No. 2 cannot be put.

There are no objections to any of the other motions proposed by the honourable Member for Calgary North or any other honourable Members with the exception of No. 19 proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). It appears to be faulty in some respects, perhaps not substantially, but I do have some difficulties. For the moment we might deal with No. 1 which stands in the name of the honourable Member for Calgary North.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable Member that perhaps the argument he has made was submitted in a manner that is out of order from a procedural standpoint. The honourable Member stated the amendment he proposes goes to the substance of the bill. I appreciate that. This is why I am worried about the matter.

I respectfully suggest to the honourable Member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) it is not good procedure to try and introduce a substantive amendment by way of modification of the interpretation clause. I doubt whether a precedent can be found in our practice. I have not been able to find one where a substantive amendment was effected by a modification of the interpretation clause. I have studied the matter very closely. I suggest with respect to the honourable Member that I do not think I can vary the opinion I expressed when the matter was raised in the first instance.

Earlier this year I dealt with this matter at some length. I believe it was on May 21. There is a report of a ruling of the Chair in *Votes and Proceedings* for May 21 dealing with a similar situation. I went into the background on this matter from a procedural standpoint and at that time I reached the conclusion that this kind of amendment could not be moved. I suggest to the House that I have to reach the same conclusion at this time. There may be some other way that the amendment might have been introduced. There is still Third Reading stage where the matter can be debated.

The honourable Member stated this proposal had been made in committee. I cannot reach the conclusion that it necessarily follows that the amendment would be in order in the House because, of course, we are not bound by rulings made in committee. The honourable Member realizes this and has so indicated.

Taking all factors into consideration I must say with great regret that I do not see how I can allow the motion to be put. No. 2 must fall on the same ground. The reservations I have about motion No. 19 might be considered when that amendment is reached. It is my thought that perhaps this proposed motion is irrelevant in the sense that it is beyond the scope of the legislative item that it seeks to amend.

Mr. Woolliams, seconded by Mr. Bell, moved,—That Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out clause 7 on page 5 thereof and substituting the following:

"7. (1) The Rules may provide for a rota of judges to provide for a continuity of judicial availability in any centre where the volume of work or other circumstances make such an arrangement expedient.

(2) No judge shall be required under rules made under subsection (1) to remain in any centre other than the National Capital Region for a period longer than one month, unless it becomes necessary to do so to complete the hearing of a cause or matter, or unless he consents thereto."

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.