

*Criminal Code*

Consequently, in the light of the debate, the hon. member for Regina East, pursuant to standing order 75(8), moved an amendment to improve the bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, it belongs to you to take a most important decision since the minister wants to speed up the debate, not caring what the members of the opposition have to say, rejecting any amendment and referring to clause which have nothing to do with the amendment. However, Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With respect, I do not want to allow that remark to go unchallenged on the record. My purpose in intervening was not to limit debate in any way but to ask for an interpretation of the rules of the house. I would appreciate it if the hon. member would stay on the point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I would like to say at this point that I think we should limit the discussion to the specific point of order raised by the Minister of Justice, which has subsequently been commented on by other hon. members. I think that as much as possible we should avoid going beyond that point of order and the reasons why it should or should not have been raised. An important point is now before the house. I might point out to hon. members that I have given this matter a great deal of thought and am almost on the verge of giving a ruling. I do not want to curtail discussion, but I think any discussion we have should relate to the point of order originally raised.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for being so lenient. I was just coming to this, in order to explain our point of view.

On the one hand, we can see the minister's position and, on the other, Standing Order 75(8) clearly states the bill shall be open to debate and amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there are about 44 amendments before us—that was foreseen—it seems to me that we were free to move a motion under Standing Order 75(5) which reads:

—any motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause in a bill, it shall be printed on a notice paper.

Now, Standing Orders do not indicate that once the motions have been presented, and a twenty-four hours written notice has been

given and put on the Order paper, that any amendment may be accepted. I think that on the contrary sub-section (8) specifies that it is permissible to move amendments in the light of the debate.

Therefore I think, Mr. Speaker, for this reason among others, that this amendment is most acceptable and will be approved by the house.

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I say just a brief word with respect to two points that have been made from the other side of the house. First, may I deal with the point emphasized by the hon. member for Sarnia when he argued that Mr. Speaker's grouping of a number of amendments, as he did on Friday, ruled out this kind of subamendment. May I point out that on Friday, as recorded in *Hansard* on page 7972, at the very time when Mr. Speaker said that amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41 were being grouped and marshalled, the hon. member for Regina East rose and asked Mr. Speaker a question on this very point. As a matter of fact, he said that these amendments deal with the position of medical practitioners, staff and other personnel who may be involved in abortions. In other words, at that very point, when it was relevant, he asked Mr. Speaker whether it would be possible to move an amendment to deal with one of these points. Mr. Speaker's reply was:

Of course, this will have to be considered when the hon. member suggests these changes to the house. It may be possible to move subamendments provided that they are in order.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** "It may be possible", and it is decided when the question is raised. Mr. Speaker did not decide it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Of course he did not decide it, because the amendment had not been drafted; he did not have it in his hands. My point is that it is in order generally, because of what Mr. Speaker said, to decide that a particular amendment, because of its form, may or may not be in order. But to assert that it is not in order is, I suggest, quite false. I submit that the hon. member for Regina East protected himself by making that point on Friday.

The other point is that the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Calgary North said two or three times that the hon. member is trying to go behind the bill amending the Criminal Code by seeking to amend subclause 8 of the bill. There is no subclause 8 in the