

*Criminal Code*

friends have proposed, No. 11 and No. 9, but perhaps in view of the broad debate we have had in respect of lotteries on amendment No. 10 the debate on the other two might be shortened.

The sum of my remarks is that we take the votes not later than 9.30 o'clock tonight in order that we may clear up what we have disposed of at that time.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion appears satisfactory to us at first blush. I assume that if we are left with two amendments which have not been concluded by 9.30 the hon. member suggests we group those with other amendments that Your Honour intends to group later for a series of votes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I agree with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) as far as amendment No. 8 is concerned.

With regard to amendments Nos. 9, 10 and 11, I do not agree for the reason that they refer to the same clauses of the bill.

According to indications you gave at the outset of the debate on bill C-150, those amendments would be debated as far as amendment No. 11. If we voted as suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that might indicate a change in the speeches on amendments Nos. 9 and 11.

For the same reasons put forward with regard to amendments Nos. 3 and 4, we could agree to the proposition made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre until we reach amendment No. 8.

[*English*]

**Mr. McCleave:** Mr. Speaker, in respect of the suggestion by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I think the more logical course would be for us to complete the debate on amendments 9 and 11 since amendments 10 and 11 fit logically together. At that point we should vote on everything. I understand the hon. member suggests that if at 9.30 this evening we have not completed the debate on amendments 9 and 11 we should hold any recorded votes that arise on amendments preceding No. 9 so we will keep everything in neat packages. This should commend itself to Your Honour as providing some protection to those members in the corner of the chamber to my left who moved other amendments or have not had the opportunity to speak on

them, although the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has had this opportunity. I believe there should be a mixture of both common sense and democratic procedure adopted in respect of these votes.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I think the last remark of the hon. member who preceded me was not intended as a shot at the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who made it very clear that he did not want to interfere with anyone's right to carry on the debate.

I rise mainly to bring out the following point in respect of this point of order, and I hope the hon. members who gave notice of amendments Nos. 9 and 11 will not take umbrage at what I am about to say. I have not taken part in the debate on amendment No. 10 regarding lotteries but I sat here much of yesterday listening to the debate, which I might add was very interesting.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Let me address myself particularly to the amendments of the members of the Creditiste Party and ask them whether this is a fair statement. I have noticed that the debate so far on amendment No. 10 has by no means always been limited to that amendment. Amendment No. 10 deals only with the deletion from the amendments to the Criminal Code of the reference to provincial and federal lotteries. A number of speeches were not at all limited to that question but dealt with the whole question of lotteries private and public, the whole ambit of legislation concerning lotteries, and the whole ambit of the amendments proposed to the Criminal Code concerning lotteries.

I am wondering, therefore, whether the hon. member for Abitibi, whose contribution to the house and whose sincerity I very much respect, and the other members of his party would not agree that having had this kind of discussion, wandering all over the question of lotteries, we could set ourselves a goal of ending the discussion on amendments Nos. 9, 10 and 11 by 9.30 this evening. If hon. members of the Creditiste party, or two or three of them, were to speak again on amendment No. 9 or 11, they would merely be repeating what they have already said on amendment No. 10. I have great respect for their ingenuity to say it in a different way, but it would in substance be repetition.

This is the fifth day of the report stage of this bill. There are some 40 amendments; I do not recall how many have been declared out of order and what combinations are being