

Old Age Security Act

and I am positive, as are all hon. members, that had it not been for matters of procedure, all these amendments would have been accepted unanimously.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We must go on to the next item.

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to my hon. friends of the Social Credit party that we might ask the Bank of Canada to print new Standing Orders for the House.

Mr. Gauthier: It would certainly be better than if it were done by the present government.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Late notice has been given of three motions, Nos. 5, 6 and 7. The Chair has just read them and had a brief consultation. It may well be that some of these motions are not in order. I refer firstly to motion No. 5, standing in the name of the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) which reads as follows:

That Bill C-207, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by striking out the words "eighty dollars" at line 3, page 2 and substituting the words "ninety dollars".

To my mind, that motion is clearly out of order for the reasons I indicated a moment ago. It offends the royal recommendation which is on record, and I am sure the hon. member for Simcoe North would not want to do that.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) would not want to offend the recommendation of His Excellency. He is the last one who would want to do that. These motions were filed today. We listened with interest to what Your Honour said about the four motions filed by members of the Créditiste party. Our motions were filed earlier today and we thought they would not appear on the notice paper until tomorrow. We would not object to their being considered tomorrow. There are one or two, to my recollection, in connection with which I propose to raise strenuous argument.

As I say, I did not think we would be dealing with them until tomorrow and I do not have the amendments before me. I think, therefore, in line with the proposal made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), we might adjourn further proceedings on this bill until tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That having been said, we may consider that motion No. 5 is still under consideration. I doubt very much that I can change tomorrow the opinion which I have just expressed, even though the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) may advance strenuous argument. In fairness, however, I think it would be much better if we allowed these motions to stand until tomorrow so that the Chair and all hon. members may have a chance to study them more closely.

• (2130)

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the comments made by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). It seems to me that we can make progress if we

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

call order No. 3, the report stage of Bill C-2, an act to amend the Criminal Code.

* * *

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1972

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE, CRIMINAL RECORDS ACT, NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT, PAROLE ACT AND VISITING FORCES ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-2, to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the amendments that were adopted in committee will be found in *Votes and Proceedings* of Thursday, May 11. I rise on a point of order with respect to a technical error that appears in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). As I understand it, the amendment to clause 4 would strike out lines 4 to 13 inclusive on page 5, when the intention of those who accepted the amendment in committee was to strike out lines 4 to 19. This is simply a technical error.

If the House will permit me to make an amendment it will restore the intention in the reprinted bill so that all the lines that were intended to be struck out will be struck out, and not lines 4 to 13 as inadvertently mentioned in the amendment to clause 4. I realize that I require unanimous consent to make this technical amendment. It is not of substance. It was drawn to the attention of the minister by the legal officers.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order to ask the minister whether page 5 of the reprint of the bill as amended and reported by the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs conforms to the error that is in *Votes and Proceedings* of May 11 or whether it conforms to what was intended. After all, what would be before us at this point would not be in *Votes and Proceedings* but in the reprinted bill.

Mr. Baldwin: Maybe you cured your defect.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Maybe our good friends the printers have corrected the committee's error.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the error does appear in the bill. As I understand it, it would be corrected if an amendment were accepted that Bill C-2 be amended by striking out lines 24 to 29 on page 5 thereof.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Can our shirts be kept on for a minute?

Mr. Speaker: The House will enjoy a moment of silence.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the moment is over. I have obtained the advice of top-flight legal counsel. I am informed that it was the understanding of the committee that what now appears as lines 24 to 29