

*Criminal Code*

feel that if we did not put in something like section 7 a situation could develop whereby amendments could be moved to various clauses of a bill, one of which might pass—it would be a red letter day if it did—and then it would be clear that certain other clauses in the bill would have to be changed slightly in consequence of the first change. If we did not provide for that situation I think we would be stuck with the impossibility of doing this because we have a rule which says that at the report stage we cannot debate or discuss any clauses except those concerning which notice of amendment has been given.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The purpose of section 7 of Standing Order 75 is simply to permit consequential amendments to other parts of a bill. It has nothing to do with the rule set out in section 8, namely, the right when an amendment is properly before the house, as amendment No. 21 is, to move an amendment to the amendment. That is what my friend the hon. member for Regina East has done, and I submit his amendment is in order.

I sympathize warmly with the Minister of Justice when he says that if this kind of thing can be done we will probably be here until August or September, but that does not invalidate the rule. Let me say to the minister that under the new rules there could have been a dozen amendments put down at the report stage to every one of the 120 clauses in this bill. This would mean something like 14,000 amendments and we might be here for a very long time.

**Mr. McCleave:** It would amount to 1,400.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It would be 1,400, I am sorry. I did my arithmetic very quickly.

**Mr. McCleave:** It sounds better.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It seems to me this is clearly what we provided in the rules. The rule of relevancy must also apply. My hon. friend's amendment has to be relevant to what has been proposed in the main amendment before us, but certainly his right to move an amendment is something we anticipated when we drew up these rules, and I think they are quite clear on that point.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** If you will recognize me again on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The minister has already spoken. If he wishes to add further arguments I think he would have to do so by consent. I see one or two others who wish to enlighten the Chair. Perhaps the minister feels his remarks have been misunderstood. There is provision for an explanation on that ground.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Apparently there is agreement on the part of the house to allow the minister to speak.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for that agreement, but I do not want this taken as meaning I waive the right of an hon. member to speak more than once on a point of order. I accept the agreement on the part of the house and thank hon. members.

On this point of order I have three short arguments. Let me first underline what the hon. member for Calgary North said so ably. Even with a liberal interpretation of Standing Order 75(8), surely by the wording of the amendment it must be clearly an amendment to the amendment, in this case to amendment No. 21. What this subamendment tends to do is to amend the bill itself. It goes beyond amendment No. 21 even on a liberal interpretation of Standing Order 75(8), which suggests that the amendment must be an amendment to amendment No. 21. This is an amendment to section 8 as proposed in the bill, and it goes well beyond the scope of the Standing Order.

The second point I wish to draw to the attention of Your Honour is the seriousness of the ruling you will have to make. Standing Order 75(5) taken together with 75(8) limits the debate to any amendment printed in the order paper and submitted 24 hours before the debate begins. If amendments to amendments are to be allowed, then the limiting effect of Standing Order 75(5) and 75(8) would be completely bypassed. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has admitted, we would then be completely out of control. I suggest to Your Honour that Standing Order 75(5) is restrictive and taken together with 75(8) must limit the debate to those amendments on the notice paper.

My third argument is that if you look at the wording of the hon. member's subamendment you will see it really proposes to include the members of hospital staffs. These words are in fact included in some of the other amendments which have been grouped by