

*Lobbyists Registration Act*

I cannot see how Motion No. 2 is different from Clause 5 of the Bill. As a matter of fact, the only difference I can detect is that there is in my motion the following subclause:

(v) the appointment of any individual to any body or office established by or under the authority of any Act of Parliament or by or under the authority of the Governor in Council,—

In fact, that particular subclause was in the original Bill when we debated it at second reading. In the legislative committee, the Government withdrew that subclause. I simply added it back in.

Right at the end of the motion, there is another part that is different. I have added such other information relating to the identity of the individual, the client, the employer or any corporation or subsidiary. I cannot see that my Motion No. 2 is any different from what is in the Bill now except for the addition of the appointment of any individual. In other words, those who lobby on the appointment of an individual are considered to be taking part in lobbying activities.

I cannot understand why the motion would not be accepted. As far as I can see, it does not go beyond the scope of the Bill which we debated in principle and which is before us today.

There is one other point I would like to bring to Your Honour's attention. It must have been an error in the printing of Motion No. 6 which has been accepted. It reads: "graphs 5(1)(a) to (g)," and it should be (f) rather than (g).

**Mr. Boudria:** That is what it says. Mine must be reprinted.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I am looking at the Order Paper of Monday, July 11.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member is correct, of course, but I would like to inform him that on today's Order Paper, it has been corrected.

I would first like to thank the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria), the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Hawkes) for their representations concerning the amendments at report stage. The Chair has taken the representations into consideration and is now ready to make a decision on Bill C-82.

[*Translation*]

There are eleven motions in amendment at the report stage of Bill C-82. These motions in the names of the Hon. Members for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria), and Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), cause the Chair some difficulty. The majority of these motions were dealt with in the legislative committee which studied the Bill.

• (1210)

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 attempt to introduce a further element into Clause 5. This is of course with respect to the

representation made by the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). Clause 5 states in part that "every individual who for payment undertakes to arrange a meeting or to communicate with a public office holder shall file". Thus it appears that the principle or scope, and those words are used interchangeably, of Clause 5 is to restrict registration to items based upon arranging meetings or communicating with public office holders. In addition, the Bill makes no reference, among other items, to mass mailing, advertising campaigns, collecting information, or summary of costs. Accepting this point, that the scope of the said clause is as stated, then to insert additional items not previously covered would indeed take the clause beyond what was originally envisaged at second reading.

Accordingly, as paragraph 1 of Citation 773 of Beauchesne's states, an amendment is out of order if it is beyond the scope of the clause under consideration. That reference is further supported by Erskine May, twentieth edition, page 555.

[*Translation*]

I thus find that the proposed motions numbered 1, 2 and 3 are beyond the scope of the clause and therefore are inadmissible and consequently will not be put to the House.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 8 were considered at length in the legislative committee. Nevertheless, after consultation, Hon. Members have made the case that this matter of requiring lobbyists to register certain items is of enough significance that it warrants further consideration as permitted under Standing Order 114(10). Accordingly, Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 8 will be debated together but voted upon separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions numbered 5 and 9 were moved, debated but negated at the committee stage. Therefore, in accordance with Standing Order 114 (10), they shall not be selected for the consideration of the House.

[*English*]

Motion No. 10 is similar to Motion No. 9 and as a consequence will not be put to the House.

[*Translation*]

Motion numbered 11 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) attempts to give the registrar more powers than those that were envisaged when the House gave the Bill approval in principle at second reading. Therefore, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Beauchesne citation 773, I declare it inadmissible.

[*English*]

To summarize for Hon. Members, Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10 and 11 are not admissible and will not be selected. Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 8 are in order.