

I advise hon. members that a recapitulation of this ruling is available at the table.

I know the hon. member for Churchill wishes to comment, and I of course will hear him. It may be of assistance to the Chair.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a difficult issue in getting up after a Speaker's ruling.

However, Sir, you in your wisdom have ruled a number of motions standing in the name of a number of our members, including the hon. member for Edmonton East, the hon. member for Nickel Belt and the hon. member for Essex-Windsor, out of order.

Some of these deal with environmental legislation. Others deal with an oath of office to be signed by members of the board of directors of the new Petro-Canada Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, you have also ruled out amendments which would have the effect of applying the provisions of the Official Languages Act in the bill. You have been quite correct in citing the citations and history in terms of the rulings that have been made in the past with regard to having new items brought in.

Normally, they have been ruled out of order. I would submit that that has not always been the case. I can point to Bill C-79 which was passed by this House last Friday.

At that time, in a report from committee, new amendments were introduced and, ironically, one of the new motions that was brought forward from the committee was on an oath to be sworn by the members of the Board of Internal Economy.

I refer to page 16060 of *Hansard*. At that time, I said:

— the House will be aware that in committee review of the legislation a new clause was added to the bill, which is an unusual procedure. Normally, it would not be allowed in this manner.

The House was made aware at that time that a new clause was being added that went beyond the scope of the bill.

What we are asking and what the hon. members in the New Democratic Party have done with their amendments here is to have a similar oath put in place for a company.

### *Government Orders*

I think we are talking about a ruling. If it was in order Friday to have a new clause requiring an oath for members of the board of directors of the House of Commons, if I may use that term with regard to the Board of Internal Economy, then certainly in terms of procedure it is just as in order today, four sitting days later, to have a similar oath put into a bill. Certainly in terms of procedure, it is in order today, less than four sitting days later, to have a similar oath put into a bill. We are not talking about private corporations versus public corporations, House of Commons, or outside the House of Commons. We are talking about procedure. If it is acceptable in one incident, it is certainly acceptable in this incident.

I would also point out that in terms of the Official Languages Act, this is a situation where the government is, by changing a corporation from public to private, basically saying that the Official Languages Act no longer applies. I am surprised that government members would allow the government to take that position. I do submit, Sir, that if we are going to allow new clauses in one bill, without the objection of the Chair, that should be the case for other bills as well.

If government members wish to defeat our amendments on the environment, on official languages, and on an oath for the board of directors, that is their privilege and right. But I do believe we should be allowed to make that presentation and to bring those amendments forward for debate and for a vote.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for Churchill for the intervention and also for his courtesy to the Chair in letting me know earlier this morning that he would want to make the point which he has made. He also understands, and he has indicated this to me, that the point he is making is not likely to result in a change in the ruling which the Chair has just given.

I wonder if I could take the House again into confidence with respect to these amendments. We have as much as possible been trying to have a process whereby the amendments would be the subject of very extensive discussion in some cases, certainly between the member who is filing the amendment and the table officers.

When there is sufficient notice, that is a very practical and useful practice, and I thank all hon. members for having co-operated as much as they have. Unhappily in