

Government orders

Madam Speaker, this truly reflects the reality, after consultations with experts from Canada and especially from Quebec, and I present it to you here.

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

Mr. Lapierre: Madam Speaker, I know that you will consider that amendment.

I suggest that that amendment to our amendment negates the present amendment. The latter is intended to create the obligation to go to Canadian bidders first.

The most our colleague from Gatineau—La Lièvre is asking for is what was already announced in all the press releases from the consortia. They say they will do their best. We suggest that their best is not enough, Madam Speaker. We want them to be bound by a legal obligation.

The amendment is basically diluting our amendment to the point of negating it completely. That means that the member for Gatineau—La Lièvre is indirectly saying no to our amendment.

I would ask him to be straightforward. He should just get up and say he is against Canadian companies, not hide behind a sub-amendment. Even his leader said he supported our amendment, Madam Speaker. But now I get the feeling that they are a little twisted in that party because they do not know where to stand. They spoke against our amendment, but their leader said he was for it. They are all mixed up, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, because I think the member for Shefford is losing his temper for no reason.

One must realize, Madam Speaker, that the amendment to the amendment proposed by the member for Richelieu is precisely intended to add to the contracts and tendering documents for contracts a provision encouraging greater Canadian content without impeding project advancement. That is clear and very precise.

Mr. Lapierre: It is a negation!

Mr. Gauthier: The member for Shefford may think it is, but it is not, Madam Speaker.

• (1600)

Madam Speaker, I believe the motion to be acceptable because it clarifies further the amendment proposed by the member for Richelieu.

The reason for such an amendment, Madam Speaker, is quite simple. Bills are now written simultaneously in both languages. In the French text, there is no paragraph f), but in the English version there is one, and it reads as follows:

[English]

Such other terms and conditions as the minister considers desirable.

[Translation]

But, Madam Speaker, this paragraph is not in the original French text. That is what the government was trying to do. Correct this error, so to speak, and include an amendment which would give the minister the right to decide, when the amendments will be adopted, that there be a highest possible Canadian content, without prejudice to the project itself. Madam Speaker, the amendment complies with the Standing Orders.

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu): I raise on a point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honorable member for Richelieu raises on a point of order.

Mr. Plamondon: Madam Speaker, the person who can best know whether or not there is a contradiction between this proposition and his amendment is the person who presented it. And in my introduction on this amendment, Madam Speaker—

SPEAKER'S RULING

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am sorry but I have to interrupt the Hon. Member straightforwardly. The person who is most able to determine if the amendment is relevant or not is the one who is at the Chair. And, after having examined the amendment presented by the Hon. Member for Richelieu and the amendment to an amendment that has just been presented by the Hon. Member for Gatineau—La Lièvre, I must rule that the amendment to the amendment complies with the Standing Orders and put it to the House now.

Mr. Plamondon: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.