

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-84, an Act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, as reported without amendment from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: On the Order Paper there are 45 amendment motions at the report stage of Bill C-84, an Act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada. They are in the names of the hon. members for Edmonton East, Nickel Belt, Essex-Windsor, Scarborough-Rouge River, and Ottawa-Vanier.

[English]

There are a number of duplicate motions in the names of members of the New Democratic Party. As the House knows, duplicate questions cannot be proposed for debate.

After consultation, the Chair wishes to announce that it will select, where they are otherwise in order, the motions standing in the name of the hon. member for Essex-Windsor rather than the motions set down by the hon. members for Nickel Belt or Edmonton East. I think hon. members understand the reason behind this.

Motion Nos. 2A, 14A and 19, are in order and will be grouped for debate but they will be voted on separately. Motion Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 31 and 32 are not selected since they are identical to Motion Nos. 2A, 4A, 6A, 8A, 12A, 14A and 32A, respectively.

[Translation]

Motion Nos. 4A, 6A, 8A, 12A and 23 are in order and will all be debated and voted on separately.

[English]

Motion Nos. 9, 10 and 10A, standing in the names of the hon. member for Edmonton East, the hon. member for Nickel Belt and the hon. member for Essex-Windsor are identical. They are also beyond the scope of the

bill and constitute an attempt to do indirectly what cannot be done directly. Hon. members are aware that this is not in accordance with parliamentary practice. Thus, it is not competent to introduce into the bill an oath of office which contains conditions foreign to the bill, since introducing these conditions would otherwise be out of order. I would refer hon. members to citation 773, paragraph (1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, and I quote: "An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the bill, [or] beyond its scope—". The 21st edition of May's *Parliamentary Practice* makes the same point in almost the same words at page 491. These three motions will therefore not be selected for debate.

[Translation]

A motion quite similar to Motion No. 15 was debated and rejected by the legislative committee. After consideration I decided to let the House debate this motion. It will be debated and voted on separately.

Motion Nos. 16, 17 and 17A in the names of the hon. members for Edmonton East, Nickel Belt and Essex-Windsor go beyond the scope of the bill and therefore are out of order. As I pointed out before, this basic principle can be found in the fifth edition of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms* and in the 21st edition of Erskine May.

• (1120)

[English]

Motion Nos. 18 and 24 attempt to introduce provisions of the Official Languages Act into the bill. These provisions are also beyond the scope of this bill, so I must regretfully rule them out of order.

Motion Nos. 20 and 32A are in order and will be debated together, but they will be voted on separately.

Motion Nos. 21, 22, 22A, 25, 26, 26A, 27, 28, 28A, 29, 30 and 30A also standing in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton East, the hon. member for Nickel Belt and the hon. member for Essex-Windsor are all variations of an amendment that was debated and negated in the legislative committee. They will not be selected for that reason.

As the explanatory note to section 5 of Standing Order 76 points out, the report stage "is not meant to be a reconsideration of the committee stage of the bill".