

PETITIONS

NORTH THOMPSON RIVER

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have an opportunity to present this petition on behalf of a number of constituents from central and northern British Columbia who have been informed of the intention of a certain company in western Canada, in association with a California company, to dam the North Thompson River at Vavenby, British Columbia, in an effort to divert the water into the Columbia Valley trench and through a series of canals and pipelines into San Diego, California. Not surprising, this would cause a lot of concern for people who are concerned with diverting water and upsetting the ecosystem to that extent.

They are simply calling upon the Government of Canada to state categorically that this would not be allowed.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): I have another petition on behalf of a number of people, primarily from Kamloops and a number of other surrounding communities, who are asking the federal government to ensure that proper funding is provided to our Royal Canadian Mounted Police to enable it to fulfill its mandate.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, question No. 157 will be answered today. I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

Question No. 157—**Mrs. Gaffney:**

How much money has been spent on the Royal Commission for New Reproductive Technology since its inception in October 1989?

Mr. Leonard Gustafson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Since its inception in October 1989 until November 15, 1991, the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technology has spent \$12,794,067.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the other questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-39, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan, the Family Allowances Act and the Old Age Security Act, as reported (without amendment) by Legislative Committee B.

SPEAKER'S RULING—MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker: It is now my duty to give a ruling with respect to a number of amendments that came in late yesterday afternoon to Bill C-39. I want to say first of all that the staff worked until midnight trying to deal with them all and we have not had time—and I hope hon. members will appreciate this—to discuss with members the amendments that have been filed. It just has not been possible and I have not had very much time to look at them myself except early this morning.

I am going to do the very best I can with this but I am conscious of not being able to follow our usual practice which is to try to have discussions with members before I give the ruling.

[Translation]

There are 33 notices of motions in amendment to Bill C-39, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan, the Family Allowances Act and the Old Age Security Act, at report stage.

[English]

Motions Nos. 1, 1A, 2, 2A, 3, 3A, 6, 6A, 10, 10A, 11, 11A, 12, 12A, 15, 15A, 16, 16A, 17 and 17A standing in the names of the hon. members for Winnipeg North and Cape Breton—East Richmond are beyond the scope of the bill. Therefore, in accordance with Beauchesne's sixth edition, citation 698(1), these motions cannot be selected.