

*Borrowing Authority*

I am taking it that the House Leaders will have a discussion as to how they wish to proceed. In the meantime, the questions of privilege are before the House. Debate will continue at some future point if some arrangement is not worked out by the House Leaders.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**POINT OF ORDER**

MR. GAUTHIER—S. O. 62—SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** I would like to speak to another point of order but on a different matter, if you are finished, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, in the heat of the debate, some comments were made about parliamentary procedure. At one point I even proposed using Standing Order 62, and I will read it so that Hon. Members will understand what I was doing at the time.

[English]

Section 62 of the Standing Orders states:

When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

I understand the situation on Thursday. When I rose you ruled at that time that the question of privilege superseded—

[Translation]

Perhaps I may refer to *Hansard* of April 27, at page 1003, immediately after the motion that was moved by me, and I quote:

The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier has moved a traditional motion that another Hon. Member be now heard. That is properly a matter for a debate. In my view having set out the fact that we have questions of privilege here—

And you continued your comments, Mr. Speaker. Subsequently, as we shall see a little further in *Hansard*, the Minister of External Affairs accused me of challenging the Speaker's decision. He said, at page 1004, and I quote:

Challenging the Speaker. Shame.

Following that decision, there was a certain amount of disorder.

I simply wanted to remind Hon. Members and this House that when I said that we were rewriting the rules, what I meant was that to me, this kind of motion was always in order, not debatable, and should be put to a vote immediately. I was not challenging the Speaker's decision at that point, which was that the main question was the question of privilege, but I would like to make it clear that no precedent has been established here, that the Chair did not decide that in future, a motion that another Member be now heard would be debatable or could, for instance, be rejected by the Chair.

**Mr. Speaker:** I want to thank the Hon. Member for his comments. I understand his position very well. I think this may be the result of conversations between the Hon. Member and the Chair, and that the Chair's decision is clear, at least with respect to what happened on April 27. I can assure the Hon. Member that I understand his position and that in the circumstances, it might be useful for the Chair and the Hon. Member to have a private discussion about the procedures.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1989-90**

MEASURE TO ENACT

**Hon. John McDermid (for the Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C-11, an Act to provide borrowing authority, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as Hon. Members are aware, the Financial Administration Act requires that statutory borrowing authority be obtained from Parliament in order for the Government to increase its outstanding debt.

Specifically, Part IV, Section 43 of that Act requires that "no money shall be borrowed or security issued by or on behalf of Her Majesty without the authority of Parliament". This refers to new money only rather than the refinancing of existing debt since Section 46 of the Act provides continuing authority to borrow funds to repay maturing debt.

While Section 47 provides for temporary short-term borrowings, statutory borrowing authority must be obtained from Parliament to permit the Government to implement a regular debt program to meet its financial requirements.