

Point of Order

remains only a fine principle which is still not honoured in practice.”

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial very well expresses this government's commitment to pay equity, not only in the federal public service but throughout the country.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: In view of matters that are taking place a little later on this afternoon I want to announce that there will be shuttle buses provided for members from the west door of the Centre Block commencing at 1745 hours and continuing through to 2100 hours. If there is need for any further information I ask that hon. members phone my office.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

WAYS AND MEANS MOTION—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: There is agreement in the House, I understand, that I render a judgment now on a point of order raised by the hon. member for Kamloops a few days ago rather than wait until the completion of Routine Proceedings. I am prepared to do that.

On January 24, 1990, the hon. member for Kamloops rose on a point of order to contest the procedural acceptability of a Ways and Means motion in which there had been concurrence the previous day. While the Chair allowed the bill, which was based on this motion, to be introduced and read a first time, I indicated to members at the time that I would not allow second reading debate on the bill to begin until the procedural arguments raised by the hon. member for Kamloops had been considered and a decision rendered. I am now ready to rule on this matter.

Before entering into the case itself, I would like to address a technicality on the timing of the member's point of order. The member for Kamloops explained that he did not raise his point of order on January 23 because Standing Order 83(3) states, “a motion to concur in” a ways and means motion “shall be forthwith decided without debate or amendment”.

The Chair would like to point out that the practice and rules of the House would not preclude a member from raising a procedural objection to the admissibility of a Ways and Means motion when it is called.

Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, citation 235, states:

Any Member is entitled, even bound, to bring to the Speaker's immediate notice any instance of what he considers a breach of order—He should do so as soon as he perceives an irregularity in the proceedings which are engaging the attention of the House.

The Chair simply wants to point out the difference between the restriction against debate on the motion of concurrence and the raising of a point of order. I am quick to point out that while I have made these remarks in the interests of clarification, it makes no difference to the ruling I will make and in no way was the hon. member for Kamloops prejudiced against putting his point of order and arguing the matter. In short, the member could have raised his procedural arguments on January 23 but could not have debated the subject matter of the motion.

[*Translation*]

Let me now proceed to render my decision. On January 24, the hon. member for Kamloops pointed out that a phrase in the motion of ways and means moved by the Minister of Finance referred to a document which had not been tabled in the House of Commons. Specifically, the important passage read:

[*English*]

That a tax—be imposed after 1990 under the Excise Tax Act at the rate of 7 per cent—as set out in the document entitled “The Goods and Services Tax” tabled in the House of Commons by the Minister of Finance on December 19, 1989 and “The Goods and Services Tax Technical Paper” issued by the Minister of Finance on August 8, 1989.

[*Translation*]

It is the second document referred to in the motion which at that time had not been tabled in the House.

[*English*]

The member for Kamloops claimed that a tax bill had been founded in part on a document released through the press and not tabled in the House. And this, he contends, challenges the age-old practice that money bills must originate in the House. Furthermore, he asks whether amendments can now be proposed to the bill