

*Government Orders*

## NAYS

## Members

Althouse	Anawak
Angus	Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bélair
Benjamin	Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie	Boudria
Catterall	Clancy
Copps	Dingwall
Ferguson	Flis
Fulton	Gaffney
Gray (Windsor West)	Harb
Jordan	Kaplan
Keys	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen	Laporte
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	McCurdy
McGuire	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills
Nault	Nowlan
Plamondon	Samson
Simmons	Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart	Stupich
Tobin	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wappel	Whittaker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—47	

## PAIRED—MEMBERS

Allmand	Bosley
Duhamel	Gauthier
Landry	Layton
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	Littlechild
MacLaren	Sobeski

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion carried.

## MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, February 12, consideration of Bill C-76, an act to amend certain statutes to implement certain fiscal provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 25, 1992, as reported (with an amendment) by a legislative committee; and Motions Nos. 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, and 14, 15, 16 and 17.

## SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** Last Friday, February 12, 1993, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell raised a point of order concerning the notice of a report stage motion for Bill C-76, an act to amend certain statutes to implement certain fiscal provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 25, 1992, which he stated had been sent by fax by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre to the Journals Branch prior to the close of the notice period of 6 p.m. on Thursday, February 11. The Deputy Speaker took the matter under consideration and promised to return to the House at the earliest possible opportunity.

[*Translation*]

The Chair has now had the opportunity to look into the matter. The member raised two issues in his point of order. First, he stated that the motion had been sent prior to the 6 p.m. closing, and second, he argued that an original signed copy of the document should not be

necessary and that a signed notice received by fax should be acceptable.

[*English*]

After carefully reviewing the events, I have determined that the motion submitted in the name of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre was received by fax at the Journals Branch at 6.02 p.m. on Thursday, February 11, as clearly indicated on the fax copy itself.

The member's office was immediately notified that the motions were received after 6 p.m. and that an original signature was required and therefore on two counts was not receivable. In addition, the member's office was also advised that there was some question as to the form of the motions themselves. However, based solely on the late receipt, there is no doubt that the motions did not meet the requirements of the Standing Orders for notice.

There is a long-standing tradition of this House that original signatures by a member are required for all notices and the advent of new technology has not altered this practice. This practice has existed in order to protect members from any unauthorized use of their names.

The House may wish to consider through appropriate channels whether it wishes to amend this practice to meet the demands of new technology. Meanwhile the current practice must prevail and all notices submitted for the Notice Paper and received by fax, which members know are really photocopies, are accepted as advance notice and cannot be considered official unless supported by the member's original signature on the document in question and which must be received shortly thereafter.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could elicit a very short clarification from the Chair.

In the event that an hon. member sends to the Clerk one of these notices by way of a fax transmission, such fax transmission then to be followed up by an original signature, must that original signature also appear in the Clerk's office before the designated time of six o'clock or can one of those be received afterward? It was not