Point of Order-Mr. Riis

- 2. (a) Canadian Forces Superannuation Account: 1986-1987
 - (i) Account Balance March 31, 1987 \$16,110,864,205
 - (b) Public Service Superannuation Account: 1986-1987
 - (i) Account Balance March 31, 1987 \$24,769,356,677

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

OUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 286 and 294 could be made Orders for Returns, the returns would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Questions Nos. 286 and 294 be deemed to have been made Orders for Returns?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

FUNDS ALLOCATED TO RIDING OF HAMILTON MOUNTAIN Question No. 286—Mrs. Dewar:

For (a) the period between September 4 and December 31, 1984 (b) 1985 (c) 1986 (d) 1987 (e) 1988 to present, have any government departments or agencies allocated funds in the riding of Hamilton Mountain and, if so (i) which departments or agencies (ii) in what amounts (iii) under which categories and programs?

Return tabled.

DSS—CONTRACTS AWARDED IN CONSTITUENCY OF CALGARY SOUTH

Question No. 294-Mrs. Sparrow:

Between (a) January 1, 1982 and December 31, 1984, (b) January 1, 1985 and December 31, 1987, inclusive, were contracts awarded in the constituency of Calgary South by the Department of Supply and Services and, if so, in what numbers and, in each case, in what amount?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Hawkes: I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

POINT OF ORDER

NECESSITY OF WAYS AND MEANS MOTION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, yesterday at this point, I rose on a point of order after the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) gave notice of a Ways and Means motion relating to the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States. It is my understanding that the Government wishes to seek the concurrence of the House now in that Ways and Means motion before we go on to the important Meech Lake debate later this morning.

I am of course, Mr. Speaker, making an assumption that you will be making a ruling on my point of order in advance of the question being put to the House, and I wish to take a moment to make some additional comments to clarify the point of order I raised yesterday.

As you will recall, the thrust of my objection to the Ways and Means motion rested on two fundamental points: first, that because the Ways and Means motion contained no provision to increase charges to the public, it was therefore totally unnecessary as a preliminary step to the introduction of the free trade legislation. I cited a number of authorities, including Beauchesne and Erskine May, to corroborate my point. Second, I argued that by its very nature, a Ways and Means motion limits the scope for amendments to the Bill that it precedes, and Beauchesne is absolutely clear on this point.

In your preliminary response that you made yesterday to my intervention, you indicated that, without seeing the Bill, it was difficult to determine whether it would impose an additional charge on the taxpayer. You stated, as reported in Hansard at page 15587:

The second matter of course is that without seeing the Bill I am not completely sure that I would be able to accept some of the propositions which the Hon. Member has cited, which may of themselves be good authority. However, I cannot tell until I see the Bill whether in fact the Bill conforms with the five paragraphs that are now in front of the House and the notice of Ways and Means motion. I draw to the attention of the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap the fact that paragraph i) of the notice of Ways and Means motion states:

i) to impose customs duties in accordance with the Tariff Schedules of Canada referred to in Annex 401.2 of the Agreement;

I cannot tell from that whether that will increase customs duties or decrease them. It seems to me it puts us in some difficulty.

I recognize your difficulty, Mr. Speaker. However, consider the implications on Members of the House from all sides who participate in the legislative process of giving the Government a *carte blanche* opportunity to introduce Ways and Means motions. Consider, for example, the following case that could arise out of the ability of a Government to introduce Ways and Means to any Bill where charges on the taxpayer are altered, either to increase charges or to decrease them.

Let us consider the possibility of a Ways and Means motion being sufficiently vague and obscure as to leave some doubt in the minds of Members of the House about whether they are voting on whether or not to concur in a motion that would