

Privilege—Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra)

Government wants to bring forward initiatives that will enhance both the Government's position relative to the family, but more important, show that the family is the cornerstone of society. I am glad the Hon. Member has recognized that.

Second, in terms of the family allowance proposal that the Member has put forward, I remind him that in 1976 when he was a member of the Government opposite, the Government froze indexing of family allowances.

[Translation]

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the Prime Minister's decision to remain seated, because it is embarrassing when the Government cuts \$55 million from its spending program for families but can find one billion . . . I am not surprised he is embarrassed.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Minister of Social Injustice in Canada. Speaking of the Throne Speech, the Minister said that it was his task to initiate action to improve the quality of life of our families. I am asking a straightforward question, and I would like a straight answer: Was it the Minister's task to cut \$55 million from family benefit programs? Was that his position?

[English]

Ms. Copps: You guys think this is a real joke. Families don't.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Hon. Member should look at the proposal the Government is putting forward. Most social agencies said: "Increase the child tax credit". We have done that. If the Hon. Member takes a look at the proposal that was in the Budget itself, the reduction of the escalation is less than what the Liberals imposed in 1976.

* * *

CLERK OF PETITIONS' REPORTS

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Tuesday, September 10, 1985, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

I have a ruling to render on a previous point of order.

The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) is rising on a point of order?

* * *

● (1500)

PRIVILEGE

CORRECTION TO STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The responses of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) on a daily basis prompted me to rise to correct the facts. I know that he does not like facts

interfering with the scope of his argument, but I just want to say to the House that I am not, nor was ever, a director of Inco.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

TABLING OF NOTICE OF WAYS AND MEANS MOTION—RULING OF MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: On Monday, September 9, 1985, the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) raised a point of order as to the appropriateness and procedural acceptability of the tabling of a notice of a Ways and Means Motion by the Hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Hnatyshyn) on a point of order and thereby interrupting another Hon. Member's speech.

The Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier, in his submission yesterday morning, drew an analogy between the prohibition in our rules of moving motions to adjourn or of amendments on a point of order. He argued that the Hon. President of the Privy Council had acted contrary to our practices and precedents.

On that particular point, I would point out that motions to adjourn and amendments are subsidiary motions and consequently are related to and dependent upon a main motion before the House. That is why they must be moved within the confines of a particular debate and not in an incidental manner.

Standing Order 65 permits a Minister of the Crown to table Ways and Means motions at any time during a sitting regardless of the matter then before the House. However, the Chair has some difficulty in interpreting the words "at any time" in the absolute. For instance, it would not be proper to do so during Question Period. Our practice is certainly clear in that instance.

Having now had the opportunity to review previous cases, I can inform the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier that the Minister has in fact not contravened our practices, nor set a precedent. I would refer him to the *Debates* of December 11, 1973, page 8639, where a similar motion was tabled by means of a point of order. While I must find, therefore, that the action of the Minister on Monday was in order, I hasten to add that I have some reservations about interrupting another Hon. Member in order to table such documents unless the adjournment hour is about to preclude such a tabling.

In the future, may I suggest, it would be preferable to table such notices of motions at the end of Government Orders and before Private Members' Business, or after a Member has resumed his or her seat and before another Member is recognized for debate.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that in your ruling you identified and described precisely what I did last Monday.