

2. Were any consultants paid more than \$20,000 and, if so, in each case what (a) was his/her name (b) was the amount (c) services were provided?

Return tabled.

* * *

[English]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS AND ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS FINANCING ACT, 1977

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-12, an Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Established Programs Financing Act, 1977, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: As Hon. Members are aware, there are 9 motions standing on the Notice Paper at the report stage of Bill C-12, an Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Established Programs Financing Act, 1977.

Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 give the Chair some concern as to their procedural acceptability, in that they infringe on the financial initiative of the Crown and, in some cases, are contrary to the Royal Recommendation attached to the Bill.

It would seem that Motion No. 4 is proposing to impose a condition on the expenditure of each cash contribution by the provinces. While the Chair has some concerns about the procedural acceptability of the motion, I am prepared to give the Hon. Member the benefit of the doubt and will, therefore, put the motion to the House, that is, Motion No. 4.

Motion No. 5 seeks to add a new element to the Bill and is therefore beyond the scope of the Bill.

If either the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) or the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) wishes to put forward procedural argument, I am prepared to hear them when each motion is numerically called by the Chair. Since the first three motions

Established Programs Financing

are in the name of the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam, perhaps the Chair can recognize her first in order for the Hon. Member to present her arguments.

Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, Motions Nos. 1 and 2 address the retroactivity of this Bill as do subsequent Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9. Motion No. 3 addresses the six and fiving of post-secondary educational transfers.

Speaking first then on Motion No. 1, and the subsequent motions which also address retroactivity, my argument, Mr. Speaker, would be that this legislation is retroactive to April 1, 1983. That is to say that the six and fiving goes back to April 1, 1983, a full year ago. A full year has passed. We are now into the second year covered by the Bill, namely, 1984-85. The argument, surely, Mr. Speaker, is that the supreme authority of Parliament is totally denied when we are asked to impose restrictions on post-secondary educational transfers for a year which is now finished and over.

There was an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for the Government to have done this six and fiving on time. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, it did indeed introduce a Bill last year to cover the 1983-1984 part of the two-year program. That Bill sat on the Order Paper and actually the Government allowed it to die. The Government, in other words, knew itself by introducing it that the correct procedure would have been to have the Bill passed during the year in which it would take effect.

It seems to me that it is utterly disdainful of the authority of Parliament to ask this House now to place limits on fiscal transfers for a year which has already expired. That would be my main argument, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member has indicated her desire to interpret the intent of the Bill and, in her opinion, her motion is a logical interpretation of the implications of the Bill. However, in the opinion of the Chair, Motions Nos. 1 and 2 propose to change the base year for calculations of cash contributions and entitlements. In the opinion of the Chair, they call for greater expenditures than provided for in the Royal Recommendation and, therefore, are out of order.

Motion No. 3, if adopted, would change the basis for calculation of the escalator which is used in determining the level of an entitlement. In the Chair's opinion, such a change in the escalator would increase post-secondary education entitlements and hence be an added charge on the public purse which, lacking the Royal Recommendation, is out of order. As well, the motion proposes to eliminate a phase-in formula which is contrary to the purpose of the Bill.

So, regretfully, I will have to rule Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 out of order. However, I will put Motion No. 4 to the House for debate.

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, I did not give my arguments for Motion No. 3. I thought you only wanted to hear my arguments for Motions Nos. 1 and 2 on retroactivity. I wonder if I could make my argument for Motion No. 3?