

Point of Order

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton West:

That the matter of access of certain members of Parliament by taxi to Parliament Hill today be referred to the Standing Committee on Elections and Privileges.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

SUPPLY DAY MOTIONS

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I recognize the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands on a point of order.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I want to respond, if I may, to assist Your Honour in making a ruling on the matters raised this morning by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader. There are two or three questions that he put to you and asked you to answer in a hypothetical way and I wanted to make clear our position on this matter so that Your Honour, in making a ruling, will be able to consider the views of the opposition.

The significant question that he posed was, was it necessary before a discussion on an allotted day and before a motion could be put down on an allotted day that the government designate the allotted day. I have reviewed the authorities as best I can and I submit that the answer to the question is no, there is no need for a designation before any member of the opposition can set down a motion.

I refer the Chair to Standing Order 81(12)(b) which makes it clear that in putting down a motion on an allotted day that is to be votable on a Friday, the opposition must give 48 hours' notice of the motion. If the parliamentary secretary's interpretation of this rule was correct, it would mean that by holding up the designation until Thursday evening on any supply day on a Friday, the government could effectively forestall the opposition from choosing to have a vote on a Friday. It is clear from the reading of the rule that the intent is to leave the leeway with the opposition. I submit that the

answer to his first question must be no, there is no necessity for a designation before the opposition may set down a motion for a supply day.

Second, I want to note that the Notice Paper for Thursday, as my friend will see indicates that the notice was given pursuant to Standing Orders 81(12) and 81(14). It was clear on the designation of the Leader of the Opposition's original notice that it was for a votable supply day on Friday last week.

The government chose not to designate Friday as a votable supply day and accordingly, another notice was given on Thursday for Friday and it appears on Friday's Order Paper, by the hon. member for Algoma. While the terms are exactly the same, the fact is the first notice was given to conform with Standing Order 81(12)(c).

I submit that in making any ruling on this matter, the words of Standing Order 81(12)(c) are relevant, and I have dealt with the other issue. There is no need for designation, in my submission, before the notice is given.

With respect to the withdrawal of notices, the Parliamentary Secretary suggested that it was improper for the member to withdraw without recourse to the House. I refer Your Honour to Citation 543 of Beauchesne's sixth edition which states as follows:

There are only two ways in which a notice can be withdrawn from the *Order Paper*: first, by the Member giving a written notice to the Clerk of the House or second, by the Member informing the Speaker of the desire that the question be dropped or withdrawn.

I understand that the appropriate notice was given in writing to the Clerk, and accordingly, the notice is withdrawn *ipso facto* and there is no need for the member to do anything else or seek the leave of the House to withdraw the notice. I ask Your Honour to rule accordingly.

The member suggested that it was improper to have multiple notices. Again, I refer to Standing Order 81(12)(c), which states that when notice has been given of two or more motions by members in opposition to the government, there is no reference to parties, there is no reference to anything except members in opposition.