

Point of Order

Mr. Gilles Loiselle (Minister of State (Finance)): I am informed by the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions as follows:

We presume that the Member intends the term "shortfall payments" to mean any actuarially determined special payments required to amortize unfunded liabilities or experience deficiencies in the pension fund. According to periodic statements and reports filed with the Office of the Superintendent, the Bank of Nova Scotia made no such payments to its pension fund in the period from 1972 to date because none were required.

Information filed with the government on this plan prior to 1972 has not been retained.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Orders of the day. The Parliamentary Secretary on a point of order.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER**SUPPLY DAY MOTIONS**

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition, but I do want to raise a point of order which should take me two or three minutes.

I was away last week, but I have followed the debate that went on and some of the events that are recorded in *Hansard*. I have several procedural questions about the multiple notices which have preceded our entering this order just now. I do not want to argue that the motion is not receivable. That is not my intention at all. I only ask the Speaker to rule on these several questions as a guide for the future.

Since the first notice of this opposition day motion was given last Wednesday, before the government designated

that today would be an opposition day, the first since the week before last, my first question to you is: Is a designation a necessary precondition to giving notice of an opposition day motion, and if not, why not? I submit on this point that our whole chapter of Standing Orders on Supply begins after the designation of the continuing order for Supply with the words in Standing Order 81(2) to be precise, and I quote:

On any day or days appointed for the consideration of any business under the provisions of this Standing Order—

All the rest of the procedure flows from the appointment of such days. Such appointment is a precondition to everything else, including notice. Surely one reason for this is, as the same Standing Order 81(2) says, that such days are government business days on which Supply business takes full precedence.

My second question grows from what we saw on the Notice Paper Friday, a second motion from the same opposition political party identical in wording to the first, but in the name of another member. My question is as follows: Given the wording of Standing Order 81(2)(c) about the Speaker's power of selection and the commentary on that Standing Order in the Annotated Standing Orders, is it not the case that what is contemplated in Standing Order 81(12)(c) for the Speaker to select from are motions from different political opposition parties, not the same party?

My third question grows from what I see on today's Order Paper and Notice Paper. The original motion from the Leader of the Opposition is the only one on the paper, since the one that came on notice one day later has now I take it been withdrawn. While there were two identical motions on Friday's paper, now there is only one. My question is the following: Is it in order for any or all notices for such motions to be withdrawn without the consent of this House?

I have a fourth question, Mr. Speaker. Is it in order, either before or after an allotted day has been designated, for one or both opposition parties to raise multiple notices of motion on the paper, thus giving the Chair, I would argue, the impossible task of exercising its selection power of Standing Order 81(12)(c) in a way I do not think was contemplated, that is within a single political party? Is it the Chair's view that members have to prepare for a possible debate on any of a number of motions?