

I want to add that this is a petition that I personally support very strongly.

## CANADA POST

**Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions asking that Marie Skłodowska Curie be honoured for her scientific contributions to humanity.

This is a request made by many of my constituents and constituents of the Niagara Peninsula. I would ask that this House consider these two petitions in the name of my constituents.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, I move that all questions stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Shall the questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

## AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre (p. 19027).

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing on a point of order.

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Madam Speaker, I have a different point of order from those raised before and I will be as brief as I can.

This relates to the possibility of dividing Motion No. 30 into categories so that we can make an effective decision on each, because Motion No. 30 is complex and contains several distinct proposals. I think it is not possible for members to give a yes or no answer to the question of whether this motion should be adopted. It is over 30

*Government Orders*

pages long and contains 64 clauses touching on virtually every aspect of the operations of the House.

• (1520)

I suggest dividing the proposals into perhaps five groupings: One, proposals to change the dates and hours of House sittings and to limit the debate on supply, the budget, the Throne Speech and so on; two, proposals to alter the operations of committees; three, proposals to amend the passage of government bills and government business including reduction in time of some speeches, to refer those bills to standing committees, to facilitate the use of closure and time allocation, to remove the right to divide on first reading, et cetera; four, proposals to override the denial of unanimous consent; five, proposals to change the conduct of Private Members' Business.

I would like to refer to Beauchesne, fifth edition, page 150, paragraph 415 where it states:

(1) A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the House may be taken on each separately. The Speaker has a discretionary power to decide whether he should divide a motion.

It should be noted as a precedent that in 1964 the Speaker make a landmark decision on that particular provision in Beauchesne when he decided to divide what was a short nine-line motion. At that time the House was seized with a motion which sought to change the Canadian flag and sought to enable the Union Jack to continue to be flown.

The Speaker at that time recognized that many members wished to say yes to parts of that motion and no to other parts of it. He relied on British practice and quoted one British Speaker from 1912, I believe, who said: "The rule of course is if any member feels embarrassed on voting on a resolution that the Chair shall revise the resolution in order that the member may if he wishes to vote yea on one part and no on the other not be embarrassed by having to vote yea or no on the whole of it".

In that particular case the Speaker of our House ordered the flag motion divided.

Since then the House has been offered many complex or complicated questions, including constitutional amendments for example, and often an accommodation is made among the parties to permit the proposal of a