

present a grievance and humbly sheweth that whereas Members of Parliament are proud of the new Charter of Rights and the protection it provides handicapped persons; and whereas the recent CRTC decision denies the request that all telephones be hearing aid compatible and therefore acceptable to handicapped persons; and whereas this decision gives no commitment to modify eventually existing or all new phones for hearing aid adaptability; wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to make a clear commitment to render our telecommunication system equally accessible to all Canadians.

MR. MURPHY—CANADA LABOUR CODE

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I have a petition signed by residents of Canada. In their petition they talk about the very sad fact that Public Service employees of the federal Government are not protected by the provisions of the Canada Labour Code when it comes to health and safety legislation. Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray that the federal Government will enact legislation that will place public government workers under the jurisdiction of Part IV of the Canada Labour Code and hope that this legislation will be enacted soon and will be much stronger than the existing legislation in protecting the rights of government workers.

MR. ANGUISH—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATE

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, I have a petition signed by residents of Saskatchewan from the communities of Kyle and White Bear. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your Honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party and that the Crow rate must be maintained and the railways of all Canada upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners ever pray.

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières):

That this House proceed immediately to Orders of the Day.

Madam Speaker: The House has heard the motion. All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Western Grain Transportation Act

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion (Mr. Pinard) agreed to on division.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pepin that Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport.

Madam Speaker: I would now like to rule on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton-Mountain (Mr. Deans) before we entered into the debate. I have to tell him concerning this point of order that nowhere in our practice or precedents can I find any support for the Hon. Member's arguments. A bill may be objectionable to certain Hon. Members on account of its contents or scope but this does not make it procedurally unacceptable.

The citations used by the Hon. Member in presenting his argument do not sustain the point he was trying to make. He quoted from page 380 of Erskine May's Nineteenth Edition on the matter of complicated questions—and I emphasize the word "questions"—and for the sake of the record I will read the entire paragraph from which the Hon. Member quoted:

The ancient rule that when a complicated question is proposed to the House, the House may order such question to be divided, has been variously interpreted at different periods. Originally the division of such question appears to have required an order of the House, and in 1770 a motion 'That it is the rule of this House, that a complicated question which prevents any Member from giving his free assent or dissent to any part thereof ought, if required, to be divided,' was negatived on a division. As late as 1883 it was generally held that an individual Member had no right to insist upon the division of a complicated question. In 1888, however, the Speaker ruled that two propositions which were then before the House in one motion could be taken separately if any Member objected to their being taken together. Although this ruling does not appear to have been based on any previous decision, it has since remained unchallenged. A complicated question can, however, only be divided if each part is capable of standing on its own.

This paragraph is contained in a chapter which is entitled "The Process of debate, by motion, question and decision". If one examines the context of the quotation selected by the Hon. Member, it is clear that it does not refer to the content and scope of bills. The chapter deals, as the title implies, with the various forms that motions can take, the rules relating to them and the putting of the question on a motion by the Chair and precedents in our own Parliament are to that effect as well. A