

remember not only the names of the ten victims but the words of Mary Jane to which I just referred.

In concluding, I would like to suggest that while the motion of the Hon. Member for Oshawa is most appropriate, as I said tonight, I would like to see a new element of definitiveness in the motion. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that while the motion prompts the debate that we are now engaged in, it does not specifically condemn the Soviets for their action. As a result, I would propose that the motion be amended as follows:

That the period after the word "routes" be deleted and the following words added immediately thereafter: "therefore this House directs the Speaker to convey to the Chairman of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet the unanimous condemnation by this House of the conduct of the Soviet government in the destruction of this defenceless, civilian airliner and the 269 souls aboard."

In proposing that amendment, I would like to recall what already has been said by the Hon. Member for Oshawa and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, that they want to send a message to Moscow. If we want to send an effective message to Moscow concerning the matter before us this evening it cannot be fully done by a debate that may run into the wee hours of the morning. It can be done most effectively by every Member of this House standing up and voting as I have suggested in my amendment to show our unanimous condemnation of what has transpired and what we are all condemning tonight.

I notice that the Hon. Member for Oshawa, prompted by some of his colleagues, said there is no vote tonight. If my amendment, is accepted I would ask for the unanimous consent of this House that the motion as amended, which will then be before the House, be in fact voted upon before we adjourn later this evening.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Before recognizing the next speaker in the debate, the Chair should bring to the attention of Hon. Members that the motion being proposed by the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) is a substantive motion, and in the normal course of events, and in view of the nature of the question now before the House, could only be accepted with due notice being given to the House. However, as the Chair understand it, the Hon. Member for York-Peel seeks unanimous consent to have the motion which he has read accepted by the House at this time. I may have misunderstood the Hon. Member for York-Peel, but I think the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is seeking the floor. I will listen to him for a moment.

● (2100)

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I might be of some assistance to the Chair. What is before you is an amendment to the motion; it is not a motion standing by itself. I would hope that before making a decision as to whether or not that amendment is acceptable, you would want to hear submissions on it. At the moment, the submission I make is that what you have before you is an amendment, not a motion, therefore not requiring notice.

I do not believe, and I so submit, that it is necessary to seek unanimous consent to put that amendment, but it certainly is

S.O. 30

necessary to seek the unanimous consent of the House as to whether or not we vote on the amendment.

I would think, judging by the remarks made by the Leaders of all Parties in their various roles tonight in the opening of this debate, that Members of the House would certainly want to see this amendment put to a vote so that our feelings, obviously the unanimous feelings of the House, would be conveyed to the Soviet Union through the Chair in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, it is certainly evident from the comments I made when moving the motion that if this amendment is deemed to be accepted procedurally, it would have the wholehearted support of Members of the New Democratic Party.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, we are debating a very important subject under the provisions of our Standing Orders and, more specifically, under the provisions of Standing Order 30, which clearly indicate that we have here a motion to adjourn the House, which is supposed to be approved as soon as Members have ceased to speak to the motion. I submit, with due respect, that there are other ways of moving a substantive motion on this subject, allowing Members to make their positions known by voting separately on the question. In any case, the approach taken by the Conservative Member who is moving an amendment to the adjournment motion is not, in my view, in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House, and I think it creates a dangerous precedent. I can assure the Hon. Member that we will certainly find other ways, in the course of another debate or through another motion or procedure, to give Hon. Members an opportunity to express their views on this issue within the reasonably near future, but the fact remains that the amendment he wishes to move is entirely at odds with the letter and the intent of Standing Order 30, which we want to see applied in its entirety, and consequently, we have no alternative but to deny the unanimous consent he is requesting for an amendment to an adjournment motion.

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the Government House Leader is correct in his interpretation of the rule, although I cannot bring myself to agree with him. But even in the absence of that and given the subject matter of the debate, and given what the already expressed feelings of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) are, the feelings of the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) who has expressed the views of this Party, and those of the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) who moved the motion, and given that those feelings will obviously continue throughout the rest of the debate, I would suggest, and I so ask, that unanimous consent be given—and the House can do anything by unanimous consent—to put the amendment as well as to put the question.