

directed in the House to the Minister of Fisheries in the absence of the Minister of State (Fisheries) should properly be directed to the Minister of the Environment who, according to the law, is still the Minister of Fisheries.

**Mr. MacLean:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would ask the government to expedite the answering of starred questions which are placed on the order paper, so that pressure can be removed from the present situation which forces hon. members to ask, in the oral question period, questions which might satisfactorily be answered as starred questions if there was any assurance that such questions would be promptly answered.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a related point of order, having called the attention of the parliamentary secretary to questions Nos. 2,184, 2,185 and 2,186 standing in my name on the order paper for over a month. These questions were answered in detail in the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence about a week ago, and I wonder when I might expect a response on the order paper.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT, THE SALARIES ACT AND THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES ACT

#### AMENDMENTS RESPECTING SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-44, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act, the Salaries Act and the Parliamentary Secretaries Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates and as reprinted in accordance with Mr. Speaker's decision of Wednesday, April 23, 1975.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Chair has had an opportunity to consider the amendments filed to see if there is some order in which they might be grouped for today's discussions. Perhaps for a moment we could direct our attention to that question and to the question of the deferring of divisions if they occur. I have asked the House leaders to give some consideration to this problem.

It is the suggestion of the Chair that motion No. 1 be debated individually and that any division thereon be deferred. In like manner, motions Nos. 2, 3 and 4 might be grouped for debate but each disposed of by a separate vote and deferred division, if necessary. Third, motions Nos. 5 and 6 could be grouped for debate but, again, a separate vote called on each motion and division deferred, if required. Finally, motions Nos. 7 and 8 could also be grouped for debate but, again, a separate vote and division, if necessary. During the course of discussion of the several amendments, if it appears that a number of divisions have developed, rather than deferring all of them and having too many at one time the House may want later to direct its attention to the possibility of disposing

#### Members' Salaries

of perhaps four divisions, if they have accumulated, and there are approximately that number remaining. But for the moment perhaps this might be an acceptable way to begin the proceedings.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I say, on behalf of my party, that the groupings you have made seem eminently fair and sensible. We are happy to accept the direction you have suggested. I wish simply to indicate that it is my intention, under the provisions of Standing Order 75(8), to move an amendment to motion No. 4 which is on the order paper in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp). I mention my proposed amendment now because this may have some bearing on when votes are taken. Since my amendment is one which will be made on the floor, it might be desirable to take a vote on it when the debate thereon is ended, so that the vote on motion No. 4, either as is or as amended, could be amongst the votes which are deferred.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to motion No. 2 standing in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman). Your Honour will probably have noted that it contains two separate and distinct propositions. I think it would be helpful to the House if Your Honour could split that motion into two, so that the question of retroactivity could be debated with and voted on with motion No. 7. The second part could be debated with motion No. 4, with separate votes taken on each motion, that is, that part of motion No. 2 which would be debated in the course of motion No. 4 standing on its own.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to say a word or two on the point of order raised by the Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council (Mr. Reid). It seems to me that the contention that there are two separate propositions in the proposed motion does not make it automatic that it should be voted on separately.

If one looks at the motion in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) he will see that it has in it several distinct and separate propositions. If we are going to apply the rule just suggested to one motion, it would have to be applied to others as well. It so happens that there are portions of the motion in the name of the President of the Privy Council which I find more offensive than others and I shall be moving an amendment for a separate vote on the portions of the motion which I dislike the most. It seems to me that if anyone is really anxious to have separate votes, that is the way it can be achieved, rather than asking Your Honour to split a motion into separate votes. This has been done on occasion, but it is very rare and it is an extremely complicated procedural proposition.

● (1510)

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, while the parliamentary secretary has a point, we in this party are willing to overlook the lapse of the rules by the NDP party and take just one vote on the matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It is true that more than one amendment suffers from the disability that the hon. par-