

Points of Order

[Text]

INQUIRY ON FEDERAL WATER POLICY

Question No. 44—**Mr. Caccia:**

Did the Interdepartmental Water Policy Task Force in response to the report of the Inquiry on Federal Water Policy make any recommendations and, if so, what were they?

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Yes. The recommendations will be made public shortly.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROJECTS IN VICTORIA—HALIBURTON

Question No. 45—**Mr. Scott (Victoria—Haliburton):**

In (a) 1985 (b) 1986 to date, were any projects approved to create summer employment for summer students in the constituency of Victoria—Haliburton and, if so (i) how many (ii) how many jobs were created and what was the total amount spent to create these jobs?

Hon. Benoit Bouchard (Minister of Employment and Immigration): (a) Yes. (i) Contracts signed, 75; (ii) jobs created, 200; federal funds contracted, \$386,569.

(b) Yes. (i) Contracts signed, 120*; (ii) jobs created, 224*; federal funds contracted, \$391,224*.

* As of November 26, 1986.

[Translation]

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

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

PETITIONS—ALLEGED MISREPRESENTATION BY MEMBERS—
SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: This is my ruling as a consequence of an intervention by the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) on November 6, 1986, who rose on a point of order to object to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy) on presenting a petition. The Hon. Member for Victoria alleged that the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville had gone far beyond the content of the petition, thereby misleading the House and misrepresenting the petitioners. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council (Mr. Lewis) made the same allegations about the petitions presented by the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper), as well as the Hon. Member for Comox—Powell River (Mr. Skelly).

The Chair heard arguments from several Members on both sides of the House, including the Hon. Members for Windsor—Walkerville and Winnipeg North Centre, who counter-argued that their remarks were merely an attempt to paraphrase the contents of the petitions.

First, let me remind the House that since February 24, 1986, the rules regarding the presentation of petitions have changed considerably. The major change is that Members are now required to obtain certification from the Clerk of Petitions that their petitions meet the requirements of our Standing Orders and of our practices.

On presenting their petitions Members are permitted to give a brief summary of the content of the petition and, when Members have not been brief, my predecessors and myself have not hesitated to call Members to order and insist that they shorten their remarks. Members have been consistently reminded to keep their remarks short and pertinent. I refer Hon. Members to such interventions by Speaker Francis on January 24, 1984, as reported at page 702 of *Hansard*, and by Speaker Bosley on November 5, 1985, as reported at page 8376 of *Hansard*. I will spare the House all such references for they are too numerous to list here. There has been some indication that there has been, and perhaps continues to be, a problem.

May I also remind the House that, as reported in *Hansard* at page 1131 on November 6, the Chair intervened while the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville was presenting his petition, particularly when he used the words "American blackmail". In my opinion he was going beyond the thrust of the petition and entering into a debate about a matter for which he obviously had strong feelings.

The issue of whether some Members have "unwittingly misled the House and misrepresented petitioners" is a more difficult one. The Hon. Member for Victoria has not charged that any Member has intentionally misled the House. His complaint is that the language used exceeds the language of the petitioners. As I have pointed out, the Chair interrupted the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville on exactly this point.

● (1120)

I can assure the House that I will continue to be diligent and will remind Hon. Members that they are to describe only the substance of the petitions when presenting them to this House. I would like to thank especially the Hon. Member for Victoria for bringing this matter to the attention of the Chair and the Chamber.

PETITIONS—APPROPRIATENESS OF QUESTIONS—MATTERS
BEFORE COMMITTEE—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: On November 6, 1986, the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) rose on a point of order relating to the appropriateness of questions asked during Question Period relating to Order in Council appointments which are currently before standing committees pursuant to