

tions, and do nothing to reduce the numbers of unwanted pregnancies.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to refrain from imposing any criminal sanctions against abortions.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

Mr. Speaker: Shall all questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 81—POVERTY

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East) moved:

That this House regrets that almost one million Canadian children are living in poverty, that 1.4 million Canadians each year must rely on food banks and that the current recession and the proposed Goods and Services Tax will make this situation worse; and

That the House, desiring the elimination of poverty in Canada by the year 2000, demands immediate programs to ameliorate the plight of the working poor, including a review of the minimum wage, discriminatory employment practices, current available children's benefits and other income support programs.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending December 10, 1990 the House will move through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bill. In view of the recent practice, do hon. members agree that the bill be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (1540)

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions. I am not sure whether there is agreement, but I would ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons as well as the House leader for the New Democratic Party whether or not there there would be a disposition in the House for the time allotted to the parties in the speaking order in which they are recognized by the Speaker that that individual party have the right to divide the time as it sees fit, namely, for our first speaker, instead of having

Supply

the 20 plus 10, we would have ten and five and ten and five.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I want to signal our usual co-operation on this matter and as we are such fine people on this side, we will co-operate in any way we can.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I do not appreciate the implications in those last comments but I have to say that since this is the final allotted day and the fact that we are not beginning debate until well after the usual time, I would like to make a slight change to that proposal. I think in the interest of equity and fairness that we consider the proposal but that we simply rotate in the usual fashion, not on the basis of 20 and 10, but on the basis of ten and five. If that is the interest of the House, we are certainly willing to co-operate.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting proposal which comes from the House leader of the New Democratic Party. It is a major deviation from the practice of what we have been doing in this House for quite some time of course, but in view of the circumstances quite appropriate.

I would have thought that the hon. member would want to co-operate, in view of the fact that the subject matter is put forward by the hon. member for Hamilton East, and have more members of his party and my party enter the debate. But on the proposal which is being put forward, in view of the fact that it is unprecedented to have that kind of an arrangement, we will have to go back to the 20 and 10.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we can simply ask that our hon. friend from the New Democratic Party consider the proposal made by the Liberal Party earlier. My hesitation in accepting the proposal that he made is quite simple. The issue we are dealing with today is of such fundamental importance that many of us have laboured long and hard to compose remarks which deal in considerable length with a very important issue and one which was dealt with previously by his previous leader.

By giving to the parties themselves the ability to decide how to divide up their time, we would have a system that is equitable and fair and would enable the Liberal Party to make proposals and to organize themselves in the way that they felt was most effective but would not derogate from the ability of members to deal with this important subject in a more extensive way if they felt it was constructive to do so. I think it is consistent with the traditions of this place and if we are prepared to show