

*Point of Order—Mr. Prud'homme*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I apologize to the House. I had forgotten the Hon. Member had already been up today. Excuse me.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Crosbie:** Come back tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am apologizing to the House and to the Hon. Member. I had forgotten he had already been up today. With one minute left, I should have—

**Mr. Broadbent:** You recognized him.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Because other Hon. Members were rising at the same time—

**Mr. Broadbent:** He had the floor.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps the Hon. Member for Oshawa could wait to hear what I have to say before he comments. There were other Hon. Members rising and I should have gone to someone else at the time. I would have simply corrected that fact at that moment if there was time left. The time having expired, rather than go to someone else, I think it simply makes sense to end Question Period at that moment, although I should have recognized someone other than the Hon. Member for Skeena at the time.

\* \* \*

## CLERK OF PETITIONS' REPORTS

**Mr. Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Friday, January 17, 1986, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

I am also in a position to give a response to a question of order raised by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme).

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## POINT OF ORDER

## REQUEST FOR PHOTOCOPY OF PETITION PRESENTED IN HOUSE—RULING OF MR. SPEAKER

**Mr. Speaker:** Last December 20, the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) drew my attention to the fact that he wanted to obtain complete photocopies of certain petitions and that he had been advised that, according to our practice, he could not have a photocopy of the signatures but could indeed have a look at those petitions.

I checked the precedents and I must confirm to him that the practice of the House of Commons has been that petitions presented by Hon. Members may be consulted upon request, but there has been hesitation in the past about providing copies of the signatures on the petitions. There are many reasons for

this, but the fact remains that petitions presented in the House are public documents and that, in my opinion, any petitioner signing such a document knows full well that a third party may consult the document and obtain the name of petitioners. The petitioner may or may not give his or her address, for that does not change anything to the petition and is not contrary to our Standing Orders.

I must say to the House that I would be reluctant to order that petitions be photocopied at the request of the public at large, but the question to be determined is whether a Member has the right if not the privilege to obtain a copy of one or more petitions presented in the House. It seems quite logical to me that, if a Member may present a petition in the House, the same Member or another Member may also obtain a copy, including the signatures. If a petition comes to the House through an Hon. Member, it seems to me that a copy may be taken out by a Member and, as in many other cases, Hon. Members are responsible for what they do with it.

Therefore I have asked the Clerk of Petitions to send a complete copy of a petition to a Member who will ask for one.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

## PETITIONS

## FULL INDEXATION OF FAMILY ALLOWANCE AND REPEAL OF TAX INCREASES

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap):** I have a number of petitions with hundreds of names from Kamloops, Invermere, Terrace, Cranbrook, Prince George, Courtenay, West Vancouver, Surrey, Delta, Coquitlam and Vancouver. I could go on and on but they have been signed by the citizens in virtually every town in British Columbia. The petitioners suggest that the massive cut-backs to child tax benefits are really an unfair attack on women and families with children and are especially unfair to single parent mothers. They ask that the Government reinstate full indexation of universal family allowance and rescind a number of the regressive tax increases in the last Budget.

## FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap):** I also have a petition which was actually incorrectly submitted. I will not submit all of the loose papers, but there is an appropriate petition which makes the same point. The petitioners are concerned about the increasing federal taxes on gasoline. It is priced at a rate per litre which some people are finding extremely excessive.