

Petitions

for some reason, want to do harm to us. I do not understand why, but some do.

I appreciate the Hon. Member raising this question, but it could have been raised more properly with me privately since it is a matter of the administration of the House of Commons.

* * *

PETITIONS

MR. TAYLOR—REINSTATEMENT OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR CERTAIN CRIMES

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, I have great pleasure in presenting a petition on behalf of some 116 Canadians who are residing in the Province of British Columbia, largely in the riding of Comox-Powell River. Ballots were printed by Proctor Publications Ltd. in *The Press* newspaper of Sechelt, British Columbia. The petition requests that capital punishment be reinstated for premeditated crimes of first degree murder and for the murder of children. A growing percentage of the population of adults in Canada want capital punishment reinstated, and this petition is representative of the thinking of more than 80 per cent of Canadians.

The Government has a responsibility to reflect the thinking of its people in its legislation. The petitioners pray that the Government will bring a Bill to the House of Commons reinstating the death sentence for anyone found guilty, beyond the shadow of a doubt, of deliberately taking the life of another human being, particularly anyone murdering a child.

MR. SKELLY—LABOUR DISPUTE AT NORDAIR

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Madam Speaker, I would also like to submit a petition on behalf of a large number of Canadian citizens interested in participating with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Government in this new age of co-operation.

The clerical and technical employees of Nordair have been on strike since June 24, 1982. This company is 86 per cent owned by Air Canada, and Nordair refuses to bargain. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia) refuses to answer a request from Nordair employees to appoint a mediator to attempt to resolve this nasty and prolonged dispute. The petition asks the Government to practise what it preaches and begin some co-operation by appointing a mediator.

Madam Speaker: I caution Hon. Members that these two petitions have been presented in an argumentative way. I think Members are going beyond the rule and making a habit of presenting petitions in this manner. The titles of petitions should be presented to the House, and that is it. That is the way in which petitions should be presented to the House.

Statements by Ministers. I understand that by unanimous consent we will continue for a period of 20 minutes with

questioning which follows the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde).

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, I was not consulted on this new type of procedure in terms of questioning the Minister on a statement. I agreed with the unanimous consent yesterday to move forward on that basis or with that type of procedure, but I do not agree today to extend it.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, when the Government House Leader made his submission with respect to the results of the meetings between House Leaders at the opening of the House, he disclosed the fact that there was unanimous consent. Madam Speaker will recall that I rose afterwards and I believe the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) did likewise. I submit that it was at that point that unanimous consent was sought and achieved, and it is too late now for the Hon. Member to rise in an attempt to refuse unanimous consent.

Mr. Yurko: Madam Speaker, I am amazed at how the House Leader of the Official Opposition can distort the facts. You asked for unanimous consent to extend this unusual procedure just a few minutes ago. There was no attempt to ask for it before then.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, there is an interesting point which should be considered in this matter. I agree with the House Leader of the Official Opposition that we in fact commented upon the request of the Government House Leader some time ago with regard to extending the period into today. There was no evidence at that point that anyone objected to it. I would point out, however, that all that is being done is that the length of time in total to be afforded to questions to and responses of the Minister will not exceed the length of time taken by the Minister yesterday. I suggest that with that in mind, and also with the previous consultation which took place, perhaps unanimous consent is not required.

Mr. Nielsen: And with the previous consent of yesterday.

Madam Speaker: I remind the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko) that earlier in the proceedings of the House the matter of continuing the questioning of the Minister on his statement of yesterday was raised. Both Party Leaders agreed that that was the conclusion which all Parties had reached. No one at that time posed any objection, and I assumed that the consent of the House had been given to proceed to the period of questioning.

Furthermore, Standing Order 15(3) indicates that the Speaker has some leeway in determining the period of time for these questions. It reads:

Mr. Speaker shall limit the time for such proceedings as he deems fit.

If I read the sentiments of the House, it seems to me that a period of 20 minutes for questions is quite appropriate.