

They ask that they be considered along with the over 40,000 signatures which have been submitted by other members of the House only today in regard to these devastating cutbacks.

PETRO-CANADA

Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Mr. Speaker, I rise, under Standing Order 36, to present a number of petitions certified correct as to form and content.

The petitioners, all people from my own riding of Nanaimo—Cowichan, humbly sheweth that Canadians need Petro-Canada during this time of serious price instability in the petroleum industry to take the lead as a green energy company and to remain 100 per cent Canadian.

Therefore the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to defeat or repeal Bill C-84 and keep Petro-Canada as a Crown corporation acting in the best interests of all Canadians.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Meritt): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, and add to the almost 50,000 names a further 1,350 signatures against the cutbacks to the CBC, in the Windsor area.

Mr. Speaker, these names are simply a few of the hundreds of thousands of people across Canada who are outraged at this government for cutting back on that thread that keeps Canada together. I represent many people in my riding who, like these people from Windsor, want that funding returned to the CBC.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I rise to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36, signed by numerous residents of Edmonton, Alberta and Toronto, Ontario, who object to the goods and services tax in so far as it applies to books and the printed word.

Even though that tax has been adopted by the House, I am sure these petitioners will have noted the tax is such a disaster that the Minister of Finance has recently introduced a series of proposed changes to the act. One hopes he can keep introducing a string of changes that

will relieve Canadians from any obligation to pay this odious tax.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have a statement. On Tuesday, December 18, 1990, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell raised a point of order regarding the acceptability of a petition which the hon. member for Kamloops had risen to present.

The petition in question contained, in addition to the signatures of Canadian residents, the signatures of several persons not resident in Canada. The member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell rightly pointed out that it is not the practice of this House to receive petitions from non-resident aliens. Citation 688(1) of *Beauchesne's* fifth edition reads as follows:

Aliens, not resident in Canada, have no right to petition Parliament.

This citation is based on a ruling recorded in the *Journals* for March 20, 1880 at page 165. The Chair faces a dilemma however. If this petition cannot be presented because it contains several unacceptable signatures, then those Canadians who signed the petition in good faith will be denied this opportunity to petition Parliament.

When Speaker Bosley was faced with a similar situation in November 1984, he made the following statement:

On reviewing the Canadian and British precedents, I found no clear answer to the admissibility or non-admissibility of a petition which is signed by Canadian citizens and, at the same time, by non-Canadian citizens, not resident in Canada. In October 1983, Madam Speaker Sauvé ruled that a petition signed by American citizens was not receivable. That petition was signed exclusively by American citizens. Our precedents on petitions related to private bills indicate that petitions from foreigners have been accepted from time to time when the subject matter related to legislation or an area of jurisdiction of the Canadian Parliament. According since I could find no clear direction in our practice and procedure and so that those Canadian citizens who signed the said petition not be denied their ancient right to petition the House of Commons and since this is the first time this issue has arisen in this Parliament, I ask the House that the petition presented by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre be received by unanimous consent.

After having considered the problem, the Chair believes that the right of Canadians to petition their House of Commons would be better served if petitions, which are otherwise in order and have been so certified by the Clerk of Petitions, can be presented even if they contain