

Point of Order—Mr. Shields

pleased to be able to table this petition against the Cruise missile in the House today.

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Madam Speaker, I also wish to present a petition today calling upon the House to oppose the testing of the Cruise missile on Canadian soil. I am presenting this petition to express the views of over 560 residents of Kootenay East-Revelstoke, who feel that the Cruise missile is a new and dangerous weapon in the nuclear arms race and as such is a threat to all peoples and nations of the world. The undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon this House to oppose the testing of the Cruise missile on Canadian soil.

MR. WENMAN—THEORIES OF EVOLUTION AND CREATION

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Madam Speaker, like other petitioners I, too, rise and present my petition with the words that I have the duty to present a petition on behalf of concerned residents of the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. The purpose of the petition is to ensure that a balanced portrayal of two competing theories, namely evolution and creation, be given fair and representative time in our public institutions, and specifically on the CBC.

MR. TAYLOR—CALL FOR REINSTATEMENT OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, I have great pleasure in presenting a petition on behalf of 37 Canadians who reside in various places in the constituency of Bow River. The petition requests capital punishment be reinstated for crimes of first degree murder where a person is found guilty beyond the shadow of a doubt. The Government has a responsibility to reflect the thinking of the people in its legislation, and these petitioners pray that the Government will bring a Bill to the House of Commons reinstating the death sentence for anyone found guilty of deliberating taking the life of another human being.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SHIELDS—PARLIAMENT OF U.S.S.R.

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Madam Speaker, I wonder if there would be any possible way to find out how many petitions are presented in the Russian Parliament concerning deployment of the SS 20 missile?

Madam Speaker: I am afraid I cannot help the Hon. Member. He might ask a question on the Order Paper or somewhere else.

Mr. Towers: Ask the NDP.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

Madam Speaker: I have notice of a motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 26 by the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent).

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, the House has just had presented to it petitions coming from thousands of Canadians opposed to the testing of the Cruise missile on Canadian soil. Just before I move the motion, Madam Speaker, I would say that this matter is of considerable urgency because a deal of some kind has been negotiated between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America, the details of which will be announced before Parliament comes back after the Christmas recess. It is therefore our view that such a matter of profound importance ought to be debated here in Parliament.

Under the provisions of Standing Order 26, Madam Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House to discuss a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the advisability of the Government of Canada concluding an agreement with the Government of the United States of America to test Cruise missile weaponry in Canada.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member has given the Chair a statement, as required by Standing Order 26, of the matter proposed to be discussed. The Hon. Member argues that the matter is a genuine emergency because he has been advised that the text of the agreement has been agreed upon, that the House will recess tomorrow and that, in the past, international agreements have been debated in Parliament.

I cannot quarrel with the two last statements, but I do have some difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that there is a genuine emergency because the text of the agreement has been agreed upon and the House will adjourn tomorrow. My predecessors and I have consistently defined "genuine emergency" as a sudden occurrence. That condition is not met in this case.

The matter of an agreement for the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada has been raised in this House under various forms on numerous occasions. More particularly, on April 29, 1982, the Hon. Member proposed a non-confidence motion under supply calling for, *inter alia*, no Cruise missile testing in Canada, which was voted upon and lost.

I would refer the Hon. Member to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 288, which reads as follows:

The Speaker is bound to apply to motions made under S.O.26 the established rules of debate, and to enforce the principle that subjects excluded by those rules cannot be brought forward thereon, such as a matter under adjudication by a court of law, or matters already discussed or appointed for consideration during the current session, whether upon a substantive motion, upon an amendment, or upon an Order of the Day.