

Committee Reports

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is essentially the understanding. Ordinarily, where one speaker would be heard for 20 minutes, followed by a ten-minute question period, I understand the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) wishes his Members, because of the number who wish to speak on the matter, be heard for ten minutes, so that two Members could speak in the place of one.

I do not know whether there is a disposition to dispose of the question and answer period in that regard. There may be, in which case we can go along with that as well.

Mr. Deans: The agreement as spelled out by both my colleagues is correct. If there were a disposition to dispose of the question and answer period and allow a third speech to be made, we would be delighted to have that take place in order to complete the number of New Democrats who feel this is an important Bill which should be dealt with in some detail.

Mr. Nielsen: No, Mr. Speaker, on that latter point, the Members of the Opposition will retain the right to ask questions. However, in circumstances where the New Democratic Party splits its 20 minutes into two ten-minute periods, or one fifteen-minute and one five-minute period, the question period which would then follow would not be the normal ten-minute period but rather five minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that generally agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

STANDING ORDERS

PRESENTATION OF FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Thomas H. Lefebvre (Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle): Once again, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you and to all my colleagues a unanimous report from the Special Committee on Standing Orders.

[*English*]

This report is not only unanimous, it is in both of Canada's official languages, and shows the consensus reached once again by this great Committee. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Editor's Note: For above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS**MR. TOUSIGNANT—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL**

Mr. Henri Tousignant (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty to present to the House a petition signed by 1,300 residents of my riding and launched by Monsignor Hamelin, Bishop of the Rouyn-Noranda Diocese, which reads as follows:

We have all followed the debates on the testing of the Cruise missile on Canadian soil. Six religious of Canadian Christian churches made a statement on that subject on December 14, 1982. They disapproved of the part which Canada had accepted to play and hoped that our country would act as a peace mediator on the international scheme.

By signing this petition, we want above all to state publicly that we disagree with the decision of the Government to allow Cruise missile testing on Canadian soil. That decision is a clear and open acknowledgement that we are participating in the nuclear arms race: for quite some time now, Canada has been subsidizing hundreds of Canadian companies working on the development of nuclear weapons.

It is our duty to make our peace aspirations known to a Government which has decided on our behalf to drag us as a nation in the preparation of a nuclear holocaust. Our silence could only be interpreted as complicity. We are openly stating our categorical refusal to take part in the atrocious death of millions—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the petition is too long. Can he say in a few words what is the meaning of the petition of his constituents?

Mr. Tousignant: Mr. Speaker, just a few more words.

—of innocent human beings and perhaps even the total destruction of our planet.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that I speak for those people as their Member of Parliament. That does not necessarily mean that I endorse the petition.

[*English*]

MR. SKELLY—ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION OF B.C.

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I also have the honour to present a petition on behalf of the residents of the Sechelt Peninsula comprising the communities of Gibson's Landing, Sechelt Peninsula and Pender Harbour, British Columbia, to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled.

The petition deals with the proposal by the Electoral Boundaries Commission of British Columbia to include the Sechelt Peninsula within the electoral district of Capilano-Howe Sound. The petitioners urge that consideration be given by this House to retain the Sechelt Peninsula within an area of common interest to the north island constituency of North Island-Powell River. The petitioners also call attention to the fact that many people in the Province of British Columbia, including the Sechelt Peninsula, stand to be disenfranchised by the current provisions and failure of the Elections Act to provide an absentee ballot.