

Government Orders

Parliament to present petitions on behalf of their constituents. I was doing that.

As a matter of fact, to save some time, because it was a long petition and rather than read out all parts of it I thought I would summarize it. As you so aptly pointed out, Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues were waiting to also present petitions. So I said: "How can I condense this and yet reflect the basic thesis of the petitioners?"

Mr. Milliken: That is what the rules say you must do.

Mr. Riis: Well, as my hon. friend from Kingston and the Islands points out, that is what the rules indicate. One is to summarize as best one can the content of the petition. I did that. I pointed out that a particular firm was planning to introduce engineering works to divert the North Thompson River into the Columbia valley basin and eventually to transfer water to San Diego, California.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands wish to say a few words on this in regard to this debate? Then I will set it aside for a ruling.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, by chance, I consulted the sixth edition of Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules & Forms* and I found citations concerning the presentation of petitions in this House. Citation 1041 reads as follows:

A member, when presenting a petition, may not make a speech nor present argument in support of the petition.

Only a brief summary of the petition is allowed. Citation 1042 reads as follows:

When presenting a petition, a Member may make a brief statement of the content of the petition. In making such a statement, the Member should avoid going beyond the thrust of the petition and entering debate.

I think that the rules are very clear. If there is a problem with what the hon. member for Kamloops said when presenting his petition, I am sure that the hon. government Whip immediately raised the problem with the Speaker.

Perhaps the hon. member for Kamloops said something that was in the petition. I do not know and I cannot

say, obviously. He can only present a summary of the petition and that is what he said today. Now if you want to hear more from the hon. government Whip, fine. If not, I think the case is very simple and you should give your opinion on it.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not think I have to hear any more arguments. I want to thank the government Whip for coming into the House while the hon. member for Kamloops put his arguments forward. I also want to thank the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

I will review the "blues". I would like to have another look at the "blues" just to see exactly how that petition did read and then I will come back with a ruling. We will carry on with debate.

• (1510)

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, since it was not clear when the government Whip indicated his concern, could I ask for a clarification? What is the point of order? What is the concern that was raised by my hon. friend?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Do you want me to repeat it, or do you want the government Whip to repeat it?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I know that you could repeat it, but I would like my friend to repeat it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I think you will have an opportunity to read the "blues" and I do not think we should get into the debate any further at this time.

Mr. Langdon: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but surely now that my House leader is back in the House it is the time that the government Whip, if he has something that he wishes to raise, should raise it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I just said that he did raise it. The hon. member for Kamloops had heard the remarks. I think he will be able to look at the "blues," and then I will be able to make a ruling on it as soon as I have an opportunity to read the petition again in the "blues". I feel that the matter is closed now.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter into debate on this most important piece