

of age, many of whom are in dire financial need and who are excluded from the benefits of Bill C-26.

Another petition, this one from a neighbouring constituency, strongly deplores this discriminatory legislation against some Canadians between 60 and 64 years of age.

I have another petition in which the petitioners oppose the unacceptable, unfair and discriminatory treatment of single, separated and divorced persons between 60 and 64 years of age. They insist on a new amendment being introduced to make them eligible to these benefits in accordance with a basic principle of social justice.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata (York South-Weston): Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions to present to the House. The first petition is from the residents of the federal riding of Essex-Kent. They are petitioning the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and asking him to extend eligibility for the spouses' allowance, which has been granted to needy widows and widowers between 60 and 64 years of age, to all Canadians who are either single, separated or divorced and who have identical needs.

I have a further petition. It is similar to the first one. It is from residents of the federal ridings of Calgary West, Calgary North and Calgary South, and several from Calgary Centre. This particular petition is asking the Government to extend the eligibility for the spouse's allowance, which has already been granted to needy widows and widowers between 60 and 64 years of age, to all Canadians who are either single, separated or divorced and who have identical needs. Mr. Speaker, 80,000 persons will suffer discrimination and social injustice if the Prime Minister overlooks the amendment they are proposing to Bill C-26.

I have a further petition signed by 19 residents of the federal ridings of North Vancouver-Burnaby, Capilano and Vancouver-Kingsway. These petitioners as well are petitioning the federal Government to extend the benefits in Bill C-26 to all Canadians who are either single, separated or divorced and who have identical needs.

The last petition I wish to present today is from a number of residents of the federal riding of Rosemont in Quebec. These citizens, who are very concerned about Bill C-26, are asking the federal Government to extend the eligibility for spouse's allowance to all Canadians who are either single, separated or divorced and who have identical needs.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of Bills.

Mr. Malépart: Petition.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of Bills. I had called it, I am sorry.

[Translation]

Mr. Malépart: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: What is the question of privilege?

Petitions

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, strangely enough, my privileges as a Member of Parliament are being jeopardized by your attitude.

My colleague has just finished with his petitions. I rose immediately, and you have twice refused me—

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is clearly not a question of privilege. It is also very clear to the Member that I had called petitions three times.

[Translation]

I called petitions three times and the Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) did not rise. I waited—

Mr. Malépart: But, Mr. Speaker—

[English]

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. I am indicating to the Member that there is no question of privilege. I had called petitions three separate times. The Hon. Member for York South-Weston came in after the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell had finished. He came in and I called "further petitions", and the only Member who rose was the Hon. Member for York South-Weston. He was the only Member who rose. When he was finished I had already called it three times, and I therefore moved to the Introduction of Bills.

● (1530)

[Translation]

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) on a point of order.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to point out that I believe that you were looking the other way. I saw what happened. Since my colleague was on his feet before you called the next item, there is no reason for not recognizing him on petitions.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Is the Hon. Member indicating he wishes to challenge the Speaker's ruling? Is the Hon. Member indicating that?

[Translation]

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): That is not what I meant.

Mr. Malépart: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have indicated to the House that as far as I am concerned everybody who had indicated they wished to present petitions had been heard. That is it.