

*Tabling of Documents*

22, or any other Bill, is not relevant to the matter before us today. Your Honour has underlined that and I thank you for it.

The question before us is, is it possible for any Member of the House to short-circuit the routine business of the day? It is very clear in the *Projected Order of Business* that the daily routine of business is composed of matters which must be dealt with consequentially; one must follow the other. It is the routine way in which this House handles its affairs.

You can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that a Minister may be present to make a very pressing statement and an Hon. Member may be present to present a report from the committee. There may be a report from an interparliamentary delegation to be presented. Certainly there are bound to be petitions of some import that Hon. Members want to present. For any Hon. Member to rise in his place to move from Tabling of Documents directly to Motions without the unanimous consent of the House is, I argue, quite clearly an abuse not only of the traditions of the House but of the way in which we conduct our business from day to day.

The Chair will know that it is impossible for the Parliament of Canada to conduct its affairs day by day in a haphazard way. There must be an anticipation of the next item. If that cannot be anticipated, then Hon. Members cannot be prepared to make their contributions to the House, regardless of whether it is a report, a petition or the introduction of a Bill.

I want to say to the Parliamentary Secretary, through you, Mr. Speaker, that what he has done today comes as a surprise and a shock. This is particularly so because members of the Party opposite said they would reform the Parliament of Canada and that they had respect for this institution. For the Parliamentary Secretary to attempt to short-circuit the routine business of the day by moving from one item to another way down the list flies in the face of the rhetoric and the views that have been expressed opposite about the need to reform Parliament. I can in no way see that such a motion can be justified or acceptable.

I call upon you, Sir, on the basis of what has been said by Hon. Members on this side of the House, to call this motion out of order and to have us go back to the next item following Tabling of Documents, the routine and regular way in which we do business in the House.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I shall not be too long because the argument on our side was covered very ably by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski).

As to the question of what the House can and cannot do, I hold the view that the rules of Parliament are designed to facilitate the business of the House. When the House makes a decision, it is the decision of the House based upon a motion made. I do not believe that the Canadian people sent us to Parliament to remain mired in routine proceedings and for that—

**Mr. Axworthy:** What? What?

**Mr. Penner:** Never heard such a thing.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I notice some amazement on the part of Hon. Members opposite. Why do they not try it out the next time they go home, try it out on the people who sent them here, the taxpayers. Ask them if they want Hon. Members to spend day after day mired in routine proceedings rather than dealing with the business of Government. Why do they not ask their constituents?

In any event, I wish to deal quickly with the matter of superseding motions. On page 151 of Beauchesne's in Citation 417, several motions are referred to as being superseding motions. All of these motions are designed to enable the House to move from one item of business to another. I suggest that that list is not exclusive.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson), referred to precedents. If one argues that the House is governed by precedent, one must also take into account how precedents occur. Precedents occur when things happen. If we follow the argument that the House deals only with precedents, we must ask when the first precedent was created. Obviously the first precedent was created when the House made a decision on a motion. We suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the House has the ability to decide on the motion before it and that the Chair should rule that motion in order.

In addition to the motions referred to on page 151 of Beauchesne's, I would like to add for the Chair's consideration a citation found in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition on page 383. It is referred to as "Forms and Formulae No. 45". The form there is "That the House do now revert to Routine Proceedings", or "to Government Orders", or "to Public Bills and Orders", or "to Private Bills" or "to Notices of Motions". Those are all items which are referred to as headings under Routine Proceedings. Obviously at some time in the past, that type of motion was in vogue. I suggest that we bring it into vogue now.

The question of how one submits petitions to Parliament has been referred to in the debate on this point of order. There is no question that under Standing Order 106(3), Hon. Members have the ability to submit petitions to the Table. Every day as Parliamentary Secretary to the government House Leader I rise to supply responses to those petitions which have been presented to the House. That is definitely in order. However, I would like to deal with something that came up in the course of debate.

There has been a suggestion by the Hon. Member for Burnaby that the Government is preventing the introduction of three very important Bills. For those who are perhaps not aware of this, I would point out that Hon. Members introduce Bills under the heading of Introduction of Bills. The three very important Bills the Hon. Member for Burnaby wishes to introduce on an urgent basis so that they make the next draw are all listed on the Order Paper under the date of February 2, 1987. For two and a half months these very urgent and