

like to draw to your attention. That is the part of the motion that deals with the act respecting port wardens.

This is not really a motion to reinstate this bill in this House. The words in that section of the motion deemed this bill to have been passed and read at third reading in this House.

In other words, there is to be no discussion of this bill again. It is not put up for debate; it is not put back on the Order Paper. It is deemed passed by this House. That is completely beyond the scope of what a reinstatement motion can do in this House. It is not putting this bill back on the Order Paper. This bill will never appear on the Order Paper; it will be deemed to have been passed. I presume that if this motion were adopted in this form, the clerks would send a message to the Senate informing it that this House had adopted this bill.

For this House to adopt a bill without any debate, without any discussion at any stage, is completely irregular and improper. There has to be some limit to the powers which can be proposed in this place. The Speaker, as our presiding officer, must be able to say at some point: "This goes too far. This is beyond the ability of the House without unanimous consent".

With unanimous consent we can do anything in this place. However, for the Chair to permit a motion that circumvents all our rules in relation to a public bill is a very serious situation for the Chair to find itself in. Based on the authorities that I have cited, which give great authority to the Chair, there has to be some way to place restraints on what the government could do.

What is to stop the government then from introducing a motion saying: "In respect of the following 20 bills, they will all be deemed to be passed by the House of Commons"? Then they are all passed.

In other words, the government could introduce 20 bills on day one of the session, then introduce a motion on day two and debate the motion for two days and deem all of the bills passed.

That is the effect of this motion and that is contrary to constitutional law. That has never been done before. This is far beyond what is a reasonable limit on reinstatement of bills. I stress in the history of the customs, the usages and the practises of this House for over 50 years, according to my research, there has been no such motion ever introduced and passed in this House, except by

Government Orders

unanimous consent. The government itself exercised its royal prerogative on May 13 to bring this session to an end on May 12. The publication has been made of the Governor General's proclamation declaring the session at an end. He started it again.

• (1030)

It was the government's decision to do it. It cannot have it both ways and now bring one of these motions to trample on the rights of this House and in effect prevent us from debating these bills. I request that Your Honour declare the motion out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I made an error. I am quite sure some hon. members noticed it. The hon. member for Kamloops, and I apologize to the hon. member.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I simply want at this point to echo the comments made by my previous two colleagues. That is, to consider this motion to be appropriate would be setting a frightening precedent and would be making in my judgment a mockery out of the work done in a serious way by hon. members in this House.

The government is attempting to do in a two-day debate what this House is charged with doing by other well established and traditional means. To reflect once again the views of my colleague who spoke previously, I ask you to think of the consequences.

The government is attempting by a simple motion to deem a series of bills that are not even on the Order Paper, introduced, approved in principle, studied in committee, concurred in at report stage, read a third time, and passed.

If this motion is in order, then surely other motions to deem other bills passed would also have to be considered in order. Conceivably, to take this to an extreme, the government could accomplish by this means its entire legislative agenda within a two-day debate. That is, as some of us have indicated, a result of the change in the attitude of the government.

If this motion is allowed to proceed, we could compress in a sense the entire government agenda, with all of its legislation passed, in a matter of hours or days as opposed to it going through the appropriate stages.

What could possibly stop this abuse? The only thing that could stop it, Mr. Speaker, is your intervention today.