

*Government Orders*

Before I proceeded in this way I did seek advice. I sought counsel from people who are experts in procedure. I talked to a number of people to make sure that what I was dealing with here did not require a second motion. I must say the advice I received, I think unanimously, was that what would happen is that all we would be dealing with is a part of the motion becoming mute but not in any way requiring a new motion or some sort of other method of dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker, if you check through practices in this House you will find that on a regular basis we will decide to do something in the House and yet we will continue to go through the process, the forms, even though there has already been a decision of the House. We do that because we recognize that we have a situation which has been changed by this agreement but we continue with that process to follow through with the form. I think that applies very much in this case. The fact that one particular element of this motion has already been dealt with by the House does not in any way make the rest of the motion irregular.

The final argument made by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, and he used the example of the port warden's bill, was that what is happening is we are cutting off debate, we are bringing it in at a stage that is not even a stage of the House.

We do not traditionally talk as a message to the Senate as being a part of our first, second or third reading process. We do not traditionally include it in part of the stages of a bill or a motion. Nevertheless, it is very much a part of our process. Our message to the Senate is a signal saying that we in this House have dealt with first, second, third, committee and so on stages of the bill and have sent a message off to the Senate and waiting for its reply. It is a part of our process. It is a part of our practice and to reinstate this particular bill at this stage is completely in order and is consistent with what I have said earlier, that in fact what we are dealing with is not a cutting off of debate but a continuation of a bill at a stage it was at prior to the prorogation of this House. The House leader of the Liberal Party made three arguments. First, he said that one paragraph has already been adopted by the House and therefore the motion is out of order. I think I have dealt with that at length.

• (1110)

Second, he said that there are five separate and distinct matters in this motion and therefore it is abnormal and should be ruled out of order. That is not the case. What we have is five distinct subjects within a motion, but they are not totally separate because of the thrust or theme of this motion.

The thrust or theme of this motion is reinstatement. What we essentially have is a motion asking for reinstatement at a certain stage and the particulars of that relate to particular bills. It is not unlike what we just went through in this House of Commons a short time ago when we dealt with rule changes. We had a motion to deal with rule changes but Private Members' Business and dealing with committees at great length were in that process. We had several subject areas that are unique and distinct in our Standing Orders but the motion that was being debated was the reform of the House.

That is exactly what we are in right now. We have a discussion of a motion before this House to reinstate the business of the House. Then what we have is only the particulars of that motion, the clauses of a bill if I can put it that way, which reinstate particular items at a certain point.

We are dealing with different items in a particular motion and to rule that motion out of order on that basis would mean no motions could proceed in this House of Commons because virtually every motion we deal with on the floor of this House contains in it different and quite often very diverse subject matters and subject areas.

I want to look at citation 751 of Beauchesne's. The reason I want to look at it is because I think it points out the processes of this House, the way that we as members deal with the processes and the way that the Speaker analyses and rules on those processes. Can one imagine a situation in which this House makes a decision on a certain subject and then immediately by motion reverses the decision?

Citation 751(1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition states:

When the motion that the bill be now read a second time is negatived,—

In other words it is defeated:

—it is competent for a Member to move immediately without notice: "That the Bill be read a second time on—