

the mandate of the legislation which will set the rules under which the security service has existed these many years and will still exist. It will not be born anew with this legislation.

We also have to address a sense of fitness. Is it appropriate that this House would take these amendments coming from committee—all of which have been discussed extensively and are the subject of briefs which were prepared by Canadians of eminent learning and experience—and decide that it would not accept any of the amendments? Worse than that, it will not even let those amendments be put.

I know that Your Honour will consider my remarks carefully. I know that the Table officers have been listening closely. I have tried to put my argument in such a way that it is clear, concise and flows in some proper order. I have some hon. friends in this Chamber who do not believe that anyone here could ever say anything which is clear, concise and in the proper order. Perhaps they are seeing the rest of us through eyes that know themselves only too well. I shall rest my remarks and trust in the wisdom and judgment of the Chair, which is assisted, of course, by able Table Officers. Depending on the ruling, I do not know whether I will have the chance to be as approving later as I am now. However, faith and trust are important matters. We should call upon them at times like this and wring every ounce of goodness which we can from them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I find it almost a challenge, of which I may not be worthy, to follow the Hon. Member who has just sat down. He covered almost everything that one could ever expect to be covered with regard to the ruling. I look forward to reading *Hansard* in order to garner even more wisdom from his comments.

I would like to deal with three matters and I would like to deal with them very quickly. The first matter is the appropriate groupings, as we interpret them, from the point of view of the amendments which we have put forward. I would like to reply to a question which was asked by the Speaker when he was in the chair yesterday. I would also like to deal with the question of admissibility of the clause which will put into place parliamentary oversight.

To begin with, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will know that Mr. Speaker Francis, on page 4639 of *Hansard*, when referring to my hon. colleague from Burnaby, said:

—but the issue before us is a group of amendments and, with all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair would invite him to direct his remarks to the way in which the amendments should be grouped.

At a later point in the proceedings yesterday, Mr. Speaker Francis indicated that the question of grouping was the responsibility of the Chair and that there were many ways in which amendments could be grouped. Of course, he is absolutely right. It is the responsibility of the Chair. Not only that, there are a number of different ways in which amendments could be grouped, given that he specifically requested us to

suggest for his consideration how we thought they should be grouped.

I would like to draw your attention to the comments of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) who, having probably as much knowledge of the content of this legislation as any single Member in the House of Commons, and I suspect having as much knowledge of the content of the legislation as any member of the public in Canada, as reported on page 4641 of *Hansard* proposed a way of grouping the amendments which were put forward by the New Democratic Party. His suggestion would allow us not to have to deal with each and every single one that was filed for the purpose of report stage debate. He has reduced from some 90 or more amendments the total number of votes to something in the order of 12 to 14 votes. In doing that, I think he met the challenge of the Chair. The Chair quite rightly requested that proposal.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the amendments which we proposed were to be grouped in the way in which the Hon. Member for Burnaby suggested, they would be grouped according to subject matter. I think that that is a practical way in which to apply groupings. They would also be grouped in such a way as to allow a vote to take place which would dispose of the amendments without the necessity of going through each one individually. I commend to the Chair that particular series of groupings. I would expedite the business of the House in dealing with the Bill. It would improve the mood of the House, which I think we are all trying to do at all times. It would make it possible for the House to deal in a fair and reasonable way with this very difficult subject matter.

It was said by the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko) yesterday that this is perhaps one of two pieces of legislation which have been paramount importance to the country. He is absolutely right. I think for the benefit of hindsight historians will reflect upon this legislation and the constitutional changes which took place two or three years ago. They will analyze the work of this Parliament and come to the same conclusion: that those two pieces of legislation will probably turn out to be the most significant legislation which has been dealt with during the history of this particular Parliament. There will be tremendous force and effect felt as the result of the changes which we now have before us. Therefore, we ought not to deal with it frivolously. Neither should we allow the possibility of taking an extra day or two to interfere with doing a good job.

The second point which was raised by the Chair can be found on page 4641 of *Hansard*. Again, Mr. Speaker Francis rose and asked the Hon. Member for Burnaby the following question:

Could the Chair ask the Hon. Member if he is prepared to withdraw any of these motions to delete? Does he consider that every single motion to delete should be considered by the House?

You will perhaps be aware, or you will be made aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Burnaby, in his response, said that we did not in fact intend that every single motion to delete ought to be or need be dealt with by the House. He has, after a very careful analysis of each of the motions, offered to