

Security Intelligence Service

Conservative Party was using any kind of delaying tactic in the committee.

Mr. Pinard: I did not say that.

Mr. Fraser: The House Leader for the Government calls across that he did not say that, but I believe it is important that that be placed on the record. I take the Hon. House Leader as indicating he is not saying that, and he is not saying that on behalf of the Government.

Mr. Pinard: That is right.

Mr. Fraser: During committee, Mr. Speaker, a number of amendments were brought forward by this Party. All of them were very much related to the submissions which were made to the committee by the number of witnesses who appeared in front of the committee. At the time those amendments were made there was no ruling that they were out of order or that they should not be considered.

I am not going to pre-argue the case. However, I do want to draw the attention of the House, for instance, to Motion No. 3, which is a motion in my name. I will just deal very briefly with the amendment in Motion No. 3 to paragraph (d) of the main Bill. Paragraph (d) of the main Bill—so that the public listening to this can understand it—concerns the power of the security service to use intrusive surveillance, that is, wire tapping, search, and so on, to survey Canadians who have not committed any crime at all. This particular clause probably engaged as much time with respect to the remarks of witnesses who came in front of us as any other clause. I know the House Leader for the Government did not have the opportunity of studying completely the discussions which took place at committee. If amendments of that importance cannot be put at this stage, then one has to wonder what we were doing in committee.

● (1130)

I could go on, and I do not want to stretch your patience—

Mr. Speaker: The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member, but what the Chair has suggested is that the motions deleting one clause after another and the schedule could all be grouped as the first item for debate. This would give the Hon. Member for Vancouver South an opportunity to examine what I have said and make detailed argument later. I hope that would suit his convenience and that of other Hon. Members.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a misunderstanding. I accept, of course, that it could not have been moved at that precise moment, but my attempt to seek a short adjournment had nothing at all to do with delaying the Bill. In fact, it was an effort to expedite proper consideration of the Bill.

I do not want to go into the groupings themselves, but given that you have suggested there are some 30 to 35 different amendments which could be grouped together and disposed of at the same time, and because in each instance the hope of this Party would be to have each of them deleted, it is entirely possible that the force of the argument in each individual case

would be sufficient to justify consideration of the deletion of a particular clause without affecting the remaining clauses. The reason I raise this is because it requires some time to look at whether or not there is an interrelationship between one clause and the other. We just do not have that kind of time right now; the debate has to start at some point. Presumably it would start on the amendment to Clause 1, or the proposal to delete Clause 1.

Mr. Pinard: He just made a suggestion.

Mr. Deans: Presumably it would start on one of the clauses put forward for consideration during report stage. You can appreciate that for us to be able fully to understand, cross-reference and interrelate each of the clauses and determine the full force and effect of your preliminary ruling right now would be virtually impossible. I know the Table officers were not able to do that within ten minutes of having received the various clauses we proposed should be amended. I am asking only that the House not sit until two o'clock in order that we can sit down and consider carefully the effect of the proposals. Otherwise you will be seeking submissions later in the day, I hope, perhaps in the morning, on your preliminary ruling and we still will not have time to consider the preliminary ruling.

Given the importance of this legislation and that it will have such profound effect on the lives of Canadians now and in the future, given that it is far reaching in its implications, it is surely not too much to ask that an hour be allocated to all Members concerned for the purpose of reviewing the preliminary ruling in order to determine where the debate might start today, so that we can proceed. As it now stands, if one was to accept the Government House Leader's proposal, you are left with very little alternative but to stall the Bill in order to gain time to make sure the arguments being put forward are real, sensible and intelligent. What we are asking for, and we ask the Government House Leader to consider it carefully, is, would it not make more sense in the over-all scheme of things for us to have an hour and 25 minutes, as I read it now, to consider the Bill, the proposed amendments and the preliminary ruling, and then come back and make our brief submissions? Then we will perhaps have decided collectively where the debate on the Bill can reasonably begin this afternoon.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put in your mind one thought which has not been covered this morning, your point number four dealing with Motion No. 11 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), which you say seeks to change the purpose and principle of the Bill by retaining it within the RCMP. You have to remember that if that had all been debated fully and voted on at second reading, your ruling might be more in order. The fact of the matter is that it was closed off at second reading. Those principles were not discussed and voted on by the House as amendments at that stage. Therefore, it would seem proper to do it at this stage because Parliament is the place where these things are to be debated.