

proceedings which took place in committee. I know that the Speaker is aware of the fact that the chairman of the committee has felt it necessary to submit his resignation because of the unusual and, indeed, unprecedented circumstances which arose at that time. The chairman indicated that he felt he had no alternative but to effectively impose closure, despite the fact that Standing Order 82 makes provision for closure not just in the House but also in committee. Surely, that would have been the appropriate means of bringing debate to a conclusion at committee stage, rather than the chairman taking the law into his own hands.

I would remind the Chair of the length and nature of the consideration of clauses in this legislation. Consideration took place on Wednesday nights, Thursday mornings, afternoons and evenings, and again on Friday mornings. We considered the clauses of this Bill on a clause by clause basis as well as the amendments to the legislation.

● (1640)

With respect to the time constraints in that committee, the Speaker is very much aware of the fact that the mover of an amendment had two minutes to indicate the basis for that amendment, and other parties represented on the committee had one minute to respond, a total of five minutes with respect to most clauses, although there were some greater provisions of time for more controversial clauses. Nevertheless, I emphasize that by the time we arrived at eleven o'clock on Thursday night, after having sat all day, the chair—

**Mr. Speaker:** With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair is prepared generally to accept argument, or a recital of facts relating to committee, 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.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to lay a foundation for my remarks with respect to the grouping of amendments by noting that the procedures in committee were most restrictive indeed, and where there is any question as to the full and adequate consideration of the merits of the clauses in question, the Chair should surely err on the side of full debate and not on the side of restriction.

**Mr. Speaker:** With all due respect, again, to the Hon. Member, the Chair is hardly in the position of looking behind a committee report and passing judgment on proceedings within a committee. Committees are masters of their own fate. However, the Chair is very anxious to have the argument of the Hon. Member concerning matters relating to the preliminary ruling which the Chair made yesterday. Would the Hon. Member assist the Chair by indicating in what respects he agrees or disagrees with the preliminary ruling?

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe I have made my point with respect to the unprecedented nature of the committee proceedings and the unfortunate denial of full debate in the context of the committee, a denial which led to

*Security Intelligence Service*

the chairman of that committee feeling he had no alternative but to resign.

With respect to the question of the grouping proposed, and the admissibility of the motions which are dealt with, I propose to respond to the Chair's preliminary ruling in the order in which the Chair has in fact made suggestions to the House. I appreciate the time which we have had to consider this question. As the Chair is well aware, the matters are not capable of speedy resolution. However, we have had an opportunity to consult and consider and, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to respond to the points in the order in which they have been submitted to the House.

I would, as a preliminary question, Mr. Speaker, just ask whether the Chair does at this point have a preliminary ruling with respect to the motions which are numbered in sub-paragraph (10), or whether the Chair intends to make a preliminary ruling on that at the conclusion of the proceedings?

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair has indicated the procedure. Yesterday I indicated the matters in which I have come to preliminary conclusions. I am inviting argument on the matters mentioned yesterday. With respect to the remaining items in the Bill, all of them, again I will follow the same procedure. I will give my preliminary findings and give Hon. Members an opportunity to consider them and make argument again. Then there will be the final decisions.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will then confine my remarks to paragraph 1 through paragraph 9 in the Speaker's preliminary ruling. First, with respect to paragraph 1 dealing with the motions to delete which I submitted, motions seeking to delete separate clauses of the Bill as well as the schedule, the Chair suggests that the cumulative effect of affirmative votes on those motions would be to kill the Bill. Thus, in the opinion of the Chair they must all be disposed of together. The Chair suggested they be grouped for debate with a vote on Motion No. 1 disposing of all the remaining motions to delete the clauses and schedule of the Bill.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, with respect, that this exceeds what would be appropriate in considering some separate elements of a complex piece of legislation. The Chair suggests that by virtue of the cumulative effect of these motions to delete, the Bill in fact would be "killed"—to use the words of the Chair—and that is good reason for lumping them together. However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, with respect, that given the very stringent limitations on time at report stage—and that is understandable because we are not under the rules of committee where there is unlimited time for debate and we deal on a clause by clause basis—we do not want to rehash everything that has gone on in committee. Nevertheless, the purpose of submitting these motions of deletion was by no means to suggest that there should be a separate debate and separate vote on each and every motion of deletion. However, Mr. Speaker, what I was intending, having reviewed the provisions of Beauchesne and the Standing Orders carefully, which do clearly permit motions to delete, I felt it was appropriate to err