

is not a matter of volume. It is not a matter of numbers. If the Opposition had proposed 5,000 amendments, and 4,900 were ruled out of order for one of the reasons or on the basis of one of the principles the Chair mentioned just now, the fact that 4,900 amendments were ruled out of order would not have been any more difficult to digest.

Basically, what the Chair is doing is to apply the principles of parliamentary procedure. Because the Opposition, and more specifically the New Democratic Party, decided to propose a series of amendments that are so obviously meant to be dilatory, and I am thinking more specifically of the amendments the Chair regrouped under item 1, which I think was an excellent idea and a very good thing for Parliament, since they were proposing to eliminate every clause from the Bill, one by one, thus requiring 93 amendments and 93 votes—This is childish! This is ridiculous. It contradicts the very philosophy of Parliament. It is certainly evidence of systematic obstruction by the New Democratic Party at the report stage of Bill C-9. I think the public is intelligent. I think Hon. Members generally are as well, and from the notices that have been given for amendments to Bill C-9, it is clear that the New Democratic Party prefers obstruction to making tangible improvements to the Bill. We have just witnessed that this is so. The Parliamentary House Leader of the New Democratic Party is trying to take advantage of the first opportunity that comes along, even if it is unlawful, irregular and against Standing Orders, to prevent Parliament from sitting. A stroke of genius! The New Democratic Party, a third party, wants to prevent Parliament from sitting!

It seems to me that the very basis for intelligent behaviour in an institution like ours is to allow debate. It is not to gag Parliament by letting the bells ring, by preventing us from trying to improve a Bill that has been given very thorough consideration for a very long time by Hon. Members and by the Senate. I shall not elaborate, since the House is aware of the considerable time and effort spent by Hon. Members on both sides of the House, especially by Members on the Government side and Members of the Official Opposition, in trying to improve this Bill. However, when we see the purely obstructionist approach being taken by the New Democratic Party at this time, when we read the amendments it is proposing, and in view of what the Parliamentary House Leader of that Party has said he intends to do, which is to prevent the House from sitting by moving that the House adjourn, personally, I must say it is ridiculous and an insult to the intelligence of this House, and furthermore, at this particular time in Parliament, it is an insult to the Canadian people. I hope they will reconsider.

My hon. friend is smiling! I think if he had heard the nonsense his hon. friend the Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) said on the Standing Committee, he would be laughing at his hon. friend and not at the parliamentary system. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Chair be firm in its application of

### *Security Intelligence Service*

parliamentary principles, and that it should not let itself be unduly influenced by the dilatory tactics of a third party that is looking for a bone to pick just before the election, and I also suggest that the Chair apply its ruling as it deems appropriate here in the House, in accordance with parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Speaker, you are aware that the Standing Orders of the House give the Chair full discretion at this stage. The Chair is not obliged to call on the Hon. Member—it is not the first time I have raised this point. I have also raised the matter before your predecessor. The Standing Orders that deal with the report stage give the Chair full discretion to determine the order of amendments, how they are regrouped, and which amendments are admissible or not. It is in a spirit of generosity. I presume, that the Chair is allowing the Hon. Members concerned to express their views during a limited but reasonable period of time, whereupon I assume the Chair will make a final ruling.

I only wish—Since the issue is so straightforward, it is not a matter of volume and it should surprise no one, whether the Chair rules fifty or 100 amendments out of order, when we know how easy it is to overload a Notice Paper and to give notice of vast numbers of amendments that are not admissible. I hope the Chair will hand down a final ruling later today on all items and for all amendments, so that we can proceed as soon as possible with the debate on this Bill.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that as far as the Government is concerned, we want the House to have a reasonable period of time for consideration of the report stage and third reading of this Bill, provided the Opposition, and particularly the New Democratic Party, does not abuse its rights during the debate. Up to now we have had the impression that, because of the number and nature of the proposed amendments which the Chair is about to re-group for the purpose of debate, purely dilatory tactics were involved. Considering the intention of the Parliamentary House Leader of the New Democratic Party to propose the adjournment of the House to prevent the House from sitting, we must assume that it is indeed their intention to prevent Parliament from sitting, to prevent intelligent consideration of this Bill and to indulge in all kinds of obstructionist tactics to prevent consideration of a Bill they do not support, but which is supported by the majority in this House.

● (1125)

[*English*]

**Mr. Fraser:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that at an appropriate time today there will be some detailed discussion of your ruling—or your preliminary ruling, as I understand it. I note you are nodding, Mr. Speaker. However, I must say, Sir, first of all, that during committee there was never an allegation made by the other Opposition Party, by the Government or by those of the media who were observing, that the Progressive