

Security Intelligence Service

to Motions Nos. 23 or 19. Motion No. 24 deals with the collective bargaining rights of employees of the service. How on earth can it be argued that there is any connection whatsoever between a bar on discrimination in the hiring of employees and denial of collective bargaining rights of employees and the kind of directive which can be issued, or the requirement that the Director of the service keep the Minister fully and currently informed of all operations of the service? There is patently no connection whatsoever. I submit those motions should be dealt with separately and voted on separately.

Coming to the penultimate paragraph in the Speaker's preliminary ruling, this paragraph deals with Motions Nos. 31, 32 and 34. The suggestion is that they be debated together but voted on separately. Once again it is important to note—I am not sure if my privileges are being affected by the attire of the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Peterson), but I will attempt to carry on despite the obvious distraction. Motions Nos. 31, 32 and 34 are to be debated together and voted on separately.

Looking at the contents of Motions Nos. 31 and 32, I have no difficulty with the suggestion of the Chair that they be grouped for debate, although I believe they should be voted on separately. Motions Nos. 31 and 32 both deal with Clause 12.

I would have preferred that Motion No. 31 stand on its own, particularly because it would include an amendment that would ensure that the new security service would not be engaging in some of the dirty tricks that unfortunately brought such discredit to the RCMP security service. That amendment states that it shall not be a function of the service to carry out measures to enforce security. That is a very important amendment which should be debated and voted on separately. In the interest of time, I am prepared to agree with the Speaker's suggestion that it be voted on and debated together with Motion No. 31.

The suggestion that Motion No. 34 be lumped with Motions Nos. 31 and 32 must surely be unacceptable. I see the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) nodding his head in agreement. Motion No. 34 deals with an entirely separate question. There is a suggestion at page seven that Clause 13(3) be dealt with separately. That clause permits the new civilian security service to enter into agreements or arrangements with governments of foreign states. The Solicitor General admits that the present RCMP security service enters into arrangements with countries that do not even acknowledge the existence of their own security agents.

The suggestion in Motion No. 34 is that we not permit that kind of co-operation with banana republics that the Solicitor General might want to have a cosy relationship with. Motion No. 34 is fundamentally distinct and separate. Indeed, it relates to a separate clause from Motions Nos. 31 and 32. On that basis, I submit that Motion No. 34 should not only be voted upon separately but debated separately as well.

Finally with respect to paragraphs 10 and 11 of the preliminary ruling, I note that the Speaker will be making another

preliminary ruling on the motions referred to in those paragraphs.

I have tried to keep these remarks brief. I will have some remarks of similar brevity with respect to the Speaker's preliminary ruling on the other motions. I underline the fact that we are dealing with a Bill which fundamentally affects the rights and freedoms of Canadians. If there is to be full and informed debate on the sensitive questions which have been the subject of such intense public discussion over the years, we as Members of Parliament must have an opportunity to debate them fully in the context of report stage. It is on that basis and in the interest of time that I will take my seat. I hope the Speaker will carefully consider the representations I have made with respect to this preliminary ruling.

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is not possible for the same individual to occupy the Chair perpetually throughout a long day and it is no slight to you, Sir, when I say that I regret that Mr. Speaker is unable to hear this argument. However, I am sure that you will pass my comments on to your senior colleague.

• (1740)

An Hon. Member: Have no doubt.

Mr. Fraser: I hear from my colleagues on the Government side that I should have no doubt that my comments will be passed on. I have no doubt about that at all, because of course it will all be recorded. Whether it will all be read is something else again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Let me assure the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) that the Chair has many ears and that it is all ears.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: He got a haircut!

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, your comment has brought forth ribald comment here in the Chamber. I hope for your own dignity, Your Honour, that you did not hear some of the comments that have been made which, of course, have been made in jest.

I would first like to point out that there are about 24 motions which have been put forward in my name on behalf of this Party, all of which propose amendments to Bill C-9. The important thing to remember is that of those 24 motions, only approximately 11 of them are separate motions or motions that stand on their own. It must be clearly understood that a number of the motions which have been put forward are consequential upon another main motion. The motions which are consequential motions are the following ones: Motions Nos. 3, except for paragraphs (f), (g), (h) and (i). At this time I wonder if I could give to the Table a copy of my own amendments with comments. I think this would assist the Table in taking notes throughout this argument.