

legislation that there is relevance to the principles approved by the House on second reading.

I realize I have mentioned this before in other procedural arguments, but I feel strongly, and Hon. Members of my Party feel strongly, that, as much as possible within the bounds of procedural acceptability, we allow motions and amendments which are germane to the legislation and in which there is a very substantial interest of the people of Canada and very great stakes are involved.

On that note, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will exercise the fair discretion of your responsibilities as Speaker of the House and allow the motion which was presented by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), namely, Motion No. 94.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because I would certainly by and large adopt the arguments made by my friend, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn), with respect to the admissibility of Motions Nos. 93 and 94.

With respect to Motion No. 89, which attempts to provide for greater flexibility and independence on the part of the review committee in the hiring of its staff and the establishment of its budget, I recognize the citation which Your Honour has referred to from Beaulieu does specifically preclude any imposition of an additional condition with respect to the royal recommendation. Of course, since the involvement of the Treasury Board would appear to be one of the safeguards which, even though some of us might disagree, the Minister appears to want to include in the powers of the review committee, I recognize that that is a condition and that by attempting to remove that condition we appear to be moving beyond the scope of the royal recommendation. Therefore, I will not take issue with Your Honour's preliminary ruling with respect to Motion No. 89.

I would, however, strongly appeal to the Chair to reconsider Your Honour's preliminary ruling with respect to Motions Nos. 93 and 94. I recognize the wisdom of Your Honour's preliminary ruling with respect to Motion No. 89. However, I ask Your Honour to reconsider Motions Nos. 93 and 94 for the reasons enunciated by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West, and given the context of the proposal which is set out in Motions Nos. 93 and 94. Motion No. 94 generally refers to the relationship between the proposed civilian security service and other intelligence agencies in the Government of Canada. Motion No. 93, which is set down in my name on behalf of the New Democratic Party, calls for a review of the relationships between the service and all other bodies and agencies engaged in security or intelligence functions in Canada. Then there were a number of other provisions with which I believe the Chair has not taken issue.

Your Honour stated in your preliminary ruling: "This is clearly a new idea which was not contained in the Bill as agreed to at second reading stage". Surely, Mr. Speaker, one of the purposes of clause by clause study is to improve upon the substance of legislation, not to import wholly new concepts

Security Intelligence Service

or new ideas which are beyond the scope of the Bill. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, where there is an opportunity to improve upon the Bill as presented, surely that is the responsibility of the committee.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that by including this provision we have not gone beyond the broad scope of the Bill, the principles of the legislation. What we are doing effectively, Mr. Speaker, is responding to many representations which have been made to the effect that one of the responsibilities of a new review committee must surely be not only reviewing the intelligence functions of the service but as well the relationship between the service and other intelligence agencies in the community. Certainly this was a strong recommendation of the McDonald Commission.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that we are not dealing in this instance with a suggestion that the review committee should somehow have jurisdiction over other intelligence agencies. That would be a separate amendment, to suggest it should have the power, as indeed was recommended by a number of witnesses, to effectively provide for oversight of the other operators in the intelligence community. Some of us believe that would be a good idea. However, that is not the purpose of this amendment. This amendment states that the security service obviously is going to have relationships with other agencies in the intelligence community. It would merely expand—but not beyond the principles of the Bill—the scope of review of the new security intelligence review committee to encompass those relationships. Therefore, it builds upon the foundation of the Bill, Mr. Speaker. It does not in any way add a new or different principle to the Bill.

I suggest that if there is any doubt whatsoever as to the procedural acceptability of a motion of this nature, particularly where it is—I believe the Speaker would recognize—very close to the line, perhaps, it nevertheless is one which I would submit, after reviewing the question, falls within the nature of an amendment which adds to the Bill. It certainly does not in any way alter the substance of the Bill. Therefore I would urge Your Honour to permit the debate which should be held on this very important amendment. I would urge Your Honour to allow the debate to take place on Motions Nos. 93 and 94.

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that you are in the position of having to make rulings on these amendments a few minutes after the new Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Turner—who has come out of a convention talking about reform of this place, reform of the Liberal Party and reform of the process—has just moved a form of closure on the security Bill. Your Honour, of course, is not a part of any of that. I could not agree more that this is not of your doing. However, it is interesting and I believe it puts Your Honour in a more difficult position than Your Honour ought to be placed in.

However, the fact of the matter is that shortly after this great convention in which we are told we are going to have change and reform, the first thing which is done by Mr. Turner is to make sure that closure is put on the discussion in this House of the security Bill. There is no way he or anyone