

Security Intelligence Service

a parliamentary oversight committee—a concept not in the Bill as introduced or read a second time. Such a committee was also mentioned in Motion No. 4, previously ruled out of order, and is a new idea which was not contemplated in the Bill as agreed to at second reading. Thus it is clearly beyond the scope of the Bill and I must rule each of these motions out of order.

Seventh, Motions Nos. 18, 21, 27, 29, 44, 53, 65, 74, 81, 83, 91 and 115, all standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vancouver South, are consequential to Motion No. 11 and, since Motion No. 11 is out of order, I must find each of these motions similarly out of order.

I regret to rule out Motion No. 49 on the same grounds. The motion combines two distinct and separate ideas: the first parts are consequential to Motion No. 11, while part (d) provides for a mechanism for reporting unlawful activities of employees of the service to the attorneys general of the provinces. Parts (a) through (c) must be ruled out of order. Unfortunately, since it is part of the same motion, part (d), which itself would have been in order, must also be ruled out of order. In such circumstances, the Chair must be guided by the principle that if any part of a motion is faulty, the entire motion is out of order. May I refer the Hon. Member to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 428(2), to that effect.

• (1115)

Eighth, Motions Nos. 19, 23 and 24 are to be grouped for debate but voted on separately.

Ninth, Motions Nos. 31, 32 and 34 should be debated together but voted on separately.

The Chair will rule on the remaining 42 motions as soon as possible.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, so that there is absolutely no question with respect to the statement you have just made, I should say at the outset, without having consulted with my colleagues, that my initial reaction to your ruling is that it is very, very restrictive indeed and I think it casts serious questions on the ability of the Chamber to operate in a free and democratic way because of its very narrow interpretation. I simply want to give notice that I would like the opportunity to make a full presentation to you, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that I may do so.

I would simply say that we will be questioning vigorously and in depth some of the propositions that have been put forward by you in your preliminary statement. If we are to follow the procedure set out in this statement, particularly when debating a Bill which affects the civil liberties of Canadians as this Bill does, there would be serious consequences in that we would be restricted in our ability to present reasonable amendments. I make that preliminary statement so that there will be no question at all about the concern that we in this Party feel with respect to this legislation and particularly with respect to our ability to have a free and unfettered debate on a matter which is of such serious consequence to Canadians generally.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I first want to say that the preliminary ruling does in fact cover a substantial portion of the Bill. As you can appreciate, Sir, the ruling is difficult to digest at the moment. It must be cross-referenced and studied before we will be able to make any kind of reasonable response.

With that in mind, I am sure you can appreciate that it would be extremely difficult to proceed with any kind of reasonable or intelligent debate, Sir. For example, the rulings on the motions cover so many of the clauses of the Bill as to make it extremely difficult to find where one could legitimately make any intelligent proposals. I would therefore move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson), that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: A concern that I have with regard to this is that I made a preliminary statement which is a matter of order and the Hon. Member was recognized on a point of order. I cannot accept a motion to adjourn on a point of order. There will be opportunities for the Hon. Member to move his motion but he was recognized on a point of order. Therefore, I cannot accept a motion to adjourn on a point of order.

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, my fellow Parliamentary House Leaders have had a chance to express their immediate reaction to your statement on the admissibility of the amendments. The reaction on this side of the House differs from that of my hon. colleagues. First of all, it should be understood that the Standing Orders of the House apply at all times and must always be applied in the same way. The same principles shall apply, whatever the subject of the Bill before the House.

I noticed that my colleague, the Parliamentary House Leader for the Progressive Conservative Party, was upset because the subject is national security and involves imposing certain restrictions on freedoms which would otherwise not be restricted. This is irrelevant. His objection has no legal grounds. We have Standing Orders. We have a body of parliamentary jurisprudence. We have parliamentary principles that must be applied, whatever the subject of the legislation before the House.

• (1120)

In the circumstances, our immediate reaction is very positive, because we find that the Chair has strictly applied the rule of relevance and the basic principles of parliamentary procedure. The point was to find out whether the content of the amendments in question corresponds to the principles you have mentioned, and I have no reason to doubt the results of the thorough study that was made by the Chair, with the help of House officials.

I heard the Parliamentary House Leader for the New Democratic Party say he found it difficult to digest, because in its preliminary ruling, the Chair set aside a number of items. It