

jurisdictions such as the United States, West Germany and elsewhere. Certainly this concept is one that should be included. Indeed, Hon. Members of the House should be given an opportunity to debate it at this stage of our proceedings.

For the Chair to suggest, after having given lengthy consideration to this question of parliamentary oversight at second reading, after having invited witnesses to make representations with respect to the role that Parliament will play in oversight and after having had a comprehensive debate on that very question in committee, that somehow down comes the guillotine and we are no longer permitted to debate the question surely is unacceptable if we are to give the Bill adequate scrutiny.

Finally on this question, I would note that there appears to be at least a considerable inconsistency in the preliminary ruling of the Chair. Motion No. 123 which was submitted by the distinguished Hon. Member for Vancouver South reads:

The administration, provisions and operation of this Act shall be reviewed on a permanent basis by such committee of the House of Commons—

Or such joint committee, to paraphrase in the interests of time.

—as may be designated or established by Parliament for that purpose.

Motion No. 117 refers to a committee which would be responsible for engaging in effective and comprehensive oversight of the administration, policies and operations of the service. Motion No. 123 talks about a committee which deals with the administration, provisions and operation of this Act. How is it that my motions, which deal with the essential question of parliamentary oversight, are ruled out of order?

Mr. Peterson: Oh.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): I would be prepared certainly to yield to the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Peterson) if he wishes to speak at this point.

Mr. Peterson: I am going to the garden party.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): I would submit that Motion No. 123, which is entirely in order, in effect is on the same point as the motions which have been ruled out by the Speaker.

Turning to subparagraph (7) of the Speaker's preliminary ruling—and I do not have very much more to say on this very important preliminary ruling—it deals specifically with my arguments with respect to the procedural admissibility of Motion No. 49. First, I would note that the motions which are consequential to Motion No. 11—Motions Nos. 18, 21 and so on as set out in subparagraph (7)—proposed by the Hon. Member for Vancouver South with respect to the bringing of the service under the control of the RCMP should be considered by the House, just as those consequential motions should be considered by the House.

Motion No. 49, just to refresh the memory of Hon. Members, contains three or four subparagraphs. I would just ask that the Chair exercise some leniency, since it suggested in its ruling that subparagraphs (a) through to (c) are to be ruled out of order. I assume that is pursuant to the ruling on

Security Intelligence Service

subparagraph 4. Surely the Hon. Member for Vancouver South should be permitted to put the remaining subparagraph (d) of Motion No. 49. That is the paragraph which would require the Attorney General of Canada to report all relevant information to the Attorney General of the province in which the alleged unlawful activity occurred, unless the Attorney General of Canada certified a document. That motion of the Hon. Member for Vancouver South is clearly in order. If the Chair insists on ruling subparagraphs (a) through (c) out of order, certainly this House could proceed to consider subparagraph (d) with respect to the reporting of possible illegal activity.

• (1730)

Turning to the final page of the Chair's preliminary ruling, I will now deal with paragraph 8. This paragraph deals with Motions Nos. 19, 23 and 24. It is suggested in the Chair's preliminary ruling that these motions be grouped for debate, but that they be voted on separately. I have no difficulty with voting on these motions separately, but surely even a cursory examination of the provisions of Motions Nos. 19, 23 and 24 makes it clear that the subject matter of these motions is fundamentally different and distinct. They should not be grouped for debate any more than they should be grouped for a vote.

There are two separate broad subject matters referred to in Motion No. 19 which have been lumped together in the interests of efficiency and time. Motion No. 19 refers to the proposed power on the part of the Minister and requires the Minister to issue policies with respect to the use of undercover operatives by the service, policies with respect to the use of physical surveillance, the training of employees and minimization procedures for warrants issued under the Act.

Second, it would require that a clause be added that the Director shall keep the Minister fully and currently informed of the operations of the service. That clause stands on its own in terms of some requirements for reporting on the part of the service. That is an amendment which was proposed to Clause 6.

Motion No. 23 proposes an amendment to an entirely separate clause on an entirely separate question. How on earth the Chair, with the advice of the Table, saw fit to group a motion which deals with directions that can be given to the service with a motion which sets out various prohibited grounds for discrimination in hiring members of the service remains a mystery. I can only assume that that was done by inadvertence. There is clearly not the slightest shred of linkage between Motion No. 19 on the issuance of directions and Motion No. 23 on a separate clause entirely which deals with the suggestion that there must not be discrimination in the service on the basis of race, colour, national or ethnic origin, religion, sex, marital status, family status, sexual orientation, disability, political belief or conviction for which a pardon is being granted.

With respect to Motion No. 24, which is lumped with these two entirely separate motions, that motion is totally unrelated