

Eighteenth, Motions Nos. 159 and 160 should be grouped for debate. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 159 will dispose of Motion No. 160. A negative vote on Motion No. 159 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 160.

Nineteenth, Motions Nos. 166 and 167 should be grouped for debate. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 166 disposes of Motion No. 167. A negative vote on Motion No. 166 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 167.

The Hon. Members for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) and Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) have suggested that the proposal to bring the Security Intelligence Service under the control of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is fully within the purpose of the Bill as read the second time, because the purpose of the Bill, as laid out in the title, is to establish the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

In making this suggestion, they quoted Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 704(1), as follows:

A bill may have two titles, one long and one short. Both the long title and the short title may be amended, if amendments to the bill make it necessary.

(1) Long Title—the long title sets out in general terms the purposes of the bill. It should cover everything in the bill.

May I underline that the purpose of the Bill is laid out only in general terms in the title. It is clear from a reading of the Bill that it intends to establish a service distinct from the RCMP.

In my view, Motions Nos. 3, 11, 18, 21, 27, 29, 44, 49, 53, 65, 74, 81, 83, 91 and 115, which relate to this proposal, negate the purpose of the Bill, which is specifically prohibited by our practice, and I refer Hon. Members once again to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 773(5) to that effect.

May I say, in passing, that a careful examination of the notice submitted by the Hon. Member for Vancouver South in relation to Motion No. 53 reveals a single motion, not three separate motions. While I might agree that some of the parts of the motion, had each been a motion standing on its own, would have been in order. I again refer the Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 428(2), to which I referred in relation to Motion No. 49. It reads:

When an amendment is irregular in one particular, the whole of it is not admissible and must be ruled out of order. Journals, April 29, 1970, p. 732.

Therefore, Motions Nos. 3, 4, 11, 15, 18, 21, 27, 29, 44, 49, 53, 65, 74, 76, 81, 83, 84, 115, 117 and 175 are all ruled out of order.

At this point, the Chair has to make some remarks regarding the three remaining motions which, at first glance, give the Chair some procedural difficulty.

Motion No. 89 is attempting to remove the control of the Treasury Board over the operational expenditures of the review committee. This is clearly beyond the royal recommendation.

May I refer Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 540, which states, in part:

The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the Royal Recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down once for all (unless

### *Security Intelligence Service*

withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of the charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

Since this appears to relax one of the conditions of the royal recommendation, it would seem to infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown and would be out of order.

Motions No. 93 and 94 go beyond the scope of the Bill. Both these motions contemplate a broadening of the review committee's functions to include its reviewing of the relationships between the security service and other intelligence agencies in Canada. This is clearly a new idea which was not contained in the Bill as agreed to at second reading stage. It would seem that both these motions are out of order.

The Chair has undertaken to hear procedural argument on Motions Nos. 89, 93 and 94, but will do so at a later time.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with care to the Speaker's ruling. I wonder if Your Honour could indicate specifically if you have dealt with the question of Motions Nos. 15, 76, 84, 117 and 175 with respect to the question of the parliamentary oversight committee? I did not see any explicit reference to that particular subject. It may be that it is couched within the terms of the ruling itself. Perhaps the Speaker might indicate where that is to be found?

**Mr. Speaker:** I made very explicit reference to a parliamentary oversight committee in my preliminary ruling and did not see fit to repeat it. A motion has been accepted to refer to a parliamentary committee, but the basic principle of creating a special committee with special duties by this means is unacceptable.

**Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South):** Mr. Speaker, in rising, I am, of course, very cognizant of the respect which I, as a Member of this House, owe to you as the Speaker of our House. I hope you will keep that very much in mind in listening to what I have to say. Your ruling, of course, must be accepted in the sense that it is a final ruling. Your Honour will know that at least for two days I strove mightily to change your mind. I understand that you have your obligations and you have to make these rulings according to the precedents and rules as you interpret them, and I respect that.

As Your Honour knows, Hon. Members of the House and I have always done everything we could to make it very clear that we cannot conduct our affairs in this House without respecting your position and recognizing the fact that sometimes you have to make decisions which do not please all Hon. Members. However, I want to say this, and it is no reflection, Sir, on you. I am not questioning in any sense your integrity or devotion to your duty in making the ruling you did. People were asked to come before the committee and make suggestions about this Bill—

• (1600)

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair has some concern. Is the Hon. Member debating the ruling of the Chair?

**Mr. Fraser:** No.