

When the Order of the Day for the consideration of a report stage is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this Standing Order shall be open to debate and amendment.

As I understand it, it would be entirely in order to propose amendments to the motions of which notice has been given under the provisions of Standing Order 79(8). I do not know whether it is appropriate for me to seek guidance at this point. I may ask the indulgence of the Chair on that point. If that is indeed possible, it would be possible to move amendments to Motion No. 5 which would achieve the objective set out in Motions Nos. 6 through 9.

Mr. Speaker: The answer to the Hon. Member's query is yes, amendments are permitted.

● (1710)

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, that would facilitate the discussion on Motion No. 5. I would still strongly argue that Motion No. 5 should be dealt with separate from Motions Nos. 6 through 9.

Turning then to Motion No. 11, which is—

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has at this point proposed a certain scheme of grouping. The Hon. Member is giving an argument for an alternative scheme of grouping. It would be possible, the Chair submits, for a number of schemes to be proposed. The difficulty the Chair has is, first, trying to do justice to the Hon. Member's argument, and every effort will be made, but there has to be a decision. There is an element of discretion in the decision. Can the Hon. Member give good reasons why these groupings are better than the suggested ones? Short of being corrected upon reading the transcript—it is not always easy to follow argument—the Chair has the impression that several schemes could be offered on about the same basis. The Chair is then left in a position to choose. If the Hon. Member can give me reasons why the groupings I have suggested are really not satisfactory, it would be helpful.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, with respect, that is precisely what I have attempted to do by dealing with the substance of the motions in question. As the mover of a number of motions which the Speaker has attempted to group, and having had an opportunity to re-examine the substance of those motions, I am trying to provide an alternate means of dealing with the grouping of the motions in question, bearing in mind the suggestion of the chair yesterday that Members should in fact review the Speaker's preliminary ruling in the context of the motions which they have submitted. If it is the Chair's opinion that I am not doing that, I apologize. My clear intention is to point out the distinctions with respect to substance on a number of these motions.

With respect to Motion No. 11 which stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Vancouver South, the transcript of the committee will record the fact that I myself did raise some question as to the procedural admissibility of a motion which would maintain the security service under the control of the RCMP. I note the Bill does propose to create an independent service which is not under RCMP control. I think that given

Security Intelligence Service

the fact there was considerable debate on the question whether or not a service within the scope of the RCMP, but subject to stricter guidelines, would in fact be an alternative acceptable to this House, and I have certainly made my views known on that subject—

Mr. Speaker: The Chair does not wish to be disrespectful to the Hon. Member. I have in mind a citation in *Beauchesne* and the role of the Chair in the circumstances. From the Fifth Edition of *Beauchesne*, I quote again Citation 795 (1) and (2) which read:

(1) At the commencement of the report stage of a bill, the Speaker by virtue of S.O. 75(10) may select or combine motions in amendment for debate as he may think fit. At this time, he may also give notice of those motions which are of procedural concern and ask for guidance on their procedural acceptability.

(2) By practice, the Speaker will also decide whether the motions will be voted separately or in groups.

The concern the Chair has at this point is that the Hon. Member appears to be proposing a totally different scheme. The Chair stands to be corrected on reading the record. It would be helpful if the Hon. Member could give an indication that he has a difference of opinion regarding where the Chair has proposed that certain amendments are not acceptable. Would he focus on that? The Chair is anxious to be fair and just. The grouping obviously is at the discretion of the Chair. The Chair is not prepared to argue that the greatest of wisdom in the world resides in the Chair. There is going to be a certain arbitrariness in the grouping and in the decisions as to voting, but the Chair tries to reduce that element to the absolute minimum. But what appears to the Chair to be a totally different scheme at this point presents certain difficulties.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not attempting to present a totally different scheme; I am attempting to respond on a point by point basis to the scheme which Your Honour has proposed. I am in no way proposing a scheme which is entirely separate from that.

I am not going to make any further representations with respect to Motion No. 11, other than to indicate clearly that if we are to have a full and informed debate with respect to the fundamental question whether the service should be included within the umbrella of the RCMP and subject to greater parliamentary safeguards and restrictions on powers, then certainly Motion No. 11 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vancouver South would facilitate such a debate.

As to the procedural acceptability of that motion, certainly the Chair has made its views known. I believe it would facilitate that debate. I will leave it at that, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to Motions Nos. 13 and 14, paragraph 5 of the Speaker's preliminary ruling, the Chair is suggesting that Motions Nos. 13 and 14 should be grouped for debate, and that an affirmative vote on Motion No. 13 would obviate the need for a vote on Motion No. 14. If there were a negative vote on Motion No. 13, there must be a vote on Motion No. 14.

Briefly, I must note that Motion No. 13 deals with the question of the appointment of the Director of the service who, subject to a certain subsection, has operational responsibility