

*Security Intelligence Service*

were saying, along with the amendments we were putting forward, was reasonable. Indeed, they accepted one of the amendments. One Member abstained, and the chairman, having sat through this for months and months, voted with the Opposition on one of our amendments which resulted in its getting through. Government Members have strong feelings on this themselves and they would like to see some changes.

We have our little green book, Mr. Speaker, which gives us the process for resolving conflicts. When the Government decided that the NDP had put in too many amendments or that it was stalling, there was a mechanism to deal with that. Standing Order 80 provides that the Government can try to reach an agreement which can be filed in this House and put time limits on the committee stage. But even if it cannot get agreement from all three Parties, it could have used Standing Order 81, which states:

When a Minister of the Crown, from his or her place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several Parties have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours—

That can be filed in the House as well, but no one approached us.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I really apologize to the Hon. Member for interrupting him again. However, I feel he is not addressing the very specific matter of groupings and the Speaker's comments. The Hon. Member is now referring to events which occurred in committee. I appreciate his earlier remarks, that he is attempting to lay the foundation for argument on some point which he plans to raise later on in his remarks. But I would invite the Hon. Member, for the sake of orderly debate and strict relevancy to what is now exercising the House, that is commenting on the Speaker's proposed ruling, to reach that point as soon as possible so that I can have a better understanding of what he is arguing.

● (1240)

**Mr. Thacker:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that in your equitable jurisdiction you would agree that the court should never be put in the position of having to rescue someone as a result of one of the people appealing to you not having followed the rules. If the Government would have followed Standing Order 81, wherein it could have dealt with us and the two Parties could have struck an agreement, it would not have mattered what the NDP wanted. Failing that, it could have acted under Standing Order 82 wherein the Minister can simply and say there is no agreement. Therefore, they could have brought debate to a close, not only in the House but in the committee. That is the point. There was a mechanism to resolve the conflict in the committee. Standing Order 82 states "at which a public bill was under consideration either in the House or in any committee". That is my point. They are calling upon the Chair to extricate them from a situation which the Government itself caused. I do not think the highest court in the land, and the Speaker of that court, should have to rescue the Government as a result of its own incompetence.

Referring to what you were calling upon in terms of motions, Motion No. 11 is one of the PC motions which is

really the heart and core of what we are saying in the sense that the existing service should continue, that the statute which is going to codify the existing practice should simply apply to the existing organization which is there. We should, as a Parliament, be able to make a division on that. It would be quite appropriate for you to say that Motion No. 11, being the substantial element of it, has a lot of consequential, so that if Motion No. 11 is deleted all of these consequential motions fail. That would be a reasonable grouping right there. It is not crystal clear from the preliminary ruling that that is the case. I think that should be one of the chapters. That would be fair and reasonable.

My hon. colleague from Vancouver South laid out very well the case as to the other groupings and the other nine motions, all of which I believe should be found in order. The House should be able to divide on those. The proposal of the Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) is truly a reasonable proposition for the grouping of the NDP amendments as well.

I would like to make one brief comment with regard to some of the remarks that were made in the House about the conduct of the chairman of the committee. I believe he was put in an impossible situation, just as you are, Mr. Speaker. In that impossible situation he had to act, and he acted to the very best of his ability. As a result he did the honourable thing: he resigned at the end of it. He said that he had been put in such a terrible position by the actions of the Government that he felt he had no choice as chairman of the committee but to make a resolution and resign. The Government should have gotten him off the hook by coming to the House and seeking an order under Standing Order 82. That was the proper and lawful mechanism to resolve it, but the Government allowed the chairman of the committee to hang out on the line. He had to save their bacon two or three times. Indeed, when he felt it was proper he voted with the Opposition Members. Now the Government is bringing in motions to change around the amendments that were accepted and voted on by some of their own Members. It is an absurd situation. I take exception to the chairman being hung out to dry for the incompetence of the Government.

I want briefly to reiterate the argument put by my hon. colleague from Vancouver South. I too went back and looked at the *Journals*. I believe this is one of those cases where the quote in Beauséne does not adequately reflect the actual wording of the *Journals*. I can remember the Chief Justice of the trial division of the Supreme Court of Alberta speaking to us when we were graduating as young law students. He told us how we would go before the court and be psyched out by senior lawyers who have had 20 years' practice and seem to know everything. He told us not to be fooled by it. He said that if a young lawyer goes behind the headnote and reads the cases, he will often find that the case does not actually bear out what the senior counsel, going on long-term memory and flying by the seat of his pants, is saying. He told us we would win several cases on that. That is true. This is an example of that, Mr. Speaker. I would encourage you strongly to read the