

at the appropriateness of the relationship between the other clauses.

If that were to be done, then we will not have jeopardized the possibility of reasoned argument and the validity of the move to delete the other clauses up to and including Clause 96. In that way we would not have to debate in a ten-minute period why each and every clause is an inappropriate inclusion in this Bill. If that were done, I do not think that you would in any way have undermined your preliminary ruling. I do not think that, with the exception of one additional round in the sense of debate, you would have added significantly to the length of time that will be taken in consideration of the Bill. And you would have bought some time for those of us who want to be able to review the other clauses to see whether or not the preliminary ruling is a ruling that can be supportable either in whole or in part.

I think that is not an unreasonable request to make, Mr. Speaker, and it might at least facilitate getting us off the discussion on the preliminary ruling. It might facilitate our getting off this discussion. We might get on to another one. It might not be a very satisfactory discussion but nevertheless we will no longer be discussing your preliminary ruling and we will come back to that discussion at another time.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the preliminary ruling on the motions to delete, I want to indicate once again the difficulty of debating at this stage the suggestion that the motions to delete all be dealt with as a package and in fact voted on as a package with the suggestion that a vote on one would dispose of all remaining motions. I point out to the Chair once again that the purpose of proposing—and I recognize the somewhat unprecedented nature of the proposal—the motions to delete the clauses in question was to ensure that there would be an opportunity for full and adequate debate with respect to the different areas of principle in the Bill itself and with respect to the different major areas of a structural nature in the Bill itself.

I recognize the suggestion is a preliminary one, and that each Member has in effect ten minutes to discuss all the major structural elements. I would note, however, that a deletion of one element of the legislation does not necessarily mean that the whole of the legislation falls, by any stretch of the imagination. There is, for example, the initial section which includes motions to delete with respect to the structure and establishment of the service itself. There is another section which is entirely separate with respect to certain duties and functions of the service after having established the nature of the powers and the responsibilities of the Director. There was yet another provision with respect to the role of the judiciary, Mr. Speaker.

I had thought the officers of the Speaker might have grouped the motions to delete. I certainly did not expect that they would be dealt with *seriatim* but that they would be grouped in a manner which would facilitate debate on the broad subject matter, to which the several headings of subject matter refer. I am quite prepared to assist the Chair by coming back with a suggestion with respect to grouping the motions to delete under the major heads of the Bill. As I have

Security Intelligence Service

indicated, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that all 96 clauses can effectively be dealt with as a package, I say with respect, is not doing justice to the nature of this Bill.

I will certainly undertake, as I have indicated, to attempt to prepare a grouping of the motions to delete under the broad subject matter to which they refer. Pending that, we will proceed in the normal course of events with Motion No. 1, as is generally the case, the broad principle of the legislation at report stage. Certainly at three o'clock, 3:30 p.m., or four o'clock, whenever Your Honour deems it appropriate, I will be pleased to make representations with respect to grouping the motions to delete as well as with respect to some very serious reservations on the proposals concerning other elements in the preliminary ruling.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I want to raise one other point I should have raised earlier. You have made reference on a number of occasions to the fact that all of the motions to delete stand in the name of the Hon. Member for Burnaby. The reason for that is, of course, because he is this Party's critic for this particular Ministry. It was at our request that all the amendments stand in his name.

I hope by virtue of placing the amendments on the Notice Paper in the name of one Member that we are not jeopardized from having the appropriateness or correctness of the motion considered independently. We could have filed them under 31 names if that would have made it any easier for the over-all consideration of the Chair; but we felt it was appropriate for the critic to do that, just as the Minister would probably feel it appropriate that he should move the amendments he would like to see made.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: I just want to say that I see there is not just one member of the New Democratic Party whose intelligence has been put on hold—they are all in it together, if they approve this kind of obstruction. The Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) is making a big thing of the fact that different principles are involved in requesting the withdrawal of a clause or group of clauses. He seems to forget that the report stage is not the only stage at which the Bill is debated. This legislation was debated in the House of Commons for weeks on second reading, which is the most important stage of the Bill, when the principles are discussed. The Bill was examined, clause by clause, for weeks in Committee. There will be the report stage, and then third reading as well. The Hon. Member is giving the impression that the report stage will be his only chance to take the Bill apart and to speak to the Bill. This is absolutely ridiculous. This is not what parliamentary procedure is all about, and it is not what is meant by the report stage of a Bill. It is a very recent development, to have Hon. Members proposing a host of amendments at the report stage in the House.

Traditionally, the debate on the report stage of a Bill was very brief. Today, what we are seeing is simply that the House is being given notice of systematic obstruction. It is just that.