

recently have been, the Speaker may indeed have to exercise his power of selection in the near future.

● (1540)

The second power given to the Speaker during report stage is that of grouping motions either for debate or for voting or both. Again, this power is absolute and the Speaker can combine motions as he may think fit. No occupant of the Chair can exercise this discretion without keeping in mind the importance of his decisions. That is why I have sought comments on the procedural acceptability of certain motions in amendment to Bill C-9. In listening to yesterday's and today's comments, what I have heard were interventions dealing with the substance of the amendments, the desirability of the amendments and a wish to discuss in principle certain clauses of Bills at report stage. All of the above are noble intentions but, unfortunately, they are not of a procedural nature.

I have also been offered alternative grouping schemes, and I have been convinced in listening to the argument that the scheme that I proposed should be modified.

In presenting his argument, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) suggested that the initial grouping contained in the Chair's preliminary statement, if taken as a precedent, would undermine the right of Members to present motions to delete and have them debated.

There is no question about the procedural acceptability of these motions, and I might add that the debate has already begun. While Members have an undoubted and, within the limitations set out in our rules and practice, virtually unlimited right to propose motions to delete clauses at the report stage, the Speaker has the power to group motions for debate.

While Members' rights to offer such motions at report stage cannot be undermined, may I draw the attention of all Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 787, which states, in part:

—Although amendments which are rejected in the Committee and amendments attempting to restore the original text of the Bill may be proposed, the Speaker's power of selection of motions in amendment is a check upon the excessive repetition of debates which have already taken place in Committee.

The Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) made several points on the grouping of the motions to delete, and his arguments have convinced me to group the motions to delete clauses with those motions which amend the same clauses. The remaining motions to delete have been grouped in three separate groups, according to parts of the Bill. To do so effectively, I have had to group all the motions standing on the Order Paper. The grouping of all motions for the report stage debate shall, therefore, be as follows:

First, the motions to delete clauses which do not also have substantive amendments proposed in relation to them will be grouped for debate as follows:

(a) Motions Nos. 10, 16, 20, 25, 26, 28 and 35 will be debated together, and a vote on Motion No. 10 will also dispose of the remaining motions in this group.

Security Intelligence Service

(b) Motions Nos. 64, 69, 70 to 73 inclusive, 80, 82, 87, 88, 90, 92, 98, 103 to 107 inclusive and 110 to 112 inclusive will be grouped for debate, and a vote on Motion No. 64 will dispose of the remaining motions in this group.

(c) Motions Nos. 124 to 128 inclusive, 131 to 137 inclusive, 142 to 150 inclusive, 156 to 158 inclusive, 161 to 165 inclusive and 168 to 174 inclusive will be grouped for debate, and a vote on Motion No. 124 will dispose of the remaining motions in this group.

Second, Motions Nos. 2 and 5 to 9 inclusive should be debated together and voted on as follows:

(a) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 2 will dispose of Motions Nos. 5 to 9 inclusive. A negative vote on Motion No. 2 will necessitate a vote on Motion No. 5.

(b) In the event that a vote on Motion No. 5 is decided in the affirmative, this vote will dispose of Motions Nos. 6 to 9 inclusive. A negative vote on Motion No. 5 will require separate votes on Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9.

Third, Motions Nos. 12, 13 and 14 should be debated together and voted on as follows:

(a) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 12 will dispose of Motions Nos. 13 and 14. A negative vote on Motion No. 12 will necessitate a vote on Motion No. 13.

(b) In the event that a vote on Motion No. 13 is decided in the affirmative, the vote will dispose of Motion No. 14. A negative vote on Motion No. 13 will require a separate vote on Motion No. 14.

Fourth, Motions Nos. 17, 19, 22, 23 and 24 should be debated together and voted on as follows:

(a) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 17 obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 19. A negative vote on Motion No. 17 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 19.

(b) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 22 disposes of Motions Nos. 23 and 24. A negative vote on Motion No. 22 requires separate votes on Motions Nos. 23 and 24.

Fifth, Motions Nos. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38 and 39 will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

(a) An Affirmative vote on Motion No. 30 will dispose of Motions Nos. 31 and 32. A negative vote on Motion No. 30 will require separate questions on Motions Nos. 31 and 32.

(b) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 33 will obviate the need for a vote on Motion No. 34. A negative vote on Motion No. 33 will require a vote on Motion No. 34.

(c) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 36 will dispose of Motion No. 37. A negative vote on Motion No. 36 will require a vote on Motion No. 37.

(d) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 38 will dispose of Motion No. 39. A negative vote on Motion No. 38 will require a vote on Motion No. 39.

Sixth, Motions Nos. 40 to 43 inclusive, 45 to 48 inclusive, 50 and 51 will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows: