

Security Intelligence Service

Mr. Speaker: A number of the amendments would certainly permit that. Again the Chair invites the Hon. Member to consider whether, when a specific amendment is put forward, an amendment to delete is also required.

Mr. Robison (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I certainly will consider that. I will review the motions which have amendments attached as well as motions to delete. I am quite prepared to do that. If the debate can be facilitated by a discussion on the amendment, I am certainly prepared to withdraw any motion to delete on that particular clause. I appeal to the Chair that there are a number of clauses which have no amendments attached whatsoever. The only means of dealing with those particular clauses and that particular subject matter would be by way of a motion to delete, precisely because there are no amendments which deal with the subject matter referred to in that particular grouping.

Those are my suggestions with respect to grouping the motions to delete. I certainly will review the motions in light of the Chair's suggestion. I note as well that the Bill itself is broken into four or five major parts. There is a clear recognition of the fundamental distinction of the different parts. I will attempt to deal with the motions to delete, particularly in the context of those motions which are made to clauses which are the subject of amendment.

That is the proposal which I would make with respect to the grouping of amendments. I strongly appeal to the Chair that there must be some systematic grouping by subject matter. To suggest that one 10-minute speech can deal with all of the diverse subjects which are touched upon in the groupings I have indicated does not do justice at all and is far too restrictive. The votes on those questions are separate elements.

The second paragraph of the Chair's preliminary ruling is with respect to Motions Nos. 3 and 4. The Chair notes that these motions propose to add new features to the Bill by means of a substantive amendment to the interpretation clause, which is out of order. I certainly recognize the citation in question. I suppose this relates to a difficulty which is referred to in Sub-paragraph (7) of the Speaker's preliminary ruling. If indeed the Speaker rules that one sub-paragraph of Motions Nos. 3 and 4 is defective, I appeal to the Chair as to whether that would in fact mean that all elements of that motion are defective.

We are dealing here with the definitions section. There are a number of provisions in Motion No. 3 in the name of the Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), and in Motion No. 4 submitted in my name, which in no way expand the scope of the Bill beyond that which is permissible. There are a number of sub-paragraphs. As I say, given that this is a definition or interpretation section, I appeal to the Chair to show some latitude in permitting those paragraphs which do not, in the view of the Chair, exceed the bounds of relevance. Those particular paragraphs should be permitted under the scope of Motions Nos. 3 and 4 instead of striking them out entirely.

I will give just one example of what I am referring to. In Motion No. 4 submitted in my name, there is a provision for an expansion of the definition of security assessment which would simply require that the criteria for such security assessments be set out in regulations under the Act, which regulations shall be made public. Clearly that is within the scope of the Bill. I recognize that the Chair has some concern about the concept of the parliamentary oversight committee. However, I would appeal to the Chair, given that this is a definition section, to show some latitude. If the Chair feels it necessary to strike one or more of the paragraphs as attempting, in the words of the Chair, a substantive amendment to the interpretation clause, those other provisions included in other paragraphs should be permitted to stand.

Turning to the third paragraph of the Chair's preliminary ruling with respect to Motions Nos. 5 to 9 inclusive, the Chair is suggesting that these should be debated together. It is also suggesting that an affirmative vote on Motion 5 would dispose of the subsequent four motions, but that a negative vote on Motion No. 5 would necessitate separate votes on Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9.

I would draw to the attention of the Chair that we are dealing with very different subject matters in Motions Nos. 5 through 9. Motion No. 5 is submitted by the Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand). Motions Nos. 6 through 9 were submitted in my name on behalf of the New Democratic Party. Motion No. 5 would substitute five different definitions of "threat to the security of Canada". There was some debate on that. Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 deal with four distinct elements of the definition of threat to security.

Given that, I strongly urge the Chair to reconsider its decision with respect to the grouping of these amendments. At the very least, I suggest that Motion No. 5, which was submitted in the name of the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East, should be dealt with as a separate motion and that Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 submitted in my name be dealt with. If the Chair insists they be dealt with together, so be it, they can be dealt with together. However, I suggest that to lump Motion No. 5 with the subsequent four motions does not enable us to do justice to the very essential questions which are raised in these motions.

I note as well the suggestion that an affirmative vote on Motion No. 5 disposes of Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9. With respect, if Motion No. 5 were to be adopted, that in no way disposes of Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9. Motions Nos. 6 through 9 in fact delete specific elements of the definition of "threat to the security of Canada". These specific elements stand on their own. They are specific paragraphs. As I understand it, amendments can be proposed to Motion No. 5. I would seek some guidance from the Chair on that question because it affects my argument with respect to Paragraph No. 3. As I read the Standing Orders, that is permissible under Standing Order 79(8) which reads as follows: