

Security Intelligence Service

specific groupings before commenting in detail on them. At this stage the Chair is suggesting that for the purpose of opening debate there be a general grouping of all the clauses which are moved for deletion. The Hon. Member for Burnaby appears to be suggesting that some of these clauses are more important than others. I invite him to make his comment. I invite him to spell it out. I invite him to indicate to us exactly which, in his opinion, have greater priority than others.

Certainly on the face of it, when one individual Member of the House, having participated in committee and having voted clause by clause in committee, presents amendments at report stage dealing with the deletion of every single clause and the schedule, the Chair has to bear in mind the time of the House and certain priorities. The Chair is suggesting that we could begin the debate by grouping all of these. If the Hon. Member has suggestions for further refinements or further groupings and reasons for that, the Chair is quite prepared to hear him.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, our dilemma is simply this. You indicated clearly at the outset of the proceedings today that this was a preliminary statement. I am not standing here to defend the amendments put in by the NDP. The difficulty we face is that this is a matter which is going to require some study and preparation for us to be able to present a reasoned argument to you. With respect to the amendments put in by my colleague from Vancouver South, we will be wanting to make some specific presentations to you.

With all respect to you, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to proceed with this debate this morning, I would think that we should not rush into any grouping at this point in time. We are going to discuss this whole question and allow the NDP an opportunity to make representations as to the way they view their amendments. Let us not presume anything at this point in time. I think that is counter-productive. We should go ahead as we would normally and debate Motion No. 1 until whatever time is satisfactory to you. We can each make our representations. In the meantime some of us will give attention to your preliminary ruling. After you have had the benefit of our representations you may decide to make a final ruling. That would be the appropriate time to consider the question of groupings.

I think it is counter-productive to decide now to debate Motion Nos. 1 through 96 as if they were one motion. I suggest to you that we should proceed in the normal fashion which will allow us a little time to prepare our arguments. After hearing us you will have an opportunity to make your final decision with respect to any grouping. It seems to me we would make more progress if we followed my suggestion of proceeding in the normal fashion this morning.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, the sole purpose of my intervention at this stage is to reiterate that the Speaker's ruling does have very serious consequences in terms of how we approach this legislation and the substance of the legislation. Rather than proceeding as my colleague, the House Leader for the Opposition, has suggested, it would be appropriate to take the time to study the Speaker's preliminary ruling. As I have

indicated, I have some very serious concerns with respect to the suggestion that any references to a parliamentary review would be out of order. That flies directly in the face of what has been discussed, both in the House at second reading in principle when it was ruled in order, and in committee. We will certainly have something to say about that.

I suggest that we be given an opportunity to consider the ramifications of this ruling. We received it as we entered the House. At whatever time the Speaker considers appropriate we may make more intelligent representations with respect to the question of groupings rather than, as I suggested, dealing with all of the motions to delete and grouping them under the broad subject matter to which the motions to delete refer.

Mr. Speaker: It would be helpful to the Chair if there could be argument against the first proposal. The proposal is that all the motions for simple deletion be grouped for debate at this point. In the course of that debate the Chair would be quite prepared to hear argument as to why the groupings should be different. So far the argument has not been persuasive to the Chair. I think it is almost unprecedented for one Member of the House to move at report stage the deletion of every single clause and schedule of the Bill.

Mr. Pinard: Stupidity.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has not been able to find any precedent on the matter. The Chair is very much concerned to proceed on the basis of a clause by clause debate at report stage. Section 79(10) of the Standing Orders reads as follows:

The Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the report stage and may, if he or she thinks fit, call upon any Member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the subject of the amendment—

• (1150)

At this stage, for the purpose of commencing the debate on a preliminary basis, the Chair proposes to call all of the clauses as proposed for deletion by the Hon. Member for Burnaby and the Schedule, Clauses 1-96 inclusive, and to hear argument.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, briefly, without in any prejudicing what may well follow, given that in fact the clauses starting with Clause No. 1 running with some intervals to Clause 96 deal with somewhat different subject matters, and given that the argument for deletion would be different in each case—in other words, the argument for deletion may well be sustained by a vote of the House in some instances and may well not be supported by the House in other instances—and given, as I have indicated earlier, that we need some time to resolve it, may I ask whether you might consider a further split? Call Clause 1 separately, leaving the others grouped as they are now so we can look at them and consider them. All that we have then done is added another round of debate. We are not, therefore, asking that you open up the whole matter for debate on every single clause, but that you call Clause 1. We will proceed with the debate on Clause 1 presumably and then look