

Mr. Speaker: The Chair is, of course, guided by strictly procedural considerations at this point. The Chair is faced with the fact that one Hon. Member of this House has moved in his own name at report stage the deletion of every single clause and the schedule. It appeared reasonable for the Chair to commence with grouping these motions, bearing in mind that the clauses have been considered clause by clause in committee and we are now at report stage. That might be the starting point of debate. But the Chair is, of course, the servant of the House. The Chair would be disposed to call a motion in the name of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) deleting Clauses 1 to 96 inclusive and the schedule as the basis for debate. It could commence on that basis. This appeared the most reasonable way of proceeding in the view of the Chair. What is the wish of Hon. Members? Any further comments?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, your preliminary ruling was handed to myself and my colleagues as I entered the Chamber. There is no question that we will want to make full and complete representations with respect to this preliminary statement you have made. Rather than prejudge the matter and see what happens, I would prefer to move along in what would be the normal way if there had been no preliminary statement made by Your Honour. That is to say, it seems to me that we can discuss Clause 1, which, in the tradition of both the House and committee concepts, means a rather wide-ranging and full debate with respect to the principles of the total Bill. If that met with approval, I think we can make some progress in the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Can the Chair make an observation in response? The motion as proposed by the Chair would certainly permit that. Grouping all the clauses of the Bill would permit the most broad general debate on any clause or any aspects.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Of course, Mr. Speaker, but you will know that we are severely limited in our interventions to ten minutes per Member on each amendment proposed at report stage. If you were to make a final determination of grouping all those motions for debate, we would find ourselves in the position of having a ten-minute speech. I will let the NDP defend their own tactics but it seems to me that in order to have this matter dealt with on a fair and equitable basis we should not prejudge anything. If we have to deal with ten-minute speeches, we should deal with Clause 1 and Clause 2, and so on, and we will have our chance to make representations to the Chair later in the day. At that time you will have to make the decision and we will have to see what we do about that.

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the Hon. Member for Burnaby in just a moment. I just want to say that the Chair is proposing this to start debate. If there is good and sufficient argument that the motions should not be grouped, that individual clauses should be considered, the Chair would be prepared to reconsider. For purposes of procedure the Chair is proposing at this point that all the motions which relate to deletion should be grouped. This would permit a very general

Security Intelligence Service

opening debate. The Chair would be prepared to accept argument with regard to the specific sections or combinations.

● (1140)

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I listened with care to the remarks of the Hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) and those of the House Leader for the Official Opposition. The difficulty with proceeding, as has been suggested by the President of the Privy Council and his colleague, the House Leader for the Official Opposition, is that, as the House Leader for the Opposition has noted, if the Speaker's preliminary ruling with respect to Sub-paragraph (1) is to stand, we are then precluded from any further comment on the over-all thrust of the legislation.

The purpose for moving a series of motions to delete various clauses was certainly not that there should necessarily be debate on each individual motion to delete. I would draw to the attention of the Chair that a number of these clauses deal with specific, broad elements of the legislation. The amendments to delete encompass a variety of different subject matters. They deal with the structure of the review process, the powers which are accorded to the new agency, and a series of other broad areas. Each individual motion to delete should not be voted upon or discussed separately, but rather they should be grouped under the broad subject matter to which they refer.

When we come back at two o'clock to make comments with respect to the Chair's preliminary ruling, I will be pleased to make some suggestions with respect to that. That was the purpose of the motions. We were somewhat limited in terms of the time within which we had to submit amendments, as is always the case. Rather than erring on the side of not having submitted sufficient amendments to cover the broad subject matters, I think it makes more sense to consider grouping the motions to delete which are referred to sub-paragraph (1) under the broad subject matters to which they refer. There may be six or seven broad subject matters.

The difficulty with proceeding now on the basis of the Speaker's preliminary ruling on Motion No. 1 is that we still do not know whether that will indeed be the case. I would also note some very serious concerns which have already been expressed with respect to the restrictive nature of the Speaker's preliminary ruling. With respect to the substance of the Speaker's ruling, the suggestion that an affirmative vote on Motion No. 5 would dispose of Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 flies in the face of the substance of Motions Nos. 6 through 9. Motion No. 5 is a motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) which would restrict, to a certain extent, the definition of "threats to security" in the Bill. The subsequent motions, which were moved by a different Member, would deal with an entirely separate question. Even if Motion No. 5 was to be adopted, that would not in any way dispose of Motions Nos. 6 through 9. Similarly in the case of Motions Nos. 13 and 14 where we have unrelated subject matters—

Mr. Speaker: The Chair would be prepared to hear detailed argument later and invites Hon. Members to consider the