

Security Intelligence Service

on the side of caution and to submit motions to delete in the full knowledge and understanding that such motions would in fact be grouped by subject matter.

That is what I understood the role of the Chair would be after having, of course, consulted with the officers at the Table. It would be to consider the broad subject matter which is dealt with by the motions to delete; then to group them accordingly for debate.

However, if your honour examines the subject matter of the motions to delete, it is virtually impossible, in fact entirely impossible, in the course of a ten-minute speech to deal with such disparate elements as the management of the service; the question of the nature of intrusive warrants under the Act; the role of the oversight committee; the question of the handling of complaints with respect to the service; an entirely separate part on security offences; a series of consequential amendments; and a provision with respect to collective bargaining rights for employees in the service. There are six, seven or more fundamentally different areas which can certainly not be disposed of by one vote and certainly not, Mr. Speaker, appropriately or adequately dealt with under the provisions of one motion to delete, that is, Motion No. 1.

I would note, and I would draw to the attention of the Chair, two rulings by former Speaker Jerome with respect to the question of motions to delete. I am sure the Chair has considered these. However, I believe in the context of this question of grouping that it is appropriate that they be brought to the attention of the House.

First, there was a ruling of May 11, 1977 by Mr. Speaker Jerome with respect to the question of demanding a division of a Bill. The Chair will recall the controversy surrounding the omnibus Bill on the Criminal Code. At that point there was some suggestion that the Bill should be divided. The Chair, in rejecting that suggestion, suggested that instead of dividing the Bill, the device which was open to Hon. Members for that purpose was a motion to delete pursuant to Standing Order 75(5), as it then was.

I would like to quote—I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I just wanted to ensure I have the full attention of the Chair for this particular point. This is a quote from the ruling of—

Mr. Speaker: In case the Hon. Member has any doubt, the occupant of the chair will carefully read the transcript. Will the Hon. Member please proceed?

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the ruling of May 11, 1977 with respect to a motion to delete, Mr. Speaker Jerome said:

The motion allows a Member to isolate those sections of a bill which he feels ought not to be amended or ought to be voted separately, without offending the principle of the bill.

That was the purpose of what may have been an admittedly somewhat awkward decision to submit motions to delete to each clause. However, the purpose of that was to ensure that the separate sections of the Bill would be voted separately

pursuant to the ruling of Mr. Speaker Jerome on May 11, 1977—

Mr. Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please indicate to the Chair just what he thinks the Chair should do, just exactly how they should be grouped, because the Chair is inviting specific comments? The Chair has listened patiently. The Hon. Member may have had some doubts as to whether the Chair is listening. The Chair wishes to assure the Hon. Member it is doing its very best to listen, but is waiting for very specific comments from the Hon. Member in terms of what should be done.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have just one final reference with respect to—

Mr. Kaplan: Tell us how they should be grouped.

Mr. Deans: He is going to tell you, if you will wait.

Mr. Kaplan: He has been speaking for 15 minutes. He has not said anything.

Mr. Deans: Are you going to bring in a security service and stop him?

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) has the floor.

Mr. Deans: Bring the Minister to order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) please be quiet. His colleague, the Hon. Member for Burnaby, has the floor.

● (1650)

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, just one final reference with respect to the question of grouping.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) has the floor. Will the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain please be quiet. His colleague, the Hon. Member for Burnaby, has the floor.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): On June 29, 1976, Speaker Jerome dealt with the question of motions to delete. He said that even if the fundamental principle of the Bill appears to be contravened by a motion to delete, because the Standing Orders make provision for this it “appears to give them a sanctity that does not extend to other motions”. The relevant provision is as follows:

It seems to be going far too extensively beyond the Standing Orders to suggest that, because the effect may be in some or in their collectivity—

And I emphasize that:

—or in their collectivity to change the principle of the Bill, every Member who wants to put down a motion to delete at this stage ought to be deprived of that right.

In this particular instance it was a one-clause Bill and the motion was to delete the clause from the Bill, which obviously