

Canadian domicile as it may relate to some special privileges or rights with regard to immigration. It seems, on a preliminary examination, that the concept of domicile is a totally new one in respect of the provisions of the act.

Mr. Brewin: It has been in there for years.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) wishes to make an argument, I have indicated that this is my preliminary view, subject to discussion. It seemed to me that I was doing a courtesy to hon. members to give them this information and to make available the preliminary arguments and concerns of the Chair in order that hon. members can address themselves to the preliminary argument.

Subject to argument on the point, it seems that motions Nos. 2 and 9 suffer from a procedural difficulty with respect to the introduction of a new concept. Similarly, the motions which relate to motion No. 40, motions Nos. 34, 35, 36, 43 and 45. These all relate to the basic proposition put forward in motion No. 40 which seeks to introduce an entirely new concept into the act in the form of a refugee claims board with certain powers, to say nothing of the fact that the board, consisting of some 18 members, I believe it is proposed in the motion, would have to be paid. Some expense there would have to be contemplated. Presumably, there is a fundamental difficulty in respect of the royal recommendation. If not that, there is at least the difficulty of introducing into the act a concept that seems to be beyond that contemplated within the four corners of the bill and the clauses mentioned here.

These are the areas in which I would be prepared to hear argument in terms of procedure. I again indicate, as I have in the past, that I will ask for copies of these notes to be circulated to hon. members to assist them in their preparation. I have not cited the references to the procedural text because hon. members will see those during the course of the argument.

The remaining motions seem to be acceptable, on a preliminary analysis, on procedural grounds. I would attempt to group them as follows. Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5 should be grouped for debate, with separate votes on motions Nos. 1 and 4. A separate vote will also be taken on motion No. 3, and this vote will dispose of motion No. 5. Motions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 could be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 10, 11, 12, 22, 27, 28, 33, 46, 47, 48, 53, 54 and 55 will be debated and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 25 could be grouped for debate. Motions Nos. 13, 14 and 17 would be voted on separately. An affirmative vote on motions Nos. 14 and 17 would dispose of motions 15 and 18. However, a negative vote on the motions will require separate questions to be put on motions Nos. 15 and 18. Motion No. 16 will be voted on separately, and this vote will also dispose of motion No. 25.

Immigration

Motion No. 19 will be voted on separately. Motion No. 20 will be voted on separately, and this vote will also dispose of motion No. 21. Motions Nos. 23, 24 and 26 could be grouped for debate, and a vote on motion No. 23 will dispose of motions Nos. 24 and 26. Motions Nos. 29, 30, 31 and 32 could be grouped for debate. A vote on motion No. 29 will dispose of motions Nos. 31 and 32. A separate vote is required on motion No. 30.

Motions Nos. 37 and 38 should be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 39 and 41 could be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 42 and 44 could be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions 49, 50, 51 and 52 will be grouped for debate. A separate vote will be called on motions 49 and 51. A vote on motion No. 50 will dispose of motion No. 52.

● (1510)

Those are my preliminary suggestions. The House may now wish to begin discussion of the first group, motions 1, 3, 4 and 5. However, since we would probably move on rather quickly to motion No. 2, with respect to which, as I have indicated, the Chair finds some difficulty, it might be useful to hear argument now. I notice, though, that the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay is not present at the moment, so perhaps the House would wish to discuss the first group of motions, and in the course of that discussion the Chair might be given some idea when argument with regard to motions Nos. 2 and 9 will take place.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, with regard to motions 2 and 9, in relation to which Your Honour mentioned that a new concept of domicile had been introduced, I should like a ruling from the Chair on motions 22 and 23 which also bring in the concept of domicile. Possibly that ruling could be given before we continue.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I have not had time to assimilate all the suggestions made by Your Honour, but with regard to motions 2 and 9, which deal with the question of domicile, I respectfully submit that this is not a new concept. For many years the concept of domicile has been a familiar one—a certain number of years of residence in Canada excluding, except in extreme cases the right of the government to deport someone if that person had acquired Canadian domicile. This feature was discussed by the minister in committee, and I respectfully submit that the effort made by the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay in motions 2 and 9 is entirely in accordance with the right of parliament to say that it wishes this long-standing provision to remain in the law.

Mr. Speaker: I want to make sure whether the hon. member for Greenwood is indicating that this bill, Bill C-24, contains in it any reference, other than report stage motions, to the term "domicile".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the suggestion made earlier, that this procedural debate might be deferred until we have dealt with the first