

common parlance, on the amendments that have been brought before the House at report stage of Bill C-55.

I regret to advise that the ruling is fairly lengthy because of the great number of motions. Hon. Members have been extremely co-operative with the Table in assisting to bring about a ruling which not only upholds the procedural niceties but tries as much as possible to give to Hon. Members who are moving motions the maximum of free speech on these important matters.

I am now ready to make a final ruling on the motions on the Order Paper put forward in amendment to Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof.

To recapitulate the debate so far, a division has been deferred on Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9. Motions Nos. 5, 8 and 10 have been dropped by the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap).

Motions Nos. 11, 13 and 14 are now before the House. That grouping will be followed by debate on Motions Nos. 27, 29 and 34 which will be debated together but voted on separately.

Motion No. 12 was not selected as it is similar in substance to Motion No. 11. That was the situation at one o'clock today. Now to continue.

Motion No. 1 is similar to a motion moved in committee and ruled out of order in that it attempted to define the rule of the adjudicator by way of amending the interpretation clause which, of course, is contrary to our procedural practice. I concur in the decision of the committee chairman and must similarly rule this motion out of order. The Hon. Member is referred to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 773(10). In addition, this motion is attempting to amend the parent Act, the present Immigration Act of 1976, by introducing definitions which are not in that original Act. As Speaker Lamoureux said on June 11, 1970, it appears that the amendment seeks to go beyond this Bill to amend the Act itself. In other words, it has sought to make a change which would not only affect the Bill before us but as well the Act which the Bill itself seeks to amend. I regret to say that in most circumstances this motion and amendment cannot be accepted.

Motion No. 2 will not be selected as a similar motion was debated and negated in committee. In this regard, I thank the committee member, the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes), for bringing this point to the attention of the Chair on Friday.

Motions Nos. 15, 16, 28 and 46 were debated and decided in committee. Consequently it is my view that they ought not under the circumstances to be selected or proposed to the House.

Motion No. 17 will be debated and voted upon separately.

Motions Nos. 18 and 21 will be debated together, with an affirmative vote on Motion No. 18 obviating the question being put on Motion No. 21. A negative vote on Motion No. 18 will require the question to be put on Motion No. 21.

Immigration Act, 1976

Motions Nos. 19 and 20 will not be selected for debate. A motion substantially the same as Motion No. 19 was disposed of in the legislative committee. Motion No. 20 is similar, and neither motion will be selected for debate.

Motions Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 30 deal with the concept of a safe third country and will be debated together but voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 25, 31, 32 and 33 will be grouped for debate but will be voted on separately. All of these motions deal with the concept of a credible basis for a refugee claim. After consultation, the Hon. Member for Spadina has agreed to drop Motions Nos. 26 and 36.

There will be a separate debate and vote on Motion No. 35.

Motion No. 37 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Spadina and Motions Nos. 53, 57 and 70 standing in the name of the Minister sponsoring the Bill will be grouped for debate but voted on separately. Motion No. 69 will not be selected as its content is covered in Motion No. 70.

Motion No. 41 will not be selected as its content is covered in Motion No. 40 which will be debated and voted separately. Motions Nos. 43 and 44 will be grouped for debate but voted separately.

Motions Nos. 45, 47, 48 and 49 all deal with Clause 14 and will be grouped for debate but will be voted on separately.

• (1510)

Motion No. 50 will not be selected as it was debated and negated in the legislative committee.

Motion No. 54 is similar to Motions Nos. 55 and 56. Thus Motion No. 54 will not be selected as it is the same as Motions Nos. 55 and 56 and was placed on the Notice Paper later. They will be debated together and a vote on Motion No. 55 will be applied to Motion No. 56.

Motion No. 58 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) is the first in a series of amendments which attempt to introduce a new concept into the Bill, a concept which was not contemplated in the Bill as read in this House a second time. When the Bill was last before the House, it provided for limits on the number of steps in the process of refugee determination. Here, however, the Hon. Member is attempting, through a series of amendments, to prolong this clearly limited process.

As all Hon. Members are aware, the consideration of a Bill at the report stage is now a more formal repetition of the committee stage with the rules of debate which are proper when the Speaker is in the chair being applied. According to Erskine May, Twentieth Edition, at page 549, the proceedings at report stage should not therefore amend the Bill in a manner destructive of the principle of the Bill.

The proposals calling for a definitive role for the Deputy Chairman of the Convention refugee determination division in the refugee determination process appears to the Chair to go beyond the principle of the Bill. It is clear from all of the