

Immigration Act, 1976

assuming responsibility for duties which had previously been performed by the RCMP.

(ii) For the fiscal years 1985-86 and 1986-87, the numbers in New Brunswick declined for 296 to 282 and from 448 to 434 in Newfoundland. The Province of New Brunswick reimbursed the Government of Canada \$13,372,120 and \$14,522,551 respectively. The Province of Newfoundland reimbursed Canada \$22,503,206 and \$23,641,324 respectively for the same periods.

(iii) A rate per person is not struck, in relation to total police services in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Newfoundland.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The question as enumerated by the Minister of State (Mr. Lewis) has been answered.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the other questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, September 18, consideration of Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee, and Motion No. 4 (Mr. Jourdenais, p. 9105), Motion No. 6 (Mr. Marchi, p. 9104), Motion No. 7 (Mr. Heap, p. 9104), and Motion No. 9 (Mr. Heap, p. 9104).

Mr. Speaker: I have a brief further preliminary ruling to present to the House.

On Friday, September 18, 1987, the Chair made a preliminary ruling in respect of the motions on the Notice Paper in amendment to Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof. Following consultations with the Hon. Member for Spadina, (Mr. Heap) the Chair will now make a definitive ruling on the grouping presently before the House.

Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 9 will be grouped for debate but voted upon separately. Motions Nos. 5, 8, and 10 will be dropped, as it is not the Hon. Member's intention to proceed with them.

Motions Nos. 11, 13 and 14 will be debated together. There will be a separate vote on Motion No. 11. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 13 obviates the necessity for a vote on Motion No. 14, however, a negative vote on Motion No. 13 requires a

separate vote on Motion No. 14. Motion No. 12 will not be selected as it is similar in substance to Motion No. 11.

Should debate be completed on Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 9, the House will then proceed with Motions Nos. 11, 13, 14. The next grouping to be put to the House will be Motions Nos. 27, 29 and 34 which will be debated together but voted on separately.

I should advise Hon. Members that consultations are continuing on the remaining motions in amendment and the Chair intends to give a final ruling at three o'clock this afternoon. Thus, the House will now resume debate on Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7, and 9 which were proposed to the House last Friday.

I want to express the appreciation of the Chair to the Hon. Member for Spadina for his co-operation in the consultations since Friday, and to some other Hon. Members who have made representations. As I say, there will be further consultations taking place between now and a little later in order to be sure that we are making rulings which are fully understood by all Hon. Members.

[Translation]

Mr. Jourdenais: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais) on a point of order.

Mr. Jourdenais: Mr. Speaker, I am simply seeking clarification. I did not hear Motion No. 15 being called. You called Motions Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 27, 29 and 34, but I did not hear you call Motion No. 15 which was supposed to come up for debate after Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8—motions debated last Friday—and I should like to know what happened to Motion No. 15.

Mr. Speaker: As I said earlier, I expect to make a ruling on the other amendments this afternoon, including Motion No. 15.

[English]

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot remember from Friday's debate, which was somewhat hurried in several ways, what action we took on Friday on Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 9, specifically whether I spoke to any one of them. I think I probably did. However, because of the uncertainty about the ruling, I am not quite sure how it is ruled.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I can assist the Hon. Member for Spadina. We are resuming on Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 9, and I think the record will show that on those motions grouped for debate the Hon. Member has in fact spoken.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 9, are you saying we are addressing them collectively or are we going individually? I would like to speak to Motion No. 6, particularly, but I am not sure whether we are on Motion No. 4 or are taking all four motions as one cluster.