

my colleagues opposite. We all had a good run at the procedure, and I think we all found some precedents we did not know were there and learned things through the process. I think it has been very helpful and I do compliment you, Sir.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, we in the Official Opposition wish to thank you for your most thoughtful and reasoned ruling which has shed light on many previously obscure corners of parliamentary law. However, having listened with interest to the comments of the Hon. Deputy Government House Leader about his commitment to the parliamentary process, I would ask him if he would act on that commitment by withdrawing the motion he has on the Order Paper to suspend the rules and the parliamentary process based on them in order to facilitate the Government's program which he has not been able to manage properly so far.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I too want to rise with my colleagues to say how much we appreciate not only the thoughtful insights you have provided us today as a result of your comments but also your willingness to hear representations from all sides of the House to such a degree that we would all feel that this particular issue has been well aired at this point. While we certainly accept your judgment, I simply say to my colleague, the Deputy House Leader for the Government, that this is simply the first hitter for the first inning.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the Chair can respond very briefly and again reiterate how much I appreciate the tone and the manner in which argument was given, and I want to say to some especially in this Chamber that the Chair took away those arguments knowing full well the very great importance that was placed upon them. I appreciate the comments that have been made.

## THE ROYAL ASSENT

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McKinnon):** Order. I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Government House,  
Ottawa

June 8, 1988

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Bertha Wilson, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in her capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 8th day of June, 1988, at 4.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

Yours sincerely,  
S. Orr  
for Anthony P. Smyth  
Deputy Secretary, Policy and Program.

## Immigration Act, 1976

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

##### MEASURE TO AMEND—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House resumed from Friday, June 3, consideration of second reading of, and concurrence in, amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof.

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday when I had the floor on Bill C-55, I had just completed addressing what our Party feels are very significant objections we still have to the legislation as tabled in the response of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall) on Friday morning in the House. At the time, there was concern on this side of the House that the Minister was trying to translate what were very minor modifications and amendments with which the Government agreed in the Senate report into very major amendments. She was trying to suggest that the response to Bill C-55 would make Bill C-55 a very different and radical piece of legislation. We rejected that on Friday. We take the same position today.

• (1610)

In resuming debate on Bill C-55, I want to point out that because the Minister had recently assumed the portfolio, there was an expectation that she would address the major hurdles which had faced her predecessors. The expectations on the part of non-governmental organizations were dealt a very significant blow when they heard the Government's response.

Before dealing with the Bill clause by clause or amendment by amendment, I want to place on the record some of the feelings of those non-governmental organizations. I want to point out the degree of frustration they are suffering because of the response from a Government which is obviously still very much opposed to compromising on some very fundamental objections. These objections go beyond philosophy. In fact, according to the legal experts who appeared before the committee, those objections will lie at the centre of the court challenges which may paralyze the legislation. That would really be a problem for the Government because the country was told not to worry, the Government was going to put a new system in place, only to have it tied up in the courts with a possible decision that it is in violation of the Charter or the Constitution.

The Canadian Council for Refugees said the Bill would essentially jeopardize the lives of refugees. B'nai Brith said, "You could not have come up with a Bill more open to legal challenges than if you had tried. This thing is going to be ensnared in legal challenges for years to come under everything from the Charter of Rights, the Bill of Rights, Canadian law and international." The Coalition for A Just Refugee and Immigration Policy condemned the five amendments as