

discussed, when we have accepted changes and when hon. members who introduce amendments agree to withdraw them on the basis of the government's response, to bring in amendments which we have already agreed at the committee stage should be withdrawn. That seems to me to be an abuse of the process. This is not a motion which was defeated at the committee stage. It was introduced at the committee stage. There was discussion around the table by members from parties of every political persuasion, and finally the individual who moved the amendment saw fit to withdraw it because he felt the amendment which had been proposed by the government adequately covered the position he maintained. If that was not the case, the hon. member could say, "No, I do not like the compromise. We will vote on my amendment. If we cannot get my amendment, then we will look at the one introduced by the government". However, in this case agreement was reached and we came up with the wording "misrepresentation of material fact be proved to have been intentional". So I think that kind of amendment really has no place if the committee stage is to have any importance at all.

For the reasons cited, I feel we have gone a long way to meeting the concerns of hon. members opposite and, quite candidly, of hon. members from this party as well. This is the kind of bill which crosses party lines. People have very strong feelings in particular areas, and that is why there is no argument with hon. members in this party or with hon. members opposite about the interventions they have made. Those interventions have been made because of a strong feeling of conscience, and for that I frankly congratulate and commend hon. members. I do not feel angry with them or ashamed of the fact that there are some hon. members in my party who do not agree with everything that the government is trying to do. I welcome the interventions, but in this case I do not feel these amendments are acceptable, given the changes we have already made.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Immigration

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion negated on division.

Motion No. 23 (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont) negated on division.

Motions No. 24 (Mr. Brewin) and No. 26 (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont) negated on division.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre) (for Mr. Fairweather) moved:

Motion No. 27.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 16 to 24 at page 22 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) At the request of the person with respect to whom an inquiry is to be held, or of the immigration officer representing the Minister, an adjudicator may allow an inquiry to be held *in camera*.

(3) Except as provided in subsection (2), an inquiry by an adjudicator shall be held in public."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The motion is negated on division.

Motion No. 27 (Mr. Fairweather) negated on division.

[English]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 28.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 37 by striking out line 35 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"time, but the minister shall not make such an order without granting a hearing at which the applicant may be heard and represented".

Mr. Epp: What about motion No. 26?

Mr. Cullen: Motion No. 26 was taken care of by the last vote.