

Immigration Act, 1976

Government was surprised that debate took place yesterday. He indicated that the Government somehow expected that Bill C-84 would be dealt with yesterday. That is obviously not the case. The Government itself has scheduled Bill C-84 for debate on Thursday and Friday of this week. Obviously it expected the debate to continue.

I do not understand what the Parliamentary Secretary was getting at. Obviously, the Government did not expect the motion to be passed yesterday afternoon, an hour after the various House Leaders had met. It knew the debate would continue. The Government had planned to debate the motion later this week.

The point is that that motion was not the business planned for today. It does not help the House when legislation is changed at the last minute, causing problems for all Hon. Members and especially those who have very heavy committee assignments.

The Parliamentary Secretary said that the Bill had to be rushed through the House of Commons and that it was pressing legislation. The Parliamentary Secretary well knows that it was not the Government's intention to have the House sitting on January 27, 1988. Indeed, it had proposed that we extend the Christmas break until February. I do not see how the Government can be in that much of a rush with this piece of legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for his comments. As Hon. Members know, of course, it is the Government's prerogative to decide the order of business and the Government may change without any notice whatsoever the Projected Order of Business we receive every morning.

Yesterday during debate on Bill C-84 there was an amendment moved by Mr. Marchi which the Chair took under advisement. The Chair is now ready to rule that the amendment is indeed in order, so the Chair will put the amendment to the House. Mr. Marchi, seconded by Mr. Berger, moves:

That the message of the House of Commons to the Senate be amended by:

- a) deleting, in paragraph one, the reference to Senate amendment 4;
- b) deleting paragraph two;
- c) adding to paragraph nine a reference to Senate amendment 4; and
- d) adding after amendment 3 the following:

"That amendment 4 of the Senate be amended by deleting the said amendment and by striking out line 16 on page 7 of the Bill and substituting the following therefor:

"(2)(c) and against whom a deportation order has been upheld by the Board; or"

Debate will now resume on the main motion and on the amendment of Mr. Marchi.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with the question of filibustering, I think you would find the Government willing to forgo further government speakers since the opposition spokesmen have already voiced their

opinions on this motion and have expressed their parties' positions. I think we could shorten the debate if the Opposition would be agreeable to holding a division this afternoon. We could deal with the legislation here and now and send the message back to the Senate.

If the Opposition is not disposed to do that, I would be prepared to speak. I see that the spokesperson for the Liberal Party is saying no. I take that to be a signal that we are to carry on this afternoon at least.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is correct that I signalled no on behalf of my colleagues, but in no way should the record show that that means that there is any filibustering as suggested by the Parliamentary Secretary. I think that was a cheap shot. If he has thoughts and wishes to deposit upon the floor of the House of Commons, I would welcome his doing so. Otherwise, he should sit down and allow other members from my Party and from the NDP who do have worth-while recommendations on this very sensitive Bill to speak.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair must find that a matter of debate and give the floor back to the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen).

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I did not notice any cheap shots going across the floor.

Yesterday, the Minister tabled a motion which was in fact a message to the Senate responding to its message to the House about Bill C-84. In that message, the Minister pointed out that the Government was prepared to accept some of the amendments the Senate had proposed and to reject others. In fact, the Government has accepted almost 50 per cent of the Senate's amendments, but we certainly will not accept all of them.

I was present yesterday when the opposition spokesmen addressed the House and I think it is now time to underscore the Government's position on this matter. First, we must underscore the fact that Bill C-84 is not immigration legislation. I heard an awful lot of language in the opposition speeches purporting that Bill C-84 deals with immigration. In fact, it does not even deal with refugees, it deals with fraud in the refugee system. It is detention and deterrence legislation. I think it is important to clarify for Canadians that we are not dealing with immigration legislation, even though many people may have confused those two issues.

There was a time when we did not have to deal with this matter at all when we dealt with immigration. I was a member of the Green Paper committee which sat in the summer of 1975 and toured across Canada debating the 1977 Bill which became law in 1978. I think there are only three Members left in the House now who sat on that committee, the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson), the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) and I.