

Immigration

we are suggesting. Let each day's evil take care of itself. We will let tomorrow go without any votes, and take care of Monday when it comes.

● (1710)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we understand the suggestion shall apply to today only. To that extent, we agree. We can discuss what is to happen on other days.

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, that suggestion is agreeable to us.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed, and so ordered, that the taking of deferred divisions on report stage amendments will proceed at 9.45. The proceedings will be interrupted at 9.45 this evening for the taking of any deferred divisions which have accumulated within our procedures up to that point. We may consider how this procedure will affect the adjournment debate already announced.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, could the bells not ring for 15 minutes only?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Part of the order should say that the proceedings will be interrupted at 9.45, the bells will ring for 15 minutes, and the votes will be taken at ten o'clock. That would allow the adjournment debate to proceed as announced a few moments ago.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: For the purpose of the procedural argument, perhaps we could address ourselves to motion No. 40.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, as I said before you ruled on motions 2 and 9, it is somewhat difficult to argue in support of the establishment of a refugee claims board primarily because the establishment of the board will involve some financial expenditure, which is beyond the ability of a private member to recommend. Although I was absent from the committee hearings when the point was discussed, members of the committee experienced certain difficulty in having this matter brought forward and voted on during the committee's regular proceedings. However, committee members tried to bring about a more effective, efficient and fair way of dealing with refugees than our present immigration procedures contemplate. I recognize that the introduction of a refugee claims board may introduce a new element into our procedures. However, if I can set aside for a moment any suggestion of a charge against the Crown, I suggest that this is not a foreign idea. At least, the idea of suggesting one procedure as against another is not foreign to us.

As Your Honour may know, and as the minister has said several times, there is in the bill a much more clearly stated procedure with respect to the processing of refugees than ever was contained in our immigration law. I am attempting to bring about, by way of this particular procedure and motions

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

set down on the order paper, much more clearly defined procedures, perhaps more public procedures and, in the final analysis, a much fairer way of processing refugee claims which may come to the attention of the department. If one can judge by what has been said in the House today, there is concern that somehow one of two things will happen: that an enormous number of people will suddenly appear on our doorstep—

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With respect, I thought we were debating the procedural acceptability of the motions, and not debating their merits. It seems to me the hon. member is now debating their merits.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In every case, anticipating what may be raised hereafter by way of argument on the merits, I may perhaps be lulled into being somewhat generous with remarks concerning the procedural point. However, I should bring the hon. member back to the point being debated.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I thought I was debating the procedural aspect. I wish to make clear that I am not attempting to introduce a proposition at variance with what is contained in Beauchesne's fourth edition. I am not trying to introduce a proposition foreign to the proposition of the bill. I do not think the minister himself would argue that anything in these motions is foreign to the purpose of the bill. I merely wish to make our procedures more equitable. Being concerned with equity, I argued that this particular series of motions should be accepted. I did not intend to introduce any factors inconsistent with the over-all scope of the immigration bill. That scope, or those objectives, are set out clearly. There is an attempt in my motion to be much more non-discriminatory, more open and more fair with respect to those whom we judge should be granted refugee status.

The question of costs involved can be interpreted perhaps in one of two ways. From time to time private members have proposed legislation allowing for the appointment of individuals, and such legislation has in no way obligated the Crown with respect to expenditures. Realistically, I recognize that this would very likely be the case in the present instance and I would accept Your Honour's ruling in that regard. I think the ideas incorporated in the motions are eminently reasonable and in harmony with the bill as presently printed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member recognizes his fundamental difficulty in proposing the motions he has just defended. I am sure the motions are well-intentioned and would put forward a régime designed only to extend greater justice and fairness to those who seek refugee status under our immigration law. However, it is basic and fundamental, under our practices and precedents, that it does not lie within the power of a private member to put forward, by way of amendment or otherwise, measures which would call for the expenditure of funds, unless he has been able to contrive, I presume with the assistance of the minister, the royal recommendation in respect thereto.

But that is not the case at present. Therefore, on that one, basic ground alone, without going further, the motion fails. It