

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion negatived on division; and this division disposes of motion No. 5, also in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood.

Motions Nos. 3 and 5 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is now on motion No. 4 in the name of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare motion No. 4 carried on division.

Motion No. 4 (Mr. Cullen) agreed to.

● (1650)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—Transport—Increase in freight rates on potatoes and provision of additional equipment—Reason for timing of announcement; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—The Canadian Economy—Report of Fitzgerald Associates on “The Way Ahead”—Request for tabling of report or reference to committee; the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—Veterans Affairs—Date of establishment of local office in Brandon.

Immigration

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members may consider this to be an appropriate time to proceed with the argument in respect of motions Nos. 2 and 9 and also motion No. 40 and other motions related thereto. If there are any members who wish to discuss the procedural regularity of motions Nos. 2, 9 and 22, I would be pleased to hear their arguments now, although I note that the hon. member in whose name motions Nos. 2 and 9 stand is not expected to be here to pursue those matters.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to argue in defence of the procedural regularity of motions Nos. 2, 9 and 22. I recognize the points you made when you gave your preliminary opinion, to the effect that there is no reference to domicile in Bill C-24 and that therefore these report stage amendments bring in a new proposition.

Mr. Speaker: The situation that we are facing here seems to me to be very similar to the one we faced in the bill to amend the Criminal Code with respect to capital punishment, that is, that what was a concept in the immigration law previously, namely, the concept of domicile, was removed by this bill which repeals the existing law and replaces it with a concept of permanent residence. That being so, the question that would remain is whether reinstating a concept which was taken out of the law by virtue of a bill which repeals it is simply a change in detail or a change of such a fundamental nature that it goes to the principle of the bill.

I would indicate that since the amendment is sought to be made to clause 4 of the bill, it is significant that clause 4 appears under the heading “Principles”, and that the principles of the bill appear to be stated in clause 4 as relating to concepts of Canadian citizenship and permanent residence. If that is so, the concept of permanent residence would appear to be part of the principle of the bill in place of the previous concept of domicile. Therefore, the amendment which would seek to reinstate from the statute law an aspect of the law which was there before, but which is repealed by this bill, would seem to be going contrary to the principle of the bill. I thought I would expose that reasoning for the benefit of the hon. member.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for adding to what you said earlier. I thank you in particular for drawing the parallel to the legislation that we had with respect to the criminal law. Initially, may I make the