

Division

an opportunity to discuss the government's bill, to do my best to see that any discrimination which may exist in Bill C-220 is eliminated.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, I do not feel compelled in any way to take part in this debate but I wish to say a few words in connection with the apprehensions expressed about the last three lines of clause 17. There seems to be a general impression that this appeal board will be the panacea to all our problems. That is not the case. There also seems to be an impression that immigration matters should be removed from federal government responsibility. I am sure the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) would be the first to object if he could not pin down someone in this house in connection with immigration problems.

With the establishment of the appeal board we will establish two classes of appellants and two classes of relatives. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) said that in a court such as this, and it will be a court, great emphasis will be put on precedents. Obviously smart, good lawyers, and therefore expensive ones, will do a better job than mediocre lawyers, so that before we know it we will have a class of immigration lawyers who will charge big fees. If such is the case then automatically we will have two classes of applicants.

• (4:30 p.m.)

On the other hand, I cannot accept the minister's point of view which he expressed in the words "we will try it and see". I cannot accept legislation based on trial and error. I am sure the minister did not mean that, because any legislation which we pass in the house is enforceable and should mean exactly what it says. We should not take the attitude that we will see what happens and if it does not work out we will do something else. I am sure the minister did not mean that.

I have no objection to retaining the last three lines of clause 17 because it will give me and other members of the house an opportunity to question the minister from day to day, whereas if these lines were not included the minister could say, as we have been told in the case of the C.B.C., "It is out of my hands. It is in the hands of the appeal board." On the other hand, I do not think that these three lines will provide the solution which some members in the house feel they may.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, may I answer the hon. member?

[Mr. Haidasz.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The minister will require the unanimous consent of the house to speak now. Is there unanimous consent of the house?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): If the minister speaks again some of us may wish to say another word.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Lewis) which was negated on the following division:

• (4:40 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Lambert
Alkenbrack	Lewis
Baldwin	MacEwan
Ballard	MacInnis
Barnett	(Cape Breton South)
Beaulieu	MacLean (Queens)
Bell (Carleton)	MacRae
Brand	McCleave
Brewin	McCutcheon
Cameron (Nanaimo-	McIntosh
Cowichan-The Islands)	McKinley
Cantelon	McQuaid
Chatterton	Madill
Churchill	Martin (Timmins)
Clancy	Mather
Coates	Moore
Crouse	Muir (Lisgar)
Danforth	Nasserden
Diefenbaker	Nesbitt
Dinsdale	Noble
Douglas	Nowlan
Enns	Nugent
Fane	Orlikow
Fawcett	Ormiston
Forbes	Pascoe
Forrestal	Peters
Fulton	Prittie
Gilbert	Pugh
Grafftey	Rapp
Gundlock	Régimbal
Hales	Ricard
Harkness	Saltsman
Herridge	Schreyer
Horner (Acadia)	Scott (Victoria (Ont.))
Howard	Simpson
Howe (Wellington-Huron)	Smallwood
Irvine	Southern
Jorgenson	Starr
Kindt	Thomas (Middlesex West)
Knowles	Winch
Korchinski	Winkler—80.

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison	Batten
Allard	Bécharde
Andras	Berger
Asselin	Byrne
(Richmond-Wolfe)	Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Badanai	Cameron (High Park)