

### Immigration

be spelled out. As it is, it is rather one-sided. It says a person must give an undertaking. Nowhere does it say what, *quid pro quo*, the government is prepared to provide.

I am very keen on the idea that organizations and persons should assist refugees into this country without being closely connected by marriage, or anything of that kind. I am very anxious that that be done. But I think if we are going to ask people to make obligations, we should spell out the whole contract and make it very clear that the person making the obligation—or his protegee, her protegee or its protegee, as the case may be—is given an additional score on a possible points system, or additional consideration with respect to admission to Canada. For that reason, I think the amendment is somewhat defective. But as the minister came a long way toward meeting the desires of the committee, I do not feel disposed to vote against his amendment.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 49 (Mr. Cullen) agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Motions Nos. 50 and 52 are grouped for the purpose of debate, but they will be voted on separately.

**Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher)** moved:

Motion No. 50.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 115 by striking out lines 39 to 44 at page 68 and substituting the following therefor:

“(3) Every order in council, regulation or form made under this act shall be laid before parliament within fifteen days after the order in council, regulation or form, as the case may be, is made or, if parliament is not then in session, within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof and every order in council, regulation, or form shall be subject to affirmative resolution of parliament and shall not come into force until 30 days after it has been published in the *Canada Gazette*.”

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood)** moved:

Motion No. 52.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 115 by adding immediately after line 50 at page 68 the following new subclause:

“(5) Any regulation passed under provisions of paragraphs 1(a), (b) and (c) of this section shall not come into force unless approved by the House of Commons after a motion for consideration is signed by 20 members which shall be considered within 15 days after the motion is filed when the House of Commons is in session or within 15 days after the opening of parliament, if it is not in session.”

**Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher):** Mr. Speaker, I will speak briefly on motion No. 50. This topic has been swirling around immigration debates for as long as I have had the opportunity to read the record of our debates. As the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) so perfectly describes it, the topic is legislation by regulation. As a member of the committee, I can appreciate that the minister and his officials must

[Mr. Brewin.]

have a fair amount of regulatory power. They must have that so they can react to changing conditions. Conditions can change very quickly. There are fewer receiving countries in the world taking in fewer immigrants, and it is incumbent on the minister and his officials to respond. I think we all understand that, but we do not accept the fact that regulations can come very close to changing the spirit of legislation. I believe that the supremacy and primacy of parliament should prevail. It is for that reason that this amendment has been moved.

We were able to squeeze—how shall I put it—half an amendment out of the minister. The minister went part of the way in meeting the objections we raised at second reading. The minister said he went a long way. I suppose it depends upon where you start. However, I think we must keep in mind the experiences of the last few years. There was a time when people could change their status while in Canada. They might have come in as students or visitors and changed their status to that of landed immigrants. When that change was made there was a great effect on the flow and the nature of the flow. There was nothing parliament could do about it. The only time we had a chance to do anything was when the main estimates or the supplementary estimates were before the committee. At best, that is a frail substitute for what we really want. We do not want regulations to change dramatically the immigration policy of this country as to flow or qualitative flow. Changes like that should be presented to parliament, because parliament is supreme. It is for that reason this amendment is before us. The minister has gone part of the way in meeting our objection, but obviously not far enough. Clause 115(3), at page 68 of the bill, reads as follows:

No regulation made under paragraph 1(a), (b) or (c) shall come into force until 30 days after it has been published in the *Canada Gazette*, and the text of such regulation shall be laid before parliament as soon as practicable.

As I understand that wording, regulations cannot be passed in the dead of night. We will not wake up in the morning to find that our immigration policy has changed dramatically. That subclause means that regulations will be published in the *Canada Gazette* and will not come into effect for 30 days after that. I know that the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has had more experience with the *Canada Gazette* than I have or might ever have. He feels the *Canada Gazette* is not well enough organized and wonders how many Canadians read it anyhow. However, those interested in immigration will be reading the *Gazette* and they will at least have some prior notice. This prior notice will allow them to raise objections or to indicate what effects they think the regulations might have on immigration policy.

● (1550)

The other position the minister has taken is that he will lay the text of such regulations before parliament as soon as possible. I am not worried about the time-frame; that is acceptable. We are in a co-operative spirit. However, simply laying the text of the regulations before parliament does not give parliament any chance for debate. While parliament will be notified, parliament will not be able to see whether the