

Immigration Act, 1976

place and say something about these amendments, if he has the guts to speak.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I have just a short comment. I would point out to the Hon. Member for Spadina that the *Calgary Herald* has probably read most of the critics of this legislation but has evidently not read the Bill. It would be good for its editorial board to spend some time reading the legislation before it makes that kind of comment.

Second, I want to say that I agree with the principle of the Hon. Member's motion. As he pointed out, the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Collins) has already taken care of that principle in the legislation by introducing at committee stage a review clause which at first called for a five-year review and, as the Hon. Member pointed out, it was reduced in committee to four years. I think that is a reasonable length of time.

As I say, I can agree totally with the Hon. Member's principle, and that is a review of the legislation, because world circumstances change and domestic circumstances change. It is wholesome to review the provisions of the Bill in that context. However, I do think it is unrealistic to think of reviewing the legislation in two years. There are far too many undulations of circumstances. There is just not enough time to see the effects of the legislation through the administration of the Bill.

Therefore, I think it is impractical to think of a review process after two years of implementation. I would hold to the four year provision we passed in committee.

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

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 22 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the 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 will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Attewell)—Administration of Justice—Length of prison sentences—Granting of parole; the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway)—Young Offenders Act—Maximum sentence for murder—Request that statute be amended; the Hon. Member for Montreal—Saint-Marie (Mr. Malépart)—Tax reform—Future of Minister of Finance—Old age exemption—Minister's position.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and the Criminal code in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the Bill now before the House.

Call in the Members.

● (1640)

And the division bells having rung:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Accordingly, the first question is on Motion No. 5. Mr. Heap moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-84 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Heap), which was negatived on the following division.

(Division No. 230)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Blaikie
Boudria
Broadbent
Caccia
Cassidy
Copp

de Corneille
de Jong
Dingwall
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Grondin

Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Heap
Henderson
Jewett
Johnston
(Saint-Henri—
Westmount)