

house, have shown that we are not trying to put the minister on the spot or make political capital out of anything that has been produced. There has been on the minister's side above all an attitude today in the amendments which he has produced, except for this last one, which shows a consideration for the suggestions made that one cannot but admire and respect, and I do.

So this is not an argument that too often occurs on the floor of this house, for which all of us are often responsible, where one takes a stance for purposes other than the merits of the law. We are urging the minister to reconsider this question because we are convinced that on the basis of what he is trying to accomplish he is doing himself—I do not mean this in a personal sense, but in that of the department—and the law a discredit by insisting on retaining this power.

I do not know what else I can do except urge him that the only way he will have adequate experience is to permit everyone who has the right under the opening words of the clause to exercise it if they wish to do so, and afterwards the minister will have actual case histories that may show a requirement for change. Let him then come back to the house and ask for those changes to me made. If his request is based on that experience, I cannot imagine members of this house refusing him those changes. Otherwise I do not think it is possible for those of us who feel strongly about this matter to accept the position he has stated.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, I think I should state now that it is the intention of the department to extend this right as soon as possible to all Canadians and all non-citizens in Canada including, of course, landed immigrants. This is our intention; this is what we want to achieve. I agree that it looks like discrimination to give certain rights to one group of citizens and refuse those rights to another group. But I think we have to carry out this experiment. I do not think that in order to ascertain the value of the experiment it is necessary to cover all classes at the beginning, because even if there is a legal difference between a landed immigrant and a Canadian citizen the process of sponsorship is exactly the same. We will gain exactly the same experience with the first group as if we were covering all groups.

So I would state that is our intention to extend this provision to all Canadians and

Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board
landed immigrants, but I think we need to know exactly how this measure will proceed and what kind of obstacles we will meet. We ask for this gradual application of clause 17. I believe there is nothing that would justify anybody in the house believing that this is not our aim and is not what we intend achieving, because in the past year I believe we have indicated that we are applying this law in the spirit to which I have referred.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak again on this question; I have repeated my argument several times already. The minister remains adamant on the matter and that is his right, as it is our right to try to get him to change his mind. I wonder whether it would not be more appropriate, and I would be surprised if the rules do not permit this to be done, to divide the amendment before the committee into its two separate parts and vote on each one of those parts separately, rather than voting on the entire amendment. The amendment contains two quite separate and disparate parts which are not related one to the other at all.

Mr. Marchand: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the two parts are related. In the clause as it now stands we refer to "Canadian citizen". It may be suggested that we are not adding anything, but I think we are making a change in deleting the expression "Canadian citizen" and replacing it with "person", because this means that the governor in council will have much more power than under the clause as it now stands. Both parts are related, because in the first part we determine which persons can sponsor and have the right of appeal, and the other part deals with the classes of persons. I think it is a unit and we should vote on it as one amendment.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to open a lengthy procedural argument, and I am sure the committee generally feels that way. But I would remind the Chair of citation 200, paragraph (4) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which reads as follows:

A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the house may be taken on each separately.

That citation refers to "the house", but one does not need to take any time to argue the point that the rules that apply in the house apply also in committee. Furthermore, I would point out that the amendment which has been moved from the government side in