

*Supply*

When a Government Member says we are tainting the Public Service and then fires an individual civil servant for a job well done, it simply shows he has a "suck and blow and hold your breath at the same time" attitude. Even if that were possible, I am not sure it would be worth the price of turning Tory blue.

**Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, this is a useful motion which has been proposed by the Hon. Member for York West. I would like to point to two main parts of the motion on which I wish to dwell. One of the demands in the motion is that the Government should establish a system which would guarantee full accessibility to the system for refugee claimants by rejecting any pre-screening stage within the process. I think this is a most important matter for us to examine at this time.

The Bill before us is a long and complicated Bill which makes many changes, some of which perhaps go beyond what the Minister or the Cabinet were aware they might be doing.

It will not be easy in 20 minutes, in a day or in a week to deal comprehensively with all aspects of the legislation. However, the matter of accessibility, whether people will have a fair chance to get a fair hearing under our system, is I believe the very most important point we have to consider at the outset.

The second demand of this motion really is part of the first, so I will go to the third demand, which is that the Government should initiate a system which will provide every refugee with the opportunity of an appeal before a competent and independent refugee body which would consider all facts and circumstances of the appellant's claim. I am very glad we have the opportunity for this debate as a way of opening up, both to Members of Parliament and to any listening members of the public, some of the main issues before us presented by the Government's Bill C-55. This is a matter on which I have worked hard for five and a half years. It is a matter about which I feel very strongly. I will try to concentrate on reasoning with the arguments and I hope I will not fall into too passionate a rhetoric, which is very easy to do.

This is a very deep issue. It affects immediately tens of thousands of refugees, or potential refugees—real ones—and affects indirectly and very really a very great many other people in Canada besides, both morally and, one might say, in their own personal interest. It affects these people morally because Canada has undertaken solemn international obligations to protect a person who is out of his or her country and unable to return because of fear of persecution on account of political, religious or other such reasons. What this legislation will do, if it is adopted, is to make that mostly a mockery. Therefore, it is very important that the public understand what is being done in the name of the people of Canada who were given the Nansen Medal. That medal was not given to the Government. It was given to the people of Canada. The Government should not dishonour the record of the people of Canada.

This Bill will also injure Canadians in another way, in their more personal interests, by damaging an ancient right which has been enjoyed by British subjects for four centuries in Britain and by Canadians for as long as there have been Canadians under present Canadian and British law. I will come back to that later.

As has been pointed out by a number of people, we have perhaps 15 million refugees in the world. Some of them are refugees because they are fleeing from repressive governments. Some of those countries our Government opposes or condemns. Some of those countries our Government supports, such as the Government of El Salvador to which our Government has made a bilateral loan. I had the opportunity to visit El Salvador last week in order to learn first hand some of the human rights conditions which have forced probably one million of the five million people in that country to seek refuge. One half a million or more people have gone to the United States and a half or million or more have become refugees, displaced persons, within their own tiny country. Yet Canada approves of the Government of El Salvador. It said so after examining its election procedures, and supports it through a grant or loan of \$8 million. We therefore have some obligation for refugees who comes to us, especially from a Government which we support.

● (1210)

Others come as a result of hunger and poverty in some countries such as the Philippines, Guatemala or the countries of sub-Sahara Africa where agriculture of the type which supported the people for thousands of years has been destroyed, in large part as a result of the enterprises of countries such as the United States and Canada. These countries ensure that the fertile land is not used to enable those people to eat, but is used to sell us luxuries. Therefore there is hunger. That is the principal reason for hunger in so many countries, countries often with very fertile land such as Guatemala and the Philippines.

Again, there are refugees from those countries because the hunger in those countries also generates violence, violence by the Government that forces the people to live in impossible conditions and violence by the people who resist the repression of the Government. This is not new. It is related to another pattern.

For about 30 years now countries such as Great Britain and those countries of western Europe as well as the United States and Canada have either invited, or at least tolerated, people coming from what we might call the countries of the south to work in our countries, usually as cheap labour. The tide is now being reversed.

When I spoke last week with the Vice-Minister of Planning in El Salvador he was not urging that Salvador send more cheap labour to Canada. He was urging that Canada should invest in factories in El Salvador with our wood, or perhaps cut the parts for jeans here and have them sewn together down there by what he called—and he speaks very good English and