

Gunther Plaut, the author of a study on this very question. With regard to this Bill he says:

It does not do justice to our international obligations to protect refugees. Nazi Germany would qualify as a safe country under Canada's proposed new refugee rules. I don't think that I would have been let in. I came in the 1930s from Nazi Germany. The Government is building a Berlin Wall around the country.

Tom Clark of the Interchurch Committee for Refugees says:

Instead of access, there is a screen. Instead of bringing Canada a notch ahead of European countries, the Immigration Minister has brought it down to their level. It's despicable.

Michael Schelew of Amnesty International says:

It's an about-face on Canada's humanitarian record that may place people fleeing persecution in jeopardy.

Lorne Waldman of the Canadian Jewish Congress says:

A long-term aim of the Immigration Department is to eliminate all refugee claims within Canada. The Government has spent millions of dollars and innumerable hours consulting on this problem, and everyone's recommendations have been ignored altogether.

That is the verdict on Bill C-55 which is now before the House. That is the verdict of people to whose opinions we should pay attention.

There was a new Bill introduced this morning labelled Bill C-84. The Government attempted to introduce debate immediately without an opportunity for the country, and the Opposition in particular, to look at it. We received, on a so-called confidential basis, a draft at 5.30 last evening. It was not a complete draft at that. We got official copies just before the House met and were then required by the Government to respond to this very difficult and complicated Bill on this very vital human question.

We will study it. My colleague, the Member for York West, has already given an initial response. We will examine whether the remedies are enforceable. Are these procedures appropriate? Is there sufficient due process? Are existing remedies under existing statutes already sufficient? What sort of legislative duplication have we here? What sort of judicial complications have we here? What sort of constitutional doubts are we raising here?

For example, will we give the same treatment to those individuals, church groups, and so on which bend the rules to bring in legitimate refugees as we do to those unscrupulous commercial operators who exploit illegitimate refugees in order to circumvent the system?

Bill C-84 needs the careful scrutiny which Bill C-55 has already received. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Bill C-84 cannot be read alone. It must be read with Bill C-55. Why were there no abuse provisions in Bill C-55 which is now before Your Honour? Why have one Bill with the procedural remedies and enforcement provisions and another with the substance of the law relating to refugees? You cannot study the remedies or enforcement procedures without reviewing the substance. Until we are satisfied with Bill C-55 we will not feel comfortable with Bill C-84 because they are one package.

Immigration Act, 1976

We are in favour of tough measures against profiteers and abusers. We want to examine carefully whether the measures in Bill C-84 are targeted properly. We must have a fair system in place before we design measures against abuse of the system. The system is in Bill C-55 and we are not satisfied with it. The remedies in Bill C-84 must be read in conjunction with the substantial measures contained in this Bill. We do not favour jumping the queue or cutting the line, but we do not favour closing the theatre either.

[Translation]

We do not favour jumping the queue, we do not favour cutting the line, but we do not favour closing the theater either.

[English]

I believe that Canadians want a larger population to help develop our vast land, create new markets and new jobs. The low fertility rate in the country and the aging population will become a real concern for our country by the year 2000, particularly for maintaining productivity and providing a tax base adequate to support our social programs. I do not have to deal with the phantom issue that immigrants and refugees take jobs away from other Canadians. That does not happen. The entrepreneurship, the work, the ideas and the resources have historically provided more jobs than were ever replaced.

We continue to hold that liberal view on immigration. As I said earlier, we also deplore the abuse of our refugee system by unethical consultants and other profiteers. We will support any reasonable measures designed to crack down on the abusers of refugees and of the system. Contrary to what the Government would have the public believe, there are already legislative measures in place to allow the Government to detain and deport people who may be a threat to the security of Canada. There are also measures on the books already aimed at consultants which the Government has refused to use. We will want to ensure that the new measures are better than what we already have. Why the duplication? Why the failure to use what is already on the statute books of the country?

● (1610)

Sections 19 through 32 of the Immigration Act, 1976, declare persons with a criminal record or those likely to engage in criminal activity, inadmissible to Canada.

In order to be deported under those sections, persons must first be given an oral hearing. There is also Section 95(I), (j) and (n), which allow for prosecution of consultants and other profiteers.

Section 95(n), which was used to prosecute the captain of the *Amelie*, provides, on an indictable offence, for a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or both; and, on a summary conviction offence, for a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or both. As well, the fraud sections of the Criminal Code have always been available to the Government. What are the effects of this cumulative remedy?