

Immigration Act, 1976

leader, not a follower. We are a leader when it comes to trying to come to grips with the very traumatic human dilemma of persecution in whatever shape it comes.

● (1720)

The Government is saying is that the way to have an efficient system is by turning people away. Yet what will happen if the U.S., Sweden, Great Britain, France, Norway, Holland, or whatever country you choose, says Canada has been a leader in this area and if they can pass this kind of legislation, then why can't we? Or, why shouldn't we? I ask my colleagues in all honesty to ask themselves what would happen if those countries move to a safe country concept or prescreening? Every country will have a safe country list. Every one of those lists will be compromised by political and diplomatic pressure. What you will then have is every country washing its hands of the problem. One country will say go to Canada. Canada says go to Germany. Germany says go to France. France says go to Japan. The world will then be completely safe according to the safe country lists. I predict that will happen.

Canada is going to be progressive but we are saying they have to be progressive, too. Canada is going to do its share and they have to do their share as well. Canada will take a satisfactory number under a satisfactory system but others must have the same. That should be our attitude. It should not be that we are going to try and close it down and so should they. If we have an international corridor of locked doors, will that help the situation? Will that make a refugee's life less desperate or more desperate?

If you were a legitimate refugee facing persecution and one country said you cannot come in, and the next country said you cannot come in, and the third country says you cannot come in, that will give rise to the sleazy operators who profit from human misery while trying to get people in the back door rather than through the front door. That kind of restrictive, let us close the door and wash our hands of the situation mentality, will get us in greater trouble. Maybe not today. Maybe not tomorrow. However, some day we will be in trouble.

We should be saying to refugee claimants that we have a good system. We have the expertise to make sure they are legitimate. Use that opportunity well and do not try and get in our country through the back door. That is the positive, courageous message and it will encourage respect for the law.

It is with those thoughts in mind that we bring to this debate a sense of concern that hopefully will be translated into a compromise by a new Minister. We hope she will go beyond the inflexibility demonstrated by her predecessors and sit down and ask if there is a way that the Government can be assured of an orderly process and satisfy those who champion the cause of refugees that refugees will have a fair chance. Is there a way to bring these two so far irreconcilable groups together? We believe there is. We believe it is possible. We should believe it is probable. We have met much greater and more difficult

challenges than that. We can overcome the gap that exists between the Government and public opinion. We need to do that because we are talking about human decency. We are talking about people who do not have a place to stand.

Do you think those people would want to be on the move if they had a choice? Do you think they would pack their bags and jump on a plane if they had a choice? Do you think they would try to abuse the compassion of a country because they want to? Of course not. If the world were perfect there would be no immigrants or refugees. However, this is the international reality and I am asking the Government to lead the march toward an international solution. I am asking it not to run from it and, more important, not to encourage a dismantling of the political will and courage to deal with it.

Therefore, in concluding my remarks because I want to hear the remarks of my friend, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), I will move two amendments. The first amendment, seconded by the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice (Mr. Grondin) is:

That the proposed motion to amend the Senate Amendment 3 to Clause 48.01(1)b of Bill C-55 be amended as follows:

"strike out lines 26 to 31 on page 14, and substitute the following:

ant's habitual residence,

"(i) that has been prescribed as a country that complies with Article 33 of the Convention either universally or with respect to persons of a specified class of persons of which the claimant is a member, and

(ii) those laws or practices provide that all claimants or claimants of a particular class of persons of which the claimant is a member would be admitted to that country, if removed from Canada, and would have the right to have the merits of their claims determined in that country.

The second, seconded by the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice is:

That the proposed motion to amend the Senate Amendment 11 to Clause 98.01(1)b of Bill C-55 be amended as follows:

"strike out lines 25 to 27, on page 55, and substitute the following:

"tion, the country's policies and practices with respect to Convention refugee claims and the country's record with respect to human rights, and in regard to an advisory list of safe countries as drafted and defined by the Convention Refugee Determination Division;"

I submit these amendments in the hope that the Government will give them due consideration.

● (1730)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kempling): The Chair will reserve decision on the acceptability of these amendments. I might note that the Member is not allowed to move two amendments at the same time. We will get back to the Hon. Member at a later date.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There has been agreement to grant the Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) an extra 10 minutes, therefore, a full 30 minutes. I ask you not to see the clock at the end of 20 minutes but rather to grant him a full 30 minutes for his remarks.