

*Immigration Act, 1976*

recognized by the Nansen Medal. Our spirit of generosity is recognized the world over as being of a very high order.

Who should that generosity go to? I suggest that we owe that spirit of generosity to those who do not have protection. None of us like the concept that someone who is in a camp in West Germany is a refugee claimant. Is a person better off in a West German camp than he or she would be on the Cambodian border, or than they would be in a camp in other countries of the world, or than the three million Afghans in Pakistan? Do Members wish to stand in the House and say that the people with no resources who are in refugee camps in Pakistan are less deserving than people who make their way to West Germany and are in that situation?

It is an inescapable fact that the people who need our protection most are to be found in those border situations and not in West Germany, Denmark, Sweden, or Great Britain. Surely we are part of an international community where we have some faith and some trust in other countries.

There has been no suggestion, except for some amendments proposed by some witnesses, that would have determined a safe third country simply to be a signatory to the Convention. That would include over 100 nations. I would quarrel with that type of amendment. We are talking about a determination by Cabinet that a country that goes on the list will, in practice, fulfil its obligation to *non-refoulement* of refugees in either a direct or an indirect manner, in other words, that it will provide the type of protection that we in Canada provide.

We are attempting to say to people around the world that, if you are in one of those countries and you fit the classification, you should not waste your money on bogus consultants, or board a leaky boat with people who may not have the proper credentials to captain those boats. Do not risk the North Atlantic in winter. There will be no advantage for you in arriving on Canadian shores. Presently you are in a protected situation, see it through.

This nation goes one step further. It says to all of those people in all of those countries that they have a right to approach a Canadian embassy and ask for resettlement in Canada. They will be given special consideration. If their economic needs are such that they have to learn the language and get settled, we do have a sponsorship program. We have an unlimited capacity in this country; the limitation is only put on by the generosity of Canadians. Sponsorships can come from social organizations to bring refugees to Canada from the refugee camps in Europe and in other places. But we tell them to take their place in line, argue their case in that situation that their needs are greater than someone else's.

By putting this provision in our law, essentially we are saying that we will protect the domestic resources to enable them to be used to deal with legitimate people in need of protection. This clause deals with the reality that indeed they have achieved prior protection. They are outside their country of origin and they are in a country whose system we value.

When this concept was originally introduced in the House, I wondered about the wisdom of Cabinet being the final arbitrator of the list. During the 55 hours of testimony I listened to many people, and I came to the conclusion that that was probably the only way it could be done.

We are part of an international community. It is our Government, Cabinet, and Ministers who speak for our nation as they talk to other nations. Members will see in the motions before us that at the heart of the redrafting of the safe third country concept is the stipulation that a person can only be returned to a country they came from that is on the list. If they came from France, they can return to France. If France does not wish to admit them, they can go forward in our system. Where is the tragedy in someone who was safe in France being returned to France? Surely the resources we save with speedy removal back to safe situations for a limited number of people are resources which we can take, use, and redirect to people who need our help. Why should we allow people who do not need our help to get it?

● (1730)

It is a bit like a situation where, because of a crisis, a community is cut off from food supplies and we have extras. If our next door neighbours have more than we have, should they get a share, or should that share go to those who need it, those who do not have it? That is all we are talking about in terms of the safe third country concept. If one already has protection in a very safe situation, I say: "Please stay there and do not come to Canada; we will give our resources to people who need our help".

**Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say something in support of Motion No. 18 that would strike out the section in Bill C-55 dealing with the safe third country concept, to which the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), as proposer of the motion, and the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) have spoken, of course on opposite sides of the question.

The Hon. Member for Calgary West has been endeavouring to make a reasonable argument for this as an acceptable measure and a humane measure. Of course he ignored the fact that this is only one provision of a Bill, which has been recognized by the vast majority of organizations concerned about refugees, designed to exclude from Canada, to keep from our shores—and that of course is in the literal sense—to keep out of our airports, and to keep from our ports of entry persons who could conceivably be kept from coming to Canada.

The concept of a safe third country is one of trying to force on other countries what the Canadian Government is not prepared to have Canada do. It is a matter of trying to force other countries to accept a burden, while at the same time, by its very actions, indicating an unwillingness in the case of the Canadian Government and suggesting an unwillingness on the