

The solution is there, as all Hon. Members know. There is the Plaut report which has been around since the winter of 1984-85, if the Government had had the political will to deal with it. In its recommendations the Plaut report takes into account Canada's international obligations. It emphasizes the importance of a speedy process. It also emphasizes the importance of remembering that in this game there has to be fairness.

I will now conclude my remarks. It was very popular to imprison Japanese Canadians at one time. We do not want to make a similar mistake with the type of legislation that the Government is proposing for speedy adoption at this time. That applies both to Bill C-55 as well as to Bill C-84.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member. I have given him an extra two minutes, but his time has now expired. The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy) on a question or comment.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I was in my office when I heard the hon. gentleman making his intervention. I hastened down to the Chamber to identify myself with every word that he has uttered.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McCurdy:** Mr. Speaker, my great-great-grandfather on my father's side was one of those who brought not shiploads but row-boats full of refugees from the United States. Among them were my maternal great-great-grandmother and grandfather. When I look at Bill C-84 it is perfectly clear that I would not be standing here before Hon. Members today if this Government had been in power at that time.

**Mr. Lewis:** That is nonsense!

**Mr. McCurdy:** It is also clear that in its haste to correct its public image the Government has hastened to identify itself with those who have not given very much thought to the issue of immigration or of refugees as they affect the country. They have deliberately attempted to confuse the two for no other reason than political opportunism.

I listened to the Hon. Member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore (Mr. Boyer). I was amazed at the intellectual contortions that he went through in order to justify the absolutely unjustifiable. How can the Government ignore everyone in the country who has been involved with the question of refugees? There has been report after report. A parliamentary committee has studied the matter. Does the Government do this for no other reason than political opportunism?

I stood in this House and congratulated my country with pride because it won the Nansen Medal. I am ashamed of what the Government is attempting to do. Canadians have legitimate concerns about the abuse of the refugee process. But that is an abuse, as the Hon. Member indicated, that could

have been corrected a long time ago without having premised its action on political opportunism and panic.

My question to the Hon. Member is very simple. Can he see any reasonable basis, apart from political opportunism and panic, which would justify, give any intellectual basis or any principled basis to what the Government will do by the introduction and passage of Bill C-55 and Bill C-84?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) can either answer tomorrow or take 60 seconds in which to answer now.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** I can't wait to hear it, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Berger:** If you can't wait, then stick around, Ray.

**Mr. Caccia:** I can understand why the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) feels compelled to leave the Chamber. Evidently, it is getting too hot in the kitchen for him.

There is no reasonable basis, no reasonable argument, that can be made for Bill C-55. That is the reason why, after questioning and after the three-hour debate, our immigration critic put forward his motion with respect to hoisting the Bill for six months. That represents our position. It represents a well thought out position, a position which the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) arrived at slowly and gradually in a reasoned and patient manner after having exhausted all the alternatives. At that time that seemed to be the only possible solution to a situation in which a majority Government would not listen to our pleas to make at least two changes. If I remember correctly, two changes would have permitted the passage of the Bill very speedily. But we were faced with a stone wall. That is the reality.

• (1800)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY—COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS—  
HEARING OF WITNESSES. (B) MINISTER'S POSITION

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today and address an issue which I had previously pointed out to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) concerning the effects of Bill C-22 on Canadians from coast to coast. At that time in February of 1987, I brought to the attention of the House the fact that there was a decision reached by members of the legislative committee reviewing Bill C-22, that it was my understanding and belief that the Minister had given a directive to those members of that particular committee in order to prohibit and to prevent the committee from examining