

before him should take an example of people who were previously refused. I think you call it—

[*Translation*]

In legal parlance, this means that the ruling would have to be based on the precedents.

I believe that Section 34 should be completely eliminated.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Before recognizing someone else, I simply want to say to the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais) that I was not showing any impatience, but that I simply wanted to indicate to him that he had only 30 seconds left and that his allotted time was nearly expired.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be able to speak briefly on Motion No. 29 which would delete the last few lines on page 15.

It is very important that we understand the process that is taking place here. We are attempting to take a bad Bill and perhaps make it less bad. It is a slow and painful process because Members on the government side are refusing to accept any positive change suggested at this report stage.

I was impressed when I heard the speech of the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais). In the last two years the Hon. Member has spent a great deal of time looking at this subject. As a result of having spent that time, he has reached certain convictions and ideas that he feels are absolutely essential to the process. Yet the Government absolutely refuses to pay attention to the types of things recommended by the Hon. Member and the committee which he chaired.

● (1610)

I know that the Hon. Member is not alone in the Conservative caucus and that there are other people who think as he does. I just wish that there were other Members who had the gumption to get up and speak as he does; then perhaps we would see some real change and movement on this particular Bill.

We are concerned with the fact that this clause allows the Government to say that a claimant who comes to Canada from another country shall be considered as coming to Canada from that country, whether or not the person was lawfully in that country.

This means that the Government can return somebody to a third country as being a safe third country, even if the person has no right to stay in that country. What a travesty that is for a refugee policy!

A few weeks ago I spoke with an American worker who works with refugees in that country. She said that in the area where she worked a great many families were involved in giving some refuge or some sanctuary to people from Central America who did not have legal standing in the United States. The United States is very restrictive in terms of the kinds of

### *Immigration Act, 1976*

people to whom it will give refugee status. If one comes from El Salvador, for example, one can forget it. She is working with a number of American families who are involved in providing sanctuary, yet changes in American law introduced in the last few months impose very severe penalties upon anybody who has someone living in his home or who gives work to someone who does not have legal status in the United States.

These people had a natural desire to come to Canada, and this refugee worker was helping some of them do so. Canada's refugee policy should be open to them, at least to give them a hearing. Many of them, not all of them, were genuine refugees. As all Hon. Members acknowledge, we need to eliminate the abuses and to speed up the process. We agree with that, but we must have an open system so that genuine refugees can come here and get a hearing.

With the law as we see it today, we are saying that we will return such people to countries like the United States even if they have absolutely no standing in the United States, even if they are not legally allowed to remain in the United States. However, we claim that by doing that we are complying with international covenants. That is a sham.

Canadians who are genuinely concerned about the refugee policy can only be ashamed that the Government is taking such action. On that basis, I simply appeal again to government Members to consider the example of the Hon. Member for La Prairie, to consider the rather silent voices of other Conservative Members who have very serious reservations about this legislation, and to support this amendment. At least let us try to make a bad Bill a little less bad.

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Madam Speaker, I should like to deal with two or three issues raised in the debate and then with the motions.

The Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) read from a handwritten note—I think that was the characterization of it—from the Department. Maybe it is time in this country that the attempt, for example, to take handwritten notes from one union member to another union member and characterize them as government policy was exposed by members of the Press Gallery. Surely, with 27,000 employees in a Department, the Minister cannot be held accountable for a handwritten note which goes from one employee to another. To bring it up in this Chamber in that fashion is a bit of sophistry, and I think it should be laid bare for what it is. It simply cannot go on.

When unions choose to join a particular Party and, internal to their functioning on the job, to write each other notes, the Government cannot and should not be held accountable by this Chamber or by the press of the country.

I come to the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais). In my intervention last week I indicated that I thought upon further examination that he might not want to