

to the refugee determination system. A number of years ago Canada signed the UN Convention on Refugees. We undertook certain obligations. We have an obligation not to send people back to countries where they have reasonable grounds to fear persecution. We are not to do that directly or indirectly. Because the Government is not prepared to look at other measures to do what it should be doing, stopping bogus refugee claimants, it is trying to stop certain people from being able to make refugee claims and send them back to a so-called safe third country. The argument is that genuine refugees are not being sent back to a place where they will be tortured or murdered. The Government is doing indirectly what it will not do directly, and that is not acceptable.

**Mr. Friesen:** You are totally wrong.

**Ms. McDonald:** My colleague from Spadina gave an example of a refugee turned back from Denmark to Turkey and then from Turkey to Iran. Denmark would not have sent the refugee directly back to Iran, but it did indirectly. Closer to home we have plenty of examples. Canada will not send refugee claimants back to El Salvador or Guatemala, but will send them back to the U.S. and the U.S. is sending refugee claimants back to those two countries. We know that some people being returned are tortured and killed. It is inexcusable for the Government to hide behind this indirect procedure.

We have had some people say "remain" may not be the right word. What does that mean? How long do we mean? If the Government has a better word, let us hear it. This is absolutely crucial. We are serious about this amendment. If the Government agrees on the principle but just quibbles with the word, let us have a better word. We are certainly willing to listen. What I fear is that it is not just a quibble about the word, it is a quibble about the real intent of having proper protection for refugees. This strawman of someone being born in the Soviet Union and coming via the United States to Canada is a preposterous example. The U.S. would not return such a person to the Soviet Union, but it does return people to Latin American countries which are run by dictatorships and which are torturing and killing civilians.

Obviously this Bill was designed with geography in mind. Latin American refugee claimants are very likely to come through another country, namely the U.S. Just look at the map. They are not very likely to be coming directly. Yet their needs are just as great. They are just as genuine refugees because they come from another country as they would be if they came directly.

We should not be doing indirectly what in conscience we could not do directly. That is why this amendment is absolutely crucial and if the Government has any intention of living up to its word not to send back refugees to countries where they will be liable to torture and murder, then it ought to accept this amendment as well.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I want to adopt the very reasonable words and logical argument

*Immigration Act, 1976*

used by the Hon. Member who just spoke. I found the comments of the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) to be rather picky. Quite frankly, I thought it was rather hypocritical to say that this amendment would create another loophole which would turn Canadians against refugees. It is the Government that tried to ride this wave of hysteria, which came over this country after the East Indian boat people landed in the Maritimes, to a higher standing in the Gallup poll. It never got anywhere. It was shameful. Thankfully, Canadians have not rewarded them for it.

Part of the Government's reaction to this clause is indicative of the way it has approached this Bill. It is not a fair Bill and it has been approached with hysteria and panic. That is reflected in the Bill to the point where a nun even appeared on television and suggested that through this Draconian Bill she might have to go to jail if she continued to help South American refugees. That is the end of the road this Government is on. The Canadian people will subsequently reward government Members in the election for that direction.

It is preposterous to make these picky arguments about whether a person remains for 10 minutes or 10 generations. "Remain" means stay. That is pretty obvious.

As to the Hon. Member's example of the Green Card, that reminded me of the song "Back in the U.S.S.R.". What did that mean? I think that was a strange example. The reality is what is happening with the Central American refugees. They are the ones who will be hurt and may die as a result of unamended clauses like this. In order to get rid of bogus refugees the Government could have adopted the system suggested by the Commons committee.

• (1710)

This clause should be adopted. The Government is being picky in not doing so. The Government's example is bad. This is a good amendment and the remarks of the Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) were right on. Let us get on with it and adopt this small but very important amendment.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.