

*Immigration Act, 1976*

queues being formed under the legislation brought forward by the Conservative Government since it came to office. There is the queue for the rich. If one has \$250,000, one can apply through various operations in Vancouver, Toronto or Montreal and simply come in as a business landed immigrant.

The other queue, as the Hon. Member pointed out, is somewhat different. The fact is that with the passage of Bill C-84, should it happen today or in a few days, the situation will not in fact change enormously other than the situation for the refugees themselves. What they will find after this Bill is passed is that their condition will be worse. They can be held for up to 28 days without counsel, without any kind of adjudication hearing, no question about their documents or where they come from or anything else.

I would like to read one short paragraph from an evaluation done recently by the Library of Parliament on the 174 East Indian refugees. It reads:

Events in Nova Scotia with the East Indians may well illustrate the importance of having a detention review at an early stage. Initially, a very high percentage of the arrivals were claimed by immigration officials to be security risks. Yet ultimately not one was detained beyond two detention reviews by the adjudicators, officials who have been sometimes criticized for favouring the Immigration Department. An adjudicator was quoted in the press as saying that there was insufficient evidence to justify the continued detention of the six individuals detained beyond the initial review. This episode illustrates the importance of prompt and regular review of all detention cases.

In fact, quite the opposite is going to occur in terms of this legislation. The refugees will be held even longer. There are Canadians who thought for one brief moment that perhaps the period within which refugees would come and stay in Canada would be shortened to perhaps a couple of months, from what has grown to be three, four, five, eight, or ten years. Many Canadians have objected, and in many cases quite properly so, to that process which has dragged out for decades, certainly for years. But the Government completely fails to address that.

In terms of the history of the ship issue, which is directly related of course to the 174 refugees, a situation which supposedly stimulated this legislation, I do not think any British Columbian can forget the turning back of the *Komagata Maru* from Vancouver in 1914 when a boatload of 376 Sikhs were expelled from Canadian waters, 26 of whom went to their deaths. I think many Hon. Members, including the Hon. Member who spoke earlier from Montreal, remembers the boatload of 907 Jewish refugees on the *St. Louis* who were refused entry in June, 1939 and were all returned to the Nazi gas chambers. Why would a government want to bring in a clause in a Bill in relation to turning back vessels where a Coast Guard official or someone else might or might not even go on board, but the vessel is simply turned back without to any of the refugee claimants, being talked to, without ever any of their documents, being seen, or without any information about them? How can Canadians forget the *St. Louis* and the *Komagata Maru*? In terms of solving anything, again, it simply creates a more horrific problem.

I think the Government is trying to sell Canadians a real bill of goods, first, the emergency for which this House is still

sitting today, a month after the recall, with no attempt by government Members to participate seriously in the debate, or even to turn up for the votes. Only 84 government Members even bothered to turn up on the first vote. This is a fine emergency. Where were the other 110 Members?

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, I know the House and all Canadians, especially those in the Atlantic Provinces, have been amazed at the new policy of the New Democratic Party. I wonder if the Hon. Member would elaborate on his comment of September 1, 1987, wherein he indicated that some of the *bona fide* refugees that came from Central and South America, sister countries, "are in fact closer to my constituency and my Province of British Columbia, if you think particularly of Central America, than it is Nova Scotia or other parts of our country".

**Mr. Fulton:** Madam Speaker, I can give the Hon. Member a very simple geography lesson. The cost of travel from Vancouver to Mexico, or to Guatemala or Nicaragua, is considerably cheaper. I would encourage the Hon. Member at some point to fly to the Queen Charlotte Islands or to Whitehorse and to come into my constituency. He would find out that in fact from some parts of my constituency, taking the Polar route, it would be easier for me to sit in the Japanese Diet in Tokyo than it would be to sit in Ottawa, in terms of geography.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, I would like to point out to the House that Parliament was called back as a result of a growing concern in the country about the abuse of Canada's traditional hospitality to refugees, and that there was great concern about a illegal immigrants who were jumping the queue. There has been ample debate of Bill C-84 at second reading and in committee. We have endeavoured to move the debate along. However, unfortunately, we have not been able to move the debate on third reading to a close.

Therefore, I wish to indicate that since an agreement could not be reached, under the provisions of Standing Order 115 and Standing order 116 with respect to an allocation of time to the third reading of Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976, and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, under the provisions of Standing Order 117, I give notice of my intention to move a time allocation motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allocating a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage of the Bill.

• (1740)

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Deputy Government House Leader read out a motion—

**Mr. Lewis:** A notice of motion.