sorry, we are too busy, you will have to wait a year", I believe he has no recourse. It is shaky.

I also believe, as my colleague from Notre–Dame–de–Grâce does, that much more debate is needed before this bill is accepted even in principle. I know that the government plans to force the vote on Monday. Our party will be voting against it because there is simply too much that is either unclear or outright wrong in the bill as it stands.

There was no broad consultation with the non–governmental organizations: the churches, the refugee support committees, the ethnocultural groups, many of whom are very active in this matter, and the ethnocultural council. There was very little consultation even with the experienced members of the bar or with individuals whose profession is to work with immigrants and with refugees.

That must be done in the next three months or so, but also with that there should be consideration of withdrawing the bill, as the government has done in some cases, in order to bring in an amended form after the public has had a chance to discuss it. I hope to return to that if there is time.

One question that some of us will want to examine in some detail is the one the minister raised of the UNHCR, United Nations High Commission for Refugees' statement of approval of the bill. It is well know that the UNHCR works within very close limits. It can operate in any country, such as Canada, only as a guest, and only with the goodwill of a government. It has no right to act against a government or in opposition to a government.

Furthermore it depends on voluntary financing. It is true that Canada is a generous donor to the cost of the UNHCR. It is equally true that the UNHCR in the past has always followed the practice of never biting the hand that feeds it. The fact that it has approved of this bill really just means that the UNHCR, as usual, publicly agrees with the Government of Canada. It is not a serious endorsation and whether anyone read the bill or not is open to question.

I want to begin with what I have been able to do in a hasty study and hasty consultation with some people with experience. I want to give a few examples. One would be an example of the anti–democratic taking of power from Parliament in the transitional provisions.

Section 107 of the bill on page 106 states:

> Subject to sections 108 to 116, every provision of the Immigration Act as enacted by this Act shall, on the coming into force of that provision, apply in respect of every application, proceeding or matter under that Act or the regulations made thereunder that is pending or in progress immediately before the coming into force of that provision.

This appears to people such as the newly claimed chairman of the immigration bar in Ontario to be retroactivity. This means that of the 300,000 or 400,000 immigrant applications that have been made or are in progress, perhaps some of them even completed, the fees have been paid, plans may have been made, some can be cancelled. They have acted according to the law and have been found acceptable according to the law but it can be cancelled by a decision of the cabinet or indirectly by a decision of the cabinet.

No Canadian citizen, no would–be immigrant even if he has paid his fee, no members of Parliament or Parliament itself will have any power to correct that sort of injustice. It is a very serious matter to introduce massive retroactivity into the proceedings of a government. It is generally considered to be quite un–Canadian.

Along with that section, on page 6 there is section 6(5) of the act. This one gives the cabinet wide powers to change the landing requirements for any country or any class of would–be immigrants. It reads:

> 6(5) Subject to subsection (8) but notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any regulation made under paragraph 114(1)(a), an immigrant and all dependants, if any, may be granted landing for reasons of public policy or compassionate or humanitarian considerations if the immigrant is a member of a class of immigrants prescribed by regulations made under paragraph 114(1)(e) and the immigrant meets the landing requirements prescribed under that paragraph.

In other words, as it was explained to us informally in dealing with eastern Europe, we might give certain countries a waiver releasing immigrant applicants from those countries from having to meet the normal requirements of independent immigrants to Canada.

We are told that it does not apply to family members and it does not apply to refugees but it would apply to those this government is most interested in, to the independent immigrants. There could be a rule set up for this group, a different rule set up for that group and a different rule set up for the other group with no control by Parliament and no real accountability to the public.