

Security Intelligence Service

months. I think this is unreasonable. It does not make sense, because although this is obviously a way to systematically obstruct a piece of legislation, it certainly does not help the House deal with this legislation in a sensible manner, and make sensible improvements. At this point, the Government had to act responsibly. We have a host of legislative measures on the *Order Paper* and we must also deal with Supply proceedings and the Government's requirement for borrowing certain sums of money which will be needed very shortly. We have all these measures which must be put before the House, and we cannot tolerate that at the preliminary stage of the debate on each Bill, Hon. Members try to cause undue delay and indulge in systematic obstruction.

Therefore, the procedure followed by the Member for La Prairie (Mr. Deniger) is entirely proper. Sir John A. MacDonald used it in the constitutional debate at the very beginning of Confederation. In fact, I referred to it when we used the same procedure in the debate on the Crow.

This procedure quite simply prevents the introduction of amendments on second reading—dilatatory amendments, according to the information given by the New Democratic Party—and makes it possible for every Member who chooses to continue to abuse the time of the House to speak for ten additional minutes before the Bill is referred to the committee. I hope that, under the circumstances, Hon. Members will have the decency of not abusing the time of the House and the reasonable procedure we have used. I hope that after hearing 25 Members before today, plus 18 more once I am through, Mr. Speaker, which adds up to some 45 speeches on second reading, as early as Monday we will be able to see the light at the end of the tunnel, so that this very important Bill to establish a Canadian Security Service will be considered in committee by Members on both sides of the House who will hear witnesses, examine every detail of the Bill and introduce amendments if it can be improved. We have already proved that we are reasonable and that we are prepared to accept amendments. We have done that and the door is still open. However, it would be ridiculous at this stage if Members were to prevent the Bill from moving forward and being improved, and that is what we are trying to avoid by using this procedure.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to have a constructive debate on this Bill on Canadian security. The best way to do that, in my opinion, would be to have the second reading vote at the end of the day Monday, so that the committee will be able to consider the Bill and leave the House free to study other measures which are required for Canada's economic and social development.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order, please. It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed with Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

• (1600)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—PUBLIC BILLS

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Shall all orders and items preceding No. 16 stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Stand.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING REFUGEE STATUS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina) moved that Bill C-219, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 (determination of refugee status), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill if passed will save a great deal of human anguish for people who are claiming refugee status and will save the administration of Canada, particularly in the Immigration Department, a great deal of expense and time. This Bill would alter the present system by which those who come to Canada and claim refugee status within Canada are examined in order to determine whether their claim to refugee status meets Canada's law. At present the system is very slow, as everyone will agree. Everybody concerned is very unhappy with the slowness. This Bill proposes a system which has been shown by experiment to be very effective in overcoming these problems.

The Bill is very simple. Section 45 of the Immigration Act would be amended by adding immediately after subsection 4 the following:

—before advising the Minister pursuant to subsection (4), the Refugee Status Advisory Committee shall, by notice in writing, afford the person who claims that he is a Convention refugee an opportunity to be heard and, at any such hearing, that person or his representative may adduce evidence, documentary or oral, in support of his claim.

That is all I am asking. It would not only benefit many thousands of people who must now wait in uncertainty and difficulty, but it would benefit the Immigration Department by removing one of the very serious hindrances to its present operation.

In brief, our refugee procedure is as follows for inland determination of refugee status. A person comes to a port of entry and declares that he is a refugee, or perhaps he has already entered the country on a visitor's visa or a student's visa. Because of changes in his country, at the expiration of his visa he makes a claim for refugee status. That is within the present law. After he makes that claim his case is then heard before an Immigration officer and a transcript is made of his evidence. The Refugee Status Advisory Committee examines