

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate my hon. friend's question. To answer, I should go back one step.

Obviously, if the people my hon. friend referred to came with all their documents in order, they would not go into the detention home. Immigrants come with documents in order. My hon. friend suggests that people without documents come in here *carte blanche* and if we cannot decide the case in seven days they should be walking the streets. Canadians do not want that. If a bona fide legitimate immigrant comes with the necessary documentation and presents that documentation, there will be no difficulties.

**An hon. member:** That is not the case.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Madam Speaker, I have a couple of very serious questions to ask the minister concerning the difference between normal procedures where a person is going to be deprived of certain rights because we can document that the individual has been involved in certain activities.

This bill starts by saying that if a person is a member of an organization that is deemed to be a criminal organization, a terrorist organization or a subversive organization or associates with them the person can be removed without any indication that the person himself is involved in any of those activities or had any intention to be involved.

We have organizations in this country which have been deemed as having some kind of negative connotation, for example, Palestinian and Jewish organizations and organizations from the Innu Canadian community.

My understanding is CSIS will determine that a certain organization is involved in terrorist activity. The public will never be told. An individual will never be told. That individual becomes involved in an activity someone has deemed that organization is involved in. By being associated with that organization which the individual knows nothing about or involved in very open community affairs be they philanthropic, religious or otherwise of which the community is very much aware, that individual is liable to removal from Canada simply based on that association. Not only can they be removed because they associate with an organization nobody has publicly named, but they did so in an *ex parte* court hearing that neither they nor their lawyer had access to.

• (1610)

I am wondering if in the fervour of making sure legitimately, as I think all Canadians want, people who are involved personally and individually in activities that are criminal, terrorist, or subversive are removed, people, particularly in ethnic communities will be frightened to be involved in any community activity in case CSIS has deemed that organization is subversive.

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, I had a chance to discuss the matter briefly with the minister of immigration. He advises me we have simply added the clauses in the Geneva convention pertinent to this particular area to the provisions in our present legislation.

This is not always a nice business. People we are refusing admission to do not play by the same rules as you and I. They often do not have any rules, or they have rules you and I find abhorrent.

**Mr. Karpoff:** So we are going to adopt the rule.

**Mr. Lewis:** Now wait a minute. My hon. friend dismisses the fact there has to be a full court hearing where the individual in question is represented by counsel, and the lawyers for both sides have an opportunity to put their case before a Federal Court judge. There is also an appeal process. There is that protection plus the CSIS review, if my hon. friend wants to address it too. All of these provisions are in there to protect the legitimate immigrant who wants to get into this country.

We are simply saying these folks do not play by the same rules as you and I, which Canadians respect and want to protect the public. We are saying we have enough people who respect the rules who want to come to this country. We are going to exclude those who do not respect the rules.

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Madam Speaker, this government once again is introducing in Bill C-86, an act to amend the Immigration Act. It is a very controversial piece of legislation and I think very unjust in many respects. The government is already ramming it through second reading at the end of a session when there is not sufficient time to either debate it in full or have adequate consultation. Already groups, including immigration lawyers, churches, refugee support groups, the Canadian Labour Congress, the Cana-