

*Government Orders*

in Parliament, let alone a vote to stop or amend any discriminatory aspects.

Fourth, by illusion or implication, it slanders refugee claimants, implying that there is a serious number of them who are fraudulent or criminally intending or even terrorist intending, whereas I believe there is either little or no evidence of terrorist activity. I know that when Bill C-55 was considered there was, according to the RCMP then, no evidence of danger to Canada from undocumented aliens. It also restricts the refugees' access to the refugee determination system and further restricts their right of appeal.

Fifth, the bill, which is over 113 pages long, is very complicated. It is being pushed at second reading before the parliamentary Library staff have had time to study and analyse it.

Sixth, because of these reasons this bill will intensify conflict and disunity and racial tension among Canadians.

The bill has some virtues. Some of them, as the minister has said, are on points that many of us have been asking to have amendment. First, I want to say that I agree with the minister that it is a good thing that the rate of immigration has been raised to 250,000 per year. I have supported any governmental initiatives that increased up to this point and I believe the proposal of the Canada Ethnocultural Council that immigration be roughly at the level of 1 per cent of the Canadian population is a very reasonable proposal. This government's policy roughly follows that. I have always supported that.

I also agree with the principle that he imposes no numerical limit on in-Canada landings, whether it be refugee landings in Canada or other landings for humanitarian cause, such as the alien spouse of a Canadian married in Canada. There is to be no limit by number of those.

I welcome also and I know the chairman of the Immigration and Refugee Board welcomes the provision of a means of discipline of board members. I do not believe that all the troubles that we have heard about were to be attributed simply to lack of discipline. I think

there were deeper troubles in that board, as I have said before in this House.

I am also quite content with extending the visitor's visa normally to six months. I wish, as my colleague from Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has mentioned, that it would be possible—I do not know why it is not possible—to enact a provision for bond. That is if a Canadian wants a relative to come over to a wedding, to a funeral or something like that, and offers a bond of so much money for performance by the visitor. I have been told by officials that the law will not make that bond enforceable. Yet such bonds are normally taken in a matter of bail of a prisoner or for that matter for the release of a person detained by the immigration department at the port of entry.

If bonds are usable in those cases, I do not understand why they are not usable in the case of visitors. I think every member of Parliament must have cases where we are quite sure that a visitor was bona fide but was refused a permit.

I also agree with the proposal to give permanent residents some sort of proof, a card to carry as permanent proof of residence, so they do not have to make special arrangements every time they leave Canada to make sure they will get back.

• (1730)

I welcome the abandoning of the credible basis part of the preliminary hearing in immigration and refugee board work. I do not welcome the handing over of other aspects of the board to the senior immigration officer at the port of entry, but I will come back to that later. To get rid of that very foolish legislation of five years ago on credible basis was really long overdue and I am glad that it will be done.

It will certainly be good news if the convention refugees, so determined in Canada, can be landed within six months, along with their spouses and children, but I wait to see whether that will happen. I have heard promises similar to that regarding spouses from other countries and certainly it has not in all cases been carried out. I do not have the complete list, but that is only a promise and there is nothing in the bill that I can see that gives the convention refugee the right to have that promise enforced. If the government says: "Well I am