excellent recommendations. Now we see the recommendations and proposals of the standing committee virtually rejected.

The Member for Calgary West, rather than urging the Government to at least consider with some sympathy the recommendations of the standing committee, is saying that the House should reject these amendments which I believe try to amend the Bill to include some of those recommendations.

Let us consider some of the recommendations made by the committee in its report which was tabled in November, 1985, and was based on a study asked for by the then Minister of State for Immigration. This report contains a proposal for a swift, fair system of refugee status determination. The committee proposed that a refugee claimant be sent directly to the refugee board first, without a lot of immigration procedures. The board could decide on that status, being trained and authorized to do so, and the Immigration Department could take over from there and either admit the person on refugee grounds or, if there were no other humanitarian grounds, expel the person from the country. The Government would have been required to reply in four months.

The Government has never dealt with this report. Instead, it introduced this Bill last May. According to this legislation, a refugee claimant is first sent to an immigration inquiry to determine whether there is any reason not to remove him or her. The immigration adjudicator, a member of the refugee division, may only examine the eligibility and credibility of the claimant. This means that they do not judge the merits of his or her claim, only whether he or she could have been safe in another country through which they passed and should be removed to that country, or whether the country from which the claimant is fleeing is in fact one that does not produce refugees. On either of these grounds, they may prohibit him or her from going to the Refugee Division to state their whole claim.

We oppose this Bill and these provisions because it will prevent most claimants from having access to an otherwise good refugee determination system.

We also oppose the harsh restrictions on time to find a lawyer, except for ones paid for and provided by the Minister, and the severe restrictions on the right of appeal to court.

I have another reason for opposing this Bill. I am somewhat hesitant to say it publicly, but I think it needs to be said. We have a long record in this country which is documented so vividly in the book: "None Is Too Many", written by Irving Abella. That book demonstrated conclusively that, unfortunately, there were and are officials with a great deal of power in the Immigration Department who were and are prejudiced against certain types of people, such as non-whites.

• (1200)

We have a perfect example of that in this new committee which has been given some prominence because of the membership of former Justice Clyne of British Columbia. That committee was organized by a former senior official in the department and it is saying our immigration policy has to be changed so that we permit only people who are acceptable to those whose views are such that anyone to the left of Genghis Khan is a communist and therefore undesirable. They want this country to adopt the immigration policy it had for many years until, I suppose, the late 1950s or early 1960s. That policy was that the only people acceptable to this country as immigrants or refugees were white people.

It is time not only that we have a good law but that the Minister of State for Immigration (Mr. Weiner) exercise his authority and take steps to see that we get rid of those kinds of people in our Immigration Department. There is no place there for people with those kinds of views, and I am satisfied there are still too many of them.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the cumulative effect of Motions Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 30 with respect to the safe country concept. The Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) made reference to the fact that the Government made amendments to this legislation to try to better define the safe third country concept and then suggested we would be able to deport, as it were, individuals to countries which subscribe to Article 33 of the UN Convention.

For the benefit of my colleagues and for those who may be watching this debate, Article 33(1) says that "No contracting state shall expel or return a refugee in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where his life or freedom would be threatened on account of his race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion."

It is very curious, however, that the Government of Canada was not prepared to say that we would not deport individuals to countries who do not subscribe to the entire Convention. There are some 46 Articles in the Convention and the Government of Canada very conveniently sought to limit it to those countries who subscribe to Article 33. Article 32 talks about expulsion. Other Articles talk about the rights of individuals not to be returned indirectly or directly to a place of torture. Article 33 is quite limited because it does not suggest that a safe country, on paper at least, may not be safe by the end of an individual's journey.

I think we can best look at the concern involved by looking at the country to the south of us. Some time ago I received a letter from an individual connected with the Anglican Church and its efforts to help refugees. I was told a story which shows the faults of the safe third country concept advocated by the Conservative Government. Essentially it was a story of a mother with three children whose husband was murdered in El Salvador because he was involved in the labour movement there. After he was murdered the mother and three children were told by officials that if they did not leave El Salvador they would face the same fate. The mother wasted very little time and escaped. Many of her fellow villagers who unfortunately did not escape faced that very same fate.