Oral Questions

LABOUR

Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. I appreciated her response on the grain transportation problem.

I stood in the House on February 7 last year with regard to a similar problem. The government passed legislation to put the workers back to work. Now we are dealing with a similar problem again.

What long term measures is the minister willing to employ to ensure that year after year western Canadian grain farmers do not have to go through similar problems?

[Translation]

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the concerns of the hon. member for Provencher because work stoppages are indeed, might I say, excessively frequent in British Columbia's harbours. I intend to have an industrial inquiry commission look into the various existing collective bargaining procedures with a view to making a very specific recommendation so that we can have—

[English]

Mr. Thompson: A review! Oh no, not again!

[Translation]

Mrs. Robillard: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I am unable to respond, with all the racket the hon. members opposite are making.

[English]

The Speaker: Once again I appeal to members to listen to the questions and answers. It is a matter of common courtesy.

• (1445)

TAXATION

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is confusion surrounding the Liberal position on the electronic transfer tax, otherwise known as the Tobin tax, which seeks to impede the flow of capital around the world.

Last week in Copenhagen the human resources minister said that it was a good idea. He repeated it again in the House on Monday. The finance minister denounced it and now it has been undenounced—

Mr. Young: Undenounced?

Mr. Abbott: Yes, undenounced by the foreign affairs minister.

What is the position? Does the government support the Tobin tax? Yes or no.

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important for the hon. member to remember

[Translation]

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can understand my hon. colleague's concerns about strikes in British Columbia ports. Today, however, we have a major crisis with grave economic consequences. The government will act as soon as it has the co-operation of the various parties in this House.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Yesterday, the UN Committee Against Torture ruled that Canada's treatment of Mr. Khan, a refugee claimant from Pakistan, violated the international convention against torture, to which Canada itself is a signatory.

Since the decision concludes that this individual would be in danger of being subjected to torture if Canada sent him back to his native country, does the Canadian government undertake not to deport Mr. Khan?

[English]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for the question. I am aware of the UN committee's decision.

We have asked the UN committee to reconsider its position on the basis that this individual also had a criminal conviction in Canada in 1993. No longer is this simply a case of protection for an individual. There is also the claim that Canada has every right to uphold the protection of the community and society.

[Translation]

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis–Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how does the minister explain the fact that the Immigration and Refugee Board apparently did not look into the grounds for Mr. Khan's request, as the UN committee's ruling indicates?

[English]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the UN said Canada's system and how it deals with and treats refugee claimants is among the best in the world. With all due respect to the UN, Canada's house is quite clean and quite orderly.

However, it is our right as a country that this decision be not binding on Canada. We have every right to uphold our laws and the protection of our citizens. That is exactly the point we are making to this committee in asking it, even though its decision is not binding, to reconsider the sovereign right of a country to protect its borders and citizens.