

Immigration Act, 1976

In addition to that, the screening process about which the Member is concerned will prevent repetitive claims. It will ensure that claims from persons who have had an opportunity to obtain the protection of the convention in other countries are not being brought up in this forum yet again.

Although the Hon. Member asked the question, I see that he is now busily engaged in discourse. It may be that on this matter, unlike most others, the Liberals already know what they think and are not interested in listening.

The adjudicator and the refugee division member may also reject a claim where both determine that there is no credible basis for it. This, by any standard, is a relatively low standard. Any arguable claim will be afforded a further hearing before the refugee division.

Those are but a few of the reasons which the Hon. Member, in his quest for further intellectual understanding of this matter, may want to consider further. These have been thought about and are being responded to in the two Bills which are before Parliament and deserve passage now rather than the six-month hoist proposed by the Hon. Member's Party.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the House will know, and I want everyone to know, that we are presently debating an amendment moved by the Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) which reads as follows:

Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976, and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof, be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

I have a very short, precise question for my colleague. How do the people of his riding react to the Liberal motion, supported by the NDP, not even to discuss this Bill until 1988? How do the people of Etobicoke—Lakeshore react to that firm position of the Liberal and New Democratic Parties not even to discuss this Bill until 1988?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, this question has not completely caught me by surprise because I have heard the point raised earlier in debate today. In Etobicoke—Lakeshore people are generally very concerned about this and want to see some action. They are not concerned about parliamentary niceties.

I have stressed two things concerning Parliament. I say that the Opposition has filibustered, that the Hon. Members for York West (Mr. Marchi) and Spadina (Mr. Heap) have been filibustering. I assist my constituents by providing the phone numbers of those two Toronto Members so they can phone directly and register their feelings there.

• (1730)

Furthermore, I believe that many of these people in my riding and elsewhere are those who wanted very much to see Parliament address the capital punishment issue. When I am asked why, in view of our majority in Parliament, we do not use closure even if the Liberals are so out of touch that they introduce a six-month hoist and the NDP blindly support that,

I say that there is only so much that can go through Parliament at one time, even with closure.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will recognize the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) for a short question or comment.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, when I hear the definition of a filibuster as three hours of debate, I thank you especially for the chance to reply. First, the Bill was introduced on May 3 at first reading and, on June 18, there were three hours of debate. The amendment was moved on June 18.

The Sikhs came in mid-July and we are now in August. What is the Hon. Member talking about? He is trying to be what I would call dishonest with the Canadian public. I suggest that he stick to the facts. The motion was made in good faith on June 18, one month before the Sikhs came to this country. Those Members are exaggerating beyond all belief and scaremongering as they usually do. They are telling us that we should believe what they say. There is no way we can do that.

The Hon. Member did make a positive comment about my Leader's speech when he said that we should ask the United Nations or Commonwealth group to sit down and talk about the international problem of refugee movement across this great planet of ours.

If the Hon. Member supports that view, will he tell us how soon he could convince his Leader, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), to convene that Commonwealth conference and get on with this very acute world problem of migrants and to discuss with our friends how we will come to an agreeable solution to settle the issue?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, in the brief bi-partisan moment of this debate, I would suggest to the Hon. Member that I believe the earliest opportunity would be this fall in Vancouver when the Commonwealth leaders gather there.

I never repeat what goes on in the Conservative caucus meetings because we are not supposed to do so. I always tell my wife that I cannot tell her what goes on in caucus, but she says she does not have to ask because she can read about it the next day in the newspaper. However, without telling the Hon. Member what was said by our Leader in caucus, I can tell him that there is enough on the public record that must clearly make it evident to any discerning Canadian that, above all, the attribute that singles out the Prime Minister is a sense of tolerance and concern for the wellbeing of people. I make that not as a partisan comment but as a very sincere observation of the man.

I believe the suggestion raised on the floor of the House late this afternoon is one that he would find most attractive, most commending and compelling. If he does not read about that suggestion in *Hansard*, I will personally bring it to his attention as an item that might well be on the agenda. It is another issue on which our country is uniquely situated to play