

*Oral Questions*

is obvious. But according to the Auditor General, the decision was not in accordance with departmental procedure. My question is quite simple. Does the Government intend to make decision according to the rules, yes or no?

● (1450)

[English]

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I thought the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion outlined the steps in a very clear and coherent manner. I have tried to follow that up today in the best manner possible. Yesterday he quoted the Alberta Regional Executive Director for the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion, and this goes back to November 26, 1986.

This is not a new story. It was released in December, 1986, when the annual report of the IRD Program was tabled in the House and there was some comment about it at that time. I am surprised that the Hon. Leader of—

**Mr. Broadbent:** We thought that it was consistent with the rules then.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Of course it was and it still is. That is the decision of DRIE officials. It was confirmed by the Regional Director in Edmonton and it was quoted yesterday.

\* \* \*

### IMMIGRATION

#### AMNESTY FOR REFUGEE CLAIMANTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The House has passed Bill C-84 and Bill C-55 which deal with immigration and an ever growing number of refugee claimants in Canada. Yet it is reported in today's newspaper that the Government has "every intention" of introducing an amnesty to clear the backlog of refugee claimants.

Will the Minister tell the House and the people of Canada if this report is true? If not, what is the Government's intention on this very important issue?

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, every time I have been asked about an amnesty for people claiming refugee status, I have always said no.

The reason is a good one. Although they wanted to come to Canada and they were assured that there would be an amnesty anyway, one, two, or three years after, I considered that to be a very bad signal.

On the other hand, I believe that it would just legitimize queue-jumpers. All those who come here and have to wait a while to be accepted are not to be treated unfairly by that kind of rule. I repeat today that there is absolutely no question of giving amnesty to anybody.

#### STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO CHAIRMAN—DESIGNATE OF REFUGEE BOARD

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. Could the Minister give us an explanation of why the newly designated Chairman of the Immigration and Refugee Board could have given out this erroneous information?

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, when I met with Mr. Fairweather it was very clear that he had the right to speak out on immigration. However, it is obvious that a Minister has the right to say what I said today, and I repeat that there is no amnesty for anybody.

\* \* \*

### ENERGY

#### COME-BY-CHANCE OIL REFINERY—IMPORTATION OF JET AIRCRAFT FUEL

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Already this year Air Canada has had to import a million barrels of refined jet fuel into Canada because it could not get it in Canada. Canadian Airlines International has had to import 200,000 barrels already this year because it could not get it in Canada.

This jet fuel could be refined by the Come-by-Chance refinery. It would create 300 jobs at an annual payroll of an additional \$9 million.

Why, when this jet fuel cannot be purchased in Canada and has to be imported, will the Hon. Minister not lift the sanctions or the restrictions on the Come-by-Chance refinery and allow it to supply this refined jet fuel?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, there are no restrictions on the Come-by-Chance oil refinery except such as the owners of that refinery agreed to by way of a contract.

The hon. gentlemen opposite are experts at tearing up contracts. They want to tear up the free trade agreement. They want to tear up this and they want to tear up that. Now the hon. gentleman is saying that this contract should be torn up.

It was entered into between Newfoundland Energy Limited and Petro-Canada, and the Newfoundland Government participated. They entered into a contractual agreement. In return they got \$30 million worth of assets for one dollar. If