

Adjournment Debate

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Shall the recorded division be deferred?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): As the Chair cannot presume the outcome of the deferred division on Motion No. 13, the question, of course, cannot be put at this time on Motion No. 14.

The Chair has examined a suggestion made earlier by the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) with regard to Motion No. 65 standing in his name on the Notice Paper. Since the Hon. Member wishes not to proceed any further with Motion No. 65, it will, therefore, be dropped. Therefore, Motion No. 67 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) will be debated and voted on separately.

The next grouping of motions for debate will be Motions Nos. 27, 29 and 34.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway)—Employment—Job creation in Toronto area; the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson)—Canadian Security Intelligence Service—Indian Cabinet Minister—Knowledge of presence in Canada. Request for parliamentary inquiry; the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier)—Official languages—Right to use official language of one's choice. Right to use official language everywhere in Canada—Opportunity to put pressure on Albertans.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): We will now proceed with the next grouping.

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina) moved:

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14 by striking out lines 12 to 17 at page 15.

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14 by striking out lines 36 to 50 at page 15.

[Translation]

Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie) moved:

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14 by striking out lines 15 to 19 at page 16.

[English]

Mr. Heap: Madam Speaker, we have three motions here, Motions Nos. 27, 29 and 34, which have been grouped by the Speaker for debate. I wish to mention briefly what they are and then comment. In Motion No. 27 we call for deleting paragraphs on page 15 which were introduced by the Government during the last couple of days of the committee meeting. The first paragraph is actually a little ambiguous. It is the second two paragraphs I am moving to delete.

The first paragraph says that a claimant who is in the country solely for the purpose of joining a connecting flight to Canada shall not be considered as coming to Canada from that country. There is no logical objection to that clause but there is a hook in it, as I found after having more time to consider it. However, I shall not be opposing that clause because, taken in isolation, it seems useful and fair. The trouble is that we will not be able to take it in isolation, not with what is going on at Pearson Airport and the immigration proceedings there. It is subparagraph (b) that I propose to delete. It states:

(b) a claimant who comes to Canada from a country shall be considered as coming to Canada from that country whether or not the person was lawfully in that country.

• (1550)

Paragraph (4) states:

(4) For the purposes of paragraph (1)(b), where a person who has come to Canada in a vehicle seeks to come into Canada without a valid and subsisting passport or travel document issued to that person and claims to be a Convention refugee, the burden of proving that the person has not come to Canada from the country in which the vehicle last embarked passengers rests on that person.

What I am concerned about in the paragraphs that I have read is a person who has escaped from El Salvador from the death squads and the bombing of civilian villages by the air force that the American Government supplies, pays, arms and directs, and that person has escaped into the United States where it is possible, of course, sometimes to hide among the