

Immigration Act, 1976

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 134 and 143 could be made Orders for Returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Questions Nos. 134 and 143 be deemed to have been made Orders for Returns?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

DPW—AWARDING OF CONTRACTS TO METROPOLITAN TORONTO AREA

Question No. 134—**Mr. Stackhouse:**

For each of the years 1985 and 1986, did the Department of Public Works award contracts over \$10,000 to firms within metropolitan Toronto and, if so (a) how many contracts (b) what were the names and head office addresses of each firm?

Return tabled.

VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL POLLUTION LEGISLATION

Question No. 143—**Mr. Caccia:**

In (a) 1985 (b) 1986, were any charges laid as a result of the violation of federal pollution legislation and, if so (i) how many (ii) under which Statutory authorities and what was the number of separate charges under each (iii) how many led to successful prosecutions and, in each case, what was the penalty?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976**MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Bouchard that Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and the amendment of Mr. Marchi (p. 7338).

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mrs. Collins). I am sure that she, like the rest of the Members of Parliament in this Chamber, has been very busy answering the telephone and her mail over the past couple of weeks regarding the immigration policy, especially as it pertains to refugees.

I think the message we received, especially in my area of Essex—Kent, was that our constituents want the policy tightened up and tightened up reasonably fast. Of course that is why we are back in the Chamber today.

The Hon. Member will know that we are now debating an amendment at this time which calls for the policy not to be debated at the present time but to be debated six months hence. I am wondering how her constituents would react if we waited for six months.

Mrs. Collins: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that my colleague has brought that matter to my attention. As I am sure my colleagues are aware, we are actually debating the motion put forward by the Opposition that Bill C-55 should be hoisted for six months. My constituents in Capilano find that incredible, totally incredible. Most people do not follow the proceedings of this Chamber very carefully. In most cases I would have to mention to people that this had happened, that the Liberals in the first part of the debate immediately asked for a six-month hoist on this legislation, and that the NDP apparently supported it.

That is not what Canadians want. I think my colleagues across the House must be totally out of touch with public concerns on the issue. Canadians want action now. They want fairness, as I discussed in my speech earlier, but they want action and they want the legislation to be passed expeditiously. This is why I ask my colleagues in all Parties to work quickly to get this piece of legislation through all stages.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I should like to pose a question to the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mrs. Collins). As she probably knows, the United Nations Commission on Refugees has given an *aide-mémoire* to the Government suggesting that Bill C-55 contravenes the convention on refugees. Amnesty International, the Canadian Bar Association, and all refugee organizations and church organizations in Canada have said the same thing, that the pre-screening provisions and appeal provisions of Bill C-55 are in direct contravention with the international obligations we have signed. They are in direct contravention with the Charter of Rights. Those statements have been made by anybody who knows anything about the business itself. Those statements have been made publicly.

The Hon. Member will also know that members of our Party have said that if the Government was prepared to make amendments to those two key items in Bill C-55 it could gain immediate acceptance and quick passage.

The Hon. Member should take into account all the evidence and weight coming from the United Nations, Amnesty International, the Commons committee including a majority of