

Government Orders

With regard to co-operation on amendments, particularly on the amendment that the hon. member mentioned—I am going to try to say this as clearly and as succinctly as possible because this is something that a number of members on the other side in both parties do not seem to understand—the reason is that we are on opposite sides. We have different beliefs and different ways of achieving our ends.

We are on the government side. We have a majority. Frequently we are going to disagree with the Bloc on a number of issues, particularly those issues that go to the heart of what it is to be Canadian. We disagree as well most vociferously with the third party on practically everything.

Consequently I am not quite certain what the members of the opposition expect here. That is the point. They are the opposition. We are not supposed to agree.

I am quite happy to think that both parties are serving Her Majesty in the best way possible by being a loyal opposition and disagreeing with what we say. If we agreed, I would be worried.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I know that the parliamentary secretary likes to talk about flying as does the minister. He certainly has alluded many times to the planes that fly and land and the ones that crash. I believe the parliamentary secretary is still flying and she has not come down to earth yet to learn what is happening. She needs to put her feet on firmer ground.

The parliamentary secretary attended various meetings and listened to all kinds of experts dealing with Bill C-44. Several flaws have been pointed out in the removal provisions by these experts.

These flaws are in the existing legislation as well as Bill C-44. It is not going to change anything.

Could the parliamentary secretary tell me if the government is going to keep confined those violent criminals until travel documents to remove them are obtained rather than releasing individuals into society. I have the name of one here. Mr. Gregory George Jordan has been charged with second degree murder. He is an Australian with a deportation order against him. He is walking around on day parole. What is the parliamentary secretary going to do about individuals like that? Is she going to keep them confined until removal orders are present to remove them?

• (1710)

Ms. Clancy: Madam Speaker, sometimes one feels as if one is a voice howling in the wilderness. The hon. member knows, or at least he should know after a year and some time in the House and

after a year and some time as the critic for immigration, that commenting on individual cases is neither proper nor appropriate. He knows I am not going to comment on a specific case.

What I am going to do is refer the hon. member yet again to the provisions of the bill that deal with the question of serious criminals, that deal with their removal. I remind the hon. member that a bill that is not yet passed can hardly be enforced. Let us get the bill passed so the kinds of criminals he is talking about can be dealt with expeditiously.

If we had the support of the third party on this bill, if they were so concerned with the whole question of criminality and the speedy removal of serious criminals, then perhaps they would support this bill instead of haranguing on issues that are not really on point.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Madam Speaker, in a sense it is a pleasure to rise in the House today to address Bill C-44, an act to amend the Immigration Act and the Citizenship Act. This bill is not all bad but it surely is not all good. If I had to summarize, it is just not good enough.

When the government first announced its intention to amend these two controversial pieces of legislation it was my hope to be able to offer support. However, since the bill is little more than smoke and mirrors I have to speak in opposition to it.

The bill offers very little of substance and provides only a false impression of security to the millions of Canadians who are concerned about our lax immigration process. It offers no significant changes, contrary to the words September 19, 1994 by the immigration minister. During his speech at second reading the minister said: "Enforcement is a priority of my department".

Yet in this bill we see no provision for extra enforcement officers. There are also no specific measures for strengthening the enforcement process. In fact, during his speech the minister admitted: "There has been slow enforcement" yet I repeat there are no provisions to increase enforcement.

He also said: "When it comes to enforcement of immigration issues we have to do a better job". I fully agree with the minister's statement and therefore have to ask why this bill has side stepped the issue of enforcement?

The minister also talked of the integrity of the immigration system saying: "If we do not deal swiftly and crisply with both the perception and the reality of abuses to our immigration and refugee system, the integrity of the entire system is in jeopardy". The minister was correct in his assessment, yet by offering up this innocuous legislation he will create a false sense of security that will do more harm than good to the integrity of the process he is worried about.