

*Immigration Act*

would be denied entry under the present provisions of the act. I find it very strange that while we provide a class of prohibited persons who cannot enter Canada, we reward those whom we find in our midst who have circumvented the very provisions of the Immigration Act designed to keep them out. The second category includes those persons who have been convicted of a criminal offence in Canada. Criminals are not among those who are entitled to entry. Surely they must be included among those who are available for immediate deportation.

● (1610)

Next are those persons who have entered Canada as visitors and continue to remain here after their visitor status has expired. In this case, immigration files are filled with cases of aliens who, in defiance of our law, have entered Canada and continue to remain here. It is general public knowledge that persons coming to Canada under an alleged visitor category intend not to be a visitor at all but come simply to gain entry to Canada and thereafter remain, contrary to the provisions of the Immigration Act.

Another category includes those persons who come to Canada with forged or fraudulent documents of entry to Canada. I cannot imagine not taking the swiftest action with respect to people who have entered Canada in that fashion. It is well known that the member of the Baader-Meinhof gang, to which I referred, did in fact obtain documents of that kind at our Paris embassy.

We welcome to Canada those people who are prepared to contribute to the welfare of Canada. I submit to you that we do not welcome those who come to Canada to draw on the welfare of Canada. There is an obligation imposed on parents legally in Canada to support their dependants. People who come to Canada and fail to accept that general principle of Canadian law while not citizens of our country ought not to enjoy the other benefits of remaining within the boundaries of our nation.

A practice has regrettably grown up for multiple adjudications by officials of the department. These numerous adjudications of cases have the effect of delaying a final determination and add immeasurably to the cost of the taxpayers of Canada of administering the Immigration Act.

Clause 3 amending Section 35 endeavours to eliminate several adjudications on the same matter after a deportation order has been issued. Further adjudications have been used for the purpose of stalling or unreasonably delaying the process intended to be established by the act, and the passage of this bill with Clause 3 intact would have the effect of eliminating that general abuse. There is no intention to destroy the basic rights of appeal which continue to exist and in respect of which there is no proposed amendment.

The third substantive amendment would eliminate a practice which has grown and expanded and is now so widespread that it has been given a name. It is called the "Buffalo shuffle." Ministerial permits have been issued to permit otherwise unauthorized persons to enter Canada so long as they follow the practice in complying with the current provisions of

Section 37 of departing from Canada and immediately re-entering our country.

One of the recent best known beneficiaries of the "Buffalo shuffle" was a certain gentleman named Calamusa. His name has been mentioned in the House. We will recall that Mr. Calamusa was first deported from Canada in 1972 because of his criminal record in his own country. After re-entering Canada illegally in 1976, he was incarcerated for three months for possession of counterfeit money. He has struck out on three counts with respect to whether or not he should remain in Canada. Despite all of that, armed with a minister's permits, Mr. Calamusa was chauffeur-driven by officials of the Department of Employment and Immigration to the American border in July, 1980, permitted to re-enter Canada, and was then chauffeur-driven back to Winnipeg, all with the consent and under the instruction of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy).

Clause 4 amending Subsections 37(1) and 37(2) would end that practice. Persons outside Canada who had been deported would no longer be entitled to a minister's permit. We will recall that Mr. Calamusa was a gentleman who had in fact been deported from Canada. He is not the most outlandish example of people who have been deported and who have gained re-entry into Canada and stay here, some of whom are ultimately incarcerated for the commission of some heinous offence.

The second amendment contained in Clause 4 would relate to circumstances where persons were in Canada, and in those cases they would be entitled to a minister's permit only under very restricted circumstances. Those circumstances are set forth under Paragraph 27(2)(b). They are not the kind of offences one would find particularly reprehensible. If I might just refer to them, they include those who have engaged in continuous employment in Canada, contrary to the rules, and with respect to Paragraph (i) have not left Canada on or before a date specified in their departure.

Clause 5 provides for the execution of deportation orders within fixed periods of time changing the current provisions of the act which permit execution of deportation orders to refer specifically to the words of the act: "As soon as reasonably practicable."

This clause fixed two time periods. One as it relates to landed immigrants who were inadmissible at the time they came to Canada and should never have entered; criminals convicted of criminal offences in Canada or those who had entered using forged or fraudulent entry documents. In this case, these people would be subject to deportation within a period of five days. All others who were inadmissible under the present provisions of the act, who had engaged in subversive activities, who were convicted of criminal offences, were alleged visitors, but who, in fact, remained in Canada beyond the time permitted, would be deported within a period of 48 hours.

I am reminded of Mr. McCarthy's case, Mr. Speaker. You may recall that he was apprehended in Vancouver on a minor jaywalking offence. At the cost to the taxpayers of Canada,