

*Order Paper Questions*

refugees which if adopted would fairly and effectively solve problems of backlogs and unsubstantiated claims.

They therefore call upon Parliament to withdraw C-55 and substitute legislation embodying the principles of fair and quick oral hearings before a refugee board independent of the Immigration Commission, universal access to such hearings for every applicant in Canada, and the right of appeal on the basis of fact.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition concerning Bill C-55.

The petitioners state that a standing committee of Parliament proposed a new procedure for refugees which if adopted would fairly and effectively solve problems of backlogs and unsubstantiated claims.

Therefore, the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to ensure that the Government and Parliament withdraw Bill C-55 and substitute legislation embodying the principles of fair and quick oral hearings of claims of refugee status before a refugee board independent of the Immigration Commission, universal access to such hearings for every applicant in Canada, and the right to appeal on the basis of fact.

**Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and duty to present a petition from a number of residents of the Cities of Toronto, Montreal and other municipalities in Ontario and Quebec. They object to Bill C-55. They point out that the concept of a safe third country has no foundation in law and no definition and therefore subjects the refugee process to undue political and diplomatic pressures. They also point out that a better alternative has been provided by the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration which has the support of churches, the labour movement, the Bar Association and many other groups.

Therefore they request Parliament to withdraw Bill C-55 and substitute legislation embodying the principles of fair and quick oral hearings of claims of refugee claimants before a refugee board independent of the Immigration Commission, universal access to such hearings for every applicant in Canada, and the right to appeal on the basis of fact. In duty-bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[*English*]

**IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976****MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Government has kept its word and called the Bill we have on the Order Paper. I do not see either Minister to discuss the Bill. We have a series of amendments which are at this time usually the object of debate. I have one sheet of paper given to me by the Clerk concerning some amendments. I just wondered if prior to getting into the debate we could have some direction as to who is speaking for the Government in this debate and when we can expect to start debate on the amendments. The first amendment will be that of the Minister himself, Amendment No. 1.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the House that the debate will be led off by the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Friesen). We are ready to go and I am sure things can proceed after your preliminary ruling.

**Mr. Fennell:** Got you, J.R.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I have to apologize. I guess it was a Pavlovian reaction of some kind. I expected the Parliamentary Secretary to be in his place, which is on my extreme left. Today he is right in front of me. I understand there has been a shuffle and the Whip has brought some of his friends to the centre of things. I apologize.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Speaker:** This is also a problem for the Chair.

[*English*]

There are 23 motions on the Notice Paper in amendment to Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976, and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof. I have had an opportunity to review some of the motions and propose that consideration be given as follows:

Motions Nos. 1, 4, 7, 11 and 18 standing in the name of the Minister will be grouped for debate and a vote on Motion No. 1 will be applied to Motions Nos. 4, 7, 11 and 18.

Motions Nos. 2 and 3 seek to delete Clause 2. Since the motion of the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) was received first, it will be selected for a separate vote and debate. Motion No. 3 will not be selected.

Motions Nos. 5, 9 and 20 will be selected for separate votes and debates.