will put forward would have been accepted by everyone. When I say everyone, some 150 to 175 organizations are opposed to our legislation, Bill C-55, because it is an inhumane legislation, a legislation that should never have existed.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a telegram from an organization which I respect and which all of us in this House should respect—it came from Mr. Donald Anderson, Secretary General to the Canadian Council of Churches. That message, that telegram did not come from a nobody. He suggests, concerning Bill C-55:

[*English*]

> We appreciate government work to try to improve Bill C-55. Unfortunately our deep concerns remain. How can we know if a person claiming to be a refugee needs our help if we do not hear their problems? Each person claiming to be a refugee should have a right to have their individual circumstances assessed and their case decided on its merits before competent independent decision makers. To us, this is the intent of the Convention and Protocol.
>
> Immigration programs may legitimately choose who comes on humanitarian grounds and may set priorities on countries they may come from. We understand the attractiveness of this approach. Bill C-55 provides for exclusion of people not on the basis of their individual circumstances, but by a political cabinet decision that the country they transited before arriving in Canada is deemed to adhere to Clause 33 of the Convention, that is, it is deemed the transit country will not return the person in any manner whatsoever to a country where he or she may face persecution.
>
> This is a far shot from our obligation to give an individual who arrives in Canada a fair hearing of his or her claim to need our protection.
>
> Also, there is no meaningful appeal to any of the critical decisions made which can remove claimants from Canada in proposed inquiries or hearings.
>
> We cannot accept legislation which sets aside a claimant's right to just procedures in the name of administrative convenience. We urge you to reconsider, to abandon this Bill C-55 and to speedily replace it with one conforming with the principles of allowing every claimant a hearing on the merits and a meaningful appeal. There are alternative processes we can surely all support.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, thank you for signalling that I have little time left. I would have appreciated having 45 or 50 minutes. But when we see people, organizations like The Coalition for a Just Immigration and Refugee Policy state:

• (1740)

[*English*]

The coalition for a just immigration and Refugee Policy sees the approach to Bill C-55 as incorrect because it is not workable, it puts genuine refugees in danger and will not survive challenge in the courts.

[*Translation*]

We have already been told on four, five, six, seven, ten occasions that this famous Bill will be challenged in the courts. I can already foresee a backlog of some 25,000, 30,000 or 40,000 claimants seeking refugee status. I will refrain from trying to make political gains with this, Mr. Speaker, although I am very tempted to do so, but it will be very nice, come election time, to have some 50,000 people claiming refugee status—their brothers and uncles will love us.

To return to Motion No. 47—

[*English*]

People determined to be Convention refugees in Canada may nevertheless be denied landing on the grounds that they are medically inadmissible or because they have reasonable grounds to believe they will be unavailable or unwilling to support themselves.

[*Translation*]

To expedite matters, I should like everybody to vote on Motion No. 47.

[*English*]

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my intervention is going to be rather short. I think my colleagues have covered the arguments in support of this amendment which stands on its own. My contribution, as I look at the existing language used in reference to the new language we are being asked to consider today, is where it states that neither the applicant nor any member of the applicant's family is a person described in paragraphs 19(1)(a),(b), and so on. The definition of "member of the family" which the Government appears to find offensive in terms of determining who can or who cannot come into the country, is defined under Section 19 of the present Act. It refers to an individual with a disability. I want to read it because the existing language is extremely insulting, if not insensitive, to disabled people. It says: "Persons who are suffering from any disease, disorder, disability or other health impairment". That in itself flies in the face of everything that has been said about the nature of disabled Canadians since I came into this House.

There was an all-Party committee that still exists in the House, with the agreement and support of all Members on all sides of the House, and which has been in existence since 1980. That committee produced a report, and I could show you stacks of subsequent reports, which all argue that there must a change in the attitude of people in society towards those individuals who are disabled.

The key argument which we had been using to try to persuade policy makers is that people who are disabled are not ill. All disability is not related to health problems necessarily. A person with a physical disability should not be considered someone who, for some reason, has a disease, disorder or other health impairment. Very often that disability is not even related to a health problem. It is certainly not related to a disease or disorder very often. Many people are born with disabilities and they are not health related. More often than not an individual can quite properly function in the mainstream of Canadian society if we give them some assistance.

I would certainly urge the Government—and the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has clearly stated his commitment towards improving the lot of disabled individuals in Canadian society—to take a hard look at how it has defined disability under the existing Act which, of course, will be