

Immigration Act, 1976

I see you are signalling that I have only two or three minutes left in debate, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be able to continue because there are other areas into which I would like to delve.

Those are the criteria by which this legislation must be measured. Those are the criteria this Minister ought to use to build refugee legislation that looks not only to the next year or two, years when the Minister may still be here in that capacity, but to the long term. He must measure his legislation in comparison to tradition.

After this Minister is long gone and after I am long gone—MPs and Ministers come and go, Canada always stays—this Minister will have to live with himself. He will have to live with his community. He will have to be able to account to his community for his actions and for the direction this policy is taking. I submit to him that it would be very difficult to look in the mirror or to his community for approval for this piece of legislation. He knows that and he is under pressure.

I respect the pressures that we are all under, but I also respect individuals. I respect Ministers who will stand up in Cabinet and in Parliament and be counted for the long term. I respect Ministers who move in directions in which they are proud to move and who lead Canadians to a progressive vision of things to come. All of us share in the commitment that is Canada. Every Canadian wishes to have a system that is expeditious and is fair to those who are seeking our assistance.

Every Canadian is compassionate. Every Canadian is humane. Very many Canadians know about the opportunities they have had to start anew in this country. My family knows it and the Minister's family knows it as well. In all justice and fairness, we cannot enter Canada and then say: "Now that we are here, let's lock the doors". The building of Canada does not stop here. Future generations will be made up of immigrants. Our birth rate is dwindling and our aged population is growing. Because of our small population, this country will once again be built by continuous and massive waves of immigrants and refugees.

Yes, there has been some abuse. Yes, the odd individual tries to circumvent the system and get into Canada the wrong way. The Government must stand up and say that the vast majority of immigrants and refugees, however, are individuals who do not cheat Canadians or the system and that they too, once they take their oaths of citizenship after three years, are as proud, as loyal and as hardworking as every Member of Parliament in this Chamber.

In conclusion, I hope that the Minister, at second reading or at committee stage, in partnership with witnesses, refugee groups and the churches, who will once again have to come to Ottawa to plead their case, will listen and will do two things. I ask the Minister to drop the pre-screening and to drop the safe third country concept. If he does that, he will make a bad Bill a liveable Bill into and he will have my support. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for—

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I forgot to add that I would like to move an amendment in conclusion.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the Hon. Member had ended his speech. Certainly our procedures allow ample opportunity at later stages for a member of his Party or for any other Member of the Chamber to move a motion.

I think the Hon. Member had clearly terminated his address. He may indeed rise on a point of order to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to have the floor once again for the purpose of introducing a motion, but if that were to be the case, then I think I would find myself predisposed to denying that unanimous consent at this point.

The Hon. Member is simply the second speaker on a very major piece of legislation. Nothing in our rules or procedures precludes the opportunity at a later stage for someone else to introduce a motion, but I think it would be inappropriate and might set a dangerous precedent for the future if someone who has given up the floor is allowed all of a sudden to reclaim it for the purpose of introducing a motion without the unanimous consent of the House.

• (1700)

Mr. Kaplan: May I rise on the same point of order?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no need to hear the Hon. Member on the same point of order. I had given the floor to the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), and I will allow him to resume.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your understanding. In that spirit I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976, and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof, be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence."

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I seek a little clarification. If this motion is found to be in order, what does it do to the length of time allowed for speeches? Are we now debating an amendment? Does the third Party in the House have the right under our Standing Orders to a 40-minute speech at a later date when we come back to the main motion? Or do we now proceed to 20 minute speeches on the basis of the amendment? Just what is the result?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair finds the motion in order. As far as the time allowed for speeches is concerned, it is the understanding of the Chair, and I will verify this, that the first three speakers get 40 minutes each without questions regardless of whether an amendment is moved by any of those speakers.

The Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) has the floor.