

Immigration Act, 1976

of Motion No. 53. It is an important motion related to safe third country. In committee we tried wording of one kind and another to make it very clear under statute law that people who came from a country of prior protection could be returned to the country of prior protection and nowhere else. Motion No. 53 is essential. It is the chosen wording that will accomplish that task. When people come from prior a country of protection, they can be returned to the country of prior protection and nowhere else. That is a very important principle. The wording of Motion No. 53 gives effect to it, and it is a very necessary part of the Bill.

In terms of Motion No. 37 put forward by the Hon. Member for Spadina, I do not think there is any disagreement in the House that, in the case of people denied entry to determination on the basis of security and criminality, it would be a wise idea for us to inform the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. It goes on today and it is not part of statute law. I suggest it will go on tomorrow and it need not be part of statute law. Indeed, there may be advantages for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to have informal information about a situation rather than formal information. Therefore, I think handling that matter administratively is preferable to trying to handle it statutorily.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment proposed by the colleague, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). I do that because it makes such eminent sense to me. The intention of the amendment as proposed is to mitigate a departure from the principle of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees which we believe is contained in Bill C-55. Section 48.01(1)(e) starting at the bottom of page 14, excludes certain classes of persons from access to the refugee status determination procedure, persons who may engage in spying, subversion or violence and war criminals or persons convicted in Canada of a very serious crime.

The UNHCR does not ask us to accept such persons for landing, but does ask us to determine whether they are refugees and, in that case, act in the light of that recognition. One practical application is to allow time to inquire, with their help, whether another country may accept and protect a person which Canada does not wish to keep. This amendment would not delete or reverse the clause in the Bill, but it would perhaps prevent a real refugee from being returned to the country that was persecuting him or her. It may cost something for detaining that person, but in only a few cases. I think this makes sense.

I want to take the opportunity to say something about some remarks I made earlier today, to which the Parliamentary Secretary took exception and for which he criticized me for, as he said, dealing with individuals.

Let me make clear first of all that in my dealings with representatives of the Department of Immigration here in Ottawa and in Winnipeg, I have met with nothing but co-operation, help and fairness. When it has turned down a case I

have been asked to take up with the Department, the explanations given to me have been reasonable. The officials have pointed out that the law or the regulations did not permit the request, and explained why. I have no complaints. The fact is the Department is made up of human beings with all sorts of points of view. There have been and are people in the Department who have prejudices against certain individuals or certain groups because of their race or religion.

• (1700)

I will be very happy to expand on this at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have not checked with my colleagues but I think that there would be a disposition to have a voice vote on this set of motions tonight rather than to carry them over until the morning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the Hon. Member who just had the floor wants to terminate his remarks today or whether there is another Member in the House who has not spoken on this set of amendments and who wishes to speak. I have spoken, but I am not sure that there are not other colleagues on other sides who wish to speak on this issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There has been a proposal asking for unanimous consent to proceed to a voice vote. Do I have the unanimous consent of the House in that respect?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I could finish my remarks now if the House wants to let me finish. That is all right with me. However, I certainly want to finish.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the House allows the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) to proceed with the remainder of his speech, he has to two minutes left and the House could then proceed with a voice vote. Would there then be unanimous consent to start Private Members' Hour at approximately 5:10 and extend it until 6:10?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is agreed. Thus, Private Members' Hour will start for a full 60 minutes after we proceed with the voice vote on the motions that are now on the floor of the House.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that I have clearly understood what you have just said. It means that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) would close the debate on the motion, if I heard the Chair properly, and no one else could speak on it. There may be some others in the House who may want to speak to this motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I asked if someone else wishes to speak—