

Immigration Act, 1976

be published. He also stated that if the Government wants to leave the Convention, then it should say so openly.

I have been saying that if we are to accept refugees then we should have a fast, fair and just process. Do we have a fast, fair and just process when the refugee to be is screened before he has the right to express himself? Do we have a fair process when a person can be refused by an adjudicator and a member of the division without really explaining himself because he has status in another country? That person can then be deported by the Government back to this country and that country does not want him. He is told, "Go back to Canada". When he comes into Canada he again faces another clause read by the adjudicator who says:

[*Translation*]

claim already rejected in Canada.

[*English*]

What are we to do with a person who was rejected once because he comes from a safe country and this safe country does not want him? Will we keep sending people back and forth between countries? I really do not understand the true meaning of the word "fair".

I could give ample examples of specialists who do not agree with this Bill. For instance, the Coalition for a Just Immigration and Refugee Policy stated that the approach in Bill C-55 is incorrect because it is not workable and puts genuine refugees in danger and will not survive challenge in the courts.

Rabbi Plaut is a well-known expert on refugee matters. He was asked to conduct a royal commission on refugee matters, which he did. He has said that Bill C-55 has the wrong focus because its aim is deportation instead of status determination. He also states that the process will not be shorter but longer and more complex. Rabbi Plaut is against Bill C-55 on the grounds that a determination system should be fair for genuine refugees. These are the comments of a man who has been involved for over 35 years, if I recall correctly, with refugee matters. He is a man who is recognized by all Canadians as the best expert, and he is against Bill C-55. Yet there are still some people who want to pass Bill C-55 the way it is.

The Bill has to have a great many changes made to it. As a matter of fact, 77 amendments have been proposed to it at report stage. I have not been in the House of Commons for too long but I am told that there have not been very many Bills to which 77 amendments have been proposed at report stage. So there must be something wrong with Bill C-55. I think that whoever will vote for Bill C-55 should make an *examen de conscience*.

In June the House of Commons voted on capital punishment. We were told that it was to be a vote according to our conscience. Some Members voted yes for the return of capital punishment, while others voted no. After the vote on Bill C-55 is taken I am anxious to see if some of the people who voted against capital punishment will have voted in favour of this Bill. Capital punishment was used to punish people who were

against society, people such as murderers and those who did not want to follow what society asked of them. But Members voted against the return of capital punishment so that we would not have to kill these people. They will now vote and cause thousands and thousands of people to be sent back to their home country where they will be killed or tortured. But it does not matter because they are not people from our country; they are people from other countries.

• (1240)

I hope that whoever votes in favour of Bill C-55 will *examen de conscience* and think twice before making the decision to vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 25 states: That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14 by striking out lines 37 to 41 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor: . . . I hope my colleague in the House will vote in favour of adding this sub-clause:

"(ii) by an adjudicator and a member of the Refugee Division as not being eligible to have the claim determined by that Division, other than a claimant declared ineligible pursuant to paragraph (a) who has been returned to Canada by the country which has issued the valid and subsisting travel document by that country pursuant to Article 28 of the Convention or a claimant declared ineligible pursuant to paragraph (b) who has been returned to Canada by the prescribed country, or as not having a credible basis for the claim."

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment. We are in some sort of a bind because Bill C-55 is before the House. But the main amendment which should have been made and considered would have been to refer this measure back to the House just so we could have made sure it would be fair, fast and efficient.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, in debating Motions Nos. 25, 31, 32, and 33, we are mainly concerned with the question of the applicant's credibility, but not exclusively.

Although I support Motion No. 25, on which the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais) has spoken, I wish to use what time I have on the other three motions.

Unfortunately, Motion No. 31 has a misprint which probably came from my office. It arises from the confusion between the two versions of the Bill that were printed as of September 15. Therefore, I must seek unanimous consent of the House to amend my motion to read:

"(6) Notwithstanding paragraphs 1(c), 1(f), and (5), . . ."

There were changes made between the two printings which require this change.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have unanimous consent to amend his motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.