

has visited this country—cheap labour. We know how Salvadoran labour is cheap labour. They assassinate labour union leaders. So, again, Canada is not an innocent bystander in the situations in the world that produce these refugees. Canada has its own responsibility for the fact that there are such refugees, or our own share of responsibility, with a number of other countries, whether they are East or West. The tide is now being reversed.

That is the context in which we now see a concerted move by the countries of western Europe, including Great Britain, by the United States and now by Canada to restrict the entry of people from what we call the Third World, from former colonial countries, from countries of the South, into our countries of the North. We no longer want them as cheap labour. We are saying to Salvadorans, "Stay in Salvador and struggle to get a \$4-a-day job. Do not come to Canada looking for a \$4-an-hour job." We have a total perversion of the refugee determination process presented to us.

We have the pre-screening system. There are three screens being put forward by the Government. Two of them are contained in Bill C-55 and one of them is done by regulation. In Bill C-55 one screen is called the safe country. If a Salvadoran comes up to Fort Erie and was living in the United States illegally—no doubt—then we will send him back to the United States because Canada considers that a safe country. We do not know what the United States will do because we do not care to know. When we enquire of the United States, from those who have studied refugee matters in the United States, we find that only 2.7 per cent of Salvadorans who have claimed refugee status in the United States have been recognized as refugees.

Naturally, when the United States supplies the guns and the military advisors with which the Salvadoran people are being killed, the United States is not about to admit that those Salvadorans who escape to the United States are genuine refugees. Until now Canada has had the courage to disagree with the United States. Now, in an indirect way, Canada is going to join the United States in forcing those people to go back to the situation that they quite reasonably fled.

There is another screen. A person will be told, if he comes from a certain country, "Oh, that country does not produce refugees. That country has a good record of human rights. We do not have any refugees from that country. So you could not possibly be a refugee and we won't even listen to your story".

Clause 48.4 of the Bill quite clearly lays down that the only evidence to be considered by this team of an adjudicator and a refugee board member is the track record, that is, Canada's recording of a track record of a country from which the refugee comes, as to human rights and as to whether we have any experience of receiving refugees from there. So if there is a coup in some country the day after this Bill is passed and the supporters of the former government run for their lives and a few of them get to Canada, Canada will say, "We have never received any refugees from your country. Therefore your country is not a refugee-producing country. Therefore you are

Supply

not a refugee. Good-bye, don't talk to us. We don't want to hear your story". That is what this Bill means. That is the second screen.

The third screen is already in place. This country, this Government, and to some extent the previous Liberal Government—and I am sorry the previous speaker is not here to respond to this—has continued the policy and extended very widely the policy of refusing to admit a person who comes from a well-known refugee-producing country, if it is suspected that by setting foot in Canada he would gain the opportunity to claim refugee status. Chile was the first notable example. Years ago the then Liberal Government put a visa requirement on Chile. This Government has also put a transit visa requirement on Chile, and on all countries for which this Government requires visitors' visas. Therefore, if a person comes from a refugee-producing country this Government hopes to keep that person out of our borders entirely by the visa.

If a person comes from a non-refugee-producing country, this Government hopes to keep him out on the grounds he could not possibly be telling the truth. If he has spent any time in another country which this Government would like to consider safe, without ever defining what is safe, the Government will say, "Go on back there and make a refugee claim. We don't care whether your refugee claim is fairly considered or not".

The problem is that these screens completely destroy the value of having a refugee board or division, and the Government sometimes calls it one and sometimes the other in different documents. There will be very few people who will get the benefit of this fine, just, well-tuned service. Nearly all of them will be stopped at the border. The Government estimate we hear is 50 per cent. Many people in the private sector have an estimate of about 80 per cent that will be stopped at the border.

That is the first and worst part of this legislation. But there is a very serious matter also in relation to the appeal. The appeal system is one that has been condemned by Rabbi Plaut and by all the NGOs who have appeared before us.

● (1220)

Although there was uncertainty in the report of the standing committee a year and a half ago, it is now recognized in fact—and this can be tested—that the members of the standing committee know that there has to be a much more thorough, genuine form of review dealing with the facts of the case than is possible through an appeal to the Federal Court, let alone what this Act provides, that is, appeal to the Federal Court only with leave. The Federal Court has a record in granting leave in about 2 per cent to 5 per cent of the requests.

The appeal system, as provided here, not only denies the standards set up by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, not only denies the tradition of Canadian law, British law, and I guess French law, but it will be peculiarly