

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14 by striking out line 29 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"claim by notifying an immigration officer who shall refer the claim to the Refugee Division."

[Translation]

**Mr. Heap** moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14 by striking out lines 30 to 45 at page 12.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14 by deleting proposed Sections 48, 48.01, 48.02, 48.03, 48.04, 48.05, 48.06 and 48.07 at page 13 to 23 inclusive.

● (1320)

[English]

Do I have unanimous consent for the the Hon. Member for Laurier (Mr. Berger) to move Motion No. 14?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Mr. David Berger (Laurier) (for Mr. Marchi)** moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14

(a) by striking out lines 15 to 19 at page 13

(b) by striking out lines 21 to 23 at page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

"shall determine whether the claimant should be permitted to come into Canada or to remain therein and whether the claimant is eligible to have the claim determined by the Refugee Division; and"

**Mr. Jourdenais:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The Hon. Member for Laprairie (Mr. Jourdenais) on a point of order.

**Mr. Jourdenais:** Madam Speaker, when the Chair gave its ruling earlier, it was my understanding that, for the Motions which have been grouped, that is Nos. 4 to 13, the debate would be on Motion No. 13, and that if the vote were in the affirmative, there would be no debate on Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6 and so on, and if it were in the negative, there would be a debate. I was not here earlier when you called for the Hon. Member for Laprairie.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** With leave of the House, I shall now repeat in French my answer to the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), who asked me exactly the same question a few moments ago. The interpretation given by the Chair was that Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13 and 14 would be debated together, but that there would first be a vote on Motion No. 13, as an affirmative vote on this motion would cancel the need for the other votes. That was the question and the answer is still the same.

*Immigration Act, 1976*

**Mr. Jourdenais:** Madam Speaker, may I have the consent of the House to debate my motion?

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Motion No. 4 was in the name of the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais). As the Hon. Member was not present, it was set aside without proceeding.

Is there unanimous consent that we return and include Motion No. 4 in this grouping?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie)** moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-55, be amended in Clause 14 by striking out lines 20 to 37 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"45.(1) Subject to subsection (5), where a person who is sub—"

He said: Madam Speaker, I want to thank Hon. Members for this opportunity to take part in the debate on my amendment No. 4.

Madam Speaker, I am in duty bound and even compelled by my conscience to rise in debates concerning certain amendments.

First, having been elected in 1984 and being a Member of the Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration, since the beginning, I have attended many meetings, where a number of persons have appeared, stating that what we need in Canada is a system with a refugee status that is more precise, more clear cut, easier, more understandable than the one we now have, that is before Bill C-55 was put forward.

Many people are wondering and asking me: How is it that Fernand Jourdenais, Chairman of the Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration, is the only one in his group willing to defend Bill C-55? The reason why I insist indeed on introducing certain amendments is that when the Bill was introduced in May, Members of the Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration had very strong reactions, and some even said: We worked for two and a half years and nothing, almost nothing of what we decided in report No. 5 is written down in the Bill.

There is something in the Bill, there is certainly the basic principle of having a clearer, more open and speedier system. But out of 62 pages of proposals, we have quite a problem understanding actually, when one is outside the law profession, is not a lawyer or a judge, and you know as well as I do, Madam Speaker, that one must be cautious with the so-called "small print"!

If we look at page 11 of the Bill, Clause 45, we find something which is contrary to the principle and the aim of Bill C-55.