

**Bill C-4 Key Quotes from the House of Commons
September 23, 2011**

Full text of Hansard:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=1&DocId=5130843&File=0>

Rick Dykstra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC)

In a question to Wayne Easter, Lib.: **He indicated that it would create two streams of refugees. In fact, that is not the case. The individuals who are on these ships are not refugees. They are not refugees until they have actually gone through the process and have either qualified or not qualified through the process.** Therefore, in no way, shape or form are there two sets of refugees based on the bill. It is a very factual bill and the member needs to ensure he is correct on it.

In a question to Hélène Laverdière, ND): **People who have been declared refugees by the United Nations, who are not in this country but are waiting in other countries, deserve and have earned the right for a new life.** We offer that in Canada. Those are the people who come here to live and lead a better life.

John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC)

In a question to Peggy Nash, NDP: In terms of refugees, I am given to understand that Canada receives a higher proportion of refugees than any other country in the world in terms of our population. People around the world put great stock in our refugee policy. In fact, I was just in Iraq and met people who were concerned about coming to Canada. **It is only because we can protect the integrity of our refugee system that we can open our doors as we do.** I ask the member to respond to that. Without the abuses that have happened, does she understand that we can therefore protect the life, liberty and pursuit of happiness of true refugees who would come to our shores?

Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP)

In a question to Massimo Pacetti, Lib.: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague was here when Jean Chrétien took the Clarity Act to the Supreme Court to get clarification that it was constitutional. NDP members are saying quite clearly to the government that if it firmly believes that the bill is appropriate and constitutionally valid, **it should take the bill to the Supreme Court before the bill comes to committee and get the Supreme Court decision.** I can only assume it does not want to do that because it may not like the answer.

Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)

In a question to Franke Valeriote, Lib.: [...] the government brought in Bill C-11 about a year and a half ago. The features of that legislation have not yet been fully implemented. The point of that legislation was to reduce the refugee backlog. **I would ask the member why he thinks the government is not waiting to see if it is successful before introducing this bill.**

In a world where no information is perfect, **I would ask the member what he thinks leads the minister to believe that these people who misinterpret or get false information will actually understand the provisions of the bill.** They will certainly not hear about the tough new rules from the smugglers. How will these people know about these tough new provisions?