

*Immigration Act, 1976*

the Minister to ask for a person to be detained for 21 days. The adjudicator has no discretion whatsoever to overrule that request. Madam Speaker, you realize that the Minister is taking unto himself or abrogating unto himself these special powers, powers which are outside the elected process. I think the Minister is making a serious and grave mistake. It will leave him open to unnecessary manipulation. I think it is wrong.

The Minister now calls the shots. It is dangerous. He has done that because we were faced with 174 immigrants off the shores of Nova Scotia where the people came out and welcomed them. I really think that is pushing it a little too far.

I think that those moves are un-Canadian. I also think that they run afoul of our human rights code. However, in respect of documentation, just what do they expect? Most refugees are suffering from the trauma of running away, the trauma of dislocation, and the trauma of leaving their families, their language, their culture, and their life-style. Who in his right mind wants to pick himself up and move, unless circumstances are detrimental to his daily living, to his future and to the future of his children? It is not a choice which people make lightly. Then, to be harassed in the way the Bill harasses them, goes beyond my ability to find credible anything the Minister has proposed.

Do they think refugees will fall outside our Charter provisions? Do we not believe that individual rights, once one is on Canadian land, belong to everybody and that they should be treated with cordial decency? If one needs to be sent away because one is an undesirable, there are ways to do it.

Will the Canadian public realize the full impact of these proposals, or will it assume that Bill C-84 is needed to deal with the abusers and the exploiters? I think there has been a lot of misinformation out there. There are people in my riding who are desperately looking to family rejoinder and have been thwarted in that desire. They see the family structure differently than we do. We think of the family in terms of the nuclear family, but the extended family is their perception. They want their brothers, their sisters, and their children who are over 18 years of age to be here. This is quite normal. These people have, for the most part, brought wealth, industry and have promoted business in Canada.

• (1650)

One-third of this country has been built by immigrants, many of whom came as refugees. I can only hearken to my experience in my own Jewish community in the City of Montreal. We were 45,000 Jews in Montreal prior to 1939. We more than tripled our numbers, and I think in Montreal itself we have brought economic prosperity, civility, culture and enrichment to it. I am proud of what the refugees from the camps of Europe brought to Canada. They came as refugees, and it was not easy for them to get in here because it was hard to get past the front door. They were true refugees. These are true refugees in Asia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Afghanistan,

Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, El Salvador and Chile. The people in my riding, no matter what colour, language or cultural persuasion, want us not only to treat refugees fairly and decently but to tell smugglers, "No". The people want us to link this whole thing into amendments that are sensible and fair.

I think as people have talked over the summer they have begun to realize that the true evil at the door is this Bill, not the refugees who are knocking at the door. If the Government receives parliamentary approval for this Bill, what will the Government do about Bill C-55? Will it die on the Order Paper? Again, what about family rejoinder, which we have been looking for, the promulgation of extension to older children, the extended family, which we have been awaiting?

There are all kinds of things that have been put on hold while we debate Bill C-84. I am not happy with it. I could go into great detail but there are others far more expert on this matter. Certainly the committee heard expert witnesses. I would suggest that the Minister and the Government would do well to hearken to the voice of reason and find ways to fine and penalize the smugglers, the abusers. I hope the Government will open its heart to the real refugees who need to come to our shores.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that in this country of ours, a country so large with such a small population and with material and human resources to provide a good life for all its people if it were planned with common sense, a country which in recent years, at least, has had a generous and humane approach to immigrants and refugees, would be at the point of enacting a Bill dealing with refugees and potential refugees that is so inhumane and mean-spirited that we will be despised by people of good faith all over the world.

This is a country which was established in the way we know it now by the coming of immigrants and refugees to this part of the continent. All of us, with the exception of the native people of Canada, are either immigrants ourselves or descendants of immigrants or refugees or descendants of refugees. I said a moment ago that in recent years we have had a relatively good record with regard to the entry into Canada of immigrants and refugees. But up to World War II and, indeed, for a number of years after World War II, our record was a very bad record because it was not until the late 1950s and the early 1960s that we adopted policies on immigration and refugees which were not discriminatory. Until the late 1950s, immigrants who were permitted and encouraged to come to this country were essentially from countries in northern and western Europe and were white. Through our laws and regulations and through the way in which senior employees in the Departments which controlled immigration dealt with immigration we discouraged and prohibited people from eastern and southern Europe and from Africa, Asia, Central and South America and India from coming here. Indeed, it was fair to say that it was almost impossible to permit the