

*Immigration*

But what is hardest for me as a local member to accept is the failure of the National Capital Commission to do its job. This was the instrument, a Crown corporation, independent, not reporting to a minister, directly reporting to parliament, all those great so-called virtues, able to offer free, independent advice, and it had the benefit of certain streams of information. In its Annual Report of 1975 the National Capital Commission talked about moving 25,000 jobs out of the national capital region into others parts of Canada. That was the one quarter of the total employment within the region it was going to move out. And it knew what the relocation from Ottawa to Hull involved, the 15,000 jobs.

If any body has access to the plans of the government with respect to its projection of growth in the public service, surely the National Capital Commission had its sources of intelligence. And in the face of these three streams of information the relocation to Hull, the decentralization outside the national capital region, the freeze on hiring policy, it still proceeded with the most outlandish schemes for satellite devolvement, a satellite community of 100,000 people in the Carlsbad area in Ontario and 100,000 people in the Aylmer area in the province of Quebec, linked by a transportation corridor. It was sheer folly, daydreaming and madness, in light of the total situation.

Within the National Capital Commission the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing. This Crown agency was grossly negligent in its advice to the Government of Canada regarding the planning and development of the national capital. Members of the agency do not have to get elected. And they really do not care whether the local members are elected or re-elected, and they say as much to us. It is very difficult, as a local member, to find my letters unanswered, to find that when I approach them there is this haughty disdain which suggests that I am somehow of a lesser breed of humanity. I am treated with contempt when I try to get elementary advice. I think I am entitled to receive information and courtesy.

The facts are that a good part of the bungling and the planning of these moves to which the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has referred is the responsibility of that agency, those who are supposed to be the eyes, the ears and the brains, giving independent advice to the Government of Canada.

[*Translation*]

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that the National Capital Commission has been remiss in its duties. What the Commission did, as far as I am concerned, has nothing to do with its responsibilities in that regard.

[*English*]

I just think that this motion cannot be supported by hon. members in this House, and I hope that it does not even come to a vote because it is so contrary to the thrust and spirit of our times and the policy of national unity we are trying to develop. But if the intent of the hon. member was to provoke a debate on a matter which is of very real concern, one which has been a sore point with many of us, to focus attention on the lack of consistent policy in this area, for which the national capital has

[Mr. Francis.]

suffered and will continue to suffer in the period ahead, then I think to a certain extent it certainly served its purpose.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** In my opinion the nays have it.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** On division.

Motion No. 41 (Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton)) negatived.

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont)** moved:

Motion No. 42.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 70 by striking out line 25 at page 41 and substituting the following therefor:

"refugee may, within such reasonable period of time as is"

**Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher)** moved:

Motion No. 44.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 71 by striking out lines 7 to 11 at page 42 and substituting the following therefor:

"unless there are reasonable grounds to believe that the claim is fraudulent, frivolous, or unfounded, it shall allow the application to proceed, and in any"

**Mr. Epp:** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at length on motion No. 44 but it is my intention to set out briefly the arguments which were made during the committee stage. Much of the debate in this area, both here and in the committee, has been concerned with the manner in which a claim to refugee status is to be judged. Amendments have been put forward by hon. members on both sides of the House in a serious attempt to establish a procedure for judging such claims.

I have not felt able to support all the amendments; I believe the bill gives adequate protection as it stands to persons claiming to be refugees. Nevertheless, there is one area in which the processes suggested in the bill appear to be deficient. I refer to the provision for an oral hearing. This is the subject of motion No. 44—we are considering the general topic of redetermination and appeal procedure specifically for those claiming refugee status before the Immigration Appeal Board. What will happen, as I understand the legislation if it remains unamended, is that when a person comes to Canada or makes application for refugee status the evidence is taken down under