

As regards Mr. Van der Veen's remarks, I think you mis-characterized them. I have discussed the evidence with Mr. Van der Veen.

That is Mr. Van der Veen of the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

He did not say that the legislation complied with international law. He made the statement that the UNHCR had not taken the position that it was contrary to international law. Those are two very different things.

He made some observations on the dependence of the United Nations on the funding of member countries, including Canada. He then goes on to say:

The *aide-mémoire*, with which all of you are familiar, is an incredibly strong statement.

I have spent the last six years of my life ploughing through tens of thousands of pages of UNHCR documents and I have yet to see the language of a critique addressed to a western country that even comes close to this degree of specificity. While it may not say that the bill violates international law, that *aide-mémoire* makes very specific recommendations for changes in order to bring this bill into compliance with the international standards set out by the executive committee.

On that point, I think it is imperative to note, since we are referring to primary sources in the convention, that Article 35 of the convention obliges us to co-operate with the UNHCR. That is a very unusual provision in an international convention, extremely unusual.

We have set up the executive committee to facilitate that collaboration. Canada has been a long and devoted member of that committee. Canada, along with the others, unanimously developed certain standards, which we are now not respecting.

He concludes with some observations on the practice of states being important to the development of international law. There is surely the truest observation, the truest appreciation of what the United Nations really thinks about this matter of how Canada is treating refugees, and to quote two lines from the official's testimony is quite unfair. It is, therefore, essential that we take very seriously the kinds of proposals the Hon. Member for Spadina has put forward.

As the Parliamentary Secretary has recognized, the Hon. Member was there from beginning to end, other than his having to speak in the House at some point. He was there early and he was there late. He was there listening carefully and gathering those impressions that are necessary in deciding how we should regard this particular Bill. When the Hon. Member puts motions forward, even if government Members regard them as making speedy operation of the new system unworkable, and even if it is going to make it unworkable as a whole, those it seems to me are words of praise for procedures that are designed to ensure that Canada will live up to the United Nations Convention, a Convention to which we are signatories and with which we have worked over the years.

Surely, with legislation of this sort, with procedures of this sort in effect, we deserve to be booted off the committee to wait for a new government to establish proper standards for this country, standards of humanity for refugees, to ensure that this country really lives up to our traditions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Immigration Act, 1976

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 22, 23, 24, and 30 have been grouped for debate but will be voted on separately.

The first question is on Motion No. 22 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. Shall the recorded division stand deferred?

Mr. Friesen: There are only three Members standing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There are only three Members standing. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 22 (Mr. Heap) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 23 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 23 (Mr. Heap) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 24 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.