

Immigration

Mr. Railton: There have been some recorded Unemployment Insurance Commission experiences, just as the previous speaker emphasized, with examples of "beating the government" and so on. I do not think we can criticize the government social security programs in every way. I felt the article published in the *Globe and Mail* today by Mr. Malone, the publisher of that wonderful newspaper, was a little bit too critical. It was mainly saying that the government has been too generous in its social security programs. I cannot agree with this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976**AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Cullen that Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to think this is on the instalment plan. When I was in college I was told that there were at least three good points to every sermon. I did not know there were three good sermons to every point. This is the third opportunity, on second reading, that I have been speaking on this subject.

I want to deal very quickly with two or three aspects of the bill which concern me very much. One has to do with respect to the violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. If one reads the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was passed in 1948 by the United Nations, Article 13 certainly touches on measures within this bill which would certainly come close to being in direct violation of the Universal Declaration.

Hon. members will recall that Article 13 states that everyone has the right to freedom of movement more particularly residents within the borders of each state and, second, everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country.

Clause 8(1) of this bill with respect to proof of citizenship deals with the individual who comes into his own country.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

Clause 21(1)(b) deals with the whole question of the regulated residency under the so-called terms and conditions of the bill. This certainly seems to fly in the face of Article 13 as it is stated in the Charter on Human Rights.

Third, in Clause 115(1)(n) the governor in council has the ability to make regulations, and I quote:

requiring any person or class of persons to report to an immigration officer before leaving Canada and prescribing the information to be provided and the manner in which such report shall be made to the immigration officer by any such person;

The possibility of requiring some sort of notification, or even permission, before departure is one that I find most offensive, certainly offensive in light of the Declaration of Human Rights. More than that, more recently we have had the International Covenant on Civil and Human Rights. It is interesting to note Article 12 and 13, Article 12 in particular, which reads:

1. Everyone lawfully within the territory of a state shall, within that territory, have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence.
2. Everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own.

That is an additional reinforcement of the way Bill C-24 appears to violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the subsequent convention. The interesting thing is that the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was only acceded to by our country on May 19, 1976. It finally received the assent of a sufficient number of nations to bring it into force on August 19 of last year. Presumably that was just at the time when this particular bill was in its final drafting stages. It is for that reason that one cannot be sanguine about the possibilities and intent of this legislation. As it is stated in the explanation clause, Clause 115(1)(n) may be used at some time in the future to provide for examination of outbound travellers if this step becomes necessary for the proper identification and control of illegal immigrants. As the minister well knows, it does not stipulate that it will only be used in the case of those who are illegal immigrants.

This is one of the reasons I brought in Bill C-404 on March 3 dealing with the question of human rights. I will quote from one aspect of it, that part which, and I quote:

denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate or imposes a discriminatory tax, levy, fine, fee or other charge on any citizen as a consequence of such citizen's desire to emigrate.

These are the things which concern us very much about countries in eastern Europe which place very real proscriptions on those who desire to leave their own country. For us even to have the possibility of these provisions in the bill seems to be, quite frankly, an illiberal and retrograde move.

As I said before the supper hour, this bill, when compared to the joint committee about whose report I even had some considerable reservations, seems to fail both in the letter and in the spirit.

I mentioned earlier the problem with respect to regional development moving from inducements and incentives, which was in the joint committee report, to that of absolute regulation.