

Immigration

remove from the jurisdiction of the laws of that country those nationals who had not yet left that territory.

This concept is the one contained in the very definition of the word "refugees" spelled out in the Geneva convention, and in the wording of Bill C-24. The motion presented by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) aims at enlarging this very narrow definition and to surround the concept of the word "refugees" with a democratic context which is recognized today by most international bodies as necessary. One of the most recent international bodies to have seen the day, namely the European Common Market, made it mandatory for its members to respect the basic notion of a democratic regime and it has even provided for specific procedures to preclude or even reject certain requests for admission in cases where the political regimes of these countries did not meet those objectives with regard to freedom that all members of the European Economic Community are bound to uphold.

The definition given by my colleague, the hon. member for Montmorency, to the concept of "refugees" matches this evolution in international law which is now entrenched in the constitutional charter of the most recent regional international organizations. There is no doubt, as it has been underlined by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) that a broader definition of the concept of "refugees" would lead to less stringent admissibility standards. However, it would not change the criteria or the conditions. Essentially it aims at extending to a greater number of individuals who are experiencing trouble with the prevailing law of their country, the possibility of applying for admission to Canada. It does not constitute an obligation per se for a potential guest country—under those circumstances, Canada—automatically to grant the requests for admission made by those refugees. Essentially, the aim is to allow applications for political refugee status by foreign citizens at odds with the laws of their country for the reason that the latter do not meet with the democratic goals and freedoms to which Canada is committed.

Obviously, as emphasized by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, the extended definition will entail extra work for immigration officers having to deal with such applications. It would certainly not lead to the excessive levels of applications that have been referred to at certain stages of the bill. It is vital in my view, dealing with the motion by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) that we as a Parliament ask ourselves what Canada's responsibility is, that we promote and defend a certain commitment, a certain content of international responsibility, that we use up to date concepts.

The hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) stressed in his speech that the most difficult cases before us today involve precisely nationals still living in their own countries. I think the amendment gives us an opportunity to redefine the context in which Canada will be operating tomorrow at the international level. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, have a large experience of a number of countries that went through difficult political circumstances but that, thanks to the support, help and understanding of other countries more deeply committed to those goals, are trying to redevelop a certain concept of

[Mr. Joyal.]

international life different from that which prevailed after World War II, but better adapted to the historical context of the later part of the 20th century.

Therefore, the amendment now before us has in my view a significant symbolic value, in that it makes reference to the role that Canada proposes to play during the years to come. On the very long list of amendments proposed today some are built on basic concepts in our democratic society. I had an opportunity outside Parliament to refer to some of those concepts and those amendments are a new opportunity to come back to them. However, at this stage of the debate, it seems to me perfectly convenient to replace the purposes of this legislation within the context of Canada's international obligations.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion 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.
And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The deferred division on motion No. 1 also defers division on motion No. 4. As announced by the Chair, I will now put the question on motion No. 3 standing in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

[*English*]

At this time I have to put the question on motion No. 3, which will dispose of motion No. 5. Motion No. 3 is in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.