

Immigration

approve. I certainly approve the setting out of objectives in the bill, although there are some changes that should be made. Particularly I welcome the clauses which refer to the reunion of Canadian citizens and permanent residents with their close relatives from abroad. There must be close co-operation among the federal government, the provincial governments and all levels of government.

We accept the rejection of discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, ethnic origin, religion, sex or political opinion which are contained in clause 3 of the bill. In particular, we welcome the explicit statement of Canada's determination to fulfil international obligations with respect to refugees and to uphold its humanitarian approach with respect to the displaced and the persecuted.

We share the view of the joint special committee of the Senate and the House of Commons that Canada needs immigrants, not only on demographic and economic grounds, but to take into account families and humanitarian considerations. The view of the joint committee is embodied in the bill as a whole. It is an aid to vastly increased mobility. Canada cannot afford to have an open-door policy. It has to maintain some control over the total number of immigrants coming to Canada each year. We do not support the policy of total rejection of immigrants flowing into Canada. Our preference is for a policy of moderation in the choice of the people we allow in, and a fair and decent handling of the people who apply to come to this country.

The statement of the principles and the objectives in the bill in no way obviates our criticism of some of the clauses which urgently require amendment for reasons we will outline as the various amendments come forward. We regret that so large a part of the provisions of the bill which applies to immigrants has been drafted by public servants and is based on regulations and orders in council. Such a process fails to secure adequate knowledge or scrutiny by the general public or by those concerned. I have introduced amendments which deal with this. We have had many excellent representations from church committees, legal aid societies, the Law Union of Ontario, civil liberties unions, la Ligue des Droits de l'Homme, and other organizations. Almost every one of the amendments I have proposed is based on those recommendations.

I should like to deal with motion No. 3. It spells out the class of people who shall be admitted to Canada as sponsored immigrants, that is to say, should be allowed into Canada with a minimum of regulations and obstacles put in their way. This is supposed to be the purpose of this bill. Clause 3(c) reads as follows:

to facilitate the reunion in Canada of Canadian citizens and permanent residents with their close relatives from abroad;

Motion No. 4 in the name of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) is typical of his amendments and his approach. It includes such other classes of persons as are prescribed for the purpose of that provision. In other words, even when we are trying to advocate the reunion of families, we have to turn to the executive to do so. We in this parlia-

[Mr. Brewin.]

ment are not asked or permitted, apparently, to state the number of positive persons who should be admitted.

My amendment under motion No. 3 deals with husband, wife, mother, father, fiancé, grandfather, grandmother, and so on. It does not change the law except in certain minor particulars. At present, the law is in the regulations and is not in the act. Under the present regulations, the law is not substantially changed by my amendment. My amendment contains two things, one of which the government has announced to be its intention, namely, the admitting of people who are fathers, or mothers, over 60 whether in the work force or not.

Hitherto the law has been that one could be sponsored only if he were over 60 or so disabled that he could not work. In my judgment, the government has rightly suggested that persons can and should be allowed to sponsor their mothers or fathers regardless of their age. I have added one other change, and that is to include the words "natural son or natural daughter". The reason is that there are many countries, some of them not far away from Canada, where the institution of formal marriage is not the same as in our country. People marry, live together and have a family, but they are never formally married. In those circumstances, under the present regulations a mother is entitled to bring in what is referred to as her illegitimate child, which is a distasteful term. The same right should be extended to a father who has supported, looked after a child and behaved as the father. I feel that wording should be included, and that is why I suggest it.

The basic purpose of this amendment is to have parliament take the responsibility, and not the bureaucracy. There is a difference. We are sent here to legislate on sensitive and important issues, and I resent the growing habit, which has been evident for quite a while, of delegating these things to the governor in council, which is another term for the bureaucracy. I have never been in Her Majesty's privy council or cabinet, and thus I am not sure what they do with their time, but I imagine they have a great deal to do and do not have much time to direct to the question of immigration. There is a difference between the minister and myself, and the minister and some supporters of his party. That basic difference is whether we believe in the supremacy of parliament, or not.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this group of motions I will not be too long. However, I should like to say a few words at the outset with general reference to the process we have been dealing with. In particular, I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) concerning the non-liberal attitude of the government in terms of propelling so rapidly the final decision of the House of Commons in this debate.

● (1540)

I think the editorial in this morning's *Le Devoir* is entitled, if I can give a rough Anglophone translation, "A bad climate for a fundamental law". I agree. The law we are presently dealing with in this statute having to do with immigration is the first