

Canada to tighten immigration rules

By SUSAN REISLER

Canadian University Press

The federal government is moving to crack down on the flow into Canada of draft dodgers, deserters and politically active people generally.

Otto Lang, manpower and immigration minister, told a recent press conference that stringent immigration rules proposed in a special report for the government are aimed at ensuring that Canada gets "the cream of the crop."

"Revolutionaries would be kept out of the country if they are intending to subvert our democratic process," Lang said.

The report, compiled by Toronto lawyer Joseph Sedgwick at government request, calls for a security review board which would consider the cases of people engaged in extra-parliamentary opposition in their homelands.

The government would have the last word in defining security risks because the minister of immigration would decide on appeals against negative review board decisions.

The operation of such a board is complicated, Sedgwick says, "because those in charge of security cannot in most cases reveal, publicly, their information or its source."

"I assume that the security board will sit in camera," he writes, "and that it will have the power to consider evidence that would not be evidence under the strict rules they apply in courts of law, and particularly that it would have the right to receive evidence by way of solemn declaration."

U.S. Co-operation

The proposal would also allow the government more space to co-operate with United States officials in discouraging draft dodgers and deserters from emigrating to Canada. Once the word spreads in the U.S. that appeals will be limited and applicants may have to go through strict security

clearance, the number of "exiles" applying for landed immigrant status will likely decrease. The applicants could not afford the risk of being turned down and deported back home where they would face jail terms of a minimum of five years.

Draft dodgers and deserters usually use their "illegal" stay in Canada to accumulate the points they require for admission to Canada under the point system.

If they are ordered deported because they do not at first meet the requirements, they can appeal the ruling. And because the backlog of appeals is so heavy, their case may be postponed for up to a year. In the meantime they can line up for a job and be "entrenched."

In most cases, the board, faced with a dramatic change in status, grants the appeal.

Under the new proposal, the draft dodger or deserter would not be able to make that long appeal. He could only go to a special inquiry officer who the report says should deal with appeals quickly. The person would be swept out of the country.

Political Asylum

The only recourse would be to apply for political asylum. Sedgwick recommends that the person responsible for the fate of this person be the minister of immigration.

"The granting of political asylum is essentially a political question which would be more sensibly received by the minister than by a quasi-judicial body such as the appeal board," Sedgwick says.

Sweden is the only country which recognizes desertion as grounds for political asylum, and there is reasonable doubt that Canada will follow Sweden's course.

Other recommendations in the report are measures that would "sensibly reduce" the legal recourse of those who pose as

visitors to seek landed immigrant status while still in Canada.

Sedgwick suggests that applicants for landed immigrant status in Canada be examined in the same way as if they applied abroad: Should their application be rejected they would have the right to an inquiry by a departmental special inquiry officer. There would no longer be a right to

appeal to the independent immigration appeal board, except by leave of the board, and such leave should be given only in special circumstances.

Current "breakdown"

At the heart of the current "breakdown," says Sedgwick, is a Liberal immigration policy which allows immigrants to get a foothold

in Canada even when they don't meet the necessary criteria.

Although Long declined comment on when the report would become law, it is known that the government would like to see it implemented as soon as possible to rid themselves of the opposition criticism of Liberal immigration policies.



Lip service is no service

By RON PUSHCHAK

It occurs to me that if York University has created and supports an Environmental Studies Faculty has some allegiance to the concept of Environmental quality. In fact, I see the University in the position of being morally committed to the taste of improving the human environment, not only in the real world (read "off the campus") but right here on home turf. The situation of York University possessing a faculty of Environmental Studies while being an active participant in the process of environmental deterioration, through its physical plant, the use of plastic waste in the cafeteria, the lack of recycling facilities for paper, and its encouragement of the automobile society is to me, a gross act of tokenism — lip service to the good cause of environmental quality to ease the guilt feelings of inaction.

Lip service is no service. To have

an Environmental Studies Faculty is to be willing to act in accord with the moral obligations attached to such a faculty and ignorance can be the only plea to explain the way things are now. There are many ways to start York's programme of needed improvements. The one that I would like to examine now is that of transportation to, and on, the campus.

Mistakes

I, as are most of my E.S. colleagues, am new to this part of the city and to this type of campus, but there are some startlingly obvious mistakes in the campus situation that we can recognize as having been made before. Why they have been repeated here shall probably be one of the less-sweet of the "humanities" building should have indicated to me that all was not well.

The car is king on York campus.

It may be true that roads are peripheral to the action area of the university centered about the library, Ross building, central square complex, but the fact remains that the students do a lot of walking to the playing fields, hitchhiking poles, physical complex and the temporary office buildings, and while walking, are in constant danger of being traffic victims. On University of Toronto campus (my former home), the battle has constantly raged to have the congested city streets removed from the campus by closing them. The hopes of that achievement are remote unless some inattentive motorist mows down a dozen or so students on St. George Street or Hoskin Street on their way to class. Even then "public interests" may triumph again and the student deaths be denoted as sad but unavoidable. Why then has York taken the trouble to incorporate the public race cause into its potentially uncongested campus? The answer lies in the inability of planners to see alternatives to the automobile ethic when the campus was planned. "We have the car and we must use the car."

But this, I contend, does not necessarily follow. Although it is obvious that the transportation needs of York are heavy because of its outlying situation relative to the City of Toronto, and the homes of most York students, it is also obvious that the car has a strangle hold on the life style of the campus and that drastic changes are in order.

Change bus service

The need for change lies first in bus service. The planner who placed the campus bus stop more than 300 yards away from the

central people traffic area suffered from indigestion of his foresight. The solution, however, appears simple. Only buses and delivery vehicles be allowed use of the service and drop-off ramp under the main front ramp of the Ross building. This act would put the bus stop at the front door of the campus and would put an end to the frustration and anger of seeing a bus at the far bus stop and knowing that it is a mirage — an elusive butterfly that cannot be caught. It would also have the effect of giving the pedestrian bus user an advantage by being at the front door while the parking lots would still involve the long, cold walk to reach. (It is the frustration of bad bus service that compels students to buy cars, especially in winter when the cold walk to a cloud of fumes where the bus has been, proves too vexing.) If another stop is needed at the Vanier and McLaughlin area, then I see no reason why the bus cannot make an additional pause. I'm sure the increased number of riders would be welcome and I'm sure no one needs to be reminded of the benefits that increased bus use would mean in terms of pollution reduction and easing of congestion, both on campus, and on the surrounding traffic arteries.

The frequency of buses is also an issue and the arguments in this instance are mainly economic. It is true that buses cost much money to run but we students must urge our administrators out of their traditional mental sets and into a new range of economic alternatives. For example, those individuals who insist on car use for distance or convenience reasons should be forced to pay an extra 5 or 10 dollars in annual parking fees to subsidize bus riders. This tactic insures that the people active in

environmental deterioration are made to pay for it. In fact, it is only justice that the greatest consumer (of environmental quality) pay the greatest price. If money is still an issue, then the university should give long term leases to private developing companies to build more residence units on the unused south and east sides of the campus. This action would increase the amount of badly needed living space in the campus vicinity and the revenues would be channeled into the bus budget.

Mini-bus service

The campus, in conjunction with government agencies, could also undertake to subsidize and set up a mini-bus service similar to that of the go-transit-system. A system that has no set routes but flexibility to meet student transportation needs as they change. The bus service could be extended to the night and weekend time periods with the result that York would live as a campus after 6 p.m. A light fixture(s) could be installed in obvious places in the central square that would operate by going on when a bus was at the front door and by flashing when it was about to leave. Such a move would make life for the community student much easier and would make the campus a more viable place to live and learn in. If money was still a hang-up, then I would propose that the campus give a theatre company the franchise to operate on the campus with the revenues channeled into transportation costs.

The need for change is well past its due time. The need for pressure from students is now. Write Dean Slater in support of changes for York's transportation facilities. Do it.



Excalibur Tim Clark

"Did you see the flashing red light?"