

not seem to me to be much consensus. Secondly, when I note some of the views expressed by the Inter-Church Committee on Human Rights and the Inter-Church Committee on Population, both of which committees represented a very broad range of all the major religious denominations in this country, it seems to me that the minister has been very loth to accept what I consider to be some of the very sensible recommendations which they made. Let me quote just two short extracts from the presentations which were made, firstly by the Inter-Church Committee on Human Rights in Latin America. I quote from the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration for June 2, 1977. As found at page 30A:23, they say:

● (1630)

We are asking your initiative and support in three ways:

1. that you go on record supporting the development of criteria appropriate to refugees separate from those applied to regular immigration applications.
2. that you support the right to a personal oral hearing before a panel which would make the final decision, with appropriate opportunity to prepare such a hearing, for applicants for refugee status within Canada. To this end we are recommending the creation of a refugee claims board.
3. that you support amendments to the new immigration bill which would institutionalize these changes.

They then go on to outline the clauses which would implement those proposals. At page 30A:35 of the same day's proceedings, when dealing with the need for special refugee criteria, they had this to say:

In any situation, but especially in a world filled with evidence of growing brutality and oppression, refugees, the displaced and the persecuted should find quick refuge and untroubled safety among us Canadians. We are concerned that Bill C-24 does not really provide for special handling of these people with special needs.

In light of those two assessments of the bill, I find it very easy to support the motion of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) and I am surprised that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), and also the minister, suggested that this would open the door to millions of people. If, as suggested in the amendment, people in foreign countries were permitted to apply for refugee status, this would not mean that they could leave that country. After all, Vladimir Bokovsky, to mention one of the most recent dissidents who wanted to leave the Soviet Union, was not permitted to do so until that government agreed to let him go. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn did not want to leave the Soviet Union, but he left when the government put him out. So to say that we will permit people to be classed as refugees if they want to leave their country merely broadens the classification.

So far as we are concerned, the country in which those people are living must first permit them to leave, and I suggest that on the basis of both past and present experience the door would not be opened very much more than it is at the present time. I agree with the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) that if we have the will, it is certainly not beyond the ability of the department to work out a procedure that would be satisfactory.

### *Immigration*

I want to say a few words about families. In his motion No. 4, the minister proposes that the act be amended so that at a certain point which he defines, clause 2 would read as follows:

—"family" means the father and mother and any children who, by reason of age or disability—

These are, to me, the important words.

—are in the opinion of an immigration officer, mainly dependent upon the father or mother—

And so on. I can see 20 different definitions there. An immigration officer in Vancouver may use that definition to decide that a certain person is in the family, whereas an immigration officer in Winnipeg may come to a different conclusion, an immigration officer in Toronto may arrive at a third definition, an immigration officer in Montreal a fourth, and so on. Or two officers in adjoining offices in the same city could come to two completely different decisions.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** So could the same officer, on two different days.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Or, as my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) says, so could the same officer, on two different days or in two different hours. So it seems to me that motion No. 4 as drafted by the minister is very deficient, and that motion No. 3 as drafted by my colleague from Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) includes a much better definition of "family". It is much more specific and gives quite a clear directive to an immigration officer, rather than leaving it to the whim or fancy of one immigration officer as opposed to another. The criteria are quite clear, and it seems to me the motion should be supported. I urge the minister to reconsider his position and to be a good deal more generous than he proposes to be on the subject of refugees. I ask him to adopt the motion proposed by the hon. member of his own party, the hon. member for Montmorency.

● (1640)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont):** Mr. Speaker, during its proceedings the House must consider various bills, but by their nature and their object some of them deal with the substance of the country itself and more especially define our prospects for the future which must be specified during the discussion so that the country in which we will be living during the next few years meet the objects of democracy and freedom without which a society cannot make any progress, but comes to a standstill.

The amendment moved by my colleague from Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) deals with one of those notions reconsidering our international responsibilities. When the Geneva convention was signed, it dealt with the sovereignty concept as known and applied after the Second World War. The drafters of that time wanted the country to keep total jurisdiction over its subjects, citizens, nationals as long as they remained within its borders and as soon as they had left their territorial boundaries, they could then claim protection from other states. But a foreign state could not intervene within that country in an attempt to