

included in the law what has been done in practice for some time already, and what will have to be done with increasing frequency in any case in view of the new modern trend toward development, toward the proliferation of totalitarian regimes, Canada could literally be invaded by people claiming the status of political refugees.

Still, Mr. Speaker, I think we must make a distinction between the admissibility and the selection of individuals coming to Canada or wishing to come here. It is obvious that if a much broader or narrower definition of a refugee were given, a greater number of individuals would become admissible. However, under the legislation, at the selection stage Canada can always reserve the right to receive or to accept a limited number of applicants, in accordance with our possibilities. Nevertheless, and it must be pointed out, we would have to give priority to the most urgent cases, that is to the people who are most politically threatened. We should not use that possible reservoir of immigration to improve the quality of our immigrants, because they are really special cases, as it has been recognized by the minister when he accepted an amendment to clause 6 of Bill C-24.

Mr. Speaker, in the document which the minister distributed a few weeks ago on the procedures concerning the recognition of the refugee status, the following appears on page 2: "The bill provides for the great majority of refugees accepted by Canada to continue to be selected abroad." The individuals can be selected either in Canada, in their country of origin or in a third country. Since it is recognized that only a minority will be selected and will receive the status of political refugees in Canada itself, it remains that the majority of refugees will be selected either in a third country or in their own country, and, Mr. Speaker, according to very recent history, we know that the majority of those who come and who will have been chosen outside Canada will have been selected within their own country. The amendment therefore simply asks the government to recognize in the legislation what is done in practice through administrative directives and special programs.

Mr. Speaker, it would be truly shameful if Bill C-24 so restricted the definition of refugee that it would not include perhaps the majority of people who would want to come to Canada as refugees. I would very quickly like to point out to the House that my amendment is within the spirit of the recommendations, more specifically recommendation 93 of the special joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate, and I know that the minister has been saying since the beginning of the debate, and especially in committee, that such a provision of the bill followed the recommendations of the special joint committee. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this argument should not be used only when convenient. I believe that the joint committee has done some great work and I would like to pay tribute to all my colleagues who took part in the work of this committee, but as much as we can say that the work and the recommendations of the special joint committee were useful in other cases concerning other sections of the bill, we can also say that this argument is valid in the case of my amendment.

### *Immigration*

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying that it is important that the act itself contain a definition of refugee which takes more into account the present realities concerning this issue, and I know that the House in general has set an example to the rest of the world in this matter during the last few years and that it has been generous. However, the new legislation should not use terms which are too restrictive. We will perhaps have to live with it for 10, 15, 20 or 25 years. It would not be a good thing if in 10 or 15 years, a government that is not as receptive or a minister who has something against such people were able to hide behind a narrow definition to justify a policy which would be equivalent to refusing to take its moral responsibilities towards the international community.

● (1520)

[*English*]

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I should like, first of all, to say that I most wholeheartedly support the motion of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) which I think is an excellent motion, and rightly is a reasonable, up to date definition of "refugee" which is essential if we are to live up to our promises in this regard.

My next point is this. I see that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) has moved over to this side of the House for a moment and I want to say something to him as a preliminary to my remarks. A lot of people, not just members of parliament but the various staffs around this place, resent what I would call this inhumanity, this almost insanity, of forcing the House to go through this sensitive, difficult and lengthy bill in the middle of July. I do not think there is any necessity for that whatever. I credit the minister with much more common sense than to have advocated this himself; I think it must have been pushed on him by these young Turks who have sometimes adopted the style of a steamroller to try to get their way.

I make honourable exceptions here, Mr. Speaker. In our committee on this bill, the hon. member for Montmorency and the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) worked hard, stayed with it and took it seriously. But apart from that we had platoons of people who just put up their hands without showing the slightest interest in what was going on. I want to protest that and say that it is not fair to force members of parliament to stay here in the middle of July to deal with this bill when we in our party—I cannot speak, of course, for any other party—were perfectly ready to come back in August after a decent break. This procedure disrupts family arrangements, reasonable plans for travel and holidays which have been made, and disrupts going to one's constituency. I think it is absolutely deplorable. I want to express that opinion right here and now.

● (1530)

As far as this bill is concerned, I have submitted a number of amendments. They do not constitute a radical revision of the proposed bill. There are some things in the bill of which we