

where it states "regarding", not "including", that if the two qualifications mentioned in Clause 4(a) and Clause 4(b) are not met, then the two representatives may consider it their duty to hear no other matter. That is the point to which I wish the Minister would respond.

● (1310)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will allow the question by the Member for York East (Mr. Redway) and the Minister can reply to both.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, my constituents strongly support an orderly refugee determination process. That is particularly the case if they are in the category of constituents who have family in other countries whom they would like to bring here. They want to make sure that no one is jumping the line and that they have the right to bring in their relatives on an equal basis, with no one getting ahead of them. At the same time they want to make sure there are no genuine refugees who are sent back to a country where their lives will be in peril.

I recall a time in 1979, during the Clark Government, when we were faced with a great number of Vietnamese boat people wanting to come to this country. At that time the Government encouraged the private sector, churches and non-governmental organizations to sponsor these refugees in great numbers.

I have two questions for the Minister. First, will the Government be undertaking a program of advertising and encouragement in order to try to get the church groups and non-governmental organizations, many of whom are raising concerns now about genuine refugees, to sponsor refugees so that we can solve this problem in a way they want to do it, but in an orderly and legitimate fashion?

Second, in addressing the problem of immigration targets as the Minister indicated he will be doing in June, is he prepared to broaden the definition of family class at that time for other immigrants to this country?

Mr. Weiner: Mr. Speaker, currently there are some 72 agreements with parent organizations and umbrella organizations, all of which are intended to help fund some of the refugees who will be brought to this country. I indicated that some 5,000 will come in under that program.

Indeed, some 20,000 designated refugees and others under the humanitarian programs will come to Canada in 1987. We are constantly looking for ways of maximizing the benefit of the resources we put into this area.

In a world with 15 million refugees, it is very clear that we are trying to help those in most desperate need, and 20,000 out of 15 million is like winning the lottery.

We are working aggressively to indicate to the community that there is no ceiling to the number of refugees who can be brought here, provided they are prepared to pay for and sponsor them after we have helped pick them.

Indeed, we are also looking at other options of managing refugee programs. As part of our consultation on over-all

levels, when we allow the numbers to rise—if we can do that with the consent of the House and the Government—obviously we will look at all categories. One area to which we must respond, and will, is the concern for the family. The standing committee asked me to respond and we actually deferred to spring the decision on that. However, we are examining this area within the levels we will bring to the country.

I have said clearly that if we increase the numbers we should do so by allowing all categories to be opened fairly to dependants, business investors, entrepreneurs and, indeed, refugees, if possible, since there are some resource implications. There may be more innovative ways of proceeding. Hopefully it will allow the family class to be expanded somewhat.

I understand the Hon. Member's comments. I heard those same remarks from families right across the country who indicate the importance of reuniting families much more expeditiously and completely.

The Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) is again trying to fine tune whether, in the first step, the adjudicator and the independent refugee board member have any discretion. I clearly stated in a previous response to a question by the Member for York West that there is that discretion. Indeed, the Member for Laurier (Mr. Berger) raised a question of privilege, which is now in your good hands, and we continue to maintain that there is that discretion and the ability to test the credibility of the witness. If one of the Members feels that an individual is in danger, there is the ability to refer the individual to the full oral hearing in a non-adversarial way before the independent convention refugee determination board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 1.16 p.m., I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At 1.16 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[Translation]

CANADIAN CULTURE

NEED TO PROTECT EXISTENCE OF *LA VIE EN ROSE* MAGAZINE

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, with deep regret we learned last week that *La vie en rose* magazine would be suspending operations for at least six weeks and that it might even stop publishing for an indefinite period.

Despite the financial support of its readers, both men and women, and of the federal Government last fall, unfortunately *La vie en rose* has been unable to erase its deficit. We deplore as well the lay-off of a good many of its employees.