

### Immigration

group of motions, namely, 1, 3, 4 and 5. If they move quickly, we could perhaps go on to motions 6, 7 and 8, and meanwhile arrange for some consultation on the matter and advise Your Honour when we would be ready for the procedural discussion.

**Mr. Speaker:** That was the suggestion I made a few moments ago. We all wish to move with some speed to deal with this complex bill, and our opportunity to examine the measure is to some extent limited by the compression of time. This is why I am very receptive to argument that the concept of domicile does, perhaps, exist elsewhere in the statute and has not been introduced for the first time in these motions. Hon. members have an opportunity to develop this aspect and make reference to it, but I would think it worth while to go on to deal with the first two groups of motions and leave the procedural argument until later.

**Mr. Epp:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. To ease the work of the House, I should like to mention that when we get to the question of domicile and the argument on that point—whether it is a new concept, or whether it is already in the bill—the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston) will not be here to put forward his views.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps we can proceed, then, to the consideration of motions Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5.

#### [Translation]

**Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency)** moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 20 to 28 at page 1 and lines 1 to 5 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“‘refugee’ means any person who, by reason of a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion,

(a) is unable or, by reason of such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of the country of his nationality, or

(b) not having a country of nationality, is unable or, by reason of such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of the country of his former habitual residence;”.

#### [English]

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood)** moved:

Motion No. 3.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 2 by striking out lines 27 to 37 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“‘family’, for the purposes of any provision of this act, shall mean any person being a husband, wife, natural son or natural daughter under the age of 18 or mainly dependent on the family for support, father, mother, fiancé, grandfather or grandmother, brother, sister, nephew or niece, grandson or granddaughter under the age of 18 years, sponsored by a Canadian citizen or a person admitted to residence in Canada;”.

**Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration)** moved:

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 2 by striking out lines 27 to 37 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“‘family’ means the father and mother and any children who, by reason of age or disability, are, in the opinion of an immigration officer, mainly dependent upon the father or mother for support and, for the purpose of any

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre.)

provision of this Act and the regulations, includes such other classes of persons as are prescribed for the purpose of that provision;”

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood)** moved:

Motion No. 5.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 2 by striking out lines 17 to 20 at page 3 and substituting therefor:

“person who is a member of the family as defined in this act;”

#### [Translation]

**Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency):** As we are nearing the end of this session, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important that all hon. members should co-operate to conclude the business of the House as soon as possible, but there are matters of principle which we should not overlook just for the sake of making our lives more agreeable.

The purpose of the amendment which I proposed to the House is to define more generally and—if I may use the word, Mr. Speaker—more liberally the expression “Convention refugee” in clause 2. Bill C-24 defines the expression “Convention refugee”. This convention we are dealing with here is the Geneva convention which was signed in 1951 and to which Canada is signatory. We must realize, Mr. Speaker, that the Geneva convention which was signed almost immediately following World War II had a very particular and special significance in that it did not concern essentially people who were politically persecuted, but people who had been displaced by the unfortunate events the world had gone through between 1939 and 1945. Canada being a party to that international convention undertook to accept certain minimum obligations. On the contrary, article (5) of the convention very clearly indicates that with respect to their obligations towards refugees go beyond the signatory countries may easily that to which they committed themselves by signing the convention.

Mr. Speaker, it would be truly unrealistic to stick to the definition of the Geneva convention when we know that an increasing number of people will want to claim the status of refugee from within their own country, when the convention says that to qualify as a political refugee, one must necessarily be out of the country of his nationality. The proliferation of totalitarian regimes in the world can only increase that trend because of violations of human rights by an increasing number of countries. Mr. Speaker, this is a situation that is recognized by the department when, for example, in issue no. 11, reference is made to clauses 115(1)(d), 6(2), 115(1)(e), when the reasons are given for the regulations that will accompany the legislation and it is suggested in support of what I just said, that there is an increasingly frequent number of situations where certain groups are the victims of serious political persecutions and must seek to settle somewhere else although they do not meet the definition of the term “refugee” under the United Nations convention, and it goes on to mention the Ugandan and Chilean cases.

Mr. Speaker, it would only be natural to include in the legislation what is in any case being done in practice, what is being done in the case of the Ugandans, what is being done in the case of the Chileans, through administrative directives, or special programs. It is suggested, Mr. Speaker, that if we