

Refugee Update

I N S I D E

Urgent Actions:

Results to
Date

page 3

Commentary:

Where's The
Action?

page 4

The Backlog:

Slow and
Painful

page 5

Network News:

Montreal Looks
Good!

page 8

A Letter

September 12th, 1989

Dear Friend,

The new statistics came out from the Immigration and Refugee Board yesterday. We made up some charts that give you an idea of the figures for the first eight months since the new law came into force.

Eight Months — At A Glance

(January 1, 1989 to August 31, 1989)

Claims Withdrawn	269
Claims Pending	3691
Claims Completed	3243

Accepted 2589
Denied Hearing 382
Rejected After Hearing 272

Total Number of Claims 7203

Overall Acceptance Rate (2589/3243) 80%

The total number of claims opened (7203), is less than half of that in previous years. You can see that the government's plan to get the numbers under control is really working.

Some people argue that, if the numbers are down, it's because claimants are no longer coming from countries like Jamaica, Portugal and Turkey. They have a point but we're still concerned that a lot of refugees needing protection are being deterred from coming into the country under the new law.

There was a tragic situation reported in the *Toronto Star* this morning. A young Guatemalan, Sergio, had come through the United States to the Canadian bor-

der last month. He said he wanted to claim refugee status but was sent back to the U.S. to wait for a hearing.

Last week, in Buffalo, just two days before he was supposed to come to that hearing in Canada, he committed suicide. He hung himself. "He was just plain scared at not knowing what was going to happen to him", said Sister Cindy Drennan, a Catholic sister who was helping him.

Since the new law came, Canada has sent back over 750 people to the U.S. in this way. Can you imagine what it feels like to be sent back to a country where you have been hiding, travelling underground and always afraid of being caught and deported home...to a place where the acceptance rate for refugee claimants from Guatemala is 5.3%?

Although the Board's statistics are pretty impressive, they don't say anything about the real lives of the people who are being rejected under the new law. Just think about all the cases we have worked on since the new law came in. We're just lucky there has been such hard work done by people from Amnesty International, the Vigil network and the churches! They have prevented the deportation of serious cases.

But we're going to have to do some serious thinking about the future. Barbara McDougall is now publicly taking credit for protecting the cases that "fall through the cracks." She is also commending us on our work in bringing these cases to her attention. We have to figure out how our work to protect refugees at risk will allow us really to challenge Canada's refugee policy and its shrinking commitment to refugee rights. Glad you are near to help!

On another front, we were at a meeting with an immigration official responsible for detention in the Toronto area. He told us they had decided to close down the detention centre at the Shield and Sword Motel, which housed a strip bar and was widely reputed to be a drug depot. That was good news. But it was kind of scary when he started saying they were on the verge of deciding whether to get into "the detention business" more seriously. That would mean

Top Twelve Claimant Countries

(As of August 31, 1989)

—Claims Completed—

Country	Claims	Accepted	Denied Hearing	Rejected After Hearing	Acceptance Rate	Pending and/or Withdrawn
1. Sri Lanka	1080	595	3	13	97%	469
2. Lebanon	1069	394	21	51	85%	603
3. Somalia	894	421	3	26	94%	444
4. El Salvador	570	189	4	31	84%	346
5. Iran	524	293	5	13	94%	231
6. Poland	290	71	25	16	63%	178
7. China	275	81	3	21	77%	170
8. Czechoslovakia	216	61	2	28	67%	125
9. Guatemala	165	55	2	6	87%	102
10. Pakistan	125	24	12	1	65%	88
11. Ghana	123	20	17	8	44%	78
12. Nicaragua	100	27	2	2	87%	69

building something or taking over some really big facilities that would be cost efficient.

It's very clear that they are using detention as part of an enforcement plan. They watch the statistics from the Refugee Board very closely. A big factor in whether they detain a refugee claimant or not is the number or percentage of claimants being accepted from that person's country. If chances are good that the person will be accepted as a refugee, they won't detain. Otherwise, they detain to ensure that the person is immediately available for deportation after the case is turned down.

We still really don't know how many people have been deported. We have only been able to monitor a handful of the 654 cases denied a hearing or rejected after a full hearing.

But we do know that the deportation process is dangerous. In many cases, the Canadian immigration authorities contact the refugee claimant's embassy to ensure the issuance of proper travel documents. Your guess is as good as ours as to the impact on friends and family back home. Pretty frightening.

When the actual deportation takes place, Canadian immigration hands over the travel documents to the purser of the aircraft who in turn gives them to the authorities upon arrival in the claimant's country. So much for anonymously slipping back in...!

Sometimes Canadian immigration hires guards to escort "problem behaviour cases" on the flight home. If they actually anticipate problems, they may "medicate" the person to ensure a smooth flight.

In other news, there seem to be limited "freezes" on deportations to five countries. Internal immigration directives read:

The Minister has instructed that, due to the current civil strife in Lebanon and Haiti, no removals are to take place until such time as the Government receives a clear briefing on the situation...

With regard to El Salvador the situation indicates that we should proceed with caution in removals...

All removals of Chinese citizens to China will be suspended for a period of sixty (60) days, or until the situation improves.

We were speaking to an immigration department spokesperson who said the Haiti freeze would probably be lifted soon because "things are back to normal" there. He also said there was a kind of freeze on certain cases from Iran, but we couldn't get any more details.

Well, that's all the news for now. Take care and we'll write you again in the new year.

In solidarity,
"J.R.S."



BASTA!

List of Urgent Action Cases

(September 12th, 1989)

- "Hussein" Case (January, 1989)—This is the 18 year old Ethiopian from the Ogadan who was "screened out" last January (leading to the formation of the Vigil network). Well, all the hard work finally paid off and he was recently promised a special Minister's Permit which will allow him to become a permanent resident in Canada.

- "N.P." Case (February, 1989)—This young woman from Iran became the focus for the court battle in Ontario over whether writs of habeas corpus could be used to protect refugee claimants denied full hearings and facing deportation. The Ontario Court of Appeal decided that habeas corpus could not prevent the deportations. However, a Minister's Permit has also been promised to N.P. and she will be able to stay in Canada.

- "S.M." Case (March, 1989)—This union activist from El Salvador was facing deportation in New Brunswick after his case was rejected at a full hearing. He too has been promised a Minister's Permit following a national urgent action campaign.

- "Abdi W." Case (June, 1989)—Abdi is a Somalian who was denied a full hearing even though he claimed to belong to the persecuted Hawiye clan and even though he and his family supported the opposition Somali National Movement. A national urgent action and a brief to the minister of immigration helped obtain a promise of a Minister's Permit.

- "Mohammed Ali" Case (June, 1989)—This young Somalian also claimed persecution because of his family's support for the Somali National Movement. His father died in prison for his political beliefs and Mohammed himself was tortured. He was denied a full hearing but following a national urgent action campaign he has been promised a Minister's Permit.

- "J.M.I." Case (June, 1989)—This young Salvadoran was rejected after a full hearing in May, 1989. The Refugee Board turned down the claim on the ground that his refusal to do military service in El Salvador is not sufficient for granting refugee status in Canada. An application for leave to appeal has now been granted and any threat of deportation is suspended until the final appeal is heard.

- "Shanmuganathan" Case (June, 1989)—This young Sri Lankan refugee claimant was rejected after a full hearing because "he appeared too timid to organize the demonstration" he described. An application to appeal the decision has been filed and there have been no new developments since a national urgent action was launched on his behalf on June 20th.

- "P.D." Case (June, 1989)—This refugee claimant from the Philippines was denied a full hearing. He has been in Canada since 1980. An appeal of the rejection has been filed and an urgent action campaign was launched in June, 1989. No response has been received from the Minister of Immigration.

- "K.M.I." Case (July, 1989)—This refugee claimant from Pakistan was denied a full hearing notwithstanding his assertion of membership in the Lahori religious sect, severely persecuted in Pakistan. As the result of a letter from the Vigil network, his deportation has been suspended to allow submission of further documentation.

- "Lebanon" Cases (August/Sept., 1989) Notwithstanding the supposed temporary freeze on deportations to Lebanon, at least one case has arisen where immigration officials have threatened rejected refugee claimants from Lebanon with deportation. In that case, an intervention by refugee supporters resulted in a halt to deportation proceedings for a review of the case. Refugee supporters are monitoring another rejected case in which deportation proceedings have not yet begun.

URGENT ACTION...URGENT ACTION...URGENT ACTION...URGENT ACTION

- "Lume Muvoni" (September, 1989)—Lume Muvoni is a 31 year old refugee claimant from Mozambique. His refugee claim is based on persecution by RENAMO, a group known for human rights violations against the civilian population in Mozambique. Muvoni claims that most of his family, including his wife, father and sisters and brothers, were killed in attacks by RENAMO (which has been likened to the Pol Pot regime that committed so many atrocities in Cambodia). He says that he has a sister and daughter in a refugee camp in neighbouring Malawi. Muvoni was rejected as not having a credible basis for a claim and denied a full hearing. He is presently locked up in an immigration detention centre in Montreal. A coalition of Montreal groups including the Committee To Aid Refugees (CAR) and the Quebec Civil Liberties Union (La Ligue) are asking Barbara McDougall to intervene in the case. They are also using the case to once again challenge the screening provisions of the new refugee law which result in such a claim being denied a full hearing.

Write to: Barbara McDougall; Minister of Immigration; House of Commons; Ottawa, Canada; K1A 0A6; call: (613) 994-2482.

Commentary: Where's the action?

The struggle to reform Canada's new refugee law is at a stalemate. The government has temporarily retreated from the idea of safe third countries, is rarely contesting cases at the screening stage, and is quietly beginning to reinstitute the principle of holding off



deportations to war-torn countries.

For their part, refugee supporters have stuck to the task of monitoring the new system and parading its failings in public when necessary. Many of the cases raised by the Vigil Network have been given Minister's Permits.

What can we expect beyond this? The new law still makes life-threatening "mistakes", there is still no meaningful appeal process, and many of those appointed to the new Refugee Board have demonstrated they are unfit for the job. Yet the Conservatives have assumed the role of victor. Refugees are no longer an issue. Period. The firm and capable Barbara McDougall has been widely praised by her colleagues for successfully removing the new law from the media spotlight.

The largest outstanding issue remains the uncertainty of those in the backlog. Although the minister has repeatedly denied any plans for an amnesty, it is uncertain how she will proceed without drawing a lot of criticism from all sides.

With the folks in Ottawa demonstrating such complacency, it is important to look beyond our borders to assess whether such a laissez-faire attitude is warranted.

Not surprisingly, the reality outside Canada reveals great upheavals which suggest our refugee policy is

profoundly artificial and unresponsive to current protection needs. Over the summer months alone, Canadians were witness to events signalling fundamental global changes: Tiananmen Square, Poland, ethnic unrest in the Soviet Union, the Alaska oil spill, David Suzuki's prediction on environmental refugees. And more refugees from Viet Nam, Africa, Sri Lanka, El Salvador, and East Germany.

What does this all mean for refugee supporters in Canada? Unfortunately, the media remain an unreliable source of analysis and understanding of what is going on. The East Germans are an interesting example of the media's double standards in reporting on refugees. Notice that all media coverage has referred to them as "refugees"; no reference here to "queue jumpers" or "illegal immigrants". Next, note how cheerfully the exodus has been reported. Acknowledging the East Germans are seeking more "freedom" in the West and are not facing any life-threatening conditions in the East, the stories go on to report that West Germany is fairly happy to receive the new, mostly young arrivals. They admit the country needs people to replace the aging workforce.

These positive images certainly clash with portrayals of similar unexpected arrivals in Canada. One need only remember the backlash led by the media against refugees after the arrival of the boats carrying Tamil and the Sikh refugee claimants in 1986 and 1987. Have the media provided such favorable coverage to the East Germans because the events occurred so far from Canadian shores? Because the refugees in this case were fleeing a communist country? Or because the persons in this case were white Europeans? These biases are not new in Canadian ethnic history.

As the eastern block begins to thaw and western nations continue to forge new trade rules for themselves and for those around them, the raft of social fallout continues to mount: civil wars (Third World wars really), dictatorship, repression, murder, torture, hunger, displacement, refugees. We hear it all on the daily news, but only as if it's all "out there" in some other world.

But if Canada and the West think they can escape what's "out there" by simply fortifying their immigration policies, there is a new refugee front which will not be so easily "managed" away.

The very idea of "environmental" refugees is awesome. Some environmental groups already routinely talk about safe and unsafe regions of the globe: areas that will survive the contamination crises in the years ahead and those that will not. There are countries that are disappearing under water (Bangladesh) and others becoming deserts (in Africa) and all the small nuclear disasters continue to add up.

The emergence of "environmental refugees" will blow the lid off the narrow debate over "political" and "economic" refugees. The refugees will be coming

from the whole world, and not just the Third World. The biases that favour refugees like the East Germans will come head to head with the biases that rejected the Sikh and Tamil claimants. What criteria will we use to assess environmental refugee claims?

Or maybe there will be no confrontation. Currently, the developed world protects only about three percent of the world's refugees. Perhaps it will be just as successful with environmental refugees. Perhaps the East German case is indicative of how the future may unfold: the West will continue to take in those who fit within their cultural biases and will expect the Third World to do likewise.

The real issue appears to be more one of attitude than of numbers. It's easy for Canada to look good letting in over eighty percent of current claimants when the government has bent over backwards to ensure that only the smallest numbers arrive here. It's easy for Canada to cheer the East Germans when it's not our protection they have sought. And it's easy to put off the threat of environmental disaster until its too late.

The deeper reality appears to be the increasing lengths to which Canada will go to distance itself from the misery of refugees. This trend can be seen not only in our new law, but in the decreasing number of



TORONTO GUATEMALA SOLIDARITY COMMITTEE

government sponsorships, the increase in business immigrant programmes, and the willingness of media sources to exploit negative stereotypes about third world refugees.

The deeper challenge will be for refugee supporters to have some meaningful impact...

The Backlog: Slow and Painful

The government is finally getting around to processing refugee claimants in the so-called backlog (people who made refugee claims prior to the coming into force of Canada's new refugee law on January 1st, 1989).

But the process is going to be very slow. By August 12th, 1989 the *Toronto Star* reported that only 400 of an estimated 124,000 backlogged refugee claims had been cleared.

And it is going to be very painful too. Consuelo Rubio, a community legal worker at Toronto's Centre For Spanish Speaking Peoples is concerned about the impact on many of those in the backlog who left children in war-torn countries or places where death squads operate. Until their cases are processed and they are granted permanent resident status, there's little they can do to bring their children to Canada:

"People are just doing whatever they can to bring their kids up here (illegally)," Rubio said. "They're paying thousands of dollars to do it, they're appealing anywhere they can. I had some people referred to me after they tried to kill themselves." (*Toronto Star*, Sept. 12, 1989)

And the painful waiting will no doubt play into the government's hands. The *Toronto Star* reports the following as of September 8th, 1989:

Firdaus Kharas, assistant deputy chairman of the Immigration and Refugee Board, believes 5 percent of an estimated total of 124,000 refugee claimants who arrived before Jan. 1 will leave voluntarily.

But there hasn't been a rush of refugee claimants lining up to leave Canada yet, according to immigration department statistics.

Only 21 claimants have taken up Ottawa's offer of a guaranteed interview with an overseas visa officer in return for dropping their claims.

Just one person in the backlog of 124,000 has been deported so far, and another is slated for deportation, while 1,090 have won the right to stay in Canada pending medical and security clearances.

It is not surprising that so few have decided to leave voluntarily to date, since the people being processed are mainly from "Group 2" (see below) and have usually heard that they will almost automatically be accepted. But as time drags on, we must be concerned that backlog claimants whose cases are less secure may begin grabbing for straws like the guaranteed "interview".

Experiences To Date

The backlog is supposed to be cleared in the following order:

- "Group 1"—This covers about 30,000 people who

had completed their Examination Under Oath (EUO) under the old law.

- "Group 2"—This covers about 6,000 people who arrived between May, 1986 and February, 1987 and were issued Minister's Permits because they were from countries on the old B-1 list (Note: even persons who did not renew their permits, but opted to make claims under the new law, may seek to be included in this group). The largest number of claimants in Group 2 are from El Salvador, Guatemala, Sri Lanka, and Iran.
- "Group 3"—This covers about 12,000 people who had received their "first inquiry" under the old law but had not completed their Examination Under Oath.
- "Group 4"—This covers the last 37,000 people who had not yet received their first inquiry under the old law.

In Winnipeg, Group 1 claims that are not accepted after the transcript review are getting hearing dates at this time.

In Toronto, refugee supporters say they are seeing only Group 2 cases being processed. Their experience of the process is as follows:

Step #1 —Call-In Notice

The Group 2 claimant receives a phone call or a letter advising of an interview at immigration department offices. This will be the initial interview for humanitarian and compassionate grounds review.

One of the problems is that there is not often enough lead time given the claimant. Toronto groups are now requesting that at least two weeks notice of the interview be given.

Step #2 —PIF Form

If the claimant is called-in by letter, a Personal Information Form (PIF) is attached. If by phone, the claimant is told to come and pick up the PIF at immigration before the interview. Although completion of the PIF is not essential for the interview (it is needed at the subsequent inquiry), refugee supporters recommend that it be completed before the interview (see below).

The form is straightforward except for the last and most important page where the details of the refugee claim must be inserted. It is essential that the claimant check off one of the 5 grounds of persecution listed in the form or the claim may be contested.

Step #3 — Humanitarian and Compassionate Interview

The interview is essentially to review whether there are any humanitarian and compassionate grounds to accept the case. It will be very rare that anyone will be accepted at this stage as the grounds are limited to high level political cases (e.g. defections of hockey players and ballet dancers) and cases where claimants have close family already accepted as permanent residents in Canada.

When there are no humanitarian or compassionate

grounds, the immigration officer proceeds to give the claimant 2 options: leave Canada and apply from overseas to return as an immigrant or proceed to an inquiry to determine the credible basis of the claim.

If the credible basis inquiry is chosen, the claimant is told to return to an inquiry on a given date and to bring 3 copies of the completed PIF. If the PIF has not yet been completed the immigration officer may proceed to "assist" the claimant to fill it out. This is where some danger can arise since a statement by the claimant that there are no real grounds to fear persecution may lead to a negative recommendation by the immigration officer at the inquiry. It is safer to have the PIF completed beforehand.

Step #4 —Credible Basis Inquiry

The claimant comes back for the credible basis inquiry on the scheduled date and is usually with about 20 or 25 other claimants in the waiting area. The immigration Case Presenting Officer (CPO) reviews the PIF and the file.

Because Group 2 is made up of persons from the B-1 list, the government has decided to concede the credible basis of these claims except where there is a clear indication that the person is not a refugee (for instance, if the person has failed to check off one of the 5 reasons on the last page of the PIF or has verbally said to the immigration officers that he or she has no fear of returning home).

The experience in Toronto is that if the PIF has been properly completed, the CPO proceeds to the inquiry before the immigration adjudicator and Refugee Board member takes place. These are group inquiries involving 5 claimants at a time.

The CPO says that the government does not contest credibility. The adjudicator then announces the decision that the claimants all have a credible basis and can proceed to a full hearing of their cases.

Outside the inquiry room, the CPO explains that there will not be a full hearing and that the person will now be processed for permanent residence.

If, on the other hand, the CPO does contest credibility, a full inquiry will be held. It will be very important that the claimant is adequately represented by counsel at the contested inquiry.

Step #5 — Permanent Residence

Before immigration can actually begin to process people for permanent residence, they must wait for the government to pass new regulations under the Immigration Act. This is expected to happen within the next couple of months.

Even then, there are concerns over how long it will take for people actually to receive their permanent residence. Some refugee supporters fear there will be delays of six months. The problem is that until permanent residence is received, claimants in the backlog cannot begin the family reunification process.

Our Backyard

Increased Detentions and Rapid Deportations in U.S

New U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) measures instituted early this year have been strongly criticized as efforts intended only to address American public opinion. The measures provide for increased detention of asylum seekers, and a new one-day adjudication process designed to enable rapid deportations. A U.S. interfaith delegation that visited the Rio Grande Valley in May said in its joint statement that the current INS policy serves only "to remove the refugees and the problem from public view and create serious obstacles to the filing of legitimate asylum claims." (*Inter Religious Task Force on Central America*, July 1989).

Mexico: Part of the Solution or Part of the Problem?

Throughout the 1970's and early 1980's, Mexico was a champion of many social change movements in Latin America. It rarely interfered with refugees passing through Mexico on their way to the United States and Canada. That has been changing and recent moves to militarize the Mexico-Guatemalan border only confirm indications of a new stiffer position from Mexico.

Although government sources in Mexico claim the border security measures are designed to address drug traffickers, unconfirmed sources have said the manoeuver has been funded with U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service money. In any case, the result has been a marked decrease in the number of refugees able to enter Mexico from Guatemala.

UN Conference on Central American Refugees

An important conference was held May 28-30, 1989 in Guatemala to enable donor countries to hear how the Central American governments intend to follow through on earlier commitments to resolve the refugee crisis. (Latest UN figures say that 4 million people or 15% of the region's population are in exile). Despite a recognition that real solutions remain unlikely while violent conflict continues in the region, there were a number of important achievements:

1. All five Central American presidents committed

themselves to resolving the crisis themselves without seeking resettlement assistance from other countries.

2. Terms of reference at the conference included not just refugees, but returnees and displaced persons as well.

3. Local non-governmental organizations assisting refugees were successful in gaining admittance and were able to participate in the proceedings.

Salvadorans Plan More Mass Returns From Honduras

Almost all the Salvadoran refugees remaining in Honduras have formally expressed their interest in returning home. This includes all those in the Colomoncagua and San Antonio camps and more than half of the 3,700 people at Mesa Grande. No definite timeline has been set for the return, though negotiations are underway involving the refugees, the UNHCR, the governments of El Salvador and Honduras, and non-governmental organizations.

Human Rights Not Aid Factor, Minister says

The human rights records of countries are not being considered as Ottawa decides how much foreign aid to give them during the coming year, International Development Minister Monique Landry said on June 9th, 1989. Although the government said last year that human rights considerations would be one of six criteria on which it would make aid decisions, the cabinet has not yet considered which countries, if any, it might view as offenders, Ms Landry said. Ottawa continues to give aid to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, despite protests from non-governmental agencies over continued human rights abuses in these countries. (*Globe and Mail* Sept. 5, 1989)

Closer to Home: Ottawa Privatizing Refugee Work

The federal government's share of refugee sponsorships has hit a nine-year low after dropping steadily since the Progressive Conservatives took power, Immigration Canada figures show. Former deputy prime minister Eric Neilson recommended the government stop sponsoring refugees altogether in a 1986 task force report on steps to cut the federal deficit. Since then, Ottawa has put a stronger emphasis on letting wealthy business immigrants into the country. (*Toronto Star* 6/12/89)



Network News

Coming Events

- **Who Is Our Neighbour — A Conference On Human Rights And Refugees**

Beaconsfield United Church; Montreal, Quebec
Sunday, October 22, 1989; 1:30 — 8:00 P.M.

There will be four workshops held from 2:30 to 4:30 in the afternoon: (1) Sponsorship/Settlement; (2) Amnesty International—Human Rights; (3) Current Laws and Lobby Activity; and (4) The Situation in El Salvador/Women's Solidarity

Supper will be from 5:30 to 6:30.

The guest speaker is Nancy Pocock, a Quaker and refugee rights activist.

Sponsored by the West Island Refugee Association and the Committee To Aid Refugees (CAR).

- **"Rights For Refugees" International Buffet**

Fulford Hall, Synod of the Anglican Diocese of Montreal; Sunday, November 5th, 1989; 6:30 P.M.

This is a fundraising event for the Canadian Council of Churches Court Action on the new refugee determination legislation.

Barbara Jackman, a prominent immigration lawyer, will be the guest speaker.

This event is sponsored by the Committee To Aid Refugees (CAR).

- **Canadian Council For Refugees — Fall Consultation**

The Canadian Council For Refugees (CCR) Fall meeting will be held November 23, 24 and 25, 1989, in Montreal. This is the twice-yearly gathering of groups and individuals across the country working on different aspects of the refugee issue.

Topics covered will include Educating Canadians About Refugee Issues, Protecting Refugees In Canada Refugee Women and Resettlement Issues.

For more information contact the CCR office at 4285, boul. De Maisonneuve ouest, Montreal H3Z 1K7 (514) 939-2752.

Resources

- *Crossing The River* directed by Camelia Frieberg is a moving 27 minute film/video about refugees and why they flee. The film focuses on the story of Carmen, a young Guatemalan woman who flees after her husband is killed and she is arrested and tortured. She leaves her children behind and the film captures the real suffering being endured by thousands of refugee claimants in Canada who are unable to be reunited with their families.

Available from Camelia Frieberg through Jesuit Refugee Service.

- Two new films about refugees and immigrants recently premiered at the Toronto Festival of Festivals.

Coming To Canada is a documentary-drama produced by John N. Smith of the National Film Board about the arrival of a group of Tamil refugee claimants off the coast of Newfoundland. The film is well worth seeing.

Who Gets In is another documentary about Canadian immigration policy and how it favours certain classes of immigrants. We'll leave the rest up to your imagination!

- Speaking of films, look for the new film *Romero* about the life of Salvadoran Archbishop Oscar Romero, assassinated for his stand on behalf of the people of El Salvador.

- **SAFE PLACE: Canada's New Refugees** is a new 27 minute video produced by Richard Fung and Peter Stevens. This documentary features the lives of four new refugees to Canada: Iliana, from Chile; Saeed, from Iran; Hasaan, from Somalia; and Thelma from Guatemala. They describe why they had to flee, how they got to Canada and how they were treated on arrival in Canada.

SAFE PLACE shows how Canada's history has shaped our current attitudes to refugees. It also sketches how the current government is becoming harsh in its treatment of refugees, and how the media have sown confusion and fear by perpetuating the myths about refugees.

Recommended for refugee groups, churches, high school classes, and unions.

Available from Richard Fung and Peter Steven through Jesuit Refugee Service.

- *What Are You Doing Here In My Garden?* is a new audio visual presentation produced by the Jesuit Refugee Service — Canada. This slide tape show is an educational tool designed to allow groups to discuss the refugee question at their own speed.

- Also from the Jesuit Refugee Service: *Step By Step: A Manual On Education About Refugee Issues*. The manual will be available in October, 1989.

Please let us know by December 1st, 1989 of any events in your area or new resources you would like mentioned in the January, 1990 issue of *Refugee Update*.

Refugee Update is published by Jesuit Refugee Service—Canada of the Jesuit Centre For Social Faith and Justice. Some funding is provided by the Canadian Council For Refugees.

Editorial team: Steve Foster, Ted Hyland SJ, Colin MacAdam.

Single issue: \$2 **Bulk (20 or more):** 50¢

For subscription information: *Refugee Update*; c/o JRS/Canada; 947 Queen Street East; Toronto, Ontario; M4M 1J9; telephone: (416) 469-1123