

embraced by the committee and by many other Canadians. We must also keep in mind that the Official Opposition Party, together with the New Democratic Party, also made separate recommendations, whether in written or verbal form in debate on the floor of the House of Commons. The non-governmental organizations, the churches, Amnesty International, the Inter-Church Committee, all made their recommendations to this Government, and in fact, the previous Government, with respect to ensuring that the proper reform take place rather than simply reform for the sake of reform.

The current chairman of the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration, and Member of Parliament for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais), a government Member, in his capacity as chairman, urged continuously for a refugee determination system that would do honour to our traditions and to the recommendations and input that had been received from the public for a good many years.

One has to wonder if the refugee determination was important to the Government, if the reform of the refugee process was a priority. After hearing all the evidence from Rabbi Plaut, the committee, Canadians, non-governmental organizations, why did it take three years before legislation was placed on the floor of the House of Commons for deliberation in this national Chamber?

One can conclude that it was not a high priority on the Government's agenda. It was not made a necessary prerequisite in order to clean up the system, to reform the system, so we could once again place the confidence of Canadians in an immigration policy and refugee determination system that works. The confidence of Canadians is a crucial variable in the over-all equation. Without the confidence, understanding and support of Canadians, governments are paralyzed. Governments are not able to enact progressive legislation unless that legislation is rooted in the sentiments of Canadians from one coast to the other. It is that support from Canadians that permitted former governments, including the short-lived government of the then Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Joe Clark, to enact a program. Between that Government and the Government of the Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, close to 106,000 Vietnamese boat people, were brought in, some 50,000 supported by the communities themselves, sponsored by Canadians, and the other 50,000 supported and sponsored by the Canadian Government.

There was the movement of 37,000 Hungarians in 1958, the movement of 11,000 Czechoslovakia refugees in 1968, the 7,000 Uganda refugees in 1972, the special South American program in 1973 which allowed 7,000 refugees to come in, the 11,300 Lebanese refugees in 1976, the 9,300 Polish refugees who were let into this country in 1982, the special Salvadoran movement in 1982 numbering 3,000 refugees, and so on and so on.

Therefore, when the Minister says the Government has increased Government sponsored refugees to 12,000, that is true. Those are refugees from the camps. But what the

Immigration Act, 1976

Minister does not say is that in addition to the thousands we as the previous Government sponsored, and in addition to accepting claimants from within the country, we have had thousands upon thousands of special refugee movements that this Conservative Government has not allowed.

Miss MacDonald: Five thousand refugees from Vietnam is all the Liberals would bring in.

Mr. Marchi: When the Conservative Government attempts to create a crisis out of 300 refugees who came in on a boat, it is shameful against the backdrop of the thousands upon thousands who have been allowed to come in. The former Minister of Immigration is speaking from her chair. I hope at some point in the debate she will stand up and account for those numbers rather than looking simply at the 12,000 who were sponsored from camps.

Miss Macdonald: All the Liberal Government would bring in were 5,000 refugees from Vietnam.

Mr. Marchi: I ask her to address herself to the other refugees Canadians have allowed their governments to move on. It is those same refugees who live in this country today. It is those same refugees who now expect the same tolerance, the same progressive attitude, that needs to be discharged with respect to refugees and immigration.

While they and every Member of this Parliament certainly do not want abuse and fraudulent claims, do not want to reward those who base their actions on human desperation, they do expect a policy that is tolerant, fair and speaks to a higher order and to the best interests of this country, rather than subscribing to those policies which may be politically expedient for the day but in the long term are found to be wanting.

With respect to fraudulent claims, the problem is equally crucial. If we allow into our system fraudulent claims, if we bring into this country those who do not deserve our protection, those queue-jumpers, that will in fact destroy any legitimate system. Any illegitimate claimant in the line-up delays justice for the individual who legitimately merits the protection of this country or any other country. There is no disagreement with that.

At the same time, however, in cleaning up the abuse, in dealing with those who wish to use our regulations and laws for their own purposes, we cannot lose sight of the protection for the legitimate person. We cannot lose sight as a country of the fact that legislation must be enacted which first and foremost protects those who legitimately need our assistance.

When the Government talks about deterrence, with which this Government has preoccupied itself in trying to sell the two refugee Bills we are discussing in the House of Commons, it always does so by saying it is against abuse and wishes to discourage people from abusing the system. It is as if to suggest that someone else in the House of Commons is in favour of abuse, as if to suggest there is a segment of society