

tan Toronto police officer was killed and his partner wounded in a gun battle with an individual who was ordered deported three years ago.

With people waiting in line for years to immigrate to Canada why does the IRB quash deportation orders of known criminals and why does the department fail to execute deportation orders? I believe the minister should endeavour to find out, and I believe he should apply his words of June 22, 1992, to the workings of his own department. The system is clearly breaking down.

Canada must cease to become a haven for immigrants and refugees who were involved in criminal activity. While we will continue to welcome genuine convention refugees, we must strive for an immigration policy that is driven by the economic needs of our great country.

The average annual number of immigrants admitted to Canada over the last 25 years has been approximately 150,000. This should be our starting point. Then based on the health and the needs of the economy this number could be adjusted, up or down. Undoubtedly because of the immigration policies that are driven by special interest groups the government will denounce such a strategy.

Quebec with its controls of its own program of immigration has decided that it will be cutting back and accept only 16 per cent of all newcomers to Canada this year. What is its reasoning for this? It is its economy, of course, a very fundamental reason I believe.

Its economy is too sluggish and too weak at the moment to absorb and settle immigrants. To quote the red book again: "If a province is utilizing this strategy why is it so incomprehensible to suggest we can use a similar strategy on a national basis". The Reform Party's position is clear. Any immigration policy must be based on the economic needs of our country. What could make more sense?

Finally, this government must reform our system of removals and deportation. Criminals and bogus refugees are being granted stays by the IRB. This must cease immediately. This policy in fact is to the detriment of legitimate immigrants, legitimate refugees, and to the detriment of the Canadian taxpayer who must fund legal representation for these people either before a never-ending string of immigration appeal boards or before a judge in the criminal justice system.

Without real reform to the immigration policy and the workings of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada's economic recovery will most assuredly continue to be weakened and the safety of Canadian streets will most assuredly continue to be compromised.

Government Orders

This is not a time for simple housekeeping initiatives. This is a time to stop listening to special interest groups and start listening to the Canadian people. The Reform Party fully intends to be this government's worst nightmare on immigration policies until constructive, sensible and economy driven reforms are made to Canada's immigration programs. They can go to the bank on that promise.

• (2110)

I would like to address briefly the fact that I am appalled closure would be used on a housekeeping bill such as this one. I would simply quote the member for Kingston and the Islands:

I want to start by talking about the fact that the government is using time allocation once again on this bill. Just to remind the House and the Canadian public of the Draconian approach this government takes to dealing with legislation in the House—

Those were the comments of the member for Kingston and the Islands in February 1993.

In May 1991 the member for Ottawa—Vanier stated:

That is far from being democratic. Here we have an abuse of power by the majority because the government happens to have the numbers and it can impose upon the minority a process which, to say the least, is objectionable.

On May 29, 1991 the member for Kingston and the Islands stated:

A new definition of democracy—I suggest that it is contrary to all the practices of this House for the last 124 years. It is a breach of the proprieties of this place. While the Speaker has ruled that the motion is in order, and I respect that ruling, I suggest that it is—morally wicked of the government to proceed with this motion and particularly then to apply closure to the motion and thereby curtail debate on it.

On May 29, 1991 the member for Winnipeg St. James stated:

If there is going to be any debate, it will not put up with it very long, because it has a Draconian device, a Draconian mechanism called closure. If you deign and if you dare say anything in opposition to the government's proposals or to its motions, it will cut you off.

Finally on March 24, 1994 the leader of the government in the House of Commons stated:

Mr. Speaker, I said on behalf of the government it will be found over the life of this Parliament that this government will be using time allocation and closure far less frequently than its predecessor.

Four times in one night. He continued:

I challenge the opposition House leader to raise this again after a few years and see if I am right.

Perhaps after a few years it will be raised again. This housekeeping bill is no excuse for closure, but I will take this opportunity to close my address as one of the last speakers before the summer adjournment of Parliament.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.