

The Budget

means they will have to pay \$1,475 just for the right to settle in Canada.

In many countries, this amount is the equivalent of a year's wages or even more. A family of four will have to pay about \$4,000. Many people whose refugee status has been recognized cannot afford to pay \$500 to obtain permanent residence. Some people arrive here without any money at all. How can they deal with this increase? It is unacceptable that future immigrants who never lived in Canada or visited this country will have to pay for the Canadian government's deficit.

The government overlooks the fact that the country of origin has already invested a lot of money in educating these immigrants who are a formidable asset to Canadian and Quebec society. Furthermore, people will have to pay \$200 instead of \$80 to obtain citizenship certificates. This is unacceptable. The government expects to collect more than \$100 million per year as a result. This discriminates against workers and poor people from developing countries, like the head tax on Chinese immigrants in the 19th century, which was intended to discourage the Chinese from coming to Canada.

The government has shown no compassion at all for people who seek the protection of Canada under the Geneva Convention. The budget cuts will have a severe impact on the IRB. The number of commissioners who deal with refugees will drop from 175 to 112. The board's budget will be reduced from \$82 million to \$77 million. On the whole, the budget of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is shrinking, despite the fact that fees for services rendered have gone up, sometimes by 200 or 300 per cent.

Because of office closures, staff cuts, the creation of two huge processing centres in Vegreville and Mississauga and other operating problems, the department is no longer capable of carrying out its mandate.

• (1525)

On top of that, we had the appointment a few days ago of Jean-Guy Fleury as executive director of IRB. Mr. Fleury formerly held a position with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, a fact that was omitted from his biographical notes.

Why does the Liberal government want to establish this kind of association between immigration and intelligence and national security matters?

[English]

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is by way of a comment because I really cannot let some of hon. member's comments go unanswered.

With the greatest of respect to the hon. member and his background in immigration, his lack of comprehension of the

policies of the finance minister and the minister of immigration and our policy initiatives which have taken place during the last several weeks is tragic.

The idea that the department of immigration would not reduce its moneys is simply ludicrous. Of course it will. We all have to. Every single person in this country has to make a sacrifice to ensure that the country will continue and that the institutions of this country will continue to serve all Canadians.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Ms. Clancy: Madam Speaker, I wonder if we could call a meteorologist. There appears to be some heavy weather on the other side.

At any rate, over the sounds of the empty barrels, for the edification of the hon. member for Bourassa, for the 3,000th time since the announcement was made I want to explain the situation with regard to the fee. Very briefly, the \$975 will be charged to adults on landing. No one will be turned away. Government loans will be available. Immigrants and refugees have paid back their loans from this country at the rate of 95 per cent. To say anything less is insulting to immigrants and refugees.

[Translation]

Mr. Nunez: Madam Speaker, I notice a great difference in the position taken by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration when she was in opposition, on this side of the room, and her speech today, now that her side is in power. Why is she not giving the same pro-immigration and pro-refugee speech she gave before? Why has she changed so much? Today she is defending policies criticized by all of the organizations that assist refugees and immigrants. Everybody is against this immigration tax. Everyone opposes the \$975 fee.

She tells us that no one will be denied entry over this fee, but she does not tell us that, to qualify for a loan, an individual must show that he or she meets the loan repayment conditions. In poor countries, few people earn \$975 a month; sometimes they do not even earn that in a year.

[English]

Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wanted to respond to a couple of points the hon. member from the Bloc raised.

With respect to the reductions of the dairy subsidies in the budget, I believe the member may have erroneously left the House with the impression that Quebecers and Quebec dairy farmers were the only ones who received these kinds of cuts. That is not true at all. In fact, I have just received information in my office of a Canadian analysis. Each one of the dairy farmers across Canada contributed equally to the reductions, in terms of those subsidies, to the tune of about \$1,000 per farm unit. I can