

Immigration Act, 1976

defective and badly written Bill and refused all amendments which could have improved it.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore invite all Members of this House to reject Bill C-84 because the Conservative Government has refused the amendments which could have made this Bill more acceptable. In its present form, the Bill is totally unacceptable for the great majority of Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria). The refugee legislation which we are debating today, Bill C-84, and the other Bill that is in committee, Bill C-55, will become the refugee determination system. The Member quite rightly pointed out that we need legislation which stops abuse, but not on the backs of legitimate refugees; legislation which makes that clear in legal terms.

There are many parts of Bill C-84 which will be challenged in the courts because they do not live up to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms within our Canadian Constitution. All Canadians are equal under the law. That is why I was very disturbed this morning to read a letter from the President of the Canada Employment and Immigration Union who alleges that the Deputy Minister of Immigration and others would have violated the immigration laws of this land for a personal return or as a personal favour. That allegation must be investigated. If it is left unaddressed and swept under the carpet it will give a very clear signal to Canadians that there is one law for the Deputy Minister and his friends and another law for all other Canadians and claimants.

I would like my hon. friend to address for a moment that very dangerous signal which can be sent out. At the very time the Government is talking about curbing abuse, we have heard an allegation by a union president that abuse is taking place in the higher offices of the Government. Would the Hon. Member share his comments on this issue with the House?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my colleague, the Member for York West for that excellent question. He is very rapidly becoming one of the most knowledgeable experts in this House on immigration and refugee issues. Very clearly what the Member is indicating to us is that the allegations made, albeit not thoroughly investigated yet, do give an indication at this very delicate time to many Canadians that certain individuals appear to act in a manner which suggests they are above the law. There is one law for ordinary Canadians in immigration policy, and there is another law for my constituent who is trying to get her mother and father into Canada. Some have to wait endlessly in a line—two years in one case of a constituent from Orleans to whom I spoke this morning. There is another law for those who want an individual to be here for what appears to be some form of personal reward. That gives a very dangerous signal to Canadians. Compound that fact with the two things I have just described, plus the two following issues: one, the arbitrary piece of legislation with which we are dealing now with its

tremendous failing. Second, this country is not even meeting its immigration quotas it now has. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we are short by tens of thousands—I believe the number is somewhere in the order of some 40,000 or 50,000 people short of meeting the quotas—

● (1300)

Mr. Witer: The levels for 1987 are 115,000, up from 85,000 in 1984.

Mr. Boudria: The Member sitting to my extreme right, which is appropriate under the circumstance, could correct me if he says that we are meeting our immigration quotas. My understanding is that we are between 40,000 and 50,000 short of meeting our immigration quotas.

Mr. Redway: Immigration has increased in the last three years.

Mr. Boudria: Members will have their opportunities to state whether in fact the Government is meeting its quotas. The Government has increased the quota, yes. The target is increasing, but the shortcomings are worse, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Witer: The number of landings was 100,000 in 1986, up from 84,000 in 1984.

Mr. Boudria: We are desperately short of staff to handle the number of claimants in the area of refugees. We know how badly equipped we are there. We know that it takes a year and a half or so for the refugee determination process, and in the way of applications for immigration it is even worse.

It seems, at least from the allegation made by the union in this case, that if you know the right person at the right time for the right reason, the rest is irrelevant. You can get into Canada very quickly.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, the other area of concern I would like to have the Member address is the concern that regardless of what the clauses purport to say, claim or do, many legal experts have testified before the committee that the legislation and the particular clauses are seriously flawed. This piece of legislation will be tied up by the courts, which would have the effect of paralyzing the policy which is the concern of the legal community. Here we have a Government that brought us together under the guise of an emergency only to have in 12 months, 16 months or 18 months this policy which will be made null and void and unworkable because there will be rulings by the Supreme Court or other courts that will make a determination that it is unconstitutional.

In light of that, would the Hon. Member support having the Government send this piece of legislation directly to the Supreme Court for a judicial review so that we can buy some time and alleviate having the legislation travelling a very slow and agonizing death in the courts? The purpose of a judicial review would be to get a Supreme Court ruling immediately so