

*Immigration Act, 1976*

country. They said that more weight should be given to the circumstances of the individual who is coming now. The Government refused.

Third, the UN asked that a decision against a refugee should be reviewed because a mistake could cost a person's life. Again, the Government of Canada, a member of the executive of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, refused.

These three main objections to Bill C-55, made by every witness before the committee except those representing the Immigration Commission or the airlines, have been argued in Parliament and in public at every opportunity. The Government's refusal to heed them stands as a disgrace to Canada.

I also warn Hon. Members of the House and my brother and sister Canadians that we cannot deny justice and liberty to refugees without at the same time undermining and weakening the rights and liberties of Canadians.

We have seen how Bill C-84 denies the right and freedom of Canadians to help an undocumented refugee come to an immigration office in Canada to claim refugee status. Now Bill C-55, in the course of denying to a refugee claimant the right of a meaningful appeal of review of his or her claim, also denies to all Canadians the right to ask the courts to correct a mistake made by an immigration officer in the case of a Canadian applying to sponsor a relative for immigration. The Progressive Conservative Government, by whipping up a false panic about refugees, is eroding the freedom of individual Canadians to do what they believe is right.

I have described the strong opposition of Canadians to Bill C-55. However, the question many ask is: Why is the Government doing this? There is no doubt that the number of refugee claimants has risen very fast. There are ten times as many coming to Canada as there were a few years ago. There were 18,000 refugees last year. This is the Government's chief excuse, yet the previous Progressive Conservative Government decided to bring 50,000 from Vietnam in 1979, nearly three times as many. Why is there panic now?

The biggest shift in the flow of refugee claimants is in the countries of origin. After World War II, most refugees to Canada came from the communist countries of eastern Europe. They were anti-communists—including some Nazi war criminals, we find—and they were white. Now, most refugee claimants are from former colonial countries, often from brutal right wing regimes and not all clearly anti-communist. Most of them are not white.

Why are they coming? This new wave of refugees is a sign of much larger trouble in the world, especially in the past ten years.

During the fifties and sixties, and into the seventies, the Governments of western Europe and North America accepted millions of immigrants, legal and illegal, short-term and long-term, Caucasian and non-Caucasian. They fueled our manufacturing and service industries with cheap labour, and

strengthened the expansion of our markets into the former colonies of Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Asia and the southern Pacific.

However, when that expansion reached its limits in the mid-seventies, and markets began to shrink, the countries of western Europe and North America began to cut back. Wage freezes, currency devaluations and restriction of immigration began. To bolster our industrialized nations, agricultural prices were cut, impoverishing many former colonial countries. Multinational manufacturers also began shutting down factories and data processing services in industrialized countries and moving to the former colonies for cheaper labour. The recession of the early 1980s speeded this up. One result was a sharper cut in the demand for cheap labour in Canada and our neighbours in North America and western Europe. At the same time, areas like Latin America experienced growth of Governments preaching the doctrine of national security. With arms, military advisers and police training, provided mainly by the United States and western Europe, these Governments began attacks against what they chose to call "communist subversion", such as did Pinochet's coup in Chile in 1973.

● (1620)

Powerful corporations joined with the military to suppress labour unions and hold wages well below the rate of inflation. In areas such as Latin America, the Philippines and Sri Lanka, peasants were forced off the land. Foreign-owned factories recruited labour at starvation wages, and more military repression was used to suppress unions. At the same time, the foreign owners of industry, including much agri-business, with the help of international banking institutions, ensured that more capital flowed out of these countries toward western Europe and North America than flowed into them.

The poverty of the people deepened rapidly. So the seeds of civil war were sown in many of the former colonies. From these same countries came refugees fleeing persecution because of their attempts to defend their right to eat or fleeing hunger in a land they no longer owned or where they could no longer grow food to eat.

More recently these former colonies have been burdened with huge external debts. Money spent to build and service factories there for foreign corporations, money lost to sinking agricultural prices, and cost of arms provided for industrial countries and used by the military to suppress discontent, was all charged against these impoverished Governments and hungry people. The refugees kept coming in search of a chance to live.

The peoples of these countries, officially politically independent, began movements and even wars of liberation from economic bondage that was killing them. The North Atlantic powers intervened to support Governments that would repay their debts to our banks regardless of cost to the people. More arms, military advisers and occasional military invasions