

Many national churches in Canada have master agreements by which many of their parishioners or congregations have sponsored refugees. The national organization has worked out the basic arrangements with the minister and the department so that a congregation which may not lack much experience in immigration and refugee procedures can undertake to sponsor one person or one family. This has happened in hundreds or thousands of cases across the country.

The agreement in these master agreements was that the government would provide the loan to bring the refugee or refugee family here. The sponsoring organization, the churches, and others would undertake full responsibility for the person's financial and other welfare for the first year after the refugee or the family arrived.

The churches and the other sponsoring organizations have kept their part of the arrangement, relying on the government to provide the funding for bringing the refugees here. The churches have committed their budgets to ensuring that the work will be done in Canada by local congregations. Members of congregation have committed their budgets to the same purpose, to the maintenance of the refugees after their arrival in Canada. Suddenly they are told that there are no more loans to bring in the refugees.

I am advised by the Interchurch Committee for Refugees that the agreement included under a clause of notice that either party may give notice of the discontinuation of this arrangement. Knowing at least since June of last year when it gave \$5 million for the emergency in Southeast Asia, knowing that the people from eastern Europe were coming in faster and taking up the loans faster at the end of last year, and knowing that they were coming in still faster at the beginning of this year, the government gave no notice to the private sponsoring organizations, the churches, and others.

The government violated its obligation to give one-month's notice. If the churches had violated their obligation, we would be hearing loud complaints from certain people in the government. Certainly we would be hearing loud complaints from the member for Surrey—White Rock who, during the debate on Bill C-55, took every opportunity he could find to taunt the churches with not bringing in as many refugees as the government brought in. If the churches are so interested in refugees, he asked

in committee and in this House, why do they not sponsor more of them?

When the churches had a chance to answer him—and usually he said it where they did not have a chance to answer—they pointed out that a church group might undertake to sponsor 500 refugees in one year but through government red tape only got perhaps 250. It was not the churches' fault that the other 250 did not come; it was government red tape.

The government red tape is such that when the churches agree to sponsor a refugee, say from Africa, who has been declared by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees to be a genuine refugee, the churches say: "Yes, bring that man" or "bring that family". The government does not trust the United Nations High Commission for Refugees enough to take its word.

The Canadian government funds the UNHCR, and I must say that it funds it generously compared to some other countries. In that respect the Government of Canada is doing a good job. It is providing the money that is absolutely essential for maintaining the life and the future of 15 million refugees in the world, mostly countries located in Africa and Asia. For some strange reason, after funding the UNHCR and after having a member appointed by this government sitting regularly on the executive of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, the government will not take its word that Mr. So-and-So or Mrs. So-and-So and their children are refugees. The government will delay, sometimes for months or even for years, a decision as to whether the sponsoring group in Canada should be permitted to bring that designated refugee to Canada.

We do not know very much of what goes on in the refugee camps when the Canadian consular officers visit the camps to select refugees. There are strong indications that in fact refugees from those camps are selected first for their supposed economic benefit to Canada. Are they tool and die makers? Are they nuclear physicists? Do they have some specialties that we think Canada might want?

Only secondly are they selected for their need, either because they are in danger of damage to their health by a long stay there or because there is some other danger. In some of the camps there is danger from marauding armies. Either the country they live in or the country next door have occasionally invaded those camps and