effectively to the benefit of the real refugees. This is a real world, not a theoretical world. It requires subjective criteria not subjective opinion. We are putting common sense to what we are doing.

**Mr. Berger:** We have heard that before.

**Mr. Weiner:** Of course you have, and you are going to hear it again. I know the Hon. Member does not like to hear it, but the majority of Canadians understand and know that what we are doing is about to be for the benefit of all real refugees. I hear a lot of naivete, but we have a realistic solution. We are creating a hospitable environment where genuine refugees will benefit.

We cannot take the public attitude for granted for the support which is needed to build broader refugee programs with the type of refugee problem the world is facing. We must continue to build that feeling in Canada. We must build a broader immigration policy because of the benefits immigrants and refugees bring to this country.

We have built a lot of safeguards into the process. Those are the strengths of what we are doing. We have given the benefit of the doubt to the claimant. Every claimant will be seen and heard by an independent, objective convention refugee board member. This person will be represented by counsel at all stages at quality hearings. All of those things will be done. With respect to a Third World country, we will be very, very careful. The human rights record of that country will be carefully examined, its record in protecting refugees and all nationals. We are going to seek the widest possible advice in building that list. We will be consulting the very people who have worked for years in the refugee community, the organizations, our own embassies and high commissions abroad and the international humanitarian agencies. A documentation centre will be set up, and indeed I have underlined that there must be an *ad hoc* arrangement. The country we are going to be asking the person to go back to and seek protection in must be willing to receive him back. What we are doing is good for the refugee, it is good for the community and good for Canada. I will repeat the words of the Montreal *Gazette*, and say that this Bill should be passed speedily.

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise and address Bill C-55 at the beginning of second reading. It is ironic to a certain degree that Bill C-55 in its second reading has come up in this year of 1987 which has been designated by the United Nations as the International Year for the Homeless. It is an effort of the international community to reach out to those who do not have a home, those who are looking for a roof over their heads for themselves and their families.

I cannot think of any individual or group who better defines the homeless than those who are refugees. It is ironic that when we put a magnifying glass to this piece of legislation, it really translates, for these refugees who are searching for their new home, that the Government is playing Pontius Pilate. It is

washing its hands of responsibility, which runs counter to the traditions of past Governments and this country. In fact, in large measure, to be a Canadian means to have initially been a stranger, to have left the familiar for the new. That is what it means, in large measure, to be a Canadian. Waves upon waves of immigrants have sought a new opportunity, a new chance, and Canada has allowed that new lease on life. At the same time these refugees have helped to build and develop a country which is second to none in the world.

When we talk about our immigration program, we talk of family reunification, extended family reunification and independent categories of individuals, such as entrepreneurs who wish to come here and invest their capital and know-how, students wanting to access our educational system and, after they leave and return to their own homelands, become ambassadors, if you will, for this country. And we also talk of refugees. In terms of refugee legislation, Canada has played a leadership role in the international community. It is not every day that in competition with the big superpowers of this world, we can lay claim to being the leaders on one particular issue. But if there is one area in which Canada can hold its head high, acting as a trigger for other countries, it is in the area of refugees. Successive Liberal Governments have had the courage to lead and not follow.

● (1620)

The Minister is right when he says that it is not the Government or Members of Parliament who build countries, that it is not necessarily Members of Parliament or governments who have to be thanked for allowing people to come to a country. It is Canadians and public opinion which have wanted those policies to happen.

I submit to the Minister that we need a Government that is also prepared to lead. We need a Government that is prepared not to manipulate public opinion for its own political and partisan reasons. We need a Government which will educate, lead and articulate what it means to be a landed immigrant and what it means to be seeking refugee status. We have to deal with those matters legitimately. It is morally bankrupt and intellectually dishonest to confuse the two and to play one against the other.

The greatest frustration in Canada *vis-à-vis* immigration, or one of them, is probably the inability of Canadians to sponsor family and relatives to come here. Many of us in this place go home on Friday evenings and have our constituency days on Saturdays. How many immigrant-related cases do we see? How many individuals do we interview in our offices who cannot understand for the life of them why their uncle, their aunt or their nephew cannot come here where they would have shelter, financial, and linguistic and cultural assistance from their families? They would probably even be given a job. They cannot understand why they cannot come into the country. Unfortunately, some of them look to the refugee back-log and ask themselves: "How come the Government is prepared to let refugee A in but not my nephew?" That is a legitimate