

*Adjournment Debate*

United States will not use a subsidy bonus program for sales of wheat and grain into Canada's traditional markets.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for External Relations):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to reply to my hon. colleague on behalf of the Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board, who would have liked to reply himself, but who is unfortunately unable to be here. He is on his way back from Japan, where he discussed this important matter with his foreign counterparts. This, by itself, is a very good indication of the will of this Government to remain competitive on the market and to ensure the best possible share of the international market for our grain.

The Minister wants our market to remain competitive and to continue to develop. He is quite familiar with the U.S. Farm Bill and intends to discuss it with his counterparts. This is the way that our Minister has decided to handle the issue.

[English]

For instance, we know the loan rate to American grain producers has been lowered 27 per cent, from \$3.30 U.S. to \$2.40 U.S. per bushel. This will result in downward pressure on the world price of wheat, which is essentially set by the United States, the world's largest grain trader.

We also know that American grain growers will be protected from falling prices. Subsidies will cushion the blow. Some predict that farm subsidies, overall, will cost the U.S. Treasury as much as \$70 billion over the next three years. A large part of this amount is earmarked for export programs. The United States intends to recapture its market share and reduce its burdensome stocks.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, we all know that, each year, the European Economic Community countries spend \$18 billion, or 70 per cent of their budget, to support their grain industry as well as stocks which are becoming increasingly large.

In the short term, Mr. Speaker, neither the American legislation nor the action taken by the European Economic Community are useful in the present situation.

However, our Minister has decided to sit down with representatives from Australia, Argentina, the United States and the European Economic Community with a common purpose to find an equitable solution. I can assure you that this matter will be raised during the coming week when our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) meets with the American President.

[English]

REFUGEES—DRAFT LEGISLATION INQUIRY. (B) CONTENT OF ALLEGED DRAFT

**Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, on February 6 during Question Period, I asked the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald) whether she would confirm that she recently approved a draft authorizing immigra-

tion officials to expel within 72 hours most refugee claimants who, in fleeing their country, passed through another country. She evaded the question. She would not confirm nor deny that there was such a document authorized by her. She said I was wrong, which was an evasion of a direct answer. Yet, I have it on the best authority that such a draft was circulated with ministerial support.

That draft would exclude from Canada most refugees who might arrive once the draft was adopted. There is a known crisis in the matter of refugee claimants within Canada. The crisis has been created by the misconduct of the immigration bureaucracy and the neglect of a succession of Ministers.

● (1810)

In addition to people who came here claiming refugee status, there were others who claimed other types of hardship under the humanitarian and compassionate sections of our immigration law. They were quite improperly put into the refugee stream, and thus they bloated the refugee stream.

There were other delays caused by the staff simply not providing typists to type the transcripts after the interviews. The length of time between each stage of the refugee process lengthened. What once took a year took two years, and it now takes five or six years.

The Immigration Appeal Board was slow and often incompetent. It was the cause of many appeals. It was finally the cause of the grand appeal to the Supreme Court one year ago next month, which finally made clear that a person is entitled to an oral hearing before his life is to be jeopardized by being deported as a refugee claimant.

The delays have caused hardship to refugee claimants and their families, and cost to the Government. Yet the Minister herself caused delay a year ago when she delayed for six months the reception and publication of the report of Rabbi Plaut, which had been asked for in the previous year by the then Government. She stalled further the action on that report by asking the committee to study it. When the committee studied it and tabled its reports in Parliament in November and December, after many hundreds of hours of painstaking work, instead of acting on it, even within the rules of the House, the Minister of State for Immigration (Mr. McLean) violated the rules last Friday by refusing to respond to the report of the committee which was tabled in November in the House. On the 120-day limit, he was supposed to give an answer, and he just refused to do it. He said instead that he would couple it with an answer to a later report some weeks down the road. That report which he refused to answer was the report that would have provided a legislative plan for correcting the errors and weaknesses of our present refugee system. Therefore, the errors and weaknesses continued to accumulate.

What has happened during this past year is that certain sharks, certain shysters, consultants and some lawyers brought in hundreds of Portuguese people last year, and more this year, to abuse the situation of backlog and delay. They claim they are Jehovah's Witnesses and would be persecuted if they returned to Portugal. Nobody believes the claim. It does not