

the authorities endeavoured to deport him on three occasions. The total cost of that little manoeuvre was \$10,490. Yet all of this was as a result of the delays in the process involved in deportations. While he was originally apprehended on a jay-walking charge, this gentleman, as hon. members may recall, was a member of the IRA and other terrorist organizations.

• (1620)

Clause 6 would reduce the grounds of appeal, Mr. Speaker, to errors of fact and law. Clause 7, which adds certain classes of illegal immigrants to those already listed in Section 104(2) of the act, is designed to permit law enforcement officers to apprehend additional classes of illegal immigrants, specifically those referred to in Section 27(2)(a) and Section 27(2)(k) of the act's present provisions.

This bill is designed, Mr. Speaker, to put some backbone in the Immigration Act's provisions. At the same time it is designed to eliminate a well-known abuse, which, as I have indicated, has been employed by the department itself for the purpose of circumventing the intention of Parliament. I submit that the provisions of this bill bring about a necessary remedial change to the immigration laws of Canada and I recommend them to hon. members of the House.

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate and I am pleased that a number of members of the House on this side feel so strongly about this issue that I am swamped with prospective speakers. I refer to such champions of justice as the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Berger), the hon. member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher), and the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen). They all want to speak so I will try to be brief and, hopefully, they will all have an opportunity.

Canada's Immigration Act, Mr. Speaker, sets forth in very clear terms the objectives of Canada's immigration policy. It enshrines such fundamental principles as non-discrimination, respect for the family, concern for refugees and the promotion of our social, economic and demographic goals. The inclusion of these objectives right in the act serves one very important purpose. The intent of the law is sometimes open to interpretation. By having these objectives in the act itself, it clearly states not only the law but its intent.

The act begins with a clear statement of specific objectives from which flow all of its provisions, regulations and administration. The powers and authority it confers are precisely delineated. The procedures to which immigrants and visitors are subject are clearly set out. Both the public interest and civil rights of immigrants and visitors are protected. It retains that which was valid and useful, and provides enough flexibility to be adaptable to our changing needs. It establishes firm criteria which may be interpreted in regulations as the need arises, but it does not list rigid prohibitions which prevent the use of common sense. I know the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson) is a firm believer in common sense in

government, and that is what we are trying to demonstrate in this act.

The act also provides a means to determine the size and distribution of the immigration movement, which is very necessary in a land of increasing urbanization whose resources are now recognized to be more limited than we once believed.

However, at the same time, it leaves the determination of the actual size and distribution of the movement to be set after consultation, and does not establish rigid figures cast in stone. For the first time, demography and immigration are linked in a statute that provides for the views of provincial governments to be taken into consideration, establishing a system whereby the level of immigration to Canada is a matter of open decision-making by the federal government in consultation with the provinces.

We all know how anxious the hon. members opposite are for the federal government to consult with the provinces on issues of concern to them, and this is in the act. These levels, publicly announced on an annual basis, estimate the number of immigrants the government expects to admit over a specified period of time. Furthermore, it links immigration to Canada's labour market needs and population objectives. While Canadians are being trained, immigration will continue to be one of the routes used to ensure the economy is provided with the workers needed for its expansion. However, immigration is only a partial solution to alleviating the constraints on economic growth. It must go hand in hand with improved training for Canadians, careful manpower planning and the migration of workers from other parts of the country.

In the years to come, Mr. Speaker, we will probably have to increase the number of skilled and professional workers brought in from overseas. Given the length of time required to train Canadians, even if we markedly increased our training efforts it is unlikely we could meet the demands projected for 1985. Just today you will remember that a Conservative member was asking us about PetroCan seeking skilled workers from outside the country simply because enough of them were not available here. Of course, that again, I think, demonstrates the wisdom of the recent program announced by the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) to try to meet those needs in Canada.

At the same time we have to ensure that immigration forms only a temporary bridge between labour demand and supply, nothing more. The future development of Canadian industry demands that employers and governments make commitments now which will provide skilled workers for the future. Our training systems must continue to develop and employers must live up to their responsibilities. For these reasons we have built an important safeguard into our immigration policy. Before skilled labour can be recruited from abroad, employers must demonstrate that no Canadians are available to fill vacancies and they must train Canadians to qualify for future openings. I am sure all of us are familiar with the fact that this is pretty well enforced. I am sure very few if any of us have not had employers come to our office and tell us how they had a specific person in mind, but in fact they were obliged to go