

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if only we could have a policy that would allow both genuine refugees to come to Canada and enjoy protection, and people who have all the qualifications of a good Canadian, who have parents or relatives in Canada, to come without resorting to unrealistic and often illegal means, all would be well.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party oppose Bill C-84. Because actually Bill C-84 and Bill C-55 fail to solve the problem we are now facing in Canada. Why does the Government not address that immigration policy, the whole matter of immigration that is so vital to Canada? The reason I already gave in this House, Mr. Speaker, at second reading stage. If in 1958 Canada had had the immigration policy or what is proposed in Bill C-84 and then in Bill C-55, I for one would not be here today in Canada and in this House to speak on immigration policy. This is the problem we have, Mr. Speaker. We cannot afford, as a country that is so great, so vast, so generous, to have legislation as restrictive and repressive as Bill C-84.

Of course, Government Members will suggest: You Liberals only criticize. What would you propose? Mr. Speaker, I view Canadian immigration policy as so important, so vital a matter that if I may, I would like to state the Liberal Party's position—a position that is clear and tolerant, that reflects Canada's unique nature.

• (1350)

Let me make it quite clear that we strongly deplore the facts that a few unscrupulous counsellors and other similar profiteers abuse our refugee status determination system. We will support any reasonable measure designed to remove people who take advantage of refugees and of the system. However you should know that the legislation already contains certain provisions under which the Government can take legal action against these people. So we have to make sure that the new measures are an improvement over the existing legislative provisions.

Under Sections 19 to 32 of the Immigration Act, 1976, individuals with a criminal record or likely to indulge in criminal activity are inadmissible in this country. Before being deported pursuant to these sections, the individuals involved must be given a hearing. Subsections 95(i), (j) and (n) also provide that legal action will be taken against counsellors and other profiteers.

Subsection 95(n) under which action had been taken against the captain of the *Amelia* stipulates that the author of a criminal act may be fined a maximum of \$5,000, or imprisoned for a term of less than two years, or both. In the case of summary conviction the subsection provides for a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or imprisonment for a term of less than six months, or both. Criminal Code sections concerning fraud may also be invoked.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government did have a law to take measures to enforce the legislation on the immigration of refugees to Canada. There is no emergency just because 174 people landed on our shores. In the past, Mr. Speaker, Canada did welcome hundreds of thousands of refugees. However, we never had to call back the House of Commons during the summer. It is not that I do not enjoy being here, but like every other Member of Parliament, I had planned to meet my constituents during the summer. However, we are now here to discuss a problem which the Government could have dealt

Immigration Act, 1976

with. Could there be other reasons? I do not want to discuss these reasons for the moment because I believe that the whole refugee issue is important for Canada and I shall use what time remains to speak about it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that, as early as in 1980, when our Party was in power, the former Minister of Employment and Immigration, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), had recognized the problems we are facing today. Studies had been made and changes were officially recommended, in 1984 by Ed Ratushny, and in 1985 by Rabbi Plaut, both of whom had been commissioned by the Liberal Government to find solutions before the refugee problem became a real crisis. We Liberals therefore ask for a quicker refugee determination process with universal access. We shall continue to demand two minimum guarantees: First, that there be a hearing for each claimant, which guarantee was ruled necessary by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1985 in the Singh case, and second, that we keep our international commitment as signatory of the United Nations Convention on Refugees never to extradite a claimant to a country where he might be in danger. We cannot give our support to any legislation which does not contain these two guarantees.

We also ask for an broader definition of the family class which better corresponds to the concept of the extended family held by many immigrants. For many of them, it is quite normal for a cousin to live under their roof and be considered a member of the immediate family. We are talking here about cousins, Mr. Speaker, but at the present time, neither the brothers nor the sisters are allowed to come to Canada. Often, even the parents—I shall never forget the first immigration case I had to deal within my riding. I did not even have furniture in my office when a man entered and told me this: I have a problem. My mother is 75 years old, and I have managed to bring her here as a tourist. I was in Italy attending my father's funeral and I just could not leave her all alone over there. I brought her here as a tourist. Upon her arrival, I went to the immigration office. The officer told me: You will have to send her back to Italy. She will have to submit there an application to come here. Mr. Speaker, you can easily imagine the anxiety of that woman. She was 75 years old and all her family was settled here in Canada. She had no one back there. Now, the immigration officer had said she had to go back to Italy.

Those are the policies which the Government should define. I am sure that once it has done so, and properly defined as well the enlarged families of Canadians with relatives abroad, established a system making it possible for these people to submit applications to enter Canada through our embassies and consulates abroad, following a process which is neither too long nor too complex, I am sure we will be able to deal with the false refugee problem, because we would be left only with true refugees. I think that Canada should do its share to help true refugees who are seeking asylum in this country.