Dear Mr. Axworthy:

We are responding to a recent press release that the number of immigrants to Canada will be reduced.

We accept the logic of reducing the number of immigrants at this time when our country is unable to provide employment to its citizens, but we believe Canada would be evading its duty more if we close our doors to those in need. We therefore ask that the governmental officials should reconsider this decision.

Turning to another facet of immigration, we ask that Canadian officials involved in counselling normal immigrants, and perhaps even those refugees who might have a further option, acquaint these people with the realities of life in Canada. It would appear that many have unrealistic expectations.

If potential newcomers have the hurdles and alternatives clearly set out for them by Immigration counsellors at the time of interview, then many decisions made about coming to Canada clearly become wrapped up in tendentious moralizing that the result tells us more about the political attitudes of the authors and, perhaps, about the U.S. government than about refugee assistance programs for the Indochinese. The feature article in this issue takes the Congressional Report as its centrepiece and uses the European report and the Governors' report concentrating more on the non-governmental sector than Europe — it is not surprising to find the Governors' report concentrating almost entirely on problems of administration and coordination.

The European report concentrates on the actual social measures provided for the refugees — reception centres, housing, resettlement patterns, social assistance, language training, education, health, secondary migration and family reunification. These are more or less the same topics dealt with in the Second American report prepared in February focusing on the refugee assistance program of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) of the Department of Health and Human Services. Unfortunately, this American report was not written by an independent consultant with a knowledge of and experience in refugee matters, but by the surveys and investigations staff of the Committee of Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives. The lack of independence and expertise in this case is combined with such poor social science methodology and such illogical reasoning wrapped up in tendentious moralizing that the result tells us more about the political attitudes of the authors and, perhaps, about the U.S. government than about refugee assistance programs for the Indochinese. The feature article in this issue takes the Congressional Report as its centrepiece and uses the European report and the Governors' report as a Greek chorus from which comments and insights can be gained into one policy direction active in the U.S. government.

Correction

In the Note on the Politics of Counting the World's Refugees (page 12, Sept - Oct, 82 Refuge), the fifth sentence should read, "The number of Palestinian refugees does include children of refugees..."