

effect, it would be a pretty poor choice for them. After living as a family of refugees, to leave one of their members behind is almost no choice at all.

• (1720)

A few weeks later, that young man hanged himself so as not to be the burden preventing his family from being relocated to Canada.

The Mennonite Central Committee, which has a great deal of experience in handling refugee affairs, pointed this out as a very tragic application of our law in this respect, especially in comparison to the United States where, in a case like that, they would have brought the person along and given him treatment since tuberculosis of that small degree can usually be treated with today's modern methods. That deals with one of the clauses of exclusion.

Another clause is 19(1)(b) which states:

Persons who there are reasonable grounds to believe are or will be unable or unwilling to support themselves and those persons who are dependent on them for care and support, except persons who have satisfied an immigration officer that adequate arrangements have been made for their care and support;

Therefore, either sickness or any kind of disability resulting in an inability to earn a living can be a ground for excluding a refugee if such a person is in the refugee's family.

While I would like to wipe out that whole exclusion, I cannot do so because of the action of the committee. However, I hope we would not exclude such a person if the sick person or person unable or unwilling to earn a living is not at least a dependent parent or dependent child. This is a matter of simple humanity.

We are not supposed to be dealing with regular immigrants. In fact, it seems that the practice of our overseas officers, with whatever instructions they have from headquarters, is increasingly to treat refugee claimants as though they were simply applicants for immigration to Canada. They are being asked about their education, skills and health, and whether they will be economically advantageous to the Canadian economy. Rather than that they are supposed to be considering human need.

Sometimes a refugee or members of a refugee's family have suffered very severely. Sometimes they have been wounded or tortured, physically or mentally. Sometimes they are half starved and have not had proper health care to prevent infections and so on. Not all refugees are in perfect shape when they apply to come to Canada. It is inhumane to exclude a *bona fide* refugee because a son, daughter, husband or parent is sick. That is bad enough, but it would also be inhumane to exclude a person because one's brother falls under one of these other categories under paragraphs (c), (d), (e) and so on.

When one considers the situation in the world now, we must follow the United Nations request and treat the case individually rather than collectively. Some of us joined the Army in the

1940s to fight against this kind of collective treatment, and we would like to defend the rights of the individual as in this clause.

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the amendment moved by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). It involves a very important principle and I heartily concur with his analysis in terms of individual rights and the importance of dealing with people as individuals. It is quite spooky when one considers people being condemned on the basis of the situation of a relative.

The Member for Spadina has already pointed out how he was unsuccessful in achieving significant amendments on this point in committee. What he is trying now, and what I am supporting, is a much lesser amendment. However, something is better than nothing in order to reduce the damaging effect of the Government's intentions to proceed in this respect.

This Bill is primarily a disaster. It is an extremely unfortunate Bill which will cause a great deal of harm. However, scattered throughout the Bill are some good points in its various clauses.

One of them is the right to landed status for people who are judged to be refugees. While there will not be many people judged to be refugees because many will be screened out before they even have a chance to make an application, they will have a little more protection than they received in the past. They will have the opportunity to apply for landed status.

However, what will happen next? The situation of family members then comes into play. As the Hon. Member for Spadina has noted, refugees who come to Canada to apply for refugee status are often in very bad shape. They have been through a great deal in their own country and may have suffered further in transit to Canada. It should not be surprising that some relatives will not be in the best of health and could be suffering from torture or physical and mental abuse. I believe a bit of compassion is in order at this stage.

I heartily urge the Government to see the merits of this amendment, in one area where it has done something right in permitting landed status to a certain, albeit small class of people. It should not close the door to them on account of the status of a relative.

Why should the Government not go the next step in this very limited area and accept the amendment of the Hon. Member for Spadina?

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to speak in favour of the amendment. However, I have some misgivings due to the nature of the Government's legislation. It is disgusting that the Government would deny refugees from landing in Canada by claiming that a family member had a disability or an illness, especially a treatable illness. The Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) used the example of a minor case of tuberculosis.