

What constitutes an unsavoury character? Is it the colour of his skin, the kind of clothes he wears or how he wears his hair? Where do you draw the line?

I am sure the member did not want to leave the wrong impression. I say to him by way of feedback that the impression he left was a fairly frightening one. Early in his intervention he was talking somewhat off the cuff and he indicated, maybe unwittingly, that even when people are not convicted of a crime certain conditions ought to apply. I say to him that is a fairly frightening prospect. If that is the kind of ground rule he would envisage, I put it to him that suggestion undermines most of the rest of what he said about a robust policy and an open policy and that kind of thing.

Maybe unwittingly the member let us into his thoughts more than he intended. Before we judge him on that could he tell the House what he meant? Would he maybe give some examples of what types of individuals, though not convicted of crimes, he might seek to keep out of the country.

The second question flows from the first one. Is that kind of thinking to be applied by people already in the country? Do we have a certain broad-brush approach that would judge people even though the courts have not found them guilty of anything? Would we have a broad-brush approach that ostracizes those people? How far does he go with that? Does he advocate maybe deportation for those unsavoury characters? Where does he draw the line?

**Mr. Shields:** Mr. Speaker, I am always disturbed when someone tries to put a twist or a turn on something that is said very clearly and stated very clearly.

We in Canada today cannot, under the present immigration laws, bar from Canada known drug dealers who have formed cartels. We have no way of keeping them out under criminal activity. It is well known by Interpol and by the international enforcement agencies that they are drug dealers and that they belong to organized drug cartels. It is the same with organized crime in various countries. Interpol and the other agencies know that it is there. We all know the criminal activity that takes place and those who are higher up are insulated from it. It is known but it cannot be proven. Those are the activities that we in Canada are setting up so that we are giving immigration officers an effective way to determine inadmissibility based on those grounds.

### *Government Orders*

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Athabasca for a fairly clear setting out of certain matters. I would like him to enlarge on a couple of aspects relating to refugees.

At present in the refugee determination system for those who come to Canada to claim refugee status, they have the preliminary hearing in which most of them are found acceptable to continue on to the second stage hearing. The government has said that it has eliminated that hearing. It has put several elements, including one very controversial one, into the hands of the senior immigration officers at the port of entry.

If a person comes from a country considered not to be a refugee-producing country, he can be sent right back without a hearing under the new proposed act. If he came through a country that is considered to be a country with a fair refugee determination process, he can be sent back to that country under the new system.

My question to the hon. member is would he consider the United States a safe country to which to send back Guatemalan or Salvadoran refugee claimants who had come over land and through the United States to Canada to claim refugee status?

In face of the fact that the United States has generally accepted only 2 or 3 per cent of Guatemalans or Salvadorans claiming refugee status in the States, at least three-quarters of the ones who came to Canada, often more than three-quarters, were found by our refugee board to be genuine refugees. Would the member advocate that if this bill is passed, Guatemalan and Salvadoran refugee claimants coming to a Canadian port of entry through the United States should be sent back to the United States?

**Mr. Shields:** I want to thank my hon. friend for the question.

He refers to coming to Canada to claim refugee status. I hope he is not inferring that this is the only place that anyone can apply for refugee status. They can apply for refugee status at any Canadian embassy or consulate anywhere in the world. We have many of them and I think he knows that. People coming from Guatemala or San Salvador have other places they can apply rather than the border. The United States I would consider a safe country under the refugee determination system. It has proven that in the past. It has been a very generous country in the past. Whether Guatemalans or Salvadorans would be accepted or sent back to the United States would depend on the individual applying at the border.