

*Immigration Act, 1976*

many but enough of them—who have done these things for financial gain.

This clause applies to the kind of people I have listed above, but it also applies to members of ethnic organizations and particularly of the newer ethnic organizations whose members still have family and friends who want to come to Canada, and this provision would apply to people in every city and town in Canada who are involved through church organizations in helping refugees who come to Canada establish themselves. I find the clause to be completely inexcusable and unacceptable. I am not satisfied, nor are the members of my Party and the people involved in this kind of work, with leaving it to the good will and good intentions of this Minister or any other Minister to decide that because they have done their work for humanitarian reasons, these people will not be prosecuted. That clause alone would convince me that I ought to vote, as I will, against this Bill.

● (1710)

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak about Bill C-84 because I think it is bad legislation. As Canadians come to hear more about it and the supposed emergency for which this House was recalled, they will have a better idea of why the Government is providing bad leadership and bad legislation.

This is an example of what I would describe as real low-road politics. The way the Government handled this matter was designed to prey on those irrational, hateful or racist feelings many people harbour. It was also designed to create the illusion that this approach would likely speed up family reunification for those who have waited many months or years for that to come about.

I want to talk for a moment about when the Government, in July, attempted to have the House recalled supposedly to deal with an emergency involving the drug legislation. The Speaker, properly interpreting the rules of this House, did not agree to a recall. Then the Government saw another opportunity when a ship entered Canadian waters with 174 refugee claimants on board and landed them in eastern Canada. It was an opportunity to whip up a reaction among Canadians and create the impression or, as we have now learned, the illusion that there was an emergency for which Members should be recalled.

Many Canadians wondered how great was this emergency. We learned the answer to that, of course, on the first vote on this legislation when only 84 government Members voted. Many Canadians wonder why, first, so few government Members voted on the Bill and more than half were away on business which they felt was more important, and, second, why those same government Members failed to speak on the Bill. That number included the Chairman of the committee, who has done so much good work in pointing out the flaws in this terribly Draconian Bill.

Canadians want legislation which provides law and order and goes after the real smugglers who benefit financially at the

expense of the oppressed and persecuted. Canadians do support going after those who trade in human tragedy and create financial gain for themselves while doing it. However, one of the points raised time and again with me by church groups and others in my constituency is Clause 9 of this Bill which allows selective prosecution of those involved in bringing refugees into Canada. Many Canadians were shocked and continue to shudder at the Minister's promise that he would never prosecute humanitarian groups or persons. He was only intending to prosecute obvious scoundrels who might try and smuggle people in, for example, by landing them at night on a deserted coast.

It is quite contrary to Canadian law, British common law, and the traditions of this country for this House to draft and pass legislation which allows a Minister, without regulation or direction, to decide unilaterally who should or should not be prosecuted. As many of those groups said, they make their decisions on refugee matters based on conscience and will continue to do so whether or not they are branded by the Parliament of Canada as law-breakers and criminals. It is so wrong for that kind of selective use of power to remain in legislation that I would vote against this Bill on that basis alone.

Of course, the media created the story around the 174 mainly East Indians who arrived on the East Coast and created the illusion that there were security risks and a flood of refugees and so on. Most Canadians know now that the number of refugees we were talking about would add only one-half of 1 per cent to the existing backlog of refugees. In addition, not a single one of those 174 continue to be held because of any kind of security risk or security violation. We have to ask ourselves how good was the information the Government was operating on. Obviously it was not very good. The profound claims which were made and which created so much hysteria have not proven to be true.

One of the presentations made to the legislative committee dealing with Bill C-84 came from the Canadian Ethnocultural Council. All Canadians interested in this matter would be well advised to have a look at the document. It is not that long and is available through the House. That group represents the following organizations: The Armenian National Federation, Byelorussians, the Canadian Arab Federation, Vietnamese associations, the Hispanic Congress, the Jewish Congress, the Polish Congress, the Chinese Canadian National Council, the Council of Muslim Communities, Croatians, Cypriots, Czechoslovakians, Estonians, the Federation of Danish Associations, Koreans, Sikhs, Portuguese, Finns, Germans, Hellenics, Icelanders, Lithuanians, Latvians, Indians, Japanese Canadians, the National Black Coalition, Italian Canadians, Barbadian associations, Pakistani Canadians, Russian Canadians, Serbian National Shield Committee, Slovaks, Slovenians, Ukrainians and the United Council of Filipino Associations, to name just a few. They made some very important points. On the very first page they pointed out that 75 per cent of Canadians support entry for genuine refugees