

*Immigration Act, 1976*

perfectly reasonable without seeking to bend or break the rules.

However, the cases which I get are not like that, for the most part. If I do get a case like that I tell them what to do if they encounter any problems, and then to come back to me if they still have problems. Nine times out of ten I do not hear from the constituent again.

I had one case of an elderly woman who was here visiting her family from Hong Kong and became sick. Because she was in Canada as a visitor she was not entitled to any medical treatment but she was certainly too ill to go back to Hong Kong where she would be able to get treatment. In that case I talked to the Minister personally and she was accepted on a Minister's permit. She certainly was not going to leave Canada and was probably going to die in a few months. Because she was accepted on a Minister's permit she was entitled to coverage under medicare in the Province of Ontario. We were assured by the provincial authorities, with whom we were in contact, that they would give that treatment. That is a humanitarian case in which I intervened.

I intervened in another case of a constituent who is a manager of a restaurant in downtown Ottawa. He is very hard working. He has been working for 14 or 16 hours a day, six days a week, in order to save enough money to fulfil his dream of bringing the rest of his family to Canada, as he is entitled to do. However, in this case there were all kinds of hassles from the Canadian High Commission in Pakistan. I cannot remember the details, but it had gone on for four and a half years. I intervened and eventually spoke to the Minister. The Minister's office became upset about it and sent cables to the office in Pakistan. I am happy to say that this family has finally been reunited here in Canada.

There is a great difference between the two cases I have just cited and the case of someone who had a perfectly normal opportunity to apply and who would have had absolutely no difficulty submitting an application and having it considered in the normal way.

Let us suppose that Mr. Grossmann's application for landed immigrant status was refused. Let us suppose it was refused because the law said that where there is an ample supply of people to fill the demand in a particular occupation we do not accept people from another country. What happens then? Hon. Members opposite say that because this individual was the grade seven teacher of one of the Mulroney kids the rules should be bent.

I would be quite open to a suggestion that perhaps we should change the rules and have more open immigration, that someone like Mr. Grossmann can make a contribution to our country even if there does not happen to be a great demand for teachers at this time. However, that would mean widening the doors to all applicants, not only one applicant who happens to be acquainted with the family of the Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, today's debate deals with Bill C-84. And, as everyone knows, this legislation is aimed at restricting the entry of refugees and refugee claimants that are entering Canada. It is a bill that is offensive, and it is opposed by the churches and all the groups that help refugees.

Mr. Speaker, this House was called back here in mid-August because of what this Government called the immigration crisis, the refugee crisis. But I believe it was a political crisis for a Government that had fallen down to third place in the polls. And it still holds third place today, and for good reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress the situation that prevails today, the double standard imposed by the Conservative Party. On the one hand, they turn down legitimate refugee claims, under the agreements entered by Canada with countries all around the world.

On the one hand it does this, but on the other it demonstrates very clearly that if you know an acquaintance of the Prime Minister or his family, you may be allowed, thanks to the direct intervention of the Prime Minister's Office, to do some queue jumping and have your application considered ahead of any other.

If someone who is here as a student or on a minister's work permit comes to see me because he or she wants to become an immigrant in this country, I feel compelled to advise him or her in the proper fashion by telling him or her to go back home. If your country of origin is very far away, go to England then, or Atlanta, New York or Buffalo, anywhere in the United States where there are immigration offices which are accustomed to accepting applications from people residing in Canada but who have to leave the country in order to apply for landed immigrant status following the normal process.

Now, if this is the normal procedure for everybody, I wonder why it is not the case for someone who is an acquaintance of Mrs. Mulroney or her son who is attending school?

**Mr. Malone:** False.

**Mr. Cassidy:** If the Hon. Member does not agree with current immigration procedures, he should make sure that changes are made on a general basis, but his constituents would not appreciate at all that someone who lives here in Ottawa and knows the Prime Minister personally be entitled to have his application considered in this country ahead of those submitted by some constituents of the Hon. Member who do not enjoy the same privilege.

**Mr. Malone:** You are a phoney!

**Mr. Cassidy:** I challenge the Hon. Member to have the application of someone living in his riding considered on the same basis as that of Mr. Grossmann, thanks to the intervention of Mrs. Mulroney and the Prime Minister's Office.