

*Immigration Act, 1976*

excuse for the Government to tell us that it cannot be done. It can be done, but the political will is not there.

To add insult to injury, we have a Minister who has the nerve to say, "Don't worry, you guys over there, the Inter-Church Committee, we will not prosecute you. We will keep our word". How serious is that? How can you make laws that way? Not even a banana republic would do that. It is either on the books or it is not, and it is on the books, unfortunately.

● (1650)

The matter was raised at second reading stage a number of times by the Hon. Member for York West and by other Hon. Members including myself. This clause is a shame and it must be given attention by the Government if it has any respect for volunteer organizations and all those involved in this kind of work.

I know that the Parliamentary Secretary has a special sensitivity for the movement outside the country in which refugees are involved, and I know that he will take the matter up with the Minister. The Bill cannot be allowed to go ahead like this.

As we all know, there is an enormous difference between those who get involved for the purpose of profit-making and those who are involved for humanitarian considerations only. Everyone in this room knows that there is a big difference. The distinction can be made and it is clear. The terminology does exist if one wants to choose from it. It must find its way into this piece of legislation.

Clause 9 is a repugnant clause for which there is no room in the Bill in light of the traditions we have developed in Canada. It is not consistent with our international reputation. There is no way that this clause should be allowed by those back-benchers over there to stand on the books. It ought to be changed and ways to do it must be found.

I fully support the amendment of the Hon. Member for York West. Blanket incrimination rather than targeting those whose motives are venal is not fair and is not right. The distinction must be made.

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) said that it is up to the Government to find the word to be used. Now the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) asks why the Government does not find the word. It is their amendment. Why did they not find the word? They can get themselves the latest edition of *Roget's Thesaurus* and use any synonym they want.

I have no objection at all to their using any word they want in their amendment. If it meets the narrow definitions of the Criminal Code, that is fine. However, I can say that the word "humanitarian" will not do it.

I agree that that word is used elsewhere in the statutes and even in the immigration law. However, it is not used in definite

regulations. It is of course used in the context of broad Canadian goals.

I would ask the Hon. Member for Davenport, as I asked the Hon. Member for York West in committee, to define "humanitarian" in a world context. Both Hon. Members know that every radical group in the world thinks its goals and objectives are humanitarian.

**Mr. Blackburn (Brant):** Pinochet never uses it.

**Mr. Friesen:** Of course, he is saving his country from communism. Check with Abu Nidal or the Ayatollah. The Ayatollah has saved his country from that great Satan, the United States. What a favour he has done for the Iranian people! That, in his world context, is being a humanitarian.

As I did in committee, I will bring it a little closer to home. Within the last two weeks, there was a case in British Columbia of a young lady riding a motorcycle who had an accident. Her leg was severed and she was taken to the hospital. The humanitarian staff at the hospital wanted to save her life. However, the treatment required a blood transfusion and she was a Jehovah's Witness. Try as they might to be humanitarian in their scale of values, her scale of values did not allow them to give her a transfusion, and she died.

How are we to define "humanitarian"? We cannot use a loose, subjective word like that and expect the law to carry weight and to be effective.

Hon. Members have spoken about the threat to churches. I have been interested in refugees for a long time and I have been active in my church for a long time. I have never once felt threatened by the law because of my interest in refugees.

**Mr. Blackburn (Brant):** Of course not, this law wasn't passed then.

**Mr. Caccia:** That's right, big deal.

**Mr. Friesen:** That's right, big deal. Let me offer the House the statistics. There is no need for any organization to come to the border with so-called refugees who are undocumented. To come to the U.S.-Canada border without documents is unnecessary. They can go to any Canadian Consulate in the United States to obtain documentation. They can go to refugee detention centres on the U.S.-Mexico border and be documented. Any church or humanitarian organization that so chooses can go to the United States and sponsor refugees to give them a more certain future than it would be doing it the way they describe they want to do it.

Central American landings seem to be the focus of attention of all the groups that have criticized this legislation. In 1986, the Government sponsored 299 Central American landings in Canada from Central America. Private groups sponsored 14. From the United States, the Government sponsored 1,018, and private groups sponsored 76. From others abroad, the Government sponsored 2,465, and private groups sponsored 149.