

else because the death squads and others terrorizing civilian populations in much of Central and South America do not view very kindly those who are active politically and are attempting to get papers to get out of the country.

Let us take a look at what is being proposed. Let us look at proposed Section 95.4 and see what it says. I quote from the Bill:

● (1220)

Every person who knowingly counsels, induces, aids or abets, or who knowingly attempts to counsel, induce, aid or abet, any other person to make any false or misleading statement in connection with a claim by that other person to be a Convention refugee is guilty of an offence and is liable

(a) on conviction on indictment, to a fine not exceeding ten thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or to both; or

(b) on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or to both.

That is the standard wording you find with respect to indictable or summary convictions in most of the Criminal Code of Canada.

I think most Members would note that *The Ottawa Citizen* today ran an article by Iain Hunter pointing out what Anglican Archbishop Edward Scott, President of the Canadian Council of Churches, has to say about the orchestration of the emergency involving the 174 people who landed in Nova Scotia. There was the orchestration of another boat supposedly coming along. The Government knew all along that the first boat was coming but orchestrated it to get emergency recall of Parliament, not just to deal with Bill C-84 and Bill C-55, but to deal with Bill C-22, the drug Bill, and the rail back-to-work legislation. Now we find today all kinds of other legislation.

The Parliamentary Secretary this morning, quite contrary to the rules of the House, as is often his way, commented on the presence or absence of Members of the House. That is the kind of scurrilous activity we see the Hon. Member involved in all the time. He says, "How was I to know about the rules?"

We are talking about a law which potentially affects refugees whose lives are in danger. It is one thing for the Hon. Member to say they can just drop in on an embassy in Detroit or somewhere else in the U.S., and that there are no quotas. My colleague from Spadina has spoken to officers who work in various consulates in the U.S. and has confirmed that there are quotas in operation. We know what is happening in the U.S. where sections similar to 95.1 and 95.2 have been introduced. We know what has gone on. There have been direct belligerent prosecutions of church groups who have been attempting to assist those whose lives are very much in danger as they try to escape from the terrorist activities of certain groups in Central and South America in particular, but in other areas of the world as well.

Let us look at what proposed Section 95.1 states, keeping in mind what I put on the record with respect to proposed Section 95.4. It states:

### *Immigration Act, 1976*

Every person who knowingly organizes, induces, aids or abets or attempts to organize, induce, aid or abet the coming into Canada of a person who is not in possession of a valid and subsisting visa, passport or travel document where one is required by this Act or the regulations is guilty of an offence and is liable—

Such a person is liable in the same way as proposed Section 95.4(a) and (b). Who is this directed at? Let us think about the evidence given by the Government concerning the number of refugees who came to Canada last year without proper documents, some 6,000. None were found to have any serious criminal record or to have difficulties in Canada. None were found to be terrorists or potential terrorists. This clause is directed specifically at those groups who have been assisting refugees from Central and South America.

The Parliamentary Secretary and others over there laugh and say the church groups do not need to worry. They do need to worry; but it is the law. Government Members say they will only selectively prosecute. We will only prosecute if they decide they do not like you or they get a call from the CIA or the FBI, or for some other reason. It is illogical and bad law. The intellectually dishonest presentation involved has also become the trademark of Members like the Parliamentary Secretary. That is why British Columbians do not like Members like that who involve themselves in this kind of scurrilous intellectual dishonesty day after day in this House, painting false pictures. The Hon. Member knows they are false.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Could I ask the Hon. Member not to get personal, please. Debate.

**Mr. Friesen:** That is hard to do.

**Mr. Fulton:** It is hard when one has to deal with the kind of absolutely false information put on the record day after day by that particular Member.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The time for the Hon. Member's speech has terminated.

Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 16. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.