

Immigration Act, 1976

The 1977 Bill did not deal extensively with fraud in the refugee system, because at that time very little fraud went on. In fact, there was very little refugee movement at that time. There were fewer refugees around the world and there was much less international movement. Finally and much more importantly, society at that time was much more orderly and held a much more law-oriented view of a process like refugee determination.

Since mid-century we have been seeing the results of a new definition of morality. I remember going to the University of Washington in the 1970s and watching the tumult on the university campus. Everything was being challenged. The most popular philosophers of the day were Sartre, Camus and Marcuse. Those philosophers had at least one thing in common. They had an existential view not only of life but of the individual, of man, and expressed the importance of the individual and his right to self-expression as the most important thing in life to that person and, by extension, to society. Self-expression and self-authentication were the most important things. To that extent, there was no longer any inherent or absolute morality.

Tangentially, this meant that every law not only could be challenged but had to be challenged. If we were to disagree with a particular piece of law we would be dishonest to ourselves if we did not challenge it. We would be denying our own morality if we did not challenge what we thought was wrong.

There accumulated a whole generation of people who challenged everything. They challenged the law, the authority and the Government. I am not saying that some of that was not necessary. It was necessary to make some improvements, but it became a point of morality and of personal integrity to act in that manner.

When I was on the campus of the University of Washington, I saw a crowd of students and off in the distance a police car. I watched the crowd pick up stones and throw them at the police car. The policeman had not arrested anyone. He had not even challenged anyone. However, it was just because the police car was there that it had to be challenged. I remember sitting in the library watching, I am sure, off-campus people coming through and pushing books off shelves. They were wantonly destroying university property. I remember them challenging the administration just because the administration was there. It was not that what the administration had decided was going to radically affect everyone's life. It was because the university administration was there and everything it decided had to be challenged.

● (1530)

We educated a whole generation of students that if we did not challenge everything we were being untrue to ourselves. A mentality developed which said that disobeying the law was a point of morality. For example, burning draft cards in the U.S. was a point of morality because it offended a government

regulation, a government administration. Police were pigs. Authorities were the establishment. Government was authority and automatically wrong. Universities at that time cultivated a culture whose *raison d'être* was to oppose. Individual morality was more important than community values or the rule of law.

I raise that because the people who went to school in those days have now become professionals. In some cases they are lawyers. They may be teachers or doctors. They have come through the system with a mind-set and a way of looking at the world that has its own repercussions. That philosophy is now an international commodity. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) may laugh but it is true.

Mr. Keeper: What have you got against universities?

Mr. Friesen: I used to teach at a university so it cannot be all that bad.

We are now at the point where that kind of mind-set is an international commodity. On every front when it comes to refugee policy, or immigration policy for that matter, we see this kind of mentality. It manifests itself in declarations made by bogus claimants. It does not matter what you say, just as long as it might be acceptable and will get you into the country. Lying becomes a way of life if it will help you get into the country. The incidents of the last few weeks ought to underscore that.

We are redefining what constitutes a refugee. That redefinition is not supposed to be done by Canadians, it is supposed to be done by so-called refugees, you see. If you are facing economic deprivation in your country, then you are no longer dealing with refugees in a political sense. You have economic refugees and you are redefining for Canada what constitutes a refugee. If you have committed a crime, a capital offence in your country and are therefore afraid for your life, then you are entitled to call yourself a refugee because if you stay in your own country and the law has its way, you might be either incarcerated or face capital punishment. You are entitled to call yourself a refugee.

The decision is no longer supposed to be made by the Government, it is now supposed to be made by the refugee. We are seemingly supposed to accept holus-bolus that if someone comes to our borders and says "I am a refugee", the Government and people of Canada are automatically supposed to say, "Okay, if you say so, we will accept the fact that you are a refugee". Or, if a lobbyist makes a representation on behalf of a refugee or a group of refugees, we are supposed to accept that lobbyist's word that this person or this group are refugees.

If there is one phrase which has recurred over and over again in these debates and in committee hearings and in Senate committee hearings, it is: "You will be sending genuine refugees back to a hostile country." That is the recurring phrase. I am asking, how do you know that they are genuine refugees? Unless they have gone through the refugee determination system, how do you know in advance that they are genuine refugees?