

Immigration Act, 1976

Mr. Friesen: If they were really interested in sponsoring refugees, that is the way to do it.

Mr. Caccia: Judge the quality not the numbers.

Mr. Friesen: The Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) says, "judge the quality".

Mr. Caccia: Yes, of course.

Mr. Friesen: First, I am mystified as to what he means by that. Second, the quality is in the integration in Canadian society. If they would get their work done in the United States in a Canadian consulate or a detention centre refugee camp—

Mr. Caccia: If they are in Nicaragua, what would you do?

Mr. Friesen: —on the U.S.-Mexican border, they would come already providing themselves with a fuller way of life in Canada.

Up to June, 1987, the church groups together with private individuals and other humanitarian organizations from the United States sponsored 19. Where is their great concern?

Mr. Marchi: What about the boat people?

Mr. Friesen: Is there is something romantic about ferrying people to a border point in Canada? Does it add something to the glow of humanitarianism to see if this can be done clandestinely? Is it the air of excitement? If they are thinking of refugees, they would sponsor them the same way the Government sponsors them.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am certain that the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary would not wish deliberately to misrepresent the church leaders he is talking about. Rhetorically he asked, is it because they wished to ferry people to border points clandestinely. I am sure that the Parliamentary Secretary does not seriously wish to charge them either with doing that clandestinely or with having supported the idea of doing it clandestinely in their representations to our committee. I hope the Parliamentary Secretary would clarify the point and indicate that he is not suggesting that church leaders or humanitarian groups have either ferried people clandestinely or have advocated doing it clandestinely.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair takes that more as a matter of a question to the Parliamentary Secretary. It is a matter of debate and not a point of order.

Mr. Friesen: Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Hon. Member for Spadina I would want to make it clear that I am not charging the church leaders. I am simply asking them, is there an air of excitement about ferrying people to border points other than through the process of sponsorship? If the humanitarian groups really are looking for the best possible way of helping refugees, it seems to me they would want to do the work outside the country as much as they can

and bring them into Canada already fully prepared to take part in the Canadian way of life and be able to work.

As I said, I find it shocking that the Member who has constantly said that we need to get rid of the profiteers now would introduce a motion that would take away the provisions in the Bill that would help us to get rid of the profiteers.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a moment covering some of the ground somewhat hastily dirtied by the Parliamentary Secretary a few moments ago. A little bit of history is in order here, particularly in relation to Clause 95.4, at which all Members of this House should take a close look.

This clause was originally suggested by the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), which was then moved by the Government and placed into the Bill. He is suggesting as Members on this side of the House are suggesting, that proposed Sections 95.1 and 95.2 be removed, for good reason. Those two sections go after church groups and others.

We hear the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Bouchard) and some Members on that side saying, "Well, those church groups don't need to worry because we will not prosecute them", but Government Members, and the Minister in particular, are saying there will be selective prosecution. As someone who used to work in the courts on probation and parole, I know about selective prosecution. I know that Members like the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen) would like selective prosecution whereby if you do not like a particular church group or a particular group of refugees then you go after that group and by using the full force of proposed Section 95.1 and 95.2 you go after them. But if it happens to be a group you might like in your constituency or that might be politically appealing to you, then it is the wink-wink, nudge-nudge—you know what I mean, Mr. Speaker. It is not the way Canadians like laws to be written, or the way we like to see them used within the courts.

The Parliamentary Secretary and others on that side of the House often ask whether we really want these refugees who come without papers anyway. It displays the kind of ignorance that is symptomatic of that Member in particular and other Members on that side. Some of the bona fide refugees that come from Central and South America, sister countries, are in fact closer to my constituency in my province of British Columbia—if you think particularly of Central America—than is Nova Scotia or other parts of our own country. There are growing relationships between many families, certainly many western provinces, in agriculture, fisheries and the many things in which we have expertise with those countries.

Many people understand why refugees who are persecuted, politically in their own land, do not just sort of drop by the local police station and ask for their papers before heading up to Canada or the United States. They do not just sort of drop by to pick up a driver's licence, a visa or a passport or anything