

is partly an improvement. It confines it to a pattern of criminal activity planned and organized by a number of persons in furtherance of the commission of any offence that may be punishable under any act of parliament by way of indictment. The original clause 19.(d)(i) reads as follows:

commit one or more offences punishable by way of indictment under any act of parliament . . .

We all know that the statute books are full of acts regarding some serious and some trivial offences. Regulations have been so innumerable in the past that it has been almost impossible to put them in books for a person to see how many regulations there are.

● (2110)

All you need to bar a person is to have an immigration official look into a person's eyes and say, "I have reasonable grounds to believe that you will commit some offence in the future or you will engaged in the future in the commission of some offence". The first is by way of indictment—those are more serious matters—but the second is under any act of parliament. It also says "by way of indictment". It is true that it is limited to the commission on the suspicion or speculation that you might do something that the immigration officer thinks would fall within the general definitions here, and that you might be punishable by way of indictment. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the minister, that it is incredible that a so-called Liberal government would introduce clauses such as this one which deny the basic right to be tried before you are punished, which deny hearings, so that you do not know what you are being punished for. This is a move toward a repressive state and it is utterly wrong.

An hon. Member: That is untrue.

Mr. Brewin: That is what you say. I don't know how you know anything about it, but you certainly can talk.

Mr. Béchar: Are you God Almighty, Andy?

An hon. Member: Don't be so arrogant, for goodness sake.

Mr. Brewin: I am not arrogant.

An hon. Member: All he did was to ask you a question.

Mr. Brewin: He did not question me. He said that what I said was not true. He can get up and speak for himself. He is one of that platoon that walked in toward the end of the hearings and took pride in the streamroller proceedings that I referred to earlier.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should address himself to the Chair. There might have been an intervention but I did not hear any of it, so I suggest the hon. member continue his remarks and address the Chair.

Mr. Brewin: I apologize for not addressing you, Mr. Speaker, and also I apologize if I showed some heat at this senseless, needless interruption that took place, but perhaps it is because of what we have been subjected to here in the last little while.

Immigration

We spent 70 hours in this committee—we sat there for hours and hours. I think the hon. member attended only about two of those hours and managed to make irrelevant observations during that period.

I have explained why we are against it. We are against it because it is contrary to the basic civil liberties and rights of people in this country. We oppose it, and we will continue to oppose it.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I intend to address myself to motion No. 13. Let me say first of all that I am surprised that the minister should get up in his place tonight and try to reverse that which was done in committee, because I do not believe his heart is in it. It is really the ghost of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) which must be around somewhere.

An hon. Member: Even the body is here.

Mr. Epp: Let us put the facts on the table as they developed in committee. We know that the approval of medical certificates is done by medical officers of the Department of National Health and Welfare who, after examining them, send them to the Department of Manpower and Immigration. With all due respect to the medical profession—and I am not trying to step on sensitive toes—it must be said quite bluntly and honestly that the meeting we had with the medical officers of the Department of National Health and Welfare that evening was less than successful because no matter what questions we put to them, the answers implied that as lay people we knew nothing, nor should we ask. I do not accept that as a member of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: I do not believe there is such a term as medical infallibility, but that is what we were getting from them. Now after passing the amendment in committee we hear that the Minister of National Health and Welfare got all hot and bothered and left it to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) to bring in this amendment, reversing what we have decided.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Epp: If you take a look at what our amendment was going to do you will see that it was trying to ensure that the person who was having the medical examination could avail himself or herself of the best medical help available—that is all. I know that medical check-ups are done by native doctors in the country where application is made. When the minister rose in his place tonight and told us they will need another \$2.5 million, how can he justify that figure? Is that another thing that the Minister of National Health and Welfare fed to him? Did he check it out? Does he believe it? He knows the applicant pays for his medical examination. What is he talking about? Does he want us to buy that bill of goods?

Mr. McKenzie: Any excuse to spend more money.