

they will suspend the list for a period of time and wait for others that they consider to be of better quality.

I use those words, but the minister in the publicity material that he sent out used these terms to choose those that he would consider to be the best.

We all want the best immigrants, but we all know as well that the term the best can be interpreted in many ways. It can be interpreted in a very subjective way and in a political way. We do not want that. We want people to be chosen based on fair criteria. We want the best but we want them chosen against rules and criteria which are fair and which correspond to the goals of our immigration policy that I referred to at the beginning of my remarks.

Among those increased powers that are being given to the minister and his officials, one would require the immigrant to settle in certain regions and provinces. This is one of those measures that requires much more analysis. It appears that it will be made a total obligation, a condition attached to the immigration visa or the immigration residency.

For two years, let us say a dentist, would have to live in northern town A or B no matter what happened. While it has always been the policy to encourage immigrants to go to certain regions and to encourage certain professions, trades and occupations which were in demand and to try and promote those in our immigration policy, it has not been made an absolute condition and obligation. One wonders again if this requires further examination and analysis and whether this is not against article 6 of our charter of rights which says that Canadians and residents of Canada can travel to any part of Canada, live in any part of Canada and work in any part of Canada that they wish.

The bill makes some important changes. Again it is hard to assess whether they are good or bad. There will be changes to the health provisions of admissibility. In November 1991 the minister and his officials told us that they were conducting a review with respect to medical admissibility in Canada. When the officials were before the standing committee a few weeks ago, I asked about that review. They told me it was not completed. Here we are, making changes to the law with respect to the admissibility clause with respect to health and social

Government Orders

services with a statement that they will by regulation clarify whether or not certain individuals with health problems will impact excessively on the health and social service system.

We have always had laws to that effect but again I have to ask the question: What is really meant by that? To what extent are they going to exclude certain individuals with health problems from Canada if they impact excessively on the health and social service system? I give notice now that we will want to hear evidence on that before the legislative committee. If it is true that there is evidence to back that up, we will have to do something about it.

As I say, it says in the immigration policy that was passed in 1976 for which I voted at the time, that we have to protect our health and social service system, that we have to protect our communities and so on. On the other hand, we have a tradition of being generous and humane. We will have to see how this proposal balances off against those rules.

Again, I am asked to vote on this bill today and I do not know the answers to those questions. There will also be changes with respect to the ability to support oneself in the country based on welfare as a means of support. The provision may be a good one or may be a bad one. I am asked to vote on a bill that I do not have all the details about or on which I do not have enough information.

• (1700)

The government is transferring an additional burden to the transport carriers that bring people to this country. I do not know what the transport carriers will have to say about that.

I am also concerned about how we are going to keep these carriers accountable and under our control. They are going to be acting more or less as an extended arm of the Department of Employment and Immigration, of the Government of Canada, but they are not really employees who are responsible to Parliament or the Government of Canada. We are going to need testimony with respect to that matter.

With respect to the provisions for fingerprinting, photos and greater search and seizure at ports of entry, of course we have fingerprinting in this country but it is associated with criminality for the most part. It is the sort