Immigration

they will be prohibited from engaging in employment in Canada. You tell them that now they are here, they cannot get a job. "You cannot work, but if you have the right to work, we will tell you what you should do, and then we will tell you in what province you will be, and in what village you will live." All that is done not through approval by parliament but by order in council.

The bill determines health and public safety factors in relation to the admission of a person, and whether such a person could become a charge on the health or social services of a community. I suppose that an American who takes saccharin will be denied the right to come to Canada. I do not know, but you can do that by order in council. Just think about it.

The bill requires health examinations of persons outside Canada to determine whether they will be admitted to Canada. I thought the human rights bill protected those who have some physical or other disability to enable them to function in society like the rest of us, without discrimination. This bill totally contradicts the human rights bill. In fact, if I had my way—and I do not have it because there are 264 members here—I would throw this bill out.

It is a horrible bill. It requires persons leaving Canada to report to an immigration officer before leaving the country, and prescribes the information required, the manner in which the report is to be made, and sets out fingerprint, photographic or other identification requirements for those seeking admission to Canada or for persons already here. That sounds as if it came from the U.S.S.R., and I talked to some of my Ukrainian friends who are trying to get their sisters and brothers over here for a visit.

I agree with members who have criticized the Communist countries for not allowing their citizens to leave and for their denial of international agreements. This bill is as bad as anything that has been put together by a dictator. Surely our friends, brothers or sisters who come here should not be subjected to fingerprinting before entering this country. All that can be done by order in council, and when we pass this bill we will be giving public servants the right to do that.

• (2050)

The bill would determine removal and detention costs and expenses. It would require that transportation companies ensure that immigrants and visitors have visas. The little Chinese girl about whom I argued did not need one. The board upheld my argument. In other words, if they do not have visas, Air Canada takes people to the RCMP, and they are either put into a motel room or locked up for the night.

The bill will establish procedures for inquiries, establish the procedure for re-determination of convention refugee status, and prescribe the duties of the special advisory board. These boards will be told what powers they will have. As I see it, the Immigration Appeal Board no longer has the right to hear an appeal unless the person appealing has already obtained or has at the time permanent status to remain in Canada.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

The bill would authorize the making of loans to immigrants. They cannot go to a bank, even if they have security, because an order in council will tell them from whom they can borrow money, how much they can borrow, and at what interest rate they can borrow. And we advertise that Canada is the freest country in the world! That is quite a panic; it is hypocrisy of the worst kind. The bill would require licensing by a provincial bar before any person, except a member of the bar, can appeal before the board as counsel. If they do not like the Alberta bar, an order in council can be passed saying that counsel has to come from some other bar. I am talking about bars to which lawyers belong, not the ones they visit. The bill would authorize issuance of visas to representatives of foreign governments and international organizations, and prescribe almost any matter. I have read what it can do. I picked out the highlights.

Then there is a catch-all clause. It is a basket clause whereby public servants can pass orders in council prescribing any matter required by the legislation. Last year 3,326 orders in council were passed of which only 653 were published in the *Canada Gazette*. Most people do not read the *Canada Gazette*; however, 2,673 were not published.

I conducted the defence of Mrs. Inoue when she went before an inquiry officer. She was supposed to know the law of Canada. Even though she was a student she could not determine the law of Canada if there were some 2,600 laws which were never published or made known. If ever there was a bill which should be taken back and put on the tracing board, or at least taken into a committee, this is it. I am glad to see the hon. member for Peace River here because we are talking about government secrecy and confidential information. I never thought the situation was as bad as it is with regard to orders in council. You would have to be a Philadelphia lawyer to prepare appeals and to know how to present a case to the Immigration Appeal Board.

Mr. Baldwin: We have a government of pack-rats; they hide everything.

Mr. Woolliams: I think that would make a great headline for what I have said. In light of what the bill says, in light of what I have outlined, and in spite of the fact that the Immigration Appeal Board Act and the Immigration Act produced regulations which contradicted the substantive law of the two acts, we are now asked to give the government the full power to create its own immigration policy and to do what it wishes with people seeking admittance to Canada.

The committee should do the same thing as the committee dealing with the gun control bill did. Representing my party and as chairman of its justice caucus I demanded that Bill C-83 not move past the committee stage unless the regulations which were to be passed thereunder were laid before the House so that we could debate them the same as we could debate the clauses of the bill. That is what should be done now. This bill should be held up and stalled until the government comes forward with its package of regulations. And the way I see it, without any exaggeration, we may need a wheelbarrow to wheel in all the regulations which could be passed under this