work in parts of Toronto where there are large numbers of immigrants. These organizations work with immigrants and their friends and relatives to help them come to this country.

They work with the department and with the law and the regulations as enacted by the cabinet and interpreted and administered by the department. For the edification of the hon. member for Niagara Falls I will read some of the criticisms of the bill which those two organizations made. If they sound familiar, I suppose it is because the hon. member for Greenwood has included most of these criticisms in the amendments which he has proposed. Let me begin on page 32A:8 and read their comments on Clause 19(1)(*a*).

● (2130)

Under the proposed Bill, conduct permissible in Canada yet criminally punishable in less democratic countries would constitute a bar to admission; the bar should only extend to those who have committed acts which would be prohibited in this country.

For instance, if in the Soviet Union one were to distribute books written by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, one would undoubtedly be prosecuted under Soviet law for doing something illegal in that country. If you applied the present section of the act to that person, you could exclude him from entering this country.

Commenting on proposed Section 19(1)(*c*) they say:

The prohibition on persons 'likely to engage in criminal activity' casts such a wide net that it may have the effect of both undoing the effect of other sections of the bill, and short circuiting Canadian law on criminal procedure. This class of inadmissible persons should thus be deleted from the bill.

They also say this about proposed Section 19(1)(*d*):

The present act puts a person in an inadmissible class only if he has been involved in subversion by force or other means of 'democratic government', but the Bill proposes to extend this to subversion by force of any government. Since subversion of any kind against democratic government is covered by s. 19(1)(*e*) of the bill, it is recommended that this subsection be deleted.

I cannot imagine ever being involved in the subverting of any government, but can well believe that some who want to come to Canada may try to subvert authoritarian, dictatorial governments, of which there are too many, for example in Africa. Yet under that clause in this bill they could be excluded from entry.

They say this about proposed Section 19(1)(*f*):

The prohibition against persons who are 'members of or associated with an organization that is likely to engage in acts of violence' is a broad and vague classification which is prone to abuse; deserving cases for exclusion are caught by the provision covering 'persons who are likely to engage in acts of violence that would or might endanger the lives or safety of persons in Canada.'

We have seen too many examples in the country south of us of the branding as criminals and the prosecuting of people it is supposed are likely to commit acts of violence, to use the language of the bill. In whose opinion are they likely to do this? In the opinion of the minister, or of the immigration officer? Surely we are not going to condemn someone for something we think he may do. That would be dangerous.

The Parkdale Community Legal Services organization repeated many of the criticisms just enumerated. Let me put on record some of their opinions. Speaking of the provisions of subsection 19(1)(*h*) they said, as recorded at page 32A:190 of the committee proceedings:

Subsection 19(1)(*h*) is a re-doing of the present subsection 5(P) and is every bit as vague and arbitrary as the old section. It is the section which, because of its lack of criteria, is often used to exclude anyone who is merely suspicious, inarticulate or different. It too should be deleted as there are many other sections to cover those truly undeserving of admission.

Let me put on record what they say about Section 27, which is covered by motion No. 25. They say:

Section 27 covers the removal of persons from Canada after their admission and includes the removal of landed immigrants regardless of their length of residence in Canada. Subsections 27(1)(*a*) and (*e*) suffer from problems already discussed under Section 19.

Subsection 27(1)(*e*) is substantially the same as the present subsection 18(1)(*e*)(viii) and poses the same inequities. The wording of this subsection coupled with the current case law, make it possible for someone to be deported after being in Canada any number of years, for very minor misstatements on their application. The Supreme Court of Canada has characterized the effects of this section as harsh. Furthermore, when coupled with Section 9 of the new Citizenship Act, a person may have his/her citizenship revoked and then be deported for relatively minor infractions on this subsection. It is not enough to suggest that this won't be done. The power is there, and has already been used.

If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) were present he could tell the House more eloquently that I can how similar provisions in the Immigration Act were almost used following World War I in the attempt to deport from Winnipeg British people who had lived in the city many years. They had come to Canada from Great Britain and their only crime was that they were the supposed leaders of the general strike in Winnipeg in 1919. The authorities wanted to deport them under a similar section of the act, but desisted only after the protests of one who I think became a Liberal solicitor general, E. J. MacMurray.

I hope history has taught us something, has shown us we do not need such draconian legislation. Frankly, I am amazed that a so-called Liberal government should include such a provision in the bill. I urge members of the House to heed the advice of the Parkdale Community Legal Services, and of the other organizations to which I referred, and reject this clause. Such advice is based on knowledge of the law.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the intervention of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) in connection with motion No. 13. I can understand the motivation of the committee which led to the adoption of that particular amendment. It clearly was based on the presumed uncontrolled and unlimited discretion of the medical officer in formulating his or her opinion as to the health status of a particular immigrant. However, I believe there are serious grounds for concluding that the new wording proposed by the hon. member is incapable of achieving the control which was intended and, further, that it will not be virtually impossible for my department to continue to operate an immigration health service in support of Canada's immigration program. I should like to put a few reasons on record in support of this statement.

Hon. members must remember that it is not possible to designate medical practitioners for immigration medical pur-