furnished with particulars of the objections to his admission, so that he can make an appropriate answer to those objections.

It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to refer very briefly to some of the decisions of the courts. I can tell the house that I do not propose to quote legal excerpts at great length, but in 1932 Mr. Justice Duff, who later became Sir Lyman Duff, the chief justice of Canada and one of the very greatest judges produced by this country, or by any other country as far as that is concerned, in what was known as the Samegima case, which dealt with the deportation of a Japanese immigrant, had this to say, as reported at page 642 of 1932 Supreme Court Reports:

> The jurisdiction of the board, as an investigating body, is limited to the investigation of the facts alleged, a condition, again, implying intelligibility of allegation. Indeed, unless the person concerned is to have a reasonable opportunity of knowing the nature of the allegations, what is the purpose of requiring his presence? The deportation order must fully state the reasons for the decision, in respect of the allegations. The spirit, as well as the frame, of the whole statute, evinces the intention that these provisions are mandatory.

Then he went on to make this observation:

> I gravely fear that too often the fact that these enactments are, in practice, most frequently brought to bear upon Orientals of a certain class, has led to the generation of an atmosphere which has obscured their true effect. They are, it is needless to say, equally applicable to Scotsmen. I admit I am horrified at the thought that the personal liberty of a British subject should be exposed to the hugger-nugger which, under the name of legal proceedings, is exemplified by some of the records that have incidentally been brought to our attention.

I want to inform the house, Mr. Speaker, that the "hugger-nugger" to which the learned jurist referred is still going on. In fact, it is not only on but it is the normal procedure.

Later the immigration department found a new way to get around the requirement which was indicated by the judge, namely the requirement of a hearing. This was revealed in the Brent case, which was heard by the Supreme Court of Canada. I am very conscious of this case, Mr. Speaker, because I was the successful counsel in it. Mrs. Brent was a young lady who lived in Buffalo and she wanted to marry a Mr. Brent who lived in Toronto. The department of immigration refused to admit her. The real reason was that she was suspected of Trotsky-ite associations, but this was not stated in the order of deportation. The reason put forward was that she had failed to comply with the regulations in that a special inquiry officer had deemed her to be unsuitable for admission to Canada by reason of the economic, social, industrial, educational, labour or health conditions prevailing either in Canada or in the country from which she came to Canada. She asked what these conditions were and why objection was taken to her, and she was told: "You can read the regulations".

The courts, and finally the Supreme Court of Canada, struck down that regulation on the ground that parliament had delegated to the cabinet and not to special inquiry officers the right to set up the standards of admissibility to Canada. They also held that before a person is ordered to be deported he is entitled to know the objections to his admission in order to give him a fair hearing; and Mr. Justice Rand in the Supreme Court of Canada described the proceedings in that case as farcical. Again I say that these same farcical proceedings are carried on to this day.

After this decision the immigration department found a new and ingenious way to get around the intent of parliament. The present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) was then minister of immigration. I do not know whether he was responsible for this ingenious way of getting around the decision of the supreme court, but the method was as follows. It was provided by regulation that before anyone could be admitted to Canada they had to have a visa, a letter of pre-examination and a medical certificate. The only people who could provide these documents were the immigration officers; and the only people who could provide a medical certificate were the doctors appointed by the department. So that when it was decided to exclude a person, for whatever reason or for no reason, the would-be immigrant would be refused a visa or a letter of pre-examination. Or they would not be allowed to get an appointment to see a medical officer. Then they were solemnly deported on the ground that they did not have the piece of paper which the immigration department had refused to give them, and refused to give them without giving any reason for so doing.

Then a hearing is held and the hearing is concerned with whether they have this piece of paper. They are solemnly sworn in and are told they are entitled to have counsel, but the only question that comes before the special inquiry officer is, "Have you got this piece of paper?", which he knows you have not got because he is the only person who can give it to you, and he has no intention of giving it to you. The result of this so-called hearing is a foregone conclusion.

I have before me a typical case of the reasons why a visa is refused. It is a letter sent out a week or two ago to a Canadian who wanted to bring his brother and his family to Canada. This is what the letter says:

> Information has been received that the above named—