

of the fact the most persistent and vocal critics of the government's white paper in respect of the whole problem of immigration are the members of his own party, the hon. member for Hamilton West and the hon. member for Essex West. They have been most persistent. When I say "persistent" I am putting it mildly. They have been the most vocal critics of the whole approach as enunciated in the white paper.

It seems to me that the only purpose of the last part of the amendment which the minister is moving now is again to give the department, at some future date, the right to restrict. It does give the right to restrict the type of person who may appeal. I wonder what the reason is. If a person in Canada has the right to sponsor the admission to Canada of somebody, that means he is a citizen of Canada or a landed immigrant. He makes an application to bring in a relative because he believes that person comes within the class of persons permitted to come to Canada as sponsored immigrants. If the application is turned down and if that person wants to appeal to the board which is being set up under this bill, why should the governor in council want to restrict the classes for whom appeals can be made? It makes no sense. It seems to me the minister is going right back to the kind of departmental authoritarianism which gives the department the right to do things without explanation, to which so many members on both sides of the house have objected in the past.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Let me say one more thing before I sit down. If I could be sure that this minister would be the minister forever and that this deputy minister would be the deputy minister forever, I would not be so worried. I am sure I speak not only for myself but for many members, although not all members, of this house may have had individual cases. When I say that, let me add that although not every case I have taken to the minister or the deputy minister has been settled in the way in which I would have liked it to be settled, very freely and honestly I would have to say that I cannot remember a case, even when the request had been turned down, in respect of which I did not feel that there were at least reasonable doubts.

Mr. Chairman, we have had long experience with other ministers and other deputy ministers. I can remember a minister who once made the statement—and I am paraphrasing—that he was a good deal more in

Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board sympathy with persons born in Canada than with persons who were born in other countries. I can remember another minister of this department who once had in mind introducing regulations which many members of parliament, particularly those from the Toronto-Hamilton area, felt were directed almost exclusively against potential immigrants from Italy.

I am not saying that such is the intent in respect of this amendment. I am not saying that this minister has this kind of desire or that he would think along these lines. What I am saying is that if we pass the amendment as proposed by the minister it will give some minister in the future the opportunity to do by regulation, by order in council, what the government and the members of this house would not want him to do as a matter of policy. Therefore, as I say, I cannot understand the desire of the minister to have this right of limitation, which I think is unnecessary. While I do not desire to prolong the debate, I must say to the minister that this request which he is making, it seems to me, requires a good deal more explanation than we have had up until now.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, by this clause we are not restricting any rights; we are creating new rights.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest to the minister that what he is saying is only partly true. It is true that in the first part of the clause he is creating new rights on the one hand and then in the latter part of the clause he is giving himself, or a future minister, the right, on the other hand, to take away those rights. This is what we are objecting to.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, had it not been our intention to give those rights to certain categories of immigrants or Canadian citizens, it would have been silly to write this into clause 17. It is there because we intend to do it. I think members of the house should be aware that we are introducing something new and very important. Someone stated a few moments ago that under the present law a landed immigrant has the right to sponsor. Formally speaking, this is not true; he has the right to apply. In this clause we are creating the right not only to apply but to sponsor directly, even if the department does not agree. That means there is not only the right to apply, but also the right to sponsor. This is new, and we desire this. If we did not, I do not see why we would have included it here.