

This amendment would provide that the Chairman and not less than two other permanent members of the Board constitute a quorum for the making of rules and that one permanent member and not less than two other members constitute a quorum for all other purposes.

This means that the chairman, who must be a barrister, can hire two other barristers whom we are compelled to appoint, thus constituting a quorum with three barristers, and it will be ruled under these conditions about the admittance of immigrants who intend to come and settle down in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I think my judgment is as good as any lawyer in Quebec and elsewhere to determine if an immigrant is desirable or undesirable. Why should we designate lawyers; this is not a struggle, but discrimination against other social classes.

Mr. Isabelle: Because there are starving lawyers.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): I think that the explanation might be good. The hon. member for Hull just told me a good one. We would allow three starving lawyers to make their living.

Mr. Isabelle: There are too many.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): There are too many. Mr. Speaker, these are considerations that I would like to make this afternoon on Bill C-197. I believe that the bill would improve immigration conditions in Canada. But once again, let us be careful, and let us bring here people who will be good Canadians, whatever their culture.

They have to know that in Canada we have two official languages: English and French. Moreover, I hope that the federal government will consult the provinces concerning immigration in the "respected limits" of those provinces.

[English]

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, short as it may appear, this bill has nevertheless important consequences because it affects so closely the lives of thousands of people who are presently in Canada and whose destiny has still to be decided—people who have come to this country because they want to settle here and provide a future for their children.

The bill aims at the restricting of appeal rights to people who seek admission at the port of entry who are in possession of an immigrant or non-immigrant visa issued abroad, or to landed immigrants or to persons claiming to be refugees or Canadian citizens. Once law, the bill will have the effect of withdrawing appeal rights from those who are ordered to be deported at the port of entry and who do not possess an immigrant or non-immigrant visa as well as from all visitors who are deported after being admitted to Canada, and all who are in Canada illegally. Finally, I understand the bill continues the existing appeal rights of all visitors, illegal entrants and other persons who are ordered deported after the bill comes into effect if their further examination or inquiry was ordered before first reading was given to this bill. This bill also permits people who came to Canada up to November 30, 1972 to apply for regularization of their status and to have access

to the same range of appeal procedures as exists under the present act.

This legislation has been arrived at gradually, and drawn up rather reluctantly, perhaps. The measures of last November and June were efforts to find a solution without having to revoke the right of appeal from visitors. The legislation now provides for a speedy decision as to the fate of some 17,000 people. This is a figure which seems large in a domestic perspective, but which really represents only between 10 and 15 per cent of the average annual flow of immigrants to Canada. Thus, I cannot join with other hon. members in expressing dismay, shock and criticism, as so many have done. While hardship is being, and has been, suffered by persons who chose to come to Canada as visitors and to stay here, we have witnessed over the past six years an interesting period during which people have come to Canada freely, understandably producing a backlog in immigration cases.

In the limited time available to me this afternoon, I should like to put forward three observations with regard to the bill before us. First, I should like to express the hope that clause 10(1)(3) will be used frequently and without hesitation, particularly by the newly-appointed members of the board, namely, the referral of a case by one member to the quorum of three members. This is a sound and desirable provision. It seems to me that unless the single appeal board member is very experienced, a hearing by three members would tend to produce a better quality judgment. It would also give the person being judged the reassuring knowledge that he had been accorded the fairest examination he could possibly get anywhere in the world in the determining of his or her future. Efficiency may be important, but more important still is the elimination of possible errors and a reduction of the effect of unlikely but possible sub-conscious negative attitudes which may exist on the part of one individual who has to determine whether or not another person is to be admitted permanently to Canada.

• (1430)

Second, in order to avoid the pitfall of 1967 when a rigid, maximum number of nine board members was legislated, thus tying the hands of the board when it needed to expand, it seems to me it would be better legislation if section 3(1) were worded so as to permit the appointment of any number of temporary members as may be required, rather than following the same approach adopted in the 1967 legislation.

Third, another aspect of an administrative nature but yet of some weight relates to the fact that a number of cases would not be in the appeal system, either below the special inquiry level or before the Immigration Appeal Board, if the adjudication of units for occupational demand for prospective immigrants reflected the labour market demand of the moment and the demand of the regions, instead, as is presently the case, of being three to four months behind the reality of the demand of the labour market which, to make matters worse, is applied to the national average. At the present time this means that an applicant in June could be given zero units for occupational demand in his skill because the survey of the labour market for his particular occupation carried out in February indicated that there was no demand. If this were not