

carry out a job on behalf of the government and the people of this country, we should give them the tools and the powers to do the job. I am not referring to a wide-ranging, discretionary clause which would give them the power to look into the eyes of someone and say, "I do not like you. I think you are going to commit an offence".

The act requires that the immigration officer must have reasonable grounds to believe that a person will commit an indictable offence—not just any offence. To do anything else would weaken the efficacy of the act and would impair situations at the border and airports. It would seriously emasculate the bill, and emasculate immigration officers in the carrying out of their duties.

The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) has put forward an amendment which touches on an issue discussed in committee. I am sorry he is not here today. However, last night I informed him that I would speak against his amendment today and told him what I would be saying. His proposed motion refers back to subclause (c) of the draft bill. It would give power to border officers to turn back or detain someone whom he believes might commit an indictable offence, but only if that indictable offence was subject to a penalty of at least ten years imprisonment. That verges on being somewhat ridiculous, because if one peruses the Criminal Code he will find a great number of serious offences which do not have ten-year minimum penalties.

● (1230)

If that amendment were passed, a person could come to the border and an immigration officer could have a reasonable belief: he could even be told by the person wanting to come in that that person has the full intention of committing any one of a number of different crimes. It could be indecent and harassing telephone calls, bookmaking, corrupting justice, keeping a gaming house or cattle rustling, which I am sure interests hon. members from the west. It could be blowing up somebody's property or animals. It could be that that person might come here to print or tender a counterfeit proclamation of parliament. All of those are indictable offences, but not subject to at least ten years imprisonment. Therefore, even if the immigration officer has reasonable and probable grounds to believe the person would commit that type of offence, he could not keep that individual out if we passed the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

Perhaps I could break it down into a very easily understood example. If we were to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Greenwood, the hon. member would be quite happy to invite someone into his house even though he might have a reasonable suspicion that that person would set fire to his living room or to his house. The hon. member for Greenwood would say, "Come on over to my house; light your match; set my rug on fire". He would then go to the trouble of calling the fire department and the police department and trying to catch the fellow and have him convicted. He would go to the trouble of trying to get damages and then have the fellow deported.

### *Immigration*

The hon. member for Fundy-Royal, being a little more sensible, since arson can bring more than ten years, would not invite that fellow into his house, believing on reasonable grounds that the fellow would set fire to his living room. However, if the fellow was just going to blow up the house, he would invite him in because he would not get ten years for that. That is how ridiculous some of these amendments are.

I think border officials have to have some power and discretion. They are reasonable people. If a person is denied entry, he has the right to ask the border officer to divulge reasonable grounds at a special inquiry. In any event, a report is made to a senior immigration officer. The detained person might appear, after just a few minutes, before a senior immigration officer and convince the officer that he is a totally reasonable and proper person to come into the country. I think immigration officers need the tools necessary to do the work they are called upon to do.

We need the type of legislation which is in this bill as unamended in order to take care of the public in this country, to keep us at peace and to prevent those people we reasonably suspect of having criminal intent from coming into Canada. I do not think we have to open our borders and allow criminals, those with criminal intentions and those whose design is to engage in organized crime, to come into this country.

**Mr. Stanbury:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I noticed just now, in yesterday's *Hansard*, a reference on page 7889, by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), to multicultural policy. The hon. member said:

On October 8, 1971, the government announced its multicultural policy, which had hitherto been under the aegis of then secretary of state, Gérard Pelletier.

To set the record straight, I simply want to state that as minister responsible for citizenship I had full responsibility for that area of government administration, for the development of the policy of multiculturalism and its articulation as national policy, and I accept responsibility for it with pride.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The point raised by the hon. member is, of course, not a question of privilege. I would call it a point of clarification. That is truly welcomed by all hon. members, so I think the matter is settled in this way.

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about two or three of the motions which are up for debate at the present time. Two of them stand in my name, and the other one, which was discussed both last night and today, stands in the name of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen). I am indeed sorry that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) did not stay to listen to any further responses to his comments, and in particular that he did not stay long enough to hear the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young). Because I thought if there was any difficulty the Minister of National Health and Welfare was having in understanding the purpose of the amendment, which had been accepted by the committee, the hon. member for Niagara Falls might have helped a great deal, for in the context of his remarks—while I do not agree with the conclu-