

and claimed refugee status. These people were Sikhs and they claimed that they wanted to set up their own homeland and that the government of India was politically mistreating them. Now my community was divided by that. There was one congregation, one Sikh temple, that asked the government to treat these people leniently. They were the people taking the middle ground. Then another group, the East-Asian Workers Association, strongly supported the claims of these people, the potential refugees. And many other people—the very parents of the first group—in the Malton Asian Senior Citizens Association—objected to the idea that there could even possibly be any kind of refugee from India at all. They were insulted by the claim. As I say, my community was split by this issue. If the people in the community could not figure it out, how could we ask one of our officials right at the scene at the airport to do so? There is a crush of people arriving. Many times there were 50 or 100 people on an airplane at one time. They have terrible language or cultural difficulties. They do not realize what they are being asked by our officials. And our officials cannot assess the information they are being given.

We do not want those people to be given some kind of a rubber stamp and thrown out of the country arbitrarily. We want to be sure that we treat these people fairly because we are a democratic and civilized country. We want to be absolutely sure. So some were detained because they did not have the money to prove that they would come back. They could not put up a bond. Their relatives would not put up a bond. Less than 10 per cent were detained because financially they were unable to put up a bond. But the rest, over 90 per cent, were let loose into the city of Toronto. Now, one by one, they are being brought back quite properly, quite honestly. They are coming back, facing appeal hearings and talking to our officials in a calm, deliberate, legal fashion and making their case. Some are not winning those cases but they have the right for further appeal. Why do they have that right? Because this is a civilized, democratic country and we do not throw out our proper, democratic, civilized processes in the name of some efficiency that the member from York North might invent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in a democracy we have to realize the importance of due process. We cannot let some guy come along and convince us that these shortcuts are worth while. We have to admit that there is room for error in our procedures, and that to be just we have to double-check the way we do things, through proper appeals. We have to allow people to state their case. We must remember, in other words, the very moving reminder that Winston Churchill gave us—and I will paraphrase it—that democracy is an inefficient form of government, but we are going to keep it because we cannot think of anything any better.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to comment on this particular bill because I want to say to the Canadian public that it is a bill which is put out in the name of a private member and I know that it does not have the support of the Progressive Conservative Party. I

am sure the former member from Egmont and the former member from Hamilton West, who were opposition critics for immigration when I had the honour to bring forward the bill which this one amends, would be appalled at the terms and conditions which are in this particular bill.

**Mr. Gamble:** Get specific.

**Mr. Cullen:** The hon. member says "Get specific". He mentioned the name of McCarthy, the individual who was thought to be a member of the IRA and was in Vancouver where it cost something like \$10,000 to handle that case. Well, he was not picked up because he was here illegally. He was picked up for some minor offence and there was a suggestion that he might be the individual that the RCMP was looking for. He denied that. Let us suppose for a moment that he had not actually been Mr. McCarthy. Let us suppose that he had been someone else. Do you not think that we would have been in a ridiculous situation if we had said, "The Mounties say that this individual is Mr. McCarthy and as far as we are concerned that is good enough for us."? It would not have looked good if we had thrown him out and said he was in here illegally. No, he had what every Canadian has the right to expect and what every person within our borders has the right to expect—due process of law. It cost \$10,000, but for the sake of Canadian justice it was worth it. Imagine us picking up this individual and shipping him out of the country. We sure as hell would have done that under the terms of this particular bill. It would not have mattered that perhaps he was the wrong person. We would have had more than egg on our face, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot for the life of me understand how, into the twentieth century, when we try to bring some humanity in an immigration bill, a brand new immigration bill, something like this would be preferred some two or three years later as an improvement. It is a disgrace and thank heaven it is presented by an individual member and not by the opposition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the previous speakers for saving me at least a few minutes and giving me a chance to say that I entirely disagree with the bill presented by my colleague from the Toronto area, the member for York North (Mr. Gamble). I would like to draw his attention to a historical fact.

[*English*]

I would like to draw his attention at this moment to February 5, 1963, when his party was defeated in the House. It was February 5, 1963. His party was defeated by a vote of 142 to 111. If there is some lesson that we should draw from that—there is a lesson that my colleague, a member on the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and National Defence who, I agree, is very active, should draw from that. The lesson is that the kind of views he has expressed in the bill he is introducing today are narrow. I do not say he is narrow-minded, but he is narrow in his approach as to what Canada's