

interesting to follow them, to listen to them from both sides. Members of the party in power have even expressed well detailed and well grounded criticism. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say, as an independent member, that all this bodes well and is probably of a nature to bolster the reputation of the House of Commons, of parliament in the mind of Canadians, in short to give them back the real confidence they should have in the seriousness of their parliament.

I take the liberty to congratulate all those who took part in the debate, not only on this bill but also on the three bills on the public service which were considered.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to listen earlier, like all hon. members of this house, to the speech made by the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay). It made quite an impression on me, it was, for me, a source of information I did not have, it made me understand better the background of the legislation which is now before us and of the other which will be introduced later. At one point I allowed myself a more personal intervention as far as the hon. member is concerned and I did it with some hesitation because I did not want to reopen a painful wound.

However, after hearing the hon. member say that following his firm stand on the deportation of some members of the underworld, deportation which irritated some Toronto newspapers, he had had to endure the torment of a campaign of criticism during weeks, I began to wonder if the furniture case had not come to light after that and I found that it was so. In fact, the furniture story arose after the minister had done his duty and sent away people whose departure evidently jeopardized certain interests of Toronto newspapers.

In my opinion, this is a revelation which, I think, gives us a better understanding of the indignity of that smear campaign against the minister and some of his colleagues. It is also a justification of the bill before us which will protect the minister of immigration against such persecutions. If we have reached a point in our country where newspapers as important and as responsible as those mentioned a while ago can afford such campaigns, I think it is an alarming situation and we will have to tighten our security measures in other fields.

Mr. Speaker, I read the bill as carefully as possible, just like other members of parliament. I do not claim to have any special

### *Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board*

competence. I simply listened to those of my colleagues who know more about this matter and who spoke before me. I wish to point out to the minister that one thing in particular does not seem clear to me; it concerns the appeals. Are time-limits provided—at least, I do not think so—not only to lodge appeals but also to hear them? Are time-limits provided also for execution of the decisions made by this court of sorts, by this board? Are there also some provisions for some special cases where human factors might intervene and involve additional time? I do not intend to give particulars, for I know that the minister can guess what I mean, but I mention this simply because it occurred to me while I was reading the bill.

I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) at one point attack the bureaucrats and tell the minister that some measures are absolutely necessary to prevent abuse of authority among them. Then, and not without some malice, I drew a parallel. I wondered: How can a propagandist of socialism, that is, of the theory of government through bureaucrats, allow himself, even before succeeding in establishing the system in this country, to criticize the bureaucrats? There is a sort of irrationality or inconsistency in such a remark. This might suggest that if our friends in the New Democratic Party ever came to power, they would have to create other bureaucratic institutions to watch over all the bureaucrats that are already in office. We can see from here the unseemly bureaucracy which all this would entail.

I was nevertheless amused—I say this without malice—because the comments made by the hon. member for York South were, in my opinion, timely and of great value for the most part. What worries me most—I believe you will find this is a constant concern of mine—is the persistence with which the hon. member for York South champions the cause—this may not be the most accurate expression—the extraordinary tenacity with which he defends Canadians under suspicion or accused of being security risks, demanding that excessive precautionary measures be taken, fettering the government hand and foot in order to protect the rights of those citizens presumed to be or accused of being a threat to public security.

I know the hon. member for York South means well, because he believes precisely in the rights of individuals, and I think it is a