

opportunity to experiment in order to ascertain exactly what impact this may have on our policy.

The board itself will have much to learn in this respect. I feel it is only reasonable that the house let us make this experiment in a broad-minded way, contrary to the suggestion made by the hon. member for York South. We want the governor in council to extend this right to a maximum. Therefore, we are not providing restrictions to this right.

I suggest that this right can and should be granted to everyone, and we should not use the word "limit". Why should this right appear in the bill, if we do not want to grant it? No one forced us to do so. We felt that it was—and we realize that it must eventually be considered,—a matter of right and we simply ask to proceed step by step in order to find out whether the proposed structure is really the right one. If we have to change it, if we discover that we are swamped because of the inadequacy of our structures, the process will be temporarily halted, so as to enable the house to change the structure, the sponsoring, the right of a sponsor to appeal, to make adjustments concerning the board. That is the only purpose.

When the member for York South deals with merit, I shall not answer him, because I agree with him. There is only one point—he used what may not be called a misleading argument, but could become one—which is that we never suggested in the house that there would be distinctions within a given class. Should we state that Canadian citizens are entitled to sponsor, then it would mean that all Canadian citizens are entitled to do so; if we were to say, at a given time, that landed immigrants are entitled to sponsor, then we would be extending this right to all landed immigrants, and the governor in council must in no way discriminate between Canadians and immigrants. Therefore, we have no intention of discriminating, or using discretionary powers; all we want, and this seems quite reasonable to me, is the opportunity to experiment something new, which was never tested before in any country, and of embarking ourselves in a venture which is at present unknown to us. That was the spirit in which it was submitted, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I believe, with great respect, that the minister has missed the whole point of the amendment. I will not argue again the case put

23033—862½

Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board

forward in committee when the minister moved certain amendments to clause 17. Immediately thereafter what he had given with one hand he took away with the other. In response to criticisms from this side he presented amendments which I styled sophistical. I still think they were sophistical. The ministers' amendments extended the category of appellant from a Canadian citizen to any person, including a landed immigrant. Then he took the power away. Behind the closed doors of the cabinet chamber he has the right to say that it shall be only a Canadian citizen or some class of Canadian citizen who may appeal. The minister retained the power to determine what classes of relatives shall be included. As I say, he gave with one hand and took away with the other.

I do not doubt the minister's personal sincerity, but he will not be minister very long. He will not retain his present portfolio for long because I do not think anybody could take on his leadership responsibilities in Quebec and retain the responsibilities of the portfolio of manpower and immigration. Frankly, I think to do both things is impossible. The minister will have to leave a portfolio as heavy as that of manpower and immigration. That portfolio is no part time job.

For these reasons he may not be the minister for much longer. We do not know who may be the new minister, who will be the person with the right at any time to present a recommendation to the cabinet to close the door on the class of persons who may appeal. We do not know who may close the door on classes of relatives. It is not good enough to give power to the governor in council sitting behind closed doors to reduce this clause to a total nullity, because that is what is happening.

Even at this late date I suggest that the minister should reconsider the position of the government. He should adopt the reasonable position suggested to him by members on this side during debate in committee of the whole house. In many particulars the minister showed considerable flexibility as the bill went through committee. As the bill stands at third reading it has been greatly improved over the bill which received second reading. On few occasions have I seen as many useful amendments adopted in the committee of the whole house. The bill has been improved and would be improved more if the minister allowed it to go back to the committee of the whole as proposed by this amendment, and if he gave effect to the representations which I had the privilege of making in committee.