

### *Immigration*

the chairman of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration. That committee was dealing with a very important piece of legislation with myriad amendments, and not only those proposed by the government and by parties opposite in advance. Many amendments came up during the course of the discussions. Given the varying views and attitudes of the members of the committee, that particular member of parliament performed her task in an admirable fashion. She kept control of the committee meetings. When the meeting seemed to be out of control, we recognized she was allowing us to splutter on until we finally reached a better bill as a result of the committee hearings.

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

**Mr. Cullen:** I dissociate myself from the hon. member for Greenwood when he took the odd potshot at members who attended only a few of the meetings. In many instances I received representations from both sides of this House indicating interest in particular parts of the bill. Hon. members wanted to be present when the committee was dealing with particular areas of the bill in which they were interested. They would say, "I am busy with six or seven committees, but when these issues come up I very definitely want to be there". Thus, members only appeared for two or three meetings when we were dealing with specific sections. They had very important roles to play.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) performed his task on the unemployment insurance bill. When he could not be present for some meetings, he sent the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). The hon. member for Timiskaming was present for only two or three meetings, but he did a great job when he was there, putting forward views he was required to put forward. It was not necessary for him to be present at every committee meeting in order to put his view across. It is unfair to criticize members who were present for some of the meetings but not all of them.

I should like to comment on the motions put forward by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) and the hon. member for Greenwood. The first part of motion No. 23 and all of motion No. 25 have the same effect in that they would restrict the removal of persons who, while in Canada, engage in or instigate subversion by force of democratic governments, and not just any government, as the bill now proposes. The bill does not preclude lawful and peaceful activity against any form of government. It attempts to prevent the use of force in carrying out those activities.

We have a responsibility to protect the lives and property of Canadian citizens against the violence of others, even though we may not condone the particular government against which that violence is aimed. We do not want to have in Canada a counter part of the recent bombing of the Yugoslav consulate in New York which was carried out by emigré groups.

Motions Nos. 23 and 24 would require fraud or misrepresentation relating to entry into Canada, as referred to in clause 27(1)(e), to be intentional, in the one motion, or to be done wilfully, in the second motion. This would require the depart-

[Mr. Brewin.]

ment to prove that a permanent resident who gained landing by misrepresenting a material fact did so intentionally or wilfully, before his removal could be ordered. This would pose probably an impossible burden of proof upon the department. The false statements would have been made overseas, and the individual's conduct would have to be assessed as of that time in order to determine whether the fraud or misrepresentation was intentional or wilful. For that reason, I cannot support the proposals in these two motions.

Motion No. 23 in the name of the hon. member for Egmont would restore the domicile protection of the present act, which prohibits the deportation of permanent residents for the commission of certain offences if they have resided in Canada for more than five years. Although I respect and admire the integrity of the hon. member for Egmont trying to get this particular idea back into the act and passed, I basically disagree as to whether it is necessary. The paragraphs referred to in this part of the motion relate to the offences of knowingly contravening terms and conditions of landing, conviction of an offence carrying a maximum imposable penalty of more than five years, obtaining landing fraudulently, or wilfully failing to support himself or a dependent member of his family.

● (1430)

The first of these is totally unnecessary, since terms and conditions cannot continue in effect for more than six months and so could not be contravened by a person with more than five years' permanent residence. The others can be applicable at any time, but they are serious offences, indicating that the person is unwilling to carry out his legal and moral obligations, or is a danger to public safety or order in Canada.

Clause 27(1), dealing with removal of permanent residents, has been shorn of all the removable classes in the present act which cover matters outside the control of the individual or which are not indicative of serious character flaws or criminal behaviour. The whole clause, therefore, permits removal of permanent residents only for very serious reasons and leaves ameliorating or compassionate factors such as length of residence in Canada to the discretion of the Immigration Appeal Board to which permanent residents have a right to appeal. For the reasons I have cited I am not prepared to accept this part of motion No. 23.

Motion No. 26 is very similar to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) at the committee stage. Surely, if there is a reason for the committee stage, it is to look at the various amendments which are put forward, to determine if they are acceptable to the government or if they might be acceptable to the government drawn in a different form or perhaps with certain changes made. That is what we agreed to at the committee stage, and I think that is what the hon. member for Egmont was saying when he made, I believe, his first intervention at the report stage.

**Mr. Epp:** "Provencher", not "Egmont".

**Mr. Cullen:** Surely there is a time when we use the committee stage, and it is really wrong, when motions have been