

If the hon. member for York South reads the clause carefully, I think he will find that board is restricted but the right of appeal still exists.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the minister what the legal grounds might be with which the board could deal in these cases?

Mr. Marchand: I have no example to give, but perhaps the order for deportation may be against the law; it may not be well founded and it could be contested before the board.

Mr. Lewis: I suppose the minister is referring to details such as the wrong person signing the order or no inquiry having been held. This really would not get us very far.

[Translation]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I have read the amendment moved by the New Democratic Party. It suggests that in certain cases which, under the bill, would be simply settled by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) and the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. Cardin), it will be possible just the same to hold a confidential investigation in camera, and it will not be required to make public all the particulars on which either minister based his decision.

I listened closely as always to the statements of our friends of the New Democratic Party. I must say that, on several occasions, I had to change my mind after hearing certain interventions of our N.D.P. friends, who usually take the trouble to provide the house with a great deal of information.

A while ago, I was listening to the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) say that a basic principle was involved and that he could not believe that the minister was logical. This is rather strange, but it proves that truth is not transcendent, that it is not the same for all, for I too, believe there is a basic principle involved. But it does not seem to be the same that is proclaimed by the hon. member for York South.

Nor can I believe that the attitude of our friends of the New Democratic Party is logical. I understand that some of them have had unfortunate experiences during the last war. It will be recalled that censurable and, from many points of view, unfortunate things have been done.

● (3:50 p.m.)

However, it must be admitted that, in the history of a country such as ours, crises occur

Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board and such things do happen. But the basic principle here, as I see it, is to determine how best we can protect the common good. And, in order to protect the common good—I am taking an extreme case here, because I do not think it can ever occur—suppose some injustice had to be committed—as I said before, I am carrying matters to extremes—such as, for instance, handing down a decision having an adverse effect upon the personal lives of 150 immigrants per year, because they are considered as risks. The government would still be justified in taking such action, because I feel that any Canadian government, of whatever political colour, must make such decisions, after the necessary investigations, in order to preserve the common good.

I must admit that I am concerned by the position taken by our friends of the New Democratic Party. I understand that it stems from their basic philosophy, namely the protection of the individuals, of human person. This helps us to understand their attitude, to a certain extent.

But I wonder whether they do not carry this concern, this solicitude for the human person too far, and even to the detriment of the commonweal, when, one after the other, they take in the house, the defence of certain habitual criminals, certain individuals who are obvious risks from the viewpoint of security. In certain cases, they even put pressure on these people who seemed satisfied with the situation imposed on them by the government, but who, under the pressure exerted by our friends of the New Democratic Party, make appeals which are rather unexplainable.

I wonder whether that justifies them in discrediting by certain statements and certain actions, the important role of our police force, and sometimes the role of the judicature—I am thinking about the judges appointed to royal commissions for instance.

I submit that the majority of Canadians want the government to have enough leeway to discharge its responsibilities, that is to protect the common good and to prohibit under this legislation, entry into our country, or to prevent someone from staying here any longer because that person, even if not guilty of treason or any violation of the security of the state, is suspected of such activity. On the other hand, I think that the Canadian people should get the benefit of the doubt, but not those exceptional cases.

If that amendment were accepted, we would achieve the opposite purpose. That