

Immigration

and it was following those discussions that we set up in my department a special office in charge of international adoption matters whose role is to ensure better coordination and control of administrative procedures followed in Canada and abroad in the area of adoption.

So, Mr. Speaker, I recommend very strongly that the House support the proposal of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen). I think it is an eminently reasonable proposal which meets the concerns of the committee. Moreover, it will make for an effective and least expensive possible administration of immigration services, particularly as regards the health aspect of immigration services.

● (1220)

[English]

Mr. Robert Young (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the debate at this time with particular reference to motions Nos. 14 and 15. In view of the time element last evening, I deferred from raising a question of privilege which I wished to clear up. Some aspersions were cast on my service in the committee when studying this bill. If the House would indulge me for a few moments, I should like to comment on some of these aspersions. The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) pointed out that I attended only two committee hearings. In fact, I attended many more than that. I should like to indicate that he did not attend any.

Mr. Orlikow: I was not a member of the committee.

Mr. Young: You do not have to be a member in order to attend committee hearings.

Mr. Orlikow: But I read the evidence.

Mr. Young: The hon. member has the happy faculty of squeezing the largest number of words into some of the smallest ideas possible. Most of what he said last night did not pertain to the remarks I made, nor the comments I made to the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Most of what he said referred to the draft bill, not to the amended bill which is now before this House for debate. To do what he did takes things greatly out of context.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am sure he will apologize.

Mr. Young: The hon. member for Greenwood accused me of coming into committee with a platoon. He indicated that I walked in and steamrollered him. I appreciate his commenting on some of my efforts during the afternoon and evening sittings of the committee hearings. Although he was a member of the committee, he was not present when we amended the particular clause he referred to last night. I am referring to clause 19(1)(d). The hon. member was not in his place at committee, but I was and the record will show that. The understanding that the hon. member for Greenwood was presenting regarding the particular clause of the bill that he takes issue with was untrue and incomplete. I maintain that because the hon. member said last night that clause 19(1)(d) at present

[Mr. Lalonde.]

contains no right to trial and that it denied the right to be tried before punishment. He indicated that a person will be barred from entering or visiting Canada merely on a suspicion.

I should like to indicate that that is not true. If he knew as much about this new bill as he maintains, he would know there are clauses in it indicating that anyone who is turned back or detained at the border can cause a special inquiry to be held and can cause the immigration officer at the border to relate the reasonable grounds for believing he will commit an indictable offence—and not “may” or “likely to”. There have to be reasonable grounds on which to base the ruling that a person will go out and commit an indictable offence.

Mr. Orlikow: What are the reasonable grounds?

Mr. Young: We are talking about a hypothetical case. Let me refer to some practical ones. If the hon. member wants to know what the reasonable grounds are, hon. members from the New Democratic Party over the last few months have champed at the bit regarding how members of the Five Dragons immigrated to this country and are now residing on our west coast. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggart) has asked questions on how these people came to be in our country. That is one reason the government wishes to have this type of amendment in the bill.

Therefore, if there are reasonable grounds to suspect that people will come into this country to commit an indictable offence, immigration officers can say “No”. In one breath, members of the New Democratic Party are saying to the government, “Why did you let these people in?” In another breath, the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for Winnipeg North are saying, “Let them all come in”. In committee, the hon. member for Greenwood said, “Let everyone come in. Let them do what they please. If he is going to commit a criminal act, let him do that”. He indicated also that it was up to the government to go out and catch him, convict him and then try to deport him. That is a rather asinine way of going about it; it is rather ridiculous.

The clause which is presently in the bill is a good one. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood would prevent the department from keeping out, or removing persons about whom there is credible information that they are engaged in organized criminal activities although no convictions may have been registered against them. That clause was amended in committee, after long discussions, along lines originally proposed by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). The present clause attempts to deal with the fact that those involved in organized crime all too rarely come before the courts. Without it, the government would be seriously hampered in its efforts to safeguard the Canadian public against the menace of organized crime.

The hon. member for Greenwood suggests that the border should be open and that anyone, regardless of his intentions, criminal or otherwise, should be able to come into the country. If he commits a criminal act, it is up to the government to catch him, convict him and then try to deport him. If we are going to devise an immigration act asking border officials to