

*Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board*

recently landed immigrant. That is the only reason. The question has been asked: Why not extend this provision to all classes? This is a new procedure and we want to experiment with it and know exactly the verdict of the board and what effect it will have on our policy. We want to make an experiment in this regard. We are doing it by this clause. Through order in council we can modify it and extend it to other classes. I believe we are still a democracy, and if this house thinks at any time that this principle should be extended, and political parties think this, I do not think a government would resist that pressure. This principle can be extended. We are making this experiment without taking away any rights from anybody.

**Mr. Wahn:** Mr. Chairman, would it not be better to write clause 17 in general terms and reserve the right of the governor in council to exclude certain classes while this experiment is continuing? If clause 17 is passed in its present form, even if the experiment proves successful the minister will not have the authority to extend by order in council the classes of people entitled to the benefit of appeal. Would it not be better to re-word the clause to provide for a general appeal for the classes I have mentioned, giving the minister authority to restrict the classes during the period of experimentation?

**Mr. Marchand:** This is a very good idea and I will consider it overnight.

**Mr. Haidasz:** Mr. Chairman, the arguments that were made earlier this afternoon and this evening hinge on the point outlined by the hon. member for St. Paul's, and I hope the minister will bring in such an amendment to clause 17.

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 2 carry?

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a short question of the minister on clause 2. I am one of those who has a French copy of the bill. Paragraph (g) of clause 2 states:

[*Translation*]

(g) "permanent resident" means a person who has been granted lawful admission to Canada for permanent residence under the Immigration Act;

[*English*]

Does this mean a landed immigrant is classed as a permanent resident? Is it presumed by the minister that a landed immigrant has gone through all the stages of the probationary period, and under paragraph (g) a landed immigrant is classed as a permanent resident?

**Mr. Marchand:** Mr. Chairman, I do not understand which clause the hon. member is referring to.

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** Paragraph (g) of clause 2.

**Mr. Marchand:** Because the hon. member read it in French, I did not understand it.

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** These landed immigrants will probably be like me, bicultural but not bilingual. My question to the minister is this: Is a landed immigrant, under clause 2 (g), classed as a permanent resident? Is it presumed that he has gone through all the stages of the probationary period?

**Mr. Marchand:** This is a Canadian resident as defined in the Immigration Act. It is the same thing.

**Mr. Herridge:** Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister a question? What is the status of a landed immigrant if it can be proven that he gave false information to the department to obtain landed immigrant status?

**Mr. Marchand:** If the hon. member has a particular case in mind, I will meet with him tomorrow and study it. I cannot answer that question in general terms now.

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 2 carry?

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3, 4 and 5 agreed to.

On clause 6—*Head office.*

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** On clause 6, Mr. Chairman, would the minister indicate whether the intention is that there should always be one lawyer sitting with the board?

**Mr. Marchand:** When the board is sitting there should be on it either the chairman or the vice chairman.

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** I realize there should always be sitting on the board the chairman or vice-chairman, but there is no requirement that the vice-chairman be a member of the bar. I think the intention is that on each board there should be sitting a member of the bar, but in fact I do not believe this clause carries out that intention.

**Mr. Marchand:** I am not sure that this was the intention, but the hon. member has a point. I thought in the first place that the chairman and vice-chairman should be barristers, but this is not indicated formally in the bill. This is something I will look into.