

## Division

Cantin	Macdonald (Rosedale)
Cashin	MacEachen
Chatwood	Mackasey
Choquette	McIlraith
Chrétien	McNulty
Clermont	McWilliam
Comtois	Marchand
Côté (Nicolet-Yamaska)	Matte
Crossman	Mongrain
Davis	Neveu
Deachman	Nicholson
Drury	Olson
Énard	Otto
Éthier	Patterson
Foy	Pearson
Gauthier	Pelletier
Gendron	Pennell
Godin	Pilon
Goyer	Prud'homme
Greene	Reid
Guay	Richard
Habel	Rideout (Mrs.)
Harley	Robichaud
Hellyer	Rochon
Honey	Roxburgh
Hopkins	Ryan
Hymmen	Sharp
Isabelle	Simard
Johnston	Stanbury
Lachance	Stewart
Laflamme	Tardif
Laing	Thomas (Maisonneuve- Rosemont)
Lamontagne	Tolmie
Langlois (Chicoutimi)	Tremblay
Langlois (Mégantic)	Trudeau
Laprise	Tucker
Latulippe	Wahn
Laverdière	Walker
LeBlanc (Rimouski)	Watson (Châteauguay- Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Leboe	Whelan
Legault	Winters
Lessard	Yanakis—97.
Lind	
Loiselle	

● (5:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted in the affirmative.

**Mr. Rynard:** I was paired with the hon. member for Renfrew. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

**Mr. Smith:** Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development (Mr. Sauvé). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the amendment.

**Miss LaMarsh:** I was paired, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Haidasz:** I was paired with the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu).

**Mr. Macaluso:** I was paired, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Munro:** I was paired with the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

**Mr. Skoreyko:** I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) (Mr. Groos). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

**Mr. Fairweather:** I was paired.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question on the main motion?

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, in the committee stage and at second reading various spokesmen from our party, myself included, stated objections to clause 21 and proposed amendments which were not accepted. Because important and fundamental principles are at stake I propose to move an amendment dealing with clause 21. I shall not repeat in detail the arguments made in committee.

The bill as a whole, especially with the amendments moved in committee, in my view is excellent. The minister and his department deserve considerable credit for it. The bill provides for an appeal from orders for deportation to an independent tribunal.

Unfortunately clause 21 creates a grave and gaping hole in this admirable principle. In effect the clause says that in security cases the matter may be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the appeal tribunal and the appeal in those cases is rendered useless or inoperative. It is precisely in these types of so-called security cases that the right to a fair hearing and a real appeal is important. It is because of alleged or real security reports that many immigrants have been rejected without any possibility of proving that objections to them are based on mistakes of identity or on misapprehensions of the significance of political activities contained in police reports.

It is a fundamental human right to which the house has solemnly subscribed in the Bill of Rights that when a person's rights or future are being dealt with he shall be given a fair opportunity to meet the case against him. Such a person must know the outline at least of the case against him and the objections he has to meet. There are reasons, of course, why security reports from confidential sources cannot be made public or even disclosed in full at the hearing. But that is no reason for denying a fair hearing and denying a meaningful right of appeal in security cases. It is perfectly possible to maintain the right of appeal and yet to pay attention to the need of guarding security sources.

I proposed an amendment in committee which would have achieved the end I have just outlined. The amendment would have