

*The Address—Mr. Lambert*

merely to say that on a dollar basis there must be a closer balance or a bilateral balance in trade patterns.

I should like, Mr. Speaker—and here I am repeating remarks I have made in the past—to see a greater emphasis on trade with the West Indies and the Caribbean islands. I think we have a natural area there in which to develop trade. Unfortunately, while there have been certain steps taken in this regard I do not think that the massive attack, in so far as investigation and planning in regard to the encouragement of this type of trade, are concerned, which is necessary, has taken place. Therefore I would suggest to the government that this would be a very fruitful area of investigation for the expansion of the trade of this country.

We have noted in the speech from the throne the government's intention to reappoint the special committees, among them that on defence and that on procedure and organization of parliament. I hope, following the remarks of the house leader this morning, that we will see the resolution leading to the appointment of these committees very soon. I think there is a good deal of work which can be done by the committee on defence, and I will say no more except to mention the interim report which was made by last session's special committee, which gave an indication that many areas of investigation have yet to be looked at. However, I should like to emphasize one recommendation which can be applied generally to many of our special committees. It is that technical assistance be provided whereby members of a committee may be able to have recourse to expert advice in providing yardsticks on which to judge the testimony which has been given before the committee. I have heard it said by highly qualified persons that in certain special committees astute witnesses who are well prepared can, to use a trite phrase, pull a snow job on the layman in the committee. The subject matter is beyond the technical competence of the members and notwithstanding all the good will and effort on the part of the members they are not qualified really to assess the evidence sufficiently well in order to place the best recommendations before parliament. True, this may be something that the committee on procedure and organization must consider in greater detail, but I put it forward as a matter which ought to be considered.

On the subject of immigration, we have had some indication of an amendment to the act in a very narrow area. I should like to repeat to the new Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Tremblay) the remarks I made at the time of the consideration of the estimates of his predecessor. I think that

some drastic review of the regulations must be made from the point of view of the more expeditious processing of applications, and I am referring primarily to Chinese immigration. There are problems here but on the other hand I am sure we could do a great deal better in this regard.

In this connection I would draw particularly to the attention of the minister some of the problems that have arisen from the granting of landed immigrant status in the case of certain persons who have entered the country illegally. Let us take the case of a man who is married but who has entered this country purportedly as a single person and should not have been admitted because he was over 21, married, and so forth. When such people who have been given the status of landed immigrants now wish to bring forward their wives and families they are told: "Your wife swore a false statutory declaration at the time of your original application and she is therefore barred from admission to this country".

If the husband has now been granted regular status and the sins of the scheme in which he participated have been forgiven, why place the whole onus and burden for the scheme on the wife and other relatives? Surely, if the husband is to be forgiven the wife must be forgiven as well. I would say that the wife, having participated in a scheme with her husband, is no worse than her husband and as we have forgiven him, therefore we must forgive her. I would call for the immediate revision of such regulations.

Redistribution has been mentioned. I do not know exactly what the pattern is going to be so far as the redistribution commissions are concerned. We have heard that there is going to be a commission of four in each province. I do not think this is the answer. I would much rather see one commission because we are going to get the report from one commission—

**An hon. Member:** It would take longer.

**Mr. Lambert:** I suggest it will not take any longer because every province is bound in effect by the time it will take to deal with the problems of redistribution in Quebec and Ontario, the two largest provinces of the country. I would suggest that we could divide the country into four sectors, each sector to be in charge of a subcommittee of the main committee. Those sectors would be the Atlantic provinces, Quebec, Ontario, and the prairie provinces and British Columbia. Each subcommittee would have approximately the same amount of work to do. Under the present proposal there is going to be a separate commission for Newfoundland with seven seats