

Now, I have yet to meet with the provincial authorities to come to an understanding with them. If the province of Quebec should decide, like Ontario, to set up immigration offices, I think it is up to the Quebec authorities to contact us, because under the Canadian constitution—and let us say that for once that seems rather clear—the federal government's jurisdiction has precedence in matters of immigration. Therefore, that means that if Quebec wants to become interested in the problem of immigration, it is up to that province to contact the federal government. We would be very glad to discuss the matter with the provincial authorities in order to find out what their intentions are and to assist them in achieving their objectives.

● (8:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

There are a few other questions, Mr. Chairman, but if you will allow me I would prefer to answer them in writing. I know that immigration problems are very important. The hon. member for Greenwood said that for many years he has been told by ministers of immigration that everything would be corrected and yet nothing has been done. I can state tonight that it will be the same in a year or two. In the meantime we would hope to try to improve the situation now existing. I think that by proceeding along those lines some day we shall have a sound immigration policy.

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** Mr. Chairman, in his reply the hon. minister has been sufficiently provocative that I am tempted to follow him in some of the matters which he has raised. I resist that temptation, however, because I am as anxious as he is to see these estimates put through tonight. I want to refer to one matter only and that, without recapturing any of the atmosphere of this afternoon, is the matter of security.

The minister appreciates that both in immigration and in citizenship the whole subject of security is a very difficult one. Indeed it is probably the most difficult one which the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has to face. There are many times when he must wrestle with his conscience as he reads reports in front him. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister this afternoon has suggested that there will be a commission which will investigate security problems, I wonder if I might put to the minister—I do not ask him to reply or necessarily to commit himself

23033—148½

*Supply—Citizenship and Immigration*

—a request that he will insist with his colleagues that the whole subject of security as it affects immigration to this country and as it affects the grant of citizenship in this country be among the terms of reference of the commission which the Prime Minister proposed.

I believe that this would give some hope to quite a number of people who have been in difficulties in matters of citizenship. There are on the files of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration views which I have expressed in relation to this matter, which views perhaps are unorthodox. I do not think that necessarily questions of security are a reason for depriving persons of citizenship who have been in this country for many years. I should like to see the question of possible membership in organizations which, if persons were coming from abroad, might be considered of a very delicate nature in the security light, considered in a somewhat different light in relation to the question of the application of citizenship.

I spent many hours myself in wrestling with my own conscience in relation to this subject. Speaking for myself, I should be delighted to appear before any commissioner and tell him my experiences in this field as a minister. I think it would be wise and sound for this question to be part of the terms of reference of the commission proposed this afternoon by the Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marchand:** I thank the members of the committee and I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman, but that matter troubles my conscience very deeply too.

Like the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell), I feel the need to say that I am not any more at ease that he is; I try to see under what standards, at a given moment, citizens or immigrants are turned down and I am a little lost, because there is as much subjectivity in considering those standards. At one time, people can be turned down or accepted in a discretionary manner without knowing exactly what the deeper reasons are, because there are in our laws—and that is true on both sides of the house—sections which are difficult to apply. I must admit that I can say a lot of things because I am new here and people will say: "He did not know, he did not understand the difficulties".

Let us say that I would rather state that there was basic hypocrisy, because we wanted to discourage only one kind of people,