

order to elaborate a new and aggressive policy with regard to the underworld and all elements considered as a threat to the security of our country.

This report I have before me was discussed during that meeting and the general conclusions dated March 12, 1964, were to the effect that first the Chinese amnesty should be ended, and this is a secondary problem—secondary compared to the one on our mind now—with which I do not want to deal here. But the main conclusions of that meeting were precisely to set up in the department of immigration a special division which would check all the security cases outstanding and try to detect, in co-operation with the R.C.M.P., the underworld and mafia leaders in the various cities of our country, precisely in order to deport them.

● (5:00 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? I assume that the report to which he has been referring is a departmental document, not a public one?

[Translation]

Mr. Tremblay: That is right, Mr. Speaker, that departmental report was never published but it formed the very basis of a policy within the department of immigration which was actually implemented through the establishment of this special centre in the department. As a matter of fact, in November 1964, Mr. L. E. Lefaive was appointed head of the enforcement division of the department of immigration which maintained relations with the Department of Justice and the R.C.M.P. precisely with regard to the deportation of special security cases, involving mainly the underworld and the mafia. In fact, at that meeting, authorities of the justice department and the R.C.M.P. were asking the department of immigration to set up a unit designed to help in the fight against the underworld, for deportation purposes.

In fact, the unit, headed by Mr. Lefaive, and his men uncovered Bonanno a few weeks later in Montreal and some weeks later he was deported to the United States. It was precisely Mr. Lefaive and his men who, independently of the R.C.M.P. had succeeded in uncovering Mr. Bonanno who was on the list we had received.

Mr. Lewis: Is Mr. Lefaive still the head of that division?

Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board

Mr. Tremblay: Yes. I think he is still the head. In any case, he was until recently.

Mr. Speaker, this important function fulfilled by the department of immigration in matters of security is one that must be maintained and the new bill in fact provides that the minister of immigration and the Solicitor General may conduct very serious investigations in cases brought to their attention. I think the member for York South (Mr. Lewis) indicated that normally the minister of immigration makes decisions in matters of security on the basis of very slight reports. Well, I think that the minister of immigration, in all cases involving security, has all the necessary reports to make a decision and a serious investigation is made for the minister. From now on, there will be two ministers, the Solicitor General responsible for the R.C.M.P. and the minister of immigration who will jointly sign a deportation order. In those cases, the right of appeal will be suspended. I submit that, for the security of the country, this power of the minister of immigration and the Solicitor General jointly to suspend the right of appeal is absolutely necessary if the department of immigration is to continue—and I am convinced that it will, because the minister of immigration has already made a statement in the house on the subject—to co-operate very closely with the R.C.M.P. and with the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allowed to him is over.

Some hon. Members: Keep on.

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, I am almost through with my general remarks on Bill No. C-220.

I believe the indications I gave permit an understanding of the context in which the Sedgwick report on the minister's discretion was prepared and the motives that led to it. I think I have succeeded—at least I hope—in showing that this bill meets a need that was felt by all ministers of immigration, that is to unload themselves as much as possible of their discretion on an organization of officials or commissioners where no criticism could be made, whether or not they would be justified. I think the upholding of personal responsibility on the part of the minister in security matters is absolutely essential and I am convinced that with the changes in details which may be made during the debate, Bill No. C-220 was a must.