

Supply—Citizenship and Immigration

that it is as reasonably accurate as any other method for the purpose we have in mind.

The Leader of the Opposition raised two cases and I propose to deal with them very briefly. The first case he mentioned happens to be before the courts and perhaps I ought to follow the course of wisdom which is traditional in this house and say very little more about it. I made that clear when I answered the question asked by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe on that very subject some weeks ago. I told him the case was before the courts and I was not in a position to make any comment. I think perhaps I could follow that course again today, though it is regrettable that the Leader of the Opposition sought to interpret the case in a manner which, with all due respect to him, does not bear very much resemblance to the facts.

The other case he raised concerned Mr. Harold Banks, and may I say again that this is one of those instances in which the assumptions may turn out to be incorrect. We have had some discussion in the house about this particular case, and I remember about May 8 or 10 the hon. member for Hamilton West asked me whether a board of inquiry had been ordered on this case. My answer was, "No". Had that question been asked any time within the last three weeks my answer would have been, "Yes, I ordered a board of inquiry for the purpose of obtaining the record as it is and as I suppose it to be before the officers charged with the responsibility of considering the admission or right to settle in Canada of this particular person." That board will meet in Montreal. It so happens that I am the person to whom an appeal can be made and I feel I should not discuss this case today either. I could perhaps talk about the facts but I do not think it would be fair to indicate any opinion since the facts, when presented to me, should be viewed at that time in a manner as free from previous opinions as it is possible to be.

Mrs. Fairclough: Did I understand the minister to say whether a date had been set for the meeting of that board?

Mr. Harris: It has not been set and I have no particular control over that. We have regular boards of inquiry and they take their turn depending on how much they have to do.

The Leader of the Opposition made reference to an article in *Maclean's* magazine dealing with a so-called racket in Montreal in which persons were engaged in illegal practices with respect to the admission of immigrants. Once again, with great respect

to the Leader of the Opposition in his absence, I might say he was not aware of the facts in this case. I made an answer to him over a year ago to the effect that prosecutions were being launched and I thought there was no particular reason for making reference to these prosecutions until further inquiry was made. There is nothing sinister about it. The racket was in existence and it was uncovered by the department itself with the result that up to the moment one of the gentlemen involved has been convicted and fined \$100 and \$250 and dismissed from the service; another one was fined \$200; still another was fined \$250 and given three months in which to raise the fine and in default to serve one month and two months to run consecutively; one other person is still before the courts, and still another has not been apprehended because he is in the United Kingdom and I understand he was able to avoid extradition on that account. That accounts for those who were involved in the proceedings.

The leader of the C.C.F. party referred me to a letter he received from a person abroad and I think I can deal very briefly with that. This was a news item carrying a report of a meeting addressed by one of our officers, Mr. Don Brown. Mr. Brown is one of our better officers in the United Kingdom and while I fully understand and share the view that we cannot permit an overoptimistic picture to be delineated I do not think any hon. member here, especially those who have been criticizing the government for not having encouraged enough immigration, would wish our officers abroad not to be reasonably optimistic about the future in Canada. How to balance that in an address is, of course, obvious. You must put in qualifications but you must also state the facts on which you base the desire of the Canadian government to have people in the audience come to Canada, and if in the course of reporting, these qualifications do not appear, or if in the normal method of reporting meetings the full story is not given I do not feel we should complain either to the press in the first instance or to our officer.

I just want to run through the complaints made because they are similar to many which have been made and have no more justification. For example, the officer began by saying, quite properly, that it usually took three to six months to obtain accommodation of a permanent nature. I am sure no one can complain of that. Then he said that the national average wage was about £20 a week. I have not looked up the statistics lately but the last ones I saw showed that the average wage in Canada