

Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board

time what I am appealing against. I should not have to guess it. I should not have to rely on a letter from somebody somewhere, which may be complete or may not be complete. I see no reason why as part of the rights of the appellant—the appellant has to give notice under clause 19—in return the minister should not be required by the law to provide him with particulars of the grounds for the action against which he is appealing.

I will be prepared to suggest that perhaps such grounds should be given in such manner and in such form as is prescribed by the rules of the board, so that the board will have such rules and everybody will know precisely how to proceed. I shall repeat what has already been said, and then resume my seat. I think, as I said earlier, that the idea of the independent appeal tribunal is an extremely excellent one, but it will not be a good one in practice if we do not take some steps in committee of the whole to bring the procedures a little more in consonance with the demands of proper hearing and natural justice.

Mr. Roxburgh: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say just a few words. I shall certainly not take up much of the time of the committee. However, having been a member of the immigration committee ever since I have been in the House of Commons, and as one interested in these matters, I should like to make my stand clear on immigration and the bill that is before us. Before doing that I wish sincerely to congratulate the minister, our fourth successive minister of immigration in as many years, for bringing forward at such an early date after becoming minister the white paper on immigration and Bill C-220.

Speaking about Bill C-220, I should like to enter a protest at this time that a bill as important as this one dealing with immigration, and the first time anything like this has been done for years, is not available to all hon. members because there are not sufficient copies to go around. I think this is uncalled for and I should like to enter my protest in this regard.

I have no intention, as I stated when beginning these remarks, of taking up the time of the committee, but I should like to lend my support to the over-all principle of the bill. I do not agree in detail with the hon. member for York South and the hon. member for Carleton, but they have made some good suggestions, as did the hon. member for Parkdale and the hon. member for Hamilton West. I just want to let it be known

[Mr. Lewis.]

that I feel some changes should be made in the bill. I can say that during the time I have been in the house and have dealt with men in the immigration department, I have found them to be very fair. However, I have never in my life seen one civil servant make a decision against the government. They just cannot do it.

● (8:50 p.m.)

I want to congratulate the minister upon making it possible to bring about this neutral appeal board. However, I am worried about the fact that the appeal can be taken on the law alone. I am sure that during the short time the minister has occupied this portfolio he has attended a number of meetings and has become aware of feelings such as those expressed on both sides of the house this afternoon. Surely therefore he will take a broader view of this matter and take some advice from members as well as from his department. These members represent different constituencies across Canada, some of which contain as many as 50 per cent of people of European origin who, in many cases, make the finest citizens. I know there is no one here who does not admire the minister, so perhaps he will take a little advice from some of us, as well as from the members of his department.

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, many of the things about which I spoke in a general way before the dinner recess have been mentioned by the hon. member for Carleton and the hon. member for York South. However, I am still concerned about clause 17, in spite of the minister's reply. In my opinion, this provision is restrictive. When I look at it I think of the cases with which I have had to deal since I became a member. I think of the times I have communicated with officials of the department to ascertain whether or not the facts given to me were correct and the basis upon which the denial had been made. Then, I have had to make a decision as to whether or not there was a legitimate reason for going to the minister, knowing that the officials had gone as far as they could go.

I do not suggest for a minute that every case referred to the minister's office results in the decision being reversed. This would be beyond expectation, and there is no basis for it. I have found from my experience with various ministers that the case does get a consideration beyond that which can be given by departmental officials. I do not mean that these cases have been outside the regulations