way—the same excuse for refusing people who are charged for security reasons, with no meaningful opportunity to have their say in respect of such charge. Again, if I am correct, the minister said that everyone must understand that the sources of information are widespread, and that if any of the evidence which the department has becomes public, those sources of information will dry up immediately and the situation becomes impossible.

• (8:40 p.m.)

This is the kind of story one has heard time after time after time. I do not think there is any validity to it. I did not suggest, nor have I heard anyone else suggest, that the minister should be required to provide the person concerned with the sources of the information, the details of the evidence or the precise allegations made. What I suggested, and surely what is possible without hurting the process of security in the slightest, was that the person concerned be given in general terms the particulars of the grounds on which the action against him had been taken. Second, I suggested that he have an opportunity to meet those particulars.

Clause 20 of the bill provides that the hearings of the appeal board may, on the request of the appellant, be in camera. I for one would have no objection at all if the minister amended clause 20 to give the board the authority to hold hearings in camera in security cases. I am not interested in giving publicity to these matters. I agree with the minister that if we started dictating to the board how the evidence was to be taken, we might make a farce of the hearing. But I see no reason in the world why it should not be possible to give the person concerned an idea, in general terms, of the grounds on which the action was taken. I see no reason why it should not be possible for the appeal board to hear the appeal in camera, if it so decided, and the board ought to be given the authority to hold it in camera and conduct the hearing in any way that it found adequate and reasonable in the circumstances. Otherwise, I repeat what I said earlier today, that clause 21 is a delusion; it has no place here.

If the decision is to be made by the two ministers, let them make it. I will object to it as a bad principle, but at least let them make it. Then we will have—and this is the point—the situation wherein if the decision is made by the minister and the Solicitor General, they become responsible for it, and those of us who are concerned with these matters can go to the minister and make an appeal that he use his discretion, in the way that such appeals have been made in the past. But if the matter comes before the appeal tribunal and it is seized with it, and the minister and the Solicitor General plunk a certificate on the desk of the board, that ends the matter; there is no further appeal. I am certain the minister will tell me to go jump if, when that has been done, I come to him and ask him to reconsider the matter. The door is closed at that point.

Therefore it would have been much better, if this is what the minister intended to do, to take this provision out of the bill altogether and let the matter be dealt with by ministerial discretion, as before, so we would know who is responsible and could go to the minister and ask him to consider the case of any person who felt he had been aggrieved. But I want to make clear that I do not recommend that course. I think there is a place for an appeal in security matters, in this case as in connection with the Public Service Employees Act with which we dealt the other day, and as in other cases. I think this excuse about the drying up of the sources of information is not valid; it simply does not impress me.

Perhaps the reason it does not impress me is that I have not had to administer these matters, and there are matters that the minister and those around him know about that are not known to me. But I have exercised whatever mind and imagination I have, and I cannot for the life of me see why it is not possible to devise a simple procedure for giving the man charged an opportunity to be heard before an independent tribunal in camera, in secret—I have no desire for it to be made public—and without disclosing the sources of information but placing him on notice, more or less, as to the precise grounds on which the action was taken. We would thereby be giving him an opportunity to make his answer to those grounds, and counter them with facts regarding his behaviour and life. He has this right.

I think we also need amendments to this bill. I was going to move an amendment as a subclause to clause 19. We need an amendment that will provide that every appellant under the relevant clauses of the bill shall be provided by the minister with particulars of the grounds upon which the deportation order or refusal to approve an application for admission was based, in such manner as prescribed by the rules of the board. It is simply nonsense to tell me that I can appeal to the appeal tribunal, if I do not know ahead of