

Adjournment Debate

create a better life-style and, in the process, create a better Canada. They want to join in the construction of a new country. It behooves the Minister to give out ministerial permits to individuals who merit such consideration, not to individuals who, such as in the Hungary case, give secret information about Canadians who have ties with Hungary. In fact, it is testimony to the fact that these individuals should not be granted status in this country. That status should be offered to those individuals who warrant and deserve immigration here.

Furthermore, both cases do not come out of the blue. With respect to the individual having over 20 criminal convictions, three previous Ministers of Immigration rejected the lobbying efforts that were made on his behalf. The bureaucracy and the Deputy Minister continue to this day to react negatively and are at odds with the ministerial decision.

With respect to the Hungarian case, again, two previous Ministers of Immigration rejected the lobbying efforts on behalf of this gentleman, particularly by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour). We know about these two cases and perhaps there are others which will become public. The Minister has made a very serious call, he went against the advice of his Department, and it seems that while he is probably well intentioned, he has difficulty saying no to lobbying efforts. Previous Ministers and departmental officials clearly rejected special ministerial permits to these two individuals. The present Minister somehow found it possible to grant such ministerial permits.

Canadians are asking, as I did during the week of November 4, what has changed to allow the Minister to contravene his departmental officials and go against the recommendations of three previous Ministers, not all of whom were Conservatives, because the first case goes back to John Roberts when he was Minister of Employment and Immigration.

I am anxiously waiting to hear the Parliamentary Secretary tell us why the Minister granted special ministerial permits in these two particular applications. What were the circumstances that changed since the last Ministers made their recommendations? What has changed in the advice of the Department to warrant special ministerial permits?

Unless the Parliamentary Secretary can give legitimate reasons for these two cases receiving ministerial permits, I believe that he, the Minister for whom he is speaking this evening, and the Government should clearly revoke such ministerial permits. It is only in this way that we can send a strong signal to Canadians and those wishing to enter Canada that they follow proper procedures and regulations because there is no watering down of ministerial permits to people who

simply and quite frankly do not deserve them. I look forward to hearing from the Parliamentary Secretary.

• (1835)

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I guess I would be much more impressed, as would all Canadians, with the arguments put forward by the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) if it were not for the number of inaccuracies, false innuendos and the number of downright questionable comments the Hon. Member makes, both in the House and outside the House, comments which he cannot substantiate.

First, I will deal with the question of whether or not the Minister did or did not follow the recommendations of his Department. If the Hon. Member for York West was open and forthright, or if he really knew what happens in the Department—and I can forgive him for not knowing since he has not had the experience of being in government—he would know that the Minister was provided with options. The fact is circumstances change.

An interesting notion is the one that this person who has been in Canada now for a number of years was all of a sudden created out of thin air by the Minister or by the Government. We have been in government for two years now and this person has been in Canada for a number of years. If the Liberal Government and the policies which the Hon. Member would like to support were really concerned about this particular case, then I do not know how this person can still be here in Canada to be considered by the Minister.

The point I would like to make is that the Minister has acted legally. He has made recommendations to the Minister of State for Immigration (Mr. Weiner) with respect to his consideration. Cabinet determination must be given with respect to whether this person should be considered under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1976 as a person who has been rehabilitated. I challenge the Hon. Member to take a look at this person's record, since he likes to judge. I hope that some day people can judge him as fairly as the Minister is trying to judge this person. The Government will in fact take due consideration of all elements of this case, some of which have changed in the last year.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): A motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6.37 p.m.