

superior of the man who refused him. So there it stands. The same Department is deciding who listens to the appeal. For me as a lawyer this looks like an extraordinary situation in a democratic country.

As I say, an immigrant once rejected by the Department of Immigration may appeal to the Minister who is the immediate superior of the head of that Department.

This state of affairs is undemocratic and intolerable. There ought to be an impartial board of review or appeal to check the decisions of the administration. Although as a lawyer I am naturally in favour of judicial tribunals, in this case I would concede to a board composed in a similar way as the advisory committee mentioned above.

We must keep the law to a certain extent elastic, but it must be supplemented by the binding decisions of an impartial and non-political body of representative citizens who in their entirety reflect the commonweal of the whole democracy. The recently instituted Income Tax Board of Review might serve as a model for a similar board in the field of immigration.

Hon. Mr. EULER: It is not instituted yet.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: What did you say?

Hon. Mr. EULER: The Income Tax Appeal Board is not instituted yet.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Yes, but I think it is a thought which would take it out of political wire-pulling.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I think you stole that thought from the report of the Income Tax Committee, because we are hoping yet to get that through.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Yes, but I think it is an idea, for what value it may have, that immigration will be a political football so long as we do not have an auxiliary board which works with the Department. There should be either an auxiliary or advisory board composed of non-political, impartial, responsible men; and then, if the Department says to Mr. Jolliffe, "Yes, you can bring 100 Polish girls in for Mr. Dionne," all these discussions to-day in the House of Commons would not be going on, because on that board would be a man representing labour, another representing industry and management, and the commissioner would have given his signature with the approval of the Department. Now, because the Department does it, a political party grabs the incident as a splendid argument to keep the House of Commons going on something which is probably wholly unjustified, because here we have 100 Polish girls who have been taken out of a condition of hell, and they are happy to be here. Why this argument? Why waste the time of Parliament on a point which is so obvious?

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Sir. Proceed.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: In fact, immigration is of such importance to Canada, that it deserves a separate Department, with a responsible Minister at its head, and not simply a branch of another Department.

In conclusion, may we add that the task of the authorities and the public does not end with the legal admission of an immigrant to this country. The problem of immigration is closely related to that of integration of the newcomers into the economic and social life of the nation.

As has already been mentioned, there is one other matter which is very important. Once the immigrant comes here he must be looked after or supervised during a certain period, which you can call a probationary period.

In the case of immigrants who have been sponsored by relatives or intimate friends, the process of absorption is largely taken care of. In other instances, however, an adequate machinery should be set up to help them along, to supervise them for a probationary period of say five years, after which time they may be expected to have become fit not only to receive Canadian citizenship, but also to live among us as one of us.