am prepared to say that no one with any practical experience in these matters could possibly say it is not of great value to have what he considers to be a half way house, if you cannot have the full particulars made available, so as to enable the person involved to present his case in the way he could not otherwise present it.

As the Minister of Transport is aware, I was involved in these matters long before I became a member of this house. I can say without the slightest shadow of a doubt that the provision of particulars is a valuable right and one which enables an applicant to know the sort of case he must meet. Justice perhaps cannot be done perfectly in that way, but some degree of justice can be done. I should like to say to the minister—I am afraid this is repetition, but it does not seem to have sunk in too well—that this very right was provided during the war under the defence of Canada regulations in internment cases.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I was involved in a good many internment cases where the appeal board gave particulars to counsel for the parties, which enabled them to present their cases and on many occasions gain their clients' liberty. The minister says no lawyer would be satisfied to have what he calls this half remedy that I have suggested. I say to him this is really not so. Of course the lawyer would prefer to have the whole of the evidence, but it just is not the fact that if he cannot get the whole of the evidence he would not desire, in order to be able to protect his client, to have these particulars placed before him. The question is, can this be done without endangering the security of the state? It is necessary for a fair hearing of the appeal, and I suggest it can very well be done, as was done in my experience of internment cases.

During the course of his remarks the minister said he thought I was exaggerating when I suggested that half the value of this excellent bill—and I say it is excellent in its general purport—conferring these rights of appeal was taken away when the benefits of the legislation were denied in security cases. From my experience in this field, and it is very, very considerable, nearly half the cases involved are security cases or at least are assumed to be security cases, because no reasons whatsoever are given for the refusal to admit. I see the minister shaking his head. I can assure him without the slightest doubt if I can assure him of anything at all, that the right proposed in the amendment which I now put before the committee is one that would be valuable and helpful to those concerned, and could be granted without endangering in any way the security sources from which some of this information comes.

If the minister does not choose to accept this amendment now I can assure him that he will continue to be plagued until this matter is cleared up and this right is made available to those people who are very often victimized because of mistaken identity, some error in their youth or some misconceived political views of some police authorities who are often not too well qualified to hold such views. Again I plead with the minister to give serious consideration to this amendment.

I now move the amendment, Mr. Chairman. I do not think I need repeat the wording.

Mr. Marchand: I think the hon. member moved it last night.

Mr. Brewin: No, I did not move it last night. I will read the amendment. I move:

That Bill C-220 be amended by striking out section 21 thereof and substituting the following:

21. If a certificate is signed by the minister that in his opinion the basis for the order of deportation or the refusal of admission in appeal before the board is a matter which affects the security of Canada and that it would be contrary to the interest of Canada to disclose the sources of information justifying such order or refusal, then the board may conduct the hearing of the appeal in camera and, in respect to such evidence, in the absence of the accused or his counsel, but the board may direct that the minister shall furnish to the board and the appellant particulars of the allegations without disclosing the source thereof.

The Chairman: Order. May I say at the outset that I am going to accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Greenwood. Perhaps today I should make further reference to the rules and practice in committee respecting the deletion of a whole clause and substituting another therefor. May I read from May's seventeenth edition, page 550:

An amendment to leave out a clause is not in order, as the proper course is to vote against the clause standing part of the bill. Consequently it is out of order to propose to leave out the only effective words of a clause, or the words upon which the rest of the clause is dependent, or to offer any other amendment which is equivalent to a direct negative of the clause.

This principle has also been applied in the case of a clause substituting a new section for a section in an existing act of parliament when an amendment is offered to leave out all the words of the new section and insert another new section instead thereof . . .