

*Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board*

the department. I should like to say to the present minister and his parliamentary secretary that the same consideration has been shown by them.

After listening to the parliamentary secretary present this bill last night I wish to congratulate the minister for getting out of town and letting him introduce this very important legislation. I think the parliamentary secretary did a capable job. I cannot share the confidence he exhibits in respect of the bill because I have grave doubts whether it liberalizes—with a small “l”—the problems of these people. I believe that in fact it may place greater restrictions upon them. I shall listen with interest to the minister when he closes the debate today after hearing our representations. I have a feeling that if portions of the bill are retained in their present form the result will be to create rather than lessen discontent among Canadian citizens who are interested in sponsoring immigrants to this country.

• (6:30 p.m.)

With regard to the set-up of the board I notice that the chairman or the vice chairman and not less than two other members shall constitute a quorum of the board. As I read the bill I see no provision at all for the board to travel. I notice that travelling expenses can be paid while a member of the board is absent from his normal home, and so forth, but as I read the bill the indication is that all the hearings and appeals will be heard in Ottawa. If this is the case, I suggest to the minister that if we can afford to have appeal boards of the government travel across the country when dealing with matters of dollars only—I am thinking of the appeal boards under the Income Tax Act and the revenue act—surely to goodness when human considerations are at stake the same provision should be made so that this board when hearing appeals could go to the different centres where the appeals arise.

I am not speaking of security cases but of sponsorship cases with which this bill deals. It should be possible for the board to travel on the basis of a reasonable fee being charged that would not work hardship on the people who wish to make representations. It seems to me that in view of the growing establishment of citizenship courts the facilities of these courts might be used for the hearing of appeals by the board. The board will be dealing with cases concerning human values, they will be dealing with people who have come to Canada from other countries, have worked

[Mr. More.]

hard to establish themselves, made a success of their lives and contributed to the welfare of this country. I am sure that to impose burdensome costs on them when they wish to launch an appeal concerning a member of the family they are interested in sponsoring is not really the intent of the minister and should not be the result of passing this bill.

We are not dealing with regulations changing the tariffs on goods. We are not dealing with commodities as such. We have to show in the bill that we are dealing with human beings, human values, the consciences of people and the deep emotions that are involved in families concerned in these matters.

I hope that when we reach the committee stage of the bill the attitude of the minister will be similar to that of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) when we were dealing with the transportation bill. I think we came out with a good bill because the minister accepted proper criticism and constructive amendments to that bill. I believe amendments could be made that would be constructive and broaden the scope of this bill, humanize it and make the work of the board much more efficient. The board could also be given much greater scope, which I believe is necessary, than is provided in the terms of the bill now before us.

I hope that when the minister closes the debate he will indicate his willingness to consider amendments to the bill. By “consider” I do not mean superficially consider them and say he cannot accept them. I hope he will seriously consider amendments that I believe can and should be put forward that will make this bill a better instrument than it appears to be in the form in which it is presented to us.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I must advise the house that if the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) speaks now he will close the debate.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether before the minister launches into his remarks I could, I suppose on a point of order, suggest to him and other hon. members that it might be sensible to suspend the sitting now and listen to the minister at eight o'clock, so that the remarks which he makes are not interrupted by the dinner hour.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. Perhaps I should point out to the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) that pursuant to an order of the house made yesterday, the house would suspend its sitting from seven o'clock until