

*Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board* was tabled on April 2, 1965, that is on the eve of a recess, at two o'clock in the morning, approximately, by the parliamentary secretary of the then minister of immigration.

No comment was forthcoming from the opposition. I can well understand that, because the report corroborated the position I had held for months in this house on every case that had been criticized by the various members of the opposition except in one case where delays had occurred in the department of immigration and this I had admitted the day after the case was brought up in the house.

In all the other cases, commissioner Sedgwick confirmed the procedure which has been followed. It was the right one. It was the position taken by the department of immigration in those cases, the only one warranted in the circumstances and the only one in accordance with the powers of the minister of immigration and his officials.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the other aspects of the legislation. With your permission, I will simply read the last paragraph of the first Sedgwick report which has never been read in this house by the hon. members of the opposition who at that time so strongly denounced the procedure of the department of immigration but never made any comment on the judgment that commissioner Sedgwick made on the cases related to ship deserters. And I quote from the Sedgwick report, part 1, pages 37 and 38, and this brings us back to what I said about the Toronto newspapers which championed all those immigration cases in the name of human dignity and all those great principles which it was easy to proclaim at the time.

Commissioner Sedgwick said this:

I have perused a great number of newspaper reports relating to these cases. While I am tempted to comment at length on the manner in which some segments of the press chose to represent the "facts" to the public,

And the word "facts" is in quotation marks.

I refrain from doing so as I do not conceive an exhaustive examination of press comments to be within the ambit of my retainer. I will, however, cite one example as indicative of what I have in mind. In the *Toronto Telegram* of May 23rd there is an article dealing with the Hooper case under the heading "Man's Crime Was Silence". The tenor of the article is that Hooper was being made the victim of some unique and outrageous law. That is not so. Refusal to answer questions is punishable, and quite properly so, under many statutes, federal and provincial.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

It is contempt of court, and punishable, for a witness in a criminal or civil proceeding to refuse to be sworn or, being sworn, to refuse to answer questions, and there is no reason why a person suspected of being in this country illegally should not be required to give a true account of himself or be punished if he refuses. In the sense that it is an offence and punishable, silence is a crime, but the article erroneously conveys the impression that silence is peculiarly an immigration offence. Indeed, the courts could not carry on if every witness could with impunity decide for himself whether to speak or be dumb.

While I have found occasion to level some criticism I should express my opinion that the fault did not arise from any positive or deliberate intention on the part of those concerned to act in an improper manner.

Many of the attacks which have been made in this affair have been ill-founded or exaggerated, and I regret to say I am left with the impression that a good deal of the criticism is based on nothing more than cynical catering for a variety of motives, to so-called "ethnic groups".

Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure the Toronto newspapers took that stand at the time to please ethnic groups. I am rather inclined to believe that they wanted to destroy the then minister of immigration, because at the same time, those three Toronto newspapers were trying to keep in Canada—the N.D.P. members are well aware of it for they protested repeatedly to me in this regard—those three Toronto newspapers tried to keep the American strikebreakers they had brought over because of the printers' strike. In spite of the representations made by those three newspapers I took the traditional stand of the department of immigration: that of not allowing strikebreakers to stay on the job while the strike was in progress and of refusing the landed immigrant status to those strikebreakers.

I was informed that the people involved were really strikebreakers and I upheld—I did not make the decision personally—the decision of my departmental officials to deport some of the employees of the Toronto newspapers, which naturally was bound to displease these gentlemen of the Toronto press.

I was expecting attacks, and I was not surprised to read constant attacks against the minister of immigration in the three Toronto newspapers each morning. But in the case of those ships, I think their attacks were unfair and unjustified. The first report of commissioner Sedgwick showed that the position taken by the department and which I had defended in the house was eminently defensible and complied with the existing Immigration Act and the current rules.