

● (5:30 p.m.)

In respect of security I go more than half way with the minister, and for the reasons I have outlined I cannot support the wide open amendment put forward by the hon. member. Having said that I hope the minister and his officials can find some way to make these restrictions humanely intelligent.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I have not participated to any extent in this debate but I should like to comment in respect of clause 21. Let me commend the minister for supporting the clause as it stands. It is very difficult to reach perfection although we attempt to do so. This clause makes an attempt in that direction and is accompanied by some success though it may not attain it. We must content ourselves with the best that can be done under given circumstances.

Clause 21 involves very delicate, tricky and dangerous circumstances. We should not allow criminals or individuals who have shown a tendency in this direction by their past records to come into the country under the guise of humanitarianism. We must always consider causes and effects and in respect of this amendment we must pay particular attention to its possible effects.

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) said he could not support this open amendment and its implications, and I am in agreement with him. I could agree with the clause if it related only to undesirable individuals who were security risks in a political or military sense. On the other hand, I do not think all the evidence or information should be made available to an appellant or his counsel. Once that information is made available to these people it becomes almost public knowledge. Anyone who is a member of the underworld could easily obtain this information and all the damage that could be done by making it public would then be done.

Very often because of humanity we are inclined to give more rights and opportunities to individuals than they deserve, but I think in respect of the principle involved in this bill we should be extremely careful. We must protect ourselves from an indiscriminate policy of admitting individuals who may be security risks in a political or military sense.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) are responsible individuals and until the entire cabinet becomes a security risk I will rely on these gentlemen to do their

Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board duty under the provisions of the bill as it now stands.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I want to say only two or three words about this amendment. Let me point out to the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois) that neither the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) in committee nor the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) suggested that just anybody be given the precise evidence or its source.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): You have asked for all the information.

Mr. Lewis: No. The amendment of the hon. member for Carleton suggested that the minister should file a report with the appeal board but that the information should remain secret and that all the individual concerned would be informed of was the fact that a report had been made. Neither the individual nor his counsel, if he had one, would be given the information. It would be accessible only to the members of the appeal board.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Greenwood specifically provided that the evidence against an individual would be heard by the board in camera in the absence of the concerned person and his counsel. Neither of them would know what the evidence was. The particulars to be made available under the terms of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Greenwood are those particulars demanded by the appeal board, not by the person concerned or his lawyer. You would therefore have the safeguard that the board, in consultation with the minister, would ask for those particulars which could be given in the interests of the security of Canada and not for particulars which would be against the interests of our country's security.

● (5:40 p.m.)

Therefore may I say to the hon. member with respect—and I appreciate fully his motives and intentions—that he could not have read the amendment that was actually moved when he spoke as he did. I simply cannot understand the position taken by the hon. members for Carleton (Mr. Bell) and Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) that they will vote against the amendment now before the house because they disagree with the particular amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) in committee.