

Democratic Party, who proposes that the bill be not now read a third time but be referred to a committee of the house with specific instructions to reconsider clause 17.

The argumentation of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and some other colleagues is that the bill does not entitle everybody to equal treatment as regards the right of appeal in immigration matters.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I listened to the minister's explanations and I thought I could detect in them what I would call a conciliatory attitude which at times bordered on the desire to apologize. Mr. Speaker, I feel that there is no need for apologies. Some principles have apparently been forgotten and the fact is that, first of all, the right to immigration is a privilege that no country has to grant to anyone.

If I decide to bring a child into my home and adopt it, that child has no right to force anything on me; in short, no one can force anything on me unless freak accidents happened on the way, which is not the case in immigration.

I believe that an immigrant who wishes to settle in Canada is unable to assert his claim to remain in the country if the government feels there are some objections. It is not impossible for the government to have some information causing it to refuse the right of citizenship to an immigrant, perhaps not necessarily because of his shortcomings or weaknesses, but on account of incidents which, without involving him personally, make him all the same a risk for the security of the country. That is why I say that the government should retain such powers of authority.

I fail to understand why some relentlessly object to the government exercising the authority conferred legally upon it by our constitution. It has been said on several occasions: We have a lot of confidence in the present minister, but he will not be there forever and we do not know who will be there at a later time.

Mr. Speaker, I should not be concerned if the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) or any of his colleagues, except one or two I will abstain from specifying in a spirit of Christian charity, or even the hon. member for York South, were to be appointed Minister of Immigration. I should not be concerned, I say, to allow them discretionary powers in cases

*Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board* that must precisely be handled with discretion and settled expeditiously, because if settlement of these cases were to be delayed by unending procedures, the security of Canada would be endangered for all kinds of reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I think that power of discretion must be left with the government in some instances. Besides—and now I am almost tempted to be mean—I would say to our friends of the New Democratic Party that they are casting stones while living in a glass house, since not later than today the *Ottawa Citizen* reports that two young men, who were members of the New Democratic Party, for reasons which seem to me quite insignificant, have lost their membership cards and find it difficult to get them back. I notice also that a representative of the New Democratic Party stated this:

[*English*]

"We don't like giving reasons for why we would refuse membership," Mr. Harney continued. "We don't like leaving ourselves open for libel suits."

[*Translation*]

If this is true for the New Democratic Party, it could be true, all the more, for the government, whichever it is—today it is a Liberal government, maybe some day it will be an N.D.P. or a Conservative government. But I think that the principle remains the same. We must preserve in our country the principle of authority, and establish an arbitration principle among authorized representatives. The Canadian people want to be protected against what I could call the use of force, even against individuals who can, through all kinds of resources and assistance from learned legal advisers, drag out procedures with the risk of seeing those undesirable people stay here longer than necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I confess that such obstinacy in always doubting the objectivity and the professional ethics, the concern for the common good of the responsible members of government, surprises me greatly. To me, it is a kind of moral revolution which tends, in the long run, to undermine the confidence of the Canadian people in their administrators.

What is the reason for that obstinacy in suggesting that there might be something more "arbitrary" in the decision of one minister or even two ministers who base their decision on reports which have been prepared by serious people, from various sources and various bodies. I cannot believe that any minister, whoever he is, to whatever party he