

*Immigration Security Act*

necessary, and we will move an amendment to add after the words "in his opinion" the words "on reasonable grounds". It would still remain basically the minister's judgment as to whether a person should be deported, and we doubt very much whether, with the amendment we propose, the courts would be disposed to interfere. We think it wrong that the minister and his officials should have the unfettered discretion to order deportation. We think it wrong that even in clear cases, for example, of mistaken identity the right of the court to intervene should be entirely removed.

● (1600)

Many hundreds of thousands of people come to this country as visitors and it is often said that they have no rights. We repudiate this theory. Of course they have no rights except those given to them by parliament and this country. If we choose to confer on those who come to Canada for the Olympic Games or other purposes the right to question the objective opinions of the minister or his officials, we shall, in that sense, give them rights and in that sense they have rights and deserve consideration. We believe it would be well for us, in our laws dealing with visitors to this country, to continue to show respect for the judicial process, individual rights and human dignity.

We have included in the proposed amendment a new subsection which would protect, as the minister says, against disclosure of information prejudicial to the security of Canada. I understand that there is general agreement for this bill to be dealt with promptly. We do not intend to make our contribution lengthy on second reading or in committee. We hope to see the bill passed promptly but believe it would be much improved by the amendment we suggest.

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, I shall speak briefly on this bill which, although not long, is significant. I listened carefully to the minister's introductory remarks and reasons for introducing this bill. Let me say here and now that I concur with the remarks of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) and the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). This bill has been introduced to cope with security difficulties. Soon, two major events are to take place in this country and acts of terrorism might be anticipated. On the whole, the minister's arguments did not convince me, but I will not go into detail. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood addresses itself to the problem of security. If necessary, I shall be happy to speak on the amendment later at greater length.

Proposals for dealing with visitors to this country who may contravene our laws, without reasons being given for the actions taken, are dangerous. Such legislation would constitute a dangerous precedent which we should not accept lightly.

I realize that the reasons for this legislation are of the utmost importance. Nevertheless, despite the most strenuous security precautions, as the hon. member for Provencher said, one cannot be certain that acts of violence will not occur at either of the two major international events which will take place in this country. I call as my witness the events of the last decade and a half. We have seen the assassination of a president, of a president's

[Mr. Brewin.]

brother, and of other outstanding citizens despite stringent security precautions. In the final analysis, there is little one can do to prevent the most tragic, the most diabolical of incidents occurring.

Therefore, even though we will give this legislation speedy passage, we shall not ensure that which the minister seeks when asking for approval of this bill. The minister suggested that this bill, a most illiberal measure in parts, is to be temporary. We know only too well how this government's temporary measures tend to become permanent. It gives me little pleasure to say that this government's track record in keeping so-called short-term, temporary measures short term and temporary is not good. The public order bill passed in the latter part of 1970 was to be a short-term measure. Yet shortly after it was rooted there was almost universal rejection of its principles which were not acceptable to those concerned about civil liberties in this country.

Because of the public outcry against that legislation, the government so far has not introduced what it called a permanent replacement for the War Measures Act. However, it introduced the temporary public order bill. Frankly, I am worried about this short-term measure. It is not that I do not trust the present minister; I have the greatest respect for him. All the same, I think it unwise to give any minister a blank cheque, which is exactly what this legislation asks of us.

The minister assured the House that this legislation will not abrogate normal appeal procedures. That is an important assurance, confirmed by the third paragraph of the bill. I remind the minister, it is one thing to maintain appeal procedures but quite another to deny evidence and material which is necessary if the appeal procedure is to work fairly. Therefore, the minister's assurance is not plausible. I say this with the greatest respect. The assurance cannot be effective if the most vital ingredient of all, the evidence on which the deportation order is based, cannot be made available to the individual involved.

I am as anxious as anyone to give the minister full opportunity to deal with potential or actual acts of violence or terrorism. We hope such acts will not occur in our two forthcoming major international events. Of course, we must consider this kind of legislation in its correct perspective. When people remember what happened at the Munich games, at the international conference of oil ministers, and to other athletes who were either kidnapped or murdered there is a terrible tendency for them to think that we can prevent a repetition of these tragic events by suspending the normal workings of the immigration process or the process governing the movement of individuals across our national borders. The danger is that we shall take the simplistic view and legislate against that which has already happened.

I know that officials may have convinced the minister he needs this authority. I would urge all members to take into account the significance of what the minister said in connection with this legislation. Perhaps later this year, when we are dealing with the permanent legislation which is to be presented to us, we could be given a detailed report telling us how important this legislative provision really was. Indeed, we might receive a report from others, not just from the minister, so that we shall not too easily be