

Establishment of Immigration Appeal Board

such reports. In those circumstances it would be impossible to vote for any such amendment.

In committee of the whole the hon. gentleman used terms of art like "particulars." He used a word which undoubtedly would be interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada in accordance with the jurisprudence under the rules of practice and the Judicature Act and which, if so interpreted, could not conceivably keep secret the sources of information. Such an amendment as was moved in committee of the whole is one that we in this party could not support under any circumstances.

If the purpose is simply to recommit the bill in order to consider such an amendment, then I would look on it as an exercise in total futility in which I do not think the house should engage. Unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to indicate that he has in mind something totally different from the amendment he presented previously in committee, I for one intend to vote against this amendment.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in the terms that the hon. member has put forward his amendment and, shall we say, in the terms of the context of the debate that took place at the committee stage and the hon. member's references to the matter, I too, like the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell), find his proposal far too sweeping in its ambit and I would be obliged to place some limitation on it. However, having said that I wish to add that the present practices of the department of immigration, which I am sure would carry up to the appeal board, in failing to state reasons for barring immigrants, simply saying that a proposed immigrant fails to meet the requirements or the standards of the department, are not good enough.

With modern medical knowledge it can be stated that a proposed immigrant unfortunately suffers from a tubercular infection. He may well have been a mental patient. These can be facts, but on many occasions it has been said to me, "Well, we don't want to offend the susceptibilities or feelings of the sponsoring relatives." This is a lot of nonsense, if I may say so with respect to the minister and his officials. The sponsoring relatives know the situation.

With new interpretation of the regulations and with the co-operation of provincial health authorities, diseases which previously have barred proposed immigrants can now be treated, or some arrangements can be made to

post a bond of a minor nature whereby, provided an immigrant meets certain residence requirements, he can be treated like any other resident in our country. Therefore it is not proper that such reasons should not be disclosed.

In many cases the department has said, "This is a security case and let us leave it at that." I have had experience of the department lifting a corner of the carpet or raising the curtain a little bit. Frankly, I found that the security reasons given were most specious, and following discussion with the minister and his officials in a number of instances they have agreed that the person involved should not be barred.

An hon. Member: Or deported.

Mr. Lambert: I do not recall running into any deportation cases of this particular kind. In this instance I am referring more particularly to people from the Orient. I fully recognize the problems which the minister faces in this regard but I cannot go so far as the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) with regard to asking for particulars and disclosure of information.

I am sure the minister will recognize that tremendous frustration is caused to members of parliament and bona fide sponsors in this country in the case of an intending immigrant from Italy, for example, when he is told that he cannot meet the requirements and that it is a security case. It is suggested to the relatives that it looks like a security case. They ask why, and having scouted around it turns out that some jealous person went to the police and said the immigrant in question was suspect. I had a case recently of a person who in 1945 or 1946, just after the war when many Italians were starving, belonged to a certain organization, and in 1964 that fact caused a complete ban on his application to come to Canada even though his sons and daughters and other relatives, with the exception of his father and mother, were already in Canada. I must say that the minister and his officials had the good sense to review the situation, but I find it exceedingly difficult to accept this wide open amendment to the effect that the minister and his officials must disclose all the particulars. There must be some protection for the state for the greater good of the nation. On the other hand, I do hope to see some relaxation in respect of illness and residential requirements, and some relaxation in respect of the often criticized provision in relation to moral turpitude. I believe this involves a great deal of nonsense.

[Mr. Bell (Carleton).]