

*Oral Questions*

al in 1976—I ask the Minister of Justice who, in his response yesterday, acknowledged the existence of a report from his department which he did not have in front of him, if he has now a chance to review that report, and has he a report to make to the House?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, not further to what I said yesterday—

**Mr. Hees:** What have you been doing in the last 24 hours?

**Mr. Basford:**—which was a paraphrase of the report I had at that time, saying there were in Canada a number of ex-Hong Kong policemen who apparently had received in the normal way landed immigrant status—

**Mr. Epp:** What do you mean by “normal way”?

**Mr. Basford:**—that some were subsequently named in a royal commission in Hong Kong relating to corruption in the police force; that we at that time had not received but expected to receive applications for extradition, one of which has been received. We fully co-operated in the process of that extradition.

ORGANIZED CRIME—REASON FOR DESIRING NEW  
WIRETAPPING PROVISIONS

**Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, I am astonished that the minister, considering the seriousness of the subject before the House, would not have wanted to refer to his report instead of relying on his recollection as he did yesterday. Yesterday he talked of the necessity of having the new provisions of Bill C-51 passed. Why does the Minister of Justice feel the new provisions of Bill C-51 are so necessary, when it is obvious the police were able to obtain all the information aired on the CBC program under existing legislation, thus showing that we do not need wider powers for wiretapping but better enforcement of existing laws?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member obviously and genuinely misunderstood my reply. Yesterday I did not have the report to which he referred. I have since read the report to which I referred; my recollection of that report was correct and therefore I really have nothing to add today. With regard to his question, it has been made clear that most of the evidence the CBC used in its program was obtained from testimony and evidence put before the Quebec crime inquiry. Most of it was electronic evidence, wiretap evidence, and most of it was obtained before we had laws in this country prohibiting wiretapping. That is why the CBC was able to have that public information, most of which was obtained by wiretap and much of which would not be authorized today.

[Mr. Clarke.]

IMMIGRATION

KNOWLEDGE OF RCMP LIAISON OFFICER IN HONG KONG OF  
ALLEGATIONS AGAINST FIVE DRAGONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO  
CANADA

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration? I remind him we are not asking if the laws of the land have been broken; we are asking if our laws or officials were subverted by people coming into this country. The minister said yesterday and today that allegations against the Five Dragons, and possibly others, had been made and officials were aware of those allegations. My question specifically concerns the RCMP liaison officer posted in Hong Kong. Is the minister saying today that the RCMP liaison officer in Hong Kong was not aware of allegations against the Five Dragons before any of them came to Canada?

**Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can hardly expect me to comment on what may or may not have been in the mind of the RCMP's liaison officer in Hong Kong, but I would say this: Those individuals were admitted under our standard procedures for admitting individuals to Canada. They had gone through the points system; they had in fact been successful, and they were landed immigrants. If there was anything of that nature in the knowledge of the RCMP officer, I would assume that the RCMP officer would have brought that to the attention of our immigration officer.

REASON FOR FAILURE TO ACT AGAINST ONE OF FIVE DRAGONS  
UNDER SECTION 18(5)(K) OF ACT

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** In view of the minister's answer, I trust he will now check with regard to the information that any RCMP liaison officer in Hong Kong may have had and also check whether that information was passed on to any member of our Canadian immigration service and will provide us with an answer at a later date.

The minister, in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, indicated that the last person came in in 1973. That is within a period of five years, and under section 18(5)(k), five years is the period set forth which should not have elapsed in terms of the disallowance of persons coming into this country who are likely to have committed some offence, particularly under the Narcotics Control Act. I will not quote the whole section, but I would like the minister to say why no action was taken under that section of the Immigration Act since the minister has clearly admitted in the House today that at least one of the Five Dragons came in within the last five years.

**Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I have to check the specific reference. My information is that the individual Hon Kwing Shum is the one currently residing in Canada. He was the one who landed in 1973. I will check out his particular status—I do not have it in