

## S.O. 21

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge the Minister to take the necessary action as soon as possible with a view to finding a definite solution to the problem.

Solutions proposed in the past included building an elevated bridge or digging a tunnel. These proposals should now be made the subject of a serious and thorough study.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is unthinkable that in 1984, users—

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member—

\* \* \*

[English]

## IMMIGRATION

## POLICY STUDY—SIZE OF POPULATION

**Mr. Alan Redway (York East):** Mr. Speaker, according to the background paper released last Monday by the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald), if our birth rate remains constant, then 35 years from now deaths will exceed births and Canada's population, which is presently 25 million, will decline over time to only 10 million. This will happen unless we have an annual net immigration of approximately 125,000 people. This presents us with the need to make a major policy decision. Just how large should our population and our immigration quota be?

Years ago we had an open-door immigration policy, but today there is a great difference of opinion in Canada on the subject of immigration. On the one hand the unemployed, their families and friends, quite understandably advocate restricting immigration at least until the economy improves. On the other hand, equally understandably, new Canadians want to reunite their families in this country.

The study of the immigration policy announced earlier this week by the Minister will deal with all of the immediate problems that concern Canadians. I urge the Minister to take the study one step further and to begin to address the larger and longer-term question of whether our population should increase, decrease, or remain stable, and what impact each of these options may have on the economy and on the delivery of government services.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## TOURISM

## GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland-Kent):** On many occasions during the last parliamentary session, Mr. Speaker, several Members of the Opposition took the former administration to task for failing to implement a coherent tourism policy for the various departments and organizations of the

federal government. Specifically, I am referring to the Opposition Member who stated in this House last February 8:

[English]

There is a lack of co-ordination between the various government Departments regarding regulations which end up being detrimental to the tourist industry.

[Translation]

And another Member said this last March 22nd:

[English]

—but our message should be that we as politicians realize we cannot raise taxes without first knowing what effect they will cause.

[Translation]

The same day, another Member stated:

[English]

“We will ensure departmental co-operation so that all federal decisions are arrived at with the complete understanding of their effects on tourism.”

[Translation]

Now that they form the government, Mr. Speaker, where is that coherent policy? It would seem that there has been no consultation whatsoever between departments. First, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources increases oil prices, the Department of the Environment hikes user fees in our national parks, Transport Canada charges more for VIA Rail services, raises the air transportation tax and reduces ferry services.

The Department of Employment—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom).

\* \* \*

• (1110)

[English]

## AGRICULTURE

## FLOOD DAMAGE COMPENSATION FOR FARMERS IN NORTHEASTERN SASKATCHEWAN

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, last May, June, and probably July, there was considerable flooding in northeastern Saskatchewan. At that time the Prime Minister said that assistance would be provided for the farmers in that province and indicated that the assistance would be on a two-to-one basis from the federal Government. In other words, some \$16 million would be provided by the federal Government.

There was an election campaign and the current Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised that he would keep that commitment. In fact the Conservative candidate, who is now the Hon. Member for Mackenzie (Mr. Scowen), said that it would not be on the basis of two-to-one, or \$16 million, but that it would be on the basis of three-to-one, or \$24 million.