

have any power. Why should not the benefit of at least some of its advice come to parliament in an annual report? I think the minister will agree that the parliamentary committee consists of many members on all sides of this house who are knowledgeable with regard to matters of immigration, and I am sure there are many members of the house who are knowledgeable about manpower matters. The more information given to parliament on this matter, the more effectively can parliament do its job.

The minister has shown good judgment in accepting many of the suggestions made by the parliamentary committee and those made by various members of the house in debates on his estimates. I cannot imagine any reason why he should be afraid of having an annual report made. As I understand it, this does not mean that every little bit of advice that is given to him by this council has to be produced in the annual report. It does mean that this council, which will broadly represent all of Canada, will deal with subjects of extreme interest. Manpower policies play a bigger and bigger role in the up-to-date economy, an economy that is looking for growth. This is a tremendously important subject but a new one. Immigration policies on the other hand have benefited for years by open and frank discussion in the house. Therefore I think the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. McCleave) deserves support and I would suggest to the minister that he might seriously consider accepting it, rather than requiring the house to divide on it.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to support that amendment and to support the bill, because we think this manpower council may be worth while. But we take this opportunity to say we are very disturbed by reports—whether they are made accurately or inaccurately the minister will have to say—from reliable and knowledgeable people which indicate that in fact the manpower program is failing and is not doing the job it was supposed to do.

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some comments with regard to the third reading of Bill C-150, an act to establish a Canada manpower and immigration council, primarily because of the fact that owing to the velvet glove form of closure which we have on debates of the estimates of the departments I was not able to participate in the discussion of the estimates of this department when they came up on October 26. One way of silencing debate is to have the house leader of a party

Manpower and Immigration Council

announce that agreement has been reached between the party house leaders. It is rather interesting that the house leaders of some parties do not even consult the members of their party, but simply inform them that they have reached an agreement without prior consultation with the party members.

Mr. Knowles: Speak for your own side.

Mr. Cowan: I am speaking for this side and I have no hesitation in identifying it. I do know of another party, the house leader of which consults the members of his party, and knows what they think.

Mr. Knowles: Thank you.

Mr. Cowan: It is pointed out in the bill that the council is set up to advise the minister on all matters to which the duties, powers and functions of the minister extend; to advise the minister on all matters pertaining to immigrants to Canada; and to advise the minister on such other matters as the minister may refer to the council for its consideration. I take it, Sir, that this council will have full authority to cover the entire field under the domain of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand), and I wish to make some comments in that regard.

I sincerely hope that under clause 11 (e) which states that the council will be asked by the minister to advise the minister on such other matters as the minister may refer to the council for its consideration, the minister will ask them for some consideration of the use of the words "deportation" and "deport" when it comes to dealing with would-be immigrants to Canada. The words "deportation" and "deport" have a bad connotation in the minds of a great majority of the public. When people think of someone being deported, they think of banishment or exile. We remember well the history books in which we were told about deportation to Australia or deportation from France to Devils Island off the South American coast.

I know no reason why these two words should be emphasized so often in the inter-departmental correspondence and rulings of the department, and I would certainly like to see this new advisory board asked for their opinion on it, because I am certain that the great majority of its members, if not all of them, would be against the use of these words. In the army when soldiers are absent without leave they are not called deserters: Heaven forbid. A soldier can be absent without leave for a large number of reasons and