

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, December 8, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

IMMIGRATION

ALLEGED DIRECTIVE THAT LANDED IMMIGRANT STATUS BE GRANTED WHEN ORDERED BY APPEAL BOARD—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity arising from a telex directive sent by the director of immigration for the Ontario region to all officers in charge of Canada immigration centres and subsequently circulated under date of October 15, 1975 by E. J. Fanning of the Canada Immigration Centre in Toronto to immigration supervisors. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington):

That the Minister of Manpower and Immigration make a statement concerning recent instructions under which immigration officers at Canada immigration centres now operate, which state that immediate landed immigrant status is to be granted any person where such is ordered by the Immigration Appeal Board regardless of whether immigration officials have received necessary medical examination reports, or whether immigration officials have completed investigations required regarding criminal or subversive backgrounds which would be harmful to national security, and further that the minister forthwith assure the House that steps will be taken to prevent the Immigration Appeal Board from hearing future cases without availability of all evidence at the time, that the minister guarantee immediate legislative steps will be taken to prevent continuance of a situation whereby criminals, subversives and other undesirables can receive landed immigrant status by Immigration Appeal Board decisions, and finally that the minister make public the number of such individuals to date receiving landed immigrant status in this way.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This motion, pursuant to Standing Order 43, cannot be debated without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

● (1410)

[English]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—LENGTH OF PROVINCIAL COMMITMENT TO GUIDELINES ACCEPTABLE TO GOVERNMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

I should like to ask the minister whether the government is still asking the provinces to enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada for a full three or three and a quarter years, the full term of the government's anti-inflationary program, or whether the government has indicated that it is prepared to accept a shorter commitment from the provinces. I am thinking particularly of those provinces deciding to let the federal government administer the plan with regard to their own civil servants, and so forth.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the public sector, which is the part which is being discussed with the provinces, we discussed at the most recent meeting the notion of entering in for a period shorter than the full period of the program with the expectation that there would be a review and a renewal at the end of that shorter period.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—RECONCILIATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF SHORTER COMMITMENT FROM PROVINCES WITH LONGER PROGRAM OF GOVERNMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): If that is the appropriate technique with respect to the provinces, I wonder why the minister could not have agreed to it with respect to the program generally, as we suggested. However, I should like to ask the minister how he reconciles accepting the shorter commitment with the provinces—I heard the term a year and a half mentioned—with the government's whole concept of a program of gradually phasing down inflation over a period of three or three and a quarter years.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Our distinct preference was to phase inflation down more slowly over the three year period rather than have a very sharp reduction, which would bring about certain risks in the way of unemployment. Our distinct preference is to go on that slower incline. On the other hand, we have recognized that the provinces are sovereign governments in Canada, and that the best means of achieving this is with their agreement. We hoped to get their agreement to the longer period. If their agreement can only be obtained by their entering into an initially shorter period with the hope of renewal, that is the second best, but that is still a preferable solution to having no provincial participation in the public sector at all.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—POSITION OF QUEBEC ON ACCEPTANCE OF GUIDELINES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): It may very well be, then, that if the federal government decides to continue beyond the year and a half to which the provinces are committed, the program may be very