

*Immigration*

our society. There is a need for them to be advised about the many different government services that can be placed at their disposal. There is a need for accommodation and jobs. In this regard there must be more co-operation and consultation with the provinces.

We await the national conference on immigration because we all wish to contribute in respect of input. We await the green paper. I commend the minister and the government for the steps they are taking. They may rest assured that they will have the wholehearted support of members of the Progressive Conservative party.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, the question of immigration has been of importance to this country ever since white people first began to come to what is now Canada. There are many important aspects of the question. How many people should be encouraged to come to Canada? There have been great differences of opinion in this regard. There is the question of from which countries we should encourage people to come. Opinion has changed in this regard over the years. At one time immigrants were almost exclusively from Great Britain and northern Europe. This situation existed for many years but has now changed drastically. We now have immigrants from Asia, Africa, the West Indies and southern and eastern Europe.

These are all matters of great concern. We welcome the idea of a national conference at which the provinces and the various community groups, ethnic, religious and racial that have a particular interest, will be represented and will be able to make their views known so that hopefully the government may arrive at policies based on a consensus of the people who participate in that conference.

I reiterate what we have said on so many occasions in the past. The rate at which we admit immigrants into this country is in the final analysis decided by the federal government. As a result of the provisions of the BNA Act to a large extent, many immigrants who come to this country who are not fluent in either English or French, the official languages of the country, become to a large extent the responsibility of the provinces and municipalities in respect of the provision of education and the knowledge of Canada they require if they are to become active participants in this country. I say to the minister, as we have said in the past, that we believe the federal government must take a much larger responsibility in fact as well as in law to help the provinces, the municipalities and local communities develop the ability of new Canadians particularly those who are not knowledgeable in either English or French, so they may play a full part as Canadian citizens after they arrive in Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, we must state positively that this time, we are fully in agreement with the minister's statement.

We notably welcome the fact that, firstly, it deals with the establishment of a long term policy, and this is the reason for our concurrence. We also welcome the fact that, secondly, the government and the minister thought of providing for consultations and negotiations so as to come to an understanding with the provinces.

[*Mr. Alexander.*]

We dare hope that the widest possible spectrum of public opinion which is being sought, as mentioned also on page 2 of the statement, will help reach the goals which the minister has set and which I think are those of Parliament as a whole.

[*English*]

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order by way of a caveat. I have not had a chance yet to see the document the minister sought to table under Standing Order 41(2). It may be quite valid and he may be entitled to do so. I simply want to say there is a difference between making a statement on motions under Standing Order 15(3) and tabling a document under Standing Order 41(2). It may well be that a minister may make a statement which may be a condensation of what he tables. That is perfectly all right and takes less of the time of the House. But if what the minister tables is in effect a propaganda document or press release to which he refers in his statement, then we would take very strong exception to it. I have not had a chance to see the document, but I thought I should file that caveat now so this procedure would not be completed without our having had an opportunity to say we object at this time.

**Mr. Andras:** Mr. Speaker, that is acceptable. I sent copies to the opposition critics earlier today.

**Mr. Speaker:** As hon. members know, this point of order was raised last week. As raised in the previous instance the point had perhaps more validity, as I understood it, than today. I am in full agreement with hon. members who raise this point that there are two standing orders, one providing for the tabling of documents and the other for the making of statements. There is a third possibility open to ministers, that is, to make a statement outside the House. I have felt and ruled in the past that perhaps it was not consistent with the spirit of the rule to table in the House under Standing Order 41(2) a statement that a minister may want to make outside the House, in other words, to table under the Standing Order a statement to be made outside the House.

The overriding difficulty in so far as the Chair is concerned is that if hon. members object on a regular basis to the tabling of documents under Standing Order 41(2), the Chair would be placed in the position of having to exercise some measure of censorship and having to examine all documents that are going to be tabled and decide whether such documents are of a nature that they can or should be tabled under Standing Order 41(2). I remind hon. members that when this Standing Order was enacted by the House a few years ago it was for the very purpose of making it easier for the House to receive documents or papers from members of the cabinet, and I assume it is for that purpose that these documents are being tabled under the Standing Order. I would hope there would be general agreement among members of the House as to what type of documents are envisioned under the terms of Standing Order 41(2).

● (1420)

**Mr. Stanfield:** There is just one point, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister did not mean to mislead the House in any way but, as I understood him, he said that he had sent