

*Immigration Appeal Board Act*

Taschereau, Senneterre, and inviting people to go and work in the mine. Well, the people who did not know mines, of course, were saying: We will be long enough underground after we are dead, we don't want to go there while we are living. And they would not go.

I am not telling you a story, I am merely stating facts. What, then, were the authorities of Noranda mines compelled to do? They had to hire Polish, Ukrainian, Yugoslav and Dutch immigrants, and when we look into the Noranda records, we soon realize that the first citizens, the first workers, the first miners ever of the Noranda mines were immigrants who went underground to work.

Mr. Speaker, the economic crisis of 1929 was felt in the Abitibi area as well as anywhere else. As plants were closing, laid off workers became unemployed. In those days, there were no unemployment benefits, no social security, and people from Amos, Senneterre, La Sarre and other communities were knocking at the gates of the Noranda mines begging for work. They said: We have our employees. Then our people were all offended and, quarrelsomeness as ever, accused the directors of Noranda mines of having hired immigrants in their place, of having given immigrants jobs that they did not want. And that is not all! Today, in Quebec, I hear people asking why those people from Europe did not learn French.

My story continues, Mr. Speaker. The first immigrants arrived in Abitibi between 1924 and 1935, and they had young children. Now, when Polish Catholics, Ukrainian Catholics, Italian Catholics, in fact Catholics from any European country, applied to send their children to Catholic, French-Canadian schools, they were turned down; they were called European "block-heads", because they were not wanted in our schools, and they were sent to the English Protestant schools. And I am not talking through my hat, it is all true. Our education system worked that way. So after refusing them access to our schools, they are being blamed 25 or 30 years later for not having learned French. Now I ask you if that is a sign of intelligence. We have lame-brains like that in the province of Quebec. Today they say to the Europeans: You did not learn French.

Mr. Speaker I would be very pleased if everyone were required to learn French in Quebec or both official languages in Canada, for that is something I have wished for a long time. However, we are not going to encourage immigrants to become better Canadians by teaching one language to the detriment of the other.

Mr. Speaker, this language question is of the greatest importance. I knew French-Canadians in Wolfe's Cove in Quebec who welcomed immigrants from Europe who could not speak English or French, and these French-Canadians would say: if you want to get by in Canada, learn English instead of French. And 25 years later they are saying: Why did you not learn French?

Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong in this business, and it is neither your fault nor mine, but that of people who could not take their responsibilities at the proper time.

That is why I insist that the provinces be consulted before the immigrants are accepted or turned down, because I believe that according to the Constitution, the

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

provinces have something to say in this respect. They may not perhaps have the final word to say, but if the federal authorities wanted to be a little bit conciliating, they could, without hurting anyone, without wrecking anything, consult with the provinces, so that they may have something to say in the selection of immigrants.

• (1420)

Right now, any immigrant may land in Montreal, spend two or three years there and then move on to Hamilton or Toronto. Because while in Montreal, he learns enough English to transfer to a job in Toronto, albeit in the States, in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be very important that the Immigration Appeal Board make sure that the immigrants are aware, first, that in Canada, there are two official languages and a number of various cultures who tie up with the two official languages, French and English, our normal vehicles of thought, and that the publicity intended for immigrants should not be a soap publicity like the one we see on television—saying that Tide is better than Comfort or things of that kind—but should give them adequate information on Canada. We would avoid seeing for instance Hungarians arriving in Montreal and saying two months afterwards: "They lied to us at home and we want to go back as soon as possible". We should realize the existence of such problems and see to it that our selection is sound. We should not gather the scum of the earth in those countries or people wishing to flee from their country to come to Canada and repeat here their condemnable acts done at home. We must be watchful yes, but prudent also, and our publicity in foreign countries should be true and reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, one must take into account the bilingual fact and multiculturalism in this country and indulge in an honest publicity instead of merely saying: Come to our country to stay. And if we invite them to stay in one province or another, we should also invite them to adapt themselves, to acquaint themselves with the manners and customs of the province where they will live, for all provinces are not alike. A citizen from British Columbia or Manitoba is not at all like a citizen from Nova Scotia or from Saskatchewan. We are all Canadians, but we belong to a ten-member family. One must realize that there are not two provinces alike and that is why provinces should be consulted when there is a decision to be made regarding the admission or the refusal of an immigration application for Canada.

In concluding, apart from the recommendation to appoint seven temporary members to eliminate the board's backlog of appeals and anticipated appeals, I would like to quote subclause (7) of clause 3 which appears in the explanatory notes. Here it is:

(7) The Chairman and at least two other members shall be barristers or advocates of at least ten years standing at the bar of a province.

I wonder why barristers would be appointed instead of businessmen or union leaders who meet the public as often as them. It seems to me that it should not be a question of showing preference to barristers in that matter, and what I find ridiculous is the provision in clause 3 of the bill stipulating and I quote: