

### *Immigration*

that the political representation of constituencies in the national capital area was such that no voice was raised in protest against the government's proposal for relocation. Plans for relocation to Hull could have been proceeded with in a way consistent with Hull's development. Unfortunately, certain events intervened which anyone with half an eye could have foreseen, namely, some restraint was imposed on the growth of the Public Service. We had the grand scheme to develop Fullerton's fortress on the other side of the river. Unfortunately, or fortunately, the government suddenly instituted restraints of growth in the Public Service; but, at the same time, the erection of the buildings on the other side of the river proceeded apace.

Having made a glaring error in its commitment of 1969, what did the government do? It chose not to leave the buildings empty. Therefore the only alternative was to fill those buildings, in anyway it could.

I am appalled at the government's failure to co-ordinate its various policies and programs, and disturbed by the effects on morale in the Public Service. Mr. Speaker, all this should not have happened.

**Mr. Paproski:** It's incredible.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** If I may say so, you cannot move some branches of the Canadian Penitentiary Service, some parts of the Secretary of State's department, some parts of the National Parole Board and the Canadian Commercial Corporation without amending the law. It is important for us to know, when we deal with these matters, how and when the government proposes to change the law. The proposal to move the head office of the Immigration Appeal Board to the other side of the river is an attempt to put flesh on the policy the government has put forward. Mr. Speaker, we are discussing an extremely important matter.

The removal of these boards, or the relocation of the Immigration Appeal Board which is likely to move when the Department of Immigration moves, could create a host of administrative problems. As I have already said, there has not been sufficient consultation. Certain difficulties have already arisen about whether to allow public servants to observe as holidays, St. Jean Baptiste Day on June 21, or July 1. There was great difficulty.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** St. Jean Baptiste Day is on June 24.

● (1610)

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** There was some grave difficulty. The Public Service, and I am sure they were joined by employees of the Immigration Appeal Board who are affected by Section 64, wrote to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) on July 5, 1977, making some reasonable suggestions. Those suggestions have been ignored. The developers of Ottawa, who face a real problem because they were enticed on the basis of government statements, have asked for

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

some consideration from the ministry. No consideration is forthcoming.

Given the limited opportunities that there are to discuss these matters on the floor of the House of Commons; and given the fact that this whole movement seems to have been carried out a bit by the back door, and certain agencies cannot move out of the city of Ottawa in any event unless there is an amendment in the statutes, the government had better be put on notice that before many agencies move across the river it will have to come to this parliament for its consent. I have named some, and some of those are slated for a move.

There is no one in this House of Commons who is reasonable, and I hope that I am reasonable, who stands against development in the city of Hull. However, I hope that all members of this House will stand against the implementation and execution of a policy which is compounding one error of magnitude and lack of timing with another. I refer to the error of failure to consult and to take into account the difficulties that public servants, merchants, developers, land owners, business people and indeed the whole of the national capital region on the Ontario side of the river will face as a result of 15,000 public servants moving out. I assume it is only 15,000. The government has very seldom been right in its figures. I remember at one time getting a figure from the President of the Treasury Board that there would only be 25,000 positions designated bilingual, and today there are 63,000.

We have a problem in terms of honesty and directness. That problem is nowhere more evident than in this whole dreadfully mishandled matter of the relocation of public servants and the development of those buildings in the city of Hull on the other side of the national capital region.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull):** Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking in this debate on Bill C-24, but in the face of the amendment to clause 64 moved by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), and especially after the statement he just made in this House, I feel I must express my views.

First, and without dwelling on the history of the area and more importantly on that of our national capital, I must say to the hon. member who felt he was not showing bad judgment but he should be told if he did, that the national capital is directly related to the choice made by Queen Victoria. When Queen Victoria chose Ottawa as the capital of Canada, certainly the present limits did not exist. It is also the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) who decided to describe by statute the national capital area, and that area included both the Quebec and the Ontario parts in one entity called the national capital.

It is rather important to state that at a time when Canada is going through a crisis that can be termed a "national unity crisis", I feel that hon. members representing the constituencies involved should understand that national unity must start right here in the national capital region. It must be the laboratory, it must project the image the national capital