

countries in the world today which tolerate freedom of political expression and activity than there were before I became a member of this Chamber.

In a world which is faced with very strong contending pressures and ideologies, there is a danger that we might succumb, for some possible short term gain, to the temptation to reject political opinions which would be legitimate in normal times. We might believe, for some reason or other, that they should be eliminated or discriminated against.

What I have said here has been discussed in committee and was originally proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood. I am referring to the fact that we should include the aspect of non-discrimination in this legislation with respect to legal political opinion and activity. To do less than that is not to provide for pressures which will exist during the course of the years when this particular bill will serve as the immigration statute for this country. Therefore I hope the minister will give serious consideration to the inclusion of this provision in the legislation.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) and the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) indicated that the determination on the demographic policy would not be amenable. The hon. member for Provencher referred to Clause 7 which clearly spells out that the minister, "after consultation with the provinces concerning regional demographic needs," etc.—thus there is an obligation on the minister.

As has been said, the bill already recognizes that national demographic goals may be established in the future. In that case immigration planning and operations must be consistent with those goals. However, in our opinion the Immigration Act is not the appropriate vehicle for establishing statutory provisions respecting demographic planning. Demographic planning will involve much more than immigration. In fact immigration may well be a relatively small element. In any event it is also questionable whether such a positive subject as demographic planning should appear in a statute which is predominantly enforcement oriented.

I will not repeat the comments I made at second reading, but commencing on March 10, 1977, at page 3863 of *Hansard* I elaborated on those comments. Motion No. 7 is in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). In my opinion the immigration statute, which pertains mainly to the admission of people to Canada, including visitors, and the removal of offenders from Canada, is not a suitable vehicle for official endorsement of multiculturalism. From a practical standpoint one would have to be apprehensive that the inclusion of multiculturalism in the governing objectives could be used to try to compel a government either to maintain the present ethnic composition of the Canadian population or to make a deliberate effort to speed its rate of change. Neither of these extremes is acceptable.

Motion No. 8 is in the name of the hon. member for Egmont. Primarily he has refugees in mind in proposing this amendment. There should be no distinction among refugees,

fleeing rightist or leftist persecution. However, the effect of the amendment would be much broader than that. It is difficult to see how most provisions respecting subversion and national security could be reconciled with the proposed amendment. No political party is illegal in Canada, yet membership in a particular party abroad, where it is probably legal, is often the principal evidence that a person is a security risk.

With the amendment it would appear that the subversion/security provisions could apply only in the case of an overt act defined as an offence in Canadian law. This would be going too far in the case of refugees. It would effectively prevent the screening out of people, although refugees by definition, who were forced to leave their countries of citizenship or residence because of their adherence to parties with extremist policies, which would be just as dangerous in Canada as elsewhere. For those reasons I would be against these motions.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to express surprise at the minister and the government for not accepting the amendment proposed in motion No. 7. This is an extremely important and fundamental matter, because it deals with the whole question of the policies of biculturalism and bilingualism in this country, something which has been accepted by all parties.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call it six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), contained in motion No. 7 which proposes to add to Clause 3 the consideration in this act of the multicultural nature of Canada. I find it difficult to understand the government's reluctance to accept this amendment.

This country has been committed by parliament for almost 15 years to the concept of increasing the use of both the English and French languages. That policy was first announced by former Prime Minister Pearson. It was worked upon by the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism which he appointed and whose findings were supported by all party leaders and the majority of members of all parties represented in this parliament. The Official Languages Act, which was brought forward by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), was supported by all four party leaders and by the majority of members of all four parties.

Members of parliament have supported the idea of the bilingual nature of this country because we recognize the importance which the people of Quebec, particularly the majority of the people of Quebec who are French speaking,