

Government Organization

to prove to the house may be true, let him stick to Bill C-178. A rule for Peter and another for Paul is quite uncalled for in this parliament.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve was well taken and I hope the hon. member for Lotbinière will comply with the ruling of the Chair without having to be called to order ten or 12 times.

Mr. Macaluso: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Choquette: Certainly. With pleasure.

Mr. Winkler: This should be good.

Mr. Macaluso: The hon. member for Lotbinière said he was opposed to immigration being combined with manpower. Will he tell us whether he is opposed to immigration—whether, when he speaks of separatism in Quebec it is because he believes in immigration—

An hon. Member: Take it up tomorrow in caucus, Joe.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, the question of the hon. member is excellent. If I agreed to answer, the hon. member would lead me to another subject and I would be called to order. I am ready to answer him, but my reply would obviously be quite elaborate. Then, you would have to apply the rules.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the hon. member for Lotbinière is well aware of the difference between immigration and the reorganization of the department. I hope the hon. member will use the remainder of his time to discuss the principle of the bill now before the house.

Mr. Macaluso: On a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, with the information you have given, may I be permitted, in accordance with your decisions, to note this: It is that with the proposed reorganization, it is perfectly clear that the department of immigration is eliminated. It is

perfectly clear that the department of immigration is becoming a subdivision of the manpower department and that the present thinking, the thinking laid down in this bill, immigration is henceforth connected with manpower and the development of natural resources.

Now, I am opposed to that. I am violently opposed to that, because I maintain that we should have a separate department of immigration. A department of immigration and manpower that does not preclude full co-operation, that does not preclude interdepartmental correlation but I believe that we have a right—and not only the right but the imperative duty to state this—in view of the fact that the population balance is constantly disturbed by immigration. These are not demagogic recriminations, Mr. Speaker. These are facts that have been proven since 1867. The French group is constantly being drowned out and whose fault is it? I am not denouncing anyone, nor making any accusations. I say that, at the time, the concept was such that the country could not be thought of as essentially biethnic.

It was thought: The immigrants are coming, let them go anywhere. The federal government was unconcerned. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) said: There is a weakness. Yes, there is a weakness in the provincial government. Here, I want to congratulate the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau) who was one of the first to go to Quebec and to call the attention of the government to this delicate question, and he did not hesitate to take them to task for having remained inactive, as the hon. member for Trois-Rivières so aptly put it, in the field of immigration and it is at the urging of the President of the Privy Council that consulates were finally opened at Bordeaux and Marseilles, together with immigration offices and for this, I congratulate him.

● (9:00 p.m.)

However, Mr. Speaker, this does not give the results expected by these offices because, first of all, there is in France a certain resistance to the immigration of French citizens.

Therefore, I should like us, first, to have our own separate Department of Immigration. Second, I should like us to hold a national conference on immigration problems, because if the demographic balance continues to be upset, ideological revolutionaries and extremists will rise even more, and we wonder what we will do with those problems in 25 or 30 years, when the two