

Government Organization

Mr. Speaker, this is where I raise the objection I wanted to put before the house. It is that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) is seen as an assistant to the Minister of Manpower. Immigrants who arrive here are considered as values, tremendous resources that must be placed and utilized. There is a situation to which I take strong exception. I would want a Department of Immigration not established on the basis of manpower utilization, but on the basis of demographic balance, for herein lies a greater threat for Canada and Canadian unity.

There is much talk about separatism in the province of Quebec. Sometimes federal members of parliament have their heads buzzing with the cries of alarm from the province of Quebec. At times, I feel that we, French speaking Canadians, should try to understand the majority. We are very negligent. I hear certain candidates, in the current election campaign in Quebec, speaking of two nations in Canada. There are no two nations in Canada. There are two societies: one English speaking, the other French speaking.

It may be that French Canadians, because of their common language, their culture, their traditions, their religion, form a nation, but the English speaking community is not a nation. When Messrs. Daniel Johnson and Jean-Noël Tremblay refer to two nations, they are mistaken: there are not two nations, but rather two societies.

Why does the English speaking society increase faster than the French speaking one? Because of immigration. It is my duty to say so. Since confederation, federal authorities never thought about immigration in terms of bi-racialism. It is the major grievance of French speaking Canadians. They say: We have been taken in by confederation. They are not entirely right, but there is some truth in what they say. Naturally, immigrants assimilated the English culture. I find very regrettable that our leaders, since confederation, never said: We are going to consider this bi-racialism in Canada.

I find it unfortunate that the federal government could not have cared less; it has been apathetic and indifferent since confederation. It serves the Canadian society badly. A true Canadian government should serve all the regions of Canada, respect the characteristics of every corner of the country. That is why violent complaints are heard in the province of Quebec.

[Mr. Choquette.]

Mr. Speaker, the independence party is not a danger in the province of Quebec. The theoretical separatist in the province of Quebec is not dangerous. The dangerous ones are the separatists indeed who show themselves—

• (8:50 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sure the hon. member for Lotbinière would not wish to stray too far from the principle of the bill.

An hon. Member: Playing politics; that's all he knows.

Mr. Choquette: I am not playing politics. I am giving the facts, and you know it.

[Translation]

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Will the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Choquette: Certainly.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Lotbinière if he does not think that the situation he is pointing out to the house is due to the fact that the Quebec government is responsible for the lack of French immigrants?

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is right in part. Under section—

Mr. Caouette: Absolutely right.

Mr. Choquette: Right in part. If the hon. member wants to hold a public debate in Rouyn-Noranda, I will attend.

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Again I shall have to ask the hon. member for Lotbinière to adhere as closely as possible to the principle of the bill.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: I rise on a question of privilege. The member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) has just challenged me to hold a public debate in my riding. Any time he wishes, I am not afraid. I could tackle 24 at a time of the same calibre as the member for Lotbinière. This afternoon—and on this point, I agree with what the member for Lotbinière has just said—while dealing with the same matters, I was called to order a dozen times. I am wondering whether a member is allowed to do tonight what was forbidden another member this afternoon around four or five o'clock. Even though the solutions he suggests may be sound and the facts he is trying