

Immigration

realize that the concept of family class is not in the bill. This is where we have some trouble debating the bill. What we would really like to debate is the regulations. In the regulations there is a so-called family class. The definition of "family" here does have, either directly or by inference, a bearing on the family class. The whole question of family and the family class, or nominated class as it is called in the old bill, needs very thorough re-examination. In testimony in committee we were told that at the present time approximately 66 per cent of our flow is from the sponsored classes or nominated classes. If we expand into the sponsored classes parents, of any age, of Canadian citizens, it is estimated that the flow will increase to about 70 per cent.

I am very concerned about what we are going to do as we establish an annual target. If we increase those eligible under refugee clauses and increase the refugee definition, it will virtually eliminate the independent class. I refer to the immigrant who is an entrepreneur, the immigrant who would come here, not because of family reasons but for the simple reason of making a new start. If this trend continues, we are going to be in trouble. The independent immigrant who does not have relatives in Canada, but who is an immigrant we desperately need, will not come to Canada.

If we go back far enough, we have to concede that someone in our family came here as an independent immigrant and established a family, business, farm, or whatever the case may be. We today are the beneficiaries of that. Some people call them "new seed" immigrants. Call it what you will, I want to place this matter before the minister. I know his officials are very aware of it because I have hammered it so many times already. I am deeply concerned about any expansion of the sponsored class and the family class. I am not against family reunification in any way, shape or form. However, if we expand that definition too far, the independent immigrant, the entrepreneur, will have less chance to come into this country and allow us the benefit of what they can give us. This is the point that must be stated clearly and openly.

With that in mind, the amendment on refugees is not acceptable. I want, again, to stress to the minister and his officials that when we look at any expansion of the "family" definition—although I know it is not in the bill as a family class, but it is in the regulations—we should not take steps whereby the sponsor or family class will increase to such a degree that we will virtually remove the possibility of the independent immigrant coming to this country.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has to do with private members' hour this afternoon. There have been some discussions about how best we could use the hour between five and six o'clock today. Earlier today, the House leader for the NDP, whose party has the business for that hour this afternoon, agreed that it would be useful to use that hour to continue the discussion on this bill, rather than private members' business. As a result of that willingness on his part, there have been the usual discussions. I believe Your Honour will find agreement in the House, now, that the hour between

five and six today be used for consideration of Bill C-24 rather than private members' business.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I stand by what I suggested earlier.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so ordered.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on an associated point of order. In order to ease the work of the House, I wonder if we could have an order as to when votes that are deferred will be taken. Will they be taken at the end of the day on which they have been deferred? How does the Chair rule on that matter?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my understanding there have been discussions and that votes will be deferred to the end of the day. Votes will be taken tonight on votes deferred today.

Mr. Paproski: At 9.45.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I object to these discussions taking place in public before there has been consultation. I was approached about this a few minutes ago. I said I would discuss it with my colleagues and report later. Let us do it in the right way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that private members' hour today between five and six o'clock will be dispensed with in order to carry on with Bill C-24?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so ordered.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment briefly on the remarks of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen). He stated that it is good to have set forth in the bill the principle of reunification and the principle with regard to refugees. He said there is a good feeling in Canada at the moment and, therefore, let us get on with the bill. If the minister were to look at yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, he would see there has been a substantial reduction in the inflow of immigrants. One reason is the law pertaining at the moment, as well as the ill-feeling pertaining across the country.

I say to the minister that if we want to create good feelings among new immigrants, we must have proper policies with regard to employment, housing and some of the other social problems. Only then will we generate good feelings among immigrants. At the moment, in the major cities in particular, there are racial tensions which could flare up at a moment's notice. I wish to comment on that matter and underline it for the minister.

Remarks have been made on motion No. 1 concerning refugees. I rather subscribe to the remarks which accompanied