

Fifty million people is a small number. Suppose for example, we desired to relieve the congestion in China's population. Bear in mind that China has over 400 million people. Suppose we admitted to this country ten million Chinese people? How far would that ten million go toward relieving the congestion in China? Why, it would not be a ripple on the lake! But what would it do for Canada? It would utterly ruin her.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): What would it do for British Columbia?

Mr. BLACKMORE: It would swamp her. That is a serious matter; and when we bear in mind that China is only one of the congested areas whose population might seek admission to our shores, then we must realize that a great deal of the discussion we have heard tonight is quite beside the point.

May I now speak in respect of international trade? Let us grant that we gave to China all the trade it was possible to give her and that we tried to distribute our trade without discrimination among all the nations. What conceivable substantial advantage would it give these people? It would help them a little, but it would not solve their problems, particularly if we engaged in the kind of trade that is common today, namely, competitive trade.

It would not be in order to say much about the matter of distribution of goods, but I suggest that there might be another attitude toward the distribution of goods. As a result of the adoption of this new attitude we might do much that would help the Chinese a great deal more than to bring them to Canada, where they and their descendants might be very unhappy as the years went by.

I suggest, while on that subject, that we should consider as members of this house an international mutual-aid scheme under which the nations could deliver the surplus of goods beyond their own needs to a pool which would be available to the nations that have not. I suggest that they would finance that pool—and here is the important point—not with money raised by taxation or borrowing, but by the use of the national credit. Here is a chance for hon. members to show just how desirous they are of finding a solution and how much there is in all this wishful thinking that we have heard expressed.

I submit that this is a suggestion not yet canvassed, whereas every other suggestion made during the debate and during this session has been tried and has proved an utter failure. I merely throw that out in passing. If we could with our national credit, finance a mutual-aid scheme and persuade other nations

to do likewise we might help the deficient nations without bringing their people to our shores and disrupting our economies and destroying our national life.

Let us turn for a moment to the question of racial discrimination, about which there has been so much talk, and concerning which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) rose to such heights of oratory. Let us give a moment's thought to what racial discrimination is. I ask hon. members whether in what I have advocated or suggested I have advocated racial discrimination. I think not. Let me give a simple illustration. Suppose one of my neighbours fell upon evil days and got into sore need and I proposed to help him. There are two ways in which I could help him. I could invite him and his family to come and live under my roof with me and my family, or I could arrange to support him while he was building a home on his lot, and I could contribute goods and services to his support.

The second course illustrates the one I propose as the national plan which we ought to consider. No hon. member would seriously contemplate asking any individual but the most intimate friend to come and live in his own house.

An hon. MEMBER: Not even your mother-in-law.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I thank the hon. member for giving emphasis to what I say. In contemplating the bringing of large numbers of these unfortunate people to our shores, we are contemplating just such a proposal. But is it not possible for us to enable them to set themselves up in their own land where they would be happy in their own natural environment, while we contributed to their support with goods and services from our surplus? I believe that would be possible. If I proposed to treat my neighbour as I have suggested, by helping him to build a home of his own on his own lot, supplying him with food, clothing and shelter in keeping with my resources, could anyone say that I was discriminating against him? Could anyone say, because I did not invite him into my own house, that I was discriminating against him? Surely discrimination means something different from what some hon. members appear to seek to convey!

Since the matter of the united nations charter has been mentioned two or three times by members, I should like to read into the record clause 3 of article I of that charter, which I am afraid some people are inclined to regard as obligating Canada to admit any number of people to her shores: