

*Immigration Act*

Hon. members will notice that this deals with problems of an economic, social, cultural or human character; it does not extend to allowing other people into your country. There is a provision of the charter which I submit covers the very point; that is article 2, paragraph 7, and I suggest to the minister and the members of this house that Canada should make her stand on this paragraph, which reads:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the united nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII.

My argument is supported also by paragraph 2 of article 1, which deals with the right of self determination of peoples. It says:

The purposes of the united nations are:

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

Where does the Canadian government stand? Here is a question which is vital to the Canadian parliament and the Canadian people, a question they must face. Canada is one of the few immigrant-receiving nations. They are nearly all small nations, most of them in North America or South America, and Australia and New Zealand. I suggest that they must have the sole right to say who is to come to their shores. Just think what dictation by another nation might mean. If another nation could say that Canada or some other nation must allow certain people into her country that might lead to the breaking up of the united nations. It would be a fine way to lead to war. Suppose, for example, the United States said to us, "You have to let ten thousand or a hundred thousand of our people into your country every year. You have many vacant spaces; you have much territory; you must let our people in". Suppose Russia said the same thing, or China, or any other nation. Where do we stand in that case? This is a serious question to be determined by the Canadian people. Such a method might be used as a new way to undermine a potential victim. Suppose, for example, Russia or any other country set out to conquer Canada. Suppose that country could say to Canada, "Here, you must allow ten thousand communists into Canada each year". Where does Canada stand in a case like that? Canada must take her stand, and I am suggesting that Canada must never agree that immigration into this country is the concern of any other nation.

[Mr. Green.]

Then the bill brings up another issue quite apart from that of Chinese immigration; and it is an issue on which we are entitled to a statement by the Prime Minister. What is the policy of this government on Japanese immigration? On August 4, 1944, the Prime Minister made a statement which I am going to read to the house; it may be found at page 5915 of *Hansard* for that year.

Mr. GLEN: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but he is importing into this discussion something which is not before the house, the question of Japanese immigration. There is no question of that here at all.

Mr. GREEN: The minister may not like it, but I suggest this has to do with the question of immigration, and I have a right to ask for a government statement. Here is what the Prime Minister said:

... the government is of the view that, having regard to the strong feeling that has been aroused against the Japanese during the war and to the extreme difficulty of assimilating Japanese persons in Canada, immigration of Japanese into this country should not be allowed after the war. It is realized, of course, that no declaration of this type can or should be attempted which would be binding indefinitely into the future. Nevertheless, as a guiding principle in the years after the war, it is felt that the migration of Japanese should not be permitted.

That was a clear-cut statement by the Prime Minister of this country and we expect it to be lived up to.

Mr. GLEN: I suggested before, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is introducing into the discussion of this bill something which does not arise from it. The hon. gentleman is referring to the Japanese, who at the moment are still alien enemies. Any policy dealing with the Japanese certainly cannot be considered at the present time, and I suggest, therefore, that the hon. gentleman confine himself to the issue before us.

Mr. GREEN: I just want to ask these questions: How does the government propose to keep out the Japanese, and under what order in council are they being kept out at the present time?

Mr. GLEN: I must ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GREEN: I am all through; I have nothing more to say on that.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. gentleman has introduced something which may be the subject of further discussion, and I am taking the position now that the reference by the hon. member to the Japanese is not within the purview of this bill at all. In view of the