

Immigration

evidence of this criticism, I would refer the house to the contradictory statements made from time to time by government ministers in connection with the subject of immigration. It is a repetition of the pattern to which we have objected on other occasions. In an apparent desire to please all shades of opinion, the government will have one minister go into one part of the country and make a statement the effect of which is to create an impression that they are all in favour of all-out immigration, while another minister in another part of the country makes a statement which creates the impression that the government's immigration policy is one of cautious restriction.

It is another case of the government trying to be all things to all men. It is a pattern, however, which is or should be subject to the strongest criticism because it is a complete denial of the principles of cabinet solidarity and of responsible government, the principles which demand that the government should speak with one voice on the issues and policies of the day in order that the people themselves through their parliament may hold the government accountable for a definite policy and may conduct its examination of government activities in the knowledge of what is government policy.

But here just in the last short while we have seen another example of the almost complete contradiction between different government statements. I have in my hand a clipping from the *Winnipeg Free Press* and another one from the *Ottawa Citizen*, both dated January 28, 1955; both papers are of the same day. The article in the *Winnipeg Free Press* reports a speech made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) in Winnipeg, in which speech the minister referred to the question of immigration and asked certain questions, the only implication of which is that he is in favour of an all-out immigration policy. Discussing policy, he asked this:

Is it to refuse to admit population to develop our resources for fear they may soon be depleted and we ourselves become unemployed?

Or is it to go full steam ahead as we did at the beginning of the century, which policy was interrupted by two world wars?

Of course the impression created in the minds of his listeners and in the mind of anyone reading the statement is that the Minister of Agriculture is saying that the policy is full steam ahead but that it has unfortunately been interrupted by two world wars. In the article in the other paper appearing on the same date the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Pickersgill) is reported as having made a speech to the Ottawa West Liberal Association in which,

[Mr. Fulton.]

discussing matters of immigration, he laid stress upon the necessity for caution and restriction. The headline is:

Limit to Number of Immigrants Canada can Safely Absorb, Pickersgill tells Liberal Meeting

Mr. Rowe: Are they both the same day?

Mr. Fulton: I am asked whether they were both made on the same day. The *Winnipeg Free Press* article is not datelined but it appears in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of January 28. The other article appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* of January 28. They are both reporting speeches made on that immediate occasion by the two different ministers.

As I say, that is the latest example. These examples could, of course, be multiplied. There are differences between statements made in the past by the minister of citizenship and immigration of that day and now Minister of Finance (Mr. Harris) and the statements being made then by the Minister of Agriculture. I could multiply the examples. We have the former minister of citizenship and immigration, speaking on one occasion, talking of Canada's necessity to have a population of 26 million by 1975—a target, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, which is going to be much in excess of the actual number if the present policy is continued—while on the other hand the present minister says that we must be cautious and go slow.

There is therefore ample justification for the criticism of the government that its policy is not clear or consistent. That policy is not co-ordinated either. We have evidence of the fact that there does not exist a sufficient degree of co-ordination between the government's policies with respect to industrial expansion and the promotion of the development of Canada's resources in Canada and for the benefit of Canada first, and their policy of bringing in new citizens, new settlers, new Canadians to take part in and to be given opportunities of employment by that process of growth and expansion. Nor is there sufficient co-ordination, on the evidence that we have, between the activities of the immigration officials and the activities of the officials of the Department of Labour. Some of my colleagues, speaking in the course of this debate, will be giving some examples of the lack of co-ordination in that respect.

In the second place, we say that the government's policy is not in conformity with the needs and responsibilities of Canada. The needs of this country for more people are undisputed, Mr. Speaker, as can be seen by reference to statements made by spokesmen for government, business and labour. Some-