

South. There was certainly a long delay in proceeding with this measure, which might justify one in concluding that the government was impressed by what had been said. But further evidence that consideration was given to those suggestions is found, I think, in the fact that when the Prime Minister made his statement yesterday, he did deal specifically with those three points. I think congratulations should be extended to the hon. member for Vancouver South for the contribution he made in the matter; and certainly I should like to express appreciation of the fact that those points were covered in the statement so that now when we come to discuss this matter we have knowledge of what the government's policy is.

The Prime Minister covered the matter of united nations control of immigration when, as reported in his statement at page 2645 of *Hansard* he said this:

Canada is not obliged, as a result of membership in the united nations or under the constitution of the international refugee organization, to accept any specific number of refugees or displaced persons.

And again:

I wish to make it quite clear that Canada is perfectly within her rights in selecting the persons whom we regard as desirable future citizens. It is not a "fundamental human right" of any alien to enter Canada. It is a privilege. It is a matter of domestic policy. Immigration is subject to the control of the parliament of Canada.

With those statements certainly we in this party are in agreement. And in view of the possibility, through some other interpretation of the united nations charter, of our being called upon to accept large numbers of immigrants from any country which might suggest that they be allowed to come, I am certainly glad to have the statement from the Prime Minister that no such attitude would be adopted.

He dealt also with the question of Japanese immigration in these words:

With regard to the Japanese, I stated on August 4, 1944, at which time we were at war with Japan, that the government felt that in the years after the war the immigration of Japanese should not be permitted. This is the present view and policy of the government.

So that aspect of the problem of immigration has now been settled. It arose only with respect to the application of P.C. 2115, which deals with Asiatic immigration generally. We are glad to have the Prime Minister's assurance that the present policy of this government is that Japanese immigration will not be permitted.

With regard to a request for a definite statement of policy with respect to Chinese

immigration, I find that no such definite assurance and no such definite outline of what the policy will be was given. Yesterday the Prime Minister stated distinctly, as reported on page 2646 of *Hansard*:

—apart from the repeal of the Chinese Immigration Act and the revocation of order in council P.C. 1378 of June 17, 1931, regarding naturalization, the government has no intention of removing the existing regulations respecting Asiatic immigration unless and until alternative measures of effective control have been worked out.

That brings to mind the question: What is to be the effective control of Asiatic and Chinese immigration? From what the Prime Minister said it appears it is to be only P.C. 2115, which prohibits oriental immigration except for persons coming within certain specified categories. I suggest that that is not satisfactory, for at least two reasons. First, the matter is too important to be left to an order in council for disposition. A matter of such importance as immigration from the orient surely is a matter which should be determined by the government on the basis of a measure submitted to and approved by the House of Commons. The Chinese Immigration Act, which we are being asked to repeal, was a measure passed by the House of Commons, and I suggest it would be proper if the alternative immigration measure was one which had been submitted to and passed by the House of Commons.

Perhaps a more important point is that orders in council can be repealed without being submitted to the house. Orders in council have been forgotten and overlooked in the past, and new orders in council with entirely different provisions can be passed without reference to the house, or passed when the house is not sitting. It is not sufficient safeguard to say that they can be revoked by addresses subsequently passed by both houses of parliament. In dealing with matters concerning an immigration policy it is essential that the decision of parliament be obtained before the policy is put into effect.

I urge again that the proper way to determine a Chinese immigration policy, the proper way to limit immigration from China or any other country in the orient, would be by concluding a treaty with that country. Such a treaty need not be concluded on the basis of discrimination. It is not unfair or unjust, and I have the support of the Prime Minister's own statement for this, for Canada to say that we would prefer to have one type of immigrant rather than another. That is exercising a right which is just and proper and which is within our own power to exercise. In his statement on previous occasions with regard