

*The Address—Mr. Heaps*

kind. I think there must be some misinterpretation of the words or the meaning of them.

Mr. HEAPS: Let me read from the *Montreal Gazette*. The very first words in the news item are:

Despite all sentiments of humanity, so long as Canada has an unemployment problem there will be no "open door" for political refugees here—

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): That is not what the hon. member was saying.

Mr. HEAPS: I quoted the whole item at first, and then I referred to that particular part. I think I was absolutely fair in my remarks; I did not take one sentence out of its context.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): If my hon. friend will permit, he said the Secretary of State had said that the government have no sentiments of humanity. What the Secretary of State said was just the contrary—although we have these sentiments, so long as there is unemployment, and so on. That is quite different.

Mr. HEAPS: No, I adhere to what I said. According to this news item, the Secretary of State started off by saying, "despite all sentiments of humanity," and then declared that he was speaking for the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that I imagine that the passage he has read is a translation of what the Secretary of State said. I should think the minister must in the first instance have said something about sentiments of humanity calling for a certain course of action, and he may have gone on to say that despite those sentiments of humanity certain things could not be done. The thing he referred to as not being possible was the open door, something very different from not considering a settlement in the best possible way short of an open door.

Mr. HEAPS: I can only go by the press reports. I have read the report several times. It would have been better had the minister left out all questions of sentiment in discussing the matter. Perhaps at another time the minister might explain in the house his own words. But it seems strange that on a question of this kind the Secretary of State should go to Montreal and declare the government's policy. Why should not the government's policy be declared in this house, so that there would be no misunderstanding? If the Prime Minister, as I suggested, wishes to declare a policy on this very difficult prob-

[Mr. Heaps.]

lem I think there is no doubt he could choose whatever time he desired for doing so.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Perhaps my hon. friend might also wait until the Secretary of State is here to listen to the charges.

Mr. HEAPS: It is not my fault that he is not here; it is his fault. I think it is the custom when the orders of the day are called for all ministers to be in their places, and to-day I did not see the Secretary of State in his place at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Of course they are slaves.

Mr. HEAPS: Had the Secretary of State been in his place to-day I would have notified him of my intention to deal with this question. I am glad however that the Prime Minister feels that an error has been made by the Secretary of State—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. HEAPS: Oh, he cannot get away from these things. I am satisfied from the way so many of his supporters took up the cue that this report in the *Montreal Gazette* must be substantially correct. I do not believe that a paper like the *Montreal Gazette*, which is very fair in its news reports, would go out of its way to concoct a story on its own account.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): My friend has not always been such a friend of the *Montreal Gazette*.

Mr. HEAPS: I said so far as its news columns are concerned. I have never complained about its news reports.

I do not intend to spend the whole of my time on this particular question of refugees. What I have to say may be condensed into a few words. I hope that hon. members of this house, irrespective of race, creed or political conviction, will use their influence in the direction of a better understanding among all sections of the Canadian people. I know how political parties sometimes function; I realize that in the past issues were raised on which it was felt one party might obtain an advantage over the other. But where common humanity calls for action I hope that no group will try to exploit the issue. In order to avoid any such possibility I suggest that the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition should get together. They could also if they wished call in the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group, who represents a fairly large body of opinion in this country, and also the leader of the Social Credit group. The Prime Minister might make a statement to the house respecting the matter. I am of