

*Industrial Status of Women*

of this country. If we barred them I would not call that objectionable discrimination. But if the discrimination were based only on a man's religion or even on his colour, then that would certainly be objectionable, and it would also be objectionable if it covered only racial origin.

I shall put it very bluntly as far as I am concerned by stating that an objectionable person would be one who would be desirous of coming to Canada not to become a Canadian citizen and work for a greater Canada but for the purpose of acting detrimentally to the welfare of our nation. I also agree that any mass immigration of persons which would change the fundamental complexion of Canada and its people should not be allowed. If that in a broad sense still represents government policy I cannot find too much fault with it. I do feel, however, there is room for criticism, though I believe this is more in connection with the method of handling human beings.

I do not want it to be said that I am singling out any individual as an object of criticism. I do not like that sort of thing. As a matter of fact, when the present minister and his predecessor were being criticized a short time ago I felt in my own mind that they were desirous of doing a good job, and I felt they would welcome and probably needed help in their difficult task. I believe that would be a fairer approach to the whole question. In connection with the question of handling human beings I am sometimes afraid, on the basis of my own experience and for reasons I will mention, that we are a bit too inclined in this department to deal with human beings in terms of charts, graphs, figures, statistics and logistics. I am inclined to believe that our approach is altogether too cold and impersonal.

It is a mighty serious thing to break up a family, yet under this administration that is exactly what happens. I have had a number of cases in which the child of an immigrant, living at home for very good reasons, reaches a certain age beyond which the department say he may come here on his own. He is simply cut off from his family and that puts the family in the position that they either do not come to Canada or if they do come they have to leave the child there alone. The minister might say that if I have cases like that I should bring them to his attention at once, and I would have to confess that I have not brought them with me. But I certainly would not need to go up more than four floors to find plenty of examples in my files.

50433—75½

As regards those individual cases, though, I must say that when I have brought them to the attention of the department and the difficulties are based on nothing more than a confusion of regulations, they have been dealt with very rapidly. I have no desire to criticize any individual in the department, though in a moment it might appear that is what I am doing, but I would again emphasize the cold and impersonal manner in which many of these cases are dealt with.

I mentioned earlier that we repealed the Chinese immigration act in 1947. I remember the occasion very well. Members of the house praised the government for their action. I supported the idea myself because I was all too familiar with the situation existing in this country under which we allowed male Chinese entry and prohibited the entry of the wife and family. However, a recent action on the part of the government, taken during the recess, was the bringing down of a regulation stating that a child would be recognized as a lawful child only under existing Canadian law. What the government has done is in effect to reimpose a set of conditions almost as severe as those which were removed in 1947.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Applewhaite):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but it is five o'clock and the house must now proceed to a consideration of private and public bills.

**INDUSTRIAL STATUS OF WOMEN****MEASURE TO REQUIRE EQUAL PAY FOR  
EQUAL WORK**

The house resumed, from Friday, February 11, consideration of the motion of Mrs. Fairclough for the second reading of Bill No. 2, to provide equal pay for equal work for women.

**Mr. Hector Dupuis (St. Mary):** Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with my remarks in French I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Fairclough) for introducing this bill which involves a principle in more than one respect. This bill indicates that all good proposals are not the monopoly of this side of the house, and that good ideas can originate with the opposition.

**Mr. Knowles:** This is a red letter day.

**Mr. Dupuis:** I shall vote in support of this bill unless the hon. member decides to withdraw it, realizing, as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg) has said, that after discussion of this matter she may feel that she has accomplished her purpose.