

record as being entirely opposed to the views put forward before the immigration committee of the senate by Mr. Mosher.

It is a strange turn of events. I remember that back in 1909 labour of that day—and I was a member of the labour ranks as a craftsman—protested against the influx of orientals. In those days labour around the city of Vancouver was unanimously opposed to the bringing in of orientals. Now evidently there has been a change, and I am wondering what the people of British Columbia will think when the stand of the C.C.L. is made known to them.

Before closing, may I say to the house, I am wondering whether any newspaper will print Mr. Mosher's stand, and I will tell you why. In November and December last I had occasion to speak in Vancouver to three service groups on the question of immigration, with the press reporters present. I referred to the stand which Mr. Mosher had taken, and in order that I would not quote him wrongly I read from the record of the senate *Hansard*. The result was silence in the press. I have come to the conclusion that the press is just a little bit afraid to tell the people of the country that Mr. Mosher, speaking on behalf of the C.C.L., has advocated the open-door policy for all Asiatics. I doubt very much whether that view meets the views of members of parliament. I doubt it seriously, but there it is, and to that stand I am unalterably opposed.

Before this debate concludes, I trust the minister will give us a definite statement as to whether this first step is the beginning of an open-door policy. If it is we shall continue to make our protests.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this bill indicates the barrenness of the government's policy on immigration. We have been treated to two viewpoints during recent weeks, the open-door policy by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and the keyhole policy by the minister of immigration, and an endeavour has been made in this bill to bring together the different groups with a view to producing legislation which would indicate that the government is facing two ways and will finally, I suggest, please no one.

When I say that the government is facing two ways in this regard I recall that on January 27, according to the Canadian Press, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) announced that:

The Chinese Immigration Act, which drastically restricts the entry of Chinese into Canada

and long has been protested by the Chinese government, will be repealed at the coming session of parliament.

Then the dispatch went on to say this:

Mr. King said amendments to bring Chinese under the general Immigration Act also would be enacted.

While Mr. King gave no details of immigration policy generally, it has been recorded authoritatively that the government was considering the possibility of eventually establishing immigration quotas similar to those used by the United States but probably less stringent.

However, the government was not expected to reach a final decision in time to introduce legislation at the coming session.

One reason given for the delay was that the committee studying the over-all immigration picture was not expected to make its report in time for action at this session.

Instead of having an immigration policy enunciated with unity on the part of the government, we have here a haphazard, uncertain, halting, evasive attempt to bring forth a skeleton immigration policy. As a matter of fact, when the Prime Minister announced what would happen when this Chinese restriction bill was removed he said in part, "The effect of repeal will be to remove all discrimination against the Chinese on account of race." I say, sir, that statement is not correct; for the minister today admits that it does not remove all discrimination on account of race, but places the Chinese in the position that they may only come to this country provided that their husbands or fathers are Canadian citizens. So that as far as removal of any discrimination is concerned, and while removing discrimination, it in fact creates discrimination.

Some mention was made here of the united nations. I perfectly well realize that the united nations organization does not establish a supra sovereignty over Canada, but we in this parliament accepted the united nations charter and passed it. The united nations charter in the preamble provides this, in part. It declares that the united nations are determined—

... to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small.

Then article 1 of the charter provides for international cooperation—

... in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

Article 62 of the charter empowers the economic and social council to make recommendations regarding a bill of rights, with instructions to set up a commission on human rights under article 68. In other words, we