

*Immigration Act*

disorders in the country. There are groups of that sort, Mr. Speaker; I have had contact with such people, people who will never come out, so far as I can see, and mingle freely with the members of this nation. They segregate themselves. All hon. members have to do is to consider what might happen in segregated areas if a substantial number of new blood of the same sort should be brought into this country to go into these areas and increase them in size and economic power. Therefore I say there are two important considerations respecting desirables. They are both exceedingly important when we are evaluating people to come into Canada. They must assimilate with desirable results, and they must intermingle.

Tonight a good deal has been said by some speakers tending to imply that we white people consider ourselves superior to other people. I do not consider the white race superior to any other race. I believe that we are all brothers under the skin, but I should like to see us keep our places. I think people get along a good deal better with those who have the same colour of skin. That is a general rule which, I believe, applies pretty well everywhere. It must be borne in mind that the present Canadians, whose fathers came here, pioneered, fought and struggled to develop this country, could see their children and their grandchildren utterly dispossessed in the land their fathers struggled to gain. I have seen this process in action. I do not believe that the majority of Canadian people desire to see that sort of thing take place in Canada. It can happen unless we choose the right kind of people to come into this country; it is entirely without consideration of quality at all.

I have no feeling of superiority, as I said a moment ago, to any man who lives on the earth. We are all God's creatures; we are all struggling to find the right way to gain happiness in the world, but we shall do it better with those who think and do as we do.

I think the majority of the people of Canada want people of their own kind. Canada was explored, settled and developed by two great races, two of the greatest races in the world, the French and the British people. Have these races no rights? Have their fathers no rights to see their children well provided for in this land they strove to gain for them? Have their children no rights to be well born into an environment in which they can succeed and be happy?

We must sum the matter up in this simple question. Has Canada no right to remain British?

Mr. MICHAUD: To remain Canadian.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is very well put. I thank the hon. member. I say, has Canada no right to remain British Canadian?

Mr. LAURENDEAU: Put "Canadian" on the record.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We have finally arrived at the word which pleases everybody. Has Canada no right to remain Canadian?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): I will settle for British.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Canadian is good enough for me.

It must be granted that Canada owes a duty to her fellow nations. No one denies that fact. We are all our brother's keeper, even as nations, just as as individuals we are. Canada has a responsibility to other nations of the British commonwealth, and she has a responsibility to other nations of the world. She must assume those responsibilities and discharge them. But surely Canada must not be expected to forfeit her birthright to discharge her responsibilities! Her hard-earned, dearly-bought victory should not ruin Canada; and there is grave danger that if the desires of certain people are met Canada will be ruined because she was victorious.

Can we Canadians discharge our responsibility without ruining ourselves? I believe we can.

We come now to these overcrowded nations, among which we will grant that China, India and several other nations constitute a few. There are two measures which up to the present time have been advocated by various hon. members, which indicate how we might be of assistance to a nation, say like China or India or Java or Germany. One of these is by taking in as many of their people as we can take, and that seems to be the object of a number of hon. members who have spoken in this debate. The other is by freely trading with these people.

I submit that there must be measures far deeper than these two, because these two are so exceedingly limited. Suppose we had completely unrestricted immigration into Canada. How many people does the ordinary hon. member believe Canada could safely accommodate? Not so very long ago one hon. member gave a well-reasoned speech in which he finally established pretty well to his own satisfaction that we could accommodate probably nineteen million people. I would be venturesome enough to suggest that we could accommodate fifty million; probably most hon. members would hardly wish to go farther than that.