

Immigration Act Amendment

Mr. DUNNING: It dealt with a specific situation which arose at that time.

Section agreed to.

Sections 12 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

On section 16—Deposit as security for return of deserters.

Mr. CAHAN: This is a new section?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes. May I explain that when a seaman deserts from a ship in a Canadian port the ship is required to put up a deposit of \$300, if my memory serves me correctly as to the amount. That deposit is held by the Canadian government through the Department of Immigration. The deserter may remain in Canada a few weeks and then accept work on another ship leaving a Canadian port. There is no provision in the law in such cases for the return of the deposit secured in the first instance from the ship which originally brought him to the Canadian port. This is simply to provide authority that in such cases, or in other cases where similar action would be proper, the deposit may be returned. I may say this matter has been brought to our attention by the British government.

Mr. BENNETT: I believe the words "that it be returned to the depositor" might be left out. I do not think they should have the money returned to them. However, I shall not press the point.

Section agreed to.

Sections 17 to 19 inclusive agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. LOCKHART: May I make a general inquiry of the minister? I was inclined to ask the question on section 5, but possibly I may be permitted to do so now. During my brief experience in the application of the Immigration Act I have come in contact with cases in which section 5 would apply, and I have no doubt the department has had many such experiences. I do not wish to reopen the discussion, but there may have been many immigrants from southern European countries to which section 5 would apply. I am just wondering if the minister has contemplated a more definite immigration policy than has been followed in the past of promoting immigration of people of Anglo-Saxon origin. Could the minister give the committee any information as to whether he has in mind any further policy with respect to bringing out more people of Anglo-Saxon or Scandinavian origin, or generally a policy of having a better type of immigrant than on occasions we have had in the past?

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. CRERAR: I believe we are out of order in discussing section 5 at this time, but if I am to answer the hon. member it will be necessary for me to be out of order for a moment or two.

Mr. BENNETT: This bill does not touch the problem of immigration.

Mr. LOCKHART: The application of the act with respect to certain cases has brought the matter to my attention. As I say, in a general way there are many immigrants which come from the southern part of Europe.

Mr. CRERAR: And a great many from other countries as well.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Sanderson in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

To provide for federal contribution to farm employment and supplementary plans, \$3,283,500.

Mr. MacINNIS: The hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. MacNeil) asked a question with respect to wages paid on forestry projects in British Columbia. The minister replied that the federal government had set no definite wage, other than the stipulation that a fair wage would be paid. Has the minister any information as to wages paid? If the men who have worked on the forestry projects secure employment after leaving the forestry work, is the deferred part of their wages kept back, or is it kept back only in the event of their being unemployed?

Hon. NORMAN McL. ROGERS (Minister of Labour): I am sorry I have not the information with respect to the actual wages paid the men on forestry projects. As the hon. member is aware, the administration of the agreement is in the hands of the provincial department. I do know as a matter of fact that under the original arrangement a portion of the wages was to be deferred and paid to the men over a period of weeks following the termination of their service. I have no knowledge of arrangements which would be made to deal with the particular case he has in mind, namely as to whether the deferred pay would be handed out in a lump sum if the man went immediately into other employment. Have I understood the hon. member's question correctly?

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes.