

Canada. I want to protest against that type of thing as earnestly as I can.

Later on, the department of health of Manitoba protested to this government. They went further and said that they had not proper hospitalization to take care of many of the citizens of the province.

A few moments ago something was said by an hon. member about the Indians of this country. I am sure that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bryce) can substantiate that and say that there are many hundreds in his riding who are suffering from like diseases and are not being properly taken care of. The department of health of Manitoba is not properly equipped to take care of this matter. Therefore hon. members will realize the feeling that they have when the immigration branch and the other federal authorities responsible allow people to come in from many countries without a proper medical examination, as was done last fall.

I do not care whether immigrants are Chinese or Poles or even Scotch, like the Minister of Mines and Resources and myself. They should have a thorough medical examination. Whatever is done in regard to immigration in the future, whatever lands immigrants come from, I protest against the type of examination that took place last fall, and I hope that the authorities will see to it that there is no repetition of that kind in the future. For the Minister of Labour to talk about what happened when our forefathers came to the country is not good enough. We are living in a progressive age and are studying health matters. I impress upon the minister that he should see to it that a proper medical examination takes place in the future whenever immigrants come to this country and that there is no repetition of what occurred last fall. I urge that, in fairness to our young people who are raising families in this great nation of ours.

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): As a British Columbia member I feel I should rise and make a few remarks on this bill. My remarks need be but brief, because the things I should like to say have already been very well said in the opening speech by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). There is, however, one point which he made which has been overlooked in the subsequent discussion.

My understanding of the two-week gap in the discussion of the speech from the throne was that the interval was to be devoted to the consideration of orders in council which would lapse on March 31 and the conversion of those orders in council into acts of parliament.

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

With that none of us will disagree. We have ten working days in which to do this, but to-day we have wasted the entire day in talking about a part of this bill which is not a war-time order in council. This Chinese immigration bill has stood on the statute books for twenty-three years. I agree that the time has come to remove it, but I do not think this ten-day period is the time to bring it forward. After Easter, when we are on our regular programme of legislation, would be soon enough. I am quite certain that if the minister had consented to bring in this bill consisting of section 1 and section 3 regarding the dependents of soldiers it would have carried in one minute and we would have had three or four more urgent bills passed through the house to-day instead of, I will not say wasting time, but at any rate delaying the passage of urgent bills that must be passed before March 31.

If the minister would rise in his place now and say that sections 2 and 4 will be stood over, I am quite sure that we could go ahead with the other bills even at this late hour.

I wish to refer briefly to another member's speech. My good friend the hon. member for Lake Centre seemed to derive considerable satisfaction from the diversity of unity, as he said, between the immigration policies advocated by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and those apparently advocated by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Glen). I do not see the hon. member in the chamber at the moment, but I would tell him that we on this side derive an equal satisfaction from watching the diversity of unity as between himself and the hon. member for Vancouver South. It is true that one expects unity in the cabinet; but, after all, there should be shadow unity in the shadow cabinet between the shadow Minister of Justice and the shadow Minister of Agriculture.

One other reference. I listened with the greatest interest to some of the remarks made by another friend of mine in the opposition, the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Thatcher). He made an eloquent appeal that we should relieve the distress in continental Europe by allowing wholesale immigration from that part of the world. I want to compliment him on the very great change in attitude which he has shown since the last session, because, as I remember, at the last session when there were measures before the house to relieve the distress among our cousins in Great Britain he took the view that the money would be better spent at home, on Moose Jaw sewerage.