

interest him to have them appear in the record in this context. The minister gave us a statement as recorded at page 151 of *Hansard* of February 5. Answering the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart), the minister said:

Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that only a short time ago I placed before the house the contents of an order in council which was passed on May 29 last and which opened and widened the doors for immigrants coming to this country? That order in council provided:

(a) The wife or unmarried child under eighteen years of age of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents.

Is there any discrimination in such an order which is binding upon the immigration authorities? The order further provides:

(b) The father or mother, the unmarried son or daughter eighteen years of age or over, the unmarried brother or sister, the orphan nephew or niece under sixteen years of age, of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" used in this clause means a child bereaved of both parents.

(c) An agriculturist having sufficient means to farm in Canada.

(d) The fiancee of any adult male legally admitted to and resident in Canada who is in a position to receive, marry and care for his intended wife.

(e) A person who, having entered Canada as a non-immigrant, enlisted in the Canadian armed forces and, having served in such forces, has been honourably discharged therefrom.

That was the first set of widenings, shall I say, of measures to expand Canada's immigration policy, opening the door, so to speak. Further on, on the same page, the minister said:

Only on Friday last, not in consequence of the hon. member's speech, an order in council was passed, widening the doors to other classes. It is P.C. 371, dated January 30, 1947, and I will quote from it as I think this will answer the hon. gentleman's criticism of the department so far as preferred and non-preferred classes are concerned. We are providing in this order in council that the following have been added to the admissible classes:

1. The widowed daughter or sister (with or without unmarried children under 18 years of age) of a legal resident of Canada who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives.

2. An agriculturist entering Canada to farm when destined to a father, father-in-law, son, son-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, uncle or nephew engaged in agriculture as his principal occupation who is in a position to receive such immigrant and establish him on a farm.

3. A farm labourer entering Canada to engage in assured farm employment.

4. A person experienced in mining, lumbering or logging entering Canada to engage in assured employment in any one of such industries.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, as the minister finished reading those provisions, that he had surely opened the door. All hon. members

need to do is just to visualize all the possible combinations which might arise across Canada from these provisions, and then they will realize that Canada has indeed broadened her immigration policy substantially within the past year. These were serious orders in council to be passed without reference to parliament! And what was the need? I do not wish to criticize the minister or the government unduly, because they know things that the ordinary member does not know, but I consider it regrettable that these orders in council were passed without discussion by the house.

Mr. ASHBY: Sneaking them around parliament.

Mr. BLACKMORE: These are pretty serious matters. Does this bill concerning Chinese immigration now under discussion tonight mean that these order-in-council regulations apply to the Chinese? That is the first thing hon. members need to know. If these regulations do apply to the Chinese who are in the country, then I maintain that the situation deserves the most serious consideration of every hon. member. Does it apply to Germans, to Italians, to Japanese or to any other people who might seek admission to our confines? If it does, then that matter also requires careful thought.

As I see it, the main consideration for us to have in mind is primarily what sort of people does Canada want and what sort of people has Canada a right to expect. I believe it has been quite generally agreed by those who have discussed the matter tonight that Canada wants people who are assimilable, people with whom Canadians can marry with desirable results. I emphasize "desirable results".

There are certain races who are proud; when they marry with the proud white people who have made this country they have offspring who are despised by both sides, who are outcasts. I have seen this thing happen several times. I refrain from mentioning a race because I have no desire to offend anyone. I will give hon. members the information privately if they so desire. That is an exceedingly serious matter and must be borne in mind by every hon. member who shoulders the responsibility, as I know all desire to do, of the future of the country in drafting or approving immigration policies.

In addition, we want people, as I understand it, who will intermingle with the people of Canada. That means we are not desirous of acquiring people who will get into groups by themselves and tend to establish little blocks of their own nationality in the country, building, probably, for the future serious