The Budget-Mrs. Fairclough

positive approaches, democratic programming, raising of standards, flexible practices for selective immigration to replace rigid restrictions in the present act and regulations. In the meantime I had hoped to establish a more orderly procedure by reason of the regulation which has become so controversial. I could not see that anyone would be hurt because all applications now on hand would be dealt with in any event. If immigration is to be properly planned, and if immigrants are to be successful, it is necessary to maintain broader selection in the classes of immigrants admitted to Canada, in terms of skill, training, personal qualifications, and the needs of the country. The recent amendment was designed to make possible this broader selection without affecting the majority of those who formerly came under the sponsorship procedure.

As I said, I hoped I could achieve this. Unfortunately, I have not succeeded; not because the result would not have been achieved; not because prospective immigrants and their sponsors would not have been in a more advantageous position; but because the propagandists of the Liberal party have created an atmosphere of distrust and apprehension in which it is impossible to work.

Mr. Pickersgill: How childish can you get.

Mrs. Fairclough: It is interesting to note that the members of the Liberal party in this house think that is very funny. Since their laughter cannot be reproduced in Hansard, I think I must draw attention to it. This is a highly sensitive department, as hon. members know, and the reaction of human beings to any proposal is always unpredictable. Without co-operation of all concerned, no plan of procedure can be completely successful. I want to say once more how deeply I regret the misunderstanding of the intention of these regulations.

I would like to say something else of a personal nature. When I accepted the Prime Minister's (Mr. Diefenbaker) invitation to this portfolio I hoped my tenure of office would be classified as humane and sympathetic. I have no aversion to changing my mind if circumstances make such action advisable. Therefore, taking into consideration the fact that I hope to suggest revisions to migration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel I should say one word about the Prime Minister's remarks in the house on April 7 last. At that time, unfortunately. I was not in the house and the Prime Minister answered for me a question which was put with regard to these regulations. Towards the end of his remarks at the top of page 2296 of Hansard for that date he said:

I, for one, intend to have this looked into, because the section indicates that the one passed in 1956 had whatever objections can be raised against the present amendment.

I think that that has been amply demonstrated in the remarks I have made today and in the portions of these orders in council which I have read into Hansard. But I do want to take this opportunity to thank publicly those representatives of the ethnic press and the ethnic groups who got in touch with the Prime Minister, with myself and with other members of the government, and whose representations were responsible for the investigation which the Prime Minister indicated in his remarks in the house on April 7. I would just like to say that their thoughtfulness and co-operation is greatly appreciated, and I hope as time goes on we shall continue to have their help in matters affecting this department.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I did promise the hon. member an opportunity to make a correction, if the hon. member felt one was necessary, to correct something which had been said by the hon, minister.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I do feel there is one correction, and only one, which is necessary, but perhaps the hon. lady would permit me to say that I am very pleased she has taken my advice and rescinded the order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. lady said, according to the copy of the press release I have which she gave to the press before she started to speak, that there were many of these countries specified in section 20, subsection (c) of the regulation of May 24, 1956, in which there were no facilities. Now, in a very the act in a few months' time in any event, limited, narrow, restricted sense that state-I am asking my colleagues to rescind order ment is perhaps not exactly incorrect. There in council 1959-310 until such time as the are no immigration officers in those countries, discriminatory section 20 placed into the re- but we are represented either by representagulations by those now in opposition can be tives of the Department of External Affairs replaced. I trust the revisions which I will or, where there are no Canadian missions, by then propose will be understood and will have the British consulates. I would like to express the approval of all those interested in im- my appreciation of the help they gave me when I was minister—and I am sure they are

[Mrs. Fairclough.]