

Mr. MacINNIS: I didn't either; so neither of us did. If you will tell me how much you got from the breweries in British Columbia, I will tell you where mine came from.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must insist that if an hon. member wishes to ask a question he may ask it only with the consent of the hon. member who has the floor. And the hon. member wishing to ask the question must rise in his place.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am sorry; I apologize. But may I ask the hon. member a question? How many members of the British Columbia electrical union are orientals?

Mr. MacINNIS: I don't know.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No, you bet you don't know.

Mr. MacINNIS: If I may proceed without being so rudely interrupted again, I shall conclude.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You won't say anything, anyway.

Mr. MacINNIS: It would be best if the minister withdrew this bill until he has his immigration policy better organized, and can tell the house exactly what is to take the place of the Chinese Immigration Act being repealed. Until that is done, so far as I am concerned—and I believe I am speaking for this group as a whole—I will stand for equal rights for all citizens of Canada, regardless of race, colour or creed.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate thus far. I have the impression that a somewhat similar thing has happened to the house this afternoon to what happened when we were discussing the N.R.M.A. in 1944, in that there was contributed to the debate a tremendous amount of heat but the light tended to be obscured. I wonder if we cannot manage somehow to get our eye on the ball and follow it through during the rest of this debate.

The first question for us to ask is, what must be Canada's purpose in having an immigration policy? Is Canada aiming by her immigration policy to increase Canada's population, or is she aiming to bow to certain other considerations such as, for example, one or more of the following which I believe constitute a sort of summary of the arguments which have been made or implied this afternoon by various speakers.

First, to relieve congestion of population in certain densely populated areas such as China, Japan, India, Java, Belgium, Germany—dear

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

me, the list stretches out almost interminably when you start it! If Canada's object is to relieve density of population in overpopulated areas, then I fear if she undertakes the task she is attempting something far beyond her capacity.

Second, to relieve the distress of certain unfortunate individuals such as displaced people. Of course we all wish to relieve displaced people, but surely there is a limit to our responsibility in this regard. We ought to be able to find what that limit is and meet it squarely and honourably.

Third, to assume Canada's proportionate share of the international burdens which appear to rest on the shoulders of the victors in world war II. It is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, if I may stop to make it, that the people who appear to have lost this war are the victors!

Fourth, to satisfy other nations that Canada does not intend to follow a dog-in-the-manger policy designed to exclude from her soil the land-hungry millions yearning to reach her shores. Is this in other words, a measure to allay the hard feelings of other nations against us? One would think so from hearing some of the talk.

Fifth, are we by this measure aiming to satisfy certain pressure groups working for certain ulterior objectives, regardless of whether those objectives will contribute to the greater prosperity, unity and happiness of Canada?

Or sixth, are we doing this to reward the people of nations that fought well on the same side that Canada did in world war II? Is that our object?

Or seventh, is it to discharge our obligations as a signatory to the united nations agreement?

I think every member of the house will readily concede that there is a measure of validity in each one of these reasons, that probably not one of them ought to be entirely out of our minds at any given time. But as one member of the house, I feel that our primary and cogent reason is number one, to increase Canada's population, to make her stronger, more prosperous, more happy, more enduring. If we can all agree that this is the primary purpose, let us consider that to be the ball and keep our eye on it and follow it through the game.

What has the government already done toward opening the door for immigration? May I read two passages which have already been read into the record once, but which, I fancy, if anyone out in the country should do me the honour of reading my remarks it would