

Immigration Act, if they have acquired what is known as Canadian domicile. It will be understood that this is entirely different from Canadian citizenship. Have I correctly described the situation, and, if so, what steps does the government propose to take so that, at the proper time, it may be able to deal with those people?

Mr. CRERAR: If they have been admitted as immigrants and have been domiciled in Canada for five years, they are not subject to deportation. Under those circumstances they would have to be dealt with in another way. They have been dealt with by way of internment. But when it comes down to the question of deportation at this time to enemy alien countries—

Mr. GREEN: It is out of the question.

Mr. CRERAR: Of course, under war conditions it is impossible. There are leaving Canada no ships which will touch at German or Italian ports.

Mr. GREEN: I realize that. The point is that even if they could be sent back, under the Immigration Act as it now stands the government has not power to deport them.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, if they have acquired Canadian domicile, or if they were regularly admitted, given immigration status, and remained in Canada for five years.

Mr. NEILL: In respect of Chinese, do they not need to be naturalized?

Mr. CRERAR: No.

Mr. GREEN: Even if a man is a violent nazi in Canada, if he has been here for five years he cannot be deported.

Mr. THORSON: Subject to section 43.

Mr. GREEN: Will the minister explain what the government proposes to do in that situation?

Mr. CRERAR: No special consideration has been given to that matter. I do not believe the cases are numerous.

Mr. GREEN: There are several hundred.

Mr. CRERAR: The arrangement is the same in the United States. If a Canadian leaves Canada to go to the United States, is admitted by their immigration authorities and has acquired citizenship in that country, he cannot be deported back to Canada. The same is true in Canadian law. If the alien is in Canada for less than five years, he can be deported. However, as I pointed out, the difficulty to-day is that of making deportation effective.

[Mr. Green.]

Mr. GREEN: Apparently in the last war the government took power to deport these people. Will the government not give consideration to the whole situation?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. GREEN: No; I want an answer.

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. member is correct. During the last war the five-year domicile provision was overcome in some fashion. I am quite willing to say that we will give consideration to the matter. I still point out, however, that the practical problem is that of making deportation effective.

Mr. GREEN: I realize it could not be done at the moment.

Mr. POULIOT: I said that last year.

Mr. JACKMAN: Would the minister care to give some details respecting the financial arrangements in connection with the cooperative plan of bringing out British children?

Mr. CRERAR: I have nothing which could usefully be added to the statement I made in the house some five or six weeks ago. If my hon. friend will consult that, he will have all the information I am able to give him at the moment.

Mr. GREEN: What was Japanese immigration in the last two fiscal years?

Mr. CRERAR: We are getting into a rather dangerous zone.

Mr. GREEN: It certainly is a dangerous zone for British Columbia.

Mr. CRERAR: The total number admitted for the year ended March 31, 1939, was forty-two, these being nearly all women and children. The number admitted for the year ended March 31, 1940, was thirty-six, also nearly all women and children.

Item agreed to.

Special—Mines and geology branch.

190. To assist in provision of transportation facilities into mining areas and to authorize, subject to the approval of the governor in council, continuation of employment up to June 30, 1940, of extra temporary officers, clerks and employees already appointed under the terms of any item in the special supplementary estimates of this department, except the item for fur conservation, \$58,000.

Mr. GREEN: There is a decrease of over \$1,000,000 in this vote which is to provide assistance in the building of roads into mining areas. Will the minister explain why this vote has been practically wiped out?