

*Supply—Citizenship and Immigration*

Included was a large quantity of goods which could be entered duty free, and he came to the conclusion that one would require \$10,000 before he would be seriously hampered.

The fact of the matter is that when this department was first created the restriction on the export of capital to migrants was the restriction he stated, namely, £1,000, spread over four years. The additional advantages which he later mentioned were advantages which have come about because of discussions between the two governments, and because of the act of this government in greatly extending the goods which could be entered as settlers' effects. On the other hand, if you can go to Australia and take all your money with you that is a real attraction. It was a real attraction in the years 1949 and 1950 when the pound was devalued and there was considerable doubt in the minds of a good many people in the United Kingdom as to just what was the best thing to do. But if you look at the figure for that year, when we had 13,000 people come from the United Kingdom to Canada, and compare it with the 42,000 who came last year you will see that the numbers are building up and that we think we are now getting a good number of people from the United Kingdom, and we expect to continue to get that number.

**Mr. Fulton:** I might conclude on that point. I think it is important to point out that according to my information the reason there is a substantial increase, up to 42,000, which is not after all a very large part of the total immigration, is that a large portion of this 42,000 consists of wives and children coming out to join their husbands and fathers, and naturally do not represent new family units migrating from the United Kingdom in the year in question. I have been told that since 1947, 170,000 immigrants have gone from the United Kingdom to Australia alone under this empire settlement act.

**Mr. Harris:** In one year?

**Mr. Fulton:** No, since 1947. In view of the comparisons between the two countries of Australia and Canada, I venture to say, if I may without offence to Australia, that the relative attractions of the two countries indicate that Australia has been doing disproportionately well, that is disproportionately well as compared to Canada and what we have to offer to a potential British immigrant. Therefore it seems to me we should be giving more consideration to the plan. Dealing with the minister's argument—I do not want to protract this unduly—I want to ask him whether he will deal with this. He made what would appear to me, on the face of it at any rate, to be two potentially

valid objections to the use of the empire settlement act. I wonder whether we can analyse it a little further and see if they are so valid as they might seem.

First the minister said it was the opinion of those concerned with policy that you get a better type of immigrant if his passage is not completely subsidized. Well, now, it seems to me that with respect to that principle, by far the greater proportion of the displaced persons who have come here have had their passages virtually completely subsidized either by one of the refugee organizations or by the passage money being put up or guaranteed by somebody in Canada. Therefore both in the latter case particularly and in the former case the immigrant might eventually be under some obligation to repay the money.

It seems to me that by far the majority of the displaced persons being admitted to Canada have had their passage money virtually completely subsidized. I do not want to suggest that that makes them less desirable immigrants; in fact I do not make that suggestion. It was the only way they could get here. Therefore, since I do not make that suggestion, I suggest to the minister it would not be an objection applicable to the use of the empire settlement act in the case of the United Kingdom immigrant.

The minister also used words to this effect, that it was the feeling of those responsible for the policy that it was most desirable that we should retain exclusive jurisdiction over the—I do not know the exact word he used—selection of our immigrants. Do I understand from this that the use of the empire settlement act would deprive us in some way of the complete and final decision as to what immigrants came from the United Kingdom; Because if it would, then I think it is a valid objection. I should be very surprised if an agreement with the British government under that act would in fact deprive us of any element of decision as to whether or not an immigrant was suitable and should come forward.

I wish the minister would deal with these two points, because if they are to be accepted as valid then perhaps I would be more inclined to accept the objections to that scheme than I am at the moment, because I cannot see how the argument applies.

**Mr. Harris:** Before I answer that I might point out that of the 42,000 who came here last year, 18,000 were relatives, so 24,000 of those persons to whom my hon. friend refers were either heads of families or single workers.