

the immigration law and create difficulties which it will be hard to surmount. That, I suggest, would be harmful to the country.

Mr. McMASTER: The whole basis of the argument put forward by the Minister of Mines and Resources has been that we must wait for five years to find out whether a man should be deported for some defect or because of some crime which could not be discovered at the time he came in. The minister gave figures the other day of the number of deportations from 1930 to 1945 and yet, when asked for the number of immigrants that had come in, he gave only the number that came in between the same years, 1930 and 1945. In other words, he overlooked the very basis of his own argument that anyone here for five years should be deported for certain reasons. Why did he not give the number of immigrants who came from Britain in the five years preceding 1930? We know that immigration fell off largely from 1930 on because of conditions that prevailed in this country. I find that there came to Canada from the British isles in 1926, which would be within the five-year period, 48,000; in 1927, 52,000; in 1928, 55,000; in 1929, 66,000; in 1930, which may have been included in the minister's figures, 31,000; the next year, 7,000; and down to as low as three thousand.

No fair comparison can be made as between the number of immigrants who came in and those who were deported unless we go back to 1925, particularly in view of the fact that that is the very basis of the argument the minister used. The fact is that over 225,000 came from the British isles from 1926 to 1930. Adding that to the 80,000 mentioned by the minister, you will find that over 300,000 Britishers came in, and the total sent back for crimes was, using the figure the minister gave, about 1,740. That would be less than two per cent of those who came in; in fact, far less than one per cent.

What about the rest of Canada? Was the rest of Canada good during all that time? I agree with the hon. member from Vancouver East who said that if you make a man a Canadian citizen you should take him for better or for worse, just as you do if you marry a woman, and these people should not be sent back for crimes committed a considerable time after they came here. The minister mentioned 1,740 crimes committed by these 300,000 Britishers. What about all Canadians? I find that in 1930, when we deported several hundred Britishers because they had committed crimes—I am referring to indictable crimes and not the lesser offences—there were indictable crimes committed in Canada to the extent of 34,000; in 1931,

36,000; in 1932, 36,000—and all this time, remember, we were sending Britishers back because they committed crimes—in 1934, 38,000; in 1935, 37,000; and in 1936, 41,000. In other words, it did not stop crime in Canada. In 1937 there were 42,000 such crimes; in 1938, 48,000; in 1939, 53,000.

After all, I do not think these Britishers were so bad. They might be said to be at least the equal of those who were here. As a matter of fact, in computing the number of crimes committed throughout Canada, in the ten years I have spoken of, I find they amounted to three per cent for the whole period, whereas the number committed by Britishers was much less than two per cent; in fact, less than one per cent.

The Minister of Labour in half-hesitating way put his finger on the cause of deportation when he said that during that time many Britishers asked to be deported. I live in a good district of Toronto, in fact, the best district, but on our borders are a large number of people who lived in moderate circumstances—tradesmen, men working on buildings and so on—and many of them lost their jobs. I know many of those people who asked to be deported. They came to my office and said they wanted to go back to England where some of them had friends who would provide for them. At their own request they were seeking a return to the old country and at that time it was suggested that some of them were going back to take the dole. We used to use the word "dole" in those days in reference to unemployment insurance, and those people would be quite indignant when the word was used in their hearing. They would get angry and say, "It is not a dole but unemployment insurance." In fact, it was unemployment insurance such as this government introduced into this country during the last few years.

Therefore we have no reason to say that these people were unsatisfactory citizens, though the conditions here were unsatisfactory to them at that time. The present government, and also perhaps our own prior Conservative government, were to blame. People with a child of six would receive, in addition to what milk was put on their doorstep, the sum of eighty-one cents a week to support the sixth child. These men had, therefore, reason to be dissatisfied with Canada and to ask to be deported.

I really cannot understand the position taken against the amendment by the people who themselves came from the old country. I can only assume that in every walk of life, there are those who are most severe against their own people and take a contrary attitude

[Mr. Glen.]