

So far, the field officers of the Department of Immigration have done some of this work, but only to a limited extent and with little, if any, psychological and sociological training for this very precarious task. The results of their endeavours have not been very encouraging.

It seems to be only reasonable that a form of supervision should be exercised over all new-comers for their time of probation and initiation, along the lines applied to all citizens of Canada by the Selective Service during the war. An experienced staff for this task should still be available.

As to the psychological needs of the immigrant who is without relatives and intimate friends in this country, this seems to be the field where in our opinion much could and should be done by the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State, our social, charitable, and service organizations—to extend a friendly hand to those who will later become our co-citizens and compatriots. There should certainly be close co-operation between these organizations and the authorities in charge, which might even find some form of legal basis.

Respectfully submitted.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dubiński.

Hon. Mr. EULER: May I make a comment or so, and perhaps ask a question. Taken by and large, I agree almost entirely with what Mr. Dubiński has said. I agree with him that there should be no racial discrimination, and I am, generally speaking, quite sympathetic to the carefully selective immigration of Poles as well as other European people. I say that because in my own district, in the city of Kitchener—as my honourable friend from Winnipeg usually speaks of “his” city of Winnipeg so I speak of “my” city of Kitchener—we have, as I suppose you know very well, a good many hundreds of people of Polish extraction, and even of Polish birth. They are just as good citizens as we have, and for that reason I am quite sympathetic to his people. But he made one statement here with which I do not quite agree. He has four categories, and he discusses the first one on page 11, I think, that consisting of the Polish veterans to the number, I believe, of 220,000.

Mr. DUBIŃSKI: Originally. There are now only about 57,000.

Hon. Mr. EULER: And then he refers to the Yalta Agreement. Perhaps I can quote it. He says, “Mr. Churchill put his signature to the Yalta Agreement well knowing that it meant the loss of real freedom and liberty in Poland”. I don’t know anything as to that. “He then announced that these boys would receive British citizenship and be allowed to settle in any part of the British Commonwealth of Nations”. That is the point I want to make. I do not see how Mr. Churchill would have any right, moral or otherwise, to make any commitment so far as the British Commonwealth of Nations is concerned, and particularly with reference to Canada. Then you say: “We Canadians of Polish descent have the right to believe that the pronouncement of Mr. Churchill was made with the approval of our government, as we have heard nothing to the contrary. We believe that this promise should be fulfilled on moral grounds alone because fulfilment of commitments has always been a British tradition.” Would you say that because the Canadian government did not disavow what Mr. Churchill said—if indeed he did say that—these people should be admitted to any part of the British Commonwealth? Would you say that merely because the Canadian government did not disavow that we are bound, pledged to the fulfilment of what he may have said? I would not agree with that.

Mr. DUBIŃSKI: Well now, may I go this far, Mr. Senator? This was done when the war was at its height. I think the situation was not very encouraging. As you will admit, just at the time of the Yalta Agreement, the crisis was ap-