

Immigration

schools. That is good work. I want to see it extended, and more education provided for our immigrants.

The advisory council of which I spoke should also form the nucleus of a body that could direct some social research in the field of immigration. Of necessity the government's policy is a hit and miss one. Very little social research has been done in the matter of immigration. The government more or less guesses each year at the number of immigrants we can absorb. There has been no scientific investigation or research into the matter that I am aware of. It is certain that research of that kind could be of assistance to the government so the lives of the immigrants who come to Canada could become happy and the immigrants themselves could become happy and useful citizens of this country and be welcomed instead of criticized by many Canadians, as is done at the present time.

There is room in Canada for a great many more immigrants. I have no idea how many could be absorbed, and I doubt whether the government or anyone else can have any idea in that regard until more research work is done on this subject. Of course, the number we can absorb is by no means static. It will change from year to year as our economy develops and as we begin to use more of our natural resources. Canada needs these immigrants. There are many millions of people in European countries, particularly, that need Canada. All I am asking is that the government give more attention to over-all planning in the fields of employment, housing and education as they affect immigrants who come to this country.

Mr. F. D. Shaw (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, there are many good reasons why Canadian immigration is a subject deserving of most serious consideration by parliament at this time. The mover of the amendment indicated that we have been offered few opportunities to engage in a co-ordinated, organized debate. It is true that when the estimates of the department come before the house each year we are provided with an opportunity, sometimes a very abbreviated one. It is possible that we can be blamed for that. Then from time to time, as amendments to the act are brought in, further opportunities are provided.

It is particularly appropriate that we should discuss this matter at this time, because all one has to do is read the press of Canada, read the newspaper editorials, read magazines, read magazine editorials, talk to people, meditate upon individual cases that one has come in contact with, to come to the conclusion that Canadians are

[Mr. Noseworthy.]

particularly disturbed about the situation which they feel must prevail at this time.

The hon. member for Kamloops should be commended for moving his amendment at this time. I am also grateful to the minister for resisting what must have been a very strong temptation to plunge into the debate after the first speaker had concluded his remarks. Probably it is the better part of wisdom for a minister to hold back a bit and hear the whole story from every quarter of the house before answering. Then, of course, there is another advantage in that some of those who speak before he does will not have the opportunity of talking about what he may say.

Mr. Pickersgill: I thought of that.

Mr. Shaw: I am sure the minister did. If there are grounds for criticism at all with respect to our method of dealing with this subject at that time, it is in connection with the suddenness and unexpectedness with which the amendment confronts hon. members when it is moved to the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair. However, as the debate progresses it will be demonstrated that hon. members do not require much time to prepare their remarks and deal with this particular subject.

I indicated a moment ago that all one has to do is to read newspapers, newspaper editorials and so forth to realize that Canadians are greatly disturbed at the present time. Take, for example, the matter of refusing entry to immigrants on what the department says are civil grounds. I realize that some are barred on medical grounds and others for other reasons. I have been told, to use a broad general expression, that some are barred on civil grounds. There may be a good reason for this, but it is rather surprising to me. If a person is barred from admission to Canada on medical grounds the department does not hesitate a moment to say so, to indicate, "it has been found that you have tuberculosis and you are not admissible at this time." But in many instances the reason is not given as medical grounds or any other grounds. I think particularly of a case I had before the department last year of a citizen who had emigrated to Canada and been here for a number of years. He has proven himself to be a good citizen.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would not mind my making this correction. It is not the custom of the department to state the refusal is on medical grounds unless the disease is curable or remediable.