

The Budget—Mrs. Fairclough

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the members especially section 20 of this order in council which I have just read, and have them compare that order in council with the one I have previously read into *Hansard*, P.C. 2856 of June 9, 1950. I should like to invite hon. members to read carefully the text of subparagraph (c) of this section 20. A reading of this subparagraph may lead one to believe that all the classes of persons therein mentioned were admitted so long as they were of good character and in good health. Hon. members know that this was not the case. For instance, according to subparagraph (c) of the regulations of 1956, brothers and sisters from Israel were said to be admissible, but in fact a person in Canada who applied for his brother was promptly told that the department did not have the necessary facilities in Israel and therefore could not deal with such an application.

As hon. members know, this situation was corrected on August 22, 1958. Applications then on file with the department and since received have been processed or are being processed. Israel was not the only country where the facilities were not available. There are many of the countries listed in subparagraph (c) from which immigrants cannot be admitted because of lack of complete facilities. I might have time to read them. They are Spain, Malta, Cyprus, Andorra, Iceland, Monaco, San Marino, Liechtenstein, Vatican City, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, Mexico and the countries of Central and South America.

By the wording of subparagraph (c), the country was led to believe that the former Liberal administration was generous, but persons with relatives in certain countries have learned since that notwithstanding this apparent generosity in the regulations they could not bring forward their relatives. In other words, Mr. Speaker, though the Liberal government turned on the tap, no water came out.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am rising again on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I hope it is a question of privilege and not just a question of disagreement.

Mr. Pickersgill: I suggest that the minister is misrepresenting the facts, but if the hon. lady would prefer me to reserve my remarks until she has concluded, I would be very glad to do so.

Mr. Speaker: I think it would be better if the hon. member made his statement at the end of the minister's remarks.

Mrs. Fairclough: So, the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate is against restrictions.

I should like to ask him what he was doing when he laid the foundations for the backlog which is today so frustrating to prospective immigrants. I should like to know, and perhaps he can tell us when he makes his speech, what he was doing when he pretended there would be entry for immigrants where there were no facilities for examination? Apparently the only restriction he is against is the honest one. He does not mind restrictions if they are hidden in administrative detail and subterfuge. He does not mind the hidden, dishonest restriction.

Mr. Speaker: I hope the hon. member will withdraw that word "dishonest".

Mrs. Fairclough: I did not apply it to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, but to the spirit of the restrictions.

Mr. Speaker: The inference was very clear. I hope the hon. member would be good enough to withdraw it.

Mrs. Fairclough: I was referring to the restrictions, but if Your Honour thinks there is an inference I can assure you and the hon. member that the inference was not directed to him, personally.

There are many things in this act that I do not like. Since this government has taken office, Mr. Speaker, we have initiated a thorough review of the Immigration Act, the regulations, the procedure and the policy. We are still hopeful that from certain countries it may be possible to facilitate the admission of relatives of persons who cannot now come to Canada, but whatever will be the result of these efforts I can assure the house that it is not the intention of the government to deceive the people of Canada by making them believe that their close relatives are admissible if, in fact, this is not possible.

When the proposals are drafted it is my intention to consult with the representatives of the various ethnic groups, with the ethnic press, which is an important line of communication to those of ethnic origin, and I hope to have the advice of the immigrant aid agencies. In fact, I have long felt that there is not a sufficiently close liaison between my department and the agencies whose help is of such inestimable value to the newcomer. I hope we will have the advice and co-operation of labour, of business and of the church and welfare groups. I think it goes without saying that close examination of the proposed revisions will be made, and also I expect that the broad experience of hon. members of this house who, themselves, are of ethnic origins will prove invaluable.

Out of all this it is my hope that we can produce a new deal in immigration matters;