

in this case, in so far as my information goes, it was not limited actually to men who were single, that is not married, but it was proposed for certain specific purposes to admit men who could come without their wives. A good many of us would feel that, under present conditions, men coming here from Europe without their families would scarcely constitute the very best type of settler, and their admission certainly would not help in any way to alleviate conditions in Europe. That is something which I would like the committee to look into.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We will ask Mr. Jolliffe that when he comes. I was leaving one phase of this situation to the senator, and that is the distinction which we are making between men and women in the matter of bringing in their fiances. I expected her to say something on that subject. I have no less than three cases in my files of young Canadian women who met flyers when they were over here, became engaged, and these men having gone out of the country in the pursuance of duty, these girls want to bring back these men to be husbands for them; but the Immigration Branch will not permit it. If the thing were reversed, and it was the case of a male Canadian wishing to bring in a fiancee, the fiancee would be admissible. I have a rather worse case than that. A Canadian girl met a Polish man—it just happens to be Polish—in Canada, became engaged to him, he went away and she followed him and married him in England. Now they will not even let her in, much less allow him to come in, although she was born in this country and has a father and mother living here.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: On what ground?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: On the ground that, having married a Polish citizen, she has acquired Polish nationality and lost her British citizenship and her Canadian citizenship. In effect they say, "The place for you to go is Poland"—and she is one of our own girls, born and brought up in this country, who has met and married somebody we brought in here in the course of our war activities. We keep him and her out of our own country, and hers. It is brutal, unreasonable and unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I agree with all the sentiments expressed by Hon. Senator Wilson and Hon. Senator Roebuck. But I believe the inquiry should go further. I know that it is a great temptation, especially to those of us who are practising lawyers in any city and know the tremendous pressure of applications along the lines suggested by Senator Roebuck, to stress the points he has raised. I could cite several cases within my own knowledge. But I believe we should go further than that; we should call the representatives of organized labour, of the farmers, of industry, and other interests and obtain their views as to a general immigration policy. In making the suggestion I am not criticizing the Government, because governments are only human, and there is pressure from certain elements of organized labour against immigration, and pressure from certain parts of industry for immigration; likewise there is pressure from farmers in some parts of the country for immigration, while others are against it. In my opinion we should call representatives of all these interests to find out what they would suggest as a general policy for the Government of this country to adopt. For instance, I would ask the president and secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress, and also of the Canadian Congress of Labour, to come here and tell us what they think of these proposals.

The CHAIRMAN: They did so last year.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I know, but I would ask them now to prepare a brief and explain definitely their stand as to what they think the policy of this country should be. I would adopt the same course with regard to the organizations representing Canadian industry. Then, our mayors have a wonderful organization, including Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Halifax, Vancouver and all the other principal cities. I believe that this year the mayor of my own city is the president, and I think he should be invited to come here.