

*Immigration*

from 1950 to 1953 inclusive and notwithstanding the very severe immigration quotas applied by the United States, 81,000 United Kingdom immigrants went into that country.

Our criticism of the government here is based on the fact that by their negligence and inattention, they are losing for Canada one of the most desirable sources of immigrants. The figures for those who have gone to other countries confirm that criticism. Dealing for a moment with the government's statement that if you go out of your way to attract these immigrants you will get undesirable ones, we have the experience of Australia. Notwithstanding these large totals to which I have referred, Australia has found their United Kingdom immigrants so much to the advantage of that country that they have redoubled their efforts this year to attract a further large-scale movement of immigrants from the United Kingdom. I have a report appearing in the *Ottawa Journal* of February 7 which emphasizes the new efforts being made by Australia in this field. It shows the length to which Australia is prepared to go. I give you these figures.

A retail fish merchant from Beccles, Suffolk, with his wife, six sons and three daughters, is the biggest family in the current movement. Their passage cost the family £30.

That is all the family had to pay. The rest was advanced on a repayable loan scheme.

A motor mechanic from Romsey, Hants, has taken his family of nine to Australia at a cost of £20.

These facts, Mr. Speaker, support our contention that the government is not paying sufficient regard to immigration and the potentialities of immigration from the United Kingdom.

However, perhaps the most immediately pertinent portion of our criticism of government policy lies within that portion of our motion which says that in its administration it denies simple justice to Canadians and non-Canadians alike. Our reasons for this criticism are summarized in our objections to the government's position, repeatedly stated in this house and in correspondence, that there are no rights attached to immigration; that it is a matter of discretion only and cannot be made a matter of law. That is the position that has been taken in this house by the former minister. It has been inherited by the present minister and is confirmed by him in his letters; that is to say, with respect to those applying for admission to Canada, or who are applied for by Canadians in Canada, there are not legal rights; that the whole thing is a matter of discretion. Such a decision is a denial of the

[Mr. Fulton.]

rights of Canadians and can only make, as it has done, for administrative chaos amounting in fact by its very nature and extent to inevitable administrative lawlessness.

In what I have to say here I want to make it quite clear that I am not holding civil servants who administer this thing responsible for the condition which exists in the department. They have to administer a policy which places them in a position they should never be in, and administrative lawlessness is the inevitable result. I would like to lay before the house in substantiation of this argument one of the regulations passed under the Immigration Act. Section 20, subsection 4, of the regulations gives the departmental officers almost unlimited authority to reject would-be immigrants. By that regulation admission is prohibited to:

Any person, where in the opinion of a special inquiry officer, such person should not be admitted by reasons of: the peculiar customs, habits, modes of life or methods of holding property in the country or place where he resided prior to coming to Canada; his unsuitability, having regard to the economic, social, industrial, educational, labour, health or other conditions or requirements existing in Canada or in the country from which such person comes to Canada, or to his probable inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after his admission.

No order in council could be more sweeping, more ill-judged in the tremendous and arbitrary power which it places in the hands of the departmental officials defined in this case as special inquiry officers. It is as a result of that type of regulation, leaving the whole thing to discretion and to the exercise of arbitrary decisions, not subject to appeal or to any process of law or semi-judicial process, which has resulted in the injustices of which we complain.

This party is strongly of the view that you cannot base your practice, in a matter as important as this affecting the welfare of hundreds of thousands of Canadians individually as well as of the country generally, on the principle that there is no matter of right but only of discretion. The reason that we say that is that immigration does affect Canadian citizens. Canadian citizens have rights in spite of what this government may feel to the contrary. Under the Immigration Act and regulations there are laid down classes of admissible immigrants. It is provided that Canadian citizens can apply for the admission of relatives within those classes. It is therefore impossible to argue, or at least unrealistic to argue, that where a Canadian citizen applies for the admission of his relative within one of the admissible classes, no matter what may be the racial origin of that Canadian citizen—we are all