

*The Budget—Mr. Crestohl*

people. It will be most informative to hon. members to briefly review some of them, and with the indulgence of the house I would proceed to do so. I start by quoting from an article and editorial appearing in a paper on the west coast.

I quote from the *Cowichan Leader* of Duncan, British Columbia, for December 30, 1954:

If we could wish Canada any one thing in particular for the New Year it would be a record-breaking immigration wave . . .

We need immigrants. We can never develop fully without many millions more. The year 1955 is a good time to start, now that we are taking the lid off our large treasure house of resources.

And from the east of Canada, quoting editorially from the *Truro, Nova Scotia, News* of January 3, 1955:

The case for immigration is simple. In peacetime, "New Canadians" mean enlarged domestic markets for Canadian products barred by restrictive trade practices from export markets . . .

In wartime . . . "New Canadians" are a source of strength to this country's manpower resources.

Then the *Kelowna Courier* of June 21, 1954, states editorially:

Canada needs more, not fewer immigrants; indeed it is ridiculously underpopulated at present, and this is reflected in a domestic market which is so small as to hamper both industry and agriculture. The Okanagan, for instance, would have no marketing problem if Canada had a population of thirty or forty million.

And from the *Bowmanville, Ontario, Canadian Statesman* of January 21, 1954:

A greater population for Canada affords the solution of so many national problems, that it astounds thinkers on the subject that it is not more vigorously attacked and pursued by government on all levels.

The *Hamilton Spectator* of March 7, 1955, states editorially:

Canada can now produce far more than our people can consume. The larger our population, the larger the Canadian market—and the more jobs and better pay.

Then the *Swift Current, Saskatchewan, Sun*, of February 10, 1954, states editorially:

So long as immigration progresses at a snail's pace, economic independence for Canada from the vagaries of the export market will not soon be realized.

Why this timidity about immigration? Surely people, and more people and still more people is the only answer to the problem of markets.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Charles Daley, minister of labour in Ontario, is quoted in the *Port Arthur News-Chronicle* of December 29, 1954, as follows:

Canada needs more immigrants for her expanding economy, development of her domestic market and the spreading of her national overhead over more people.

Editorially the paper continues:

Such views are both sound and timely. Just how timely is indicated by Mr. Daley's statement that in Ontario alone, since 1949, over 350 new

[Mr. Crestohl.]

industries have been established by immigrants from the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany and other countries.

Number one target for tomorrow in Canada should be more people.

The *Montreal Star* of November 13, 1953, reports the statement of Mr. J. D. Ferguson, president of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, as follows:

Canadians are acting like a bunch of ostriches . . .

They depend on the sale of goods to other countries for 24 per cent of their income, and Americans for only six per cent.

Accordingly, Canada, to raise its standard, must either assure itself of its foreign markets and increase them, or else create a domestic market.

And from Ottawa, quoting the *Canadian Labour Journal* for January, 1954:

With some adjusting of our economy, and a larger population, a much greater home market could be developed in Canada which would free us to a great extent from our present dependence on foreign markets as outlets for our products.

It is interesting to observe, Mr. Speaker, that much of this vast wave of public opinion some 25 or 30 years ago opposed immigration into Canada. Of course the times have changed, and the circumstances and conditions today most certainly justify this change in public opinion.

Some labour circles, however, do not go completely along with these views. They seem to prefer a slower and more selective form of immigration. They are apprehensive that immigrants would crowd the labour market. I would like to say that I would be the first to oppose any move that might be harmful to the workers of this country. In this instance, however, I do not share their view, because they seem to place the emphasis on the immediate consequences of increased immigration, while I prefer to take the longer-range view.

It is true that there may be some pockets of employment during the adjustment period, although I feel that it would not be worse than it is at the present time. But in the long run, Mr. Speaker, immigration would prove to be a great boon not only to our labour force but to the over-all future of our country whose well-being is our first concern.

There seems to be a view that immigrants may deprive Canadians of their jobs. I would like to attempt to explode this bogey. In 1953 I believe some 200 fur workers in the Montreal area were unemployed. They blamed this on the government for having that year admitted 194,000 immigrants, among whom they said there were some 200 fur workers who grabbed their jobs at sacrifice salaries. They therefore urged that immigration to Canada be stopped.