

Mr. GLEN: I am not dealing with the admissions to Canada but with the problem before us, namely, the question of deportation, because the hon. member for Eglinton has based his argument on British subjects, and I am pointing out what has been the experience with regard to immigrants coming in over a period of fifteen years. The whole basis of the argument I am submitting here is that if the amendment is carried we may be faced with the very same condition of affairs with regard to immigrants as has been threatened in the last fifteen years. More than that; in these days, after a war of six years, when the health of the people is necessarily lower than it was before, special care will have to be taken with regard to these people. I am informed by competent medical men that though an immigrant may to all appearances be well, and may pass the medical test, in one, two or three years diseases may appear which were latent in his body but would only come to light after a lapse of time.

Mr. FRASER: He should have the X-ray examination overseas.

Mr. GLEN: They have, I know, a pretty fair inspection. But I am also told in this connection that a person might have tuberculosis and might apparently be cured of it, could come before a medical inspection board and be passed; yet the disease might develop again within a period of two or three years. The same thing occurs in connection with mental cases.

When I say I am looking at these matters from the point of view of Canada I mean I am taking the position that Canada wants men of sound bodies and sound minds to come in here, and I am quite sure that no hon. member would wish it to be otherwise, because the results, as we know them through many records of people with mental disease coming into the country, are simply appalling. I have here a book entitled "The Fruit of the Family Tree". I got it from the library. It deals, among other things, with the famous case of the Jukes family in the United States. It tells the melancholy tale of Max Juke, a lazy New England vagabond, born nearly two hundred years ago.

The original record of these 1,200 social scourges reads as follows: 300 died in infancy; 310 professional paupers; 440 wrecked by disease; 50 prostitutes; 60 thieves; 7 murderers; 53 other criminals.

In another book, "The family and the Nation", by Whetham, dealing with the same matter, it is said:

One such case has been investigated fully that of the notorious "Jukes" family in the United States of America. The pedigree contains some 830 known individuals, all descended from five sisters born about 1760. A large proportion of these individuals have been in prison, some of them for serious crimes. Frequently the women have consorted with criminals. Many of the race have been paupers, partially or wholly supported by the country. The total direct loss to the state caused by this one family has been calculated as about £260,000 while the indirect loss cannot be estimated.

Is it any wonder that I, charged with the administration of immigration into this country, should look with a great deal of disfavour on the amendment proposed by the hon. member to-night? I would wish that the immigration department should be strengthened in order that it might protect the people of this country, when I reflect on such an illustration as the history of this family and what one insane person coming to a country and procreating, may mean to the state.

In this connection may I also say that certainly the amendment moved by the hon. member should take into account the obligations of the provincial governments. They are charged with the maintenance of mental institutions. The cost of these, as everyone knows, is enormous. Why should they not be consulted, because they would be more directly affected than we as a federal government would be?

It seems to me, therefore, that this amendment—and I wish to speak of it only on its merits—should not be accepted by the committee; and I think in the light of what I have said with regard to the soundness of it the committee will support my view that it should not be accepted.

Coming back to the original argument on the amendment, I cannot understand how anyone in the light of that amendment can read it otherwise than that a person who makes application, coming into this country, can be admitted to citizenship if he has resided in Canada for a period of one year immediately preceding the date of the application and, in addition, where the applicant has served outside Canada in the armed forces of Canada during time of war or is a British subject within the meaning of section 28. The hon. gentleman made some point with regard to two exceptions and said that this was a third exception. I do not think anyone in the committee is likely to object to the two exceptions of the applicant who has served outside Canada in the armed forces of Canada, or who is the wife of and resides in Canada with a Canadian citizen and has also resided in Canada for a further period of not less than