

which suffered heavily through the war, to assume responsibility for half of the totally blind, and their dependents, under the care of IRO. Israel and France also have shown great generosity in accepting the physically handicapped.

I hesitate to enlarge further on the operations of the International Refugee Organization, but one question which came up for consideration was what organization would replace the IRO when it had to pass out of existence. We were satisfied when it was decided by a vote in the third committee at Lake Success, and later in the plenary session, that a High Commissioner for Refugees should be appointed by the United Nations. He would be responsible for and have authority to deal with the legal status of refugees who came under the limited provisions of the IRO constitution. Other classes of refugees, too, may be included later by a vote of the United Nations. The expenses of administration will be a charge on the budget of the United Nations. The High Commissioner will be empowered to handle moneys for maintenance or other care, which must be furnished by contributions from sympathetic countries, organizations or individuals, and he will be called upon to report to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

It was somewhat difficult for countries such as Pakistan and India, who have numerous problems of their own, to accept the responsibility of maintaining an office for a High Commissioner whose sole duty is to deal with European refugees; but they finally agreed to do so.

The problem is certainly not yet solved, but we have seen a very satisfactory result of a great humanitarian effort, an effort which has meant a new life to hundreds of thousands.

**Hon. Vincent Dupuis:** Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator from Rockcliffe for having brought this question before the Senate. In rising to speak on the resolution I intend to discuss only one angle of the immigration question. I think everyone will admit that the best "immigrants" are those born to Canadian parents. I do not know if family allowances are helping to increase the number of such "immigrants", but perhaps my good friend the leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) will be able to inform me on that point.

In my opinion the best type of people to bring into this country are children of, let us say, seven to fourteen years of age, from any country whatever which shares our ideology. By placing them in farmers' families or any other families willing to adopt children

we are likely to avoid the trouble and danger of deportation proceedings, which sometimes have to be taken against people who came here as adults imbued with subversive ideas and philosophies to which we are opposed.

In recommending the immigration of children I am speaking from experience. I have observed—and no doubt the experience of all honourable senators is similar—that when young boys or girls from other lands are placed in Canadian families they soon become adapted to our way of life and grow up to be good citizens, ready to fight, if necessary, for their adopted country. In my own home and neighbourhood I have seen many children who, brought over from England, France, Belgium and other countries by certain organizations, within three or four years, or five at the most, became helpful to the families that adopted them and assets to this country. I know a man who today occupies a very important position in Montreal and is one of our best citizens, but who was brought into my district as an immigrant at the age of eight.

If I may be allowed, I would suggest that the Committee on Immigration study the possibility of bringing in children between the ages of seven and fourteen and, with the assistance of the provincial governments, placing them in families. I have nothing to say against the present policy of admitting adults to this country, but I am sure that the bringing in of children would greatly benefit Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I would like to speak on the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Then perhaps my honourable friend will speak now.

**Hon. John T. Haig:** Honourable senators, I enter into this debate with a great deal of diffidence. First I wish to pay my compliments to the senator from Rockcliffe (Hon. Mrs. Wilson). There is no person in Canada by whom this resolution could have been better proposed to the Senate.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** For two or more sessions she has been Chairman of the Committee on Immigration, of which I had the honour to be a member, and she handled the committee's work well, better than most men would have done. She knows the subject of immigration, and has a very sympathetic heart towards it.

I am altogether in favour of the resolution, but with the greatest respect, I do wish to point out a few difficulties that occur to me. Canada's area and resources are such that