

immigration set-up in bringing into this country 2,900 Poles without a scientific medical examination; brought in without being X-rayed, then X-rayed after they were brought here. Do you know what it is costing Canada today for hospitalization for these people? It is costing more than \$450 a day, and we are told that will continue for three months. How long must we continue to pay out almost \$500 a day because of the inefficiency of the immigration department which, bringing in even so few as 3,000 could not carry into effect ordinary medical examination principles in order to protect our country? I am not going into all the details, but I have worked it out. Bringing in all these men, many of whom will be charges on this country, will cost us, in hospitalization alone, over \$100,000 during the coming year.

Mr. MUTCH: Don't we owe them something?

Mr. HOMUTH: Oh, don't be facetious.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: Last year I elevated my hon. friend to the position of parliamentary under-secretary; I appointed him but he is still disappointed. But, sir, I was dealing with the argument, which is defended by my hon. friend, that there is efficiency in a department that fails to exercise ordinary medical care in bringing immigrants into this country.

With regard to policy, there is just one other matter. What about the Japanese? Are we going to face that problem? Oh, no, postpone and procrastinate. The Japanese policy is going to be embalmed in orders in council which are to be attached to the omnibus resolution. The whole question of the Japanese policy will remain undetermined for another year, because the orders in council attached to the omnibus resolution deal with the matter of distribution throughout Canada, with the denial of the right of Japanese to fish on the coast, and all the other regulations made during the period of the war. That is another subject that should be faced, but it will not be faced for another year, certainly not before December 31 of this year.

Now, sir, here is the position of affairs. The regulations governing the Chinese are to remain in order in council form. Why should this question not be determined once and for all? As the hon. member for Vancouver South said, it is so easy to alter an order in council after parliament gives the government authority under the general powers. As the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) pointed out, the minister said that this was a first step. A first step where? A first step in what direction? No one knows in which direction the first step is being taken. No one

has any realization or any conception of the stand on Chinese immigration the government intends to take after it secures the repeal of the exclusion act. We have a right to demand that the immigration policy for this country be made more certain and more effective than can be the case through the instrumentality of order in council. Let us face the whole issue, the question of Chinese, the question of Japanese, the question of a general immigration policy, the question of what parliament believes is necessary in order to secure for Canada the destiny we believe to be hers. I repeat what I said in the beginning. Let us be very careful that in passing this legislation in its present form we do not place the Dominion of Canada in the position where we may have to appear before the united nations and prove to the satisfaction of the world that in fact we are not discriminating against any race and proceeding contrary to our pledged word. We accepted responsibilities under the united nations. We do not discharge them by lip service and then neglecting to act on its idealism. We do not practise its principles by intolerance. This country is great on the basis of the number of her races and the diversity of her religions. Canada can never achieve greatness on the basis of intolerance. Mutual respect, forbearance, and strict adherence to the principles and ideals of the united nations are necessary. Otherwise a year ago last fall, when we solemnly dedicated this country to the maintenance of peace by the removal of discrimination in all parts of the world, by the raising of standards everywhere, we were merely giving lip service to a principle we never hoped or dared to hope we would carry into effect.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): I listened very carefully to what was said by the hon. member who has just spoken, and I should like to know if he is of the same opinion with respect to immigration as the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green).

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. L. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, in commencing, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) upon what I thought was a most admirable and tolerant speech he made this afternoon. I believe that he made an exposition of where most British Columbian members stand on this question facing us tonight, and did it as well as I have ever heard it