

Immigration Appeal Board Act

the Punjab, an East Indian community and a significant Chinese community. It is interesting to note that on the west coast we have the second largest Chinatown in North America. They have made a unique and interesting contribution. Thank God they have not melted themselves into some sort of morpous North America. They continue to contribute in many interesting ways to the mosaic and originality of this country.

I am delighted that the provisions with regard to the right of sponsors to appeal has been preserved. If we ever depart from the principle of reunification of families, if we decide it is not right that we should seek a family unit even though parts of a family may be in many places of the world, that would be a sad thing. After all, we travel to international conferences and continually complain to communist countries for sealing their borders and not allowing families to be reunited. I had the privilege of attending the most recent Interparliamentary Union conference with the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) who led the delegation. He was successful in persuading the communist countries to accept the principle of reunification of families. I am glad we are continuing to be generous in this area.

I am delighted with the emergency provisions. Let us keep describing them as emergency provisions, because we need an over-all reassessment of the need for immigration in this country. There are many things that are right about what we have had, but a complete review is long overdue. I congratulate the minister for coming out with a very practical and sensible solution to the emergency situation which we have.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will be as brief as I can. I simply want to say this is one of the few occasions in my almost eight years in parliament that I have felt such a deep spirit of co-operation among all parties to get on with solutions to one of the serious problems in this country. From my personal experience, having been directly involved, I was gratified to see the degree of support this bill appears to have, at least at this stage. Whenever I get in this mood, of course, I always fear the gods will descend and prove that one has to be immediately humbled. With the various things with which I am trying to cope, I am sure that will happen before too long, but I hope not in this area.

I want to deal with one or two items. First, I must admit to having noted a possible misinterpretation of meaning in my own remarks in *Hansard* which I made at the opening of the second reading debate on Wednesday. Either I did not explain myself clearly or there was an error in the printing. I refer to the first paragraph on page 4953 of *Hansard*. I will not bore hon. members by repeating what I said at that time; I simply want to make the point for those who wish to follow it up. I intended to indicate that the cases to be reviewed involve individuals who were in Canada prior to November 30. However, the statement which appears in *Hansard* indicates that they must have been awaiting the disposition of their appeal prior to November 30. That appears to exclude all persons whose

[Mr. Leggatt.]

appeals were entered subsequent to November 30. That, of course, is not the case; it is not the intention. This is slightly complicated. If one reads my comment today he will understand this is my intent. I want to be very precise so there will be no possibility within human competence to get off on the wrong foot. I do not think it is a major item but I want to correct it.

There have been many suggestions of a concrete nature in every speech I have listened to in this debate. As far as I can tell, the questions were quite legitimate and constructive. I will attempt to deal with these in detail and any others that arise when we get to committee, hopefully fairly soon. There is one other question of statistics that might be useful to correct now. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Arrol) mentioned the difficulties in connection with the new regulations issued in January and quoted a number of people who reported under the requirement for non-immigrants to register if they stayed over 90 days, and if they wished to work to apply for employment visas. At an earlier stage I had mentioned a figure of under 10,000. I was concerned about the rate of registration taking place at that time.

So that the record is clear—and I am sure the hon. member got this figure from my remarks—on that occasion there were, finally, just under 29,000 who came forward to register because of their stay of over 90 days. We applaud that. There were just under 20,000 employment visas. So there was a total of over 48,000 people by April of this year who took cognizance of and responded to this new requirement to register.

I will be seeking the support of all hon. members as a follow-up to this debate and when the bill is proclaimed to do what hon. members have suggested, namely, act as missionaries and advocates, particularly to the ethnic groups of this country, to make it clear that we intend to be very fair. We want the people affected to take advantage of this last opportunity to get their house in order and gain the opportunity to become full Canadian citizens and contribute as so many have in the past to the growth of our society.

I will work very closely with anyone who wants to help me on this. I appreciate the offers that have been made and I intend to follow them up. There will be a large publicity campaign. All the trimmings are now being put together, particularly with regard to contacting ethnic circles, ethnic leaders and the ethnic press. I will disclose the details as they unfold when we get further into that.

I wish to express my gratitude to all members who have participated in this debate. I think probably we can now put a package together that will get us out of the woods and many people out of the woodwork when this effort is completed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.