

year which are published quarterly by the Department of Manpower and Immigration.

The most recent quarterly immigration bulletin, that for the period ended September 30, shows Chinese immigration from Asia as down by 2,423 landed immigrant admissions. I ask hon. members to compare the picture for the first nine months of 1969 with that for the first nine months of 1970. The number admitted in the first nine months of 1969 was 6,655, whereas the number admitted in the first nine months of this year was 4,232. Having regard to the thousands of refugees in Hong Kong who are desirous of coming to Canada, the trickle admitted to this country during the whole of 1969—the figure is 8,272—is being cut to less than two-thirds in the present year. There was also a decline in 1968 as compared with 1969, but it was only by 110.

The minister may tell us that the points system is in part responsible for the dramatic decrease I have indicated, but I do not really think so since there are thousands of Chinese who could easily pass the points test if they were given a positive opportunity to apply, be interviewed and be screened. But the attitude of the department is one of negation and brush-off for the most part.

Virtually every Canadian is aware nowadays that one of the best possible types of immigrant to Canada is a refugee of Chinese origin from Hong Kong. He may bring little or much with him, but in either event he fits easily into the Canadian pattern. He is welcomed into the already established Chinese communities and is able to integrate his customs smoothly with Canadian ways and customs. Whether he is skilled or unskilled, it is seldom you will find him unemployed no matter what the economic difficulties of Canada may be at any given time. The current recession is thus no excuse for processing fewer applicants in Hong Kong. These immigrants, if anything, lend momentum toward overcoming a recession.

I know our immigration office in Hong Kong claims it has no Canadian method of screening applicants for security; that it has to rely on the Hong Kong police force, and that this force will only process so many applicants per month. I hope the minister or his Parliamentary Secretary are not going to claim that the quota to our Canadian office by the Hong Kong police force has been diminished by that authority. If so, the minister should be soundly condemned for not making the necessary contract with the Hong Kong police so that they could employ extra police officers for the sole purpose of checking out prospective immigrants to Canada and obtaining more of them. The minister's department could always have greatly increased the flow to Canada by the simple device of making such a contract.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

• (11:10 p.m.)

It is my understanding that the Hong Kong police force has always been ready, willing and able to help their surplus population emigrate to Canada but that they can only do so much for nothing, particularly for the Canadian immigration office. The Immigration Act and its regulations speak, in theory, of non-discrimination, but in reality there are many means of practising discrimination. The apparent chop-off of Chinese immigration is *prima facie* evidence of discrimination in practice. Let the minister explain the reason or reasons, if he can. The question demands an immediate answer.

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has done some homework before rising to his feet in the House tonight, he would have discovered that the pattern of decline in immigration during the first nine months of the year is not a peculiarity of Chinese immigration but a characteristic in the immigration pattern of a number of countries, particularly European countries. Therefore, it has nothing to do with Chinese immigration per se; it is an established fact that is beyond the control of the department.

If the hon. member had proceeded further with his homework before raising the question of discrimination, as he did, he might have discovered that the Chinese communities of Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton, Sarnia, Burlington, Orillia and Peterborough, in a memorandum submitted to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) in June, 1969, had this to say:

—we more than welcomed the coming into force of the new immigration regulations on October 1, 1967. The new regulations took away the last vestige of discrimination against Asians and Africans on the face of the law as the former special sponsoring privileges given to Europeans were revoked—This is a positive step towards an objective standard and a far cry from the days of head taxes and the Chinese Exclusion Act. The Liberal government should be commended for this achievement.

As every student of our immigration policy knows, the regulations of 1967 have broadened considerably the categories of persons eligible to be called forward by their relatives in Canada. The upsurge in applications for previously excluded relatives is now levelling off and this process is beginning to become evident. The fact is that there is no increase in the number of applications awaiting processing in Hong Kong.

Mr. Dinsdale: I have six waiting.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.16 p.m.