

### *Immigration*

some time during each year. In my view the minister's suggestion just is not possible.

It is not just the act which decides how many people are to be permitted into the country. After all, how did we get these wide fluctuations about which I talked? The act has not been amended in at least ten years, so how did that occur? In my view, it is done in two ways. First, it is done by the staffing.

● (2020)

If the government or the department were to decide we were getting too many immigrants from, say, Hong Kong, all the government has to do, and I am not saying it is wrong for the government to do this, without changing the act or the regulations at all, is to cut the staff in Hong Kong or in any other country in half, and the number of people who come in for any one year from that area will be cut by half. If we want to increase the number of immigrants, increase the staff. I would not say the government has acted wrongly, or done a poor job. I am saying that if we think about this realistically, this is all that needs to be done—it is one way in which it can be done.

The other way is by tightening or loosening the regulations. I looked today at the copy of the regulations which I have. There are 45 pages of regulations. It is under these regulations that decisions about individual cases are made. These regulations never come before parliament. They are made within the department, and presumably passed by the cabinet through orders in council. Changes are made without consultation with outside opinion, whenever thought desirable. Very few people know what is in the regulations. It is extremely difficult to keep up with them. My hon. friend from Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has had more experience in this field, to my knowledge, than any other member of parliament regardless of party, but even he finds difficulty keeping up with them. By changing these regulations it is possible to change the whole system. Let me illustrate this by outlining the changes in just one regulation which I think I understand. It is the regulation dealing with employment.

At one time if a person wanted to come to Canada and had all the necessary qualifications—the right age, the right sex, the appropriate education, and prior job training—he could get the points required under the points system and be allowed in. But at the same point—I am not sure precisely when this change was made—it was decided that no person could come to Canada unless he had a job offer. This worked for a while until a couple of years ago when it was felt—and quite frankly, I believe, it was necessary—that the regulations should be tightened up again. And suddenly the regulation about employment was changed. Not only did a prospective immigrant have to have a job offer but he had to have a job offer which the National Employment Service could certify that no person living in Canada wanted to take. Just think of the changes which have taken place—from no requirement for employment to the requirement that you have a job offer, to a requirement that you have a job offer that no person living in Canada wants to take. I am not saying those decisions were necessarily wrong.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mine is an ethnic constituency. I suppose 90 per cent of them are working people, and they are worried even though they themselves are the children or grandchildren of immigrants or, in some cases, immigrants themselves. Although few of their families have been here longer than three generations they are concerned about employment and they tell you "We have to cut down on immigration." I sympathize with them and, in fact, I agree with them. I do not fault the government for cutting back on immigration, given the economic plight of Canada at the present time. My point is that all this was done by civil servants, by bureaucratic decision. I do not think this is a good way in which to operate. The people of Canada have a right to know why governments are doing things and they have to have a right to express themselves, as they can under a democratic system, in favour of, or in opposition to, the way things are done. So much for the way the system works.

I want to draw attention now to a couple of clauses in the bill which make it very uneasy, uncertain whether we should vote for the bill or not. Let me refer to clause 111(2) which says:

An immigration officer may require persons who seek admission to Canada and persons in Canada other than Canadian citizens to comply with such regulations as are prescribed providing for the identification of such persons by means of fingerprints or photographs—

Even with the shortening of the qualifying period it still takes three years before a person can apply for citizenship. I believe that when a person is admitted to Canada and is given landed immigrant status he is entitled to all the rights and privileges of a citizen. If we are placing certain restrictions on people who are not citizens, there have to be very good reasons. What is the necessity for requiring not only persons who seek admission but persons who are already in Canada as landed immigrants but who are not yet citizens, to be subject to this provision? Remember, there are people who come to Canada and who, for what they consider to be good reasons, do not become citizens.

**Mr. Alexander:** Some have been here for 50 years.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Yes. Some have been here for a long time. I myself wish they would become citizens but I respect their right to make their own decision, and I cannot imagine why this provision should be here. If the minister and his officials were not going to use that clause, why put it in? Was it simply to give some future minister or civil servant use of that provision? I cannot accept that.

● (2030)

Let me turn to another provision, clause 104(2). It provides:

Every peace officer in Canada . . . may, without the issue of a warrant, an order or a direction for arrest or detention, arrest and detain or arrest and make an order to detain

(a) for an inquiry, any person who on reasonable grounds is suspected of being a person referred to in—

Then follow some subparagraphs.

—or

(b) for removal from Canada, any person against whom a removal order has been made that is to be executed—