

is bad. Immigration is good. The future of our country will depend on increased immigration.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Roche:** The population of our country is slightly over 22 million. Our net immigration is 60,000, and our fertility rate is 1.9 per cent. Taking those together, by the year 2000 the population of this country will be 30 million. That is a very small increase relative to world standards and the population situation.

When we look at immigration we must consider that there will only be a small increase over the next 25 years. Here I speak of those sections of the country that are not Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. I speak of large sections of the west which are now short of labour. They will be involved in mammoth projects, on which the future of our country will depend for productive capacity because of the role Canada can play in a changing world. By having an immigration policy that is restrictive, we do ourselves a disservice. If the green paper were escalated and there were positive results coming from it, we would be able to move on to a positive track with regard to immigration. It would be something the Canadian people would understand and accept at a moderate pace.

● (2130)

The need, as I see it, is for a positive approach to immigration, something which the Canadian people could understand and accept, in which case we would not be hearing so much about dissident elements which are being brought here and getting so many headlines because of circumstances which have nothing to do with immigration.

The minister would be well advised, in my opinion, to pay attention to the speech made by one of his hon. friends, the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), on November 26. He did not subscribe to the theory that immigration is inimical to the employment of Canadians. I thought he made a good speech. It came down to asking for an enlargement of immigration in a positive way, so as to help our country.

I have before me the results of a Gallup poll taken recently by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion. This is the question which was asked: If immigrants are brought in, do you think only those who have definite jobs to go to should be allowed to come to Canada, or do you think they should be allowed to come here and hunt up their own jobs? In answer to this question, 61 per cent of Canadians polled said that only those with jobs to go to should be allowed in, whereas, when the same question was asked in 1947 only 49 per cent gave a similar answer. So, there is a large increase in the number of Canadians who are taking a restrictive view with regard to immigration.

The type of bill before us, and the failure to take strong action against dissident elements, help to produce the kind of statistics I have cited, figures which encourage a lot of people to say that 61 per cent of Canadians are against immigration, when such is not the case at all. I ask for a firm immigration policy geared not primarily to economic needs, bearing in mind that skill and the availability of jobs are the prime ingredients of immigration today. I say

### *Immigration*

this policy discriminates against the non-white and the non-rich parts of the world. It does so in two ways: the general population of these areas is excluded from Canada by the present piecemeal immigration policies of the government, and further, under present arrangements only the most highly educated and skilled members of the population of those countries is welcome. Thus, we skim off the people most essential to the modernization of their own countries.

I recently heard the Secretary General of the United Nations speak on this very point, saying that the western countries—he did not mention Canada particularly—were responsible for a “brain drain” of the developing countries.

I am not saying we could solve the world population problem, or the problems of the developing nations by allowing increased immigration. What I am suggesting is that having an open society would enable Canada to become a bigger base, and thus be in a better position to assume our responsibilities to produce food, energy, shelter and clothing for a world whose population will double by the end of the century, and treble by the year 2050. I am suggesting we need a national immigration policy; we need to move forward more quickly than we are doing and help Canadians understand how important immigration is to the future of our country.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I find this bill both confusing and amusing. The bill is a simple thing. It says that people who have been deported cannot re-enter the country without fear of being put in jail or fined. I presume it depends on how rich they are whether they are fined or put into jail.

This is just an indication that the Department of Immigration is in very bad shape. This is not the type of legislation used in other countries. What we are saying, is that we have no means of stopping people coming back to this country, but if they do come back and are caught here they will be subject to this law, which says that if they do not have the money to pay a fine they will be entitled to room and board here for a period of a year and a day. Well, Mr. Speaker, it may cost us between \$3,500 and \$10,000 to keep an immigrant here as our guest for a year. Surely the government can come up with a better system than this.

Few people swim to Canada, so they must come by some other method, unless they enter from the United States. They probably come here by air. All such people are scrutinized, and if the Department of Immigration is aware of who is coming before a plane lands, it will probably be able to carry out a fairly extensive check.

If a person travels from Canada to the United States, and is on the black list of the United States government, it is very doubtful whether he will be able to pass through customs. I am not sure how they work this but I know that they ask you your name at the border and where you come from. It is likely that in certain circumstances they will ask you to step inside for a few moments. Then they run a check through a computer, and if you are on the “do not ship” list you are shipped back where you came from—they ship you, anyway.

It seems to me we should be using a system which would prevent the entry of deportees rather than supplying them