

Supply—Citizenship and Immigration

been Canadian citizens for many years—some of them, as I pointed out last night, were born Canadians—are yet under a definite disability in comparison with others when it comes to the question of bringing in their relations. There is an extremely strict limitation, a strict quota, of only 250 a year now applied to the admission of relatives of Canadian citizens of East Indian origin.

The result of that policy is that these men who have been here for many years, who are first-class citizens making a real contribution to the development of our country, running large and prosperous farms, large and prosperous lumber mills—I am speaking particularly of conditions in British Columbia—and providing employment to their own families and such relatives as they have in the country as well as to other Canadians, are yet unable to bring in their relatives, a right which is extended within limits of degrees of relationship to all other Canadian citizens. It is extended even to those Canadian citizens who have been here only just long enough to become Canadian citizens namely for the five-year period necessary. They can bring in their relatives provided they can guarantee them employment and provided that their relatives come within the classes of relatives admissible under the regulations. There is no quota applied to them. They can bring them in up to any number, provided they meet those requirements. But in the case of these Canadian citizens of East Indian origin who have been here for many years—in some cases the families have been here for from 30 to 40 years—and have otherwise complied with the regulations, they cannot bring in their relatives because of this extremely limited quota of 250 a year. I believe there is necessity for a review of that situation.

I believe that there could be quite easily worked out a more generous and a broader policy with ample safeguards with respect to the preservation of the ethnic balance in Canada—which would enable us to bring in further valuable citizens and still ensure that there would be no danger of any disproportionate amount of immigration from eastern countries.

Mr. Chairman, these are a few comments on some of the weaknesses which I believe exist in present government policy. They are of a rather general nature but then, as I have pointed out, it is not easy to be specific when the minister himself, with respect to the government's program of immigration, was not at all specific last night.

There are one or two other considerations arising out of his statement which I wish he would clear up for us. Last night the

minister told us that 194,000 entered Canada in 1951 and that the figure for 1952 of 164,000 represented a substantial decrease from that peak figure. In reviewing the annual statement of his department I find it stated in two places that there were 211,200 immigrants in the period under review. I was wondering whether the minister—

Mr. Harris: That is the fiscal year. The figures I gave last night were for the calendar year.

Mr. Fulton: The minister points out that this report deals with the fiscal year whereas the statement deals with the calendar year. That would perhaps account for the difference.

There is another matter which I would hope he would clear up. That is with respect to the figures he gave. I am reading now from the text of his statement. I have not it in *Hansard* before me but it is on the third page of his text, at the end of the second complete paragraph on that page, where the minister states:

In the final months of the year, while the number of arrivals was substantial . . . with the number of dependents in each of the final three months of the year exceeding the number of those coming here as workers. The figures were 15,616 dependents and 11,944 workers.

That makes a total of 26,000. Does that mean 26,000 per month? The minister referred to that number in each of the final three months, and that would be an unusually high figure. In fact it would exceed any monthly total for the year 1951, which we were told was the peak year. Is that 26,000 per month or 26,000 for the final three months?

Mr. Harris: For the final three months.

Mr. Fulton: I do not want to get into a question-and-answer type of discussion at this stage, although I do want to have these particular difficulties cleared up. I would also appreciate a statement when the minister replies as to the effect which they anticipate in the department will be felt with respect to immigration from European countries by the difficulty he mentioned which is going to stand in the way of immigration from the United Kingdom. I refer to the shortage of shipping. The minister pointed out that on account of the numbers going over to the coronation and booking return passages the availability of accommodation for immigrants was expected to be considerably curtailed. Is that expected to stand in the way of or to create difficulties with respect to immigration from continental Europe, or is it to be an obstacle only in the way of immigration from the United Kingdom?