

*Supply—Manpower and Immigration*

criteria. I have wondered, since the minister announced the points system, whether John A. Macdonald would have qualified for admission to this country. I have my doubts.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I have a suggestion to make to the minister in this regard. If a prospective immigrant has relatives already established in Canada who are willing to vouch for him, he should be given a great deal better treatment than such people are receiving today. I have a good many immigration cases, as many other members have. I realize that the minister has used his prerogative as often as he possibly could. I hope he will continue to use it and that the kindness and compassion which he possesses will continue to be an instrument of our immigration policy.

If a person has relatives in Canada and the prospect of being self-supporting, surely that person should be allowed to enter. There are a great many cases of hardship caused by the refusal to allow relatives of people already established to come to Canada. I feel that sometimes the government is participating in the separation of families. This is an area where the minister can override some of these rigid regulations. I quite understand that an employee of the branch must apply the regulations, but the minister has a special prerogative. He is full of kindness and it should be applied in these cases. As Canadians and as human beings, Mr. Chairman, we cannot subscribe to a policy of heartlessness in connection with immigration. I ask the minister to consider these suggestions seriously because these matters are weighing heavily on thousands of Canadians today.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Waterloo South is going to deal, on behalf of this party, with that aspect of the minister's speech and estimates relating to manpower. I propose, if I may, to discuss the aspects of the minister's responsibilities which affect immigration. Before I do so, however, I should like to say one word in strong support of the position of the acting leader of the opposition in connection with the three year rule and the hardship it is causing to many of the very people the minister says the policies of this government are seeking to aid. I refer particularly to the immigrants who are brought into this country under a policy which the minister says is designed to add their skills and abilities to the labour pool and to assist not only the people themselves but the whole productive potentiality of this country. However, as the

hon. member for Ontario said, under the three year rule the number of people available for training in my city of Toronto has been cut in half. This is a tragedy for some of these people.

It is true, as the minister remarked, that these people are eligible for training, but they are not eligible for any allowances. This means that they have to go on relief. They cannot take any job that is available to them because they cannot retrain themselves so as to gain the skills that are necessary. One aspect of this matter concerns the younger people of high school age who need special instruction in English in order to qualify themselves to go to school. These are the children of immigrants, 15 or 16 years of age, who are wisely invited by the government to come to this country. Naturally they need to brush up on their English. However, the government gives no support at all to the special schools that exist to try to help these younger immigrants to qualify.

This seems to me to be a case of the left hand of the minister having no idea of what his right hand is doing. On the one hand, he tells us it is the policy of his department to aid immigrants who come to this country. On the other hand, his department introduces regulations which result in many of these recent immigrants having no opportunity for training or to become productive members of this country. The minister's actions and his words are totally inconsistent with each other.

I propose to turn now to the question of immigration as such rather than manpower. The minister, with his natural and unassuming modesty, has somehow or other prevailed upon himself to praise the policy of the immigration branch in such glowing terms that even if I had something nice to say about it I would not find it necessary to do so. It is true that the changes in the regulations, the introduction of the points system, the introduction of legislation establishing a new appeal court, are all steps forward. Exactly how they are going to work, no one is quite sure yet. I am still a little dubious about the points system.

As I understand it, you get 15 points if the immigration officer thinks you look as if you may have personal initiative. I do not know if I could ever persuade an immigration officer that I had personal initiative. How is he going to tell? By the gleam in a man's eye? I would hate to be examined somewhere and told: You have passed all the written examinations but I can tell by looking at you that you have no personal initiative and