

*Supply—Citizenship and Immigration*

reference was made, also, to the assisted passage scheme in respect of the United Kingdom, with which I shall now deal.

The assisted passage scheme was instituted for the purpose of providing the means of admitting to Canada persons with certain skills who were needed, and on the basis that these persons would not have the money with which to purchase transportation. The classes of persons who from time to time would qualify applied to all countries in which we used the assisted passage plan. That is, if we said that a person in the United Kingdom who was a nurse's aide could have the benefit of assisted passage, we said also that a person in a similar position in another country could have the benefit of assisted passage, because there was need in this country for such persons. It is true that the people in the United Kingdom who have come forward have not used the assisted passage scheme to anything like the extent that it has been used by others from continental Europe. But that is only to be expected, because people in the United Kingdom have more money and more means than those on the continent. In particular I think it is fair to say that the people of Germany have literally no means whatever. If we desire to have them here, and if they have the qualifications we want, then it is to be expected that they will apply in greater numbers than any others for assisted passage.

With respect to the persons in British Columbia of East Indian origin, it is true that there is a restriction on the number of people of that particular origin who can be admitted from the east. In 1950 they were restricted to those persons who were admissible under P.C. 2115, namely the unmarried children under 18 of Canadian citizens resident here, or the wife of a Canadian citizen. Since that time we have successively extended the group to take care of the husband, unmarried children up to 19, then up to 21 and later up to 25 under certain circumstances. I have forgotten who it was, but this afternoon someone said that the admissible groups here are those 19, and under certain circumstances 21. That is not so; the admissible group is up to 21, and under certain circumstances up to 25.

**Mr. Fulton:** They are all subject to an over-all quota?

**Mr. Harris:** That is not subject to quota; that is absolute. All those people can come in under P.C. 2115. But in addition to that 150 other persons may come from India, 100 more from Pakistan and 50 from Ceylon. As was pointed out this afternoon, we have not met that total number of 300 because of

difficulties which occurred in finding a suitable staff to go to India. We finally found a staff late last year. I expect that this year will see that number coming close to the quota. I am told that there are hardly any coming from Ceylon, so that to the extent of that 50 we may not meet the quota. Indeed, it may not be so even in the case of Pakistan, but I am quite satisfied that the number from India will, this year, be to the limit permissible.

When the hon. member suggested that these people are not permitted to bring their relatives out, I suggest he is not being entirely accurate, although I know he has no intention of not being so. This quota, if I may call it that because in fact it is, has only been in existence now for the past two years. There have been certain operating difficulties, but we are gaining experience in dealing with it. I should like to point out the persons who did come during 1951, the last figures I have. In 1951 there was one spouse of a person here; one child; seven fiancées; 14 parents, brothers and sisters; and 127 other groups.

The other groups were made up as follows: married children, 24; sisters, brothers and brothers-in-law, 24; nephews and nieces, 35; cousins, 16; grandchildren, 5; grandnephew, 1. Then there was employer application for specific purposes, 8. There was an adjustment of temporary status of persons already here who had not been properly landed, 10; and there were four more who in fact were in the country illegally, and we then regularized their papers. This brought the total to 127. I suggest that that catalogue of relatives is indicative of the type of immigration we will have when this really begins to function a little more successfully than it has up to the present time. The lack of success has been wholly due to our inability to find a staff, but the staff is now there and working in New Delhi.

The other question raised was that of a Chinese Canadian who wants to bring forward his children. I only speak of it because of the reference made by the hon. member for Kootenay West to the X-ray procedures. The committee should remember that the use of X-rays for determining age is only resorted to after an inspection has been made of the applicant by our staff in Hong Kong, and that person has been rejected as a result of the investigation. I discussed this with the head of the Hong Kong immigration office, Mr. Peters, when he was here on leave. I have checked Mr. Peters' work from time to time. I am thoroughly satisfied that Mr. Peters is a highly competent immigration

[Mr. Harris.]