CANADIAN IMMIGRATION POLICY AND PRACTICE

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION POLICY AND PRACTICE:

SOME SOCIOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

BY

ROBERT BRUCE LAWRENCE, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

MASTER OF ARTS
(Sociology)

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Canadian Immigration Policy and Practice: Some Sociological Implications

AUTHOR: R. BRUCE LAWRENCE

SUPERVISOR: Dr. P.C. PINEO

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 305

SCOPE AND CONTENTS:

In the 'Vertical Mosaic', John Porter noted that a considerable flow of post war immigrants to Canada were highly skilled and educated. During the mid-1960's the major functional requirements of the Canadian social system as it affected immigration was the requirement for increasing proportions of skilled and educated immigrants to meet the skill demands of Canada's booming economy.

As a result of this, it was hypothesized that

1. there would be an increasing proportion of immigrants intending higher occupational class levels,
2. race and ethnicity would be progressively reduced as a criterion for selecting immigrants,
3. family connection would be less of a factor in selecting immigrants intending to enter the labour force.

It was found that the basis for realizing these expected changes had been written into the Immigration Regulations; especially in the amendments to the Immigration Act of 1962 and 1967. With the introduction, in 1967, of the points system for selecting immigrants, racial and ethnic discrimination was officially eradicated as a criterion governing the

admission of immigrants. Instead 'independent' applicants were to be selected on the basis of skills, education, occupational demand, area demand and some other factors. It was suggested that the two most important criteria which would ultimately determine an immigrant's admissibility were 'occupational demand' and the 'area demand' for that occupation. Also, under a separate points system 'nominated' relatives were also subject to skills and educational selection criteria as well.

The hypotheses were generally confirmed. It was found that the skill levels of immigrants in the 1960's had increased very dramatically. The proportion of immigrants who had formerly been discriminated against the most, racially and ethnically, had also increased considerably. In the case of family oriented immigration, it appeared that the proportion of nominated immigrants may have decreased considerably.

In accounting for these expected changes several factors were noted. However it must be stressed that due to the wide scope of the research that many new hypothesis were suggested and much further research proposed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to very sincerely thank all the persons whose critical comments and suggestions contributed to the presentation of this thesis. In particular I would like to mention the following people. Dr. Peter C. Pineo, the chairman of my committee, carefully reviewed extensive passages of prose and made many very helpful comments. My discussions with him helped me clarify some ideas while abandoning others. To Dr. Frank E. Jones and Dr. J. Rosenblum, I am indebted for their reading of the thesis and their critical comments concerning my usage of theory and the subsequent analysis. To Hanne M. Lawrence, I am indebted for reading and re-reading long passages of prose and her many useful, critical suggestions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
CHAPTER 1:	Background, Theoretical Perspective, and Data Collection	4
	Background	4
	Theoretical Perspective	12
	The Functional Requirement for Trained and Educated Workers	14
	Hypothesis 1	17
	Hypothesis 2 and 3	18
	Hypothesis 4	20
	The Three Major Selection Principles	20
	a. Occupational Groups	22
	b. Racial and Ethnic Status Groups	23
	c. Family Connection	25
	Data Collection	26
CHAPTER 2:	The Three Fundamental Principles of Canadian Immigration Management and Canadian Immigration Policy and Administrative Practice	27
	Selection by Occupational Groups	27
	a. Canadian Immigration Policy	27
	b. Administrative Practice	38
	Selection by Racial and Ethnic Status Group	43
	a. Canadian Immigration Policy	43
	(i) 1945-1962	
	- Most Favoured Immigrants: Status I	43
	- Favoured Immigrants: Status II, and Neutral Immigrants: Status III	45
	- Proscribed Immigrants: Status IV	48
	(ii) 1962-1970	53
	b. Administrative Practice	55
	Selection by Family Connection	69
	a. Canadian Immigration Policy	69
	b. Administrative Practice	72
	Summary	73
CHAPTER 3:	Selection by Occupational Groups and Resultant Immigration to Canada	78
	Hypothesis 1	78
	Methodology	78
	Findings	81
	Hypothesis 4	82
	a. Chart Series 1: Immigrants Intended Occupational Class by Ethnicity or Country of Former Residence	84
	Methodology	84
	Findings	86

b. Chart Series 2 and Chart Series 3: 93
(i) Chart Series 2: The Percentage of the Three Major Sources of an Intended Occupation 93
Findings 94
(ii) Chart Series 3: The Percentage Concentration of the Three Occupations Intended by Each Source of Immigration 102
Findings 102
Summary 109

CHAPTER 4: Selection by Racial and Ethnic Status Groups and Resultant Immigration to Canada 116
Hypothesis 2 116
a. Table 12: Immigration to Canada by Ethnic Groups: 1946-1970, and Chart Series 4: Ethnic Origins of Canadian Immigrants by Ethnic Status Groups: 1946-1966 118
b. Chart Series 5: Immigration to Canada by Area of Citizenship and Ethnic Status Group, and Chart Series 6: Extrapolated Immigration by Ethnic Status Group 128
(i) Chart Series 5 128
(ii) Chart Series 6 143
Summary 144

CHAPTER 5: Selection by Family Connection and Resultant Immigration to Canada 147
Hypothesis 3 147
Summary 156

CHAPTER 6: Summary and Conclusions 159

Bibliography 176

Appendixes 179

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Points Range of a Hypothetical Independent Immigrant Intending a Professional Occupation	32
2	Points Range of a Hypothetical Independent Immigrant Intending an Occupation with Low Educational and Skill Requirements	36
3	Immigration Offices, Location and Personnel by Ethnic Status Groups	56
4	Immigration Offices, Dates Opened and Closed by Ethnic Status Groups - 1970 (May 30)	64
5	Immigrants' Intended Occupations on a Collapsed, Adjusted Blishen Scale: 1958-1970	83
6	Differences in the Proportions of Immigrants Intending Each Occupational Class by Country of Former Residence	92
7	The Changes in Percentage Concentration of the Three Major Sources of Immigration of Each Major Intended Occupation in 1958 and 1970	95
8	Intended Occupations with a High Proportion of Immigrants from a Given Source	97
9	The Changes in Percentage Concentration of the Three Major Intended Occupations of Each Source of Immigration 1958 and 1970	103
10	The Three Major Intended Occupations of Immigrants from Italy, Greece and Portugal as Countries of Former Residence - 1960	107
11	The Percentage Difference of Immigrants Intending an Occupation in 1962 and in 1970	110
12	Immigration to Canada by Ethnic Status Group: 1946-1970	119
13	Immigration Backlog, All Countries, 1955-1959	150
14	Admissibility Criteria of Nominated Immigrants	154
15	Points Range of 'Low', 'Medium', and 'High' Skilled Nominated Immigrants	155

Introduction

In this thesis were analyzed the three major selection principles governing Canadian immigration policy and practice between 1947 and 1970. From inspection of Canadian post war immigration policy and practice, these principles were defined as selection by 'intended occupation', 'racial and ethnic status group', and 'family connection'. Their derivation constituted a major portion of the thesis and gave the hypotheses much more precise meaning.

The hypotheses resulted from the relationship between these immigrant selection principles and the Canadian social system functional requirement that the Canadian occupational structure needed highly educated professionals, trained technicians and skilled tradesmen for the rapidly expanding industrial economy of the 1950's and especially in the mid-1960's. As John Porter observed, Canada has always found it more expedient to import immigrants for these skilled positions instead of training enough native Canadians. As the first hypothesis it was expected that the occupational structure of post war Canadian immigrants would be progressively a much more highly skilled flow by intended occupational class levels and specific jobs intended in Canada.

One of the potentially most important predictions of structural functional theorists in sociology is that in industrializing or fully industrial economies with their highly stratified occupational structures, the functional requirement that workers be hired on the basis of merit tends to break down systems of privilege as the basis of recruitment.

One of the most persistent traditional systems of recruitment is by race or ethnicity with the higher status positions accruing to the favoured or allegedly 'superior' group. Thus in the early 1900's, large numbers of Chinese coolies were imported to Canada to do very heavy labour on railroad construction in western Canada. However, subsequently, Chinese and 'colored' immigrants generally were emphatically discouraged and couldn't gain entry in even very low 'entrance statuses'.

However with changes in Canada's immigration Regulations in the 1960's, racial and ethnic status discrimination as an immigrant selection criterion was officially eradicated. More highly skilled occupational criterion and sponsorship privileges were standardized for all possible sources of immigration. As the second hypothesis, it was expected that the racial and ethnic composition of Canada's immigration flow would be fundamentally restructured to include greater proportions of formerly restricted races and ethnicities, if the Federal government implemented the 'spirit' of the new policy.

Another traditional system of recruitment based on privilege is selection through family or kinship ties. Under Canadian immigration policy this meant sponsored immigrants, some of whom intended to enter the labour force. There was less control occupationally over the entry of these immigrants. With the possibility of a much lower skilled flow from this source, it was expected, as the third hypothesis, that this flow would be proportionately reduced, especially at the lowest skill levels, during the 1960's.

Also tested was John Porter's assertion that post war immigration tended to fit the Canadian social stratification "vertical mosaic" of

Germans, Scandinavians and Dutch nearest to the British in their high status occupational levels and Italians, Polish, Ukrainians, and groups from southeast Europe at the lowest levels. With the immigration policy changes in the 1960's, as the fourth hypothesis, it was expected that this 'mosaic' would be restructured upwards as immigrants from all origins gained entry in higher 'entrance statuses'.

To help test the hypotheses, I developed six Chart Series and sixteen Tables. All six Chart Series and nine of the Tables were reworked from raw data taken from "Immigration Statistics", the annual publication of the Federal government department responsible for immigration.

In conclusion, the thesis findings were related to the structural functional theory and contemporary research about immigration and the Canadian social system. Many further hypotheses and research proposals were advocated.

Chapter 1: Background, Theoretical Perspective and Data Collection

Background

Three of the most important questions for understanding the social determinants of the immigration process as it has been managed by the Federal government are:

1. "Which social groups have a vested interest in immigration?",
2. "How much power do each have to gain their own ends?", and
3. "What is the ideological basis of their proposals?".

These questions are discussed with emphasis on government politicians and senior civil servants as the 'social group' in charge of the immigration process but not always necessarily in control of it.

Between 1897 and 1913 one of the largest movements of immigrants in Canadian history was carried out, largely at the instigation of Sir Wilfred Laurier's energetic Minister of the Interior, Sir Clifford Sifton. The major focus of immigrant selection was the encouragement of agriculturists or 'settlers' in order to populate and develop the Prairie privinces. This flow was to a great extent unplanned, uncontrolled and thus very much in accord with the 'laissez-faire' ideology then current. Sifton abhorred the practice of giving government 'bonuses' to immigrants and stated that he had "never known anybody who was materially assisted by the government to amount to anything".[1]

---

[1] Norma Walmsley, "Some Aspects of Canada's Immigration Policy", Report to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, December, 1965, p. 45.

Since World War II Canada has embarked on another, usually expansionistic immigration program. In the early post war period the flow of immigrants was supposedly very carefully planned to meet Canada's 'absorptive capacity' to accept them.[2] This ambiguous phrase was replaced in the 1960's by the equally ambiguous term 'manpower needs'. Canadian 'manpower needs' systematically studied, justified new immigration policies which were hopefully more rational since research techniques were more precise and policy was presumably altered accordingly.

Contrary to official pronouncements, William Petersen found that the early post war movement of immigrants from Holland to Canada, as it was officially encouraged and justified by both national governments was not really 'rational', but based "on sentiments and ideological rationalizations, reflecting the predominant prejudices and cleavages in the national society".[3]

Following Petersen, I contend that the social determinants of Canadian immigration policy and practice between 1947 and 1970 may be understood best from the perspective of group attitudes, values and prejudices as they were institutionalized in immigration policy and practice. Federal and provincial civil servants and politicians, French-Canadians, English-Canadians, 'other' Canadians, 'new' Canadians, 'old'

---

[2] In her study of Canada's 'absorptive capacity' to accept immigrants, Mabel Timlin found it to be a very imprecise analytical term which would require much more research to give it meaning. Mabel F. Timlin, Does Canada Need More People?, Oxford University Press, Toronto, 1951.

[3] William Petersen, Planned Migration: The Social Determinants of the Dutch Canadian Movement, University of California Press, Berkely, 1955, p. v.

Canadians, different ethnic groups in Canada, foreign interests and socially significant subgroups of each, advocated conflicting policy proposals based on various, and at times dubious, economic, social and political theories.[4] An unequal balance resulted between social groups favouring increased or decreased immigration in terms of numerical, occupational, family connection and ethnic group or 'racial balance' criteria.

Freda Hawkins asserted that senior civil servants in the Immigration Department[5] working with the Deputy Minister have largely created policy and administered it. One obvious result was that immigration policy usually emerged in the form of regulations for these were less liable to public scrutiny than legislation. Another result was the tremendous amount of discretionary authority granted department officials in the post war regulations.[6] Yet another result, as noted by Petersen, was that social science and social scientists were used 'largely' to justify government policies and practices already adopted for non-scientific reasons.[7]

---

[4]For good discussions of these groups and their various value premises and proposals, see David Corbett, Canada's Immigration Policy, University of Toronto Press, 1957, Chapter 1; William Petersen, op.cit., Chapter 6; John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1965, pp. 60-66; Freda Hawkins, Canada and Immigration, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal, 1972, pp. 346-353; and Mildred Schwartz, Public Opinion and Canadian Identity, Fitzhenry and Whitside, Scarborough, Ontario, 1967, pp. 86-88.

[5]Hereafter "Immigration Department" will collectively refer to the different Federal government departments which managed immigration between 1947 and 1970.

[6]Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 347.

[7]William Petersen, op. cit., p. 238.

Such "sentiments and ideological rationalizations, reflecting the predominant prejudices and cleavages in the national society"[8] and their implementation by senior civil servants, account for the very general, 'classic' statement of Canadian post war immigration policy by former Prime Minister McKenzie King, May 2, 1947 in the House of Commons.

> "The policy of the government is to foster growth of the population of Canada by the encouragement of immigration. The government will seek by legislation, regulation, and vigorous administration, to ensure the careful selection and permanent settlement of such numbers of immigrants as can be advantageously absorbed in our national economy. ...
>
> The figure that represents our absorptive capacity will clearly vary from year to year in response to economic conditions. ...
>
> With regard to the selection of immigrants, much has been said about discrimination. I wish to make it quite clear that Canada is perfectly within her rights in selecting the persons whom we regard as desirable future citizens. It is not a 'fundamental human right' of an alien to enter Canada. It is a privilege. It is a matter of domestic policy. ...
>
> There will, I am sure, be general agreement with the view that the people of Canada do not wish, as a result of mass immigration, to make a fundamental alteration in the character of our population."

Also emphasized in a special context, was the reuniting of families.[9]

However, these very general policy aims tell us little about which social groups were admissable or not admissable to Canada. Rules of admission are found in:

1. an Immigration Act,

2. subsequent amendments to an Act,

---

[8] Ibid., p. v.

[9] Canada, House of Commons, Debates, May 1, 1947, pp. 2,644-2,646.

3. Orders in Council passed under authority of an Act, and

4. administrative directives of the Immigration Department.

These rules of admission were listed in order of:

a. the decreasing possibility that the public could scrutinize this policy, and

b. the increasing ease that policy might be changed by the government or government officials.

In the period following World War II immigration was regulated through Orders in Council. The movement of refugees and other special immigrant flows were regulated expeditiously in this way. The last time that an Immigration Act was changed and hence subject to full parliamentary debate was 1952.[10] This act delegated to the Minister and his officials an uncontrolled amount of discretionary authority. Section 11 of the Act stated:

> "(1) immigration officers-in-charge are Special Inquiry Officers and the Minister may nominate such other immigration officers as he deems necessary to act as Special Inquiry Officers, (2) a Special Inquiry Officer has authority to inquire into and determine whether any person shall be allowed to come into Canada or to remain in Canada or shall be deported."

The minister could admit any individual by permit for a twelve month period and this permit could be extended indefinitely. In addition, the Minister's decision could be substituted for any decision of an Immigration Appeal Board which could be created under provisions of the Act.

Under amendments to the Immigration Act passed in 1953, 'justifiable' criteria for immigrant exclusion, as determined by the Minister, were

---

[10] Note: The Immigration Act was amended, not changed, in 1962 and 1967.

incredibly broad and included:

> "(i) nationality, citizenship, ethnic group, occupation, class or geographic area of origin;
>
> (ii) peculiar customs, habits, modes of life or methods of holding property;
>
> (iii)unsuitability having regard to the climatic, economic, social, industrial, educational, labour, health, or other conditions, or requirements existing, temporarily or otherwise;
>
> (iv) probably inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after their admission."
>
> Finally, under Section 39 of the Act,
>
> "No court and no judge or officer thereof has jurisdiction to review, quash, reverse, restrain or otherwise interfere with any proceeding, decision or order of the Minister, Deputy Minister, Director, Immigration Appeal Board, Special Inquiry Officer or Immigration Officer had, made or given under the authority and in accordance with the provisions of this Act relating to the detention or deportation of any person, upon any ground whatsoever, unless such person is a Canadian citizen or has Canadian domicile." 11

With this discretionary power the Minister and his officials could arbitrarily decide almost any case. As a result they were deluged with representations on behalf of individual immigrants and much of their work involved dealing with these cases.[12]

In 1956, this situation was partially rectified when the Supreme Court in the case of 'Attorney General of Canada vs. Brent' ruled that Special Inquiry Officers had been illegally delegated authority dealing with the admission of immigrants.[13] As a result, a 1956 Order in Council

---

[11] See Appendix 9, p. 193.

[12] Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 103.

[13] David Corbett, op. cit., pp. 38-39.

specified more precise classes of immigrants who were defined as admissable. However much of the uncontrolled discretionary power remained.[14]

The Immigration Act was amended in both 1962 and 1967 and immigration policy became increasingly more rationalized and planned. Racial and ethnic exclusiveness in official policy was progressively reduced and finally eliminated while skilled 'manpower' criteria and 'family connection' became entrenched as social and economic criteria controlling immigration. Under the Regulations as amended in 1967 these criteria and some others including 'personal assessment', 'language ability', and 'age' were assigned a specific number of points in an evaluation system totalling 100 points for 'independent' applicants. Independent immigrants usually had to get 50 points to be admissable.

The running compromise between interest groups which had determined policy and practice previously was likely still important, but 'Canadian needs' - especially 'manpower needs' systematically studied - justified the new planned immigration. As stated in general terms by Manpower and Immigration Minister Jean Marchand, "With these Regulations, I believe we can abolish (racial and ethnic) discrimination, pay more regard to the claims of family relationship, act with both greater efficiency and greater compassion than in the past and, through an expansionist immigration policy, serve the manpower needs of our growing Canadian economy."[15]

---

[14] The authority of Special Inquiry Officers to deport and the other discretionary powers were still intact.

[15] Press Release, Office of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, September 12, 1967, p. 2.

With the Regulations of 1967 based on an 'objective' points system for independent and to some extent 'nominated'[16] immigrants, and the new legislation instituting immigration appeal procedures separate from the Immigration Department[17] it might seem that discretionary authority could no longer be legally exercised by department officials. This was not the case. Through departmental directives and codebooks which could not be publicly scrutinized, discretionary assessments could be made by the Immigration Department officials for points governing 'occupational demand' and 'area demand' and by an individual immigration officer for points governing 'personal assessment' in the points system. For the typical independent applicant who needed 50 points for admissibility, these discretionary assessments would 'make or break' their chances for admission. In this way the Immigration Department officials and immigration officers could still exercise their judgement or impose their will.[18]

While the Immigration Department during the post war exercised a great deal of power that could not be publicly scrutinized, this should not be confused with them being in complete and inflexible control of the immigration process. Norma Walmsey and more recently Freda Hawkins, who did intensive studies of the Immigration Department, both felt that the department was barely in control of the immigration process for much of

---

[16] 'Nominated' immigrants were relatives more distant to a Canadian sponsor than relatives cited under general sponsorship privileges. Both the immigrant's relationship with the Canadian sponsor and the immigrant's level of education, skill, age, personal assessment and job chances in Canada counted towards admissibility to Canada.

[17] Freda Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 163-167.

[18] This is discussed more fully on page 102.

the period.[19] The most recent example of this was the mounting backlog of visitors who applied for landed immigrant status in Canada. A very large number were refused admission but through appeal procedures remained in Canada and illegally obtained Canadian jobs.[20]

It is my contention that these problems of control are related to the large number of groups who have a vested interest in immigration but very different viewpoints about what should be done. In this situation politicians have much to lose and little to gain through public action. The major result has been a conspicuous lack of support for the Immigration Department and prolonged 'foot-dragging' when issues must be publicly resolved, especially issues of 'control'.

Theoretical Perspective

To understand the immigration process in Canada and the long term trends, "the significance of new members to a social system" was studied "with emphasis on the relation of the system's functional requirements to its methods of dealing with new members". F.E. Jones suggested that this approach be based on the 'group as the point of reference', recognition of the interactive significance of numbers, and subjection of the problems of 'socialization' to functional analysis.[21]

---

[19]Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 110 and Fred Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 51-53.

[20]Guy Demarino, "Backlog Halved, New Migrant Law Coming", The Hamilton Spectator, Wednesday, August 30, 1972, p. 2; Guy Demarino, "Altered Points System to Speed Immigration", The Hamilton Spectator, September 28, 1972, p. 1; Guy Demarino, "Ottawa Plugs Immigration Act Loophole", The Hamilton Spectator, November 4, 1972, p. 1.

[21]Frank E. Jones, "A Sociological Perspective on Immigrant Adjustment", in Social Froces, Vol. 35, 1956, No. 1, 1956, p. 45.

In the thesis, the 'group' focus dealt with 'occupational groups', 'racial and ethnic status groups' and 'family groups'. It is my contention that the three fundamental principles underlying immigrant selection procedures in the post war period are based on these three 'groups'.

1. Occupational groups in the thesis refers to the collapsed listing of about 100 occupations immigrants intend in Canada as summarized by the Immigration Department in their annual publication "Immigration Statistics".
2. Racial and ethnic in the thesis refers to immigrant groups as defined in "Immigration Statistics". These designations were only used until 1966 inclusive.
3. Family groups in the thesis refers to:
   a. the independent immigrant's immediate family of spouse and unmarried children under 21, and
   b. the reuniting of relatives under sponsorship privileges. After 1967 this was sub-divided into sponsored and nominated immigrants to distinguish close and more distant relatives respectively.

The implications of the functional requirement[22] of the Canadian social system that immigrants be recruited at increasingly higher educational and skill levels were analyzed and then the guiding principles by

---

[22]Marion J. Levy's definition of "functional requisite" is the same as the normal usage of "functional requirement". It "is a generalized condition necessary for the maintenance of the unit with which it is associated. ... A given condition is a functional requisite of a system if its absence would result in (a) the total dissolution of the unit, or (b) the change of one of the structural aspects of the unit on the level under consideration." Marion J. Levy, The Structure of Society, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1952, p. 62,63. See Also Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, The Free Press, New York, 1964, p. 52.

which immigration policy and practice was managed between 1947 and 1970 were delineated.

The Functional Requirement for Trained and Educated Workers

The major functional requirement of the Canadian post war social system as it affected immigration was the requirement for workers, especially increasing proportions of educated professionals, trained technicians and skilled tradesmen to meet the skill demands of Canada's developing industrial economy. This development was most pronounced and hence demands for skills the greatest in the mid-1950's and especially in the mid-1960's.[23]

This functional requirement could have been met by training and educating native Canadians and/or importing immigrants. In the 1960's, the Canadian educational system expanded tremendously and training-in-industry and apprenticeship programs received greater attention.[24] However as Porter observed of an earlier period, Canada has always found it expedient to import immigrants for skilled positions instead of training enough native Canadians[25] and during the 1960's the search for trained and skilled immigrants was extended to new countries.

---

[23]For examples see "Skills Shortage is Squeezing our Prosperity", Financial Post, Nov. 7, 1964, pp. 17-18.

[24]"Apprenticeship in Canada", Technical and Vocational Education in Canada, No. 9, Summer, 1966, p. 14,15; and "Job Retraining Program Enrolls 30,000 Persons", Financial Post, Oct. 1, 1966, pp. 0-3. Also see Appendix 21, p. 232.

[25]Porter also noted that the immigrant labour force was a 'polarized one'. "At the lower level are those who come in to do work which Canadians seem to dislike, and at the higher levels are those who come to do work for which not enough Canadians are trained". John Porter, op. cit., pp. 40, 44-48.

Porter estimated that between 32-36% of the increment of professionals to the Canadian labour force between 1951-1961 were immigrants. This proportion would have been even higher except an estimated 20% of the immigrants emigrated.[26]

The net result of immigrants obtaining a disproportionate number of professional and skilled jobs was what Porter defined as 'mobility deprivation' for native Canadians due to 'educational deprivation'. He suggested that until at least 1961 that "Canadian institutions - particularly educational and industrial - were not geared to provide mobility opportunities".[27]

In a rapidly expanding industrial economy training native Canadians to fill skilled positions involved costly capital expenditures, extensive planning of educational facilities and curriculum and a return on this investment only after many years. Louis Parai in a special study prepared for the Economic Council of Canada

> "conservatively estimated that it would have cost $532 million (in 1961 prices) for Canada to have duplicated the additional university instruction, books and facilities embodied in the education of professional immigrants arriving in this country during the period 1953-63. In the same period, emigration to the United States accounted for the outflow of about $292 million in educational costs, leaving an estimated net gain of $240 million on these movements. It was not possible to make similar estimates for the skilled occupations." 28

---

[26] John Porter, op. cit., p. 45. 'Professionals' in this case was according to the Department of Labour definition.

[27] Ibid., p. 49.

[28] Louis Parai, Immigration and Emigration of Professional and Skilled Manpower During the Post-War Period, Special Study No. 1, prepared for the Economic Council of Canada, Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1965, p. 4.

Unlike native Canadians, immigrants were already trained and educated and there was an immigration 'lag effect' of only a few months.[29] Also by using immigrants to supply a major portion of the increment of new skilled and professional jobs, it meant that the 'labour tap' could be more easily turned off in periods of high unemployment and slackening demand for skilled workers. In addition it appeared that during these periods that the proportion of immigrants re-immigrating was considerable and permitted a greater contraction of the labour force than would otherwise have been possible.[30]

Bringing in high numbers of immigrants when business was booming in Canada but many fewer immigrants when unemployment rates were high was termed the 'tap on, tap off' approach. It was supported by spokesmen for organized labour who argued that immigration should be related to employment opportunities in Canada which would not be filled at the expense of native Canadians.[31] It was also supported by the Department of Labour in the late 1950's and early 1960's when unemployment rates were very high. As reported by Hawkins, relations between the Department of Labour and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration were quite strained during this period.

> "The Department of Labour firmly believed that immigration programming should be geared to the business cycle, and that,

---

[29] The period of time between an immigrant's first decision to immigrate and the actual immigration was usually several months due to the arrangements that had to be made. This was termed the 'lag effect'.

[30] See "Emigration" and "Emigration as % of Immigration" rates between 1951-1964, Louis Parai, op. cit., p. 133.

[31] David Orlikow, "Labour and Immigration", in Canadian Labour, February, 1964, p. 17,18.

> in times of heavy or threatingly heavy, unemployment, immigration should be severely restricted. It also believed that the annual immigration program should be planned, as far as possible, with a view to filling precise gaps in the labour force. The Department of Citizenship and Immigration, believing in the long term value of the real operational difficulties of the "tap on and off" policy, instinctively rejected this view and gave in to it only when obligued to do so." 32

During the mid 1960's when the Canadian economy was booming and skill shortages were at their peak, the Immigration Department gave greater and greater emphasis to meeting specific skill shortages in the economy. However as indicated in an internal memo between high ranking Immigration Department officials, there was still strong opposition to balancing the immigration flow to precise job openings in Canada.[33]

In the 1960's, when the demand for skilled and educated workers in a rapidly developing industrial economy was at its peak, there were several major social implications.

Hypothesis 1:

In the 1960's, with the very heavy demand for skilled and educated workers, and the policies of the Immigration Department geared to meet this demand, it was expected that the post war Canadian immigrants would be progressively much more skilled both by intended occupational class levels and by specific jobs intended in Canada. Immigrants' intended occupations as categorized in "Immigration Statistics" were the basis for testing this hypothesis. These intended occupations were assigned Blishen occupational social status scores and four 'classes' of immigrants

---

[32] Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 111.

[33] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., pp. 138, 139.

were distinguished. It was expected that the low status Class IV immigration flow would be very much reduced proportionately during the 1960's while the proportion of immigrants intending Class I, Class II and possibly Class III occupations would be considerably increased.

Hypotheses 2 and 3

One of the potentially most important predictions of structural functional theorists in sociology is that in industrializing or fully industrial economies with their highly stratified occupational structures, the functional requirement that workers be hired on the basis of merit tends to break down systems of privilege as a basis of recruitment.[34]

One of the most persistent traditional systems of recruitment is by 'race' or 'ethnicity' with higher status positions accruing disproportionately to favoured or allegedly superior groups. Porter observed that in Canada until at least 1962, there was "a kind of scale by which certain European ethnic groups rated more highly than others". British followed by northwest Europeans ranked above southern, central and eastern Europeans who ranked low "in the preference scale" and usually filled low status jobs in Canada.[35] Potential Chinese, East Indian and Negro immigration was emphatically discouraged utnil at least 1962 and was symptomatic of

---

[34]For example, Donald Treiman noted that "the demand of highly industrialized societies for a mobile and adaptable labor force likely results in a shift from ascriptive to universalistic achievement criteria as a basis for occupational role allocation." Donald J. Treiman, "Industrialization and Social Stratification", in Edward O. Laumann (ed.), Social Stratification: Research and Theory for the 1970's, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, New York, 1970, p. 218.

[35]Richmond similarly observed that one "of the consequences of post-war immigration was a reinforcement of this association between ethnicity and such factors as occupation and income". Anthony Richmond, "Immigration and Pluralism", in the International Migration Review, Vol. IV, No. 1, Fall, 1969, pp. 16, 17.

'Asiatic' and 'colo red' immigrants who had no 'entrance status' at all or a very low one. Studying both earlier periods of immigration and the post war period, Porter observed that many of these non-British immigrants went into low status occupations because there was a fairly high rate of illiteracy among them, and few of them spoke the charter group languages of English or French. "Thus cultural barriers at the time of entry harden into a set of historical relations tending to perpetuate entrance status".[36]

As would be theoretically expected, with changes in Canada's immigration Regulations in the 1960's, racial and ethnic status discrimination as an immigrant selection criterion was officially eradicated. More highly skilled occupational criterion and sponsorship privileges were standardized for all possible sources of immigration.

It was thus expected that the racial and ethnic composition of Canada's immigration flow would be fundamentally restructured to include greater proportions of formerly restricted low status races and ethnicities if the Federal government implemented the 'spirit' of the new policy. In the thesis the lowest ranked racial and ethnic status group was defined as Status IV and as determined from my inspection of Canadian post war immigration policy and practice this meant 'colored

---

[36]For Porter 'entrance status' meant "a reciprocal relationship between ethnicity and social class. A given ethnic group appropriates particular roles and designates other ethnic groups for the less preferred ones. ... In the general scheme of class and status that evolves with economic growth and immigration there exists an "entrance status" to be assumed by the less preferred ethnic groups." John Porter, op. cit., p. 63, 69. As used in the thesis, it was assumed that all immigrant groups had different entrance statuses based on their ethnicity and their occupational background.

immigrants'.[37] Since Status IV immigrants were subject to the greatest restrictions prior to 1962, it was expected that their immigration flow would proportionately increase the most in the 1960's.

Hypothesis 3:

Another traditional system of recruitment based on privilege is through family or kinship ties. In Canadian immigration policy this meant sponsored immigrants, some of whom intended to enter the labour force. There was less control occupationally over the entry of these immigrants. With the possibility of a much lower skilled immigration flow from this source, it was expected that this flow would be proportionately reduced, especially at the lowest skill levels, during the 1960's.

Hypothesis 4:

With the immigration policy changes in the 1960's for the demand for progressively more skilled workers, it was expected that the "vertical mosaic" of Germans, Scandinavians and Dutch nearest to the British in their high status occupational levels and Italians, Polish, Ukrainians, and groups from south-east Europe at the lowest levels, would be restructured upwards and that immigrants from all origins would gain entry in higher 'entrance statuses'.

The Three Major Selection Principles Governing Canadian Immigration Policy and Practice

Theoretically a basic concern of immigration researchers is the

---

[37] 'Colored immigration' was a common phrase used by Immigration Department officials in the 1950's meant Negroes and Asians used in a very broad context. Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 88.

"method of dealing with new members"[38] adopted by the immigrant receiving country. In Canada the Federal government, provincial governments, the municipalities and voluntary agencies all have policies and programs designed to 'integrate'[39] immigrants into Canadian society. At the level of analysis in the thesis, the Canadian government's immigration policies and practice may be considered in terms of the several principles by which immigration was managed in the post war period. These immigrant selection criteria were based on assumptions of how easily immigrants would be 'integrated' into Canadian society. As may be seen most clearly from the policy changes of 1967, preference was given to younger immigrants who were fluent in at least one of the charter group languages and were judged to have the personal intitiative and suitability to make a success of themselves in Canada.[40] Theoretically stated the Immigration Department implemented selection principles which it felt would contribute to the socialization of members of the immigration flow.

As already noted, from my inspection of Canadian post war immigration policy and practice, three immigrant selection principles stood out as the fundamental bases of policy and practice during this period. They were selection by

a. occupational groups,

b. racial and ethnic status groups, and

c. family connection.

---

[38]Frank E. Jones, op. cit., p. 45.

[39]'Integration' replaced 'assimilation' as the goal of Canadian immigration policy in the mid-1950's. Integration implied acceptance of Canadian ways without a complete loss of cultural distinctiveness.

[40]See Appendix 19, pp. 210.

a. Occupational Groups

Becoming assimilated in the Canadian social system, or integrated as indicated in Walter Harris's speech and subsequent government pronouncements,[41] involved for the immigrant acceptance of, or at least accommodation to new values, ideologies and patterns of behaviour. Especially important was obtaining a secure job. Many sociologists as well as social philosophers hold work position to be the central identity definer in the Western way of life. Prestige, social status and different economic rewards are all interrelated and derive from work position. These positions help us place others in a system of social stratification and allow others to place us in turn.

Processes of urbanization, industrialization and technological discoveries affect the relative distribution of different occupations and occupational levels. In the mid-1960's the major Canadian social system functional requirement which affected immigrants was the requirement for professionals, trained technicians and skilled tradesmen. Canadians were one supply factor in the demand for trained workers while immigrants were another. Canadian workers deriving more power from their work position through an associational or union basis might wish to restrict the entry of immigrants to their work position to prevent the lowering of wages and possible unemployment. Employers however, might desire immigrants to take positions that Canadians were unable to fill or to pay lower wages and 'cheapen' Canadian labour.

---

[41] Walter Harris, Canada, House of Commons, Debates, July 4, 1952, p. 4, 269 and Canada, House of Commons, Debates, July 9, 1960, pp. 4,712, 4,713.

Balancing these opposing positions from some rational perspective was essential, at least if immigration management was going to be more than simply a 'hit or miss' proposition from rational manpower considerations.

b. Racial and Ethnic Status Groups

In the thesis, 'racial and ethnic status group' referred to the degree that the entry of immigrants to Canada by a given group was facilitated or inhibited by Canadian policy and practice.[42] Since immigration laws and practice were avowedly less ethnically and racially discriminatory after 1962, and supposedly completely non-discriminatory after 1967, evidence for this 'ordering' came, to a considerable extent, between 1947 and 1962 when laws and practice were more blatantly discriminatory.

From my inspection of policy and practice, 'British'[43] and 'French' as government defined ethnicities[44] and United States immigrants, were classified as having a "most favoured" ethnic status group or Status I; northwest Europeans as having a "favoured" ethnic status group or Status II; southern Europeans, eastern Europeans, and 'others' (mainly

---

[42] 'Racial' and 'ethnic' refers to the imprecise designations of immigrant groups used in "Immigration" and "Immigration Statistics" until 1967.

[43] 'British' included immigrants from Great Britain, Ireland, New Zealand, Australia and South Africa.

[44] Hereafter 'ethnicity' will be used as the short form for the government definition 'race and ethnicity' and 'ethnic status group' will replace 'racial and ethnic status group'.

Middle Eastern immigrants) as having a "neutral" ethnic status group or Status III; and Negroes, East Indians, Chinese and Japanese[45] as having a "proscribed" ethnic status group or Status IV.

These categories show blatant racial and ethnic discrimination.[46] To the degree that these categorizations are accurate reflections of immigration policy and practice, immigration policy was and is racially and ethnically discriminatory. By deriving them, the extent of such discrimination could be precisely analyzed for the period 1947 until at least 1970 by reworking immigration statistics and reviewing government immigration policy and practice and their social effects.

These categories resemble the 'social groups' of the early theories of racial superiority and inferiority based often on biological premises.[47] However post war discrimination was justified by notions of the unequal assimilability or integration of the different immigrant groups.[48] These distinctions were clearly not based on scientific study of ethnic groups, but rather vague notions of white versus coloured, and 'Nordic' versus 'Latin', 'Slavic' and others.[49]

---

[45]Negroes, East Indians and Chinese are all-embracing ethnicity categories indeed. In this regard Immigration Statistics was footnoted, "Groupings of origins or of countries are used as a practical measure and are not to be interpreted as non-recognition of the component origins or countries". Immigration Statistics, The Department of Manpower and Immigration, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1966, p. 14.

[46]This is using the criterion that all potential immigrant groups be treated equally.

[47]See John Porter, op. cit., pp. 61-67.

[48]In two government statements at the same time, one uses assimilation and the other integration. See Citizenship and Immigration Minister Walter Harris's speech, Canada, House of Commons, Debates, op. cit., and Appendix 9, 193.

[49]This was thoroughly documented by Walmsley, op. cit., p. 84-90.

c. Family Connection

The post war immigration policy principle that immigration be encouraged by family connection was supposed to have reflected the wishes of most Canadians and immigrants. However just which relationships should be accepted for easy admissibility was difficult to resolve.[50] Since there was the selection principle that the entry of some ethnic groups be more rigidly controlled than others, it meant the institution of a non-universal family connection bias when determining sponsorship privileges. This policy criterion could be acknowledged as rational only if the supposed various prejudices of specific competing interest groups be accepted. By any other criterion, for instance the requirement of an advanced industrial and urbanized society for a certain type and size of family or the requirement for individual socialization within a particular family system, such an unsystematic rendering of this principle of selection was completely irrational.

Toward the end of the Liberal administration in 1957, Citizenship and Immigration Minister J.W. Pickersgill stated that large scale immigration to Canada was to be terminated. The Immigration Department was "to organize for an entirely different phase of immigration in which greater emphasis than ever will be laid upon sponsored immigration". This would mean "the gradual decline of the recruiting of immigrants who have no connection with Canada".[51] This criterion would have

---

[50] 'Vertical' relations would include children, parents, grandparents, etc. 'Lateral' relations would include brothers, sisters, relations by marriage, nieces, nephews, auncles, aunts, etc.

[51] J.W. Pickersgill, "Statement Regarding Liberal Immigration Policy" was quoted from G.A. Rawlyk, "Canada's Immigration Policy, 1945-1962," Dalhousie Review, XLII, no. 3, 1962, p. 295.

perpetuated Canada's racial and ethnic balance as well as reducing considerably the absolute numbers of immigrants arriving in Canada. In retrospect, this criterion would also have meant, for the first time when the economy would be expanding, that Canada would have had to train and recruit mostly native talent for an expanding job market.

Data Collection

To understand the major Canadian social system functional requirement as it related to the underlying principles of Canadian immigration policy and practice and the social effects of their implementation, a wide-ranging format for data collection was chosen. Sources included official government documents; Hansard; The Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Labour, Manpower, and Immigration; four unstructured interviews, various secondary source material and newspaper articles. From this material, the functional requirement, the underlying principles of Canadian immigration policy and practice, social structures and social causes and effects were delineated from official and unofficial sources and from 'people who knew'.[52] This method imposes on the researcher the responsibility of evaluating conflicting data and filling in gaps from each person's or group's perspective.

As an aid to the reader in judging this researcher's objectivity an extensive Appendix was compiled. It includes immigration Regulations, data on administration of the Regulations and many chart series developed in the research.

---

[52] It is interesting to note that Freda Hawkins in her comprehensive study of Canadian immigration policy employed the same data collection techniques, especially the unstructured interview. This was the most exhaustive study of post war immigration policy yet done. It was published after this thesis research was completed but some information from her book was incorporated. Freda Hawkins, op. cit.

Chapter 2: The Three Fundamental Principles of Canadian Immigration Management and Canadian Immigration Policy and Administrative Practice

In this chapter, Canadian post war immigration policy and administrative practice was analyzed in relation to the three major principles of immigration management between 1947 and 1970. The distinction was made between policy and practice since immigration policy set rough guidelines for the selection of immigrants but it was administrative practice which finally determined just which 'social groups' would enter Canada from a given immigration 'pool'. Thus each of the three principles of immigrant selection; that is, selection by 'occupational groups', 'racial and ethnic status groups' and 'family connection', was sub-divided by the headings 'Canadian immigration policy' and 'Administrative Practice'.

Selection by Occupational Groups

a. Canadian Immigration Policy

In the mid 1960's the major functional requirement of the Canadian social system as it affected the selection of immigrants was the requirement for skilled tradesmen, trained technicians and educated professionals. However during the whole post war period, Canadian immigration policy was selective by the occupations immigrants intended in Canada.[1] This was especially true of immigrants who weren't from the 'most favoured' ethnic status group - British and French.

---

[1] Before 1947 it was at its most selective. The only admissable independent immigrants were those intending to be farmers, farm labourers, houseworkers and any contract labour or service required in Canada. Order in Council 1329 revoked this policy designed to protect Canadian labour. Appendix 2, p. 180.

As set out in P.C. 2743, 1949, persons born or naturalized in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, or South Africa and citizens of the United States and France were admissable if they did not fall within general prohibited categories and had sufficient means to support themselves until employment was secured. Thus the entry of Status I immigrants was not officially restricted occupationally but was to some degree monetarily. For other immigrants excluding Asians, agriculturists, loggers with assured employment and miners were eligible for entry. For Status II and Status III immigrants, this was occupational criterion at its most selective.[2]

Under the Regulations as amended in 1952, Status I immigrants still had full open placement privileges given sufficient means to support themselves. However Status II immigrants and Greek Status III immigrants had an enlarged list of occupations by which they could enter. Depending on their citizenship, persons in approved trades, agricultural workers, some artisans, domestics, nurses, and nurses aides, and some workers were all eligible for entry. Workers for whom orders had been approved prior to 1952 who were Italian citizens could also be admitted.[3] Citizens from all other countries could not be admitted through occupational criterion.[4]

Under the Regulations as amended in 1956, Status I immigrants retained completely open placement privileges. A widened list which included citizens by birth or naturalization of Austria, Belgium, Denmark,

---

[2]See Appendix 4, p. 183.

[3]These workers were agriculturalists, loggers with assured employment and miners.

[4]See Appendix 10, p. 198.

the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland, as well as refugees from European countries, required department approval for establishment in a business, trade or profession or in agriculture. Citizens from all other countries could still not be admitted under any open placement criteria.[5]

In a June 9, 1960 speech, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Ellen Fairclough outlined very generally government 'views' on immigration.

> "Canada needs immigrants for many reasons, the most obvious of which is to provide skills and training necessary for the development of the country. ... Canada it seems to me, has a responsibility to admit newcomers in accordance with our ability to provide opportunities for them and the capacity of our society to integrate them socially and economically. ...
>
> In summary, what we are endeavouring to do is develop an immigration program in which movements are properly planned, and we therefore avoid situations where arbitrary administrative action is required. ...
>
> The key to our immigration policy will be the consistent application of proper selection standards designed to bring the best possible settlers to Canada. I am sure all Canadians would agree that once these standards are established they should be applied consistently to all who seek admission to this country, except where the admission of the immigrant is based on compassionate grounds or on close relationships; and, of course, in the case of refugees." 6

Under the revised Regulations of early 1962, Section 31 replaced Section 20 of the Immigration Act and placed primary stress upon education, training and skills as the main admissibility criteria for independent immigrants.[7]

---

[5]See Appendix 17, p. 207.

[6]House of Commons, Debates, June 9, 1960, pp. 4712,4713.

[7]See Appendix 17, p. 207.

> "This means that any suitably qualified person, from any part of the world, can be considered for immigration to Canada entirely on his own merit, without regard to race, colour, national origin or the country from which he comes." 8

However Indians, Pakistanis and Ceylonese continued to be restricted through the retention of established quotas. Within the quotas, these criteria applied to them as well.

In the 1966 White Paper on Immigration the acceptance by government officials of the functional requirement that immigrants should enter in increasingly skilled proportions became complete. Immigration policy would become 'manpower' policy on an international scale. The Department of Citizenship and Immigration was reorganized to become the Department of Manpower and Immigration.[9] In very general terms justification of these criteria were given in the White Paper.

> "We are not a country of virgin lands and forests waiting to be settled by anyone with a strong back and a venturesome spirit. Despite its low population density, Canada has become a highly complex industrialized and urbanized society. And such a society is increasingly demanding of the quality of its work force. If those entering the work force, whether native-born or immigrants, do not have the ability and training to do the kinds of jobs available, they will be burdens rather than assets. Today, Canada's expanding industrial economy offers most of its employment opportunities to those with education, training, skill. The so-called white collar workers are now the dominant manpower group. They are over 40% of the total. This group is expanding at about twice the rate of the manual group. Within the manual group, a variety of skilled trades are expanding but the need for unskilled workers is declining. Indeed, despite the high rate of our economic growth, total

---

[8] Canada, House of Commons, Debates, Jan. 19, 1962, p. 9.

[9] Only after debate in the House of Commons was the new title changed from 'Manpower' to 'Manpower and Immigration'.

> employment for manual and primary workers together has hardly expanded at all over the past decade. This pattern of increasing demand for workers with a relatively high level of education and training, and of a static or decreasing requirement for the unskilled or semi-skilled, shows no signs of changing in the foreseeable future." 10

The Immigration Act as amended in 1967 was an attempt to carefully rationalize occupational immigrant selection criteria. It was also designed to control and limit possible 'snow balling' family oriented immigration which would negate such rationalized manpower considerations.

Three classes of immigrant could gain entry to Canada - the 'independent' immigrant, the 'nominated' immigrant and the 'sponsored' immigrant. Discussion of the privileges of nominated and sponsored immigrant are in the last section of this chapter which described family connected immigration.

The criteria by which an 'independent' applicant's admissibility to Canada were/and are still determined were set out in Schedule A of the amended Immigration Act in the points system. Usually 50 points out of a possible 100 points were required for admission and criteria for assessing points included "education and training", "personal assessment", "occupational demand", "occupational skill", "age", "arranged employment", "knowledge of English and French", "relative", and "employment opportunities in the area of destination".[11] These 'objective' criteria were designed to greatly reduce the element of discretion by an immigration officer in determining an immigrant's admissibility. This would have the further result of reducing representations by Members of Parliament on behalf of

---

[10] "Canadian Immigration Policy", White Paper on Immigration, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1966, p. 8.

[11] See Appendix 19, pp. 210.

immigrants refused entry.[12]

Also included as potential independent immigrants, for the first time, were 'visitors' or 'applicants in Canada'.[13]

As suggested earlier, it could be interpreted that with these objective criteria, it would be impossible for the Immigration Department to control immigration through the discretionary exercise of power. This was not the case.

The hypothetical case of a professional, age under 35, fully fluent in one of the official languages but having no relatives or arranged job in Canada, is listed below. The points range that they could receive per Schedule A of the Regulations is as follows:

Table 1: Points Range of a Hypothetical Immigrant Intending a Professional Occupation

	Selection Criteria	Points Low	Points High	Comment
a)	Education and training	20	20	(Maximum points)
b)	Personal assessment	0	15	(Discretionary)
c)	Occupational demand	0	15	(Discretionary)
d)	Occupational skill	10	10	(Maximum points)
e)	Age	10	10	(Maximum points)
g)	Knowledge of French and English	5	5	(10 points can be given if fluent in both official languages)
i)	Employment opportunities in the area of destination (area demand)	1	5	(Discretionary)
		46	80	
Points allotted with Low Discretionary assessment				46
Points allotted with High Discretionary assessment				80

SOURCE: Appendix 19, pp. 210.

---

[12] Interview with a former Immigration Department Supervisor, Feb., 1972.

[13] See Appendix 19, pp. 210.

A less educated and trained potential immigrant with the same other attributes would receive considerably less points. However the hypothetical case of a highly skilled professional was chosen so as to make the following point.

The discretionary assessment made by an immigration officer for "personal assessment" and the discretionary assessments made by officials of the Immigration Department for "occupational demand" and "area demand" would decide an independent immigrant's admissibility in most cases.

To judge "personal assessment" immigration officers were given a departmental guideline. The 'normal curve' of points given to potential immigrants for this criterion was apparently in the range 4 to 8 points.[14] This was out of a total of a possible 15 points. Thus after points for this criterion were assigned, only the most highly skilled and educated professional would be near or at the required 50 points for admission.

From an interview with an immigration officer presently serving overseas, the hypothetical case of a highly educated person intending a profession with a high unemployment rate in Canada was illustrated. The officer stated as normal procedure, he would counsel the person not to come to Canada. If that person persisted in his intentions he would mark that person down below 50 points by changing the "personal assessment" points since the potential immigrant was obviously "being stubborn and ignoring good advice".[15]

With the manner in which "personal assessment" points are presently

---

[14] House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, Nov. 28, 1968, p. 108.

[15] Interview, November, 1972.

being managed, one vital fact emerges. The most crucial set of points determining the admissibility of most independent applicants will be for "occupational demand" and "area demand".

The Department of Manpower and Immigration supplied code books to immigration officers outlining which points had to be given for "occupational demand" and "area demand" for each occupation. They were updated every three months. With high levels of unemployment in an occupation, "occupational demand" would be 0 points and "area demand" 1 point which would effectively eliminate most potential independent immigrants intending that occupation.[16]

For all three discretionary assessments; "personal assessment", "occupational demand" and "area demand", there was no public scrutiny of the points given. The question was repeatedly raised in the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration why this was so and the departmental justification as stated by Manpower and Immigration Minister Allan MacEachen in 1970 was as follows.

> "It seems to me that if we made the guide public there would be a great temptation for any immigrant to select the occupation for which there was the highest demand. I think that is a normal human reaction, that you would at least assimilate, maybe make yourself believe, that you had the qualifications with the highest demand on the guide. This is bound to happen, I think, and what would we do then? If we wanted to carry out our obligation, the officer would have to check back again on the validity of the man's claim, that is all. ...
>
> (If the guidebook was make public), the extent of re-checking and the extent of policing that we would have to do in all our immigration offices all over the world, seems to us at the moment to be considerable." 17

---

[16] House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, Apr. 28, 1970, p. 4:13. Ibid., Apr. 6, 1971, p. 12:31.

[17] House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, March 24, 1970, pp. 1:34, 1:35.

For the typical independent applicant who needed 50 points for admission, these Immigration Department discretionary assessments, which were not public, would'make or break' their chances for admission. In this way I.D. officials could exercize their judgment or impose their will. There thus existed the possibility that either officials of Department of Manpower and Immigration or an individual immigration officer could discriminate against immigrants by certain races or ethnicities or certain types of family relationship.

However if the hypothetical professional immigrant had an arranged job in Canada these discretionary assessments would not ultimately determine their admissibility. With the 10 points allotted for "arranged employment", such an immigrant would have at least 56 points. (46 points per Table 1 + 10 points for arranged employment). Thus the Immigration Department could not deter this class of immigrant by using the points system. An immigration officer could refuse the admission of such an applicant

> "if in his opinion there are good reasons why those norms do not reflect the particular applicant's reasons have been submitted in writing to, and approved by, an officer of the Department designated by the Minister". 18

Statistics were not available but it would be revealing to know the proportion of independent applicants who were admissible irrespective of the discretionary assessments and also the proportion of immigrants who were admissible under the points system but were refused entry.

At the other end of the occupational scale in Canada were low skilled, low paying jobs. As Mr. Orlikow suggested to the Standing

---

[18] See Appendix 19, p. 210.

Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, employers in Canada solicited immigrants for a wide variety of these positions that Canadians were unable or unwilling to accept.[19] By recruiting immigrants, employers were able to perpetuate low wage rates and 'cheapen Canadian labour'. For determining these immigrant's admissibility to Canada, it appeared that arranged employment (on the employer's own terms) and the department's discretionary assessments, were the key factors. The hypothetical case of an unskilled immigrant, age under 35, fluent in one official language and with assured employment is listed below. Both "occupational demand" and "area demand" have been given maximum points since enough Canadians presumably are unable or unwilling to accept these jobs at the offered wage rates.

Table 2: Points Range of a Hypothetical Independent Immigrant Intending an Occupation with Low Educational and Skill Requirements

	Selection Criteria	Points Low	Points High	Comment
a)	Education and training	1	5	(Estimate)
b)	Personal assessment	4	8	(See footnote 64)
c)	Occupational demand	15	15	(Maximum points)
d)	Occupational skill	1	3	(Estimate)
e)	Age	10	10	(Maximum points)
f)	Arranged employment	10	10	
g)	Knowledge of French and English	5	5	(10 points can be given if fluent in both languages)
i)	Employment opportunities in the area of destination (area demand)	5	5	(Maximum points)
		51	61	

[19] House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, April 28, 1970, p. 4:14.

Since Mr. Couillard of the Immigration Department acknowledged that the department had set no policy in this area, it appeared that employers could use the points system to bring in low skill, low paid immigrant help and 'cheapen Canadian labour'.[20] The major effect exercised by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in the selection of these immigrants was to ensure that they would likely be under 35 and fluent in one of the charter group languages, both characteristics presumably contributing to their integration into Canadian society.

In both the case of high and low skilled immigrants, the major determining criteria of admissibility, at least theoretically, was 'occupational demand' and 'area demand'. With these criteria, immigration management approached the policy advocated by the former Department of Labour that immigration should be co-ordinated with job availabilities in Canada.[21]

Some indication of how rationally these 'manpower' criteria were being administered was indicated by Dr. Dymond of the Department of Manpower and Immigration to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration. Both 'occupational demand' and 'area demand' were 'average' assessments. Occupational demand was the cross-Canada average demand in each occupationa expressed in quantitative terms out of 15 points. Area demand was an assessment out of 5 points of the demand in each occupation by each labour market area.

Both assessments had major flaws. With occupational demand, a very

---

[20]Mr. Couillard also stated that the "applicant is informed of what the situation is". House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, April 28, 1970, p. 4:14.

[21]Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 111.

strong demand for a given occupation in one area could be offset by lower demand in another. With area demand there was no assurance that the potential immigrant would settle in the pre-determined area.[22]

b. Administrative Practice

The functional requirement that post war immigrants enter Canada at increasingly higher skill levels and from specific skilled occupations was a basic principle of post war immigration policy and practice and reflected strong economic and business influences. This was most apparent administratively from 1964-1967 when the Canadian economy was booming, skill shortages in expanding industries were most acute and promotional campaigns to attract immigrants were at their peak.

In 1964, Canadian immigration offices overseas were described in the "Financial Post" as 'tatty', 'filthy' and 'second rate'. 'Funds starved' publicity campaigns showed their 'threadbare' condition and the morale of immigration officers was at a 'low ebb'.[23] Beginning in 1965 however, the Immigration Department's budget was increased and Immigration Minister Bell asserted that Canada was back in the immigration business.[24]

The resulting promotional activities in France were especially heavy due to a revival of French - Quebec relations in the early 1960's, increasing recognition of the 'French fact' in Canada, a plummeting French-Canadian birth rate, and relaxed rules in France to attract immigrants. By 1967 a new $1,500,000 immigration building had been opened in Paris

---

[22] Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, November 28, 1968, pp. 113, 114.

[23] Financial Post, March 14, 1964.

[24] This was called 'Bell's Resurrection'. Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 138.

along with new offices in Bordeaux and Marseilles. Another office at Strasbourg was projected but was not established. Further the annual French publicity budget had reached $300,000.[25]

Until 1968 immigration promotional work was given similar heavy emphasis in Great Britain. The Federal government besides providing facilities for employer interviews, arranged lecture speakers, films in theatres, and advertisements in newspapers, trade journals, etc. Provincial immigration campaigns did much the same, while businesses, through recruiting teams and British employment and advertising agencies hired people for specific job openings. As different Canadian business journals asserted, it was literally a "battle for Britons", with stiff competition being encountered from Australia, South Africa and New Zealand.[26]

Ontario was the most active province in recruiting immigrants. On Oct. 14, 1967 the Ontario Branch of Manpower and Immigration had offices in Toronto, London and Glasgow staffed by 33 people while the Toronto office was expanded to improve contact with Ontario employers. In 1966 the general promotional activities in Britain of the Branch cost over $500,000 and netted a 'campaign goal of 20,000 replies in ten weeks.[27]

Supplementing general promotional activities was an active job recruitment plan for employers.

> "About 300-500 employers are on what the branch considers its "active" list of firms - those who are more or less constantly on the lookout for qualified immigrants. The

---

[25] The Hamilton Spectator, March 4, 1971, p. 33.

[26] "The Battle for Britons", Monetary Times, Vol. 134, No. 9, September, 1966, p. 41. Also see the Financial Post, May 20, 1967, p. B-22.

[27] Financial Post, Oct. 14, 1967, p. 0-6.

> complete list of employers who have been or may be interested totals some 900 firms. Last year, 332 Ontario employers were assisted, all with complete success, A.S. Clark, Branch director, says. Surplus job applications obtained by the branch are circulated to other employers. Together, these two schemes found jobs for 3,064 immigrants last year." 28

Significantly, 50% of those hired for jobs were from applications forwarded by the Immigration Department without the employer doing an overseas interview. Employers however were "extremely reluctant" to hire sight unseen highly qualified Japanese when the Federal government opened its office in Tokyo, and hence negated department efforts to supply skilled manpower, 'irregardless of race, colour, and creed'.[29]

Some companies, especially the larger ones, and some school boards, for example the Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa school boards in 1967,[30] also engaged in promotional activity and hired in Great Britain. By Sept. 1966, a peak year, some 200 Canadian companies had sent recruiting teams to Britain and as already noted, the Ontario Branch of Manpower and Immigration encouraged such companies to work through them to arrange interviews and to use their facilities.[31]

From the province of Manitoba came even more direct assistance for industry immigrant recruiters. On Oct. 15, 1966 a provincial - employer mission left for Britain and continental Europe with about 2,500 jobs to fill as listed by 125 firms. Under that province's assisted passage program

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Financial Post, August 13, 1966, p. J-12.

[30] Under a special arrangement between Canada and 14 or 15 other countries, these 'teachers' did not have to pay any income tax for a two year period. The United States was one such country but France was not. House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, May 16, 1969, p. 218.

[31] Financial Post, Oct. 14, 1967, p. O-6.

the government and industry shared equally the cost of an immigrant's moving and establishment expenses.[32]

Beginning in 1968 Canadian unemployment levels rose and promotional campaigns for immigrants were sharply curtailed. In France, for instance, the 1968 publicity budget was cut to a quarter of the 1967 budget and as reported March 4/1971 immigration officers began counselling many potential French immigrants who could meet Canada's point's requirements, not to come.[33]

As stated in the "Canada Yearbook: 1969" the Department of Manpower and Immigration

> "is responsible for immigration but is equally concerned with manpower and is obligued to discourage immigration for the applicant with an occupation for which there is little or no demand in this country. Where there are shortages of labour in certain industries, Canadian employers or provincial officials may interview candidates abroad for such industries and channel them to the Department's visa offices but these candidates also must comply with the new selection standards." 34

That is, less immigrants would be coming to Canada but generally speaking they still would be functionally required to be preponderantly from skilled occupational levels and skilled occupations or at least from low skilled occupations in high demand.

In 1969, a research project costing $1,000,000 was sponsored by the department to determine the current manpower needs of several thousand employers. This project was used to provide one basis for the rational

---

[32] The Financial Post, Sept. 10, 1966, p. 18.

[33] The Hamilton Spectator, March 4, 1971, p. 33.

[34] Canada Yearbook, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1969, p. 204.

movement of immigrants occupationally.[35]

One administrative procedure designed to provide qualified workers for whom there was an immediate specific demand in Canada was an immigrant filing system. The Canadian immigration office in London, England had the model operation with

> "many tens of thousands of names on file of individuals who would be prepared to come to Canada if they had a definite job offer in their particular trade. We work with Canadian employers who come in; they may be seeking computer specialists or health care specialists or what have you and we can very quickly run these cards and have the individuals available for interviews in a matter of days." 36

Some other immigration offices also have this system, presumably in 'traditional' source countries where there is active promotion.

In addition to specific referals of immigrants to jobs, the Immigration Department also encouraged "the movement of workers whose professions or skills are in general continuing demand".[37]

Finally, as noted by John Munro in the House of Commons, 1967:

> "The timing of arrival of independent immigrants destined to the labour force is largely influenced by the seasonal nature of the Canadian labour market. This is achieved by immigration counselling abroad, by the new immigration selection system and by the timing of granting of immigrant visas. Similarly the area of destination in Canada is determined by these same factors, although the immigrant once landed in Canada has of course complete freedom of movement." 38

---

[35]House of Commons, Standing Committee of Labour, Manpower and Immigration, April 28, 1970, p. 4:16.

[36]Ibid., April 22, 1972, p. 14:16.

[37]House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, April 14, 1970, p. 2:6.

[38]Canada, House of Commons, Debates, Dec. 5, 1967, p. 5,095.

Selection by Racial and Ethnic Status Groups

a. Canadian Immigration Policy

In 1947 Prime Minister McKenzie King observed in reference to Canadian immigration policy that "much has been said about discrimination".[39] Since Canadian immigration policy at that time was so racially and ethnically discriminatory this was not very surprising. In the immediate post war immigration Regulations and continuing until at least 1967, a preference scale by which some racial and ethnic groups were greatly favoured as immigrants over others could be readily distinguished. These groups were defined in the thesis as "most favoured", "favoured", "neutral" and "proscribed" or more simply Status I, II, III and IV respectively. The privileges according each group in immigration policy and practice between 1947-1967 provided a rather involved historical validation of this discrimination by ethnic status groups. Since the principle that immigrants be admitted according to their family connection was inextricably linked with the principle of ethnic discrimination, until at least 1962, consideration of family connection was also an important focus in this section.

(i) 1945-1962

Most Favoured Immigrants - Status I

Order in Council P.C. 2743, June 1949, summarized initial post war immigration regulations. Persons born or naturalized in Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, Irish citizens who had become citizens of the United Kingdom, and citizens of the United States and

---

[39] Canada, House of Commons, Debates, May 1, 1947, p. 2645.

France[40] were eligible for entry as "open placement" immigrants. "Open placement" refers to immigrants who had secured employment in Canada or sufficient means to maintain themselves after their arrival in Canada. As well, legal residents of Canada could sponsor a husband or wife; the son, daughter, brother or sister, together with husband or wife and unmarried children; the father or mother; or the orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age. Such privileges were much greater than for any other ethnic status group.[41]

This primarily pro-British-origin bias has been consistently maintained by supposed Anglo-Canadian ethnocentrism, values and sentiments. In 1957, during a period of very high immigration to Canada and steadily increasing unemployment, Citizenship and Immigration Minister Jack Pickersgill acknowledged that "the flow of immigrants was too big for Canada to digest" but believed that if he "tried to stop the flood of British immigrants it would be the finish of the Liberal party in many Anglo-Saxon constituencies".[42]

---

[40]Under Order in Council P.C. 4,849, Nov. 26, 1947, Newfoundlanders were included as open placement immigrants while the French were omitted. See Appendix 3, p. 181. The inclusion of French in Order in Council P.C. 2,743 was done largely to assuage general French-Canadian resistance to immigration. See for example, Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 1947, p. 2,479. Order in Council P.C. 2,743 is in Appendix 4, p. 182. After Order in Council P.C. 5,573, June 9, 1950 residents of St. Pierre and Miquelon had the same privileges as French immigrants. See Appendix 7, p. 188.

[41]These privileges were not new. They had been very similarly defined in Order in Council P.C. 695, March 31, 1931. Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 89, 90.

[42]This is from a Pickersgill statement given in Rochester, New York quoted by G.A. Rawlyk, "Canada's Immigration Policy, 1945-1962", The Dalhousie Review, Autumn, 1962, p. 295.

This "most favoured" ethnic status continued under the Regulations as amended in 1952 under authority of Section 61 of the new Immigration Act. Persons born or naturalized into the previous mentioned areas of citizenship were admissable if they had employment or sufficient means to maintain themselves for a reasonable period after their arrival in Canada, or were sponsored by a legal resident of Canada.[43]

'Born' or 'naturalized' as an admissibility criterion excluded most non-white British or French subjects in India, Hong Kong, the West Indies, Africa, Britain and France who would not have been born in Great Britain or Franch and acquired British or French citizenship.

"Most favoured" ethnic status for British and French also continued under the Regulations as amended in 1956. Sponsorship privileges however became more restricted and applied equally to most Status I and Status II immigrant sending countries.[44] These Regulations continued in force until Ellen Fairclough proclaimed a new immigration policy in 1962.

Favoured Immigrants - Status II and Neutral Immigrants - Status III

Since immigrants from ethnic groups in these two statuses were grouped in government policy proclamations, they were also grouped in this section of the thesis. However it is important to remember that Status II immigrants are considered to have a "favoured" status while Status III immigrants are considered to have a "neutral" status. As a reading aid, areas of citizenship with Status III immigrants were underlined.

After World War II the control of immigration from central, and eastern European communist countries ceased to be a probable issue once

---

[43] See Appendix 10, p. 198.

[44] See Appendix 13, p. 202.

the displaced persons programs were ended since post war communist governments effectively curbed their emigration.

In the post war period, excluding "most favoured" Status I immigrants and displaced persons, farm workers from the Netherlands were first to obtain entry privileges as a sizable group.[45] After repeated representations by Great Britain, some Maltese were also admitted under Order in Council on a trial basis.[46]

Later, under Regulations amended in 1952, nationals from Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, Sweden and Switzerland in approved trades who had funds for transportation and to maintain themselves until employment was secured, were eligible for entry. Dutch citizens were still covered by the special intergovernment agreement. Agriculturists, farm workers, domestics, nurses and nurses' aides were eligible for entry if they were citizens of Germany, Austria, Greece and Finland. As well, a legal resident of Canada could sponsor a fairly wide group of relatives who were citizens of these countries. It is noteworthy that Greece, an area of citizenship with Status III immigrants, received "favoured" status, at least in this policy statement. Italian citizens, the major source of 'Latin' immigrants were permitted the more narrow group of workers for whom orders had been approved prior to 1952. Also sponsorship privileges were more restricted. Citizens from all other European countries had no open placement immigration privileges but could be

---

[45]This was after an approach by the Netherlands government. Approximately 15,000 immigrants were involved over a three year period. See William Petersen, op. cit., especially pp. 180-183.

[46]Approximately 500 immigrants were involved in this initial experiment which was later continued. Freda Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 403, 404.

sponsored by legal residents of Canada per Section B (i) in the Order in Council.[47] Also, as noted by Freda Hawkins, by "special concessions in 1949 and 1951 which were not publicized, it was agreed that Armenians should be treated as Europeans for the purpose of sponsoring relatives. When the immigration regulations were revised in 1956, Armenians were then processed according to their country of citizenship."[48]

Under the Regulations as amended in 1956, citizens by birth of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, could come to Canada under the auspices of the department or if the department had given its approval for establishment in a business, trade, profession or in agriculture. Similarly Canadian citizens legally resident in Canada had equal sponsorship privileges of citizens of all European countries just listed. With the introduction of these Regulations, the distinction between listed Status II and Status III immigrants became obscured at the policy level but not, as we shall see, at the administrative level.

Also under the Regulations as amended in 1956, a person who was a citizen by birth or naturalization of Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, or of any other country of Europe, North America (if not already covered), Central America, or South America was eligible for sponsorship if a husband, wife, an unmarried child under 21, the finacé or finacée of a Canadian citizen or a person legally admitted to Canada as a permanent resident. No open placement immigration was sanctioned but such sponsorship privileges

---

[47] See Appendix 10, p. 198.

[48] Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 404.

parallelled the privileges for most European countries.

In 1959, after an Order in Council was withdrawn after the stormy parliamentary debate it occasioned, a similar Immigration Department directive was implemented that restricted sponsored immigration from Italy and Greece.[49]

Proscribed Immigrants - Status IV

The "proscribed" ethnic status group included Negroes, East Indians, Chinese and Japanese or as they were more generally called, the 'colored races'.

Norma Walmsley, writing a special report for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in 1965, stressed most strongly that 'ethnic balance' as a criterion for immigrant selection and exclusion, historically had meant not a French-Canadian English-Canadian ratio or a ratio of all ethnic groups in Canada, but "for decades" pertained to 'white versus colored races'.[50] This was supported by an interview she conducted with former Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Jack Pickersgill, by study of historical government policy and practice, and a reading of the minutes of the Departmental Advisory Committee on Immigration (DACI), established June 27, 1950. As quoted by Walmsley, the July 7, 1950 meeting of 'DACI' reaffirmed "the present policy of not facilitating the admission of colored or partly-colored immigrants". As well, referring specifically to Asiatic 'race', "as a matter of policy, it is not desirable to facilitate the admission of such families".[51]

---

[49] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 113.

[50] Ibid., p. 90.

[51] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., pp. 87,88.

A 'background brief' provided for committee members at the Sept. 27, 1951 meeting observed that

> "it has long been the policy of the Department to restrict the admission to Canada of colored or partly colored persons. This policy is based on unfavorable experience with respect to Negro settlements such as we have in Halifax, the generally depressed circumstances of the Negro in Canada and an understanding that the Canadian people is not willing to accept any significant group of negro immigrants."

The committee decided that rejection of such immigrants (where possible) "would be based on occupational grounds ... (which) ... would be a much easier policy to uphold".[52]

Such assumed unassimilability notwithstanding, an External Affairs representative at the September 15, 1951 meeting stated that Canadian immigration policy was likely hurting Canadian-British West Indies trade and therefore supported increased but still restricted entry of British Caribbeans 'irregardless of race'. At the October 1 meeting, it was decided that more colored immigrants should be allowed in "providing the numbers of persons landed does not contribute to a change in the fundamental character of the population".[53]

In a 1952 statement, Walter Harris, Citizenship and Immigration Minister prior to J.W. Pickersgill, summarized Orders in Council P.C. 2856 and P.C. 2155 for the House of Commons.[54] British West Indians could gain admission under sponsorship privileges per subsection 1 B (ii), or through 'exceptional merit', subsection 1 b (i). Given the few British West

---

[52] Ibid., pp. 88, 89.

[53] Ibid., pp. 88-90.

[54] See Appendix 10, p. 198.

Indians legally naturalized in Canada, only the criterion of exceptional merit was really applicable and from the minutes of the DACI meetings, it appeared that money was the defining qualification for 'exceptional merit'.

> "Individual cases were indeed often discussed during these committee meetings and exceptions made, regarding admissions of Jews, Germans, Russians, etc., provided that substantial amounts of money were ready to be transferred or were available to immigrants." 55

The rate of increase or decrease of British West Indies immigration was thus almost completely at the discretion of the Minister and his senior officials.

'Climatic' conditions was perhaps the most dubious criterion employed by the government to justify 'colored' exclusion. In a famous case in 1953, Joseph Noseworthy read a Walter Harris letter to the House of Commons which regarded a Barbados Negro applying for admission to Canada to join her grandfather. Her exclusion was justified on the grounds that she had spent the greater part of her life in a subtropical country whose climate was quite different from Canada's. It "was a matter of record" that the health of such immigrants was more likely to break down than immigrants coming from countries climatically similar to Canada. Also it was claimed that these immigrants found it difficult to succeed in Canada's highly competitive economy. When questionned about these 'facts' in the House of Commons, Mr. Harris admitted that information was not available or that suitable statistics had not been kept. Not surprisingly, charges of blatant racial discrimination were levelled at the

---

[55] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 89.

government.[56] Since 1953 'climate' as a criterion for immigrant exclusion has been left out of the Regulations. However while one criterion justifying immigrant exclusion had been removed, others just as easily could be used.

These restrictions remained substantially unchanged, until Ellen Fairclough's declaration of a new policy in 1962 with the exception of an experimental domestic employment scheme.[57]

Like Negroes, East Indians had both implicit and explicit regulations limiting their entry. Under Order in Council ı P.C. 2155, 1949, only the wife, or unmarried children under 18 could be sponsored by a Canadian citizen.[58] As indicated in the House of Commons by Walter Harris in 1952, sponsorship privileges had been slightly widened and now included husband, wife and unmarried children under 21. In addition under these 'liberalized' regulations, quotas were established with the governments of India, Pakistan and Ceylon for 150, 100 and 50 open placement immigrants respectively each year.[59] By 1956, fathers over 65 and mothers over 60 could be sponsored by Canadian citizens, who were in a position to receive and care for them. Also the quota for open placement Indian immigrants had raised to 300.[60]

---

[56] Canada, House of Commons, Debates, April 24, 1953, p. 4351.

[57] Joyce Cole, "West Indian Teachers and Nurses in Ontario, Canada: A Study of Migration Patterns", M.A. Thesis, McMaster University, 1967, p. 2.

[58] At this time, sponsorship of relatives of 'Asiatic race' was restricted to Canadian citizens, not the wider classification 'legal residents of Canada' employed for other racial and ethnic groups.

[59] See Appendix 10, p. 198.

[60] See Appendix 14, p. 202.

In post war government terminology 'Asiatic race'[61] included the categorization 'other Asians', which referred initially to Chinese and also some Japanese immigrants. This was also a consistently restricted group. Many Chinese immigrants were brought to Canada at the turn of the century by railway companies as labourers. To quote a member of parliament in 1952, these people "were regarded as being most indigestible, as peoples we could not possibly assimilate".[62]

Under Order in Council P.C. 2155, 1949, 'other Asians' had the same very narrowly defined sponsorship privileges as East Indians. A Canadian citizen in a position to receive and care for them could only sponsor a wife and unmarried child under 18. In Parliament, Immigration Minister Walter Harris acknowledged

> "that, in some cases, there have been evidences of real hardship and perhaps suffering if that rule were to be applied rigidly. It has been applied rigidly, Mr. Chairman, and I do not know of any exceptions which have been made to it up to the present time." 63

As further indicated in this 1952 statement, sponsorship privileges for 'other Asians' had been slightly enlarged to include the husband, wife,

---

[61]Freda Hawkins has summarized what 'Asia' and Asiatic race' meant to the post war Liberal government. "But in the minds of the Canadian Liberal government in 1947, Asia meant almost everything in the Eastern Hemisphere outside Europe. Its northwest frontier ran along the southern border of the Soviet Union and the Black Sea and round the eastern and southern coasts of the Mediterranean. All Turkey and lands to the south, including Egypt, were in Asia. Only the Armenians managed to slip out of the Asian net. Thus by excluding Asians and, by association and extension, Africans also (except South Africans), Canada was prepared to accept only one kind of immigrant from the Eastern Hemisphere - the European immigrant." Freda Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 94,95.

[62]Canada, House of Commons, Debates, July 4, 1952, p. 4272.

[63]Appendix 10, p. 198.

unmarried children under 21 and in very special cases sons or daughters between 21 and 25.[64] However, in a 1955 statement, apparently reflecting policy implemented through a departmental directive, Citizenship and Immigration Minister J.W. Pickersgill indicated that children between the ages of 21 and 25 were no longer eligible for admission. Under Order in Council P.C. 1551, 1955, no child under 21 could gain entry until both parents had already been landed or landed concurrently with him.[65] Later under the Regulations as amended in 1956, sponsorship privileges were modified to include the father when he was over 65 and the mother when she was over 60.[66]

Needless to say, 'other Asians' had the most restricted sponsorship privileges under the various Regulations, although 'Negroes' and East Indians were not far behind. Large scale open placement immigration was only from areas of citizenship where Status I, Status II, or in some cases, Status III immigrants predominated.

(ii) 1962-1970

Under the amended Regulations of 1962, Section 31, race and ethnicity as a criterion of immigrant exclusion was more limited in official policy. Open placement selection criterion officially applied to almost all potential groups of immigrants. The notable exceptions were immigrants from India, Pakistan and Ceylon which still were limited by a quota of 300, 150 and 50 open placement immigrants respectively. Rawlyk

---

[64] Ibid.

[65] Appendix 12, p. 201.

[66] Appendix 13, p. 202.

observed that this

> "glaring contradiction of the 'principles of equity and justice' which Mrs. Fairclough maintained were at the very heart of the regulations was the result of a real fear that without such a barrier there would be an unprecedented influx of suitably qualified immigrants." 67

Under the amended Regulations most areas of citizenship with Status I, Status II and Status III immigrants had sponsorship privileges per Section 31 (d) (i) and (ii).[68] Potential sponsored immigrants who were not citizens of any country in Europe, including Turkey, or of any country of North, Central or South America or islands adjacent thereto, or of Egypt, Israel or Lebanon, had increased but still restricted sponsorship privileges. These regulations applied to most immigrants in Asia and Africa. Citizens of India, Pakistan and Ceylon were exceptions and the very restrictive sponsorship privileges per Section 21, were considered "still in full force and effect".[69]

While this policy was certainly less restrictive than previous policy, under Section 61 of the Immigration Act, a minister still could refuse immigration privileges for the usual wide number of reasons.

Under the Regulations as amended in 1967 and effective October 1, 1967, race and ethnicity disappeared as an official criterion controlling the entry of immigrants. Federal government press releases and the speeches of Manpower and Immigration Minister Jean Marchand and his successors stress this point most strongly.[70]

---

[67] G.R. Rawlyk, op. cit., p. 298.

[68] See Appendix 17, p. 207.

[69] Canada, House of Commons, Debates, Jan. 19, 1962, p. 10.

[70] Press Release, Office of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, September 12, 1967, p. 2 and House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, April 6, 1971, p. 12:10.

b. Administrative Practice

Through strategic visa office location, staffing procedures in these visa offices, and selective advertising and promotional campaigns, the department responsible for immigration has regulated the immigration flow racially and ethnically. Order in Council P.C. 1743, 1949 defined immigrant admissibility categories by birth or naturalization according to a sliding scale of preference by what was defined in the thesis as an immigrant group's "ethnic status". Rawlyk has noted that

> "to ensure further that the bulk of immigrants would come from the British Commonwealth countries, the United States, and Northern Europe, most of the Canadian immigration offices were established in those countries, and most of the immigration propaganda was concentrated there as well." 71

As stated by an Immigration Department official,

> "We are bound by the provisions of the Regulations (since 1962) to service applications anywhere in the world but there is nothing to prevent us from concentrating our promotion of immigration from our traditional sources." 72

Table 3 breaks down immigration office location and their personnel by areas of citizenship and their corresponding predominant ethnic status group for 1961, the year before the Immigration Act was amended.

As expected, the majority of immigration offices and officers were located in areas of citizenship where Status I and Status II immigrants predominated, a total of 21 offices and 282 officials. As indicated by Walmsley two additional offices would have opened in France in April 1956

---

[71] G. Rawlyk, op. cit., p. 291.

[72] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 124.

Table 3: "Immigration Offices Location and Personnel by Ethnic Status Groups"

Ethnic Status Group	Area of Citizenship	Immigration Offices	Personnel
I	Great Britain	London, Liverpool, Leeds Bristol, Belfast, Glasgow	111
	France	Paris	22
	Ireland	Dublin	6
		8	139
II	Germany	Cologne, Berlin, Munich, Hamburg, Stuttgart	70
	Austria	Vienna	16
	Belgium	Brussels	12
	Denmark	Copenhagen	11
	Finland	Helsinki	4
	Holland	The Hague	16
	Norway	Oslo	4
	Sweden	Stockholm	4
	Switzerland	Berne	6
		13	143
III	Italy	Rome	32
	Greece	Athens	10
	Portugal	Lisbon	6
	Israel	Tel Aviv	7
		4	55
IV	China	Hong Kong	14
	India	New Delhi	7
		2	21
Grand Totals		27	358

In addition there were four 'information offices' in the United States with an undisclosed number of personnel. They were at New York City, Chicago, Denver and San Francisco.

Sources: Canada, House of Commons, Debates, February 16, 1961, p. 2135 and Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 381.

as part of the Canadian government's continuing effort to increase French immigration. However due to the French government's disapproval of immigration activities generally, these offices could not be opened until in 1964 and 1965.[73] In addition 4 offices and an unknown number of officials should be included for posts in the United States.[74] Areas of citizenship with Status III and Status IV immigrants had 4 offices with 55 officials and 2 offices with 21 officials respectively.

As was so well known by immigration officials, these staffing and office location procedures greatly determined the upper ceiling of the immigration flow, especially by ethnicity, that could be handled in a given period of time.[75]

Lack of complete facilities also effectively curtailed immigration which was seemingly permitted in official policy. Ellen Fairclough charged that prior to August 22, 1958 immigrants could not directly be admitted from the following such countries or areas: Spain, Malta, Cypress, Andorra, Iceland, Monaco, San Marino, Liechenstein, Vatican City, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, Mexico, and the countries of Central and South America. As an example, potential Spanish immigrants likely had to either go to the Lisbon, Portugal office for consideration or wait for a visiting officer to come to Madrid in Spain.

Conversely the Immigration Department facilitated immigration through the judicious use of 'immigration teams'. As reported by Mr. McGee during Question Period in the House of Commons in 1962,

---

[73]Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 103.

[74]These were called 'information offices'.

[75]Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 114.

> "since 1957, immigration teams have visited refugee camps in Austria, Italy, Yugoslavia, North Africa and the United Arab Republic for the purpose of selecting and examining applicants for admission to Canada. For the same purpose, an immigration officer has been stationed in Cairo for the past seven months and, earlier this year, an immigration team was sent to the West Indies." 76

These immigration teams facilitated very specific immigration flows. For example, as indicated in the Annual Reports of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Jews were interviewed in Morocco and Tunisia while domestics were interviewed in the West Indies and Guyana.[77]

Similarly, the lack of open placement immigration privileges for many areas of citizenship with Status III and Status IV immigrants lead to very specific family oriented immigration of the preferred ethnicities. Immigration Minister Pickersgill observed in 1956 that immigration to Canada from Egypt consisted of Britons, French, Armenians and Jews but not Egyptians. From Turkey came Armenians with relatives in Canada but no Turks. From Lebanon and Israel came relatives again while from Central and South America cametransmigrating World War II refugees with relatives in Canada.

Breaking from the criterion of family connection, Pickersgill also stated that "in the interest of world peace, Canada was willing to accept some of the Arab refugees". Opposition M.P. Regier claimed that Mr. Pickersgill also stated that they must be able to speak either English or French and have an employable trade. As Mr. Regier commented, "I do not see how that is helping the situation at all".[78]

---

[76]Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 1962, p. 1122.

[77]See for example, Annual Report 1964-1965, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, p. 21.

[78]Canada, House of Commons, Debates, Jan. 25, 1956, p. 540.

The most direct example of administrative control affected southern Europeans. Their immigration increased sharply in the 1950's as immigrants gained entry through sponsorship privileges. The 'chain reaction' or 'seed effect' of increasing applications for landed immigrant status resulting from family ties and sponsorship rights soon outstripped immigration facilities in both Rome and Athens to process them.

Norma Walmsley quoted a memo from the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Jack Pickersgill, Nov. 6, 1957.

> "At the present time, the increasing volume of sponsored immigration from Greece and Italy, which has forced the almost complete curtailment of unsponsored immigration from these countries, has been controlled administratively by limiting the processing staff. The backlog of Italian sponsored cases at the end of September 1957 was 52,004 (persons), an increase of over 20,000 from the previous year." 79

From the minutes of the April, 1958, Departmental Advisory Committee on Immigration meeting, Walmsley noted that the 'tremendous' backlog of close relative sponsored cases had reached 60,000 for Italy and 9,000 for Greece.[80]

At this juncture, the government introduced an Order in Council to correct an impossible situation only being made worse by administrative delaying tactics.

> "Wishing to place the emphasis on the well-qualified unsponsored, (it)recommended that the (generally unqualified) sponsored movement be curtailed by deleting from the 'sponsored admissibility classes' the non-dependent relatives, i.e., brothers, sisters,

---

[79]Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 114.

[80]Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 106.

> married sons and daughters. Cabinet approval was secured and an order in council was passed to that effect in February 1959." 81

It was quickly withdrawn however, after heated House of Commons debate. Former Citizenship and Immigration Minister Jack Pickersgill rising to pressures from the ethnic press and the general political situation 'roasted' the government for implementing a "stupid, cruel, silly, and inhuman" policy that discriminated blatantly against the Italian ethnic group.[82]

The new Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Ellen Fairclough claimed that the whole policy that she had inherited from Pickersgill was racially and ethnically discriminatory and that she had also inherited the present problem from him as well. She had also inherited the solution, for as Walmsley indicated, the Liberals were about to initiate a similar policy of restricting family sponsorship rights just before they were defeated in the general election of 1957.[83]

While the Order in Council had been revoked due to Pickersgill's inspired political hypocrisy, the problem still remained. It was solved through 'administrative' action. As Walmsley revealed from the January 4th and 5th 1960 minutes of the 'Management Committee', advisory body to the Director of Immigration:

> "In the discussion concerned with processing the back-log in Italy, it was decided to provide for the admission of cases of exceptional merit who were not sponsored by close relatives. The situation was, that, owing to the huge pile of 'sponsored' categories to be dealt with, "good unsponsored cases were unable to get attention"-

---

[81] Ibid., p. 111.

[82] Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 1959, p. 2711.

[83] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., pp. 111,112.

> and it was necessary to set up a system of priorities 'to do administratively what could not be done by order in council last spring'. The Committee minutes went on to state that 'because it is quite improper to exclude all unsponsored applications from considerations, cases of special merit will be given priority immediately ahead of brothers, sisters, married sons, and daughters and so on. i.e., they will be able to come to Canada without undue delay' -- despite the regulations." 84

With a new immigration policy being implemented in 1962 and with this policy being further rationalized in 1966, new immigration offices were opened and new administrative procedures adopted as the department sought to better put into practice the pronouncements that these policies no longer discriminated racially and ethnically between immigrants. However, as Hawkins observed, for an initial period,

> "the 1962 immigration regulations which removed discrimination, except in the sponsoring of relatives, did not result in a striking increase in the admission to Canada of independent applicants from non-European countries. This was not a matter of design, although this possible outcome may well have occurred to those who planned thr regulations. It was due to the fact that the facilities to service large numbers of non-European applications were simply not there: the necessary visa offices and staff did not exist. Canada was just emerging from a severe bout of governmental austerity which had caught the Immigration Branch when it was seriously understaffed. No money had been available for any kind of expansion." 85

A statement in the Immigration Department's 1963 Annual Report indicated new procedures were adopted but also that they had not yet probably affected very many new potential immigrants.

> "To cope with the increased number of applications which followed the enactment of the new regulations special measures were introduced. Where circumstances

---

[84] Ibid., p. 113.

[85] Freda Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 76, 77.

> permitted, certain countries in which Canadian Immigration offices were not located, were placed under the jurisdiction of Canadian Immigration offices located in adjacent countries, or in the general area. Other countries and areas are serviced from Immigration Headquarters in Ottawa.
>
> Under this arrangement, immigration teams are sent from the ten area offices to interview, examine, and counsel prospective immigrants residing in the countries under the jurisdiction of each area office. The first of these teams visited countries in the Caribbean Area between May and July, 1962. As a result of this visit, the admission of between two and three hundred people was approved. By the end of the summer of 1962 the case load at Branch Headquarters at Ottawa alone had increased by more than half." 86

Gradually, however, new offices were opened, or old offices sometimes enlarged, especially in areas of citizenship where Status III and Status IV ethnic status groups predominated. Table 2 lists "Immigration Offices, Dates Opened and Closed by Ethnic Status Groups - 1970 (May 30)".

On May 30, 1970 the number of immigration offices from areas of citizenship having predominantly Status I, Status II, Status III, and Status IV immigrants was 10, 9, 11 and 7 offices respectively. The corresponding number of offices in 1961 was 9, 13, 4 and 2.[87] Also under new procedures, 'immigration teams', 'area coverage' and 'coverage from Ottawa' applied primarily to Status III and Status IV immigrants. Thus both immigration policy and apparently administrative practice and control had been significantly liberalized.

The present policy of the Immigration Department regarding prefer-

---

[86] Annual Report, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1963, p. 16.

[87] Not included in these totals were four United States information offices in 1961 and 3 in 1970.

ence by race and ethnicity as it affected administrative practice was summed up best in the subtle words of the 1967 Canada Yearbook.

> "Over the years, Canada has endeavoured to acquire immigrants who were adaptable to Canadian life. Such persons, finding familiar institutions in Canada, feel more at home and this assists in their establishment in the new life they find here. Canada makes every effort to sustain the movement of immigrants from countries having like economic, social and political backgrounds. On the other hand, qualified people from other countries can integrate successfully into Canadian society and the Immigration Regulation recognize this principle. People everywhere in the world have an opportunity to immigrate to Canada if they demonstrate their suitability for life in this country and are likely to become established without hardship to themselves or disruption to the communities in which they settle." 88

Thus, 'traditional' sources of immigration to Canada were the basic promotional concern of the department although other sources still avowedly received equal treatment when they applied.

One very important factor and at the same time justification for continuing this practice was the 'brain drain' from developing nations.

> "Our endeavour is to obtain a complete balance among countries where we are permitted in all conscience to promote immigration. As I said the other day, we do no promoting as such in the so-called developing countries since we feel we could not do that in all conscience." 89

For 1967-1968, Mr. Curry of the Department of Manpower and Immigration outlined in very general terms the department's promotional effort. This was for the House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration. As stated by Mr. Curry Nov. 14, 1968:

---

[88] Canada Yearbook, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1967, p. 215.

[89] House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, Nov. 28, 1968, p. 118.

Table 4: "Immigration Offices, Dates Opened and Closed by Ethnic Status Groups - 1970" (May 30)

Ethnic Status Group	Area of Citizenship	Offices	Date Opened	Offices Closed 1961 - 1970
I	Great Britain	London		Liverpool
		Birmingham	1966	Leeds
		Manchester	1969	Bristol
		Glasgow	1948	
		Belfast	1949	
	France	Paris	1946	
		Bordeaux	1966	
		Marseilles	1964	
	Ireland	Dublin	1949	
	Australia	Sydney	1968	
		10 (8 - 1961)		3
II	Germany	Cologne	1956	
		Hamburg	1954	
		Stuttgart	1956	Munich
		Berlin	1955	Berlin (1970
	Austria	Vienna	1955	
	Belgium	Brussels	1948	Oslo, Norway
	Sweden	Stockholm	1948	Helsinki, Finland
	Switzerland	Berne	1949	
	Denmark	Copenhagen	1950	
	The Netherlands	The Hague	1947	
		9 (13 - 1961)		4
III	Italy	Rome	1948	
		Milan	1965	
	Portugal	Lisbon	1957	
		Ponta Delgada	1967	
	Spain	Madrid	1963	
	Greece	Athens	1949	
	Hungary	Budapest	1969	
	Yugoslavia	Belgrade	1968	
	Egypt	Cairo	1963	
	Israel	Tel Aviv	1955	
	Lebanon	Beirut	1967	
		11 (4 - 1961)		
IV	Hong Kong	Hong Kong	1948	
	India	New Delhi	1952	
	Pakistan	Islamabad	1967	
	Japan	Tokyo	1966	
	Philippines	Manila	1964	
	Jamaica	Kingston	1967	
	Trinidad	Port of Spain	1967	
		7 (2 - 1961)		
Grand Totals		37 (27 - 1961)		7 (17 new offices)

In addition, three information offices were still open in the United States at New York City, Chicago and San Francisco while two had been closed at Denver and Los Angeles.

Source: Freda Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 379-382.

> "In the year 1967-68 we were still continuing a fairly massive promotional effort in a number of countries, largely in Europe. Probably the biggest expenditure occurred in Britain during that period.
>
> During the present fiscal year, and looking at the requirements of it, it was concluded that heavy promotion in Britain and in other countries in Europe would not be necessary because the number of people that we would likely be able to work into our economy this year might be somewhat less than in the previous year. That is how it is working out.
>
> The promotion effort in France was maintained at a somewhat higher level, proportionately, than was the one in Great Britain because of the imbalance between the numbers of immigrants coming from Britain - which was very heavy - and the relatively light numbers that have been coming from France." 90

At the Nov. 28, 1968 committee meeting, Mr. Curry discussed the countries other than Great Britain and France where there was active promotion.

> "There is some, to a limited degree in Belgium and there is some in West Germany. There is no promotion at all in Scandinavian countries. From time to time for special types of tradesmen we try in Italy by arrangment with the Italian government each time. There is not too much really. We do some promoting in the United States, and there we are not restrained. But we do not do a great deal of it since it would be very costly to advertise in any meaningful way in the United States.
>
> I think that pretty nearly covers all places where we are actually spending money in active promotion." 91

The department's advertising budget in the United Kingdom and Europe for the years 1967-1968 and 1970-1971 was 'roughly' as follows:

---

[90] House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, Nov. 14, 1968, p. 37.

[91] Ibid., Nov. 28, 1968, p. 118.

	1968-1969	1970-1971
United Kingdom	$87,000	$110,000
Europe	$86,000	$187,000

Source: House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, April 28, 1970, p. 4:26.

In addition to selective promotion campaigns, the Immigration Department could have used or could still be using other forms of administrative control to discriminate between Status I, II, III and IV immigrants. Factors that would have to be thoroughly analyzed in order to determine if the spirit of the 1967 regulations were carried out would include

1. immigration backlog data by each area of citizenship sub-divided into 'independent', 'nominated' and 'sponsored' categories;

2. data on the number of staff at each post and the numbers of immigrants processed at each post sub-divided by 'independent', 'nominated' and 'sponsored'; and

3. data on both the length of time taken to process immigrants at each post and the timing of the granting of the visas.

Very little of this data is public and complete analysis of all the mitigating factors would be quite involved. As an indication that administrative control of the different ethnic status groups might still have been practiced subsequent to 1967 even if unwittingly,we need only note from Hansard the 'backlog' problems encountered in Portugal; New Delhi, India; and Hong Kong, China.[92] Also it was reported that on Dec. 9, 1968 there were 8,588 immigrant applicants awaiting processing in the West Indies and that on "Oct. 31, 1969 there were 4,374 applicants for admission to

---

[92]House of Commons, Debates, Feb. 28, 1968, p. 7099. Also see House of Commons, Debates, Nov. 27, 1968, p. 3249.

Canada in the nominated relative category in process at the Hong Kong office."[93]

The problem of providing a uniformly fair immigration service and the particular case of the office in Hong Kong were described by Mr. Curry.

> "I am compelled to say in all conscience that throughout our general service, with some exceptions, we are nowhere adequately serviced. In other words, we do not have enough people and money to do the job that we think we should do, but we have done our best to rid ourselves in our administration of gross inequalities. In other words we are trying to give the same service or standard in Delhi, Hong Kong and other points in Asia that has obtained over many years in certain European countries. The work load is measured very carefully, and a reassessment of the staff requirements is made periodically so that gross inequalities should not persist.
>
> The Hong Kong office is a case in point. I visited it only a month ago. Whereas we had some 15 people in it no later than four years ago we now have 38 people in Hong Kong, including the local employees. ...
>
> The sponsored person has no more waiting time in Hong Kong than anywhere else. A wife or child of an immigrant who has been landed in Canada can come forward as quickly as they could from almost any other point. The nominated immigrant may have to wait a little longer. The people who have to wait the longest from some points of view are the people who apply on their own as independent persons. I am speaking of a man with a trade or profession, but unfortunately other people have prior claims on humanitarian grounds." 94

A final illustration of 'residual' discrimination is provided by the government loan scheme. It assisted the transportation costs of an independent immigrant and his immediate family. As indicated by Manpower and Immigration Minister Jean Marchand, an increasing proportion of immigrants availed themselves of loans until in 1967 25% of all immigrants

---

[93] House of Commons, Debates, Feb. 4, 1970, p. 3198.

[94] House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, Nov. 28, 1968, p. 111.

used them. They initially were available only to immigrants from certain countries in Europe. In 1966 the program was extended to also apply to immigrants from 13 islands in the West Indies.[95] As indicated by Manpower and Immigration Minister Otto Lang in March 1970, these loans would be "placed on a universal basis on April 1 this year thus enabling an immigrant in any part of the world to obtain a loan to come to Canada if his occupation is in demand in Canada."[96] This was four years after Jean Marchand initially stated that the fund was to be universalized.[97]

In addition to general sponsored classes, the 1962 Regulations designated a second class of sponsored immigrant who in addition to being a relation, had to have "education, training, skills or other special qualifications", so as "to be able to establish himself successfully in Canada". This sponsorable class included the son, son-in-law, daughter or fiancé of a Canadian citizen.[98]

In the case of 'traditional' sources of immigration and West Indian immigrants, the only applicable sponsorable class was 'finacé' since the other classes of relations had already been included in their general sponsorship privileges. The sources of immigration that this particular type of sponsorship specifically pertained to were:

a. relations of 'Asians' who would have to get in on their own merit in addition to being sponsored; and

---

[95] Canada, House of Commons, Debates, May 25, 1967, p. 569.

[96] Ibid., March 1970, p. 1:19.

[97] Canada, House of Commons, Debates, May 25, 1967, p. 569.

[98] 'Canadian citizens' as sponsors is instead of the wider classification Canadian citizens and legal residents of Canada. With this restricted criteria it would take at least five years to forge each sponsorship link.

b. finaces of West Indian domestics who would also have to get in on their own merits in addition to being sponsored. 99

In summary, the Regulations as amended in 1962 provided Status I, II and III immigrants basically the same wide general sponsorship privileges that they had enjoyed in 1956. Status IV immigrants had considerably wider general sponsorship privileges than previously. In addition, a new class of immigrant was created who had entry privileges based on relationship and skills, education and training. This category applied primarily to 'Asians' and West Indians.

Selection by Family Connection

a. Canadian Immigration Policy

Under the Regulations as amended in 1962, the principle that immigrants be admitted to Canada through family connection was made more universal. That is, the sliding scale of preference by which a Canadian could sponsor a wider range of relatives from higher ranking ethnic status groups than from lower ranking ethnic status groups was made more equal.

The intentions of the Immigration Department, as stated in an internal memorandum by the Deputy Minister, Dr. Davidson are revealing.

> "Our prime objective in the proposed revision is to eliminate all discrimination based on colour, race or creed. This means that, if we continue to allow Greeks, Poles, Italians, Portugese and other Europeans to bring in the wide range of relatives presently admissable, we will have to do the same for Japanese, Chinese, Indians, Pakistanis, Africans, persons from the Arab world, the West Indies and so forth. The only possible result of this would be a substantially larger number of unskilled

---

99 See Appendix 17, p. 207. This restriction was removed by Order in Council P.C. 1964-1270, p. 209.

close relatives from these parts of the world to add to the influx of unskilled close relatives from Europe.

We can in short achieve our prime objective of eliminating 'all' discrimination only in two ways:

1. By opening the doors to close relatives from the 'coloured' parts of the world to the present level accorded to Europeans. This will greatly increase (probably double within a very few years) the influx of unskilled persons as close relatives: or

2. By a compromise, as proposed in the Draft Regulations, reducing to some extent the categories of European close relatives who can be admitted, regardless of skills, and then raising the 'coloured' countries to a level of equality with the European." 100

In the amended regulations, all discrimination was not eliminated, but general sponsorship privileges were widened for 'Asians' and included, per Section 31. (c),

> "a person who is the parent, grandparent, husband, wife or fiancee, or the unmarried son or daughter under twenty-one years of age, of a Canadian citizen or of an individual legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence..."

New sponsorable classes for 'Asians' included the parents of working age, grandparents and finacee.

More favoured sources of immigration included citizens of "any country of Europe, including Turkey; or of any country of North, Central or South America or islands adjacent thereto; or of Egypt, Israel or Lebanon". Sponsorable classes of these immigrants included

a. all the relations described in Section 31.(c), and partially overlapping these criteria,

b. "(i) the son, daughter, brother or sister, as well as the husband or wife and the unmarried son or daughter under twenty-one years of age of any such son, daughter, brother or sister, as the case may be; or

---

100 Freda Hawkins, op. cit., pp.130-131.

(ii) the unmarried orphan newphew or niece under twenty-one years of age, or finace..." 101

These classes of sponsorable immigrants from 'traditional' Status I, II, and III sources of immigration, plus for the first time immigrants from the West Indies, had the same wide sponsorship privileges as defined in 1956, except for 'fiancé'. The exclusion of 'fiancé' as an easily sponsorable class eliminated one potential group of fiancés that was 'coloured' and presumably unskilled; the fiancés of West Indian domestics brought to Canada under special agreement.

Under the Regulations as amended in 1967, completely universal criteria for admitting 'family oriented' immigration were instituted. Sponsorship privileges were the same for all possible sources of immigration. Two classes of relation were distinguished - the 'sponsored' and the 'nominated'. Sponsored meant dependent relatives while nominated meant more distant relatives who would quite likely enter the labour force. Nominated relatives were subject to a points system based on 70 points. Depending on the nominator's relation to the immigrant and whether or not the immigrant was applying in Canada or overseas, between 20 and 45 points were required for admission. The criteria for assessing points were "education and training", "personal assessment", "occupational demand", "occupational skill" and "age".[102] In effect the principle that family immigration be controlled by a sliding scale of preference based on races and ethnicities had been replaced by control procedures emphasizing the entry of immigrants with higher levels of skills and education.

---

[101] Appendix 17, p.207.

[102] See Appendix 19, pp. 210.

b. Administrative Practice

The principle that immigration to Canada should be encouraged by family connection was perpetuated by the notions that

1. family connection aided immigrant adjustment and socialization in Canada,
2. existing racial and ethnic 'balances' would be perpetuated by this policy, and that
3. reuniting families was an important political consideration.

These criteria did not apply to 'Asians' and the 'colored races' whose family formation in Canada by immigration was emphatically discouraged and tightly controlled in policy and practice until at least 1962. However, given these exceptions,

> "'Sponsored' immigration had begun after World War II as a seemingly practical course of action, at a time when Canada virtually had no immigration machinery. It was cheap, requiring no promotion and little selection staff. In 1950, when the Cabinet approved the admissions of sponsored relatives of almost any degree, they did not forsee the extent to which the policy would develop. It was not long before officials were attempting some form of control. In 1957 and 1952 they met with strong objections." 103

As already noted, backlogs were created as large number of Italians, Greeks and Portugese applied for entry to Canada through sponsorship. Backlogs were sharply reduced when immediate relations were given priority before independent applicants and independent applicants were given priority before more distant relations.

Despite backlog problems, the reuniting of families remained an important department consideration. Until immigration policy changes

---

[103] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 115.

beginning in 1962, many areas of citizenship without open placement privileges did have sponsorship privileges facilitating family reunification.

Beginning in 1962 however, the basic thinking of Immigration Department officials was that skills should be emphasized and sponsored immigrants without skills should be progressively excluded as a sponsorable class of immigrant. The new immigration policy of 1967 which designated independent, nominated and generally reduced but universalized sponsorship privileges, implemented such thinking that rational manpower and skill considerations were being negated by immigration where the only criterion for admission was family connection.

Still, the continuing significance of family connected immigration was underscored by the announcement February 25, 1967 in The Financial Post that the new immigration offices in Warsaw, Poland and Belgrade, Yugoslavia to be opened later that year would "be concerned with processing applications from old people and divided families who wish to join relatives already in Canada".[104]

One general practice of the Immigration Department over the years that has related family formation to economic requirements is the encouragement of workers in the spring and summer when job opportunities are available and the encouragement of dependent family immigration in the winter. Such a practice was begun primarily due to the protests of organized labour who argued that immigrants and seasonal unemployment did not mix.

Summary

As noted in Chapter 1 the major functional requirement of the

---

[104] Clive Baxter, "Immigration Pays Off in 'Instant Skillpower'", The Financial Post, Feb. 25, 1967, p. 24.

Canadian social system as it affected immigrants was the requirement for skilled workers, trained technicians and professionals to meet the labour demands of Canada's rapidly developing industrial economy of the mid 1950's and especially in the mid 1960's.

In Hypothesis 1 it was predicted that Canadian immigrants would be progressively much more highly skilled and educated during the post war period. The basis for this change was instituted in new immigration policies and practices which culminated with the introduction of the points system in 1967 as the crux of immigration management. Since 1967, for both independent and nominated immigrants a specific number of points have had to be obtained for admission to Canada. The higher the level of skill and education of an immigrant, the more points they would receive towards admission. However the two major criteria which ultimately determined the admission of an independent applicant were "occupational demand" and "employment opportunities in the area of destination".

In the case of potential immigrants with a low level of skill and education who intended jobs that Canadians wouldn't accept due to low wages or poor working conditions, the points awarded for occupational demand and area demand would sanction their admission if they were under 35 and fluent in one of the two official languages. Thus in addition to a progressively more skilled immigration flow which should vary systematically with economic conditions in Canada, there should still have been a pool of unskilled and uneducated immigrants intending low status jobs that Canadians were unwilling to accept.

In Chapter 1 it was observed that one of the potentially most important predictions of structural functional theorists in sociology was

that in industrializing or fully industrial economies with their highly stratified occupational structures, the functional requirement that workers be hired on the basis of merit tends to break down systems of privilege as the basis of recruitment. It was accordingly predicted as Hypothesis 2 that the racial and ethnic composition of Canada's immigration flow would be fundamentally restructured to include greater proportions of formerly restricted races and ethnicities. Between 1947-1967 there was a myriad of new government immigration policies and practices which favoured or restricted the entry of particular ethnic groups to Canada. Until at least 1962 there was a very evident scale of preference in immigration policy and practice which favoured British and French immigrants above northwest Europeans followed by other European sources ranked above rigorously restricted 'Coloured' immigration. With immigration policy changes in 1962 and 1967 race and ethnicity was completely eliminated as a principle of immigrant selection in law. Changes in administrative practice lagged behind but with the opening of new immigration offices in southern Europe, the West Indies and Asia and the extension of the immigrant loan assistance scheme to all possible sources of immigration in 1970, this gap between policy and practice was greatly reduced. One major bias still evident is the concentration of immigration promotion activities in Great Britain, France, some other European countries and the United States. One justification of this practice was that it would be morally wrong to advertise for skilled immigrants from developing Third World nations. In the case of India at least, with its high unemployment or underemployment rate of university graduates this argument rings very hollow and must be seen for what it was - a justification for keeping Status IV immigration 'in balance'.

However with the qualification that promotional activities were concentrated in traditional sources of immigration; it may be stated that in official immigration policy and in the most observable administrative practices, that race and ethnicity as a criterion for managing immigrant admissions was completely eradicated. It would thus be expected that the proportions of immigrants by races and ethnicities entering Canada would be dramatically restructured to include much higher proportions of Status IV immigrants.

In Hypothesis 3 it was expected that the proportion of sponsored immigrants would be reduced since this flow would likely be less skilled and educated. In immigration policy until 1967 the admission of immigrants through family connection or sponsorship privileges was linked to the sliding scale of preference favouring higher ranked ethnic status groups over lower ranked ones. This meant that immigrants in higher ranked ethnic groups could sponsor a larger group of relations than immigrants in lower ranked groups such as Asians. In fact there were several policies in the 1950's and the early 1960's which were directly aimed at preventing or greatly inhibiting the family formation of Asians and West Indians through immigration.

With the changes of immigration policy in 1967 the principle of immigrant selection through family connection was no longer linked to the principle of immigrant selection by favoured or restricted races and ethnicities. Instead two classes of relations were distinguished, the sponsored and the nominated relation - the former consisting of dependent relatives unlikely to enter the labour force and the latter consisting of more distant relations quite likely to enter the labour force. Under the

new Regulations the same classes of relations could be sponsored or nominated from all possible sources of immigration.

Nominated immigrants were also subject to a point system favouring the higher skilled and educated immigrant whose job was in demand in Canada. Thus it was expected after 1967 that there should have been a considerable drop in the proportion of low skilled nominated immigrants. Quite likely this would have meant a considerable drop in the proportion of Italian, Greek and Portugese nominated unskilled immigrants since in the early 1960's special policies had been introduced to effect this specific change.

In Hypothesis 4 it was predicted that immigrants of all origins would gain entry in higher 'entrance statuses' since the policy changes in the 1960's for both independent and nominated immigrants stressed higher levels of skill and education as admission criteria.

Chapter 3: Selection by Occupational Groups and Resultant Immigration to Canada

In this chapter are presented the empirical data to test for the expected findings predicted in Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 4.

Hypothesis 1

It was expected that the occupational structure of post war Canadian immigrants would be progressively a much more highly skilled flow by intended occupational class levels and specific jobs intended in Canada. However there still should be a pool of unskilled and uneducated immigrants intending low status jobs that Canadians were unwilling to accept.

Methodology

As a general measure of Hypothesis 1, an immigrant's intended occupation in Canada, as recorded in Immigration Statistics,[1] was scored using a compressed, adjusted Blishen socio-economic status scale.

The Blishen scale scored the 'social status' of 320 Canadian census occupations combining educational and income data for each occupation. It was an updating and revision of an earlier scale developed from the 1951 census. Significantly Blishen found that the rank correlation

---

[1] The table "Ethnic Origin and Intended Occupation of Immigrants" was used for the period 1958-1961 and the table "Country of Last Permanent Residence and Intended Occupation of Immigrants" for the period 1962-1970. For examples, see Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Statistics Section, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1959, pp. 10, 11 and Immigration Statistics, Dept. of Manpower and Immigration, Canada Immigration Division, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1966, pp. 10,11.

between the 1961 index and the 1951 occupational class scale was .96, "indicating both stability in the (Canadian occupational) structure over time and similarity of results".[2] Also, the high multiple correlation between the Pineo-Porter 'prestige scale' scores and Blishen income and educational levels scores was .919 for the 88 comparable occupations. Hence Blishen's assertion of the validity of Duncan's speculation, that

> "a man qualifies himself for occupational life by obtaining an education; as a consequence of pursuing his occupation he obtains income. Occupation, therefore, is the intervening activity linking income to education. If we characterize an occupation according to the prevailing levels of education and income of its incumbents, we are also describing one of its major "causes" and one of its major "effects"." 3

Most significantly for the thesis, occupational social status rankings in Canada are comparable with occupational social status rankings in other countries.[4]

"Immigration Statistics" in designating an immigrant's intended occupation, did not always use the same occupational listings as the

---

[2]Bernard R. Blishen "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada", Blishen, B.R. and others, eds. Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives, 3rd ed., Macmillan of Canada, Toronto, 1971, p. 498.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Donald J. Treiman in his analysis of data from thirty-eight nations which varied widely in level of industrialization "found an average intercorrelation of .84 between pairs of countries" indicating "that occupational prestige hierarchies are substantially invarient across time and space." Donald J. Treiman, op. cit., p. 211. See also J. Michael Armer, "Intersociety and Intrasociety Correlations of Occupational Prestige", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 74, 1968-1969, pp. 28,29. Much more research remains to be done in this area. However, as Inkeles explains, "there are definitely some common values about the occupational realm shared not only within particular countries but within all modern, large-scale more or less industrial societies", quoted by J. Michael Armer, Ibid.

Canadian census but often used more general occupational headings which could include two or even three census occupational categories. However these usually had quite similar Blishen scores.

One technique used by Blishen to clarify occupational trends was to arbitrarily break down the scale into 'social classes' based on scores of below 30.00, 30.00-39.999, 40.00-49.99, 50.00-59.99, 60.00-69.99, and 70.00+. This classification system could not be easily used however, since several "Immigration Statistics" occupations having two or even three Blishen numbers could sometimes be placed in two Blishen classes. Instead the following classification system was chosen.

Class I:	55.00+
Class II:	46.00 - 54.99
Class III:	33.04 - 45.99
Class IV:	Below 33.03

With one exception, there was no overlapping by occupations of social class categories and four relatively homogeneous 'classes' resulted. Generally speaking Class I, with the highest ranked occupations included almost all immigrants intending to be professionals. Class II included semi-professionals and high status clerical workers. Class III included lower status clerical workers, nurses and the majority of the skilled craftsmen. Class IV or the lowest status occupations included some lower status tradesmen including carpenters, and semi-skilled to unskilled workers such as production workers, labourers, farm labourers and domestics.

The complete breakdown of the occupations listed in Immigration Statistics by the compressed, adjusted Blishen scale was from highest to lowest socio-economic status with the qualification that the ranking of some occupations could be interchanged due to more than one Blishen

score.[5]

For each year, the total number of immigrants intending occupations was aggregated by each socio-economic class. Dividing the numbers of immigrants in each class by the total number of immigrants intending occupations yielded percentages for comparative analysis. Both raw data and percentages as well as the total number of immigrants intending occupations each year were transferred to Table 5, "Immigrants' Intended Occupation on a Collapsed, Adjusted Blishen Scale: 1958-1970".

Given the skilled occupational bias implemented in the immigration policy changes in 1962 and 1967, it was expected that Class I, Class II and possibly Class III immigration flows would be increasing as the proportion of the total immigration flow while the proportion of low status Class IV immigrants would be declining despite a continuing demand for some low skilled, low paid immigrant labour. That is basically what happened as shown in Table 5.

Findings

Between 1958-1962, the proportion of immigrants intending the mainly professional occupations of Class I increased from 9.9% to 14.7%. Immigrants intending Class II occupations such as managers and technicians increased their proportion from 2.3% to 8.8%. Class III immigrants, that is, most tradesmen, clerical workers and nurses increased their proportion also, from 23.1% to 31.3% while the proportion of Class IV immigrants, and this included labourers, domestic servants, production workers and tailors and furriers, dropped from 64.1% to 45.1%. Significantly, most of these changes in proportion occurred in 1960 and 1961 when the Minister of

---

[5]Appendix 20, pp. 223-228.

Citizenship and Immigration Ellen Fairclough was stating that skilled and educated immigrants were the ones being encouraged to enter Canada, and in 1962 the year after the policy had been changed.

As immigration increased at a rapid rate between 1963-1966 in response to a developing economy and an increased demand for workers, the 1962 proportions of immigrants from each intended occupational class remained quite constant. In 1966 the White Paper on Immigration advocated the further increased rationalization of the skilled occupational criterion for immigrant selection and the policy change of 1967 made it official. The proportions from each intended occupational class shifted again but very gradually. However the cumulative effect of these changes between 1965 and 1970 was considerable. The proportion of immigrants intending Class I occupations increased from 15.5% in 1965 to 23.3% in 1969 before declining to 20.8% in 1970. The proportion of Class II immigrants increased from 8.0% to 10.5%. The proportion of immigrants intending Class III occupations slightly decreased from a high of 33.9% in 1966 to 29.8% in 1970 while the proportions of immigrants intending Class IV occupations declined from 44.0% to 34.0%.

Hypothesis 4

It was predicted that immigrants of all origins would gain entry in higher 'entrance statuses' although the ranking system should still be intact for at least Status I, II and III immigrants.

Two types of measures were used to test Hypothesis 4. In Chart Series 1 and Table 6 the intended occupational class levels of Canadian immigrants were broken down by each source of immigration. This was to obtain a general answer to the hypothesis. In Chart Series 2 and Chart

Table 5: Immigrants' Intended Occupations on a Collapsed, Adjusted Blishen Scale: 1958-1970

	Intended Occupational Class						
	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	NOT STATED	=	TOTAL FLOW
1958	6,239	1,451	14,541	40,418	429		63,078
	9.9	2.3	23.1	64.1	.7		100.1%
1959	5,671	1,301	11.713	34.472	394		53,551
	10.6	2.4	21.9	64.4	.7		100.0%
1960	5,894	1,332	13,018	33,036	293		53,573
	11.0	2.5	24.3	61.7	.5		100.0%
1961	5,316	1,312	8,610	19,512	59		34,809
	15.3	3.8	24.7	56.1	.2		100.1%
1962	5,384	3,223	11,516	16,573	52		36,748
	14.7	8.8	31.3	45.1	.1		100.0%
1963	6,626	3,098	14,709	21,367	66		45,866
	14.4	6.8	32.1	46.6	.1		100.0%
1964	8,483	3,980	17,613	25,853	261		56,190
	15.1	7.1	31.4	46.0	.5		100.1%
1965	11,468	5,958	23,708	32,675	386		74,195
	15.5	8.0	32.0	44.0	.5		100.0%
1966	16,416	8,264	33,623	40,044	863		99,210
	16.5	8.3	33.9	40.4	.9		100.0%
1967	21,421	11,621	38,795	46,076	1,626		119,559
	17.9	9.7	32.5	38.5	1.4		100.0%
1968	21,028	10,740	29,176	34,410	92		95,446
	22.0	11.3	30.6	26.1	.1		100.1%
1969	19,676	9,523	24,798	29,218	1,134		84,349
	23.3	11.3	29.4	34.6	1.3		99.9%
1970	16,155	9,738	23,184	26,430	2,216		77,723
	20,8	12.5	29.8	34.0	2.9		100.0%

Source: Chart Series 1, 1962-1970, p. 229. Data for 1958-1961 was not included in the appendix but can be obtained from the author.

Series 2 and Tables 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, the occupations immigrants intended were broken down by the three major sources intending each occupation and conversely each source of immigration was broken down by its three major intended occupations. This was to give much more specific information about the relationship between a given source of immigrants and their intended occupations in Canada, or as it was redefined, their 'entrance status'.

a. Chart Series 1: Immigrant's Intended Occupational Class by Ethnicity or Country of Former Residence

The proportions of immigrants intending occupations in occupational classes I, II, III and IV from a given source of immigration are described in Chart Series 1.

Methodology

To measure this, data about an immigrant's ethnicity and their intended occupation would have been best. However this was available only until 1961. Between 1962 and 1970 the only suitable data published in Immigration Statistics was an immigrant's country of former residence and their intended occupation in Canada.[6] More preferable would have been data about an immigrant's citizenship and their intended occupation. Still it appeared that an immigrant's country of former residence was a fairly good indicator to measure the relationship between an immigrant's ethnicity and their occupational class levels.

Over representation or under representation of immigrants at the different intended occupational class levels referred to a comparison

---

[6] It should also be noted that there was a slight difference in the way that Immigration Statistics classified an immigrant's intended occupation after 1961. This did not affect Chart Series 2 significantly. See Appendix 22, p. 245.

between the proportions of each occupational class level of the total immigration flow, as shown in Table 7, and the proportions from each source.

As an example, the intended occupational classes of two specific immigration flows are shown below for the years 1965-1968.

Immigration From Portugal as a Country of Former Residence

Class	1965	1966	1967	1968
I	2.0	1.7	2.7	2.1
II	1.4	1.1	1.3	1.4
III	14.5	13.4	11.4	11.6
IV	82.1	83.2	82.6	84.8
Not Stated	0.0	0.6	1.9	0.2
	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%
Immigrants Intending Work	1,614	2,365	3,433	1,701

Immigration From the United States as a Country of Former Residence

Class	1965	1966	1967	1968
I	33.7	36.7	40.9	45.2
II	24.2	24.1	21.7	19.0
III	27.0	25.7	23.7	21.5
IV	14.8	13.3	13.4	14.3
Not Stated	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0
	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%
Immigrants Intending Work	6,435	7,408	8,266	9,540

Source: Appendix 22, pp. 287, 292.

When these two flows were compared to the total immigration flow, assertions of over representation or under representation of immigrants by intended occupational classes could be made. The overall immigration flow for the same period was:

Total Immigration Flow By Intended Occupational Class

Class	1965	1966	1967	1968
I	15.5	16.5	17.9	22.0
II	8.0	8.3	9.7	11.3
III	32.0	33.9	32.5	30.6
IV	44.0	40.4	38.5	36.1
Not Stated	0.5	0.9	1.4	0.1
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Immigrants Intending Work	74,195	99,210	119,539	95,446

Source: Table 5, p. 83.

Comparing the immigration flow from Portugal and the United States to the overall flow for the same period, the Portugese flow was very low skilled while the United States flow was very high skilled. The Portugese flow was very much under represented in intended occupational Classes I, II and III and very much over represented in low status Class IV intended occupations. Immigration from the United States was very much over represented in intended occupational Classes I and II, the professional and managerial classes. It was under represented in Class III intended occupations which were mainly trades and very much under represented among low status Class IV intended occupations.

It is also noteworthy that immigration from both Portugal and the United States varied only slightly, or varied consistently each year by intended occupational class. This was true for most other sources of immigration as well.

Findings

The most basic finding of Chart Series 1 was that there was a considerable difference in the proportions of Class I, II, III, and IV occupations intended by immigrants from each source.

Immigrants who by ethnicity until 1961 and by country of former residence after that,[7] were predominantly ethnic status group I in source, were over represented or had high proportions of the professional occupations of Class I, Class II occupations such as managers and technicians, and Class III occupations like tradesmen, clerical workers and nurses. They were very much under represented among the low status intended occupations of Class IV which included production workers, labourers, and domestic servants.[8] Sources of immigration with these proportions of immigrants by intended occupational class included Australia, New Zealand, the United States, Great Britain, Ireland and the Union of South Africa.

Immigrants from the United States as a country of former residence continually had the highest proportion of Class I and Class II immigrants, although prior to 1970, in absolute numbers, more of these immigrants came from Great Britain. In 1970 as the example year, 39.0% of the United States immigrants intended Class I occupations, 21.3% intended Class II occupations, 23.1% intended Class III occupations and 16.2% intended Class IV occupations. The corresponding proportions for immigrants from Great Britain were Class I 23.7%, Class II 13.1%, Class III 39.1% and Class IV 22.8%.

---

[7]Hereafter for simplification, "immigration by ethnicity until 1961 and immigration by country of former residence after that" will read "immigration by country of former residence". Thus immigrants from Great Britain as the country of former residence would also mean 'British' immigrants for the period 1958-1961.

[8]This under representation did not mean that less Status I immigrants immigrated to Canada from this intended occupational class than for example Status III(a) immigrants who had the highest proportion of intended Class IV immigration. In 1970 this was not the case due to the relative numbers of immigrants from each group involved.

Immigrants from France were the exception to the general Status I intended occupational class pattern. Their 1970 porportions were Class I 30.3%, Class II 11.9%, Class III 22.6% and Class IV 34.8%. This distribution ressembled that of Status II immigrants from Sweden, Norway and Belgium. Sweden's 1970 intended occupational class distribution was Class I 25.3%, Class II 19.3%, Class III 26.0% and Class IV 27.7%.

The major sources of Status II immigrants, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Austria, were under represented among Class I and Class II immigrants and were over represented or had high proportions of Class III and Class IV immigrants. Germany as a typical country of former residence in this group had 1970 proportions of Class I 12.0%, Class II 11.2%, Class III 34.6% and Class IV 41.8%. Spain, a Status III(a) country of former residence and a country of small immigration to Canada had similar proportions. So did Yugoslavia and Poland, the two major Status III(b) sources of immigration. In 1970 the Polish proportions were Class I 16.3%, Class II 8.7%, Class III 21.5% and Class IV 51.6%. The smaller numbers of immigrants from Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Rumania had a higher proportion of Class I and Class II intended occupations.

Italy, Portugal and Greece, the three major sources of Status III(a) immigrants, sent very few immigrants intending Class I and Class II occupations, under represented Class III immigration and very much over represented Class IV immigration. In 1970 immigrants from Portugal included Class I 0.9%, Class II 1.2% and Class III 8.5%, the lowest proportions intending these classes of any major source of immigration and the highest proportion of Class IV immigrants - 85.0%. Immigrants from Malta, a Status III(c) country of former residence had a similar pattern.

Their 1970 occupational distribution was Class I 2.6%, Class II 2.6%, Class III 22.4%, and Class IV 67.8%.

The distribution of other Status III(c) immigrants varied considerably by the country of former residence. Similar to most immigrants from sources of Status I immigration, immigrants from Egypt, were considerably over represented in occupational Classes I, II and III and considerably under represented in Class IV occupations. Their 1970 distribution was Class I 38.7%, Class II 14.1%, Class III 30.3% and Class IV 13.2%. Immigrants from Lebanon and Israel had considerable representation at all intended occupational class levels with Israel's 1970 proportions being Class I 17.4%, Class II 17.9%, Class III 27.3% and Class IV 37.1%. Immigrants from Brazil and Argentina were primarily 'transmigrants' from Europe and were slightly under represented among Class I intended occupations and slightly over represented among Class I occupations and slightly over represented among Class IV occupations. In 1970 Argentina had a distribution of Class I 12.1%, Class II 13.5%, Class III 28.4% and Class IV 43.3%. Mexico, Turkey, Iran and Syria were all countries of former residence which had quite variable but limited immigration of Status III(c) immigrants to Canada.

Immigration from the major sources with Status IV immigrants did not follow the general trend of a steadily increasing proportion of intended Class I and Class II immigration, a constant or slightly fluctuating proportion of Class III immigration and a decreasing proportion of Class IV immigration.

Instead, India, China and Pakistan had a very high proportion of immigrants intending Class I occupations coming to Canada in the period

beginning 1958. This proportion steadily declined until 1966 and 1967 when apparently due to the skill emphasis of the new policy, the proportion rose slightly again. After 1967, this proportion dropped considerably. Yet by 1970 immigration from these countries of former residence was still considerably over represented in Class I intended occupations, considerably over represented or substantially represented in Class II occupations, substantially represented or under represented in Class III occupations and under represented in Class IV occupations only in the case of Pakistan. Pakistan as the 1970 example had a distribution of Class I 30.8%, Class II 17.3%, Class III 29.1% and Class IV 15.8%

Immigrants from the Phillipines also came to Canada in decreasing proportions from Class I intended occupations. At the same time the proportion of Class II immigrants increased while the proportions from the other two classes remained constant. The 1970 occupational class distribution for the Phillipines was Class I 13.6%, Class II 20.3%, Class III 53.4% and Class IV 12.1%.

Immigration from the West Indies was quite constant by intended occupational class with Class I immigration varying the most. Immigrants intending Class I occupations were slightly above Table 2 proportions in the initial immigration period 1958-1962 and this proportion increased until 1966. Then as immigration from the West Indies increased following the policy change in 1967, the proportion of Class I immigrants decreased until in 1970 they constituted 10.6% of the immigration flow. Other West Indies proportions were Class II 10.8% - slightly under represented and Class III and Class IV both slightly over represented at 34.9% and 39.4% respectively.

Immigration to Canada from countries of former residence listed 'other countries' was preponderantly Asian and the considerable drop in immigration from these countries of former residence in 1967 was due to the inclusion of the Phillipines that year as a separate category.

'Other countries' immigration came disproportionately from intended occupational Classes I, II and III with immigrants in occupational Class IV very much under represented. Immigrants from intended occupational Class I were especially over represented at least until 1968, after which the proportion declined as the absolute numbers of immigrants coming to Canada increased. In 1970 21.6% of 'other countries' immigration was Class I, 15.3% Class II,42.2% Class III and only 18.4% Class IV.

As an aid to determining the socio-economic status ranking of ethnic groups by the occupational levels that they intended, Table 6 was prepared. At the top of the table were listed the 1963 and 1970 proportions of the total immigration flow by the intended occupational classes. Below this was listed the difference between the proportions of the total immigration flow intending each occupational level and immigrants from each country of former residence. The example of the occupational class levels intended by United States immigrants in 1970 is given below.

United States Immigrants Intended Class Proportions	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV
	39.0%	21.3%	23.1%	16.2%
Total Flow Proportions	20.8%	12.5%	29.8%	34.0%
Difference as Shown in Table 6	+18%	+9%	-7%	-18%

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 1, p.234-244.

Thus in 1970, 18% more of the immigrants from the United States intended occupations in Class I than the average.

Table 6: Differences in the Proportions of Immigrants Intending Each Occupational Class by Country of Former Residence

Ethnic Status Group	S.E.S. Rank	Country of Former Residence	1963					1970			
				I (14.4)	II (6.8)	III (32.1)	IV (46.6)		I (20.8)	II (12.5)	III (29.8)	IV (34.0)
		United States	4,210	+18	+15	- 7	-27	11,462	+18	+ 9	- 7	-18
		South Africa	167	+19	+10	+ 9	-38	266	+18	+ 1	0	-16
		Australia	1,079	+ 9	+ 4	+17	-30	2,385	+13	- 2	+ 9	-17
I	1	New Zealand	236	+ 6	+ 5	+15	-27	624	+16	- 1	+ 2	-14
		Great Britain	12,386	+ 6	0	+18	-24	14,583	+ 3	+ 1	+ 9	-11
	2	Ireland	375	+ 2	+ 1	+ 9	-11	887	+ 8	- 3	+11	-14
		France	2,040	- 2	- 2	0	+ 4	2,516	+10	- 1	- 7	+ 1
		Belgium	502	- 3	- 2	- 5	+10	416	+11	- 1	- 4	- 4
		Sweden	175	+ 3	+ 4	- 4	- 3	300	+ 5	+ 7	- 4	- 6
		Switzerland	824	- 4	+ 1	- 1	+ 5	1,765	- 5	- 1	+ 6	+ 3
		Norway	173	+ 2	- 2	+ 4	- 3	150	+ 2	- 3	- 6	+ 9
II	2	Germany	4,344	- 9	- 4	+ 8	+ 5	2,450	- 9	- 1	+ 3	+ 8
		Denmark	400	- 8	- 1	- 3	+12	419	- 7	- 2	- 1	+12
		Netherlands	978	- 7	- 2	+ 1	+ 8	1,119	- 8	- 3	0	+14
		Finland	148	- 4	+ 5	+ 6	- 6	353	-11	- 5	+ 3	+14
		Austria	563	-11	- 4	- 5	+20	480	-10	- 2	- 4	+17
	1	Eygpt	651	+ 5	+ 6	+19	-30	468	+18	+ 2	+ 1	-21
		Israel	312	+ 3	+ 4	+ 2	- 9	396	- 3	+ 5	- 3	+ 3
		Lebanon	183	+ 5	+ 2	- 6	0	590	0	+ 1	- 7	+ 6
	2	Brazil	125	- 2	+ 2	- 5	- 6	220	- 6	+ 6	- 1	+ 9
		Argentina	96	+ 3	+ 4	-14	+ 8	141	- 9	+ 1	- 1	+ 9
III		Spain	216	+ 7	- 3	-15	+11	417	- 6	- 6	- 1	+12
		Poland	433	- 9	- 2	-20	+30	368	- 5	- 4	- 8	+18
		Yugoslavia	143	-11	- 3	-18	+32	2,549	-16	- 9	- 5	+16
		Malta	456	-12	- 6	- 1	+19	152	-18	-10	- 7	+34
	3	Italy	6,618	-13	- 6	-26	+45	3,938	-15	- 7	-10	+30
		Greece	2,849	-12	- 5	-16	+33	3,881	-18	- 9	-14	+34
		Portugal	1,223	-13	- 6	-24	+43	3,002	-20	-11	-21	+51
		Pakistan	68	+47	+ 4	-10	-41	468	+10	+ 5	- 1	-18
	1	India	291	+42	+ 4	-17	-29	2,566	+10	- 1	- 9	- 2
IV		China	366	+31	+ 2	-13	-20	2,172	+ 3	+ 4	- 3	- 5
	2	West Indies	690	+ 1	0	+ 7	- 8	7,612	-10	- 2	+ 5	+ 5

SOURCE: Appendix 22, Chart Series 1, pp. 234-244.

In Table 6, the sources of immigration were roughly ranked within ethnic status groups from higher to lower socio-economic status. Using the 1970 proportions as the guideline, three arbitary levels of immigration by socio-economic status by countries of former residence could be distinguished. In the 'high' socio-economic status category would be included immigrants from the Status I countries of the United States, the Union of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain; the Status III(c) country of Egypt and the Status IV countries of Pakistan, India and China. In the 'low' socio-economic status category were included immigrants from the Status III(a) countries of Italy, Greece and Portugal; the Status III(b) country of Yugoslavia and the Status III(c) country of Malta. Immigration from the other sources could be ranked in the wide middle range between these extremes.

b. Chart Series 2 and Chart Series 3

Chart Series 2 and 3 give much more specific information about the relationship between a given source of immigrants and their intended occupations in Canada.

In both Chart Series, data about an immigrant's ethnicity and their intended occupation was used for the period 1958-1961 and data about an immigrant's country of former residence and their intended occupation was used between 1962-1970.[9]

(i) Chart Series 2: The Percentage Concentration of the Three Major Sources of an Intended Occupation

This Chart Series was designed to give more specific information

---

[9]Hereafter for simplification, "the three major sources of immigration"will be used in place of "the three major sources of immigration by ethnicity until 1961 and country of former residence after that.

about the sources of immigration of each intended occupation. The three major sources' of immigrants of each intended occupation were determined by ethnicity until 1961 and by country of former residence until 1970.

By dividing the numerical total of the three major sources of an intended occupation by the immigration from all sources, an index of concentration measuring the sterotyping of immigrants in a given occupation was created. With the policy changes in 1962 and 1967 permitting immigration from many new sources it was expected that the levels of concentration would be reduced by a considerably proportion.

The example of immigrants intending to be 'Professors & Principals' in 1970 is given below.

Intended Occupation	Flow	Flow by Source of Immigrants			Total 1.2.3	1.2.3./ Flow
Professors & Principals	1,886	1. 918 (U.S.)	2. 284 (G.B.)	3. 105 (Fr.)	1,307	69.3%

In 1970, 1,886 Canadian immigrants intended to be 'Professors & Principals'. The major sources were the United States, Great Britain and France with 918, 284 and 105 immigrants respectively. The total from these sources was 1,307 immigrants. Dividing this total by the total number of immigrants intending to be 'Professors & Principals' yielded 69.3%.

Findings

Chart Series 2 is presented in collapsed form for the years 1958 and 1970 in Table 8 below.

Generally speaking there was a considerable drop in percentage concentration of the three major immigration sources for each intended occupation between 1958-1970 as Canadian immigration policy was liberal-

Table 7: The Changes in Percentage Concentration of the Three Major Sources of Immigration of Each Major Intended Occupation in 1958 and 1970

Intended Occupation	3 Major Sources All Sources		% Diff.	W	X	Y	Z
Class I	1958	1970					
Professors & Principals	*75.4%	69.3%	- 6%				x
Physicians & Surgeons	73.9	46.1	-28		x		x
Professional Engineers	68.7	52.7	-16		x		x
School Teachers	84.6	57.0	-28	x			x
Draughtsmen	67.1	45.4	-22		x	x	
Class II							
Owners, Managers, Officials	82.7	65.7	-17	x	x		x
Science Technicians	63.1	39.2	-24	x	x		x
Bookkeepers, Cashiers	*57.5	52.9	- 5				x
Medical & Dental Technicians	*59.0	50.1	- 9				x
Class III							
Other Clerical	70.0	49.2	-21	x	x		x
Nurses, graduate	82.3	61.8	-21	x	x		x
Electricians	52.8	44.0	- 9		x	x	
Stenographers, Typists	83.1	55.7	-27	x			x
Sales Clerks, Salesmen	69.3	50.6	-19	x	x		x
Machinists	72.3	41.7	-31		x	x	
Mechanics, Repairmen	49.3	38.8	-11		x	x	
Plumbers	58.6	48.4	-10		x	x	
Electrical & Electronic Worker	*49.7	43.7	- 6		x	x	
Class IV							
Other Service Workers	57.7	47.2	-11		x	x	
Domestic Servants	63.4	53.4	-10				x
Nurses' Aides	66.5	50.8	-16		x	x	
Waiters, Porters	*60.0	33.4	-27		x		x
Tailors & Furriers	59.3	47.5	-12		x	x	
Painters, glaxiers	57.6	43.7	-14		x	x	
Bricklayers, Stonemasons	80.9	58.0	-23		x	x	
Food Workers	*49.1	42.9	- 6		x	x	
Carpenters	52.5	45.0	- 8		x	x	
Cooks	49.2	36.5	-13		x	x	
Road Transport	*49.8	44.2	- 6		x	x	
Woodworkers, Sawyers	*57.6	41.9	-16		x	x	
General Labourers	81.3	56.6	-25		x	x	
Farmers & Farm Workers	49.1	42.9	- 6		x	x	

*1962 instead of 1958

W There was a major change in concentration when the policy was changed in 1962.

X There was a major change in concentration when the policy was changed in 1967.

Y The concentration of the three major sources of an intended occupation rose after 1962.

Z There was a consistent decline in concentration of the three major sources in an intended occupation between 1958-1970.

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 2, p. 245-258.

ized and formerly proscribed immigrant groups gained entry to Canada in ever increasing numbers.

High prestige status occupations to the level of Sales Clerks, Salesmen and also Waiters, and Porters usually showed major percentage concentration declines with the implementation of the policy changes in 1962 and 1967 and uniform or declining concentration percentages for the other years between 1958-1970.

Intended draughtsmen, electricians and lower status occupations beginning at Painters, glaziers but excepting Waiters, Porters and Domestic Servants all showed major percentage declines with the implementation of the second policy change in 1967. Prior to this policy change and during the period of Canada's rapid economic expansion, these intended occupations had rising percentage concentration.

While immigration from the three major sources of an intended occupation was usually less concentrated, it did not mean that some intended occupations did not have high rates of concentration of immigrants from particular sources.

Table 8 describes intended occupations where the first major source forms a very high proportion of the total proportion of immigrants intending that occupation in 1970. 28% was chosen as the arbitrary concentration cut-off point.

As expected the proportion of the major source of immigrants for most intended occupations dropped considerably between 1958-1970. The very notable case where it did not was immigration from the United States intending to be professors and principals. In 1958 out of 390 immigrants intending to be professors and principals 174 were from the United States

Table 8: Intended Occupations with a High Proportion of Immigrants from a Given Source.

Intended Occupation	1958 Total Flow	1958 Major Source	1958 %	1970 Total Flow	1970 Major Source	1970 %
Class I						
Professors & P.	390	174 U.S.	45%	1,886	918 U.S.	49%
Physicians & S.	394	202 G.B.	51	1,113	350 G.B.	31
School Teachers	1,300	861 G.B.	66	4,157	1,161 U.S.	28
Draughtsmen	538	264 G.B.	49	1,029	302 G.B.	29
Class II						
Owners, M. & O.	944	565 U.S.	60	3,095	1,194 U.S.	39
Class III						
Nurses, g.	1,145	785 G.B.	69	2,274	666 G.B.	29
Stenographers	3,036	2,108 G.B.	69	5,530	1,641 G.B.	30
Machinists	5,505	266 Ger.	53	3,583	1,490 G.B.	42
Class IV						
Dom. Servants	7,878	2,179 It.	28	2,985	847 W.I.	28
Gen. Labourers	9,388	6,199 It.	66	1,614	613 Greece	38

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 2, p. 245-258.

or 45%. By 1970 of 1,886 immigrants intending to be professors and principals, 918 were from the United States, an increase in concentration to 49%.

The general findings of Chart Series 2 were grouped by the occupational class levels intended by immigrants from the different sources.

Class I Occupations

Class I occupations included professors and principals, physicians and surgeons, professional engineers, and school teachers, and draughtsmen.

Except for immigrants intending to be professors and principals and in 1970 school teachers, the major source of intended Class I occupations has always been immigrants from Great Britain as the country of former residence. The major source of intended professors and principals and school teachers in 1970 were immigrants from the United States.

The second and third major sources of Class I occupations were either ethnic status group I or ethnic status group IV in origin. United States immigrants were either the second or third source of immigrants intending to be physicians and surgeons, professional engineers, school teachers and draughtsmen, while British immigrants were always the second major source of intended professors and principals. Immigrants from France were the second or third source of immigrants for every intended occupation except professional engineers at least once. Beginning especially after 1962, immigrants from either India, China, "Other Countries" and the West Indies were an important third source of all Class I occupations and were sometimes the second major source.

Intended draughtsmen immigration was the only Class I intended occupation which varied considerably from the general pattern. Until 1965 an important second or third source of intended draughtsmen were immigrants from Germany. Immigrants from France were also an important second or third source between 1963-1967 while other sources included immigrants from Italy, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia in 1968.

Class II Occupations

Major Class II intended occupations included owners and managers, laboratory technicians and assistants, medical and dental technicians and bookkeepers and cashiers.

With two exceptions immigrants from Great Britain as a country of former residence were the major source of intended laboratory technicians and assistants, medical and dental technicians and bookkeepers and cashiers. In 1968 refugees from Czechoslovakia as a country of former residence were the major source of intended science technicians and between 1968-1970 immigrants from the Phillipines were the major source of intended medical and dental technicians.

Immigrants from the United States were always the major source of intended owners, managers and officials with immigrants from Great Britain always the second major source.

The second and third major source of Class II intended occupations were usually Status I, Status IV or immigrants from Germany as the country of last permanent residence. Immigrants from the Phillipines and Germany were both important second or third sources of intended science technicians and medical and dental technicians. West Indies immigrants were an important second or third source of bookkeepers while immigrants from the United States were the second/or third source of all intended occupations excluding owners, managers and officials.

Class III Occupations

Immigrants who intended Class III occupations were sub-divided into two groups:

a) those intending non-trades occupations

b) those intending trades.

a) Major non-trades intended occupations included graduate nurses, stenographers and typists, sales clerks, clerical other, and stock and shipping clerks.

The major source were immigrants from Great Britain as the country of last permanent residence except in 1970 when the major source of intended storekeepers and shipping clerks were United States immigrants.

Once again the second and third sources of such immigrants were Status I, Status IV, or immigrants from Germany as the country of last permanent residence.

Until 1967 or 1968 immigrants from Germany as the area of last permanent residence were the second or third major source as intended sales clerks, clerical other, and storekeepers and shipping clerks and until 1962 the second or third major source of intended stonographers and typists. Since 1962 United States immigrants have consistently been the second major source of intended sales clerks and salesmen and a frequent second or third major source of the other intended occupations. The important second major source of nurses have been immigrants from the Phillipines since 1965 while immigrants from Australia have been the usual third major source. Prior to 1962 Negro immigrants were the second or third source of intended nurse.

The other frequent second or third major source of Class III non-trades intended occupations were immigrants from the West Indies, especially after 1966.

b) The major Class III intended trades occupations included painter, glaziers; plumbers; electricians; machinists; mechanics and repairmen; and electrical and electrical workers.

Between 1958-1961 the major source of intended trades Class III occupations were usually German immigrants. Beginning in 1962 the first major source was almost always immigrants from Great Britain.

Between 1958-1961 the second major source of such immigrants were British immigrants except for intended mechanics, repairmen where Italians were the second major source and British the third. After 1962 the second and third major sources were usually either immigrants from Germany, Italy or sometimes Greece and in 1969 and 1970 immigrants from the West Indies.

Class IV Occupations

The major sources of immigrants intending Class IV occupations varied considerably but usually included immigrants from Italy, Greece, Great Britain, in roughly that order of importance, and prior to 1967 sometimes immigrants from Germany. Other quite significant sources of Class IV intended occupations included Portugal, France, Yugoslavia and sometimes immigrants from the West Indies.

Immigrants from Italy as the area of last permanent residence were the most frequent major sources, while immigrants from Great Britain were the second most frequent source. The major source of intended domestic servants after 1967 and intended tailors and furriers in 1970 were immigrants from the West Indies.

One intended occupation did not fit the general Class IV pattern - intended nurses aides. This immigration had the previously noted pattern of immigrants from Great Britain as the country of former residence as the first major source and after 1962 either United States immigrants or immigrants from the West Indies or the Phillipines as either the second or third major source. Prior to 1962 either immigrants from Germany or the Netherlands had been either the second or third major source.

(ii) Chart Series 3: The Percentage Concentration of the Three Occupations Intended by Each Source of Immigration

Chart Series 3 was also designed to give more specific information about the basis for the sterotyping of immigrants in certain occupations. Since it was predicted in Hypothesis 4 that immigration from all sources would be entering Canada in higher 'entrance statuses' it was expected that immigrants from a particular source would intend a much smaller proportion of occupations having a low occupational status. Thus there would be much less basis for the stereotyping of low status occupations like Chinese cooks, Italian and Portugese labourers, etc. This was measured by comparing the proportion of immigrants in the three major intended occupations from a given source to their total immigration. This proportion or index of concentration should have gone down especially for immigrants traditionally intending low status occupations.

The example of United States immigration is given below for the year 1969.

Country	Flow	The 3 Major Intended Occupations	Total	Total Flow
United States	10,220	1. 1,248 (Teachers) 2. 1,040 (Professors) 3. 956 (Managers)	3,244	31.7%

Thus in 1969 out of 10,220 immigrants from the United States intending work, 31.7% were concentrated in the three major intended occupations - teachers, professors and managers.

Only data for major, continuous immigration flows by each ethnic group were included in the Chart Series.

Findings

Chart Series 3 is presented in collapsed form for the years 1958 and 1970 in Table 9 below.

Table 9: The Changes in Percentage Concentration of the Three Major Intended Occupations of Each Source of Immigration 1958 to 1970

	Immigration		3 Major Occup.s / All Occupations		
Status I	1958	1970	1958	1970	% Diff.
Great Britain	15,077	14,583	31.8%	24.4%	- 7%
United States	4,216	11,462	25.6	28.6	+ 3
France	1,320	2,516	20.8	18.7	- 2
Australia (1962)	821	2,385	33.6	35.1	+ 2
Ireland (1962)	291	887	28.2	28.2	-
Status II					
Germany	8,431	2,450	29.1	27.8	- 1
Switzerland	590	1,765	36.6	28.4	- 8
Netherlands	3,438	1,119	32.9	29.5	- 4
Austria	544	480	29.8	23.1	- 7
Denmark	964	419	42.2	25.1	-17
Belgium	455	416	23.3	21.2	- 2
Status III(a)					
Italy	12,915	3,928	75.1	30.4	-45
Greece	3,887	3,881	66.6	36.0	-31
Portugal	728	3,002	54.8	34.4	-20
Status III(b)					
Yugoslavia	3,075	2,549	45.1	24.3	-21
Poland	1,157	368	35.0	32.6	- 2
Status III(c)					
Egypt (1962)	512	468	28.9	26.9	- 2
Israel (1962)	217	396	29.5	26.8	- 3
Status IV					
West Indies	625	7,612	55.8	32.3	-24
India	228	2,566	47.8	28.4	-19
Phillipines(1967)	2,632	2,429	66.0	47.2	-19
China	402	2,172	68.4	25.1	-43

1. Immigration in 1958 was by ethnicities and in 1970 by Country of Former Residence. In the case of immigration in 1962 it was by Country of Former Residence. For simplication only Country of Former Residence was listed.

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 3, p. 259-271.

Generally speaking, immigrants from ethnic statuses I, II and III(c) in 1958 usually had percentage concentration levels below 35% for their three major intended occupations and only Australian immigrants of all these major sources had percentage concentration levels above 30% in 1970. Only immigrants from the United States and Australia increased their proportion during this period - by 3% and 2% respectively. This generally indicated that immigrants from these statuses tended to come from a wide range of possible intended occupations and that between 1958 and 1970 this range had widened somewhat.

Immigrants from Statuses III(a), III(b) and IV generally constituted 'newer' flows which initially were quite highly concentrated in their major source intended occupations. In 1958 only Polish immigrants had a proportion below 45% for the three major intended occupations. By 1970 for immigrants from all countries except Poland, this proportion had decreased by about 20% or more. The new proportions were now similar to those of Statuses I, II and III(c) except for immigrants from the Phillipines. However since the Phillipines proportion dropped 19% between 1966 and 1970 its intended occupational flow should soon approximate that of the other immigration flows.

Thus between 1958 and 1970 there was a general trend especially for immigrants from Statuses III(a), III(b) and IV to intend a much wider range of occupations in very considerable proportions.

At the same time, the three major intended occupations from each source tended to vary quite consistently between 1958 and 1970. Stated differently, if the source of immigration was known, it was usually quite predictable what their major intended occupations would be.

Discussion of the findings of Chart Series 4 were grouped by the majority ethnic status group of each country of former residence.

Countries of Former Residence: Ethnic Status Group I

With one or two exceptions, the three most important intended occupations of immigrants from Status I were in occupational Classes I, II and III.

Between 1958 and 1970 immigrants from Great Britain had five occupations constituting these three major intended occupations. 'Stenographers, Typists' was the usual major intended occupation while second and third intended occupations included 'Clerical Other', 'School Teachers',[10] 'Machinists' beginning in 1963 and between 1960-62 'Nurses'.

The major intended occupations of United States immigrants since 1965 were 'Owners, Managers, Officials', 'Professors & Principals' and 'School Teachers' in an interchanging order. Prior to 1965 other major intended occupations sometimes included 'Clerical Other','Stenographers, Typists', 'Religion Professionals', was not a numerically large intended occupational category, there was a steady flow of such immigrants from the United States. In 1970, of 367 such intended immigrants 212 or 60.5% were from the United States.

Between 1962 and 1970 the major intended occupations of immigrants from Australia as the country of former residence were usually 'Stenographers, Typists', Nurses, graduate', and 'School Teachers' in an alternating order.

Similarly between 1962-1967 the smaller numbers of immigrants from Ireland as a country of former residence intended 'Clerical Other', 'General Labourers', and 'Sales Clerks, Salesmen' as their major occupations

---

[10]This included 'Professors & Principals' prior to 1963.

and between 1968-1970 intended as major occupations 'Nurses, graduate', 'School Teachers' and 'Stenographers, Typists' in an alternating order.

The major intended occupations of immigrants from France were occupational Classes III or IV except for intended 'School Teachers' immigration in 1968, 1969 and 1970. This was similar to the major intended occupations of Status II immigrants.

Major intended occupations included 'Clerical Other', 'Stenographers, Typists', 'Other Service Workers', 'Farmers & Farm Workers', 'Machinists', 'Mechanics, Repairmen', 'Bricklayers, Stonemasons' and 'Waiters, Porters'.

Countries of Former Residence: Ethnic Status Group II

With one or two exceptions, the usual intended major occupations of Status II immigrants as either occupational Class III or IV.

Between 1958-1962 'Domestic Servants' and 'Farmers & Farm Workers' were the major intended Class IV occupations while 'Clerical Other' was the usual Class III major intended occupation. Beginning in 1962 'Machinists' and 'Mechanics, Repairmen' were increasingly important major intended occupations while less important major intended occupations included 'School Teachers', 'Science Technicians', 'Stenographers, Typists' and 'Draughtsmen'.

As a general rule, between 1958-1970 some skilled trades and clerical occupations replaced unskilled labouring occupations and domestic servants as the most important major intended occupations.

Countries of Former Residence: Ethnic Status Group III(a) and III(b)

Between 1958 and 1970 immigrants from Italy, Greece and Portugal usually intended Class IV occupations as their major intended occupations.

Between 1958-1962 such intended occupations were usually the very

low prestige occupations of 'General Labourers', 'Farmers & Farm Workers' and 'Domestic Servants' and these formed a very high proportion of the immigration from each country. For the typical year of 1960, the three major intended occupations of these immigrants are shown in the following table.

Table 10: The Three Major Intended Occupations of Immigrants From Italy, Greece and Portugal as Countries of Former Residence - 1960

Country of Former Residence	Immigrants Intending Work (1960)	Three Major Intended Occupations		% Concentration (b. / a.)
		1. Labour	4,094	
Italy	a. 8,785	2. D. Servant	1,495	72.2%
		3. Farm Labour	754	
		b.	6,343	
		1. D. Servant	804	
Greece	a. 3,357	2. Labour	774	58.9%
		3. Farm Labour	399	
		b.	1,977	
		1. Farm Labour	1,368	
Portugal	a. 2,185	2. Labour	238	79.8%
		3. D. Servant	137	
		b.	1,743	
Total	a.14,327	b.	10,063	70.2%

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 3, p. 259-271.

After 1962 the higher skilled Class IV and Class III occupations of 'Tailors & Furriers', 'Bricklayers, Stonemasons', 'Carpenters', 'Machinists' and 'Mechanics, Repairmen' became increasingly important major intended occupations and the most important major occupations after 1966.

The very greatly decreased percentages of concentration of occupations also generally showed that these immigrants were intending a wider group of occupations in quite considerable proportions.

The flow of immigrants from Yugoslavia and Poland was very nearly identical to immigrants who were Status III(a).

Between 1958-1963 a high proportion of such immigrants intended to be 'Farm & Farm Workers', 'Domestic Servants' and 'General Labourers'. Beginning in 1964 'Waiters, Porters', and 'Tailors & Furriers' were sometimes additional intended major occupations while between 1967-1970 the major intended occupations included 'Machinists', 'Mechanics, Repairmen', 'General Labourers', 'Farmers & Farm Workers', 'Domestic Servants' and 'Tailors & Furriers'.

By 1970 the greatly decreased percentages of concentration of occupations also generally showed that these immigrants were intending a wider group of occupations in quite considerable proportions.

Countries of Former Residence: Ethnic Status Group IV

For their three major intended occupations, immigrants from India, Pakistan and Ceylon; China; the West Indies and the Phillipines intended very high proportions of high status Class I occupations, very low proportions of low status Class IV occupations, and considerable proportions of some clerical and health care occupations.

For immigrants from the East Indies and China, high status intended occupations included 'Teachers and Professors'*, while low or lower prestige intended occupations included 'General Labourers', 'Other Service Workers','Domestic Servants' 'Farmers & Farm Labourers', 'Nurses, graduate', 'Cooks', and beginning in 1965 'Other Clerical' and 'Stenographers', 'Typists'.

Immigrants from the West Indies did not intend as skilled occupations as the other Status IV immigrants. 'Domestic Servants' was always

the major intended occupation between 1958-1970 while other major intended occupations included 'Nurses, graduate', 'Clerical Other', 'Nurses' Aides', 'Stenographers & Typists' and 'School Teachers' once.

Immigrants from the Phillipines have only been separately categorized since 1967 and very high proportions intended occupations associated with the medical profession. 'Nurses, graduate' was always the very important major intended occupation while other major intended occupations included 'Nurses' Aides', 'Medical & Dental Technicians', 'Stenographers, Typists', 'Clerical Other' and 'Tailors & Furriers'.

Except for immigrants from the Phillipines, by 1970 Status IV immigrants had similar percentages of concentration of occupations as immigrants from other Status groups.

Chart Series 3 was also reworked to give Table 11.

Of 34 listed intended occupations 16 intended occupations increased their numbers of immigrants by at least 150%. This included 3 class I intended occupations, 4 Class II intended occupations, 5 Class III intended occupations and 4 Class IV intended occupations. From the very wide differences in rates of growth or decline among intended occupations of all occupational classes, one important factor is very evident. Each intended occupation must be studied separately to determine the factors facilitating or inhibiting their immigration flow.

Summary

Hypothesis 1 was confirmed. The rate of entry of immigrants to Canada between 1958 and 1970 by intended occupations grouped into four occupational classes suggested that administrative control in 1960 and 1961 and the immigration policy change in 1962 had an immediate and

Table 11: The Percentage Difference of Immigrants Intending An Occupation in 1962 and 1970

Intended Occupation	Immigration Flow		Percentage Increase or Decrease
	1962	1970	
Class I			
Professors & Principals	390	1,886	384%
Physicians & Surgeons	530	1,113	110
Professional Engineers[1]	967	2,186	
School Teachers	787	4,157	428
Draughtsmen	506	1,029	103
Other Professionals	346	963	178
Class II			
Owners, Managers, Officials	1,093	3,095	183
Science Technicians	227	1,953	760
Bookkeepers, Cashiers	522	1,595	206
Medical & Dental Technicians	227	905	294
Class III			
Other Clerical	1,863	4,708	153
Nurses, graduate	1,621	2,274	40
Electricians	463	1,167	152
Stenographers, Typists	2,315	5,530	139
Sales Clerks, Salesmen	590	2,102	256
Machinists	1,767	4,207	138
Mechanics, Repairmen	1,286	4,149	223
Plumbers	170	512	201
Electrical & Electronic Workers	310	689	122
Class IV			
Other Service Workers	339	1,364	63
Domestic Servants	3,155	2,985	- 5
Nurses' Aides	292	840	188
Other Production Workers	192	593	209
Waiters, Porters	989	1,082	9
Tailors & Furriers	1,467	3,246	121
Painters, glaziers	356	554	56
Bricklayers, Stonemasons	618	1,256	103
Food Workers	524	615	17
Carpenters	714	1,551	117
Other Construction Workers Excluding Labourers	82	573	594
Cooks	397	1,229	210
Woodworkers, Sawyers	393	895	140
General Labourers	3,145	1,614	- 49
Farmers & Farm Workers	1,923	2,129	11

1. Professional Engineers includes Chemical Engineers, Mining Engineers, Civil Engineers, Electrical Engineers, Other Engineers, Mechanical Engineers and Industrial Engineers.

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 2, p. 245-258.

abrupt effect proportionately increasing higher status Class I, Class II and Class III immigration and decreasing low status Class IV immigration. The effects of the policy change in 1967 and probably administrative changes prior to 1967 were not as marked but the long term cumulative effects were considerable. Immigrants intending Class I occupations increased their proportion before declining somewhat in 1970, immigrants intending Class II occupations increased their proportion, the proportion of immigrants intending Class III occupations remained fairly constant or declined while the proportion of immigrants intending Class IV occupations declined. It appeared that between 1968 and 1970 that the flow of immigrants to Canada by their intended occupational classes had reached some kind of an equilibrium. In 1970, 20.8% of all immigrants intended the most professional occupations of Class I, 12.5% intended the semi-professional occupations like owners and managers, and technicians of Cla-s II, 29.8% of all immigrants intended Class III occupations which included most of the skilled trades, nurses, and clerical workers, and 34.0% intended the semi-skilled and unskilled occupations of Class IV. These included the occupations of production workers, domestic servants, general labourers, farm labourers. Thus a considerable proportion of immigrants were still entering Canada intending occupations with low socio-economic statuses.

Hypothesis 4 was only partially confirmed. Except for sources of immigration having mainly Status IV immigrants, the general trend was towards an increasing proportion of immigrants intending Class I and Class II occupations, a slightly fluctuating or declining proportion of immigrants intending Class III occupations, and a declining proportion of

immigrants intending Class IV occupations. Stated differently, immigrants from most sources of immigration, excepting Status IV, were entering Canada in higher entrance statuses.

Sources of immigration which had predominantly Status IV immigrants were very much over represented in high status Class I intended occupations in the period prior to 1967 when their total immigration flow was quite low. After 1967, as immigration from the East Indies, China, the West Indies and the Phillipines increased considerably, their proportion of Class I immigrants decreased substantially but was still considerably over represented in 1970 except for immigration from the West Indies which was somewhat lower skilled.

When over representation or under representation of an intended occupational class was analyzed by the different sources of immigration, United States immigrants were found to have the highest proportion of high status Class 1 and Class II occupations. Also grouped as intending a 'high' proportion of high status occupations were immigrants from the Status I countries of the Union of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain; the Status III(c) country of Egypt and the Status IV countries of Pakistan, India and China. In the 'low' socio-economic status category were included immigrants from the Status III(a) countries of Italy, Greece and Portugal; the Status III(b) country of Yugoslavia and the Status III(c) country of Malta. Immigration from the other sources could be ranked in the wide middle range between these extremes. Thus the ranking system of 'entrance statuses' was still intact for most sources of Status I, II and III immigrants. That is Status I immigrants still intended a greater proportion of higher status occupations than

Status II immigrants who intended a much higher proportion of higher status occupations than did immigrants from Status III(a) and III(b) sources.

More specific information about the relationship about the entrance statuses of immigrants from particular sources was provided in Chart Series 2 and Chart Series 3 and the Tables derived from these chart series. The basic findings were:

1. Immigrants who were classified 'British' between 1958-1961 or were from Great Britain as the country of former residence between 1962-1970 were the usual major source of immigrants for 20 out of the 34 major intended occupations. These occupations were at all levels of the occupational structure. Immigrants from all other ethnicities, or after 1961, countries of former residence, who immigrated in sufficient numbers to be included in the intended occupational listings tended to do so from more specific occupations and more specific occupational class levels than the British. Thus immigrants from the United States intended the highest proportion of high status occupations in the late 1960's and were the major source of professors and principals, and owners and managers. At the other extreme were immigrants from Italy, Greece and Portugal who intended the highest proportion of low status occupations. In 1970 immigrants from one of these countries were the major source of six occupations group in Class IV. They were carpenters; bricklayers and stonemasons; other construction workers; woodworkers, sawyers; general labourers; and farmers and farm workers.

2. Generally speaking there was a considerable drop in percentage concentration of the three major immigration sources for each intended occupation between 1958 and 1970 as Canadian immigration policy was

liberalized and formerly proscribed immigrant groups gained entry to Canada in ever increasing numbers. This drop however was not uniform and during the period of Canada's rapid economic expansion in the mid-1960's, many trades occupations had rising percentage concentrations. Also despite the general trend, some occupations were still intended by a very large proportion of immigrants from just one source. In 1970 this included immigrants from the United States who were 49% of the intended professors and principals, 28% of the school teachers, and 39% of the owners and managers; immigrants from Great Britain who were 31% of the physicians and surgeons, 29% of the draughtsmen, 29% of the graduate nurses, 30% of the stenographers and typists and 42% of the machinists; immigrants from the West Indies who were 28% of the domestic servants; and immigrants from Greece who were 38% of the general labourers.

3. Also generally speaking, between 1958 and 1970 sources of immigration which had very high proportions of their immigrants concentrated in three major intended occupations were now intending a much wider range of occupations in considerable proportions. The West Indies, India, Pakistan and the Phillipines were sources of immigration whose concentration of immigrants had been primarily in high status occupations although domestic servants and other service workers were low status occupations that could be included. Italy, Greece, Portugal and Yugoslavia were sources whose concentration had been primarily unskilled intended occupations in Class IV. Their concentration levels dipped as very low status immigration was reduced due to the points system and immigrants gained admission intending more skilled occupations in Class IV and sometimes in Class III.

Thus in Chart Series 2 and Chart Series 3 there was still considerable evidence for the different entrance statuses of immigrants depending on their origins. However as a result of the immigration policy changes in 1962 and 1967 there was much less of a basis for the stereotyping of immigrants from certain sources at specific occupational levels, as immigrants from all sources, except from Australia and the United States, were intending a wider range of occupations in considerable proportions.

Chapter 4: Selection by Racial and Ethnic Status Groups and Resultant Immigration to Canada

In this chapter the empirical data are presented to test for the expected findings predicted in Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 2

It was expected that the racial and ethnic composition of Canada's immigration flow would be fundamentally restructured to include much greater proportions of formerly restricted low status races and ethnicities, that is, Status IV 'Asians' and 'coloreds'. Also with the immigration of independent applicants being ultimately determined by 'manpower' criteria, immigration from each ethnic status group and sub-group should begin to vary with economic conditions in Canada and the demand for workers, at least after 1967.

The most important question answered in this chapter is what new 'racial and ethnic balance', if any, was achieved in the immigration flow as a result of the new policies and procedures. The Immigration Department's preoccupation with achieving or maintaining some very vaguely defined racial and ethnic balance[1] in the immigration flow was a consistent theme influencing all major post war immigration policy changes.

The best measure of this 'balance' would be yearly immigration totals to Canada by ethnic status groups, since it was in terms of these 'groups' that racially and ethnically discriminatory policies were practiced by the government. Canadian immigration policy when distinguishing

---

[1] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 90.

admission privileges prior to 1967 usually did so, not by ethnicity but by citizenship, often with the specific proviso that the immigrant had to be 'born' or 'naturalized' in the country of citizenship. Given the often close relationship between an immigrant's ethnicity and their citizenship,[2] it was apparent that discrimination through citizenship was really discrimination by groupings of ethnicities who were treated similarly under policy, hence the determination of 'most favoured', 'favoured', 'neutral' and 'proscribed' ethnic status group categories.

Sometimes more than one ethnicity immigrated to Canada under the same citizenship and in quite considerable proportions.[3] If these potential immigrants had the same ethnic status, there was no problem for the Immigration Department, but if there was a difference in status, the department had instituted policies and procedures to favour immigrants from ethnicities in the higher ranking ethnic status group.

For measuring the yearly immigration total to Canada by ethnic status groups, data from the Immigration Department's annual publication "Immigration Statistics" was both regrouped and reworked. The final result was Table 12, "Immigration to Canada by Ethnic Status Groups: 1946-1970". The derivation of this Table was very involved since the Immigration Department only published data about immigration by races and ethnicities until 1966 inclusive. This data could be quite easily grouped by the different ethnic status groups and this was Chart Series 4.[4]

---

[2]The exact relationship is shown in Appendix 22, Chart Series 5, pp. 286-301.

[3]For example, in the 1960's, a considerable proportion of British, East Indian, Negro and Chinese immigrants all came from the West Indies.

[4]The complete breakdown of races and ethnicities by each ethnic status group is in Appendix 22, Chart Series 4, p. 272-285.

However if Hypothesis 2 was properly tested, the immigration flow to Canada had to be broken down by ethnic status groups until at least 1970. The involved procedures by which immigration to Canada between 1967 and 1970 was broken down by ethnic status groups constituted Chart Series 5 and Chart Series 6.

Table 12 and Chart Series 4 were discussed first.

a. Table 12: Immigration to Canada by Ethnic Status Groups: 1946-1970, and Chart Series 4: Ethnic Origins of Canadian Immigrants by Ethnic Status Groups: 1946-1966

Discussion of the findings of Table 12 and Chart Series 4 were grouped by each ethnic status group.

Ethnic Status Group I

During the period 1945-1949, 207, 172 Status I immigrants came to Canada. They were primarily British but also included some French. This was 54.6% of the total immigration flow. However this was not an indicator of any long term immigration trend since there was little 'immigration machinery' during this period. Generally speaking, British immigration was encouraged as was the movement of refugees while all other immigration was mainly 'family oriented'.

With the resumption of a more normal immigration flow, British and French immigration to Canada was consistently in the ratio of about 10 immigrants to 1 respectively.[5]

The proportion of immigrants who were Status I steadily increased until 1957, when in response to the Suez crisis and poor

---

[5]This applied until 1966 inclusive after which no ethnicity data was available.

Table 12: Immigration to Canada by Ethnic Status Group: 1946-1970

Ethnic Status Group	1945 - 1949	1950 - 1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
I	207,172	224,011	38,408	60,355	124,750	35,781	27,579	29,375	21,442
	54.6%	29.6%	34.9%	36.6%	44.2%	28.7%	25.8%	28.2%	29.9%
II	48,416	270,241	34,042	48,982	63,926	31,029	23,960	24,322	14,102
	12.8%	35.8%	31.0%	29.7%	22.7%	24.9%	22.4%	23.4%	19.7%
III(a)	15,003	119,505	25,376	37,893	41,472	37,227	37,229	32,910	22,872
	4.0%	15.8%	23.1%	23.0%	14.7%	29.8%	34.8%	31.6%	31.9%
(b)	84,900	100.589	6,086	10,950	41,258	12,446	8,771	9,730	7,164
	22.4%	13.3%	5.5%	6.6%	14.6%	10.0%	8.2%	9.3%	10.0%
(c)	21,484	28,826	2,587	3,445	7,712	4,111	4,611	4,174	2,967
	5.7%	3.8%	2.4%	2.1%	2.7%	3.3%	4.3%	4.0%	4.1%
IV	2,097	12,483	3,367	3,131	2,928	4,163	4,628	3,397	2,923
	.6%	1.7%	3.1%	1.9%	1.0%	3.3%	4.3%	3.3%	4.1%
OTHERS	127	241	80	101	118	94	150	203	219
	.0%	.0%	.1%	.0%	-	.1%	.1%	.2%	.3%
Total Immigration	379,199	755,896	109,946	164,857	282,164	124,851	106,928	104,111	71,689
	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 4, pp. 272-280.

Table 12: (continued) Immigration to Canada by Ethnic Status Group: 1946-1970

Ethnic Status Group	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
I	25,243 33.8%	34,391 36.9%	40,243 35.7%	51,629 35.2%	78,180 40.2%	81,486 36.5%	58,330 31.7%	54,435 33.0%	47,698 32.2%
II	12,630 16.9%	12,531 13.4%	14,152 12.6%	18,446 12.6%	22,066 11.3%	26,404 11.8%	21,474 11.7%	18,116 11.2%	16,446 11.1%
III(a)	23,042 30.9%	28,041 30.1%	34,459 30.6%	45,068 30.7%	55,608 28.6%	60,152 27.0%	43,751 23.8%	31,733 19.6%	29,814 20.1%
(b)	5,925 7,9%	6,563 7.0%	7,868 7.0%	8,772 6.0%	10,280 5.3%	12,995 5.8%	21,015 11.4%	15,054 9.3%	13,256 9.0%
(c)	3,920 5.3%	5,520 6.0%	6,981 6.2%	7,256 4.9%	8,080 4.1%	11,729 5.3%	12,213 6.6%	8,576 5.3%	7,422 5.0%
IV	3,439 4.6%	5,609 5.9%	8,214 7.3%	13,362 9.1%	16,230 8.3%	29,250 13.1%	26,255 14.3%	33,965 21.0%	32,377 21.9%
OTHERS*	387 .5%	531 .6%	689 .6%	2,225 1.5%	4,299 2.2%	1,064 .5%	1,099 .6%	929 .6%	912 .6%
Total Immigration	74,586 100.0%	93,151 99.9%	112,606 100.0%	146,758 100.0%	194,743 100.0%	223,080 99.9%	184,137 100.1%	161,808 100.0%	147,925 99.9%

When 'OTHERS' became a more sizable group in the 1960's, it was composed mostly of Status IV Asian immigrants.

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 4, pp. 281-285 and
Appendix 22, Chart Series 6, pp. 302-305.

economic conditions in Britain, an 'indigestible'[6] 124,750 immigrants constituting 44% of the total immigration flow arrived. With the unemployment situation worsening in Canada and word being sent home about difficulties being encountered in Canada by the 1957 immigrants, Status I immigration plummetted to 35,781 immigrants representing 28.7% of the total flow in 1958. The overall proportion of Status I immigrants remained quite constant compared to the total flow until 1961 but following the general trend the total number of Status I immigrants had dipped to 21,442. Beginning in 1962 the flow of Status I immigrants increased both numerically and proportionately as economic conditions improved in Canada and costly promotional campaigns were instituted. By 1966 78,180 immigrants constituting 40.2% of the total flow arrived in Canada. However in 1967 this proportion fell to 36.5% as Status I immigration rose only slightly to 81,486. A big drop in Status I immigration occurred in 1968 as 58,330 immigrants constituting 31.7% of the total immigration flow came. This decrease of approximately 23,000 immigrants out of a total decrease in the immigration flow of 39,000 immigrants was quite disproportionate. French and especially British immigration flows were the most dramatically affected by general economic trends and business demands for more or less workers, due to 'on again, off again' promotional campaigns. In 1969 the number of immigrants who were Status I dipped to 54,330 and in 1970 dropped again to 47,698 immigrants. The 1969 Status I proportion of the total immigration flow was 33.0% and the 1970 proportion was 32.2%. This levelling off of proportions of Status I

---

[6]This was the expression used by Citizenship and Immigration Minister Jack Pickersgill in 1957, G. Rawlyk, op. cit., p. 295.

immigration in the 32-33% range approximated the 33.8% proportion of 1962, the first year of Ellen Fairclough's new policy.

Ethnic Status Group II

In the transitional post was period 1945-1949, 48,416 Status II immigrants constituting 12.8% of the total immigration flow came to Canada. This included 24,627 Netherlanders, 13,502 Germans and lesser numbers of Belgians, Danish, Norwegians, Swedish, Swiss and Finnish in that order. In the period 1950-1954 Status II immigration increased dramatically to 270,241 immigrants representing 35.8% of the total flow. This was composed mainly of 144,056 Germans[7] and 86,028 Netherlanders. Other immigrants included 10,911 Danish, 8,939 Swedish. From 1956 until 1966 the relative proportions of Germans Netherlander and other Status II immigrants remained constant. In 1966 of 22,066 immigrants constituting 11.3% of the total flow, there were 10,699 Germans, 4,413 Netherlanders, 1,711 Swiss, 1,292 Danish, 941 Austrian, 898 Belgian, 720 Swedish and 696 Finnish.

The flow of Status II immigrants followed general economic trends but not as sharply as Status I immigrants - likely due to less 'on again - off again' promotional activities. In 1956 48,982 Status II immigrants arrived declining steadily to 14,102 immigrants by 1961. Immigration climbed again numerically to 26,404 immigrants by 1967 and then followed the Canadian economy decline to 16,466 in 1970. The proportion of the total immigration flow which was Status II declined steadily from 29.7% in 1956 to 13.4% by 1963 and 12.6% in 1964 and 1965. It has since levelled off between 11-12%.

---

[7]The Orders in Council which had prohibited the entry of former enemy aliens had been revoked. See Appendix 8, pp. 189.

Ethnic Status Group III

In both Table 12 and Chart Series 5, Status III immigration was sub-grouped into three fairly distinct immigration flows by areas of citizenship.

Status III(a) included Italian, Greek, Portugese and Spanish immigrants. Only 15,003 immigrants constituting 4.0% of the total immigration flow arrived during the period 1945-1949. This included 12,038 Italians, 2,406 Greeks, 341 Spanish and 218 Portugese. Between 1950-1954 119,505 immigrants constituting 15.8% of the total flow arrived, once again mainly Italian but including some Greeks and then Portugese and Spanish. Status III(a) immigration 'peaked' between 1956 to 1959 when immigration totals by year were 37,893; 41,472; 37,227 and 37,229 immigrants respectively. The same proportions of ethnicities immigrated each year. In 1959 the totals were 27,223 Italians, 5,035 Greeks, 4,372 Portugese and 599 Spanish. Since this 'peak' period coincided with rising and then declining total immigration, the Status III(a) proportion of the total immigration varied considerably, 23.0% in 1956, 14.7% in 1957, 29.8% in 1958 and 34.8% in 1959.

As noted in Chapter 3, following the defeat of a government order in council designed to limit Status III(a) immigration, the same effect was achieved by administrative control. As would be expected, their immigration declined to 32,910 immigrants in 1960 and 22,872 immigrants in 1961.

With a greater emphasis being placed on education and skills in the new immigration policy of 1962 and the entry of Status III(a) distant relatives curtailed, immigration levelled off in the 29-31% range as a

proportion of the total immigration flow from 1962-1965. Similar to Status I and Status II immigrants, Status III(a) immigration totals began following general economic trends. Immigration rose from 23,042 immigrants in 1962 to 60,152 immigrants by 1967 and then continuously declined to 29,814 immigrants by 1970.

With the new policy in 1967 which standardized but also limited entry through sponsorship, Italian immigration was cut in half and Status III(a) immigration levelled off at 19.6% of the total flow in 1969 and 20.1% in 1970. Both Portugese and Greek immigration increased or the proportion would have fallen even lower.

Status III(b) immigrants were from the eastern European communist nations. Immigration totals were highest just after World War II when refugee programs were organized. Between 1945-1949, 84,900 immigrants arrived and between 1950-1954, 100,589 immigrants. This was 22.4% and 13.3% of the total immigration flows in those periods respectively. Poles, who gained admission under a special order in council,[8] and Ukrainians were the major ethnicities.

Other large scale refugee movements occurred in 1957 with the arrival of approximately 30,000 Hungarian 'freedom fighters' who swelled that year's Status III(b) total to 41,472 immigrants representing 15% of the total flow. In 1968, 8,000 Czechoslovakians raised that year's total to 21,015 immigrants representing 11.4% of the total flow.

The more normal Status III(b) immigration flow was unaffected by the policy changes in 1962 and 1967 and followed general economic trends

---

[8]Single Polish ex-servicement were admitted who agreed to accept agricultural employment for two years. Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 403.

with only changes of 1% or less each year in its proportion of the total immigration. This proportion declined slowly from 7.9% in 1962 to 5.8% in 1967 as the total immigration flow to Canada rapidly increased. Status III(b) immigration rose from 5,925 immigrants in 1962 to 12,995 immigrants by 1967. In a period of steadily declining immigration, 1969 and 1970 totals were 15,054 and 13,356 immigrants respectively constituting 9.3% and 9.0% of the total immigration flow. These fairly high totals, both numerically and proportionately, likely reflected the efforts of the Immigration Department to facilitate 'family oriented' eastern European immigration and represented a longer term trend. This could be altered by new refugee movements or an increase/decrease in population control measures by eastern European governments.

During the period 1958-1970 Poles and Yugoslavians were the major Status III(b) ethnicities admitted to Canada followed by lesser numbers of other ethnic groups. Since 1962 Yugoslavians have been the major ethnic group. In 1966 4,322 Yugoslavians, 2,715 Polish, 1,594 Hugarians, 503 Czech-Slovaks, 288 Ukrainians, 281 Russians, 126 Rumanians, 126 Lithuanians, 131 Latvians, 100 Estonians, 56 Bulgarians and 38 Estonians were granted landed immigrant status in Canada.

Status III(c) immigrants were mainly from 'Middle Eastern' countries. Between 1945-1949 21,489 Status III(c) immigrants constituting 5.7% of the total immigration flow entered Canada. The bulk were 20,117 Hebrew[9] while there were 1,002 Maltese and 238 Syrians. Similarly between 1950-1954 when 28,826 immigrants constituted 3.8% of the total

---

[9]The classification was changed from 'Hebrew' to 'Jewish' in 1956. "Jewish" was difficult to classify by ethnic status group since the country of citizenship of Jewish immigrants was so varied. Since immigrants from Israwl were treated similarly under policy prior to 1962 to areas of citizenship classified Status III(c), they were included with this group.

immigration flow, there were 22,191 Hebrew, 4,831 Maltese and 1,055 Syrian.

From 1956 until 1962 Status III(c) immigration was usually between 3,500-4,500 immigrants each year and between 3-4% of the total immigration flow.

The relative number of immigrants of each ethnicity was also quite constant. In 1962 this included 1,840 Jewish, 777 Armenian, 444 Lebanese, 372 Maltese, 173 Turkish, 122 Syrian, 67 Arabian, 64 Egyptian, 36 Iranian and 24 Mexican.

With the immigration policy change of 1962 and the further rationalization of policy in 1967, Status III(c) immigration began to follow general Canadian economic trends. Immigration increased from 3,920 immigrants to 12,995 immigrants by 1968 before declining to 7,422 immigrants by 1970. The proportion of the total immigration flow which was Status III(c) remained at a fairly constant 5-6% level between 1962-1970.

Ethnic Status Group IV

Status IV immigrants, or the 'colored' races as they were formerly termed by Immigration Department officials, consistently had the greatest difficulty entering Canada. Only 2,097 Status IV immigrants constituting 0.6% of the total immigration flow gained landed immigrant status between 1945-1949. This included 908 Chinese, 885 'Negro'[10] 280 East Indians[11] and 24 Japanese. This ordering of ethnicities continued until 1960. In 1961 2,923 Status IV immigrants included 1,131 Negroes, 894 Chinese, 772 East Indians and 126 Japanese.

---

[10] Negro was a residual category describing anyone who was black.

[11] East Indians meant Indians, Pakistanis and some Ceylonese.

In 1956 3,131 Status IV immigrants representing 1.9% of the total immigration flow gained entry to Canada. This increased to 4,628 immigrants and 4.3% of the total immigration flow by 1959 before decreasing to 2,923 immigrants constituting 4.1% of the total flow in 1961.

With the inauguration of the new policy in 1962, it was expected that immigration from this proscribed ethnic status group would rise considerably. This was exactly what happened. From 1962 to 1966 the yearly immigration totals were 3,439, 5,609, 8,214, 13,362, and 16,230 immigrants respectively. Significantly for a period of rapidly rising total immigration, the proportion of Status IV immigrants rose as well - from 4.6% in 1962 to 5.9% in 1963, 7.3% in 1964 and 9.1% in 1965. There was a slight drop in proportion to 8.3% in 1966. However this was misleading since the residual category of 'OTHERS' had grown to 2.2% of the total flow and was mainly 'Asians'.

After the 1967 policy change the biggest increase in Status IV immigration took place. In 1967, 29,250 immigrants constituting 13.1% of the total immigration flow gained entry. This dipped to 26,255 immigrants in 1968. However this was a disproportionately small decrease in a year of considerable total immigration decrease and the proportion of Status IV immigrants was 14.3%. In 1969, another year of substantial total immigration decrease, Status IV immigration to Canada increased by 7,710 immigrants to 33,965 immigrants constituting 21.0% of the total immigration flow. In 1970, another year of total immigration decrease, Status IV immigration also decreased to 32,377 but increased proportionately to 21.9% of the total immigration flow.

Both numerically and proportionately it appeared that Status IV

immigration may have levelled off. Given the skilled labour in demand biases of policy, the proportion of Status IV immigrants should begin to remain fairly constant, similar to other Statuses, while numerically such immigration should continue to systematically vary with economic conditions in Canada.

b. Chart Series 5: Immigration to Canada by Area of Citizenship and Ethnic Status Group, and Chart Series 6: Extrapolated Immigration by Ethnic Status Group

Chart Series 5 and Chart Series 6 were the basis of Table 12 data about the proportions of immigrants entering Canada by ethnic status groups between 1967 and 1970. The accurateness and validity of these two chart series determined accurateness and validity of this portion of Table 12. Chart Series 5 is described first.

(i) Chart Series 5

Chart Series 5 shows:

1. immigration to Canada from each area of citizenship,
2. the proportions of each ethnic status group immigrating from each area of citizenship, and
3. the average proportions between 1963-1966 of each ethnic status group immigrating from each area of citizenship.

The initial step to obtaining this data was the reworking of the Immigration Statistics table "Ethnic Origin and Country of Citizenship of Immigrants" for the years 1958 through 1966. Immigrants from each area of citizenship were grouped by their ethnic status group and percentages were derived. Status III immigrants were sub-grouped as in Chart Series 4.

The example of landed immigrants carrying German citizenship is listed below.

Immigrants With German Citizenship

Status	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
I	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4
II	98.4	98.0	97.4	98.3	98.6	98.4
III(a)	0.1	---	0.1	---	---	0.1
(b)	1.4	1.5	2.2	1.4	0.9	0.7
(c)	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4
IV	---	---	---	---	---	---
Other	---	---	---	---	---	---
%	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%
#	14,107	10,401	10,596	6,060	5,081	4,740

	1964	1965	1966	Average Percentage 1963 - 1966
I	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2
II	98.7	98.9	98.8	98.7
III(a)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
(b)	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.7
(c)	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2
IV	---	---	---	---
Other	---	---	---	---
%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%
#	4,866	7,031	7,249	

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 5, p. 286-301.

Immigrants with German citizenship were almost all Status II. That is, they were all Germans except for a few Belgians, Norwegians, etc. who had the same ethnic status and had acquired German citizenship. The

proportion of immigrants of each ethnic status group by year was very constant irregardless of the numbers of German citizens entering Canada as landed immigrants. In an age of the mass migration of workers to Germany and many other industrialized nations, area of residence was changed but citizenship was not. These workers were migrants, not immigrants applying for landed immigrant status.

With a constant flow proportionally by ethnic status groups from an area of citizenship, it became possible to predict subsequent immigration by ethnic status groups if the absolute number of immigrants entering by an area of citizenship was known. In the case of Germany and for most other countries, this was done by averaging the ethnic status group proportions for the years 1963-1966.[12] Thus the average proportion of immigrants from Germany who were ethnic status group II was 98.7%. This meant that in subsequent years that a close approximation of the number of immigrants from Germany who were Status II could be made by multiplying 98.7% times the total number of immigrants with german citizenship. In 1969, as an example, 3,880 German citizens applied for landed immigrant status in Canada. Multiplying all the German ethnic status group proportions by 3,880 yielded:

German Citizens	Immigration by Ethnic Status Groups						
Status	I	II	III(a)	III(b)	III(c)	IV	Others
3,880	8	3,830	4	27	8	--	--

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 6, p.302-305.

[12] This included the first full year of immigration after the policy change in 1962 and the last year that data was available.

By following basically the same procedure for all areas of citizenship, it was possible to determine the immigration of each ethnic status group to Canada for the years 1967-1970 by adding the totals of each ethnic status group from every area of citizenship.

Two factors could have jeopardized these procedures.

1. An area of citizenship instead of having very constant proportions of immigrants from each ethnic status group, like Germany, might have had irregular, varying proportions. In practice, immigration from most areas of citizenship did follow the German pattern and was easy to extrapolate. In cases where there were varying proportions, it was usually due to the policy change of 1962 and a resulting increase in the proportion of Status IV immigrants. Immigration from the two major areas of citizenship with varying percentages of immigrants by ethnic status group was not irregular but varied predictably according to two formulas. These areas of citizenship were the West Indies and the areas of citizenship collectively listed as "Asia, other".

(a) The flow of immigrants from each ethnic status group from the West Indies was very constant <u>numerically</u> except for Status IV immigration which greatly increased. Except for Status IV immigration, absolute numbers were averaged and West Indian immigration could be derived from the formula:

$$X = 154 + 19 + 81 + 1 + 16 + Y + 28$$

where X was immigration from the West Indies as an area of citizenship,

Y was the Status IV proportion of the West Indies immigration,

the numbers refer to the <u>numerical</u> average of immigrants from Status I, II, III(a), III(b), III(c) and Others respectively between 1963 and 1966.

For example, in 1969, 7,533 West Indian citizens applied for landed immigrant status in Canada. Using this formula

$$7,533 = 154 + 19 + 81 + 1 + 16 + Y + 28$$

$$Y = 7,234$$

This in 1969, 7,234 immigrants from the West Indies were estimated to be Status IV.[13]

(b) The most complicated area of citizenship to extrapolate was the collective listing "asia, other". As shown from their 1965 and 1966 ethnic status group averages (done in the usual way), immigration trends by the various ethnic origins, and the entry of immigrants by their country of last permanent residence; "Asia, other" was three distinct immigration flows by ethnic status groups. Greeks came from Cypress, Status III(c) immigrants came from 'Middle Eastern' countries and Status IV immigrants came from the Phillipines and in smaller numbers from Korea, Malaysia and some additional countries.[14] The formula for extrapolating 'Asia, other' immigration was:

$$\text{Status IV Immigration} = X - (I\% + II\% + III(b)\% + Y + Z + \overline{\text{Others}}\%)$$

where X was 'Asia, other' immigration by area of citizenship,

Y was 'Asia, other' immigration from the Middle East by Country of Former Residence

Z was 'Asia, other' immigration from Cypress as a Country of Former Residence,

the percentages refer to the percentage average of immigrants from Status I, II, III(b), and Others respectively.

---

[13] Appendix 22, Chart Series 6, p.302-305.

[14] The Phillipines was a separate category in Immigration Statistics beginning in 1967. For purposes of extrapolation it was included with 'Asia, other'.

Since 'Asia, other' immigration from Status I, II, III(b) and Others was so low, it was percentaged in the usual way. In 1969, 5,646 'Asia, other' immigrants applied for landed immigrant status in Canada. Using the formula:

Status IV Immigration = 5,646 - (15 + 8 + 239 + 10 + 324 + 0)

= 5,646 - 596

= 5,050

Thus in 1969, 5,050 immigrants from 'Asia, other' were Status IV.[15]

In addition to West Indies and 'Asia, other' immigration, there were other immigration flows which varied considerably by their proportions of each ethnic status group. However these flows were quite small and extrapolating their immigration by ethnic status groups did not affect the validity of Table 12 very much.

Thus immigration to Canada from all the major sources was constant or varied predictably by the four major ethnic status groups despite widely fluctuating immigration totals numerically.

2. The second factor which could have jeopardized the methods for deriving immigration to Canada by ethnic status groups was the policy change in 1967. Fortunately this change was a further rationalization of the policy change in 1962. Due to the emphasis on skilled and educated immigrants irregardless of race or ethnicity instituted in 1962, the proportions of Status IV immigrants from the West Indies and 'Asia, other' increased considerably and would be expected to continue increasing after the policy change in 1967. This was accounted for in the respective formulas.

---

[15] Using the more precise geographical criterion "Country of Former Residence" to determine Status III(a) and Status III(b) immigration resulted in a slight deficit of Status IV immigrants. This was accounted for in the formula since Status IV immigration was the 'unknown'.

The most important factor affecting the reliability of Chart Series 5 was the variation in proportion of immigration by ethnic status groups from each area of citizenship. For most sources of immigration this variation was usually less than plus or minus 2.0% and sometimes less than plus or minus 1.0% for their largest ethnic status group. Their other ethnic status groups would usually have miniscule immigration and vary by less than plus or minus 1.0%.

Chart Series 5 also sometimes showed immigration by ethnicities for the year 1966 from 'majority' and 'minority' ethnic status groups. A majority ethnic status group was defined as having the ethnicity with the greatest number of immigrants from an area of citizenship. In the case of Germany, this would be Status II since most immigrants from Germany were Germans. A minority ethnic status group would be any other ethnic status group. For these ethnicities to be listed they had to have:

1. at least 3% of the total immigration by an area/areas of citizenship and not less than 100 immigrants,

or 2. less than 100 immigrants but at least 5% of the immigration,

or 3. less than 3% of the immigration but at least 200 immigrants.

Only if there was more than one ethnicity from a majority ethnic status group was it listed.

Discussion of the findings of Chart Series 5 were grouped by the majority ethnic status group of each area of citizenship.

Areas of Citizenship: Ethnic Status Group I

Areas of citizenship having Status I immigrants predominating were countries having, or having had long term immigration themselves, and hence sent proportionately the most immigrants to Canada outside the

expected majority ethnic status group. Many of these immigrants from both majority and minority ethnic status groups could be considered trans-migrants or 'transilients'.[16]

The most important source of Canadian immigrants has been British citizens. Since 1962 they contributed more than 30% of Canada's total annual immigration flow and between 1963-1966 its ethnic status group proportions were Status I 85.0%, STatus II 0.8%, Status III(a), (b) and (c) 1.4%, 1.3% and 3.4% respectively, Status IV 8,0% and Other 0.2%.

Minority ethnicities with British citizenship in 1966, the last year that exact data was available, included 2,524 Negroes, 1,620 Chinese, 864 Indians, 362 Jewish, 226 Polish and 270 Portugese.

Immigrants with United States citizenship had the second lowest proportion of the expected majority ethnic status group,[17] average of 57.0%. Other averages were Status II 25.7%, Status III(a), (b) and (c), 4.5%, 5.4% and 4.6% respectively and Status IV 2.0%. A residual category of Other had 1.0%.

---

[16]'Transilients', as used by Anthony Richmond, refers to short-term migrants. "There is an international market for their occupational skills, they enjoy travel for its own sake, they find little difficulty making friends whereever they go, and they lack strong family or community ties that might compel them to become sedentary. The absence of roots in a particular community in such cases does not carry with it a negative value connotation or imply any degree of alienation. On the contrary, transilience would appear to be positively functional in urban industrial societies whose populations are increasingly mobile, both geographically and socially. Anthony Richmond, Post-War Immigrants in Canada, University of Toronto Press, 1967, p. 252.

[17]Of the major immigrant sending countries. Argentina and Brazil both sent smaller majority ethnic status group flows to Canada.

Minority ethnicities with United States citizenship in 1966 included 2,742 Germans, 506 Italians, 675 Jewish,483 Netherlands and 358 Norwegians.[18]

Also with a low proportion of immigrants from the expected majority ethnic status group were Australian citizens who had a 1963-1966 Status I average of 73.1%. Other averages included Status II 6.6%, Status III(a), (b) and (c), 5.7%, 10.9% and 1.4% respectively, Status IV 0.4% and Other 2.0%.

Minority ethnicities included 171 Other, 170 Hungarians and 117 Italians.

The lowest proportion of immigrants constituting the expected majority ethnic status group were citizens of the Union of South Africa with a 1966 average of 50.7% Status I immigrants. Other totals were Status II 18.2%, Status III(a), (b) and (c), 3.1%, 0.9% and 3.4% respectively, Status IV 15.0% and Other 8.7%. The Union of South Africa was one of the areas of citizenship that had changing ethnic status group percentages. Most ethnic status groups declined proportionately to the total immigration between 1963-1966. However, apparently as a result of the 1962 policy change, immigrants from Status IV ethnicities increased their proportion from 2.7% to 15.0%. This 15.0% appeared to be a 'levelling off' from the previous year. Hence 1966 percentages were used as the 'average' for determining South African 1967-1970 totals by ethnic status group. With the further change in policy in 1967, a similar change in proportions was

---

[18] It remains a moot point just how rational the use of ethnicity designations were for United States citizens, especially in cases of inter-generational immigration. Presumably a Norwegian from Norway was not the same as a 'Norwegian' whose grandfather immigrated to the United States in 1880.

conceivable. However it was unlikely that this happened since South African immigration between 1967-1970 followed the general trend and decreased rather than increasing as would be expected if a further significant change in proportions was taking place.

Minority ethnicities with South African citizenship in 1966 included 86 Netherlanders, 77 Other, 62 Germans, 52 East Indians and 48 Negro.

There was also variability in the composition of the ethnic status groups immigrating with French Citizenship. With the change in policy in 1962 the Status I average increased 3-4% to a four year average of 88.5%. Status III(a), (b) and (c) declined this same total proportion to 5.0%, 2.4% and 2.6% respectively. This rather slight change would be due to the skills bias of the new immigration policy decreasing the proportion of the less skilled Status III transmigrants. Other averages were quite small, Status II 0.9%, Status IV 0.2% and Other 0.4%.

Minority ethnicities with French citizenship in 1966 included 642 Italians, 602 Portugese, 495 Spanish and 306 Yugoslavs.

New Zealand citizens, a source of relatively few immigrants to Canada, had no minority ethnicities, a quite consistent pattern of ethnic status group percentages and a Status I average of 91.2%.

Citizens of Ireland also had the most common pattern of a very high majority Status average - 98.5%, and very low or miniscule minority Status ethnicities.

Areas of Citizenship: Ethnic Status Group II

Every area of citizenship with Status II immigrants had a very high proportion of expected majority Status immigrants and a very low or

miniscule proportion of minority Status ethnicities. Citizens of Germany and the Netherlands were the major sources of immigration but the other areas of citizenship sent a considerable proportion of Status II immigrants as well. Average percentages of majority Statuses by areas of citizenship from highest to lowest percentage were Denmark 99.5%, Finland 99.3%, Norway 98.9%, Germany 98.7%, Switzerland 97.7%, Belgium 96.7% and Other - a very small flow from Iceland and Luxembough 96.7%, Austria 96.3%, the Netherlands 96.3% and Sweden 92.8%.

In 1966 only citizens of Sweden with 64 Yugoslavs and the Netherlands with 260 Other had minority Status ethnicities. In the case of the Netherlands citizens this would have been a short term flow from her former colonial empire in the East Indies.

Areas of Citizenship: Ethnic Status Group III(a), III(b) and III(c)

Also with very high expected majority Status averages were the four areas of citizenship constituting Status III(a). Citizens of Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain had average percentages of 99.8%, 99.6%, 99.6% and 98.7% respectively and hence no minority ethnicity immigration.

Trends in Status III(a) trans-migration are shown in the following example.

Immigration From Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain 1966

	By Country of Last Permanent Residence	Expected Ethnicity	By Country of Citizenship	Expected Ethnicity
Italy	31,625	30,843	33,977	33,868
Greece	7,174	7,106	7,714	7,689
Portugal	7,930	7,899	8,900	8,857
Spain	1,161	1,095	1,931	1,905
	1	2	3	4

Source: 1966 Immigration Statistics, Dept. of Manpower & Immigration, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, pp. 14-17.

Subtracting either column 1. from column 3. or column 2. from column 4. gives an indication of the movement of workers from southern Europe to industrialized northern Europe or sometimes the United States before their immigration to Canada.

Citizens of Yugoslavia and Poland were the two major sources contributing Status III(b) ethnicities. Both had high proportions of Status III(b) immigrants - 97.5% and 98.2% average percentages respectively and no minority ethnicity immigration. Hungarian citizens, a proportionately less important source of immigration to Canada similarly had no minority ethnicity immigration and a 95.6% average. Czechoslovakian citizens, formally a very small source of immigrants to Canada had an 89.4% average during the years 1964-1966. With the tremendous numbers of Czechs and Slovaks immigrating in the late 1960's due to political and social upheavals in that country, it was quite certain that the averages derived would not be accurate for extrapolating the 1967-1970 period. Instead it was expected that this immigration flow would follow the Yogoslavian, Polish and Hungarian examples as their immigration flows became larger. Hence Polish average percentages were used in place of the Czechoslovakian.

Immigrants with Russian citizenship were only a small proportion of the Status III(b) immigration flow. The average percentage for the expected majority Status group was 82.1% but percentages tended to vary each year. This however did not affect the reliability of Chart Series 6 extrapolations significantly since very small numbers were involved.

Immigration from 'other' eastern European communist areas of citizenship also varied annually by ethnic status groups, but similarly did not affect Chart Series 6 extrapolations significantly due to the small numbers involved. Its 1963-1966 Status III(b) average was 81.2%.

Immigration from the following Status III(c) area of citizenship: Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, Morocco, Iran and Syria had very consistent annual percentages by ethnic status groups. Majority Status averages were citizens of Egypt 94.0%, Israel 98.5%, Lebanon 98.4%, Turkey 88.9%, Morocco 91.4%, Iran 92.6% and Syria 98.1%.

However while immigrants from most other areas of citizenship had one ethnicity constituting the major proportion of their expected majority ethnic status group, citizens of these countries often had many Status III(c) majority ethnicities. Thus in 1966, majority ethnicities with Egyptian citizenship included 608 Egyptians, 451 Armenians, 323 Lebanese and 133 Syrians. With Israeli citizenship were 1,249 Jewish and 129 Arabian immigrants. Citizens of Lebanon included 620 Lebanese, 136 Armenians and 106 Arabs while Turkey's flow included 454 Turks and 148 Armenians. With Moroccan citizenship were 253 Jewish, with Iranian citizenship were 105 Iranians, 23 Jewish and 22 Armenians and with Syrian citizenship were 67 Armenians and 47 Syrians.

There also were 50 Greek minority ethnicity immigrants with Turkish citizenship.

Both majority and minority ethnicity trends from these sources were very consistent and contributed to reliable 1967-1970 extrapolations.

Also included in Status III(c) areas of citizenship were Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and South and Central America. These were almost exclusively areas of transmigration. Hence majority and minority ethnicities could not be readily distinguished. Major ethnicites with the citizenship of Argentina in 1966 included 128 Italian and 53 Spanish immigrants. With Brazilian citizenship came 59 Portugese, 57 Germans and 48 Italians while

arrivals from South and Central American included 173 Spanish, 123 Negro, 107 Portugese, 106 Germans and 91 Italians. Immigrants with Mexican citizenship included 40 Spanish and 33 Mexicans.

Annual ethnic status group percentages varied by considerably more than the usual one or two percent but in the cases of citizens of Argentina, Brazil and Mexico this was unimportant due to the small numbers involved. However citizens of South and Central America constituted a considerable proportion of the total immigration flow to Canada, about 3% in 1970. Only 1966 averages could be used since this was the first year that Guyana was included as a separate category. The major possible error from South and Central America as an area of citizenship would be too few extrapolated Status IV ethnicities or too many extrapolated Status I-III ethnicities due to changing ethnic status group proportions of citizens from Guyana. Their averages could have been similar to the steadily increasing Status IV average of the West Indians. If this was the case, 1967-1970 extrapolated Status IV immigration would be low by 0.3%-0.4% at the most.

Areas of Citizenship: Ethnic Status Group IV

The major sources of Status IV ethnicities were citizens of China, Asia, other; the West Indies and the East Indies. China and Japan were the two areas of citizenship which had the most consistent ethnic status group averages, typically varying by 0.1%-0.2% annually. Both sources had years where every immigrant to Canada was a Status IV ethnicity and the Status IV averages for Chinese and Japanese citizens were 99.8% and 99.5% respectively. Needless to say there was no minority ethnicity immigration to report.

Both West Indies and 'Asia, other' as areas of citizenship had changing proportions of immigrants by ethnic status group. However for both sources these changes were regular and their immigration could be extrapolated using the already noted formulas.

Like immigration from Status III(c) areas of citizenship West Indian immigration consisted of more than one majority ethnicity. In 1966 West Indian citizens included 2,840 Negroes, 330 East Indians and 216 Chinese. There was also one minority ethnicity in 1966, 140 British. Similarly majority ethnicities with Asia other citizenship in 1966 inlcuded 186 Chinese and 2,986 'Others' who would be primarily immigrants from the Phillipines and other Asian countries. Minority ethnicities included 300 Greeks and 172 Arabs.

The other major area of citizenship contributing immigrants to Canada with Status IV ethnicities was 'East India' a grouping of India, Pakistan and Ceylon. Between 1958-1966, a period of very rapidly increasing East Indian immigration, the proportion of Status IV ethnicities was usually 90% plus or minus 2.0% and the four year average was 90.3%.

Major majority ethnicities in 1966 were 2,674 Indians, 361 Pakistani, 117 Ceylonese. Minority ethnicities included 164 British and 137 Portugese, the latter from India and the former Portugese colony of Goa.

Immigration from 'Africa, other' as an area of citizenship, a source of relatively few immigrants to Canada, was included with Status IV ethnicities since by 1966 Status IV ethnicities accounted for 41.2% of that years immigration flow while Status I immigration had declined to 35.2%. The former percent was a tenfold increase from 1963 while the

latter was a considerable decline. Given the trends and the small numbers involved, only 1966 percentages were used as the 'averages' and there could be a very slight over estimation of 1967-1970 immigration totals from Status I ethnicities and a very slight under estimation of Status IV ethnicities.

Major ethnicities with 'Africa, other' citizenship in 1966 included 76 British, 55 Negro and 41 East Indians.

Areas of Citizenship: Stateless and 'Others'

Immigrants that were stateless and held no citizenship were considerable in number but very consistent in their annual ethnic status group percentages. A four year average of 82.7% had Status III(b) ethnicities while an average of 11.5% had Status III(c) ethnicities. These percentages varied by only plus or minus 1.5%.

Major ethnicities in 1966 included 1,272 Yugoslavs, 473 Hungarians, 195 Czechs and Slovaks, 189 Polish, 144 Armenians and 88 Jewish.

The residual category of 'Others' refers to immigrants who did not have a listed ethnicity. Since most ethnicities and races which conceivably could be categorized as Status I, II, III(a) and (b) were already listed, this category could refer to immigrants from Status III(c) but more likely referred to immigrants with Status IV ethnicities.

(ii) Chart Series 6

Chart Series 6 shows extrapolated immigration to Canada by ethnic status groups for the period 1967-1970. This was obtained by multiplying a given area of citizenship's immigration to Canada between 1967-1970 by its 1963-1966 ethnic status group averages derived in Chart Series 5.

As an example, from Chart Series 5 it was determined that despite tremendous variation in general immigration totals, that British citizens entered Canada in the average proportions of plus or minus 1-2% of 85.0% Status, 0.8% Status II, 1.4% STatus III(a), 1.3% STatus III(b), 3.4% Status III(c), 8.0% Status IV and 0.2% Other. In Chart Series 6, multiplying these proportions times the number of British citizens entering Canada in 1967 - 65,614 yielded:

Status	I	II	III(a)	III(b)	III(c)	IV	Other
Extrapolated Immigration	55,614	523	916	851	2,225	5,234	131

Source: Appendix 22, Chart Series 6, p. 302-305.

Adding the extrapolated totals of immigrants from each ethnic status group together provided a grant total of all immigrants from every ethnic status group. These final extrapolations were percentaged and transferred to Table 12, pp. 119-120.

Summary

The most basic finding of this Chapter was that Hypothesis 2 was confirmed as noted in sections 1 and 3 below. The most important factor for testing this hypothesis was determining the proportions of immigrants entering Canada from each ethnic status group since it was in terms of these groups that racially and ethnically discriminatory policies and practices had been instituted.

Measuring the proportions of immigrants of each ethnicity as they were aggregated into 'ethnic status groups' was comparatively easy until 1966 inclusive since Immigration Statistics published yearly immigration totals by races and ethnicities. After 1966 determining these proportions

was much more difficult since race and ethnicity data were no longer published. However in Chart Series 5 it was found that the proportions of each ethnic status group's immigration from a specific country of citizenship had been very constant. This provided the basis for determining the proportions of each ethnic status group in the Canadian immigration flow between 1967-1970 in Chart Series 5. It was estimated that these proportions were accurate within about plus or minus 2% and that in addition that the proportion of Status IV immigrants could be estimated as much as 0.5% too low with the proportion of Status I, II and III immigrants combined estimated as much as 0.5% too high.

The basic findings from Table 12 and Chart Series 4, 5 Chart Series 5 and Chart Series 6 were as follows:

1. It appeared that government claims that it introduced increasingly non-discriminatory immigration policies and practices were substantially true. In 1962 3,439 Status IV immigrants constituting 4.6% of the total flow gained entry to Canada. In 1966 16,230 of this most discriminated against group or 8.3% of the total flow gained entry. An even bigger change took place after the policy change of 1967. In 1969 an estimated 33,965 immigrants constituting 21.0% of the total flow gained entry and in 1970 there were 32,377 Status IV immigrants and 21.9% of the flow.

A caution should be sounded. Since as we noted earlier, backlogs were noted in some Status IV areas of citizenship, examination of the rate of expansion of these facilities, the relative amount of time that immigrants must wait for processing at all immigrant receiving facilities, as well as general backlog data would be desirable before final conclusions are reached regarding ethnic and racial discrimination

in practice. As already noted, the Immigration Department is biased toward 'traditional' source countries in its promotional activities. Still, to a great extent, it appears that if there are other biases they must occur at the individual level where immigrants meet immigration officers and receive their discretionary assessments.

2. Immigration from Italy and hence Status III(a) was sharply reduced as a result of the policy change in 1967.

3. For at least the years 1969 and 1970 the proportions and numbers of immigrants from each ethnic status group and sub-group levelled off. Thus an equilibrium or 'racial balance' was apparently attained. With the present criteria controlling the admission of immigrants these new proportions should continue as a longer term trend. Altering this trend somewhat could be new booming economic development and increasing demands for skilled labour. If this occurred the disproportionate promotional activity in Great Britain and France and possibly the United States would increase considerably the proportions of Status I immigrants while correspondingly depressing the proportions of immigrants from the other Statuses. Refugee movements could also increase the proportion of either Status III or Status IV immigrants. However since these would likely be regulated to some extent through the points system this effect should be moderated considerably.

4. As noted from Chart Series 5 there was a considerable immigration of minority groups to Canada from most areas of citizenship classified Status I, Status III(c) and Status IV.

Chapter 5: Selection By Family Connection and Resultant Immigration to Canada

In this chapter presented some very general information related to Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 3

It was expected that the proportion of sponsored immigrants would be reduced since this flow would likely be less skilled and educated. More specifically, after the immigration policy of 1967, it was expected that there should have been a considerable drop in the proportion of low skilled nominated immigrants.

Statistical data from which changes in the immigration flow to Canada by family connection could be deduced were very limited or unavailable. However some generalizations could be made from different secondary source materials.

In the post war period, Canadians could sponsor a wide range of relatives from most non-Asiatic sources of immigration. Government officials believed that existing racial and ethnic balances in Canada would be perpetuated by this policy, that the intended occupations of sponsored immigrants would coincide with Canada's 'absorptive capacity' to accept them and that family connection aided immigrant adjustment in Canada. Much of this thinking was upset when very large numbers of very low skilled Italian, Greek and Portugese immigrants gained entry to Canada through sponsorship privileges in the late 1950's. Backlogs of sponsored relatives awaiting processing eventually reached unmanageable proportions in the Rome, Athens and Lisbon immigration offices.

As Hawkins observed, this sponsored movement "derived to a considerable extent from the deliberate recruitment of unskilled labourers, mainly in Italy and Portugal, by both the Canadian government and private enterprise after the war".[1] She quoted the 1963 Departmental Report of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration which outlined Portugese immigration in the 1950's.

> "Immigration movements from Portugal for the next few years (from 1953 onwards) must be studied in the light of the then current shortage of heavy manual labour in Canada, and the persistent pressure from railway construction companies and agricultural groups for immigrant workers, coupled with the decline in immigration from our traditional source countries in 1955 and 1956. For the 1954 programme, at the request of the Portugese Government, the Portugese movement comprised 200 railway workers for R.F. Welsh Company (1000 Italian track workers had been recruited in 1953), 700 agricultural workers for mixed farms, and up to 50 tradesmen with all selection to be conducted in the Azores. In 1955 the approved movement consisted of 900 farm labourers and 50 tradesmen to be selected from the Portugese Mainland. In 1956 a similar programme was approved but with selection from the Azores. For the 1957 immigration programme, in line with a general expansion of activities, the programme included 2000 farm labourers (1000 from the Azores and 1000 from the Mainland) as well as 50 tradesmen. Subsequently a movement of 1000 track workers from the Azores for the R.F. Welsh Company was also authorized in 1957. ...
>
> About this time (1957-58) serious doubts began to be felt in the Immigration Branch about the Portugese movement. The Portugese Government was obviously making efforts to concentrate our recruiting activities in the Azores. At the same time there were increasing signs that the declining need for unskilled labourers in Canada would not continue to support the type of movements we had been accepting in Portugal. The several large movements of unskilled workers from the Azores showed signs of producing a disproportionate valume of sponsored immigrants (duplicating our experience in Italy)." 2

---

[1] Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 49.

[2] Ibid., p. 50.

Between 1955 to 1964, approximately 55% of all Canadian immigrants were in the sponsored category.[3] However, as noted in a Department of Citizenship and Immigration report written in 1963, more than half of the total sponsored movement between 1951 and 1963 (except 1957) was from Italy, Portugal and Greece. Approximately 40% of the total sponsored flow was Italian. Between 1955 and 1964, an average of 19,352 sponsored Italian immigrants entered Canada each year. This constituted between 92% and 99% of the total Italian immigration flow depending on the year.[4]

In 1962 more distant relatives constituted 42.4% of the total sponsored movement. Only 7.3% of these immigrants were estimated to be admissable as unsponsored immigrants qualifying on their own merits. From Italy and Greece however, 54% of their sponsored immigrants were more distant relatives. In the case of Italy 2.4% of their immigrants would have been selected as unsponsored immigrants while the proportion of Greek immigrants was 5.3%. About one third of the Portugese sponsored movement were more distant relatives and only about 1% could have qualified as unsponsored immigrants. Further, from "a report from the Economic and Social Research Division of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in which the 1962 statistics were examined, 74.5 percent of all workers in the unsponsored movement in that year could have been classed as skilled or better, but only 27 percent of all sponsored workers could have been classed as skilled. Of all sponsored workers, 25.2 percent came from southern Europe. The proportion of totally unskilled workers among the sponsored workers from these countries was: Italy, 43.2 percent,

---

[3]Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 117.

[4]Freda Hawkins, op. cit., p. 48.

Portugal, 22.7%; Greece, 6.6 percent; all other countries, 5.3 percent."[5]

Between 1955-1959, the backlog of sponsored immigrants awaiting processing had increased considerably as shown in a Table prepared for a speech by Ellen Fairclough in the House of Commons.

Table 13: Immigration Backlog, All Countries, 1955-1959

Year	Sponsored	Unsponsored	Total
Dec. 31, 1955	26,332	50,826	77,158
Dec. 31, 1956	47,178	69,957	117,135
Dec. 31, 1957	63,659	88,962	152,621
Dec. 31, 1958	73,540	47,774	121,314
Feb. 28, 1959	75,847	55,938	131,785

Source: Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 1959, p. 2933.

As reported by Walmsley for 1958, 60,000 of these backlogged sponsored immigrants were in Italy and 9,000 were in Greece.[6]

To restrict the entry of low skilled more distant relatives, Order in Council P.C. 1959 - 310 was introduced.[7] The following classes of sponsored relatives were admissable to Canada: the husband, wife, unmarried son or daughter, the father, the mother,the grandparent, the unmarried orphan newphew or niece under 21 years of age and the fiancé or fiancée of a Canadian citizen or of a person legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence. As would be expected of an Order in Council written in 1959, these privileges were restricted to persons who were citizens by

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 106.

[7] Appendix 16, p. 206.

birth or by naturalization of Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, or of any country of Europe or of a country of North America, Central America or South America.

Eliminated as possible sponsorable classes in these reulations was the married son or daughter, brother, sister and the unmarried children under 21 years of age of any such son, daughter, brother or sister.

This Order in Council was revoked approximately one month later by Order in Council 1959 - 507[8] after protests in parliament and from local ethnic organizations. With the defeat of Order in Council 1959 - 310, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration took the situation into their own hands, at least in the case of Italian, Greek and Portugese immigrants. Instead of following normal procedure and giving priority to sponsored 'close relatives', sponsored 'distant relatives' and independent applicants, in that order, due to 'humanitarian considerations'; independent applicants were given priority before sponsored distant relatives. As reported by Walmsley, the backlogs of sponsored immigrants were soon reduced by this administrative measure.[9] Also, and most significantly, the combined proportion of sponsored and nominated immigrants had dropped from the 55% level noted by Walmsley between 1955-1964 to about the 45% level cited by Dr. Ziegler for the late 1960's and early 1970's. Dr. Ziegler noted that the immigration flow was now composed of approximately 55% independent immigrants, 30% nominated immigrants and 15% sponsored immigrants.[10] The

---

[8]Appendix 15, p. 205.

[9]Norma Walmsley, op. cit., p. 113.

[10]Dr. E. Ziegler, Canadian Institute on Public Affairs, 18th Winter Conference, "Immigration Canada. New Plicies? New Directions?", March 30-31, 1973.

most immediate effect of the policy change in 1967 in this regard was the cutting in half of immigration from Italy, the largest source of low skilled nominated immigration.[11]

Also under consideration as a possible control measure of sponsored immigration was a requirement that only Canadian citizens would have the right to sponsor. This would have meant that new immigrants would have to wait at least five years before they could obtain the right to sponsor.[12] It was never instituted due to the possible protests that would have resulted.

Under the regulations amended in 1967, and presently in force, either Canadian citizens or persons admitted to Canada for permanent residence could 'sponsor' close relatives as defined in Section 31 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h).[13] Apparently the admission of these 'sponsored dependent' relatives was almost automatic. In 1969, out of 5,687 applications received for sponsored dependents only 12 cases were refused.[14]

More significantly, under these amended regulations the Department of Manpower and Immigration was finally able to secure legislation which gave it some measure of control over the sponsorship of more distant relations. These 'nominated' immigrants, in addition to being nominated by a Canadian citizen or person admitted to Canada for permanent residence,

---

[11] See also, Tim Creery, "Italian Tide to Canada Cut Sharply", The Hamilton Spectator, Feb. 11, 1970, p. 14.

[12] White Paper on Immigration, The Department of Manpower and Immigration, October, 1966, p. 20.

[13] Appendix 19, p. 210.

[14] Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, April 28, 1970, p. 4:21.

had to obtain a required number of points in a system based on 70 points. The exact number of points that a nominated immigrant required for admissibility was based on

a. whether the nominated immigrant's blood relationship to their nominator was 'close' or 'more distant',
b. whether or not the nominator was a citizen of Canada or a person admitted to Canada for permanent residence,
c. whether the nominated immigrant was applying from outside Canada or from within Canada.

'Close' nominated relatives included a son or daughter twenty-one years of age or over, a married son or daughter under twenty-one years of age, a brother or sister, the parents or grandparents under sixty years of age or an unmarried nephew or niece under twenty-one years of age. 'More distant' nominated relatives included a newphew or niece twenty-one years of age or over, a married nephew or niece under twenty-one years of age, or an uncle, aunt, grandson or granddaughter.

The number of points required by each class of nominated immigrant for admissibility to Canada is shown in the table below.

Table 14: Admissibility Criteria of Nominated Immigrants

Points Required	Admissibility Criteria
20	Nominator is a 'close' relative and a citizen of Canada. Applicant applies in Canada.
25	Nominator is a 'close' relative admitted to Canada for permanent residence. Applicant applies in Canada.
30	Nominator is a 'more distant' relative and a citizen of Canada. Applicant applies in Canada. Nominator is a 'close' relative and a citizen of Canada. Applicant applies outside of Canada.
35	Nominator is a 'more distant' relative admitted to Canada for permanent residence. Applicant applies in Canada. Nominator is a 'close' relative admitted to Canada for permanent residence. Applicant applies outside Canada.
40	Nominator is a 'more distant' relative and a citizen of Canada. Applicant applies outside Canada.
45	Nominator is a 'more distant' relative admitted to Canada for permanent residence. Applicant applies outside Canada.

Source: Appendix 19, p. 210.

By estimating the points assessment of a 'low' 'medium' and 'high' skilled nominated immigrant, under age 35, per Schedule B; the Immigration Department's discretionary power could be outlined.

Table 15: Points Range of 'Low'. 'Medium' and 'High Skilled Nominated Immigrants

Skill Level:		Low		Medium		High		
Criteria	Points	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Comment
(a) Education and training		5	5	10	10	15	15	My estimate
(b) Personal Assessment		0	15	0	15	0	15	Discretionary
(c) Occupational Demand		0	15	0	15	0	15	Discretionary
(d) Occupational Skill		0	0	5	5	10	10	My estimate
(e) Age		10	10	10	10	10	10	The Maximum
	Totals	15	-45	25	-55	35	-65	

Source: Appendix 19, p. 210.

The two discretionary assessments "Personal Assessment" and "Occupational Demand" are the crucial factors controlling the range of points that could be given by an immigration officer. Similar to the case of independent applicants, these criteria were not liable to public scrutiny. However it appeared that personal assessment points, as they were being administered, were in the range of 4 points to 8 points.[15] Thus the 'low points' totals per Table 15 could be increased by approximately 5 points when discussing present administrative practice.

If a 'low' points assessment were given a 'low skill' nominated immigrant, virtually all classes of these immigrants would be eliminated. If a 'low' points assessment were given a 'medium skill' nominated immigrant, all classes of these immigrants below 25 points in theory and 30 points in practice would be eliminated. If a 'low' points assessment were given a

---

[15] House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, Nov. 28, 1968, p. 108.

'high skill' nominated immigrant, all classes of these immigrants below 35 points in theory and 40 points in practice would be eliminated. The last criterion would likely exclude very few cases. With a 'high' points assessment almost all classes of nominated immigrants, at all skill levels, would be automatically admissible.

Thus under the points system, the Immigration Department had almost total control of the immigration flow of 'low' skilled nominated immigrants and some control of 'medium' skilled immigrants. Conversely, many 'medium' skilled immigrants and almost all 'high' skilled immigrants would be automatically admissible under the system.

More detailed statistics were not available and the relationships between the three major principles governing the admission of immigrants to Canada could not be fully studied empirically.

Summary

Very general data was presented which tentatively supported Hypothesis 2. The flow of sponsored and nominated immigrants dropped from about 55% of the total flow to about 45% of the total flow after the policy change of 1967. Also the immigration flow from Italy was cut in half during the same period and Italy was the major source of unskilled, nominated immigrants.

However from the thesis research, several more specific hypotheses may be advanced along with the requisite data to test them.

Hypotheses

1. When flows of independent, sponsored and nominated immigrants are compared, there should be a very wide difference in the relative proportions of each by area of citizenship.

a. From European communist areas of citizenship excepting Yugoslavia, almost all immigrants would likely be sponsored.

b. Immigrants who were citizens of Italy, Greece and Portugal would likely have very high but decreasing proportions of both sponsored and nominated immigrants.

c. Since backlogs were noted for many Status IV areas of citizenship, it is also likely that their immigration flows would have a considerable proportion of sponsored and nominated immigrants. Also it would be likely that their proportion of sponsored and nominated immigrants would be increasing since higher levels of Status IV immigration are quite recent and independent applicants usually enter first to be followed by sponsored and nominated immigrants.

2. After 1967 there should be a considerable drop in the proportion of nominated immigrants entering Canada.

a. This should result from a considerable decrease in the proportion of 'low' skill immigrants, and

b. perhaps a partial decrease in proportion of 'medium' skill immigrants.

c. The proportion of 'high' skill nominated immigrants should be increasing.

3. The skill level of the intended occupations of sponsored and nominated immigrants should be substantially below that of independent applicants and this should vary considerably by area of citizenship.

a. Sponsored and nominated immigrants from Italy, Greece and Portugal should have the lowest skill levels but their proportion of 'medium' and 'high' skill immigrants should be increasing.

To properly test these presumed social effects, at least the following data are required.

1. Annual immigration totals by area of citizenship should be broken down by the number of independent applicants and the number of each type of relation.
2. Annual immigration totals of immigrant's intended occupation in Canada should also be broken down by the number of independent applicants and the number of each type of relation.
3. It also would be very useful for researchers to have some indication of how points have been assessed on an annual basis for 'personal assessment'. 'occupational demand' and ' area demand' in the points systems for independent and nominated applicants. It was argued that releasing current information about these 'discretionary' assessments would jeopardize the efficient administration of immigration policy. If this is so, then it would be both feasable and advisable to release data that is out of date by two or three years. Advisable since this would both greatly aid researchers and also contribute to greater public trust of an openly disclosed policy.

Chapter 6: Summary and Conclusions

The early post war movement of immigrants to Canada could be understood from the perspective of group attitudes, values and prejudices as they were institutionalized in immigration policy and practice. From inspection of early post war immigration policy and practice the major principles by which immigrants were selected were:

1. by occupations. There were 'open placement' privileges for preferred races and ethnicities but for other immigrants, entry was restricted to occupations for which there was a high demand.
2. by a sliding scale of preference depending on the immigrant's race and ethnicity.
3. by family connection with preferred races and ethnicities having the greatest privileges.

Since they were the 'group' at the 'hub' of the immigration process, officials of the Immigration Department were able to secure an unchecked amount of power. Further, since immigration could be a very sensitive and controversial political issue, this power was exercised with very little public scrutiny.

To understand the immigration process and the long term trends, "the significance of new members to a social system" was studied "with emphasis on the relation of the system's functional requirements to its methods of dealing with new members". F.E. Jones suggested that this approach be based on the 'group as the point of reference', recognition of the interactive significance of numbers, and subjection of the problems

of 'socialization' to functional analysis.[1]

Using the group as the point of reference and recognition of the interactive significance of numbers was a basic focus of the thesis. It was in terms of three 'groups' that what were termed the three major principles of the selection of immigrants of Federal immigration policy and practice were couched. They were:

1. occupational groups measured by socio-economic status,
2. racial and ethnic status groups ranked according to the privileges accorded them in Federal immigration policy and practice, and
3. family groups as specified in Federal immigration policy and practice.

As the entry of immigrants from each of the three groups was managed by the Federal government, it was held to contribute to the socialization of these immigrants.[2] Also, under the policy change of 1967, immigrants under the age of 35 who could speak one of the official languages and were judged to be personally suitable to make a success of themselves in Canada were favoured over immigrants who did not have these characteristics which allegedly aided their socialization in Canada.

However, at least two of these assumptions could be questioned.

1. The first was the notion that immigration through family connection aided adjustment. As reported by Hawkins, "as the years went on, this view became substantially modified, at least in official circules, not in relation to the immediate family, but to the sponsorship and automatic admission of a wide range of relatives".[3] One specific

---

[1] F.E. Jones, op. cit., p. 45.

[2] The government did not use the term socialization. It used the term 'assimilation' until the mid-1950's and 'integration' after that.

[3] Freda Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 48,49.

result was the creation of ethnic communities in the larger cities where ethnic and cultural distinctiveness could be perpetuated.

2. The second was the notion that immigrants from the preferred racial and ethnic 'stocks' assimilated or integrated better than immigrants from less favoured groups. This notion was disproven by Petersen in the case of Dutch immigrants and by Richmond for British immigrants.[4] Similarly, rates of male and female endogamy of the different ethnic groups in Canada as charted by Henripin, Charbboneau and Mertens did not fit racial and ethnic theories of which immigrant groups were easily socialized and which were not.[5]

However this thesis was not primarily concerned with the socialization of immigrants since the Federal government immigration policies and practices did not deal with this area beyond the assumptions aiding the socialization of immigrants which had been written into policy.

The major focus of the thesis was the testing of the hypotheses which derived from the major functional requirement of the Canadian social system as it was related to the immigration process. This was the requirement for skilled workers, especially increasing proportions of educated professionals, trained technicians and skilled tradesmen to meet the occupational demands of Canada's developing industrial economy. This development was most pronounced and hence demands for skills the greatest in the mid-1950's and especially in the mid-1960's. In Hypothesis 1:

---

[4]William Peterser, op. cit., pp. 233, 234 and Frank E. Jones, "Book Review of 'Post-War Immigrants in Canada', by Anthony H. Richmond", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 34, April, 1969, p. 299.

[5]Book IV: The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups, Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1969, p. 291.

> "It was expected that the occupational structure of post war Canadian immigrants would be progressively a much more highly skilled flow by intended occupational class levels and specific jobs intended in Canada. However there still should be a pool of unskilled and uneducated immigrants intending low status jobs that Canadians were unwilling to accept."

This expectation was confirmed. The rate of entry to Canada of immigrants between 1958 and 1970 by their intended occupations grouped into four classes showed how increases in the skill level jumped considerably at the beginning of the 1960's at the time of the first major policy change and that cumulative changes beginning before the policy change in 1967 were considerable. In 1958, 9.9% of the immigrants intending to enter the labour force intended the mainly professional occupations of Class I, 2.3% intended the semi-professional occupations of Class II like owners and managers, and technicians, 23.1% intended the occupations of Class III like tradesmen, nurses and clerical workers while 64.1% intended the semi-skilled and unskilled occupations of Class IV. These occupations included production workers, domestic servants, labourers, farm labourers etc. By 1970 the proportions were 20.8% intending occupations in Class I, 12.5% intending occupations in Class II, 29.8% intending occupations in Class III and 34% intending occupations in Class IV. It appeared that between 1968 and 1970 that the flow of immigrants to Canada by their intended occupational classes had reached some kind of equilibrium. However from the very wide differences in rates of growth or decline among intended occupations of all occupational classes, one important fact stood out. Each intended occupation must be studied separately to determine the factors facilitating or inhibiting their flow of immigrants. For example, since 1967 over 50% of Canada's new doctors each year were

immigrants. Apparently this was not due to a lack of qualified Canadian students prepared to enter medical schools but a system of medical education which did not provide mobility opportunities for native Canadians. Undoubtedly there were very strong economic arguments for importing doctors,[6] in addition to short term requirements to maintain doctor to patient ratios and the standards of health care. Given Canada's tremendous dependence on immigrant doctors, much further study should be done about how long this flow can be expected to last. If for example, Great Britain adopted a restrictive policy limiting the flow of doctors to Canada, it would be difficult to balance the demand for doctors to meet the supply. Certainly extensive research into this area should be conducted. Maintaining standards of health care by attracting immigrants with mobility aspirations for the economic benefits, at the expense of available, trainable Canadians could lead to an unstable supply of doctors in the long run. This is true of other skilled occupations in which there is placed an undue emphasis on immigrants as the source of supply.

The broader sociological possibility that emerged from determining the new skill levels of immigrants in the 1960's was that mobility deprivation for native Canadians may have increased, since immigrants were so much more skilled than when Porter first made his assertion. Needless to say, extensive research is needed to determine whether mobility deprivation is actually increasing or decreasing. This research should include:

1. Extensive study of the actual occupations followed by immigrants from

---

[6]Peter Calamai, "Chances Dim For Top Students to Become Doctors, Study Shows", The Hamilton Spectator, Nov. 25, 1971, p. 5.

each source. Dr. E. Ziegler is presently conducting such a study for the Federal government.[7]

2. A complete study of the educational system in Canada in the 1960's. This should focus on how it prepared Canadians for jobs, especially at higher socio-economic status levels. Given the huge capital outlay on educational facilities and the tremendous increases in the number of university graduates,[8] one might not have expected to find a continued demand for high skilled immigrants. However Canadians are selective in the type of education and jobs that they prefer. They are also selective in the types of educational institutions that they build. With present policies, the demand for doctors and tradesmen for example should continue unabated. However the broader question of where immigrants and Canadians ended up in the occupational structure is very intriguing and could be studied from census data. One hypothesis deserving study is that after 1967 when economic development and the demand for skilled workers decreased, that there was a disproportionate number of skilled Canadians/or skilled immigrants entering the labour force at levels below which they had been trained. Thus there existed the possibility that in some occupations, and depending on the occupation this would have affected immigrants more or less, that there was considerable mobility deprivation due to a compressed 'opportunity structure'.

3. Also complete study of emigration rates of Canadians and immigrants,

---

[7] From initial data for 1969, Dr. Ziegler found that approximately 75% of the immigrants who intended to be managers, professionals or technicians were in those occupations after one year in Canada. For all other intended occupations the proportion was approximately 50%. E. Ziegler, Address to Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Conference, Kingston, Ontario, May 30, 1973.

[8] Appendix 21, p. 232.

visitors, legally and illegally in Canada with jobs and Canadians overseas should be conducted. An especially important indicator, if it could be studied, would be return rates of immigrants by their intended occupation in Canada, their actual occupations and the duration of their stay.

In Chapter 1 it was observed that one of the potentially most important predictions of structural functional theorists is sociology was that in industrializing or fully industrial economies with their highly stratified occupational structures, the functional requirement that workers be hired on the basis of merit tended to break down systems of privilege as the basis of recruitment. In Hypothesis 2, it was according predicted that

> "the racial and ethnic composition of Canada's immigration flow would be fundamentally restructured to include greater proportions of formerly restricted races and ethnicities."

Until at least 1962 there was a very evident scale of preference in immigration policy and practice which favoured British and French immigrants above northwest Europeans followed by other European sources ranked above rigorously restricted 'colored' immigration. Thus, with the changes in policy in 1962 and 1967, it was expected that the flow of lowest status 'ethnic status group IV' immigrants (Negroes and Asians), would have increased the most. This expectation was also confirmed.

With immigration policy changes in 1962 and 1967, race and ethnicity was completely eliminated as a principle of immigration selection in law. Changes in administrative practice lagged behind but with the opening of new immigration offices in southern Europe, the West Indies and Asia and the extension of the immigration loan assistance scheme to all possible sources of immigration in 1970, this gap between policy and

practice was greatly reduced. With the qualification that promotional activities are concentrated in traditional sources of immigration, it may be stated that in official immigration policy and in the most observable administrative practices that race and ethnicity as a criterion for managing immigrant admissions has been completely eradicated.

The results spoke for themselves. In 1962, 33.8% of the immigrants to Canada were the 'most favoured' Status I British and French immigrants, 16.9% were the 'favoured' Status II northwest European ethnicities, 30.9% were the 'neutral' Status III(a) 'Latin' European ethnicities, 7.9% were the 'neutral' Status III(b) Eastern European ethnicities, 5.3% were the 'neutral' Status III(c) mainly 'Middle Eastern' ethnicities, while 4.6% were the 'proscribed' Status IV ethnicities which included Negroes and 'Asiatics'. In 1970 the proportions were Status I - 32.2%, Status II-11.1%, Status III(a) 20.1%, Status III(b) 9.0%, Status III(c) 5.0% and Status IV 21.9%. Numerically Status IV immigrants increased from 3,439 immigrants in 1962 to an estimated 32,377 immigrants in 1970.

For at least the years 1969 and 1970 the proportions and numbers of immigrants from each ethnic status group and sub-group levelled off. Thus an equilibrium or 'racial balance' was apparently attained. With the present criteria controlling the admission of immigrants these new proportions should continue as a longer term trend. Altering this trend somewhat could be new booming economic development and increasing demands for skilled labour. If this occurred the disproportionate promotional activity in Great Britain, France and possibly the United States would increase considerably the proportions of Status I immigrants while correspondingly depressing the proportions of immigrants from the other

Statuses. Also it should be noted that one source of immigrants which is very highly skilled and primarily from 'traditionally' accepted ethnic status groups was not fully exploited. This was immigration from the United States. Increasing the proportion of either Status III or Status IV immigrants could be refugee movements. However since these would likely be at least partially regulated through the points system this effect should be moderated considerably.

It should also be noted that acting to keep Status IV immigration in 'balance' was a complete dearth of immigration promotion in their source countries. One justification of this practice was that it would be morally wrong to advertise for skilled immigrants in developing Third World nations and that it would exacerbate further the 'brain drain' from those areas. Just to what degree there is a brain drain or a surplus of specific skills and training in each developing nation is a very complex question. The need for a wide range of skilled and professional talent may seem self evident in many developing countries. However, at present in some of these nations there is also a high unemployment or underemployment rate in specific skilled and professional occupations[9] indicating that such talent is not, or cannot be presently utilized. The policy not to promote, especially selective promotion in those nations with high unemployment rates of specific high skilled occupations, is likely hurting these countries, not assisting them. Government officials were quite aware of this situation.[10] In this context, government proclamations that

---

[9]George B. Baldwin, "Brain Drain or Overflow?", Foreign Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 2, 1969-1970, pp. 364, 365.

[10]House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, April 28, 1970, pp. 43, 44, 45.

'in all conscience' they could not promote immigration in developing nations were misleading. The real reason was to keep the Status IV flow 'balanced'.

In trying to assess why the change in 'ethnic balance' took place, as predicted from the structural functional theory, in the 1960's instead of the 1950's when the economic conditions were quite similar, several factors must be noted.

1. The most important factor was that the supply of skilled workers was no longer unlimited from the 'traditional' sources of immigration. In western Europe especially, employment conditions were much better and proportionately less immigrants wanted to come to Canada. Only Status IV immigrants could help meet the major Canadian social system functional requirement for more skilled workers.

2. The demand for skilled workers generally was likely much stronger in the 1960's.

3. Racial and ethnic discrimination as a method of managing the immigration flow came under increasing attack as was racial and ethnic discrimination generally in North America.

4. Diplomatic entreaties from newly independent Third World nations helped begin some of the initial programs by which Status IV immigrants entered Canada.

Hypothesis 3 was also based on the functional requirement in developing or fully developed industrial economies that workers be hired increasingly on the basis of merit and hence break down systems of privilege as the basis of recruitment. It was expected,

> "that the proportion of sponsored immigrants would be reduced since this flow would likely be less skilled and educated".

Only very tentative data was avilable which tended to confirm this expectation. It appeared that the proportion of immigrants who were nominated or sponsored dropped from about 55% of the immigration flow in the early 1960's to about 45% of the immigration flow in the early 1970's. Most of this drop would have been low skilled nominated immigrants and one specific result was that Italian immigration was cut in half.

The basic reason for this apparent decline in proportion was the feeling of Immigration Department officials that the sponsorship of low skilled more distant relatives upset more rational 'manpower' considerations.

Several specific hypotheses and further researches were advocated in the summary of Chapter 5.

In Hypothesis 4 it was predicted that

> "immigrants of all origins would gain entry in higher 'entrance statuses' although the ranking system should still be intact for at least Status I, II and III immigrants."

This expectation was only partially confirmed.

Except for sources of immigration having mainly Status IV immigrants, the general trend was towards an increasing proportion of immigrants intending Class I and Class II occupations, a slightly fluctuating or declining proportion of immigrants intending Class III occupations, and a declining proportion of immigrants intending Class IV occupations. Stated differently, immigrants from most sources of immigration, except Status IV, were entering Canada in higher entrance statuses.

However sources of immigration which had predominantly Status IV immigrants were very much overrepresented in high status Class I intended occupations in the period prior to 1967 when their total immigration flow was quite low. After 1967, as immigration from the East Indies, China,

the West Indies and the Phillipines increased considerably, their proportion of Class I immigrants decreased substantially but was still considerably overrepresented in 1970 except for immigration from the West Indies which was somewhat lower skilled.

Immigrants were grouped from their source countries by whether most of their intended occupations were 'high', 'medium' or 'low' socio-economic status. With a high proportion of 'high' status occupations were immigrants from the Status I countries of the Union of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain; the Status III(c) country of Egypt and the Status IV countries of Pakistan, India and China. In the 'low' socio-economic status category were immigrants from the Status III(a) countries of Italy, Greece and Portugal; the Status III(b) country of Yugoslavia and the Status III(c) country of Malta. Immigration from the other sources could be ranked in the wide middle range between these extremes. Thus the ranking system was still intact for most sources of Status I, II and III immigrants. That is, Status I immigrants still intended a greater proportion of higher status occupations that Status II immigrants who intended a much higher proportion of higher status occupations than did immigrants from Status III(a) and III(b) sources. Thus there was still considerable evidence for the different entrance statuses of immigrants depending on their origins. However the major exception to this rule was very significant since immigrants from the lowest ranked ethnic status group were entering Canada at the highest ranked intended occupational levels. To the extent that they successfully obtained high status jobs and to the extent that these jobs are inherited by their sons and daughters as they leave the Canadian educational system, the 'vertical

mosaic' described by Porter will be less applicable.

An important component of the 'vertical mosaic' are the perceptions that Canadians have about the different occupations attained by immigrants from each source. Between 1947-1970, it appeared that the actual basis for sterotyping immigrants from certain sources at specific occupational levels or in specific jobs had decreased substantially. This was in terms of both the proportion of immigrants from a particular source intending particular occupations and the proportion of immigrants of a particular occupation who came from a particular source.

One notable exception were United States immigrants intending to be 'Professors & principals'. In 1958 out of 390 immigrants intending to be 'Professors & principals', 174 were from the United States or 45%. By 1970 of 1,886 such immigrants 918 were from the United States, an increase in proportion to 49%.

Final confirmation about the potential basis for the stereotyping of immigrants from different sources in certain occupations requires more information about the actual occupations that immigrants from each source were able to obtain in Canada. When this most important question is answered the rationality of what appears to be the most fundamental principle of Canadian immigration policy and practice will be partially determined. That is the principle that immigrants enter Canada in certain occupations and at certain occupational levels in order to help Canada's economic development. That this principle was not carried to the logical conclusion of restricting the entry of independent immigrants to fill precise gaps in the labour force was greatly due to the operational difficulties envisaged by Immigration Department officials who claimed

that the labour 'tap' was not easily turned on and off. How following the example of other nations recruiting workers, it likely that Canada will import proportionately more immigrants specific jobs. This would meet both the demands of employers that specific skilled jobs be filled and the emphasis of organized labour and professional associations that this not be at the expense of available, trained Canadians. Also to the extent that the demand for professionals and skilled workers continues, and this seems quite likely, it would satisfy the wishes of officials in the Immigration Department for a policy that could be continued on a more permanent basis without the operational difficulties envisaged in a 'tap on and off' approach.

Also in view of the considerable numbers of immigrants re-immigrating, it is likely that the matching of proportionately more immigrants to job availabilities in Canada would involve a considerable modification of the traditional notion of 'settlers' entering Canada for permanent settlement. Instead some form of 'guestworker' policy as presently practiced in western Europe is very possible. That is, an immigrant would enter Canada to fill an available job for a stated period of time. This privilege could or could not be extended depending on the number of available Canadians.[11]

As present Canadian immigration policy is being managed by the Federal government, the functional requirement for importing trained and skilled workers provides a basis for controlling the immigration flow racially and ethnically so that it does not get 'out of balance'. However

---

[11] A 'guestworker' policy is not based on any notion of permanent settlement. It consists of the importation of workers, sometimes with their families but sometimes not, for a stated period of time to fill precise gaps in a national economy. Interview, Bengt Lidal, Immigration Official with the Swedish Department of Labour, April 10, 1973.

the most important questions affecting immigration management in the 1970's will not involve the degree of racial and ethnic discrimination as it may or may not exist in immigration policy. Instead these questions will be about the occupational criterion of immigrant selection. These questions will be:

1. "To what degree will the entry of independent and nominated immigrants be related to specific job availabilities in Canada?",
2. If the present points system is continued, "How rational will 'occupational demand' and 'area demand' be administered?",
3. "To what extent are there either too many or too few Canadians or immigrants intending certain occupations?",
4. "What new training programs will be implemented in the 1970's to train Canadians for professional and skilled jobs?",
5. "Will a 'guest worker' policy be adopted, and if so, what form will it take?",
6. "What 'control' procedures will have to be instituted to enforce these policies?".

All of these questions and issues arise out of, and will be greatly determined by, the social and economic forces which shaped the immigration process in Canada between 1947-1970. The major functional requirement of the Canadian social system as it affected immigration in the 1960's was the requirement for increasing proportions of professionals and other skilled workers to meet the demands of the developing Canadian economy. As predicted from structural functional theorists in sociology this lead to an emphasis on universalistic criteria for selecting immigrants at the expense of ascriptive criteria. Stated differently, racial and ethnic discrimina-

tion was practically eliminated as a basis for selecting immigrants and the selection of low skilled 'nominated' family-oriented immigration was also discouraged and apparently reduced. Instead, universally applicable occupational criteria, specifically "occupational demand" and "area demand" in the points system, determined which immigrants would be ultimately admissable.

These predicted changes must be seen in the context of the external conditions and the social forces which shaped them. External conditions which helped lead to less racial and ethnic discrimination in immigration policy and practice in the 1960's were noted to be a continuing high demand for skilled workers in Canada, a decreased proportion of skilled immigrants migrating from northwestern Europe, an available, untapped supply of skilled immigrants from Status IV sources and diplomatic entreaties from Status IV sources to promote a planned flow of migrants. Also an implicit inference from this present study was that the racially and ethnically discriminatory actions of government politicians and officials in the post war period was determined by supposed values and prejudices held by broad segments of the Canadian population. This gave way to less discriminatory actions and policies as the attitudes of Canadians became more 'liberal' regarding racial and ethnic discrimination. Just to what extent such a presumed change in values took place and also to what degree it may have preceded or followed the more immediately felt occupational demands of the 1960's for skilled workers irregardless of race or colour, remains a matter for more empirical investigation.

Similarly, it is very likely that with the universalistic

occupational immigrant selection criteria racial and ethnic interest groups in Canada would be less capable of influencing present immigration policy and practice since present policy could be more easily justified on moral grounds. However in the case of both business and labour it is likely that the new policy would be more responsive to both of these interests. Since the Immigration Department is ultimately concerned with providing a basis for a stable supply of immigrants, this type of policy would be more responsive to labour shortages than labour surpluses and hence favour business interests more. Once again more empirical evidence is needed to test these assertions.

Another implicit inference of the present study related to the ability of immigrants to 'integrate' into Canadian society. The Federal government has heavily weighted their immigration policy toward occupational factors as facilitating this integration. Just to what extent this basis is justified and just what other leadership should be provided by the government to assist the integration of immigrants is another unanswered question.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Cole, J. West Indian Teachers and Nurses in Ontario, Canada: A Study of Migration Patterns, Hamilton: McMaster University, 1967, (unpublished Master's Thesis).

Corbett, D. Canada's Immigration Policy, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.

Hawkins, F. Canada and Immigration, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1972.

Laumann, Edward O. Social Stratification: Research and Theory for the 1970's, New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1970.

Levy, M.J. The Structure of Society, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Merton, R. Social Theory and Social Structure, New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Petersen, W. Planned Migration: The Social Determinants of the Dutch Canadian Movement, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.

Porter, J. The Vertical Mosaic, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Richmond, A. Post-War Immigrants in Canada, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Schwartz, M. Public Opinion and Canadian Identity, Scarborough: Fitzhenry and Whitside, 1967.

Timlin, M.F. Does Canada Need More People? Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1951.

ARTICLES

"Apprenticeship in Canada", Technical and Vocation Education in Canada, No. 9, Summer, 1966.

Armer, M.J. "Intersociety and Intrasociety Correlations of Occupational Prestige", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 74, 1968-69.

Baldwin, G.B. "Brain Drain or Overflow?", Foreign Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 3, 1969-70.

Hettich, W. "Expenditures, Output and Productivity in Canadian University Education", Special Study No. 14, Prepared for the Economic Council of Canada, Ottawa: Information Canada, 1971.

Jones, F.E. "A Sociological Perspective on Immigrant Adjustment", Social Forces, Vol. 35, No. 1, 1956-57.

Jones, F.E. "Book Review of 'Post-War Immigrants in Canada', by Anthony Richmond", American Sociological Review, Vol. 34, April 1969.

Orlikow, D. "Labour and Immigration", Canadian Labour, Feb., 1964.

Parai, L. "Immigration and Emmigration of Professional and Skilled Manpower During the Post-War Period", Special Study No. 1, Prepared for the Economic Council of Canada, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965.

Parsons, T. "A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification", in T. Parsons, Essays in Sociological Theory, New York: The Free Press, 1949.

Rawlyk, G.A. "Canada's Immigration Policy, 1945-1962", Dalhousie Review, Vol. 43, No. 3, 1962.

Richmond, A. "Immigration and Pluralism", The International Migration Review, Vol. 4, No. 1, Fall, 1969.

"The Battle For Britons", Monetary Times, Vol. 134, No. 9, Sept. 1966.

Walmsley, N. "Some Aspects of Canada's Immigration Policy", Research Report for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, Dec., 1965.

Ziegler, E. "Address to Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Conference", Kingston, Ontario, May 30, 1973.

Ziegler, E. "Immigration Canada. New Policies? New Directions?", Canadian Institute on Public Affairs, 18th Winter Conference, March 30-31, 1973.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Annual Reports, 1950-1965, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Annual Reports, 1966-1971, Department of Manpower and Immigration, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Book IV: The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups, Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969.

Canada Gazette, Part II Statutory Orders and Regulations, Queen's Printer: Ottawa.

Canada, House of Commons, Debates, 1947-1971.

Canada, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, 1968-1971.

"Canadian Immigration Policy", White Paper on Immigration, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1966.

Canada. Statutory Orders And Regulations: consolidation. King's Printer: Ottawa, 1949.

Canada. Statutory Orders And Regulations: consolidation. Queen's Printer: Ottawa, 1955.

Canada. Statutes. Vol. 1, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1952.

Canada Yearbook, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967, 1969.

Immigration Statistics, 1950-1965, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Immigration Statistics, 1966-1971, Department of Manpower and Immigration, Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Press Release, Office of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, Sept. 12, 1967.

The Immigration Act and Regulations: Office Consolidation, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1968.

NEWSPAPERS

The Financial Post, MacLean-Hunter Ltd., Publishers, Toronto.

The Hamilton Spectator, Southam Press, Hamilton.

Appendix 1

4. Landing in Canada of immigrants of any Asiatic race prohibited

P.C. 2115

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

TUESDAY, the 16th day of September, 1930.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, is pleased to rescind the regulations made by Order in Council P.C. 182, dated 31st January, 1923, as amended by Order in Council P.C. 1966, dated 14th August, 1930, and they are hereby rescinded accordingly.

His Excellency in Council, on the same recommendation, and having regard to the unemployment conditions now existing in Canada, is pleased to make the following regulations and they are hereby made and established, under the authority of section 38 of the Immigration Act, viz.:

From and after the 16th August, 1930, and until otherwise ordered, the landing in Canada of any immigrant of any Asiatic race is hereby prohibited, except as hereinafter provided:

The Immigration Officer in Charge may admit any immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the Immigration Act, if it is shown to his satisfaction that such immigrant is:—

The wife or unmarried child under 18 years of age, of any Canadian citizen legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents.

Provided that this regulation shall not apply to the nationals of any country in regard to which there is in operation a law, a special treaty, or agreement, or convention regulating immigration.

Source: Statutory Orders and Regulations, Consolidation, 1949, Volume II, p. 2,185.

Appendix 2

3. Operation of contract labour Order suspended

P.C. 1329

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

FRIDAY, the 11th day of April, 1947.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

WHEREAS Order in Council P.C. 1413 dated the 7th day of August, 1929, prohibits the landing in Canada of contract labour other than farmers, farm labourers and houseworkers or any contract labourer where the Minister of Mines and Resources is satisfied that his labour or service is required in Canada;

NOW THEREFORE, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources, and in view of the present labour situation in Canada, is pleased to order that the operation of the said Order in Council, P.C. 1413, dated the 7th day of August, 1929, be and it is hereby suspended.

Source: Statutory Orders and Regulations, Consolidation, 1949, Volume II, p. 2,184.

Appendix 3

Immigration Act—prohibiting the landing in Canada of immigrants with certain exceptions

P.C. 4849

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

WEDNESDAY, the 26th day of November, 1947.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources, is pleased to revoke and doth hereby revoke Order in Council P.C. 695 dated the 21st day of March, 1931, as amended, which established Regulations prohibiting the landing in Canada of immigrants with certain exceptions.

His Excellency in Council, on the same recommendation and pursuant to the provisions of Section 38 of the Immigration Act, Chapter 93, R.S.C. 1927, is pleased to make the following Order and it is hereby made and established in substitution for the regulations hereby revoked:

ORDER

From and after the date hereof and until such time as otherwise ordered, the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations, is prohibited, except as hereinafter provided:

The Immigration Officer-in-Charge may permit any immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the Immigration Act to land in Canada, if it is shown to the satisfaction of such Officer-in-Charge that such immigrant is:

1. A British subject entering Canada, directly or indirectly, from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Newfoundland or the United States of America, who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment: Provided that the only persons admissible under this section are British subjects by birth or naturalization in Canada, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, or the Union of South Africa.
2. A citizen of the United States of America entering Canada from the United States of America who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment.

Appendix 3 (cont.)

3. The husband or wife; the son, daughter, brother or sister, together with husband or wife and unmarried children; the father or mother; the orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age; of any person legally resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" referred to in this section means a child bereaved of both parents.

4. (*a*) An agriculturist having sufficient means to farm in Canada.
   (*b*) An agriculturist entering Canada to farm with or with the assistance of his father, father-in-law, son, son-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, uncle or nephew engaged in agriculture as his principal occupation and who is in a position and willing to receive such immigrant and establish him on a farm.
   (*c*) A farm labourer entering Canada to engage in assured farm employment.
   (*d*) A person experienced in mining, lumbering or logging entering Canada to engage in assured employment in any one of such industries.

5. A person entering Canada to marry a legal resident thereof: Provided the prospective husband is able to maintain his intended wife.

6. A person who, having entered Canada as a non-immigrant, enlisted in the Canadian Armed Forces and having served in such Forces, has been honourably discharged.

Provided that immigrants referred to in sections 2 and 4 above are destined for settlement to a province which has not signified its disapproval of such immigration.

Provided further that the provisions hereinabove set out shall not apply to immigrants of any Asiatic race.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 81, No. 24, December 24, 1947, p. 2338,2339.

Appendix 4

7. Prohibiting the landing in Canada of immigrants with certain exceptions

P.C. 2743

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 2nd day of June, 1949.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources and pursuant to the provisions of section 38 of the Immigration Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, chapter 93, is pleased to revoke and doth hereby revoke Order in Council P.C. 4845 of 25th November, 1947 as amended, prohibiting the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations, with certain exceptions, and is pleased to make the following Order which is hereby made and established in substitution for the Order hereby revoked:—

ORDER

From and after the date hereof and until such time as otherwise ordered, the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations is prohibited, except as hereinafter provided:

The Immigration Officer-in-Charge may permit any immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the Immigration Act to land in Canada, if it is shown to the satisfaction of such Officer-in-Charge that such immigrant is:

1. A British subject or a citizen of Ireland entering Canada, directly or indirectly, from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the United States of America who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment: Provided that for the purpose of this Regulation the term "British subject" shall mean a person born or naturalized in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, New Zealand or the Union of South Africa, or a citizen of Ireland who has become a citizen of the United Kingdom by registration under the British Nationality Act, 1948.

2. A citizen of the United States of America entering Canada from the United States of America who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment.

Appendix 4 (cont.)

3. A citizen of France, born therein, and entering Canada from France, who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment.

4. The husband or wife; the son, daughter, brother or sister, together with husband or wife and unmarried children; the father or mother; the orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age; of any person legally resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" referred to in this section means a child bereaved of both parents.

5. (*a*) An agriculturist having sufficient means to farm in Canada.

(*b*) An agriculturist entering Canada to farm with or with the assistance of his father, father-in-law, son, son-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, uncle or nephew engaged in agriculture as his principal occupation and who is in a position and willing to receive such immigrant and establish him on a farm.

(*c*) A farm labourer entering Canada to engage in assured farm employment.

(*d*) A person experienced in mining, lumbering or logging entering Canada to engage in assured employment in any one of such industries.

6. A person entering Canada to marry a legal resident thereof: Provided the prospective husband is able to maintain his intended wife.

7. A person who, having entered Canada as a non-immigrant, enlisted in the Canadian Armed Forces and having served in such Forces, has been honourably discharged.

Provided that immigrants referred to in sections 2, 3 and 5 above are destined for settlement to a province which has not signified its disapproval of such immigration.

Provided further that the provisions hereinabove set out shall not apply to immigrants of any Asiatic race.

Source: Statutory Orders and Regulations, Consolidation, 1949, Volume II, p. 2186-2188.

Appendix 5

Immigration Act---Order *re* landing of immigrants in Canada

P.C. 2856

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

FRIDAY, the 9th day of June, 1950.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and pursuant to the powers conferred by section thirty-eight of the Immigration Act, is pleased to revoke and doth hereby revoke Order in Council P.C. 2743 of 2nd June, 1949, prohibiting the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations, with certain exceptions, and is pleased to make the following Order which is hereby made in substitution for the Order hereby revoked:

ORDER

From and after the 1st July, 1950, and until such times as otherwise ordered, the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations is prohibited, except as hereinafter provided:

The Immigration Officer-in-Charge may permit any immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the Immigration Act to land in Canada, if it is shown to the satisfaction of such Officer-in-Charge that such immigrant is:

1. A British subject or a citizen of Ireland entering Canada, directly or indirectly, from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the United States of America who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment: Provided that for the purpose of this Regulation the term "British subject" shall mean a person born or naturalized in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, New Zealand or the Union of South Africa, or a citizen of Ireland who has become a citizen of the United Kingdom by registration under the British Nationality Act, 1948.

2. A citizen of the United States of America entering Canada from the United States of America who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment.

Appendix 5 (cont.)

3. A citizen of France, born therein, and entering Canada from France, who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment.

4. A person, who satisfies the Minister, whose decision shall be final, that:

(*a*) he is a suitable immigrant having regard to the climatic, social, educational, industrial, labour, or other conditions or requirements of Canada; and

(*b*) is not undesirable owing to his peculiar customs, habits, modes of life, methods of holding property, or because of his probable inability to become readily adapted and integrated into the life of a Canadian community and to assume the duties of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after his entry.

5. A person who, having entered Canada as a non-immigrant, enlisted in the Canadian Armed Forces and having served in such Forces, has been honourably discharged.

Provided that the provisions hereinabove set out shall not apply to immigrants of any Asiatic race.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 84, No. 12, June 28, 1950, p. 765,766.

Appendix 6

Immigration Act—amendments, Regulations *re* landing in Canada of immigrants of any Asiatic race

P.C. 6229

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 28th day of December, 1950.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

WHEREAS by Order in Council P.C. 2115 of 16th September, 1950, certain regulations were made pursuant to section thirty-eight of the Immigration Act prohibiting the landing in Canada of any immigrant of any Asiatic race, except as therein provided;

AND WHEREAS the said regulations provided for the admission of any immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the Immigration Act, if it be shown to the satisfaction of the Immigration Officer-in-Charge that such immigrant is the wife or unmarried child under eighteen years of age of any Canadian citizen legally admitted to and resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents;

AND WHEREAS the said provision prohibits the admission of dependent children over eighteen but under twenty-one years of age, and it is deemed desirable that the age limit of such unmarried children be raised to twenty-one years;

AND WHEREAS, as people of the Asiatic races seldom marry with persons of European origin, it is deemed advisable to provide for the admission of husbands of Asiatic origin.

THEREFORE, His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, is pleased to amend the regulations made and established by Order in Council P.C. 2115 of 16th September, 1950, and the said regulations are hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following paragraph:

> "The wife or unmarried child under 18 years of age of any Canadian citizen legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents".

and by substituting therefor the following new paragraph:

> "The wife, the husband, or the unmarried child under twenty-one years of age, of any Canadian citizen legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents".

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 85, No. 1, January 10, 1951, p. 19,20.

Appendix 7

Immigration Act—amendment to P.C. 2856 of 9th June, 1950 *re* landing of immigrants

P.C. 5573

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

WEDNESDAY, the 17th day of October, 1951.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

WHEREAS Order in Council P.C. 2856 of 9th June, 1950, made pursuant to section thirty-eight of the Immigration Act, defines the classes of immigrants admissible to Canada for permanent residence;

AND WHEREAS paragraph three of the said Order in Council provides for the admission of citizens of France, born therein and entering Canada from France, who have sufficient means to maintain themselves until they have secured employment;

AND WHEREAS there is considerable immigrant traffic between St. Pierre and Miquelon a dependency of France, and Canada, and it is desirable to provide specifically for native-born residents of St. Pierre and Miquelon in the manner provided for native-born citizens of France.

THEREFORE, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and pursuant to the powers conferred by the Immigration Act, is pleased to amend Order in Council P.C. 2856 of 9th June, 1950, and it is hereby amended by revoking paragraph three thereof, and by substituting therefor the following new paragraph three:

3. A citizen of France, born therein and entering Canada from France, or born in St. Pierre and Miquelon and entering Canada from St. Pierre and Miquelon, who has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 85, No. 21, November 14, 1951, p. 1106.

Appendix 8 (a)

Immigration Act—prohibiting the entry into Canada of enemy aliens

P.C. 4850

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

WEDNESDAY, the 26th day of November, 1947.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources, is pleased to revoke and doth hereby revoke Order in Council P.C. 1373 of April 9, 1947, as amended, which prohibited the landing in Canada of enemy aliens.

His Excellency in Council, on the same recommendation and pursuant to the provisions of Section 38 of the Immigration Act, Chapter 93, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, is pleased to order and doth hereby order as follows:

From and after the date hereof, and until such time as otherwise ordered, the entry to or landing in Canada of enemy aliens is prohibited.

Provided that this Order shall not be held to exclude persons coming within the above defined class who satisfy the Minister of Mines and Resources that they were opposed to an enemy government;

Provided further that this Order shall not be held to exclude the nationals of Finland, Hungary, Italy and Roumania with whose countries peace treaties have been ratified by Canada.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 81, No. 24, December 24, 1947, p. 2339, 2340.

Appendix 8 (b)

Immigration Act—Entry or landing in Canada of enemy aliens prohibited

P.C. 1606

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

TUESDAY, the 28th day of March, 1950.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, is pleased to revoke and doth hereby revoke Order in Council P.C. 4850, of the 26th day of November 1947, which prohibited the entry to or landing in Canada of enemy aliens.

His Excellency in Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 38 of the Immigration Act, chapter 93, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, is pleased to order and doth hereby order as follows:

From and after the date hereof and until such time as otherwise ordered, the entry to or landing in Canada of enemy aliens is prohibited.

PROVIDED this Order shall not be held to exclude:

(*a*) A person coming within the above defined class who satisfies the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that he was opposed to an enemy Government.

(*b*) An immigrant of German nationality who is the husband or wife; the son, daughter, brother or sister, together with husband or wife and unmarried children; the father or mother; the orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age; the prospective husband or wife; of a person legally resident in Canada.

(*c*) An immigrant of German ethnic origin who is a displaced person or refugee, and who was not a German national on the first day of September 1939.

PROVIDED further that such person or immigrant can otherwise comply with the provisions of the Immigration Act.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 84, No. 7, April 12, 1950, p. 518.

Appendix 8 (c)

Immigration Act—Order respecting the Entry to or Landing in Canada of Enemy Aliens

P.C. 4364

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 14th day of September, 1950.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and by virtue of the powers conferred by section thirty-eight of the Immigration Act, is pleased hereby to revoke Order in Council P.C. 1606 of 28th March 1950, prohibiting the entry to or landing in Canada of enemy aliens, and to make the following Order in substitution therefor:—

ORDER

From and after the date hereof and until such time as otherwise ordered, the entry to or landing in Canada of enemy nationals, other than nationals of Germany, is prohibited.

PROVIDED that this Order shall not be held to exclude a person coming within the above class who satisfies the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that he was opposed to an enemy government and who can otherwise comply with the provisions of the Immigration Act.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 84, No. 18, September 27, 1950, p. 1283.

Appendix 8 (d)

Immigration Act—Order in Council P.C. 4364 of 14th September, 1950, revoked

P.C. 3689

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 31st day of July, 1952.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, and by virtue of the powers conferred by the Immigration Act, is pleased to revoke Order in Council P.C. 4364 of 14th September, 1950, which prohibited until further order the entry to or landing in Canada of enemy nationals other than nationals of Germany, and the said Order in Council P.C. 4364 is hereby revoked, accordingly.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 86, No. 13, August 13, 1952, p. 726.

Appendix 9

Entry under Permit

8. (1) The Minister may issue a written permit authorizing any person to enter Canada or, being in Canada, to remain therein. Issue of permits.

(2) A permit shall be expressed to be in force for a specified period not exceeding twelve months, and during the time that it is in force a permit stays the execution of any deportation order that may have been made against the person concerned. For limited period and effect.

(3) The Minister may at any time, in writing, extend or cancel a permit. Extension and cancellation.

(4) The Minister may, upon the cancellation or expiration of a permit, make a deportation order respecting the person concerned and such person has no right of appeal from the deportation order and shall be deported as soon as practicable. Deportation following termination of a permit.

(5) The Minister shall submit to Parliament within thirty days of the commencement of the first session of Parliament in each year a report showing all permits, with particulars thereof, issued during the preceding calendar year. Annual report to Parliament.

Special Inquiry Officers

11. (1) Immigration officers in charge are Special Inquiry Officers and the Minister may nominate such other immigration officers as he deems necessary to act as Special Inquiry Officers. Special Inquiry Officers.

(2) A Special Inquiry Officer has authority to inquire into and determine whether any person shall be allowed to come into Canada or to remain in Canada or shall be deported. Powers of inquiry.

(3) A Special Inquiry Officer has all the powers and authority of a commissioner appointed under Part I of the Inquiries Act and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, may, for the purposes of an inquiry, Power to examine witnesses, etc.

(a) issue a summons to any person requiring him to appear at the time and place mentioned therein, to testify to all matters within his knowledge relative to the subject matter of the inquiry, and to bring with him and

Appendix 9 (cont.)

produce any document, book or paper that he has in his possession or under his control relative to the subject matter of the inquiry;

(b) administer oaths and examine any person upon oath, affirmation or otherwise;

(c) issue commissions or requests to take evidence in Canada;

(d) engage the services of such counsel, technicians, clerks, stenographers or other persons as he may deem necessary for a full and proper inquiry; and

(e) do all other things necessary to provide a full and proper inquiry.

Nature of hearing.

27. (1) An inquiry by a Special Inquiry Officer shall be separate and apart from the public but in the presence of the person concerned wherever practicable.

Right to counsel.

(2) The person concerned, if he so desires and at his own expense, shall have the right to obtain and to be represented by counsel at his hearing.

Evidence.

(3) The Special Inquiry Officer may at the hearing receive and base his decision upon evidence considered credible or trustworthy by him in the circumstances of each case.

Burden of proof where person seeking to come into Canada.

(4) Where an inquiry relates to a person seeking to come into Canada, the burden of proving that he is not prohibited from coming into Canada rests upon him.

Reopening of inquiry.

28. An inquiry may be reopened by a Special Inquiry Officer or by order of the Minister, or by majority decision of an Immigration Appeal Board for the hearing and receiving of any additional evidence or testimony and a Special Inquiry Officer has authority, after hearing such additional evidence or testimony, to confirm, amend or reverse the decision previously rendered.

Appendix 9 (cont.)

Appeals

Where no appeal allowed.

38. No appeal may be taken from a deportation order respecting any person who is ordered deported as a member of a prohibited class described in paragraph *(a)*, *(b)* or *(s)* of section five where the decision is based upon a certificate of the examining medical officer or as a person described in paragraph *(d)* of subsection one of section nineteen.

Where appeal allowed and how it is initiated.

39. (1) Except in the case of a deportation order referred to in subsection five of section seven, subsection four of section eight or section thirty, an appeal may be taken by the person concerned from a deportation order if the appellant forthwith serves a notice of appeal upon an immigration officer or upon the person who served the deportation order.

Who decides appeals.

(2) All appeals from deportation orders shall be reviewed and decided upon by the Minister with the exception of appeals that the Minister directs should be dealt with by an Immigration Appeal Board.

Powers on appeal.

(3) An Immigration Appeal Board or the Minister, as the case may be, has full power to consider all matters pertaining to a case under appeal and to allow or dismiss any appeal, including the power to quash an opinion of a Special Inquiry Officer that has the effect of bringing a person into a prohibited class and to substitute the opinion of the Board or of the Minister for it.

Review by Minister.

(4) The Minister may in any case review the decision of an Immigration Appeal Board and confirm or quash such decision or substitute his decision therefor as he deems just and proper and may, for these purposes, direct that the execution of the deportation order concerned be stayed pending his review and decision, and the decision of the Minister on appeals dealt with or reviewed by him or the decision of the majority of an Immigration Appeal Board on appeals, other than those reviewed by the Minister, is final.

Jurisdiction of courts.

40. No court and no judge or officer thereof has jurisdiction to review, quash, reverse, restrain or otherwise interfere with any proceeding, decision or order of the

Appendix 9 (cont.)

Minister, Deputy Minister, Director, Immigration Appeal Board, Special Inquiry Officer or immigration officer had, made or given under the authority and in accordance with the provisions of this Act relating to the detention or deportation of any person, upon any ground whatsoever, unless such person is a Canadian citizen or has Canadian domicile.

General regulations

GE. The Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying into effect the purposes and provisions of this Act and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations respecting,

Persons who require assistance to come to Canada.

(a) the terms and conditions under which persons who have received financial assistance to enable them to obtain passage to Canada or to assist them in obtaining admission to Canada may be admitted to Canada;

Literacy and other tests.

(b) literacy, medical and other examinations or tests and the prohibiting or limiting of admission of persons who are unable to pass them;

Funds, passports, etc.

(c) the terms, conditions and requirements with respect to the possession of means of support or of passports, visas or other documents pertaining to admission;

Non-continuous journey.

(d) the admission to Canada of persons who have come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from the countries of which they are nationals or citizens;

Passengers brought by certain companies.

(e) the prohibiting or limiting of admission of persons brought to Canada by any transportation company that fails to comply with any provision of this Act or any regulation, order or direction made under it;

Nationals of countries that refuse to readmit.

(f) the prohibiting or limiting of admission of persons who are nationals or citizens of a country that refuses to readmit any of its nationals or citizens who are ordered deported; and

For reasons of occupation, customs, etc.

(g) the prohibiting or limiting of admission of persons by reason of

(i) nationality, citizenship, ethnic group, occupation, class or geographical area of origin,

(ii) peculiar customs, habits, modes of life or methods of holding property,

(iii) unsuitability having regard to the climatic, economic, social, industrial, educational, labour, health or other conditions or requirements existing.

Appendix 9 (cont.)

temporarily or otherwise, in Canada or in the area or country from or through which such persons come to Canada, or

(iv) probable inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after their admission. .

Source: Statutes, Vol. 1, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1952, pp. 243, 244, 250, 251, 253, 262.

Appendix 10

Department of Citizenship and Immigration
Immigration policy

Summary of persons admissible
Under P.C. 5656 and P.C. 2115

1. (A) Persons born or naturalized in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa, citizens of Ireland, citizens of the United States, citizens of France, on evidence that they have employment or sufficient means to maintain themselves for a reasonable period after their arrival in Canada, or are sponsored by a legal resident of Canada.

(B) Non-nationals in countries named above:

(i) close relatives, in the following classes, sponsored by a legal resident of Canada,
—husband or wife;
—Son or daughter, brother or sister, together with husband or wife and unmarried children;
—Father or mother;
—Grandparents;
—Orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age;
—Fiancé (e) s;

(ii) cases of exceptional merit;

(iii) refugees.

(C) All non-nationals (except refugees) mentioned above require two years' resident in the country where they apply for visa.

2. From Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland:

(A) Nationals:

(i) Persons in certain trades as may be approved from time to time, who have funds to pay for their transportation and to maintain themselves in Canada until they have secured employment.

(ii) Persons mentioned in paragraph 1 (B) (i) and (ii) above.

(B) Non-nationals as in paragraph 1(B) (i), (ii), (iii) and 1(C) above.

3. From Holland:

(A) Nationals:

(i) Agricultural workers, some artisans and workers selected under agreement with The Netherlands government.

(ii) Persons mentioned in paragraph 1(B) (i) and (ii) above.

(B) Non-nationals as above in 1(B) (i), (ii), (iii) and 1(C).

4. From Germany, Austria, Greece and Finland:

(A) Nationals:

(i) Agriculturists, farm workers, domestics, nurses and nurses' aides.

(ii) Persons mentioned in paragraph 1(B)(i) and (ii) above.

(B) Non-nationals as above in 1(B) (i), (ii), (iii) and 1(C).

5. From Italy:

(A) Nationals:

(i) Workers for whom orders have been approved prior to June 1952.

(ii) Close relatives in the following classes, i.e., husband, wife, minor unmarried children, parents and fiancé (e)s.

(B) Non-nationals as in paragraph 1(B) (i), (ii), (iii) and 1(C) above.

6. From Israel, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Iran:

Persons as in paragraph 1(B) (i) and (ii) above.

7. From all other European countries:

Persons as in paragraph 1(B) (i) above.

8. From South America:

(A) Nationals:

(i) Person mentioned in paragraph 1(B) (i) above.

(ii) Other cases on their individual merit.

(B) Non-nationals as in paragraph 1(B) (i), (ii) and 1(C).

9. From British West Indies:

Persons as in paragraph 1(B) (i) and (ii).

10. From India, Pakistan and Ceylon:

(A) Husband or wife and unmarried children under 21 years of age of Canadian citizens, plus those admissible under the agreement with India (150), Pakistan (100), and Ceylon (50).

11. For other Asians:

(A) Husband or wife and unmarried children under 21 years of age of Canadian citizens, and other unmarried children in accordance with statement made in the House of Commons last June.

12. All others:

As in paragraph 1 (B) (i) above.

Source: Canada, House of Commons, Debates, June 28, 1951, p. 4,863.

Appendix 10 (cont.)

Mr. Harris (Grey-Bruce): As the committee knows, P.C. 2115 governs the admission to Canada of immigrants who are children of Canadian citizens of Chinese origin. That order in council permits the entry of unmarried children to the age of 21 years. We have found that, in some cases, there have been evidences of real hardship and perhaps suffering if that rule were to be applied rigidly. It has been applied rigidly, Mr. Chairman, and I do not know of any exceptions which have been made to it up to the present time. Nevertheless, there have been cases presented to me by hon. members, including the hon. member for Comox-Alberni—

Mr. Fulton: And the hon. member for Kamloops.

Mr. Harris (Grey-Bruce): —the hon. member for Kamloops and many others. Having in mind the present situation in China and the known desire of parents to have their children with them, we have come to the conclusion that we will give consideration to those cases of unmarried children over 21 up to the age of 25, to see if the circumstances warrant their admission on the grounds I have stated.

Note: Part of Mr. Harris' statement was incorrect.

P.C. 2115, 1930, specified age 18.
P.C. 1606, 1950, specified age 21.

Source: Canada, House of Commons, Debates, June 28, 1951, p. 4,863.

Appendix 11

Norms of Admissibility

20. (1) Subject to the provisions of the Act and to these regulations, a person who seeks to be admitted to Canada may be so admitted if he is found by an immigration officer in charge to fall within one of the following classes of persons to which admission is hereby limited:

(*a*) British subjects by birth or by naturalization in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand or the Union of South Africa and citizens of Ireland;

(*b*) citizens of the United States of America;

(*c*) citizens of France born in France or in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon Islands;

and if such a person has sufficient means to maintain himself until he has secured employment.

(2) Subject to the provisions of the Act and to these regulations, the landing in Canada of any Asian is limited to the following classes of person or persons; the wife, the husband or the unmarried children under twenty-one years of age of any Canadian citizen resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents.

(3) Subject to the provisions of the Act and to these regulations, the landing in Canada of any immigrant is limited to nationals of a country with which the Government of Canada has entered into an agreement or convention respecting immigration or in regard to which there is in operation an agreement or convention.

(4) Subject to the provisions of the Act and to these regulations, the admission to Canada of any person is prohibited where in the opinion of a Special Inquiry Officer such person should not be admitted by reason of

(*a*) the peculiar customs, habits, modes of life or methods of holding property in his country of birth or citizenship or in the country or place where he resided prior to coming to Canada;

(*b*) his unsuitability, having regard to the economic, social, industrial, educational, labour, health or other conditions or requirements existing, temporarily or otherwise, in Canada or in the area or country from or through which such person comes to Canada, or

(*c*) his probable inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after his admission.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 88, No. 19, October 13, 1954, p. 1278, 1279.

Appendix 12

Immigration Act—amendment, the Immigration Regulations

P.C. 1955-1551

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

WEDNESDAY, the 12th day of October, 1955.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and pursuant to the Immigration Act, is pleased to amend the Immigration Regulations made and established by Order in Council P.C. 1954-1351 of 17th September, 1951, and the said Regulations are hereby amended by revoking subsection (2) of section 20 thereof, and by substituting therefor the following new subsection (2):

> (2) Subject to the provisions of the Act and to these regulations, the landing in Canada of Asians is limited to any immigrant who satisfies the immigration officer in charge that he is the husband, the wife or the unmarried child under twenty-one years of age of any Canadian citizen resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents, but no such child shall be landed unless his father and his mother have already been landed in Canada or his father or his mother as the case may be is landed concurrently with him.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 89, No. 20, October 26, 1955, p. 1735.

Appendix 13

20. Landing in Canada of any person is prohibited except where the person falls within one of the following classes of persons who may be landed in Canada if such person meets the requirements of the Act and of these regulations:

(*a*) a person who is a British subject by birth or by naturalization in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, or the Union of South Africa, a citizen of Ireland, a citizen of France born or naturalized in France or in St. Pierre and Miquelon Islands, or a citizen of the United States of America if such person has sufficient means to maintain himself in Canada until he has secured employment therein;

(*b*) a person who is a citizen by birth or by naturalization of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden or Switzerland or who is a refugee from a country of Europe, if such person undertakes to come to Canada for placement under the auspices of the Department or, if the Department has given its approval thereto, for establishment in a business, trade or profession or in agriculture;

(*c*) a person who is a citizen by birth or by naturalization of Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, or of any country of Europe or of a country of North America, Central America or South America if such person is the husband, wife, son, daughter, brother, sister, as well as the husband or wife and the unmarried children under 21 years of age of any such son, daughter, brother or sister, as the case may be, the father, the mother, the grandparent, the unmarried orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age, the fiancée or fiancé, of a Canadian citizen or of a person legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence who is residing in Canada and who has applied for any such person and is in a position to receive and care for any such person; or

(*d*) a person who is a citizen of a country other than a country referred to in paragraphs (*a*), (*b*) or (*c*) or in section 21, if such person is the husband, the wife or the unmarried child under 21 years of age, the father where he is over 65 years of age, or the mother where she is over 60 years of age, of a Canadian citizen residing in Canada who has applied for and is in a position to receive and care for any such person, but no such child shall be landed in Canada unless his father or his mother, as the case may be, is landed in Canada concurrently with him.

Appendix 13 (cont.)

21. The Government of Canada having entered into an agreement with the Government of India, the Government of Pakistan and the Government of Ceylon with respect to the admission to Canada of 150, 100 and 50 persons annually from such countries, respectively, the landing in Canada of persons from any such country is, notwithstanding section 20, limited accordingly to such numbers of persons respectively, and in addition to the husband, the wife or the unmarried child under 21 years of age, the father where he is over 65 years of age or the mother where she is over 60 years of age, of a Canadian citizen residing in Canada who has applied for and is in a position to receive and care for such person.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 90, No. 11, June 13, 1956, p. 547,548.

Appendix 14

IMMIGRATION ACT

Immigration Regulations, amended

P.C. 1958-7

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 2nd day of JANUARY, 1958.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Acting Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, pursuant to the Immigration Act, is pleased hereby to amend the Immigration Regulations made by Order in Council P.C. 1954-1351 of 17th September, 1954[1], as amended[2], as follows:

1. Section 21 of the Immigration Regulations is revoked and the following substituted therefor:

> 21. The Government of Canada having entered into an agreement with the Government of India, the Government of Pakistan and the Government of Ceylon with respect to the admission to Canada of 300, 100 and 50 persons annually from such countries, respectively, the landing in Canada of persons from any such country is, notwithstanding section 20, limited accordingly to such numbers of persons respectively, and in addition to the husband, the wife or the unmarried child under 21 years of age, the father where he is over 65 years of age or the mother where she is over 60 years of age, of a Canadian citizen or of a person legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence who is residing in Canada and who has applied for and is in a position to receive and care for any such person.

---

[1] SOR/54-422, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, Vol. 88, No. 19, Oct. 13, 1954, p. 1263 and Statutory Orders and Regulations, Consolidation, 1955, Vol. 2, p. 1855

[2] SOR/58-2, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, Vol. 92, No. 1, Jan. 8, 1958

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 93, No. 2, January 22, 1958, p. 81.

Appendix 15

IMMIGRATION ACT

Immigration Regulations, amended

P.C. 1959-310

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 19th day of MARCH, 1959.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, pursuant to the Immigration Act, is pleased hereby to amend the Immigration Regulations made by Order in Council P.C. 1954-1351 of 17th September, 1954[1], as amended[2], in accordance with the schedule hereto:

SCHEDULE

1. Paragraph (c) of section 20 of the Immigration Regulations is revoked and the following substituted therefor:

(c) a person who is a citizen by birth or by naturalization of Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, or of any country of Europe or of a country of North America, Central America or South America, if such person is the husband, wife, unmarried son or daughter, the father, the mother, the grandparent, the unmarried orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age, the fiance or fiancee, of a Canadian citizen or of a person legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence who is residing in Canada and who has applied for any such person and is in a position to receive and care for any such person;

---

[1] SOR/54-422, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, Vol. 88, No. 10, Oct. 13, 1954, p. 1266 and Statutory Orders and Regulations Consolidation 1955, Vol. 2, p. 1755

[2] SOR/58-25, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, Vol. 92, No. 2, Jan. 22, 1958

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 93, No. 7, April 8, 1959, p. 233.

Appendix 16

IMMIGRATION ACT

Immigration Regulations, amended

P.C. 1959-507

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 23rd day of APRIL, 1959.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, pursuant to the Immigration Act, is pleased hereby to order as follows:

Order in Council P.C. 1959-310 of 19th March, 1959[1], amending the Immigration Regulations made by Order in Council P.C. 1954-1351 of 17th September, 1954[2], as amended[3], is hereby revoked and paragraph (c) of section 20 of the said Regulations is hereby re-established in the same terms as it existed[4] immediately prior to the passage of the said Order in Council P.C. 1959-310 of 19th March, 1959.

---

(1) SOR/59-82, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, Vol. 93, No. 7, April 8, 1959

(2) SOR/54-422, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, Vol. 88, No. 19, Oct. 13, 1954, p. 1268 and Statutory Orders and Regulations Consolidation 1955, Vol. 2, p. 1655

(3) SOR/58-25, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, Vol. 92, No. 2, Jan. 22, 1958

(4) "(c) a person who is a citizen by birth or by naturalization of Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, or of any country of Europe or of a country of North America, Central America or South America if such person is the husband, wife, son, daughter, brother, sister, as well as the husband or wife and the unmarried children under 21 years of age of any such son, daughter, brother or sister, as the case may be, the father, the mother, the grandparent, the unmarried orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age, the fiance or fiancee, of a Canadian citizen or of a person legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence who is residing in Canada and who has applied for any such person and is in a position to receive and care for any such person; or"

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 93, No. 9, May 13, 1959, p. 330.

Appendix 17

Landing Requirements

31. Landing in Canada is limited to persons who comply with all the requirements respecting landing in Canada set out in the Act and these Regulations and who come within one of the following classes:

(*a*) a person who, by reason of his education, training, skills or other special qualifications, is likely to be able to establish himself successfully in Canada and who

(i) has sufficient means of support to maintain himself in Canada until he has so established himself,

(ii) has come to Canada, under arrangements made or approved by the Director, for placement in employment,

(iii) has come to Canada under arrangements made or approved by the Director, for establishment in a business, trade or profession, or in agriculture, or

(iv) is the son, son-in-law, daughter or fiance of a Canadian citizen who

(A) resides in Canada, and

(B) has applied for and is willing and able to provide care and maintenance for the person, until the person has established himself successfully in Canada;

(*b*) a person who is the husband, wife or the unmarried son or daughter under twenty-one years of age of an individual who

(i) complies with the requirements of paragraph (*a*),

(ii) is accompanying the person to Canada, and

(iii) is willing and able to provide care and maintenance for the person until such person has established himself successfully in Canada;

(*c*) a person who is the parent, grandparent, husband, wife or fiancee, or the unmarried son or daughter under twenty-one years of age, of a Canadian citizen or of an individual legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence who

(i) is residing in Canada, and

(ii) has applied for and is willing and able to provide care and maintenance for the person until such person has established himself successfully in Canada; or

(*d*) a person who is a citizen of any country of Europe, including Turkey; or of any country of North, Central or South America or islands adjacent thereto; or of Egypt, Israel or Lebanon, if such person is:

Appendix 17 (cont.)

(i) the son, daughter, brother or sister, as well as the husband or wife and the unmarried son or daughter under twenty-one years of age of any such son, daughter, brother or sister, as the case may be; or

(ii) the unmarried orphan nephew or niece under twenty-one years of age, or fiance

of a Canadian citizen or of a person legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence, who is residing in Canada and who has applied for such person, and who is willing and able to provide care and maintenance for such person until he has established himself successfully in Canada.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 96, No. , February 14, p. 126.

Appendix 18

Immigration Regulations, Part I, amended.

P.C. 1964-1270

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA.

THURSDAY, the 13th day of AUGUST, 1964.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL.

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, pursuant to section 61 of the Immigration Act, is pleased hereby to amend the Immigration Regulations, Part 1, made by Order in Council P.C. 1962-86 of the 18th January, 1962[1], in accordance with the Schedule hereto.

SCHEDULE.

1. (1) Paragraph (*c*) of section 31 of the *Immigration Regulations, Part I* is revoked and the following substituted therefor:

"(c) a person who is the parent, grandparent, husband, wife, fiance, fiancee or the unmarried son or daughter under twenty-one years of age of a Canadian citizen or of an individual legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence who

(i) is residing in Canada, and

(ii) has applied for and is willing and able to provide care and maintenance for the person until such person has established himself successfully in Canada; or"

(2) Subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (*d*) of section 31 of the said Regulations is revoked and the following substituted therefor:

"(ii) the unmarried orphan nephew or niece under twenty-one years of age"

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 98, No. 16, August 26, 1964, p. 836.

Appendix 19

IMMIGRATION ACT

Immigration Regulations, Part I, amended

P.C. 1967-1616

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

Wednesday, the 16th day of August, 1967

Schedule A

NORMS FOR ASSESSMENT OF INDEPENDENT APPLICANTS

1. The factors to be used in assessing independent applicants, the weight to be allotted to each factor, and the units of assessment to be used in applying those factors, are as follows:

	Units of Assessment
(*a*) Education and training	One unit for each successfully completed year of formal education and for each year of professional, vocational and formal trades training, or apprenticeship, up to a maximum of twenty.
(*b*) Personal assessment	Adaptability, motivation, initiative, resourcefulness and other similar qualities to be assessed during an interview with the applicant by an immigration or visa officer, the total assessment up to a maximum of fifteen to reflect the latter's judgment of the personal suitability of the applicant and his family to become successfully established in Canada.

Appendix 19 (cont.)

(*c*) Occupational demand	On the basis of information gathered by the Department on employment opportunities in Canada, units to be assessed according to demand for the occupation the applicant will follow in Canada, ranging from fifteen when the demand is strong to zero when there is an over-supply in Canada of workers having the particular occupation of the applicant.
(*d*) Occupational skill	To be assessed according to the highest skill possessed by the applicant, ranging from ten units for the professional to one unit for the unskilled, irrespective of the occupation the applicant will follow in Canada.
(*e*) Age	Ten units if the applicant is between eighteen and thirty-five years of age, but one unit to be deducted for each year of age over thirty-five.
(*f*) Arranged employment	Ten units if the applicant has arranged definite employment in Canada which offers reasonable prospects of continuity.
(*g*) Knowledge of English and French	(*a*) Ten units if the applicant reads, writes and speaks fluently both English and French; (*b*) Five units if he reads, writes and speaks fluently one of the two languages; (*c*) Four units for each of the two languages he speaks fluently and reads well; (*d*) Two units for each of the two languages he speaks fluently; (*e*) One unit for each of the two languages he speaks with difficulty; (*f*) Two units for each of the two languages he reads well; (*g*) One unit for each of the two languages he reads with difficulty.

Appendix 19 (cont.)

(*h*) Relative	Where the applicant has a relative in Canada willing to assist him in becoming established and eligible to sponsor or nominate him but is unprepared or unable to do so, (*a*) five units if the applicant's destination is the municipality in which that relative lives; (*b*) three units if his destination is not the municipality in which that relative lives.
(*i*) Employment opportunities in the area of destination	A maximum of five units if the applicant intends to go to an area in Canada where there is a very strong general demand for labour, fewer if the demand is less strong, and zero if there is an over-supply of labour in the area.

2. An independent applicant who intends to establish a business or to retire in Canada may be given a credit of twenty-five units instead of being assessed under the factors set out in paragraphs (*c*) and (*d*) of section 1 if

(*a*) he has sufficient financial resources to establish himself in business or to retire; and

(*b*) the immigration or visa officer is satisfied that any business the applicant proposes to establish has a reasonable chance of being successful.

3. In order to be assessed as likely to establish himself successfully in Canada, an independent applicant outside Canada must achieve at least fifty units of assessment.

4. An applicant in Canada described in subsection (1) of section 34, must achieve at least fifty units of assessment on the factors set out in this Schedule other than arranged employment.

Notwithstanding subsection (2), an immigration or visa officer may

(*a*) approve the admission of an independent applicant who does not meet the norms set out in Schedule A, or

(*b*) refuse the admission of an independent applicant who meets the norms set out in Schedule A,

if in his opinion there are good reasons why those norms do not reflect the particular applicant's chances of establishing himself successfully in Canada and those reasons have been submitted in writing to, and approved by, an officer of the Department designated by the Minister.

Appendix 19 (cont.)

an applicant in Canada who

(*a*) if outside Canada would be an independent applicant; and

(*b*) is not in possession of an immigrant visa or letter of pre-examination but, in the opinion of an immigration officer, would on application be issued a visa or letter of pre-examination if outside Canada;

may be admitted to Canada for permanent residence if

(*c*) he complies with the requirements of the Act and these Regulations;

(*d*) he makes application in the form prescribed by the Minister before the expiration of the period of temporary stay in Canada authorized for him by an immigration officer;

(*e*) he has not taken employment in Canada without the written approval of an officer of the Department; and

(*f*) in the opinion of an immigration officer, he would have been admitted to Canada for permanent residence if he had been examined outside Canada as an independent applicant and assessed in accordance with the norms set out in Schedule A, except with respect to arranged employment.

33. (1) Subject to this section, any person residing in Canada who is a Canadian citizen or a person lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence may nominate for admission to Canada for permanent residence any of the following individuals (hereinafter referred to as a "nominated relative") including any accompanying immediate family of that individual:

(*a*) any son or daughter of that person twenty-one years of age or over;

(*b*) any married son or daughter of that person under twenty-one years of age;

(*c*) any brother or sister of that person;

Appendix 19 (cont.)

(*d*) the father, mother, grandfather or grandmother of that person under sixty years of age; and

(*e*) any nephew, niece, uncle, aunt, grandson or granddaughter of that person.

(2) A nominated relative and his immediate family may be granted admission to Canada for permanent residence if

(*a*) he and his immediate family comply with the requirements of the Act and these Regulations; and

(*b*) the person nominating him has met the requirements of subsection (1) and an order of deportation has not been made against that person.

Appendix 19 (cont.)

Schedule B

NORMS FOR ASSESSMENT OF NOMINATED RELATIVES

1. The factors to be used in assessing nominated relatives, the weight to be allotted to each factor, and the units of assessment to be used in applying those factors, are as follows:

	Units of Assessment
(*a*) Education and training	One unit for each successfully completed year of formal education and for each year of professional, vocational and formal trades training, or apprenticeship, up to a maximum of twenty.
(*b*) Personal assessment	Adaptability, motivation, initiative, resourcefulness and other similar qualities to be assessed during an interview with the applicant by an immigration or visa officer, the total assessment up to a maximum of fifteen to reflect the latter's judgment of the personal suitability of the applicant and his family to become successfully established in Canada.
(*c*) Occupational demand	On the basis of information gathered by the Department on employment opportunities in Canada, units to be assessed according to demand for the occupation the applicant will follow in Canada, ranging from fifteen when the demand is strong to zero when there is an over-supply in Canada of workers having the particular occupation of the applicant.
(*d*) Occupational skill	To be assessed according to the highest skill possessed by the applicant, ranging from ten units for the professional to one unit for the unskilled, irrespective of the occupation the applicant will follow in Canada.
(*e*) Age	Ten units if the applicant is under thirty-five years of age but one unit to be deducted for each year of age over thirty-five years of age.

Appendix 19 (cont.)

2. (1) A nominated relative must achieve

(*a*) at least twenty units in an assessment based on the factors set out in paragraphs (*a*) to (*c*) of section 1, if that relative is

(i) a son or daughter twenty-one years of age or over,

(ii) a married son or daughter under twenty-one years of age,

(iii) a brother or sister,

(iv) the father, mother, grandfather or grandmother under sixty years of age, or

(v) an unmarried nephew or niece under twenty-one years of age

of a person who is a Canadian citizen residing in Canada; and

(*b*) at least twenty-five units in an assessment based on the factors set out in paragraphs (*a*) to (*e*) of section 1 if he is a relative described in subparagraphs (i) to (v) of paragraph (*a*) of a person lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence and residing in Canada.

(2) A nominated relative must achieve

(*a*) at least thirty units in an assessment based on the factors set out in paragraphs (*a*) to (*c*) of section 1 if that relative is

(i) a nephew or niece twenty-one years of age or over,

(ii) a married nephew or niece under twenty-one years of age, or

(iii) an uncle, aunt, grandson or granddaughter of a person who is a Canadian citizen residing in Canada; and

(*b*) at least thirty-five units in an assessment based on the factors set out in paragraphs (*a*) to (*e*) of section 1 if he is a relative described in subparagraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph (*a*) of a person lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence and residing in Canada.

Appendix 19 (cont.)

Every person nominating a nominated relative for admission to Canada for permanent residence shall

(*a*) undertake to provide for a period of five years any necessary care and maintenance from his own resources for the nominated relative and his immediate family in accordance with standards prescribed by the Minister;

(*b*) have carried out the responsibilities with respect to any previous application for the admission to Canada of any person for permanent residence;

(*c*) be willing and able to undertake to advise, counsel and assist the nominated relative in fulfilling his responsibilities as a resident of Canada; and

(*d*) make the nomination in the form prescribed by the Minister.

(5) Notwithstanding subsection (3), an immigration or visa officer may

(*a*) approve the admission of a nominated relative who does not meet the norms set out in Schedule B; or

(*b*) refuse admission of a nominated relative who meets the norms set out in Schedule B;

if in his opinion there are good reasons why those norms do not reflect the particular nominated relative's chances of establishing himself successfully in Canada and those reasons have been submitted in writing to, and approved by, an officer of the Department designated by the Minister.

Appendix 19 (cont.)

For the first time, a nominated applicant in Canada who

> (*a*) if outside Canada would be eligible to be sponsored as a sponsored dependant; and
>
> (*b*) is not in possession of an immigrant visa or a letter of pre-examination but, in the opinion of an immigration officer, would on application be issued a visa or letter of pre-examination if outside Canada,

may be admitted to permanent residence in Canada if

> (*c*) he complies with the requirements of the Act and these Regulations;
>
> (*d*) his application is in the form prescribed by the Minister;
>
> (*e*) a person entitled to sponsor him as a sponsored dependant applies for his admission to Canada in the form prescribed by the Minister; and
>
> (*f*) in the opinion of an immigration officer he would have been admitted to Canada as a sponsored immigrant if he had been examined outside Canada.

Norms of assessment of such nominated applicants in Canada are also set out in Sechedule B of the Immigration Act,

> 3. (1) An applicant in Canada who could have been eligible to be nominated for admission to Canada and examined while abroad as a nominated relative must achieve
>
> (*a*) at least thirty units in an assessment based on factors (*a*) to (*e*) of section 1 if that relative is
>
> (i) a son or daughter twenty-one years of age or over,
>
> (ii) a married son or daughter under twenty-one years of age,
>
> (iii) a brother or sister,
>
> (iv) a parent or grandparent under sixty years of age, or
>
> (v) an unmarried nephew or niece under twenty-one years of age
>
> of a person who is a Canadian citizen residing in Canada; and
>
> (*b*) at least thirty-five units in an assessment based on factors (*a*) to (*e*) of section 1 if he is a relative described in subparagraphs (i) to (v) of paragraph (*a*) of a person lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence and residing in Canada.

Appendix 19 (cont.)

(2) An applicant in Canada who could have been eligible to be nominated for admission to Canada and examined while abroad as a nominated relative, must achieve

(*a*) at least forty units in an assessment based on factors (*a*) to (*e*) of section 1 if that relative is

(i) a nephew or niece twenty-one years of age or over,

(ii) a married nephew or niece under twenty-one years of of age, or

(iii) an uncle, aunt, grandson or granddaughter

of a person who is a Canadian citizen residing in Canada; and

(*b*) at least forty-five units in an assessment based on factors (*a*) to (*e*) of section 1 if he is a relative described in subparagraphs (i) to (iii) of paragraph (*a*) of a person lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence and residing in Canada.

4. If the nominated relative is married, and is not the head of the family, the assessment shall be made of the head of the family as if he had the same degree of relationship to the person making the nomination as the person nominated.

The true 'sponsored' immigrant included relatives of Canadians whose only criterion of admission was that of family connection. As defined in the Immigration Act:

"Admissible Classes

31. (1) Subject to this section, every person residing in Canada who is a Canadian citizen or a person lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence is entitled to sponsor for admission to Canada for permanent residence any of the following individuals (hereinafter referred to as a "sponsored dependent"):

(*a*) the husband or wife of that person;

(*b*) the fiancé or fiancée of that person and any accompanying unmarried son or daughter of that fiancé or fiancée under twenty-one years of age;

(*c*) any unmarried son or daughter of that person under twenty-one years of age;

(*d*) the father, mother, grandfather or grandmother of that person

Appendix 19 (cont.)

sixty years of age or over, or under sixty years of age if incapable of gainful employment or widowed, and any accompanying immediate family of that father, mother, grandfather or grandmother;

(*e*) any brother, sister, nephew, niece, grandson or granddaughter of that person who is an orphan and under eighteen years of age;

(*f*) any adopted son or daughter of that person who was adopted under the age of eighteen years and who is under twenty-one years of age and unmarried;

(*g*) any child under the age of thirteen years whom that person intends to adopt and who is

(i) an orphan,

(ii) an abandoned child whose parentage cannot be determined,

(iii) a child born out of wedlock who has been placed with a welfare authority for adoption, or

(iv) a child whose parents are separated with little or no prospect of reconciliation and who has been placed with a welfare authority for adoption; and

(*h*) subject to subsection (3), where he has no relatives described in paragraphs (*c*) to (*f*), one person from among his next closest relatives and any accompanying immediate family of that person.

(2) A sponsored dependant may be admitted to Canada for permanent residence if

(*a*) he complies with the requirements of the Act and these Regulations;

(*b*) in the case of a fiancé or fiancée of a sponsor, there is no legal impediment to the marriage of that person and the sponsor under the laws of the province in which the marriage is to be performed;

(*c*) in the case of a child described in paragraph (*c*) of subsection (1), who, because of his age, would be subject to the jurisdiction of the child welfare authority of the government of the province in which he is to reside, an officer of that authority has stated in writing that it has no objection to the child's entering and remaining in that province;

(*d*) in the case of a child described in paragraph (*f*) of subsection (1), an officer of the child welfare authority of the government of the province in which the child is to reside

Appendix 19 (cont.)

has stated in writing that the authority recognizes the adoption as being valid in that province;

(e) in the case of a child described in paragraph (g) of subsection (1), an officer of the child welfare authority of the government of the province in which the child is to reside has stated in writing that arrangements satisfactory to the authority have been made to supervise the adoption of the child or to ensure that the child will be cared for if it is not adopted; and

(f) application for his admission is made by the sponsor in the form prescribed by the Minister.

(3) A Canadian citizen residing in Canada or a person lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence and residing in Canada is entitled during his lifetime to sponsor for admission to Canada only one of the persons described in paragraph (h) of subsection (1), but if the sponsored dependant chosen by him is unable to comply with the requirements of the Act and these Regulations or dies, he may sponsor one other person from among his next closest relatives and any accompanying immediate family of that person.

(4) Subsections (1) and (3) do not apply to a person lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence against whom a deportation order has been made.

Also, for the first time, an applicant in Canada who

(a) if outside Canada would be eligible to be sponsored as a sponsored dependant, and

(b) is not in possession of an immigrant visa or letter of pre-examination but, in the opinion of an immigration officer, would on application be issued a visa or letter of pre-examination if outside Canada,

may be admitted to Canada for permanent residence if

(c) he complies with the requirements of the Act and these Regulations;

Appendix 19 (cont)

(d) he makes application in the form prescribed by the Minister before the expiration of the period of temporary stay in Canada authorized for him by an immigration officer;

(e) a person who could nominate him as a nominated relative applies for his admission in the form prescribed by the Minister;

(f) he has not taken employment in Canada without the written approval of an officer of the Department; and

(g) in the opinion of an immigration officer he would have been admitted to Canada for permanent residence if he had been examined outside Canada as a nominated relative and assessed in accordance with the norms set out in Schedule E.

Source: The Canada Gazette, Part II, Volume 101, No. 17, September 13, 1967, p. 1351-1362.

Appendix 20

Immigrant's Intended Occupations Grouped From Highest to Lowest Prestige Status

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)	
Class I - Blishen Score 55.00+		
1. Chemical Engineers	Chemical engineers	76.69
2. Dentists	Dentists	76.44
3. Professors & Principals	Professors and college principals	76.01
4. Physicians and Surgeons	Physicians and surgeons	75.57
5. Geologists	Geologists	75.49
6. Mining Engineers	Mining engineers	75.42
7. Law Professionals	Lawyers and notaries	75.41
8. Civil Engineers	Civil engineers	75.16
9. Architects	Architects	74.52
10. Veterinarians	Veterinarians	74.46
11. Electrical Engineers	Electrical engineers	74.34
12. Other Engineers	Professional engineers n.e.s.	74.27
13. Physicists	Physicists	73.81
14. Optometrists	Optometrists	73.77
15. Biological Scientists	Biological scientists	73.22
16. Other Physical Scientists	Physical scientists n.e.s.	72.94
17. Pharmacists	Pharmacists	72.87
18. Mechanical Engineers	Mechanical engineers	72.78
19. Economists	Economists	71.89
20. Chemists	Chemists	70.94
21. Industrial Engineers	Industrial engineers	70.43

Appendix 20 (cont)

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)	
22. Osteopaths & Chiropractors	Osteopaths & chriopractors	70.25
23. School Teachers	School teachers	70.14
24. Accountants, Auditors	Accountants & auditors	68.80
25. Actuaries, Statisticians	Actuaries & statisticians	67.78
26. Computer programmers	Computer programmers	67.50
27. Other Biologists, Agricultural Professionals	Physical scientists n.e.s.	72.94
	Agricultural professionals n.e.s.	66.96
28. Aircraft Operators	Air pilots, navigators, & flight engineers	66.04
29. Authors, Editors, Journalists	Authors, editors, journalists	64.23
30. Librarians	Librarians	63.75
31. Other Professionals	Professional occupations, n.e.s.	60.93
32. Dietitians	P.O. n.e.s.	60.93
33. Religious Professionals	Clergymen and priests	59.20
34. Other Health Professionals	Other health professionals	58.27
35. Art Teachers	Artists (except commercial), art teachers	58.21
36. Draughtsmen	Draughtsmen	57.82
37. Social Workers	Social welfare workers	55.62

Class II - Blishen Scores 46.00-54.99

38. Owners, Managers, Officials	NOTE: (Blishen Scores Ranged From 68.32-40.14)	
	Owners and managers, education and related services	68.32
	Owners and managers, services to business management	67.28
	Owners and managers, chemical and chemical products industries	66.79

Appendix 20 (cont)

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)
Owners and managers, electrical products industries	65.78
Owners and managers, primary metal industries	65.29
Owners and managers, paper and allied industries	64.78
Owners and managers, finance, insurance, real estate	64.52
Owners and managers, rubber industries	64.09
Owners and managers, machinery industries	63.76
Owners and managers, petroleum and coal products industries	63.02
Owners and managers, mines, quarries, and oil wells	61.99
Owners and managers, textile industries	61.96
Owners and managers, transportation equipment industries	61.75
Owners and managers, health and welfare services	60.07
Owners and managers, printing, publishing and allied industries	59.69
Owners and managers, federal administration	59.60
Owners and managers, knitting mills	59.28
Owners and managers, miscellaneous manufacturing industries	58.29
Owners and managers, metal fabricating industries	57.60
Owners and managers, leather industries	57.23
Owners and managers, non-metallic mineral products industries	55.41
Owners and managers, clothing industries	54.77
Owners and managers, provincial administration	54.54
Owners and managers, transportation, communication and other utilities	53.85
Owners and managers, wholesale trade	53.80
Owners and managers, local administration	53.29
Owners and managers, furniture and fixtures industries	52.11

Appendix 20 (cont)

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)	
	Owners and managers, food and beverage industries	51.70
	Owners and managers, construction industries	46.95
	Owners and managers, wood industries	45.52
	Owners and managers, miscellaneous services	45.48
	Owners and managers, motion picture and recreational services	45.19
	Owners and managers, forestry, logging	44.00
	Owners and managers, retail trade	43.69
	Owners and managers, personal services	40.14
	Farm manager and foremen	35.05
39. Science Technicians	Science and engineering technicians, n.e.s.	54.75
40. Commercial Artists	Artists, commercial	54.06
41. Surveyors	Surveyors	53.25
42. Pedlars, Commercial Travellers	Commercial travellers	52.68
43. Other Instructors	Teacher and instructors, n.e.s.	52.07
44. Therapists	Physical & occupational therapists	51.11
45. Athletes, Entertainers	Athletes and sports officials	51.11
	Actors, entertainers, & showmen	43.85
46. Musicians	Musicians and music teachers	50.93
47. Nurses-in-Training	Nurses-in-Training	49.91
48. Bookkeepers, Cashiers	Bookkeepers, and cashiers	49.55
49. Medical & Dental Technicians	Medical & Dental Technicians	48.56
50. Financial Workers	Real estate salesmen & agents	48.74
51. Photographers	Photographers	48.07

Appendix 20 (cont)

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)	
Class III - Blishen Scores 33.04-45.99		
52. Communication Workers	Linemen & servicemen - telephone, telegraph & power	45.05
	Telephone operators	44.20
53. Interior Decorators	Interior decorators & window dressers	44.37
54. Railroad Operators	Locomotive engineers	45.99
	Conductors, railroad	45.68
	Locomotive firemen	40.92
	Brakemen, railroad	40.22
	Switchmen & signal men	33.16
55. Other Clerical	Clerical occupations, n.e.s.	42.98
56. Nurses, graduate	Nurses, graduate	42.57
57. Electricians	Electricians, wiremen & electrical repairmen	40.68
58. Auctioneers, Canvassers	Auctioneers	40.48
	Canvassers and other door-to-door salesmen	40.23
59. Printers & Bookbinders	Lithographic & Photo-offset occupations	45.00
	Pressmen, printing	39.49
	Bookbinders	38.54
	Printing workers, n.e.s.	40.13
	Other occupations in bookbinding	34.97
60. Stenographers, Typists	Stenographers	51.96
	Typists & clerk typists	39.66
61. Stationary Enginemen	Stationary enginemen	37.79
62. Sales Clerks, Salesmen	Sales clerks	37.14
63. Machinists	Machinists and machine-tool setters	36.90
64. Jewellers, Watchmakers	Jewellers & watchmakers	36.55
65. Protective Service	Civilian protective service occupations	35.80

Appendix 20 (cont)

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)	
66. Miners, Well Drillers	Miners	33.38
	Well-drillers & related workers	39.55
67. Mechanics, Repairmen	Mechanics & repairmen,n.e.s.	34.77
68. Storekeepers, Shipping Clerks	Stock clerks & storekeepers	34.63
69. Plumbers	Plumbers & pipefitters	34.38
70. Electrical & Electronic Workers	Electrical & electronic workers n.e.s.	33.80
71. Sheet Metal Workers	Sheet-metal workers	33.49
Class IV - Blishen Scores 0-33.03		
72. Other Service Workers	Service workers, n.e.s.	32.17
73. Domestic Servants	Service workers, n.e.s.	32.17
74. Nurses' Aides	Nursing assistants & aides	32.14
75. Furnacemen, Moulders	Moulders	31.32
	Furnacemen & heaters-metal	34.75
	Furnacemen & kilnmen, ceramics & glass	28.69
76. Other Production Workers	Production process & related workers, n.e.s.	31.00
77. Other Sales Occupations	Driver-salesmen	30.74
	Hawkers & peddlars	30.43
78. Paper & Chemical Workers	Paper products makers	30.53
	Chemical & related process workers	37.75
	Labourers, paper & allied industries	29.73
79. Water Transport	Deck ratings (ship), barge crews & boatmen	30.56
80. Waiters, Porters	Waiters	30.47
81. Tailors & Furriers	Tailors	30.26
	Furriers	33.03

Appendix 20 (cont)

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)	
82. Painters, glaziers	Painters (construction & maintenance), paper-hangers & glaziers	30.08
83. Painters (Excl. Construction)	Painters (except construction & maintenance)	30.00
84. Bricklayers, Stonemasons	Bricklayers, stonemasons, tilesetters	29.93
85. Plasterers, Lathers	Plasterers & Lathers	29.90
86. Food Workers	Other food-processing occupations	29.89
	Fruit-and vegetable canners & packers	29.60
87. Clay, Glass, Stone Workers	Clay, glass, and stone workers, n.e.s.	29.77
88. Carpenters	Carpenters	29.71
89. Rubber Workers	Vulcanizers	29.62
	Other rubber workers	29.51
90. Other Construction Workers Excluding Labourers	Construction workers, n.e.s.	29.43
91. Cooks	Cooks	29.43
	Bakers	29.26
92. Road Transport	Truck drivers	29.31
93. Freight Handlers	Warehousemen & freight-handlers	29.18
94. Textile Workers	Cutters, makers - textiles; garment & glove leather	31.06
	Bleachers & dyers- textiles	30.18
	Knitters	28.68
	Apparel & related products makers	28.44
	Sewers & sewing-machine operators	27.87
	Other textile occupations	27.44
	Carders, combers, & other fibre-preparers	27.37

Appendix 20 (cont)

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)	
	Loom-fixers and loom-preparers	27.09
	Spinners and twisters	26.94
	Weavers	26.77
	Winders and reelers	26.63
95. Other Transportation Trades	Transport occupations, n.e.s.	28.63
96. Leather Workers	Cutters, markets - textiles; garment & glove leather	31.06
	Tanners & tannery operatives	28.42
	Other leather products makers	27.19
97. Woodworkers, Sawyers	Woodworking-machine operators	28.29
	Sawyers	28.29
98. Cement & Concrete Workers	Cement- and Concrete- finishers	27.86
99. General Labourers	Labourers, trade	30.19
	Labourers, mine	29.96
	Labourers, paper & allied industries	29.73
	Labourers, communication & storage	29.51
	Labourers, electric power, gas, & water utilities	29.26
	Labourers, all other industries	28.96
	Labourers, other public administration & defense	28.61
	Labourers, other manufacturing industries	28.22
	Labourers, food & beverage industries	28.12
	Labourers, railway transport	28.03
	Labourers, wood industries	27.57
	Labourers, transportation equipment industries	27.49
	Labourers, construction	27.25
	Labourers, local administration	26.71
	Labourers, textile & clothing industries	26.56
100. Farmers & Farm Workers	Farm labourers	27.77
101. Loggers & Related Workers	Lumbermen, including labourers in logging	27.01

Appendix 20 (cont)

Intended Occupation	Blishen Prestige Status Score(s)	
102. Fishermen, Hunters, Trappers	Fishermen	27.17
	Trappers & hunters	25.36

Note: At the suggestion of Dr. Pineo 'owners, managers, officials' was placed in Class II. It was felt that most such immigrants would have fallen in this class.

Source: Bernard Blishen, "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada", in Bernard R. Blishen et al eds., Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives, Macmillan of Canada, Toronto, 1971, pp. 499-504 and Immigration Statistics, Department of Manpower and Immigration: Canada Immigration Division, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1966, pp. 8-11.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES IN 49 CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

(Thousands of dollars)

Year	Academic and Library	Assisted Research	Administration	Plant Maintenance	Scholarships	Other Expenditures	Total
1956-57	42,073	10,072	3,883	9,330	659	2,514	68,531
1957-58	51,583	11,139	4,784	10,535	899	3,112	82,052
1958-59	61,088	14,439	5,264	11,429	1,003	3,254	96,477
1959-60	72,409	18,325	6,101	13,235	1,398	3,857	115,325
1960-61	86,223	20,907	7,234	15,697	1,455	4,824	136,341
1961-62	101,712	26,130	8,711	17,566	1,713	5,919	161,752
1962-63	118,992	29,649	10,173	19,732	2,160	6,079	186,784
1963-64	142,223	35,564	11,782	22,940	3,134	7,011	222,654
1964-65	178,431	47,225	15,946	28,851	4,221	8,349	283,021
1965-66	226,813	60,912	19,616	36,078	7,122	10,323	360,864
1966-67	303,887	79,604	25,602	48,130	8,043	14,623	479,889
1967-68	398,906	103,158	34,124	63,778	8,550	18,275	626,788

Note: "Other Expenditures" include expenditures on alumni affairs, public relations, and placement service, as well as the net deficit on ancillary enterprises and miscellaneous expenses.

FULL-TIME ENROLMENT AT 49 CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

UNDERGRADUATE

Year	Arts	Science	Applied Science	Education	Commerce	Health Fields	Agriculture & Forestry	Law	Other Fields	Total
1956-57	16,663	4,912	11,320	4,384	3,876	8,908	1,332	1,564	4,530	57,489
1957-58	18,611	5,749	12,605	5,290	4,347	8,923	1,681	1,634	4,592	63,432
1958-59	20,588	7,244	12,578	7,034	4,473	9,084	1,740	1,701	4,764	69,206
1959-60	22,276	7,827	12,613	8,643	5,135	9,414	1,768	1,823	5,219	74,718
1960-61	25,891	8,786	12,771	10,359	5,696	10,227	1,846	1,920	5,809	83,305
1961-62	30,714	11,660	12,197	12,774	6,492	10,936	2,041	2,148	6,300	95,262
1962-63	34,943	13,765	11,930	14,051	6,923	11,828	1,990	2,354	6,437	104,221
1963-64	37,443	17,988	12,333	15,642	7,945	12,932	2,184	2,588	6,691	115,746
1964-65	43,146	20,593	12,765	18,028	8,763	14,126	3,130	2,847	7,677	131,075
1965-66	55,076	23,998	13,992	20,991	9,352	14,655	3,298	3,354	8,347	153,062
1966-67	63,093	27,851	15,843	23,582	10,550	15,955	3,575	3,917	9,192	173,558
1967-68	65,941	31,305	17,960	24,013	11,528	17,349	3,778	4,502	10,845	187,221

GRADUATE

	Arts & Science	Other	Total
1956-57	1,611	1,421	3,032
1957-58	1,971	1,664	3,634
1958-59	2,246	1,789	4,035
1959-60	2,595	2,022	4,617
1960-61	3.130	2,426	5,556
1961-62	4,133	3,083	7,216
1962-63	4,570	3,623	8,193
1963-64	6,355	4,560	10,915
1964-65	8,477	5,181	13,658
1965-66	10,811	6,140	16,951
1966-67	12,368	7,110	19,478
1967-68	15,163	8,808	23,971

Source: Walter Hettich, "Expenditures, Output and Productivity in Canadian University Education", Special Study No. 14, prepared for the Economic Council of Canada, Information Canada, Ottawa, 1971, pp. 18, 37.

Appendix 22

Chart Series 1 - 6

Chart Series 1: Immigrant's Intended Occupation Converted to a Collapsed, Adjusted Blishen Scale: 1963-1970

Intended Occupational Class		Blishen Scores		Blishen Scores
	I	Below 33.04	III	46.0-54.99
	II	33.04-45.99	IV	over 54.99

Country of Last Permament Residence		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Britain	I	20.3	20.6	20.0	19.1	20.6	26.5	29.1	23.7
	II	7.0	7.9	8.7	8.7	10.6	11.4	12.2	13.1
	III	50.3	47.7	45.5	46.7	45.4	39.9	37.1	39.1
	IV	22.4	23.4	25.3	24.8	22.3	22.1	21.3	22.8
	Not Stated		0.5	0.5	0.6	0.1		0.4	1.3
	%	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0
	Flow	12,386	15,357	20,715	31,545	32,850	20,801	17,311	14,583
Australia	I	23.7	28.0	28.3	28.6	31.3	42.1	41.7	33.5
	II	10.8	11.2	11.3	11.3	10.6	9.7	8.7	10.3
	III	49.2	42.7	44.5	40.7	41.6	34.1	33.5	39.2
	IV	16.2	17.7	15.9	19.2	16.3	14.1	16.0	16.9
	Not Stated	0.1	0.4		0.3	0.1		0.1	0.1
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	1079	1416	1680	2460	3759	2435	2230	2385
New Zealand	I	20.8	30.1	22.0	27.2	28.3	40.8	46.5	36.5
	II	11.9	9.6	12.0	16.9	11.0	13.1	6.9	11.4
	III	47.0	42.9	46.9	43.1	42.9	28.8	27.3	31.1
	IV	19.9	17.4	19.1	12.8	17.8	17.2	19.3	20.5
	Not Stated	0.4		0.2			0.1		0.5
	%	100.0	100.0	100.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	236	322	418	540	865	688	564	624

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
France	I	12.2	9.4	12.8	14.4	14.7	19.6	26.5	30.3
	II	5.0	5.4	5.5	7.0	8.3	9.7	21.1	11.9
	III	31.8	33.1	29.2	30.5	34.2	29.3	21.7	22.6
	IV	50.5	51.1	51.6	46.2	40.7	41.4	39.5	34.8
	Not Stated	0.4	1.0	0.8	1.8	2.2		0.2	0.4
	%	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	2040	2843	3165	4909	5927	4503	3132	2516
South Africa	I	33.5	38.0	33.4	29.0	31.6	43.3	39.6	38.3
	II	16.8	12.2	15.1	15.4	11.5	10.7	12.4	13.2
	III	40.7	38.5	40.1	42.8	36.7	30.9	35.7	30.1
	IV	9.0	10.8	11.4	12.6	19.7	14.8	12.0	18.0
	Not Stated		0.5		0.2	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.4
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0
	Flow	167	213	299	493	732	411	283	266
Ireland	I	16.3	16.4	19.1	14.0	14.0	22.9	28.0	28.3
	II	7.5	9.1	8.6	6.0	8.4	8.2	7.4	10.0
	III	40.8	37.7	39.1	41.0	44.3	43.4	44.5	40.5
	IV	35.2	35.8	29.1	36.3	31.8	25.5	19.7	20.5
	Not Stated	0.3	0.9	4.1	2.7	1.5		0.5	0.7
	%	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0
	Flow	375	438	560	1161	1432	1078	991	887
United States	I	32.4	34.4	33.7	36.7	40.9	45.2	43.6	39.0
	II	22.2	20.6	24.2	24.1	21.7	19.0	19.6	21.3
	III	25.4	26.7	27.0	25.7	23.7	21.5	22.4	23.1
	IV	19.3	17.6	14.8	13.3	13.4	14.3	14.1	16.2
	Not Stated	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.3		0.3	0.4
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	4210	4921	6435	7408	8266	9540	10220	11462

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Austria	I	3.4	6.0	7.2	8.2	12.6	14.2	14.3	10.4
	II	2.5	5.3	2.8	5.4	18.8	20.2	18.4	10.2
	III	27.2	31.9	30.0	31.4	24.1	28.7	26.9	25.6
	IV	66.8	56.7	60.0	54.8	44.2	36.9	40.1	51.3
	Not Stated	0.2			0.2	0.3		0.3	2.5
	%	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	563	811	1168	1876	2013	5067	1280	480
Belgium	I	11.2	21.0	20.7	20.8	27.3	30.3	40.3	32.0
	II	4.6	4.6	25.2	7.7	7.6	13.4	11.3	11.3
	III	27.5	21.0	27.0	29.1	26.0	26.7	22.2	26.0
	IV	56.8	53.3	27.2	42.0	37.5	29.5	26.2	30.5
	Not Stated		0.2		0.3	1.6			0.2
	%	100.1	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0
	Flow	502	548	600	855	765	580	603	416
Denmark	I	6.5	7.1	7.6	6.8	9.6	11.8	13.2	14.1
	II	5.5	6.0	7.3	9.9	9.3	12.8	9.5	10.3
	III	29.3	30.3	38.1	28.7	34.5	33.6	29.4	28.6
	IV	58.8	54.6	44.8	52.2	43.8	41.8	46.5	46.3
	Not Stated		1.9	2.3	2.4	2.9		1.3	0.7
	%	100.1	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.1	1-0.0	99.9	100.0
	Flow	400	518	620	795	879	5142	462	419
Finland	I	10.1	6.1	3.8	7.5	4.6	9.2	14.2	9.6
	II	11.5	12.6	3.8	7.8	11.9	7.0	8.3	7.6
	III	37.8	32.2	36.4	39.3	33.8	27.3	28.1	32.6
	IV	40.5	49.1	56.0	44.8	48.2	56.5	48.9	47.9
	Not Stated				0.6	1.5		0.5	2.3
	%	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	148	214	343	346	479	414	423	353

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Germany	I	5.0	5.8	6.0	8.1	10.0	12.2	13.6	12.0
	II	3.2	4.8	5.0	7.1	8.8	9.7	9.8	11.2
	III	39.8	40.0	41.6	40.6	38.8	39.2	35.2	34.6
	IV	52.0	49.1	46.7	43.2	41.4	38.9	41.1	41.8
	Not Stated		0.3	0.6	1.1	1.1		0.2	0.3
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	99.9	99.9
	Flow	4344	3791	5611	5598	7254	5142	3250	2450
Netherlands	I	7.4	10.2	10.5	10.2	11.7	12.0	12.8	12.4
	II	5.3	6.3	6.5	7.0	16.3	8.1	7.7	9.4
	III	32.8	35.2	36.6	37.6	32.4	29.7	24.1	30.0
	IV	54.5	48.1	45.8	42.8	37.9	50.2	55.4	47.6
	Not Stated		0.2	0.7	2.4	1.7			0.5
	%	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9
	Flow	978	1222	1643	2205	2476	1951	1488	1119
Sweden	I	17.1	14.4	19.4	16.3	16.4	22.0	23.0	25.3
	II	10.9	14.0	13.9	14.5	18.5	14.4	17.3	19.3
	III	28.6	29.3	28.6	32.3	18.8	32.3	28.1	26.0
	IV	43.4	42.4	37.7	35.7	42.4	31.3	31.3	27.7
	Not Stated			0.4	1.3	3.9		0.3	1.7
	%	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	175	229	252	387	696	418	335	300
Switzerland	I	10.2	10.6	9.9	10.7	10.8	14.2	15.5	15.8
	II	7.8	7.9	8.0	8.4	6.4	10.7	10.2	11.5
	III	30.9	33.1	40.4	39.8	31.2	34.2	33.9	35.5
	IV	51.1	48.4	41.6	40.9	50.8	40.8	40.3	37.2
	Not Stated			0.1	0.1	0.7		0.1	
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.0
	Flow	824	1180	1663	2338	2997	2642	1782	1765

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Norway	I	16.2	20.3	15.8	14.6	12.3	27.0	19.7	22.7
	II	4.6	9.2	5.3	13.0	15.3	15.0	11.4	10.0
	III	35.8	27.5	30.2	32.1	25.8	24.2	24.9	24.0
	IV	43.4	41.2	35.6	34.4	41.4	33.7	43.2	42.7
	Not Stated		2.0		5.9	5.3		0.9	0.7
	%	100.0	100.2	99.9	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.1	100.1
	Flow	173	153	202	355	399	326	229	150
Other Countries	I	23.1	20.2	24.4	26.1	28.7	31.0	26.0	21.6
	II	11.0	10.8	11.6	10.6	12.3	14.6	12.1	15.3
	III	40.5	42.8	49.7	50.4	36.2	37.6	40.2	42.2
	IV	25.4	25.5	14.2	12.8	20.2	16.5	19.8	18.4
	Not Stated	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.1	2.6	0.3	0.9	2.5
	%	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0
	Flow	1073	1743	2948	4154	2884	3202	4002	4394
Italy	I	1.4	1.4	1.7	3.3	3.4	3.5	4.4	5.8
	II	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.2	2.2	2.6	3.9	5.4
	III	6.1	5.9	8.8	14.3	16.0	19.4	20.8	19.4
	IV	91.9	92.0	88.1	80.0	77.3	74.6	68.2	64.0
	Not Stated	0.1	0.1	0.4	1.2	1.2		2.7	5.4
	%	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0
	Flow	6618	8881	12135	14613	14579	9462	4996	3938
Greece	I	2.3	2.2	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.7	2.2	3.0
	II	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.3	2.8	3.0	3.6
	III	15.9	13.9	13.5	12.6	14.4	17.3	16.2	16.3
	IV	79.8	81.0	81.5	82.3	78.1	76.9	71.9	68.3
	Not Stated	0.1	0.9	1.3	1.4	3.4	0.3	6.7	8.8
	%	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	2849	2561	3262	4145	6749	4515	4448	3881

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Portugal	I	1.7	1.5	2.0	1.7	2.7	2.1	1.2	0.9
	II	0.9	0.7	1.4	1.1	1.3	1.4	0.9	1.2
	III	8.1	13.7	14.5	13.4	11.4	11.6	10.8	8.5
	IV	89.2	83.9	82.1	83.2	82.6	84.8	81.6	85.0
	Not Stated	0.1	0.1		0.6	1.9	0.2	5.4	4.4
	%	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1	99.9	100.0
	Flow	1223	1694	1614	2365	3433	1701	2242	3002
Spain	I	21.3	12.4	16.0	14.2	16.1	12.3	16.0	15.1
	II	3.7	3.6	3.9	6.1	4.5	6.2	7.5	7.0
	III	16.7	28.4	27.6	31.8	36.6	46.7	26.7	28.5
	IV	59.9	55.3	52.4	47.9	41.0	34.8	49.9	46.0
	Not Stated	0.5	0.3			1.7			3.4
	%	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0
	Flow	216	394	456	628	719	782	375	417
Czechoslovakia	I						31.6	25.3	41.8
	II						11.7	18.5	13.3
	III						28.4	26.0	20.3
	IV						28.2	29.0	22.6
	Not Stated						0.2	1.2	2.1
	%						100.1	100.0	100.1
	Flow						497	861	390
Hungary	I					12.9	14.3	14.3	12.4
	II					11.5	15.2	13.6	16.9
	III					24.5	25.0	26.0	33.7
	IV					50.4	45.5	44.2	36.5
	Not Stated					0.7		1.9	0.6
	%					100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
	Flow					139	112	154	178

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Poland	I	5.8	9.1	6.7	8.4	14.3	19.2	18.9	16.3
	II	4.4	2.4	3.0	4.0	3.9	8.4	9.6	8.7
	III	12.2	18.0	16.4	14.6	18.2	23.3	24.0	21.5
	IV	76.9	69.8	73.8	72.0	62.4	48.9	45.7	51.6
	Not Stated	0.7	0.8	0.1	1.0	1.2	0.2	1.8	1.9
	%	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Flow	433	629	675	574	659	511	396	368
Yugoslavia	I	3.5	6.9	7.8	8.2	9.5	13.7	5.7	4.7
	II	3.5	2.5	1.9	2.9	6.6	8.7	7.3	4.0
	III	14.0	13.7	12.6	11.4	25.7	26.6	21.6	24.7
	IV	79.0	76.0	77.2	74.3	56.6	51.1	52.8	50.3
	Not Stated		1.0	0.5	3.2	1.6		12.6	16.2
	%	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9
	Flow	143	204	206	280	790	2278	1625	2549
Syria	I					29.4	15.8	9.8	
	II					10.1	9.8	13.9	
	III					21.1	28.4	25.4	
	IV					39.4	43.7	43.4	
	Not Stated						2.2	7.4	
	%					100.0	99.9	99.9	
	Flow					109	183	122	
Egypt	I	19.1	15.0	17.8	30.0	32.8	28.6	37.5	38.7
	II	12.9	12.9	14.0	13.9	20.6	25.8	11.6	14.1
	III	51.3	57.8	55.7	42.1	32.8	33.8	37.2	30.3
	IV	16.7	14.3	12.5	13.4	11.2	11.9	12.7	13.2
	Not Stated				0.6	2.6		1.0	3.6
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9
	Flow	651	1029	673	796	717	767	621	468

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Israel	I	17.6	19.8	17.5	15.5	17.2	16.9	22.3	17.4
	II	10.3	14.6	9.9	10.6	11.0	11.2	13.9	17.9
	III	34.3	32.7	32.6	40.1	37.2	35.7	23.8	27.3
	IV	37.8	32.7	40.0	33.8	34.5	36.2	39.2	37.1
	Not Stated		0.2			0.1		0.7	0.3
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
	Flow	312	480	365	791	1156	663	403	396
Lebanon	I	19.1	16.5	11.3	17.1	24.0	19.9	18.9	14.7
	II	8.7	8.2	5.0	7.4	14.9	13.3	16.0	13.9
	III	25.7	34.2	33.5	28.5	26.6	29.4	26.3	22.9
	IV	46.4	40.5	50.2	46.3	34.1	35.5	31.6	39.7
	Not Stated		0.6		0.6	0.4	1.8	7.2	8.8
	%	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0
	Flow	183	158	319	445	545	819	567	590
Malta	I	2.0	4.5	2.1	3.1	2.3	6.2	4.8	2.6
	II	1.1	1.6	1.8	2.1	3.8	4.4	2.4	2.6
	III	30.7	26.3	29.4	22.4	33.4	21.9	21.0	22.4
	IV	66.0	67.1	62.0	59.5	54.9	67.5	71.9	67.8
	Not Stated	0.2	0.5	4.7	12.9	5.6			4.6
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0
	Flow	456	575	616	326	443	274	210	152
Argentina	I		10.7	8.5	11.1	18.7	16.3	15.8	12.1
	II		4.3	6.3	5.8	9.2	10.1	10.1	13.5
	III		25.7	24.9	23.1	24.3	28.4	31.6	28.4
	IV		58.8	60.3	60.1	47.0	43.8	42.5	43.3
	Not Stated		0.5			0.8	1.4		2.8
	%		100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
	Flow		187	189	208	251	208	247	141

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Brazil	I	12.8	12.6	13.5	9.8	13.7	13.6	15.7	15.0
	II	8.8	9.4	8.4	10.7	6.3	7.6	12.5	18.2
	III	27.2	22.4	24.3	25.0	24.0	25.8	23.7	28.6
	IV	51.2	55.1	53.5	54.5	55.3	49.5	47.0	35.0
	Not Stated		0.5	0.4		0.7	3.5	1.0	3.2
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
	Flow	125	214	251	244	300	198	287	220
Mexico	I					26.1	23.0	27.7	22.7
	II					10.4	20.0	14.2	14.7
	III					20.9	22.0	26.5	24.5
	IV					41.7	34.0	31.6	38.0
	Not Stated					0.8	1.0		
	%					99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9
	Flow					115	100	155	163
Turkey	I		50.7	33.5	28.3	39.1	33.3	28.8	28.8
	II		9.7	9.2	5.6	11.3	11.4	11.5	15.2
	III		22.4	26.6	34.3	36.1	35.2	28.1	33.6
	IV		17.2	30.3	31.8	13.5	18.6	30.2	16.8
	Not Stated			0.5			1.4	1.4	5.6
	%		100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0
	Flow		134	218	198	230	210	139	125
China	I	45.6	35.4	30.6	38.7	40.9	38.6	28.5	23.5
	II	8.7	8.5	11.5	14.8	18.5	16.4	13.4	16.8
	III	19.1	24.8	30.5	30.5	26.0	24.3	24.0	27.1
	IV	26.2	30.9	27.3	15.8	13.8	20.5	33.7	29.5
	Not Stated	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.4	3.1
	%	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0
	Flow	366	508	1040	1435	2406	2746	3259	2172

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
India	I	56.4	45.7	48.4	50.1	51.9	48.4	38.0	30.4
	II	10.3	9.6	11.4	12.2	10.6	12.8	10.7	12.0
	III	15.5	22.5	21.8	22.8	22.8	23.0	31.8	20.8
	IV	17.5	22.1	17.7	14.4	12.8	15.8	19.1	32.2
	Not Stated	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.4	1.9		0.3	4.6
	%	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
	Flow	291	530	1092	1074	1802	1318	2631	2566
Japan	I				31.6	33.6	31.4	29.6	24.4
	II				7.1	10.3	9.2	10.2	14.0
	III				27.9	28.6	26.5	23.9	24.0
	IV				33.0	27.4	33.0	35.9	36.5
	Not Stated				0.3			0.5	1.0
	%				99.9	99.9	100.1	100.1	99.9
	Flow				294	583	437	443	520
West Indies	I	15.7	17.5	18.1	19.5	13.7	16.0	13.0	10.6
	II	6.9	5.2	7.6	9.2	9.8	9.5	9.7	10.8
	III	38.8	34.8	34.0	34.9	34.8	36.6	35.7	34.9
	IV	38.6	42.2	40.3	35.9	38.3	37.8	40.7	39.4
	Not Stated		0.3		0.3	3.5	0.2	0.9	4.3
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0
	Flow	1690	1473	2074	2565	5801	4826	8223	7612
Pakistan	I		57.4	50.7	56.3	63.8	42.4	35.9	30.8
	II		9.2	13.1	10.8	10.3	21.0	14.4	17.3
	III		19.1	25.4	22.9	15.0	23.6	31.6	29.1
	IV		12.1	9.9	9.6	10.6	12.9	16.2	15.8
	Not Stated		2.1	1.0	0.3	0.3		1.8	7.1
	%		99.9	100.1	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.9	100.1
	Flow		141	213	323	340	309	548	468

		1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Phillipines	I					23.3	21.2	13.7	13.6
	II					12.2	19.3	13.7	20.3
	III					50.0	47.7	48.6	53.4
	IV					14.4	11.8	23.6	12.1
	Not Stated							0.3	0.7
	%					99.9	100.0	99.9	100.1
	Flow					2632	2288	2520	2429

NOTE: No Class Proportions Were Shown If Less Than 100 Immigrants Immigrated.

Chart Series 2: The Percentage Level of the 3 Major Sources of Immigrants of an Intended Occupation

Intended Occupational		Ethnicity				Country of Former Residence		
Class I		1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
School Teachers	Flow	1300	1250	1396	1480	787	1206	1843
	1. Major Source	BR. 861	BR. 698	BR. 691	BR. 667	BR. 307	BR. 486	BR. 620
	2. Major Source	US. 202	US. 298	US. 390	US. 459	US. 184	US. 199	US. 389
	3. Major Source	FR. 37	NETH. 35	E.IND 58	E.IND 85	FR./WI 37	AUS. 96	AUS. 157
	Total 1.2.3.	1100	1031	1139	1211	528	781	1166
	% Flow	84.6	82.5	81.6	81.8	67.1	64.8	63.3
Professors & Principals (with S. Teachers until 1962)	Flow					390	539	672
	1. Major Source					US. 174	US. 280	US. 267
	2. Major Source					BR. 95	BR. 160	BR. 195
	3. Major Source					FR. 25	INDIA 34	FR. 27
	Total 1.2.3					294	402	489
	% Flow					75.4	74.6	72.8
Physicians & Surgeons	Flow	394	439	441	445	530	681	668
	1. Major Source	BR. 202	BR. 182	BR. 162	BR. 143	BR. 130	BR. 220	BR. 243
	2. Major Source	US. 52	US. 66	US. 84	US. 67	US. 97	US. 143	US. 60
	3. Major Source	FR. 37	CH. 29	SP. 32	SP. 24	OC/NBR 79	OC 75	OC. 52
	Total 1.2.3	291	277	278	234	306	438	355
	% Flow	73.9	63.1	63.0	52.6	57.7	63.8	53.1
Professional Engineers	Flow	1010	783	725	547	967	1198	1476
	1. Major Source	BR. 488	BR. 335	BR. 325	BR. 206	BR. 389	BR. 569	BR. 684
	2. Major Source	US. 146	US. 165	US. 144	US. 113	US 208	US. 173	US. 220
	3. Major Source	NETH. 60	CHIN. 32	NETH. 40	E. IND 31	INDIA 37	GER. 50	AUSTR 66
	Total 1.2.3	694	532	509	356	634	792	970
	% Flow	68.7%	67.9%	70.2%	64.0%	65.6%	66.1%	65.7%

Class I			1965		1966		1967		1968		1969		1970
School Teachers	Flow		2408		3465		5388		5965		5922		4157
	1. Major Source	BR.	803	BR.	1229	BR.	1751	BR.	1825	BR.	1598	US.	1161
	2. Major Source	US.	500	US.	644	US.	965	US.	1227	US.	1248	BR.	815
	3. Major Source	AUS.	204	AUS.	293	AUS.	538	AUS.	546	INDIA	584	W.I.	393
	Total 1.2.3		1534		2166		3254		3598		3430		2369
	% Flow		63.7		62.5		60.4		60.3		57.9		57.0
Professors & Principals	Flow		1084		1410		1986		2280		2398		1886
	1. Major Source	US.	477	US.	615	US.	857	US.	1013	US.	1040	US.	918
	2. Major Source	BR.	271	BR.	353	BR.	457	BR.	545	BR.	499	BR.	284
	3. Major Source	INDIA	72	INDIA	76	INDIA	100	CH.	88	INDIA	156	FR.	105
	Total 1.2.3		820		1044		1414		1646		1695		1307
	% Flow		75.6		74.0		71.2		72.2		70.7		69.3
Physicians & Surgeons	Flow		792		995		1213		1277		1347		1113
	1. Major Source	BR.	281	BR.	355	BR.	357	BR.	378	BR.	419	BR.	350
	2. Major Source	COUN.	141	OC.	174	CH.	108	CH.	123	INDIA	148	US.	87
	3. Major Source	US.	42	US.	58	OC.	101	OC.	95	CH.	92	OC.	76
	Total 1.2.3		464		587		566		596		659		513
	% Flow		58.6		59.0		46.7		46.7		48.9		46.1
Professional Engineers	Flow		2254		3210		3704		2814		2739		2186
	1. Major Source	BR.	949	BR.	1420	BR.	1308	BR.	775	BR.	744	BR.	571
	2. Major Source	US.	307	US.	284	US.	280	US.	310	US.	404	US.	393
	3. Major Source	OC.	154	OC.	237	INDIA	278	CH.	230	INDIA	224	INDIA	175
	Total 1.2.3		1410		1941		1866		1315		1372		1139
	% Flow		62.6		60.5		50.4		46.7		50.1		52.7

Class I		1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964
Draughtsmen	Flow		538		378		480		370		506		755		957
	1. Major Source	BR.	264	BR.	174	BR.	225	BR.	164	BR.	283	BR.	463	BR.	568
	2. Major Source	GER.	51	GER.	44	GER.	52	US.	38	GER.	40	GER.	54	FR.	58
	3. Major Source	NETH.	46	US.	32	US.	46	GER.	36	US.	25	FR.	50	GER.	46
	Total 1.2.3		361		250		323		238		348		567		672
	% Flow		67.1		66.1		67.3		64.3		68.8		75.1		70.2
Class II															
Managerial	Flow		944		837		825		896		1093		1159		1212
	1. Ethnicity	US.	565	US.	532	US.	550	US.	622	US.	626	US.	608	US.	655
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	187	BR.	126	BR.	126	BR.	102	BR.	178	BR.	183	BR.	208
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	29	GER.	23	GER.	24	GER.	24	FR.	31	OC.	60	OC.	52
	Total 1.2.3.		781		681		700		748		830		851		915
	% Flow		82.7		81.4		84.8		83.5		75.9		73.4		75.5
Laboratory	Flow		344		310		363		341		227		310		674
Technicians &	1. Ethnicity	BR.	139	BR.	140	BR.	137	BR.	130	BR.	79	BR.	124	BR.	267
Assistants	2. Ethnicity	GER.	48	GER.	36	GER.	45	US.	50	US.	26	GER.	31	GER.	69
(After 1961	3. Ethnicity	NETH.	30	US.	31	US.	35	GER.	35	GER.	21	US.	25	SWITZ.	44
Science Tech.)	Total 1.2.3		217		207		217		215		126		180		380
	% Flow		63.1		66.8		59.8		63.0		55.5		58.1		56.4
Medical &	Flow										227		242		193
Dental Tech.	1. Ethnicity									BR.	82	BR.	76	BR.	59
(Before 1962	2. Ethnicity									US.	33	US.	38	US.	21
Part of	3. Ethnicity									WI	19	GER.	20	AUST.	15
Above)	Total 1.2.3										134		134		95
	% Flow										59.0		55.4		42.2
Bookkeepers,	Flow										522		620		1028
Cashiers	1. Ethnicity									BR.	207	BR.	219	BR.	359
	2. Ethnicity									US.	67	US.	80	US.	118
	3. Ethnicity									GREECE	26	+WI	44	EGYPT	88
	Total 1.2.3										300		343		565
	% Flow										57.5		55.3		55.0

Class I			1965		1966		1967		1968		1969		1970
Draughtsmen	Flow		1589		2525		2830		2049		944		1029
	1. Major Source	BR.	813	BR.	1184	BR.	1049	BR.	543	BR.	344	BR.	302
	2. Major Source	GER.	116	FR.	211	FR.	226	AUST.	268	CZECH/	81	US	97
	3. Major Source	FR.	101	ITALY	200	ITALY	219	YUG.	124	WI. US	46	WI.	68
	Total 1.2.3		1030		1595		1494		935		471		467
Class II	% Flow		64.8		63.2		52.8		45.6		49.9		45.4
Managerial	Flow		1728		2292		3023		2385		2566		3095
	1. Ethnicity	US.	887	US	973	US.	962	US.	796	US.	965	US.	1194
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	340	BR.	674	BR.	878	BR.	556	BR.	538	BR.	643
	3. Ethnicity	OC.	85	OC/FR	78	FR.	116	CH.	205	CH.	174	OC.	196
	Total 1.2.3		1312		1725		1956		1557		1668		2033
	% Flow		75.9		75.3		64.7		65.3		65.0		65.7
Science	Flow		1044		1871		2954		2405		1960		1953
Technicians	1. Ethnicity	BR.	386	BR.	644	BR.	796	*AUST.	542	BR.	470	BR.	409
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	111	GER.	198	GER.	354	BR.	415	US.	149	US.	211
	3. Ethnicity	OC.	90	OC.	180	PHIL.	218	GER.	199	AUST.	138	OC.	145
	Total 1.2.3		587		1022		1368		1156		757		765
	% Flow		56.2		54.6		46.3		48.1		38.6		39.2
Medical &	Flow		309		389		431		1169		969		905
Dental	1. Ethnicity	BR.	118	BR.	151	BR.	138	PHIL.	263	PHIL.	180	PHIL.	202
Technicians	2. Ethnicity	US.	33	OC.	55	US.	41	BR.	204	BR.	169	BR.	150
	3. Ethnicity	OC.	32	GER.	32	PHIL.	36	*AUS.	187	US.	108	US.	101
	Total 1.2.3		183		238		215		654		457		453
	% Flow		59.2		61.2		49.9		55.9		47.2		50.1
Bookkeepers,	Flow		1345		1786		2565		2112		1639		1595
Cashiers	1. Ethnicity	BR.	499	BR.	709	BR.	882	BR.	585	BR.	341	BR.	308
	2. Ethnicity	US.	164	US.	173	WI	241	US	196	WI	274	WI	304
	3. Ethnicity	OC.	93	WI	102	US	225	WI	194	US	226	US	231
	Total 1.2.3		756		984		1348		975		841		843
	% Flow		56.2		55.1		52.6		46.2		51.3		52.9

* Czechoslovakian refugees

Class III			1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964
Graduate Nurses	Flow		1145		1073		1290		1108		1621		1879		1967
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	785	BR.	709	BR.	879	BR.	715	BR.	904	BR.	971	BR.	950
	2. Ethnicity	US.	105	US.	97	US.	119	NEGRO	133	WI.	156	US	206	US.	177
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	52	NEGRO	59	NEGRO	80	US.	89	US.	114	AUS.	145	AUS.	160
	Total 1.2.3		942		865		1078		937		1174		1322		1287
	% Flow		82.3		80.6		83.6		84.6		72.4		70.4		65.4
Stenographers & Typists	Flow		3036		2329		2567		2146		2315		2749		3540
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	2108	BR.	1588	BR.	1730	BR.	1342	BR.	1182	BR.	1360	BR.	1658
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	223	US.	177	GER.	228	US.	215	US.	224	US.	209	US	350
	3. Ethnicity	US.	193	GER.	159	US.	209	GER.	178	GER.	162	WI	208	AUS.	189
	Total 1.2.3		2524		1924		2167		1735		1568		1777		2197
	% Flow		83.1		82.6		84.4		80.8		67.7		64.6		62.1
Sales Clerks (& Salesmen after 1962)	Flow		815		750		786		407		590		1253		1807
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	421	BR.	344	BR.	378	BR.	192	BR.	228	BR.	540	BR.	765
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	85	GER.	137	GER.	142	GER.	69	US.	84	US.	187	US.	221
	3. Ethnicity	US.	59	US.	51	US.	45	US.	29	GER.	56	GER.	83	EGYPT	132
	Total 1.2.3.		565		532		565		290		368		810		1118
	% Flow		69.3		70.9		71.9		71.3		62.4		64.6		61.9
Clerical, Other	Flow		3709		3130		3293		2086		1863		2692		3179
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	1826	BR.	1455	BR.	1495	BR.	879	BR.	741	BR.	1045	BR.	1196
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	466	GER.	470	GER.	508	GER.	346	GER.	287	GER.	386	GER.	345
	3. Ethnicity	US.	303	US.	284	US.	291	US.	245	US	163	US.	169	US.	212
	Total 1.2.3		2595		2209		2294		1470		1191		1600		1753
	% Flow		70.0		70.6		69.7		70.5		63.9		59.4		55.1
Storekeepers, Shipping Clerks	Flow										198		125		184
	1. Ethnicity									BR.	80	BR.	57	BR.	71
	2. Ethnicity									US.	26	US.	18	US.	23
	3. Ethnicity									GER.	16	DEN/OC	5	FR.	13
	Total 1.2.3										122		80		107
	% Flow										61.6		64.0		58.2

Class III			1965		1966		1967		1968		1969		1970
Graduate Nurses	Flow		2829		3732		4262		3375		3248		2274
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	1002	BR.	1282	BR.	1380	BR.	1120	BR.	914	BR.	666
	2. Ethnicity	OC.	755	OC.	1225	PHIL.	1140	PHIL.	727	PHIL.	757	PHIL.	518
	3. Ethnicity	US.	211	AUS.	219	AUS.	306	AUS.	245	US.	253	AUS.	222
	Total 1.2.3		1968		2726		2826		2092		1924		1406
	% Flow		69.6		73.0		66.3		62.0		59.2		61.8
Stenographers & Typists	Flow		4413		6250		8254		6236		5531		5530
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	2070	BR.	2989	BR.	3851	BR.	2358	BR.	1690	BR.	1641
	2. Ethnicity	US.	471	US.	543	WI.	721	US.	602	WI.	951	WI.	679
	3. Ethnicity	W.I.	241	WI.	340	US.	549	WI.	581	US.	661	US.	669
	Total 1.2.3		2782		3872		5121		3541		3302		3079
	% Flow		63.0		62.0		62.0		56.8		59.7		55.7
Sales Clerks (& Salesmen after 1962)	Flow		2318		2798		2797		1982		2116		2102
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	1051	BR.	1382	BR.	1086	BR.	727	BR.	515	BR.	424
	2. Ethnicity	US.	226	US.	275	US.	289	US.	246	US.	342	US.	423
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	129	GER.	141	FR.	161	GER.	115	WI.	191	WI.	216
	Total 1.2.3		1446		1798		1536		1088		1048		1063
	% Flow		62.4		64.3		54.9		54.9		49.5		50.6
Clerical, Other	Flow		3758		4539		4966		4023		4826		4708
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	1472	BR.	1978	BR.	1893	BR.	1002	BR.	974	BR.	879
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	412	GER.	403	WI.	382	WI.	523	WI.	946	WI.	844
	3. Ethnicity	US.	307	US.	313	GER.	352	US.	417	US.	462	US.	595
	Total 1.2.3		2191		2694		2627		1942		2382		2318
	% Flow		58.3		59.4		52.9		48.3		49.4		49.2
Storekeepers, Shipping Clerks	Flow		403		660		824		280		824		310
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	169	BR.	309	BR.	312	BR.	69	BR.	312	US.	86
	2. Ethnicity	US.	38	US.	60	US.	73	US.	55	US.	73	BR.	73
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	31	GER.	35	WI.	62	GER.	20	WI.	62	WI.	35
	Total 1.2.3		238		404		447		144		447		194
	% Flow		59.1		61.2		54.2		51.4		54.2		62.6

Class III			1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964
Painters, Glaziers	Flow		747		575		622		388		356		331		705
	1. Ethnicity	GER.	254	GER.	179	GER.	172	FER.	84	GER.	65	BR.	88	BR.	163
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	102	BR.	88	BR.	103	ITAL.	65	BR.	65	GER.	59	ITAL.	101
	3. Ethnicity	NETH.	74	ITAL.	60	ITAL.	60	BR.	57	GREE.	44	GREE.	36	FR.	69
	Total 1.2.3		430		327		335		206		174		183		333
	% Flow		57.6		56.9		53.9		53.1		48.9		55.3		47.2
Plumbers	Flow		425		337		331		192		170		324		348
	1. Ethnicity	GER.	123	GER.	91	GER.	97	GER.	51	BR.	40	BR.	105	BR.	123
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	95	BR.	85	BR.	78	BR.	44	GER.	28	GER.	62	GER.	45
	3. Ethnicity	US.	31	ITAL.	23	ITAL.	25	ITAL.	17	GREE.	22	GREE.	31	ITAL.	42
	Total 1.2.3		249		199		200		112		90		198		210
	% Flow		58.6		59.1		60.4		58.3		52.9		61.1		60.3
Electricians	Flow		952		697		737		426		463		720		747
	1. Ethnicity	GER.	239	GER.	148	BR.	171	GER.	88	BR.	92	BR.	192	BR.	239
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	168	BR.	139	GER.	142	BR.	73	GREE.	74	GER.	113	GER.	76
	3. Ethnicity	NETH.	96	ITAL.	73	GREE.	65	ITAL.	62	GER.	60	GREE.	105	ITAL.	75
	Total 1.2.3		503		360		378		223		226		410		390
	% Flow		52.8		51.6		51.3		52.3		48.8		56.9		52.2
Machinists	Flow		505		444		358		269		1767		3067		3583
	1. Ethnicity	GER.	266	GER.	222	GER.	171	GER.	108	BR.	595	BR.	1265	BR.	1490
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	61	BR.	56	BR.	66	BR.	43	GER.	385	GER.	641	GER.	495
	3. Ethnicity	NETH.	38	NETH.	30	NETH.	19	US.	25	ITAL.	178	ITAL.	217	FR.	335
	Total 1.2.3		365		308		256		176		1158		2123		2320
	% Flow		72.3		69.4		71.5		65.4		65.5		69.2		64.8
Mechanics, Repairmen	Flow		1206		909		1055		512		1286		1759		1866
	1. Ethnicity	GER.	313	GER.	186	GER.	181	ITAL.	125	GER.	187	BR.	300	BR.	333
	2. Ethnicity	ITAL.	177	ITAL.	156	ITAL.	136	GER.	68	ITAL.	187	GER.	286	ITAL.	218
	3. Ethnicity	BR.	104	BR.	79	BR.	108	BR.	52	BR.	184	ITAL.	175	GER.	163
	Total 1.2.3		594		421		425		245		558		761		714
	% Flow		49.3		46.3		40.3		47.9		43.4		43.3		38.3

Class III			1965		1966		1967		1968		1969		1970
Painters, Glaziers	Flow		736		868		929		284		455		554
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	225	BR.	303	BR.	239	BR.	66	BR.	96	BR.	103
	2. Ethnicity	ITALY	125	ITALY	125	ITALY	138	GREECE	52	GREECE	87	PORT.	102
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	81	FR.	80	GER.	120	GER.	39	ITALY	59	GREECE	67
	Total 1.2.3		431		508		497		157		242		242
	% Flow		58.6		58.5		53.5		53.3		53.2		43.7
Plumbers	Flow		505		789		1007		679		581		512
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	205	BR.	353	BR.	394	BR.	170	BR.	138	BR.	139
	2. Ethnicity	ITALY	67	ITALY	125	ITALY	126	ITALY	120	WI.	90	WI.	62
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	61	GER.	59	GER.	91	GER.	75	GREECE	70	GR/ITA	47
	Total 1.2.3		333		537		611		365		298		248
	% Flow		65.9		68.1		60.7		53.8		51.3		48.4
Electricians	Flow		1030		1681		2244		1793		1190		1167
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	358	BR.	666	BR.	772	BR.	363	BR.	299	BR.	308
	2. Ethnicity	ITALY	132	ITALY	252	ITALY	292	ITALY	239	WI.	111	WI.	106
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	126	GER.	129	GER.	188	AUST.	181	GR/ITA	108	GREECE	99
	Total 1.2.3		616		1047		1252		783		518		513
	% Flow		59.8		62.3		55.8		43.7		43.5		44.0
Machinists	Flow		5072		8045		8954		6667		4364		4207
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	1815	BR.	3408	BR.	2891	BR.	1385	BR.	1150	BR.	1039
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	913	ITALY	1074	ITALY	1201	ITALY	938	ITALY	512	ITALY	371
	3. Ethnicity	ITALY	527	GER.	820	GER.	1095	GER.	797	WI.	289	GER.	345
	Total 1.2.3		3255		5312		5187		3120		1951		1755
	% Flow		64.2		66.0		57.9		46.8		44.7		41.7
Mechanics, Repairmen	Flow		2631		3664		4754		4906		4309		4149
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	534	BR.	993	BR.	1091	BR.	806	WI.	639	BR.	651
	2. Ethnicity	ITALY	431	ITALY	652	ITALY	714	ITALY	673	BR.	558	WI.	525
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	282	GER.	315	GER.	494	AUST.	387	ITALY	403	OC.	435
	Total 1.2.3		1247		1960		2299		1866		1600		1611
	% Flow		47.4		53.5		48.4		38.0		37.1		38.8

Class III			1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964
Electrical & Electrical Workers	Flow										310		563		766
	1. Ethnicity										BR. 83		BR. 181		BR. 243
	2. Ethnicity										GER. 43		GER. 85		GER. 94
	3. Ethnicity										ITAL. 28		GREE. 45		FR. 52
	Total 1.2.3										154		311		389
Class IV	% Flow										49.7		55.2		50.8
Carpenters	Flow		1638		1224		1246		634		714		1060		1336
	1. Ethnicity	ITAL.	399	ITAL.	338	ITAL.	245	ITAL.	202	ITAL.	208	ITAL.	222	ITAL.	337
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	269	GER.	175	BR.	198	BR.	103	BR.	93	BR.	179	BR.	234
	3. Ethnicity	BR.	192	BR.	158	GER.	139	GREE.	56	GREE.	77	GREE.	131	GREE.	106
	Total 1.2.3		860		671		582		361		378		532		677
	% Flow		52.5		59.7		46.7		56.9		52.9		50.2		50.7
Bricklayers	Flow		1385		1124		942		583		618		935		1176
	1. Ethnicity	ITAL.	583	ITAL.	588	ITAL.	376	ITAL.	357	ITAL.	317	ITAL.	376	ITAL.	576
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	402	GER.	256	GER.	209	GER.	78	GER.	89	GER.	164	FR.	149
	3. Ethnicity	YUG.	136	BR.	59	BR.	67	YUG.	37	FR.	53	FR.	116	GER.	114
	Total 1.2.3		1121		903		652		472		459		656		839
	% Flow		80.9		80.3		69.2		81.0		74.3		70.2		71.3
Other Construction Workers	Flow		301								82		75		99
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	86								US. 23		BR. 23		BR. 37
	2. Ethnicity	US.	64								ITAL. 14		US. 14		US. 21
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	53								BR. 14		GER. 11		GER. 6
	Total 1.2.3		203								51		48		64
	% Flow		67.4								62.2		64.0		64.7
Tailors & Furriers	Flow		573		491		468		328		1467		1935		2501
	1. Ethnicity	ITAL.	227	ITAL.	186	ITAL.	154	ITAL.	158	ITAL.	483	ITAL.	756	ITAL.	902
	2. Ethnicity	GREE.	68	GREE.	65	GREE.	67	GREE.	52	GREE.	411	GREE.	406	GREE.	510
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	45	GER.	40	GER.	47	POL.	23	GER.	107	GER.	146	BR.	216
	Total 1.2.3		340		291		268		233		1001		1308		1628
	% Flow		59.3		59.3		57.3		71.0		68.2		67.6		65.1

Class III			1965		1966		1967		1968		1969		1970
Electrical & Electrical Workers	Flow		1157		1794		2200		1355		816		689
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	366	BR.	719	BR.	709	BR.	264	BR.	161	BR.	124
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	157	ITALY	171	GER.	228	AUS.	141	WI.	96	WI.	104
	3. Ethnicity	ITALY	107	GER.	166	ITALY	204	GER.	130	US.	69	US.	73
	Total 1.2.3		630		1056		1141		535		326		301
Class IV	% Flow		54.5		58.9		51.9		39.5		40.0		43.7
Carpenters	Flow		1729		2467		2700		970		1352		1551
	1. Ethnicity	ITALY	474	BR.	692	BR.	792	ITALY	186	BR.	249	PORT.	285
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	368	ITALY	561	ITALY	428	BR.	135	PORT.	220	BR.	276
	3. Ethnicity	GREE	153	GREE	167	GREE	234	GREE	96	ITALY	118	WI.	137
	Total 1.2.3		995		1420		1454		417		587		698
	% Flow		54.4		57.6		53.9		43.0		43.4		45.0
Bricklayers	Flow		1829		2470		2381		1917		1247		1256
	1. Ethnicity	ITALY	1000	ITALY	1404	ITALY	1250	ITALY	993	ITALY	446	ITALY	357
	2. Ethnicity	FR.	211	FR.	231	FR.	224	FR.	196	PORT.	171	PORT.	249
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	177	BR.	226	GER.	218	GER.	148	FR.	139	YUG.	123
	Total 1.2.3		1388		1861		1692		1337		756		729
	% Flow		75.9		75.3		71.1		69.7		60.6		58.0
Other Construction Workers	Flow		166		243		243		1520		792		573
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	64	BR.	112	BR.	73	ITALY	791	ITALY	289	ITALY	154
	2. Ethnicity	GREE	23	GREE	30	US.	34	GREE	204	GREE	174	US.	61
	3. Ethnicity	US.	21	US.	25	GREE	20	PORT	110	BR.	60	BR.	60
	Total 1.2.3		108		167		127		1105		523		275
	% Flow		65.1		68.7		52.3		72.7		66.0		48.0
Tailors & Furriers	Flow		3119		3791		4674		3910		3907		3246
	1. Ethnicity	ITALY	1031	ITALY	1397	ITALY	1597	ITALY	1394	ITALY	686	WI.	574
	2. Ethnicity	GREE	612	GREE	783	GREE	1070	GREE	674	GREE	569	PORT	498
	3. Ethnicity	BR.	306	BR.	372	BR.	470	BR.	281	WI.	498	ITALY	471
	Total 1.2.3		1949		2552		3137		2349		1753		1543
	% Flow		62.5		67.3		67.1		60.1		44.9		47.5

Class IV			1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964
Wood Workers	Flow										373		574		573
	1. Ethnicity										GER.	82	GER.	155	BR. 98
	2. Ethnicity										ITAL.	81	ITAL.	88	ITAL. 85
	3. Ethnicity										GREE.	52	GREE.	87	GREE. 78
	Total 1.2.3										215		330		261
	% Flow										57.6		57.5		45.6
Road Transport	Flow										221		297		380
	1. Ethnicity										BR.	61	BR.	127	BR. 169
	2. Ethnicity										US.	25	GREE.	27	GREE. 38
	3. Ethnicity										GREE.	24	GER.	24	GER. 22
	Total 1.2.3										110		178		229
	% Flow										49.8		59.9		60.3
Food Workers	Flow										524		742		959
	1. Ethnicity										ITAL.	98	BR.	124	BR. 197
	2. Ethnicity										GER.	84	GER.	121	ITAL. 144
	3. Ethnicity										GREE.	75	ITAL.	94	GER. 111
	Total 1.2.3										257		339		452
	% Flow										49.1		45.7		47.1
General Labourers	Flow		9388		8940		7482		3982		3145		3559		5737
	1. Ethnicity	ITAL.	6199	ITAL.	6071	ITAL.	4094	ITAL.	2416	ITAL.	2272	ITAL.	2544	ITAL.	4050
	2. Ethnicity	GREE.	1109	GREE.	1055	GREE.	774	POL.	240	GER.	143	GER.	158	BR.	324
	3. Ethnicity	BR.	324	GER.	284	GER.	598	YUG.	217	BR.	136	BR.	158	PORT.	271
	Total 1.2.3		7632		7410		5466		2873		2551		2860		4645
	% Flow		81.3		82.9		73.1		72.1		81.1		80.4		81.0
Farmers & Workers	Flow		4914		4829		5216		2193		1923		2393		2234
	1. Ethnicity	ITAL.	1324	PORT.	1174	PORT.	1368	PORT.	321	PORT.	368	PORT.	505	PORT.	501
	2. Ethnicity	YUG.	734	ITAL.	1152	ITAL.	754	GREE.	309	US.	232	GREE.	296	GREE.	287
	3. Ethnicity	BR.	488	BR.	406	BR.	516	BR.	242	ITAL.	204	ITAL	260	BR.	251
	Total 1.2.3		2546		2732		2638		872		804		1061		1039
	% Flow		51.8		56.5		50.6		39.8		41.8		44.4		46.5

Class IV			1965		1966		1967		1968		1969		1970
Wood Workers	Flow		978		1242		1298		1824		1060		895
	1. Ethnicity	ITALY	264	ITALY	396	ITALY	325	ITALY	406	ITALY	187	PORT.	149
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	162	BR.	201	GER.	185	BR.	317	BR.	131	GREE.	114
	3. Ethnicity	BR.	120	GER.	130	BR.	174	GREE.	140	GREE.	121	ITALY	112
	Total 1.2.3		546		727		684		863		439		375
	% Flow		55.8		58.5		52.7		47.3		41.4		41.9
Road Transport	Flow		628		898		792		633		792		439
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	318	BR.	437	BR.	239	BR.	179	BR.	239	BR.	102
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	42	ITALY	143	ITALY	158	ITALY	97	ITALY	158	YUG.	48
	3. Ethnicity	ITALY	38	GREE.	55	GREE.	72	AUST.	75	GREE.	72	US.	44
	Total 1.2.3		398	q	635		469		351		469		194
	% Flow		63.4		70.7		59.2		55.5		59.2		44.2
Food Workers	Flow		1170		1478		1698		963		665		615
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	254	BR.	397	BR.	377	ITALY	193	ITALY	102	BR.	102
	2. Ethnicity	ITALY	203	ITALY	238	ITALY	242	BR.	149	BR.	99	PORT.	90
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	157	GER.	139	FR.	215	FR.	101	PORT.	61	ITALY	72
	Total 1.2.3		614		774		834		443		262		264
	% Flow		52.5		52.4		49.1		46.0		39.4		42.9
General Labourers	Flow		7112		7593		8792		2681		2018		1614
	1. Ethnicity	ITALY	4802	ITALY	4695	ITALY	4085	GREE.	789	GREE.	872	GREE.	613
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	473	BR.	577	GREE.	1462	ITALY	459	ITALY	185	ITALY	196
	3. Ethnicity	GER.	361	PORT.	456	PORT.	1097	BR.	276	BR.	144	US.	105
	Total 1.2.3		5636		5728		6641		1524		1201		914
	% Flow		79.2		75.4		75.5		56.8		59.5		56.6
Farmers & Workers	Flow		2362		3153		3203		3164		2283		2129
	1. Ethnicity	GREE.	415	GREE.	565	PORT.	592	BR.	391	PORT.	245	PORT.	382
	2. Ethnicity	PORT.	338	PORT.	546	BR.	464	ITALY	373	BR.	243	IND.	350
	3. Ethnicity	BR.	318	BR.	404	GREE.	396	POR/BR	275	US.	208	US.	238
	Total 1.2.3		1071		1515		1452		1039		696		970
	% Flow		45.3		48.0		45.3		32.8		30.5		45.6

Class IV			1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964
Cooks	Flow		421		364		391		286		397		513		555
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	74	GER.	60	GER.	69	GREE.	45	GREE.	62	BR.	93	BR.	97
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	74	BR.	45	BR.	59	ITAL.	40	FR.	55	GREE.	78	FR.	76
	3. Ethnicity	GREE.	59	GREE.	41	ITAL.	38	GER.	39	GER.	51	FR.	68	GREE.	75
	Total 1.2.3		207		146		166		124		168		239		248
	% Flow		49.2		40.1		42.5		43.4		42.3		46.6		44.7
Domestic Servants	Flow		7878		6714		5793		4318		3155		2833		2814
	1. Ethnicity	ITAL.	2179	ITAL.	2057	ITAL.	1495	ITAL.	1201	ITAL.	829	ITAL.	573	ITAL.	561
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	1557	GER.	1166	GER.	978	GER.	535	GER.	496	W.I.	360	GER.	352
	3. Ethnicity	GREE.	1259	GREE.	947	GREE.	804	GREE.	525	GREE.	392	GER.	354	W.I.	347
	Total 1.2.3		4995		4170		3277		2261		1717		1287		1260
	% Flow		63.4		62.1		56.6		52.4		55.4		45.4		44.8
Nurses Aides	Flow		752		723		627		573		292		213		29
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	296	BR.	245	BR.	215	BR.	223	BR.	87	BR.	61	NETH.	6
	2. Ethnicity	GER.	110	GER.	104	NETH.	89	NETH.	66	US.	39	US.	28	BR.	5
	3. Ethnicity	NETH.	94	NETH.	104	GER.	82	GER.	61	GER.	36	W.I.	22	HA/GR	3
	Total 1.2.3		500		453		386		350		162		111		14
	% Flow														
Waiters, Porters	Flow										989		1252		1463
	1. Ethnicity									ITAL.	357	ITAL.	373	ITAL.	361
	2. Ethnicity									BR.	162	BR.	200	BR.	256
	3. Ethnicity									GREE.	74	GREE.	93	FR.	133
	Total 1.2.3										593		666		750
	% Flow										60.0		53.2		51.3
Other Service Workers	Flow		1729		1312		1277		749		839		1093		1311
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	627	BR.	357	BR.	380	BR.	187	ITAL.	235	ITAL.	312	ITAL.	360
	2. Ethnicity	CH.	204	CH.	170	US.	160	US.	117	GREE.	148	BR.	181	BR.	267
	3. Ethnicity	GREE.	166	US.	133	GER.	143	GREE.	74	BR.	127	GREE.	164	GREE.	136
	Total 1.2.3		997		660		683		378		510		657		763
	% Flow		57.7		50.3		53.5		50.5		60.8		60.1		58.2

Class IV			1965		1966		1967		1968		1969		1970
Cooks	Flow		739		981		1387		1399		1292		1229
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	157	BR.	217	BR.	229	BR.	198	GREE.	167	BR.	162
	2. Ethnicity	FR.	95	FR.	172	FR.	208	GREE.	187	CH.	164	GREE.	157
	3. Ethnicity	GREE.	74	GREE.	92	GREE.	200	FR.	159	BR.	149	US.	130
	Total 1.2.3		326		481		637		544		480		449
	% Flow		44.1		49.0		45.9		38.9		37.2		36.5
Domestic Servants	Flow		3094		2789		2842		3408		3807		2985
	1. Ethnicity	ITALY	733	ITALY	511	WI.	1044	WI.	689	WI.	1197	WI.	847
	2. Ethnicity	WI.	412	WI.	475	BR.	275	BR.	334	BR.	461	BR.	403
	3. Ethnicity	BR.	316	BR.	296	GER.	217	NETH.	269	CH.	319	GREE.	343
	Total 1.2.3		1461		1282		1536		1292		1977		1593
	% Flow		47.2		46.0		54.0		37.9		51.9		53.4
Nurses Aides	Flow		325		603		1079		893		924		840
	1. Ethnicity	BR.	116	BR.	213	PHIL.	308	BR.	228	BR.	252	BR.	171
	2. Ethnicity	US.	49	US.	77	BR.	242	PHIL.	146	WI.	148	US.	140
	3. Ethnicity	WI.	28	OC.	74	WI.	121	US.	88	US.	122	WI.	116
	Total 1.2.3		193		364		671		462		522		427
	% Flow		59.4		60.4		62.2		51.7		56.5		50.8
Waiters, Porters	Flow		1568		1762		1830		1083		1090		1082
	1. Ethnicity	ITALY	386	BR.	342	FR.	323	BR.	125	BR.	121	US.	157
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	267	FR.	272	BR.	253	FR.	118	FR.	116	BR.	108
	3. Ethnicity	FR.	157	ITALY	184	GREE.	227	GREE.	115	GREE.	114	FR.	96
	Total 1.2.3		810		798		803		358		351		361
	% Flow		51.7		45.3		43.9		33.1		32.2		33.4
Other Service Workers	Flow		1543		1922		2865		2007		1546		1364
	1. Ethnicity	ITALY	390	BR.	540	ITALY	1009	ITALY	504	ITALY	291	BR.	272
	2. Ethnicity	BR.	362	ITALY	399	BR.	584	BR.	391	BR.	285	ITALY	210
	3. Ethnicity	GREE.	183	GREE.	244	GREE.	377	GREE.	220	GREE.	189	US.	162
	Total 1.2.3		935		1183		1970		1115		765		644
	% Flow		60.6		61.6		68.8		55.6		49.5		47.2

Chart Series 3: The Percentage Level of the Three Major Intended Occupations of Immigrants by Ethnicity/ Country of Former Residence

Ethnicity	Flow	Major Intended Occupations 1958								Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
		1.		2.		3.					
British	15077	III	Typists	2108	III	Clerical, other	1826	I	Teachers	861	4795	31.8
United States[1]	4216	II	Managerial	565	III	Clerical, other	303	II	Sales	211	1079	25.6
French	1320	III	Clerical, o	102	III	Typist	90	IV	Servants	83	275	20.8
German	8431	IV	Servants	1557	III	Clerical, o	466	IV	Farm, Labour	434	2457	29.1
Austrian	544	IV	Servants	111	III	Clerical, o	332	IV	Labourers	19	162	29.8
Swiss	590	IV	Servants	117	III	Clerical, o	60	III	Mechanics	39	216	36.6
Belgian	455	IV	Farm Labour	56	IV	Labour	26	IV	Servant	24	106	23.3
Danish	964	IV	Farm Labour	262	IV	Servants	81	III	Clerical, o	64	407	42.2
Netherlander	3438	IV	Farm Labour	430	IV	Servants	428	III	Clerical, o	273	1131	32.9
Italian	12915	IV	Labour	6199	IV	Servant	2179	IV	Farm Labour	1324	9702	75.1
Greek	3887	IV	Servant	1252	IV	Labour	1109	?	Dressmaker	228	2589	66.6
Portugese	728	IV	Farm Labour	260	IV	Labour	95	IV	Carpenter	44	399	54.8
Yugoslavian	3075	IV	Farm Labour	734	IV	Servants	405	IV	Labour	248	1387	45.1
Polish	1157	IV	Servant	156	IV	Labour	138	IV	Farm Labour	111	405	35.0
East Indian	228	IV	Labour, g	77	I	Other Prof.	17	I	Teach & Prof.	15	109	47.8
Chinese	402	IV	Service, o	204	IV	Labour	29	IV	Servants	32	275	68.4
Negro	625	IV	Servant	266	III	Nurses	49	III	Clerical, o	34	349	55.8

[1]United States immigration is by country of former residence.

Ethnicity	Flow	1959 Major Intended Occupations 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
British [1]	11984	III Typists	1588	III Clerical, o	1455	I Teacher	698	3741	31.2
United States	4181	II Managerial	532	I Teachers	298	III Clerical, o	284	846	20.2
French	1042	III Clerical, o	82	IV Service, o	73	III Typist	72	227	21.8
German	6280	IV Servants	1166	III Clerical, o	470	IV Farm Labour	298	1934	30.8
Austrian	446	IV Servants	74	III Clerical, o	26	IV Service, o	23	123	27.6
Swiss	426	IV Farm Labour	49	IV Servants	47	III Clerical, o	42	138	32.4
Belgian	387	IV Farm Labour	89	III Clerical, o	18	? Cabinetmaker	17	124	32.0
Danish	789	IV Farm Labour	249	IV Servants	88	III Clerical, o	46	383	48.5
Netherlander	2471	IV Farm Labour	355	IV Servants	300	III Clerical, o	187	842	34.1
Italian	12231	IV Labour	6071	IV Servant	2057	IV Farm Labour	1152	9280	75.9
Greek	3425	IV Labour	1055	IV Servant	947	? Dressmaker	259	2261	66.0
Portugese	1848	IV Farm Labour	1174	IV Labour	211	IV Servant	121	1506	81.5
Yugoslavian	990	IV Farm Labour	153	IV Labour	146	IV Servant	137	436	44.0
Polish	1396	IV Servants	240	IV Labour	222	IV Farm Labour	162	624	44.7
East Indian	454	IV Labour	104	IV Farm Labour	77	I Teachers	31	212	46.7
Chinese	501	IV Service, o	170	IV Servants	49	I Physicians	29	248	49.5
Negro	805	IV Servants	345	III Clerical, o	68	III Nurse	59	472	58.6

[1] United States immigration is by country of former residence.

Ethnicity	Flow	1960 Major Intended Occupations 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
British	13246	III Typists	1730	III Clerical, o	1493	III Nurses	879	4102	31.0
United States[1]	4381	II Managerial	550	Teachers	390	III Clerical, o	291	891	20.3
French	1264	IV Farm Labour	111	III Typists	88	IV Servants, o	87	286	22.6
German	6716	IV Servant	978	IV Labour	598	IV Service, o.	508	2084	31.0
Austrian	611	IV Servant	96	III Clerical, o	32	IV Farm Labour	27	155	25.3
Swiss	520	IV Farm Labour	75	IV Servant	72	III Clerical, o	62	209	40.2
Belgian	364	IV Farm Labour	49	IV Service, o	23	III Auto Mech.	20	92	25.3
Danish	762	IV Farm Labour	243	IV Servant	67	III Clerical, o	52	362	47.5
Netherlander	2673	IV Farm Labour	356	IV Servant	332	IV Labour	237	925	34.6
Italian	8785	IV Labour	4094	IV Servants	1495	IV Farm Labour	754	6343	72.2
Greek	5357	IV Servants	804	IV Labour	774	IV Farm Labour	399	1977	58.9
Portugese	2185	IV Farm Labour	1368	IV Labour	238	IV Servants	137	1743	79.8
Yugoslavian	1942	IV Farm Labour	404	IV Labour	318	IV Servants	175	897	46.2
Polish	1175	IV Labour	175	IV Servant	156	IV Farm Labour	149	480	40.9
East Indian	417	IV Labour	128	I Teachers	58	I Physicians	25	211	50.6
Chinese	236	IV Service, o	32	I Physicians	20	IV Labour	15	67	28.4
Negro	832	IV Servants	341	III Nurses	80	III Clerical, o	69	490	58.9

[1]United States immigration is by country of former residence.

Ethnicity	Flow	1961 Major Intended Occupations 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
British	8247	III Typists	1342	III Clerical, o	879	III Nurses	715	2936	35.6
United States[1]	4202	II Managerial	622	I Teachers	459	III Clerical, o	245	1326	31.6
French	958	III Typists	84	IV Servants	74	IV Service, o			
						III Clerical, o	52	210	21.9
German	3586	IV Servants	535	IV Clerical, o	346	III Clerical, o	216	1097	30.6
Austrian	368	IV Servants	83	III Typist	29	IV Farm Labour	20	132	55.9
Swiss	460	IV Servants	96	III Clerical, o	57	IV Farm Labour	49	202	43.9
Belgian	293	IV Farm Labour	42	III Auto Mech.	20	I Teacher	18	80	27.3
Danish	352	IV Farm Labour	99	IV Servants	43	III Clerical, o	32	174	49.4
Netherlander	1114	IV Servants	237	IV Farm Labour	166	IV Nurses Aide	66	519	46.6
Italian	6179	IV Labour	2416	IV Servant	1201	III Brick & Stone Masons	357	3974	64.3
Greek	2236	IV Servants	525	IV Farm Labour	309	IV Labour	206	1040	46.5
Portugese	862	IV Farm Labour	321	IV Labour	185	IV Servants	83	589	68.3
Yugoslavian	1172	IV Labour	217	IV Farm Labour	201	IV Servant	186	604	51.5
Polish	905	IV Labour	240	IV Servant	102	IV Farm Labour	97	439	48.5
East Indian	400	IV Labour	116	I Teacher	85	I Physicians	21	222	55.5
Chinese	178	I Physicians	22	III Nurses	14	IV Service, o	14	50	28.1
Negro	810	IV Servants	331	III Nurses	133	IV Nurses Aides	50	514	63.5

[1]United States immigration is by country of former residence.

Country of Former Residence	Flow	1962 Major Intended Occupations 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
Britain	8963	III Typists	1182	III Nurses	904	III Clerical, o	741	2827	31.5
United States	4145	II Managerial	626	I Ministers	280	IV Farmers	232	1138	27.5
France	1534	III Typist	100	III Mechanic	100	III Machinist	98	298	19.4
Australia	821	III Typist	138	III Nurse	84	III Clerical, o	54	276	33.6
Ireland	291	III Nurses	34	III Typist	24	III Clerical, o	24	82	28.2
Germany	3330	IV Servant	496	III Machinist	385	III Clerical, o	287	1168	35.1
Austria	531	IV Servant	80	IV Labour	56	III Machinist	48	184	34.7
Switzerland	604	IV Servant	93	IV Farmer	48	III Typist	44	185	30.6
Belgium	325	III Mechanic	28	III Machinist	19	IV Service, o Servant Machinist	14	61	18.8
Denmark	367	IV Farmers	66	IV Servants	48	III Clerical, o	21	135	36.8
Netherlands	906	IV Servant	185	IV Farmer	139	III Clerical, o	66	390	43.0
Italy	6004	IV Labour	2272	IV Servant	829	IV Tailor	483	3584	59.7
Greece	2354	IV Tailor	411	IV Servant	392	IV Farmer	169	972	41.3
Portugal	899	IV Farmer	368	IV Labour	104	IV Servant	96	568	63.2
Yugoslavia	182	IV Labour	40	IV Farmer	25	IV Servant	23	88	48.4
Poland	463	IV Labour	77	IV Servant	61	IV Farmer	51	189	40.8
Egypt	512	III Clerical, o	57	III Typist	56	III Mechanics	35	148	28.9
Israel	217	III Mechanics	27	IV Tailor	24	II Bookkeeper	13	64	29.5
India, Ceylon & Pakistan	256	IV Labour	40	I Teacher	30	I Physician	23	93	36.3
West Indies	1147	IV Servant	286	III Nurse	166	III Typist	96	548	47.8

Country of Former Residence	Flow	1963 Major Intended Occupations 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
Britain	12386	III Typist	1360	III Machinist	1265	IV Clerical, o	1045	3670	29.6
United States	4210	II Managerial	608	I Ministers	261	III Typists	209	1078	25.6
France	2040	III Machinist	173	III Mechanic	156	III Typists	116	445	21.8
Australia	1079	III Typists	156	III Nurses	145	III Bricklayers I Teachers	96	397	36.8
Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Germany	4344	III Machinist	641	III Clerical, o	386	IV Servant	354	1381	31.8
Austria	563	IV Servants	70	IV Farmers	58	IV Labourers	42	170	30.2
Switzerland	824	IV Servants	95	III Clerical, o	74	III Machinists	58	227	27.5
Belgium	502	III Machinist	49	IV Servants	39	III Mechanics	35	123	24.5
Netherlands	978	IV Servants	168	IV Farmers	117	III Clerical, o	83	368	37.6
Italy	6618	IV Labour	2544	IV Servant	573	IV Bricklayer	376	3493	52.8
Greece	2849	IV Tailors	406	IV Servant	320	IV Farmer	296	1022	35.9
Portugal	1223	IV Farmer	505	IV Labour	123	IV Servant	113	741	60.6
Yugoslavia	143	IV Labour	22	IV Farm Labour	22	IV Servants	18	62	43.4
Poland	433	IV Labour	73	IV Farmer	66	IV Servants III Repairmen	31	170	39.3
Egypt	651	III Clerical, o	97	III Typists	91	III Sales Clerks	59	247	37.9
Israel	312	III Mechanics	32	III Machinists	25	II Bookkeepers IV Tailors	14	71	22.8
West Indies	1616	IV Servants	354	III Typists	207	III Clerical, o	153	714	44.2

Country of Former Residence	Flow	Major Intended Occupations 1964						Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
		1.		2.		3.			
Britain	15357	III Typist	1658	III Machinist	1490	III Clerical, o	1196	4340	28.3
United States	4921	II Managers	655	I S. Teacher	389	III Typist	350	1394	28.3
France	2843	III Machinist	335	III Typist	164	III Repairmen	154	655	23.0
Australia	1416	III Typist	189	III Nurses	160	I S. Teacher	157	506	35.7
Ireland	458	III Typist	35	III Clerical, o	34	IV Labour	26	95	21.7
Germany	3791	III Machinist	495	IV Servant	352	III Clerical, o	345	1192	31.4
Austria	811	IV Servant	84	III Machinist	82	IV Labour	65	231	28.5
Switzerland	1180	III Clerical, o	111	III Machinist	79	III Typist	78	268	22.7
Belgium	548	IV Servants	54	III Machinist	43	I S. Teacher	34	131	23.9
Italy	8831	IV Labour	4050	IV Tailor	902	IV Bricklayer	576	5528	62.2
Greece	2561	IV Tailor	510	IV Farm Labour	287	IV Servant	208	1005	39.2
Portugal	1694	IV Farm Labour	501	IV Labour	271	IV Servant	129	901	53.2
Yugoslavia	204	IV Waiters	34	IV Servants	29	IV Labour	27	90	44.1
Poland	629	IV Labour	83	IV Farm Labour	68	IV Tailor	53	204	32.4
Egypt	1029	III Typist	175	III Clerical, o	166	III Sales Clerk	132	473	46.0
						III Machinist			
Israel	480	III Mechanic	35	IV Tailor	32	III Typist	31	98	20.4
India	530	IV Labour	63	I S. Teacher	53	III Nurse	35	151	28.5
*China	508	IV Nurse	72	IV Cooks	58	I Doctors	35	165	32.5
West Indies	1473	IV Servant	347	III Typist	165	III Clerical, o	133	645	43.8

Country of Former Residence	Flow	Major Intended Occupations 1965						Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
		1.		2.		3.			
Britain	20715	III Typists	2070	III Machinists	1815	III Clerical, o	1472	5357	25.9
United States	6455	II Managerial	877	I S. Teachers	500	I Professors	477	1854	28.8
France	3165	III Machinists	336	IV Bricklayer	211	III Typists	175	722	22.8
Australia	1680	III Typist	217	I S. Teacher	204	III Nurse	193	614	36.5
Ireland	560	III Typist	57	IV Labourer	41	III Sales Clerk	39	137	24.5
Germany	5611	III Machinist	913	III Clerical, o	412	IV Labourer	361	1686	30.0
Austria	1168	IV Labour	161	III Machinist	118	IV Servant	102	381	32.6
Switzerland	1665	III Machinist	217	III Clerical, o	152	III Typist	98	467	28.1
Belgium	600	IV Servant	84	I S. Teachers	43	III Machinist	43	170	28.3
Italy	12135	IV Labour	4802	IV Tailors	1031	IV Bricklayer	1000	6833	56.3
Greece	3262	IV Tailors	612	IV Farm Labour	415	IV Servant	269	1296	39.7
Portugal	1614	IV Farm Labour	338	IV Labour	195	IV Tailor	146	679	42.1
Yugoslavia	206	IV Labour	34	IV Farm Labour	27	IV Servant	25	86	41.7
Poland	675	IV Labour	112	IV Tailor	54	IV Servant	44	210	31.1
Egypt	673	III Typist	115	III Sales Clerk	94	III Clerical, o	62	271	40.3
Israel	365	III Machinist	36	III Mechanic	33	IV Labour	26	95	26.0
India	1092	IV Labour	102	I S. Teacher	94	I Professors	72	268	24.5
China	1040	III Nurses	131	IV Cooks	65	III Clerical, o	61	257	24.7
West Indies	2074	IV Servants	412	III Typist	241	III Clerical, o	188	841	40.5

Country of Former Residence	Flow	1966 Major Intended Occupations 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
Britain	31545	III Machinist	3408	III Typists	2989	III Clerical, o	1978	8375	26.5
United States	7408	II Managerial	973	I S. Teachers	644	I Professors	615	2232	30.1
France	4909	III Machinist	566	III Typist	282	IV Waiters	272	1120	22.8
Australia	2460	III Typist	335	I Teacher	293	III Nurse	219	847	34.4
Ireland	1161	III Clerical, o	95	IV Labour	88	III Typist	80	263	22.7
Germany	5598	III Machinist	830	IV Labour	415	III Clerical, o	403	1648	29.4
Austria	1876	III Machinist	247	IV Labour	161	III Mechanic	124	532	28.4
Switzerland	2338	III Machinist	283	III Clerical, o	265	III Typist	156	704	30.1
Belgium	855	III Machinist	93	III Mechanic	56	I Teachers	53	202	23.6
Denmark	795	IV Farmers	107	III Machinist	77	IV Servant	45	229	28.8
Netherlands	2205	IV Servants	184	III Machinist	150	IV Farmer	145	479	21.7
Italy	14613	IV Labour	4695	IV Bricklayer	1404	IV Tailor	1397	7496	51.3
Greece	4145	IV Tailor	783	IV Labour	337	IV Servant	288	1408	34.0
Portugal	2365	IV Farmer	546	IV Labour	456	III Machinist	145	1147	48.5
Yugoslavia	280	IV Labour	53	IV Servant	28	IV Waiter	26	107	38.2
Poland	574	IV Farmer	88	IV Labour	70	IV Tailor	57	215	37.5
Egypt	796	III Typists	100	III Sales Clerks	74	III Clerical, o	67	241	30.3
Israel	791	III Machinist	108	III Mechanic	75	III Clerical, o	45	228	28.8
India	1074	I S. Teachers	91	I Professors	76	IV Labour	74	241	22.4
China	1435	III Nurse	147	III Typist	97	I S. Teacher	87	331	23.1
West Indies	2565	IV Servant	475	III Typist	340	I Teacher	224	1039	40.5

Country of Former Residence	Flow	1967 Major Intended Occupations 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
Britain	32850	III Typist	3851	III Machinist	2891	I Teachers	1751	8493	25.9
United States	8266	I Teacher	965	II Manager	962	I Professor	857	2784	33.7
France	5927	III Machinist	658	III Typist	326	IV Waiter	323	1307	22.1
Australia	3759	I Teacher	538	III Typist	520	III Nurse	306	1364	36.3
Ireland	1432	III Typist	161	III Sales Clerk	83	III Clerical, o	82	326	22.8
Germany	7254	III Machinist	1095	III Mechanic	494	II Scie. Tech.	354	1943	26.8
Austria	2013	III Machinist	291	III Mechanic	188	II Scie. Tech.	105	584	29.0
Switzerland	2997	III Clerical, o	370	III Machinist	350	III Typist	207	927	30.9
Belgium	765	III Machinist	70	I S. Teacher	60	III Mechanic	55	185	24.2
Denmark	879	IV Farm Labour	93	III Machinist	54	III Sales Clerk	52	199	22.6
Netherlands	2476	III Machinist	203	III Typist	179	IV Servant	165	547	22.1
Italy	14579	IV Labour	4082	IV Tailors	1597	IV Bricklayer	1250	6929	47.5
Greece	6749	IV Labour	1462	IV Tailors	1070	III Machinist	319	2851	42.2
Portugal	3433	IV Labour	1097	IV Farm Labour	592	IV Carpenter	183	1872	54.5
Yugoslavia	790	III Machinist	106	IV Labour	103	IV Servants	55	264	33.4
Poland	659	IV Labour	87	IV Tailor	87	IV Servant	41	215	32.6
Egypt	717	III Typist	68	II Sc. Tech.	61	III Sales Clerk	56	185	25.8
Israel	1156	III Machinist	155	III Mechanic	155	III Electrician	52	362	31.3
India	1802	III Nurses	163	I S. Teacher	140	I Professor	100	403	22.4
China	2406	III Typist	197	III Nurses	180	I S. Teachers	171	548	22.8
West Indies	5801	IV Servants	1044	III Typist	721	III Clerical, o	382	2147	37.0
Phillipines	2632	III Nurses	1140	IV Nurses Aide	380	II Sc. Tech.	218	1738	66.0

Country of Former Residence	Flow	1968 Major Intended Occupations 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
Britain	20801	III Typist	2358	I Teacher	1825	III Machinist	1385	5568	26.8
United States	9540	I S. Teachers	1227	I Professor	1013	II Managerial	796	2936	30.8
France	4503	III Machinist	481	III Mechanic	356	I S. Teacher	275	1112	24.7
Australia	2435	I S. Teacher	546	III Typist	266	III Nurse	245	1057	43.4
Ireland	1078	III Typist	146	I Teacher	99	III Nurse	99	344	31.9
Germany	5142	III Machinist	797	III Mechanic	321	III Typist	270	1388	27.0
Austria	5067	III Machinist	593	II Sc. Tech.	542	I Draughtsman	268	1403	27.7
Switzerland	2642	III Machinist	304	III Typist	212	IV Servant	209	725	27.4
Belgium	580	I Teacher	82	III Machinist	45	III Mechanic III Machinist	33	160	27.6
Denmark	819	IV Farmer	99	III Typist	74	IV Servant	55	228	27.8
Netherlands	1951	IV Servant	269	IV Farmer	215	III Machinist	121	605	31.0
Italy	9462	IV Tailors	1394	IV Bricklayers	993	III Machinist I Machinist	938	3325	35.1
Greece	4515	IV Labour	789	IV Tailor	674	III Mechanic	254	1717	38.0
Portugal	1701	IV Farm Labour	275	IV Servant	237	IV Labour	160	672	39.5
Yugoslavia	2278	III Machinist	335	IV Farm Labour	229	IV Labour	193	757	33.2
Poland	511	IV Tailor	62	IV Farm Labour	45	III Machinist	38	145	28.4
Egypt	767	III Clerical, o	77	II Bookkeeper	67	III Typist	64	208	27.1
Israel	663	III Machinist	73	III Mechanic	76	III Clerical, o	32	186	28.1
India	1318	I Physician	93	I Teacher	93	I Professor III Nurse	81	267	20.3
China	2746	II Managerial	205	I Teacher	204	III Clerical, o	170	579	21.1
West Indies	4826	III Servant	689	III Typist	581	III Clerical, o	523	1793	37.2
Phillipines	2288	III Nurses	727	II Med. & Dental Technicians	263	III Typist	185	1175	51.4

Country of Former Residence	Flow	Major Intended Occupations 1969 — 1.		2.		3.		Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
Britain	17311	III Typists	1690	I Teachers	1598	III Machinists	1150	4438	25.6
United States	10220	I Teachers	1248	I Professors	1040	II Managerial	956	3244	31.7
France	3132	I Teachers	255	III Typists	185	III Mechanics	161	601	19.2
Australia	2230	I Teachers	512	III Nurses	228	III Typists	201	941	42.2
Ireland	991	III Nurses	153	I Teachers	117	III Typists	87	357	36.0
Germany	3250	III Machinist	455	IV Servant	273	III Mechanic	214	942	29.0
Austria	1280	II Sc. Tech.	138	III Machinist	115	III Mechanic	108	361	28.2
Switzerland	1782	III Typists	247	IV Servant	171	III Machinist	113	531	29.8
Belgium	603	I Teacher	96	III Typists	42	I Physician	39	177	29.4
Netherlands	1483	IV Servants	232	IV Farmer	184	III Typist	74	490	32.9
Italy	4996	IV Tailor	686	III Machinist	512	IV Bricklayer	446	1644	32.9
Greece	4442	IV Labour	872	IV Tailor	569	IV Mechanic	279	1720	38.7
Portugal	2242	IV Tailor	352	IV Farmer	245	IV Carpenter	220	817	36.4
Yugoslavia	1625	III Machinist	161	III Mechanic	113	IV Tailor	107	381	23.4
Poland	396	IV Tailor	52	III Machinist	29	IV Farmer	25	106	26.8
Egypt	621	III Clerical, o	74	III Typist	71	I Teacher	68	213	34.3
Israel	403	III Mechanics	49	I Teacher	29	IV Tailor	21	99	24.6
India	2631	III Clerical, o	298	III Nurses	229	I Engineers	224	751	28.5
China	3259	IV Servants	319	III Clerical, o	300	I Teachers	195	814	25.0
West Indies	8223	IV Servants	1197	III Typist	951	III Clerical, o	946	3094	37.6
Phillipines	2520	III Nurses	757	IV Tailors	410	III Clerical, o	297	1464	58.1

Country of Former Residence	Flow	Major Intended Occupations 1970						Total 1.2.3	Total 1.2.3 Flow
		1.		2.		3.			
Britain	14583	III Typists	1641	III Machinist	1039	III Clerical, o	879	3559	24.4
United States	11462	II Managerial	1194	I Teachers	1161	I Professor	918	3273	28.6
France	2516	I S. Teachers	201	III Typists	155	III Mechanics	115	471	18.7
Australia	2385	I S. Teachers	328	III Typists	288	III Nurses	222	838	35.1
Ireland	887	III Typists	99	I S. Teacher	76	III Nurses	75	250	28.2
Germany	2450	III Machinist	345	III Typist	169	III Mechanic	168	682	27.8
Austria	480	III Mechanic	44	III Machinist	38	IV Tailor	29	111	23.1
Switzerland	1765	III Typist	266	IV Servant	133	III Mechanic	103	502	28.4
Belgium	416	III Typist	31	I Physician	29	III Mechanic	28	88	21.2
Denmark	419	IV Servants	45	IV Farmers	35	III Mechanic	25	105	25.1
Netherlands	1119	IV Servants	140	IV Farmer	116	III Typist	74	330	29.5
Italy	3938	IV Tailors	471	III Machinist	371	IV Bricklayer	357	1189	30.4
Greece	3881	IV Labour	613	IV Tailor	440	IV Servants	343	1396	36.0
Portugal	3002	IV Tailor	498	IV Carponter	285	IV Bricklayer	249	1032	34.4
Yugoslavia	2549	III Machinist	337	III Mechanics	143	IV Tailors	140	620	24.3
Poland	368	IV Tailors	59	IV Servants	35	III Machinist	26	120	32.6
Egypt	468	I Teachers	47	III Clerical, o	45	III Typists	34	126	26.9
Israel	396	III Mechanics	44	III Machinists	38	I Teachers	24	106	26.8
India	2566	IV Farmers	350	III Clerical, o	194	I Teachers	184	728	28.4
China	2172	III Clerical, o	245	III Typists	156	IV Servants	144	545	25.1
West Indies	7612	IV Servants	847	III Clerical, o	844	III Typists	769	2460	32.3
Phillipines	2429	III Nurses	518	III Clerical, o	426	II Med & Dental Technicians	202	1146	47.2

Chart Series 4: Ethnic Origins of Canadian Immigrants Grouped by Ethnic Status Group

Ethnic Status Group		Five Years Ended Dec. 31, 1949	
I	British	197,334	
	French	9,838	
		207,172	54.6%
II	Austrian	.	
	Belgian	3,489	
	Danish	2,099	
	Finnish	657	
	German	13,502	
	Icelandic	76	
	Luxemburger		
	Netherlander	24,627	
	Norwegian	1,846	
	Swedish	1,141	
	Swiss	979	
		48,416	12.8%
IIIa)	Greek	2,406	
	Italian	12,038	
	Portugese	218	
	Spanish	341	
		15,003	4.0%
IIIb)	Albanian	88	
	Bulgarian	160	
	Czech-Slovak	4,280	
	Estonian	5,161	
	Hungarian	3,202	
	Latvian	6,382	
	Lithuanian	7,950	
	Polish	30,071	
	Rumanian	1,054	
	Russian	2,970	
	Ukrainian	18,928	
	Yugoslavian	4,654	
		84,900	22.4%
IIIc)	Arabian	34	
	Armenian	50	
	Egyptian		
	Iranian	11	
	Hebrew**	20,117	
	Lebanese		
	Maltese	1,002	
	Mexican	19	
	Syrian	238	
	Turkish	13	
		21,484	5.7%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	908	
	East Indian	280	
	Japanese	24	
	Negro	885	
	Pakistani		
		2,097	0.6%
	Others	127*	
	Grand Totals	379,199	100.1%

Source: Annual Report, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1956, p. 28.

Note: Austrian included with German prior to 1953.

* 127 North American Indians.

** "Jewish" beginning in 1956.

Ethnic Status Group		Five Years Ended Dec. 31, 1954	
I	British	202,814	
	French	21,197	
		224,011	29.6%
II	Austrian		
	Belgian	7,301	
	Danish	10,911	
	Finnish	8,939	
	German	144,056	
	Icelandic	190	
	Luxemburger		
	Netherlander	86,028	
	Norwegian	5,026	
	Swedish	3,038	
	Swiss	4,752	
		270,241	35.8%
IIIa)	Greek	10,649	
	Italian	104,736	
	Portugese	2,437	
	Spanish	1,683	
		119,505	15.8%
IIIb)	Albanian	146	
	Bulgarian	664	
	Czech-Slovak	6,686	
	Estonian	8,261	
	Hungarian	9,061	
	Latvian	7,165	
	Lithuanian	3,694	
	Polish	31,217	
	Rumanian	2,320	
	Russian	4,999	
	Ukrainian	15,304	
	Yugoslavian	11,072	
		100,589	13.3%
IIIc)	Arabian	187	
	Armenian	350	
	Egyptian		
	Iranian	51	
	Hebrew**	22,191	
	Lebanese		
	Maltese	4,831	
	Mexican	51	
	Syrian	1,055	
	Turkish	110	
		28,826	3.8%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	10,668	
	East Indian	665	
	Japanese	145	
	Negro	1,005	
	Pakistani		
		12,483	1.7%
	Others	241*	
	Grand Totals	755,896	100.0%

Source: Annual Report, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1956, p. 28.

Austrian included with German prior to 1953.

* Includes 96 North American Indians

** "Jewish" beginning in 1956.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	35,467	
	French	2,941	
		38,408	34.9%
II	Austrian	1,835	
	Belgian	1,015	
	Danish	1,496	
	Finnish	652	
	German	19,625	
	Icelandic	25	
	Luxemburger		
	Netherlander	7,328	
	Norwegian	898	
	Swedish	488	
	Swiss	680	
		34,042	31.0%
IIIa)	Greek	3,057	
	Italian	20,545	
	Portugese	1,439	
	Spanish	335	
		25,376	23.1%
IIIb)	Albanian	21	
	Bulgarian	41	
	Czech-Slovak	354	
	Estonian	194	
	Hungarian	478	
	Latvian	356	
	Lithuanian	191	
	Polish	2,073	
	Rumanian	105	
	Russian	297	
	Ukrainian	560	
	Yugoslavian	1,416	
		6,086	5.5%
IIIc)	Arabian	56	
	Armenian	144	
	Egyptian		
	Iranian	15	
	Hebrew**	1,660	
	Lebanese		
	Maltese	355	
	Mexican	11	
	Syrian	326	
	Turkish	20	
		2,587	2.4%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	2,602	
	East Indian	249	
	Japanese	102	
	Negro	414	
	Pakistani		
		3,367	3.1%
	Others	80*	0.1%
	Grand Totals	109,946	100.1%

Source: Annual Report, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1956, pp. 28,29.

* Includes 28 North American Indians
** Jewish Beginning in 1956

Ethnic Status Group		1956	
I	British	56,587	
	French	3,768	
		60,355	36.6%
II	Austrian	2,982	
	Belgian	2,143	
	Danish	3,713	
	Finnish	1,128	
	German	27,843	
	Icelandic	41	
	Luxemburger	153	
	Netherlander	8,257	
	Norwegian	1,011	
	Swedish	596	
	Swiss	1,115	
		48,982	29.7%
IIIa)	Greek	5,274	
	Italian	30,064	
	Portugese	1,984	
	Spanish	571	
		37,893	23.0%
IIIb)	Albanian	6	
	Bulgarian	33	
	Czech-Slovak	347	
	Estonian	166	
	Hungarian	4,340	
	Latvian	342	
	Lithuanian	216	
	Polish	2,438	
	Rumanian	153	
	Russian	288	
	Ukrainian	578	
	Yugoslavian	2,043	
		10,950	6.6%
IIIc)	Arabian	87	
	Armenian	189	
	Egyptian	10	
	Iranian	11	
	Jewish	2,190	
	Lebanese	414	
	Maltese	381	
	Mexican	27	
	Syrian	80	
	Turkish	56	
		3,445	2.1%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	2,103	
	East Indian	332	
	Japanese	124	
	Negro	572	
	Pakistani		
		3,131	1.9%
	Others	101	0.1%
	Grant Totals	164,857	100.0%

Source: Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration Statistics Section, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1957, p. 15.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	118,536	
	French	6,214	
		124,750	44.2%
II	Austrian	2,364	
	Belgian	2,811	
	Danish	7,883	
	Finnish	2,884	
	German	31,191	
	Icelandic	61	
	Luxemburger	127	
	Netherlander	12,720	
	Norwegian	1,536	
	Swedish	991	
	Swiss	1,358	
		63,926	22.7%
IIIa)	Greek	5,706	
	Italian	29,763	
	Portugese	4,768	
	Spanish	1,235	
		41,472	14.7%
IIIb)	Albanian	26	
	Bulgarian	59	
	Czech-Slovak	360	
	Estonian	226	
	Hungarian	29,911	
	Latvian	434	
	Lithuanian	190	
	Polish	3,096	
	Rumanian	213	
	Russian	442	
	Ukrainian	530	
	Yugoslavian	5,771	
		41,258	14.6%
IIIc)	Arabian	91	
	Armenian	285	
	Egyptian	52	
	Iranian	24	
	Jewish	6,037	
	Lebanese	361	
	Maltese	657	
	Mexican	20	
	Syrian	92	
	Turkish	93	
		7,712	2.7%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	1,686	
	East Indian	334	
	Japanese	185	
	Negro	723	
	Pakistani		
		2,928	1.0%
	Others	118	---
	Grand Totals	282,164	99.9%

Source: Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Statistics Section, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1958, pp. 16,17.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	32,489	
	French	3,292	
		35,781	28.7%
II	Austrian	971	
	Belgian	1,017	
	Danish	1,908	
	Finnish	1,296	
	German	15,842	
	Icelandic	52	
	Luxemburger	26	
	Netherlander	7,933	
	Norwegian	658	
	Swedish	471	
	Swiss	855	
		31,029	24.9%
IIIa)	Greek	5,476	
	Italian	28,878	
	Portugese	2,188	
	Spanish	685	
		37,227	29.8%
IIIb)	Albanian	15	
	Bulgarian	21	
	Czech-Slovak	198	
	Estonian	131	
	Hungarian	2,788	
	Latvian	212	
	Lithuanian	170	
	Polish	3,171	
	Rumanian	153	
	Russian	252	
	Ukrainian	405	
	Yugoslavian	4,930	
		12,446	10.0%
IIIc)	Arabian	75	
	Armenian	197	
	Egyptian	19	
	Iranian	13	
	Jewish	2,895	
	Lebanese	260	
	Maltese	482	
	Mexican	34	
	Syrian	33	
	Turkish	103	
		4,111	3.3%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	2,630	
	East Indian	459	
	Japanese	193	
	Negro	881	
	Pakistani		
		4,163	3.3%
	Others	94	0.1%
	Grand Totals	124,851	100.1%

Source: Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Statistics Section, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1959, pp. 16, 17.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	24,957	
	French	2,622	
		27,579	25.8%
II	Austrian	784	
	Belgian	844	
	Danish	1,501	
	Finnish	944	
	German	12,481	
	Icelandic	30	
	Luxemburger	12	
	Netherlander	5,684	
	Norwegian	517	
	Swedish	484	
	Swiss	679	
		23,960	22.4%
IIIa)	Greek	5,035	
	Italian	27,223	
	Portugese	4,372	
	Spanish	599	
		37,229	34.8%
IIIb)	Albanian	21	
	Bulgarian	52	
	Czech-Slovak	207	
	Estonian	103	
	Hungarian	1,101	
	Latvian	140	
	Lithuanian	110	
	Polish	3,960	
	Rumanian	169	
	Russian	202	
	Ukrainian	346	
	Yugoslavian	2,360	
		8,771	8.2%
IIIc)	Arabian	62	
	Armenian	242	
	Egyptian	20	
	Iranian	12	
	Jewish	3,395	
	Lebanese	288	
	Maltese	424	
	Mexican	23	
	Syrian	59	
	Turkish	86	
		4,611	4.3%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	2,586	
	East Indian	741	
	Japanese	197	
	Negro	1,104	
	Pakistani		
		4,628	4.3%
	Others	150	0.1%
	Grand Totals	106,928	99.9%

Source: Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Statistics Section, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1959, pp. 16, 17.

1960

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	26,435	
	French	2,940	
		29,375	28.2%
II	Austrian	1,001	
	Belgian	776	
	Danish	1,207	
	Finnish	1,047	
	German	12,430	
	Icelandic	14	
	Luxemburger	13	
	Netherlander	5,983	
	Norwegian	551	
	Swedish	489	
	Swiss	811	
		24,322	23.4%
IIIa)	Greek	5,093	
	Italian	21,690	
	Portugese	5,277	
	Spanish	850	
		32,910	31.6%
IIIb)	Albanian	33	
	Bulgarian	47	
	Czech-Slovak	220	
	Estonian	143	
	Hungarian	1,279	
	Latvian	161	
	Lithuanian	104	
	Polish	3,401	
	Rumanian	189	
	Russian	232	
	Ukrainian	349	
	Yugoslavian	3,572	
		9,730	9.3%
IIIc)	Arabian	84	
	Armenian	164	
	Egyptian	13	
	Iranian	16	
	Jewish	2,964	
	Lebanese	242	
	Maltese	485	
	Mexican	45	
	Syrian	28	
	Turkish	133	
		4,174	4.0%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	1,402	
	East Indian	691	
	Japanese	169	
	Negro	1,135	
	Pakistani		
		3,397	3.3%
	Others	203	0.2%
	Grand Totals	104,111	100.0%

Source: Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Statistics Section, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1961, pp. 16, 17.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	18,963	
	French	2,479	
		21,442	29.9%
II	Austrian	641	
	Belgian	733	
	Danish	598	
	Finnish	381	
	German	8,023	
	Icelandic	7	
	Luxemburger	10	
	Netherlander	2,293	
	Norwegian	4,9	
	Swedish	344	
	Swiss	653	
		14,102	19.7%
IIIa)	Greek	3,941	
	Italian	15,088	
	Portugese	2,999	
	Spanish	844	
		22,872	31.9%
IIIb)	Albanian	45	
	Bulgarian	30	
	Czech-Slovak	169	
	Estonian	63	
	Hungarian	783	
	Latvian	122	
	Lithuanian	114	
	Polish	2,985	
	Rumanian	156	
	Russian	209	
	Ukrainian	165	
	Yugoslavian	2,323	
		7,164	10.0%
IIIc)	Arabian	65	
	Armenian	186	
	Egyptian	13	
	Iranian	22	
	Jewish	2,043	
	Lebanese	215	
	Maltese	208	
	Mexican	29	
	Syrian	47	
	Turkish	139	
		2,967	4.1%
IV	Ceylonese		
	Chinese	894	
	East Indian	772	
	Japanese	126	
	Negro	1,131	
	Pakistani		
		2,923	4.1%
	Others	219	0.3%
	Grand Totals	71,689	100.0%

Source: Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Statistics Section, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1962, pp. 16, 17.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	22,269	
	French	2,974	
		25,243	33.84%
II	Austrian	506	
	Belgian	546	
	Danish	742	
	Finnish	385	
	German	7,000	
	Icelandic	4	
	Luxemburger	16	
	Netherlander	1,982	
	Norwegian	408	
	Swedish	367	
	Swiss	674	
		12,630	16.93%
IIIa)	Greek	4,239	
	Italian	14,538	
	Portugese	3,443	
	Spanish	822	
		23,042	30.89%
IIIb)	Albanian	28	
	Bulgarian	18	
	Czech-Slovak	151	
	Estonian	54	
	Hungarian	837	
	Latvian	66	
	Lithuanian	61	
	Polish	2,143	
	Rumanian	155	
	Russian	198	
	Ukrainian	170	
	Yugoslavian	2,044	
		5,925	7,94%
IIIc)	Arabian	67	
	Armenian	777	
	Egyptian	64	
	Iranian	36	
	Jewish	1,840	
	Lebanese	444	
	Maltese	372	
	Mexican	24	
	Syrian	122	
	Turkish	174	
		3,920	5.26%
IV	Ceylonese	8	
	Chinese	876	
	East Indian	830	
	Japanese	154	
	Negro	1,559	
	Pakistani	12	
		3,439	4.61%
	Others	387	.52%
	Grant Totals	74,586	99.99%

Source: Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Statistics Section, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1963, pp. 16, 17.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	31,100	
	French	3,291	
		34,391	36.92%
II	Austrian	588	
	Belgian	539	
	Danish	743	
	Finnish	325	
	German	6,550	
	Icelandic	18	
	Luxemburger	21	
	Netherlander	2,181	
	Norwegian	502	
	Swedish	395	
	Swiss	661	
		12,531	13.44%
IIIa)	Greek	5,647	
	Italian	16,194	
	Portugese	4,732	
	Spanish	1,468	
		28,041	30.10%
IIIb)	Albanian	51	
	Bulgarian	23	
	Czech-Slovak	160	
	Estonian	69	
	Hungarian	995	
	Latvian	92	
	Lithuanian	73	
	Polish	2,069	
	Rumanian	163	
	Russian	177	
	Ukrainian	215	
	Yugoslavian	2,449	
		6,563	7.02%
IIIc)	Arabian	154	
	Armenian	932	
	Egyptian	243	
	Iranian	72	
	Jewish	2,180	
	Lebanese	591	
	Maltese	906	
	Mexican	24	
	Syrian	108	
	Turkish	310	
		5,520	6.02%
IV	Ceylonese	19	
	Chinese	1,571	
	East Indian	1,331	
	Japanese	199	
	Negro	2,453	
	Pakistani	36	
		5,609	5.93
	Others	531	.57%
	Grant Totals	93,151	100.00%

Source: Immigration, Dept. of Citizenship and Immigration, Immigration Branch, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1963, pp. 16, 17.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	36,199	
	French	4,044	
		40,243	35.74%
II	Austrian	751	
	Belgian	723	
	Danish	852	
	Finnish	476	
	German	7,091	
	Icelandic	17	
	Luxemburger	13	
	Netherlander	2,464	
	Norwegian	480	
	Swedish	452	
	Swiss	833	
		14,152	12.57%
IIIa)	Greek	5,200	
	Italian	21,508	
	Portugese	6,109	
	Spanish	1,642	
		34,459	30.60%
IIIb)	Albanian	29	
	Bulgarian	35	
	Czech-Slovak	237	
	Estonian	57	
	Hungarian	1,054	
	Latvian	67	
	Lithuanian	84	
	Polish	2,621	
	Rumanian	165	
	Russian	201	
	Ukrainian	202	
	Yugoslavian	3,116	
		7,868	6.99%
IIIc)	Arabian	214	
	Armenian	855	
	Egyptian	380	
	Iranian	38	
	Jewish	3,113	
	Lebanese	635	
	Maltese	1,200	
	Mexican	27	
	Syrian	178	
	Turkish	341	
		6,981	6.20%
IV	Ceylonese	33	
	Chinese	3,210	
	East Indian	2,077	
	Japanese	163	
	Negro	2,627	
	Pakistani	104	
		8,214	7.29%
	Others	689	.61%
	Grand Totals	112,606	100.00%

Source: Immigration Statistics, Department of Citizenship and Immigration - Immigration Branch, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1964, pp. 16,17.

1965

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	47,221	
	French	4,408	
		51,629	35.18%
II	Austrian	818	
	Belgian	675	
	Danish	1,057	
	Finnish	656	
	German	9,832	
	Icelandic	9	
	Luxemburger	11	
	Netherlander	2,999	
	Norwegian	649	
	Swedish	545	
	Swiss	1,194	
		18,446	12.57%
IIIa)	Greek	6,730	
	Italian	29,360	
	Portugese	7,069	
	Spanish	1,909	
		45,068	30.71%
IIIb)	Albanian	31	
	Bulgarian	75	
	Czech-Slovak	306	
	Estonian	65	
	Hungarian	1,323	
	Latvian	97	
	Lithuanian	95	
	Polish	2,862	
	Rumanian	155	
	Russian	260	
	Ukrainian	283	
	Yugoslavian	3,220	
		8,772	5.98%
IIIc)	Arabian	263	
	Armenian	887	
	Egyptian	427	
	Iranian	144	
	Jewish	2,816	
	Lebanese	763	
	Maltese	1,133	
	Mexican	55	
	Syrian	241	
	Turkish	527	
		7,256	4.94%
IV	Ceylonese	101	
	Chinese	5,234	
	East Indian	3,491	
	Japanese	219	
	Negro	4,065	
	Pakistani	252	
		13,362	9.10%
	Others	2,225	1.52%
	Grand Totals	146,758	100.00%

Source: Immigration Statistics, Department of Citizenship and Immigration - Immigration Branch, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1965, pp. 16,17.

Ethnic Status Group			
I	British	71,505	
	French	6,675	
		78,180	40.15%
II	Austrian	941	
	Belgian	898	
	Danish	1,292	
	Finnish	696	
	German	10,699	
	Icelandic	15	
	Luxemburger	24	
	Netherlander	4,132	
	Norwegian	938	
	Swedish	720	
	Swiss	1,711	
		22,066	11.33%
IIIa)	Greek	8,394	
	Italian	35,107	
	Portugese	9,525	
	Spanish	2,582	
		55,608	28.55%
IIIb)	Albanian	38	
	Bulgarian	56	
	Czech-Slovak	503	
	Estonian	100	
	Hungarian	1,594	
	Latvian	131	
	Lithuanian	126	
	Polish	2,715	
	Rumanian	126	
	Russian	281	
	Ukrainian	288	
	Yugoslavian	4,322	
		10,280	5.28%
IIIc)	Arabian	533	
	Armenian	1,174	
	Egyptian	649	
	Iranian	189	
	Jewish	3,017	
	Lebanese	1,005	
	Maltese	643	
	Mexican	59	
	Syrian	265	
	Turkish	546	
		8,080	4.15%
IV	Ceylonese	138	
	Chinese	5,178	
	East Indian	4,094	
	Japanese	535	
	Negro	5,870	
	Pakistani	415	
		16,230	8.33%
	Others	4,299	2.21%
	Grand Totals	194,743	100.00%

Source: Immigration Statistics, Department of Manpower and Immigration, Canada Immigration Division, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1966, pp. 16,17.

Chart Series 5: Immigration By Citizenship and Ethnic Status Groups

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
Great Britain	I	88.6	86.1	87.1	84.7	84.4	84.9	83.8	83.4	87.9	85.0
	II	1.2	1.0	0.9	1.1	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.8
	IIIa)	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.5	2.8	2.0	1.5	1.3	0.9	1.4
	IIIb)	1.9	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.3
	IIIc)	3.2	3.5	3.6	2.6	3.1	4.2	4.5	3.3	1.6	3.4
	IV	3.6	6.2	5.8	8.7	7.4	6.6	8.0	9.7	7.7	8.0
	Other	0.1	0.1	0.1	---	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
		100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%
		26885	20372	21226	13932	17857	27316	32775	43404	65761	
	Minority Ethnicities: 2,524 Negroes, 1,620 Chinese, 864 Indians, 362 Jewish, 226 Polish, 270 Portugese										
France	I	83.9	85.9	86.7	84.1	85.4	87.5	88.2	87.2	90.4	88.5
	II	1.3	0.9	0.8	1.5	0.9	1.1	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.9
	IIIa)	5.9	4.6	5.3	6.1	6.3	5.6	5.2	5.0	4.0	5.0
	IIIb)	3.3	4.2	3.3	3.5	3.5	2.1	2.7	2.9	1.9	2.4
	IIIc)	5.4	4.2	3.5	4.4	3.6	3.0	2.4	3.3	1.7	2.6
	IV	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	---	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.2
	Other	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	99.8%	100.0%
		2845	1933	2395	1987	2350	2772	3417	3691	5896	
	Minority Ethnicities: 642 Italians, 602 Portugese, 495 Spanish, 306 Yugoslavs										
New Zealand	I	91.8	91.8	93.9	93.6	94.5	94.7	87.5	91.3	91.1	91.2
	II	2.9	2.3	2.4	3.5	2.3	2.4	6.8	2.8	2.9	3.7
	IIIa)	0.7	0.5	---	0.6	0.3	0.3	1.1	0.2	0.9	0.6
	IIIb)	3.3	3.1	2.2	1.3	---	1.6	2.0	2.7	1.8	2.0
	IIIc)	0.7	---	---	0.6	1.3	0.3	0.4	---	0.4	0.3
	IV	0.2	1.5	1.0	---	0.3	---	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
	Other	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.3	1.3	0.8	1.8	2.8	2.7	2.0
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.1%
		453	388	412	312	308	377	457	642	784	

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
Ireland	I	98.9	99.3	99.1	98.5	98.0	99.0	98.9	98.3	97.9	98.5
	II	0.2	0.7	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.4	--	0.1	0.2	0.2
	IIIa)	--	--	0.1	--	0.5	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.6	0.4
	IIIb)	0.3	--	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.3
	IIIc)	0.6	--	0.4	0.2	--	--	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.3
	IV	--	--	0.1	--	0.2	0.1	--	0.7	0.4	0.3
	Other	--	--	--	--	0.3	--	--	--	0.1	--
		100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.2%	100.0%
		1439	950	1056	549	598	759	908	1311	1774	
I United States	I	61.5	57.6	57.1	56.1	56.9	58.3	57.3	57.8	54.6	57.0
	II	22.1	24.5	25.3	25.8	26.1	24.6	26.0	25.2	27.1	25.7
	IIIa)	3.8	4.6	4.7	5.3	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5
	IIIb)	4.7	5.1	5.5	5.6	5.1	5.4	5.0	5.5	5.5	5.4
	IIIc)	6.3	6.4	5.4	5.3	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.2	4.7	4.6
	IV	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.9	1.9	1.8	2.1	2.2	2.0
	Other	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.5	1.0
		99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	100.2%	100.0%	100.1%	99.9%	100.2%	100.0%	100.2%
		9695	10240	10060	10395	10452	10313	11350	13857	16154	
	Minority Ethnicities: 2,742 Germans, 675 Jewish, 506 Italians, 483 Netherlanders, 358 Norwegians										
Australia	I	73.6	71.4	76.0	77.1	74.3	75.9	73.8	73.3	69.3	73.1
	II	4.4	5.2	5.5	4.1	5.6	6.2	6.3	8.1	5.9	6.6
	IIIa)	4.5	6.4	6.3	9.0	9.0	6.0	6.6	5.4	4.9	5.7
	IIIb)	15.5	14.9	10.4	7.9	9.2	10.6	11.0	9.1	12.9	10.9
	IIIc)	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.0	0.9	2.3	1.2	1.4
	IV	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.4
	Other	0.1	0.1	0.1	--	0.1	--	1.1	1.6	5.3	2.0
		100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.1%
		1798	1118	1403	1198	1171	1440	1896	2322	3233	
	Minority Ethnicities: 171 Other, 170 Hungarians, 117 Italians.										

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
I South Africa	I	65.5	59.2	60.9	56.0	62.0	57.2	51.2	53.0	50.7	53.0 Note
	II	22.4	20.5	20.1	21.1	20.7	21.5	17.1	20.1	18.2	19.2
	IIIa)	1.5	1.5	0.5	0.9	0.8	0.9	2.4	1.6	3.1	2.0
	IIIb)	1.5	4.1	1.7	5.5	2.2	3.0	2.2	1.0	0.9	1.8
	IIIc)	8.3	10.6	6.7	9.8	10.9	11.2	9.7	3.4	3.4	6.9
	IV	0.7	2.6	3.1	3.4	2.7	3.2	8.6	14.3	15.0	10.3
	Other	0.2	1.5	6.9	3.4	0.8	3.0	8.8	6.5	8.7	6.8
		100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%
		411	341	640	470	368	339	455	581	881	
	Minority Ethnicities: 86 Netherlanders, 77 Other, 62 Germans, 52 East Indians, 48 Negroes.										
II Germany	I	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2
	II	98.4	98.0	97.4	98.3	98.6	98.4	98.7	98.9	98.8	98.7
	IIIa)	0.1	--	0.1	--	--	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
	IIIb)	1.4	1.5	2.2	1.4	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.7
	IIIc)	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%
		14107	10401	10596	6060	5081	4740	4866	7031	7249	
II Netherlands	I	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2
	II	99.4	99.4	99.3	99.2	99.2	98.0	97.4	96.8	93.0	96.3
	IIIa)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	--	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2
	IIIb)	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.3
	IIIc)	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3
	IV	--	0.1	--	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.7	0.3
	Other	0.1	0.2	--	--	0.2	0.2	1.6	2.4	5.5	2.4
		100.1%	100.2%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.2%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%
		7488	5310	5480	1897	1631	1773	1989	2525	3671	
	Minority Ethnicity: 260 Other										

Note: Only 1966 was used to compute the 'average'

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
II Switzerland	I	2.5	3.2	2.5	1.4	1.2	1.7	0.3	0.7	1.1	1.0
	II	96.4	94.5	95.0	96.8	97.7	97.5	98.0	97.3	97.9	97.7
	IIIa)	0.8	1.5	1.2	1.0	0.3	0.5	0.5	1.1	0.6	0.7
	IIIb)	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.3
	IIIc)	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.4	--	0.4
	IV	--	--	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.1	0.3	0.1
		100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.2%
		896	725	836	630	604	603	760	1144	1650	
II Denmark	I	0.2	0.2	0.1	--	0.3	0.2	--	0.3	--	0.1
	II	99.7	99.4	99.2	99.0	98.9	99.5	99.6	99.1	99.6	99.5
	IIIa)	0.1	--	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIb)	--	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6	--	--	0.5	0.3	0.2
	IIIc)	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.8	--	0.3	0.4	--	--	0.2
	IV	--	--	--	--	0.2	--	--	0.1	0.1	0.1
	Other	--	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%
		1784	1381	1133	483	608	593	716	874	1079	
II Belgium	I	4.9	3.2	3.0	0.7	1.0	1.5	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.7
	II	90.5	93.3	93.6	96.5	96.6	95.8	98.5	97.4	95.2	96.7
	IIIa)	2.1	1.1	1.9	0.6	1.0	1.3	0.3	0.8	1.3	0.9
	IIIb)	1.5	1.6	1.0	1.5	--	1.1	0.7	0.3	2.1	1.1
	IIIc)	0.7	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.3
	IV	--	--	--	--	0.2	--	--	--	0.1	--
	Other	0.3	--	0.1	0.1	0.2	--	--	0.8	-.5	0.3
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.2%	99.9%	99.9%	100.1%	100.2%	100.0%
		1087	875	792	727	521	528	675	645	875	

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
II Austria	I	0.6	0.2	--	0.8	0.4	0.2	--	--	0.1	0.1
	II	91.2	94.2	92.6	91.5	94.8	94.9	97.1	97.0	96.3	96.3
	IIIa)	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.1	--	0.3
	IIIb)	6.2	4.3	4.3	5.8	4.2	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.2	2.7
	IIIc)	1.8	0.9	2.5	1.5	0.4	1.3	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.7
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	0.1	--
		100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%
		1033	897	1102	650	457	529	658	770	856	
II Finland	I	0.2	--	0.1	--	--	--	--	0.2	--	0.1
	II	99.5	99.7	99.7	99.4	97.4	98.2	99.3	99.8	99.8	99.3
	IIIa)	--	--	0.1	0.3	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIb)	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	1.8	0.2	--	--	0.5
	IIIc)	0.2	--	--	--	2.3	--	0.2	--	0.2	0.1
	IV	--	0.1	--	--	--	--	0.2	--	--	0.1
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%
		1261	890	989	348	343	281	401	558	614	
II Norway	I	0.4	--	--	--	0.5	--	0.7	1.0	--	0.4
	II	98.7	98.1	99.4	100.0	98.1	99.0	99.3	97.8	99.6	98.9
	IIIa)	--	0.6	0.3	--	--	0.4	--	--	--	0.1
	IIIb)	0.9	1.4	0.3	--	1.0	--	--	--	0.2	0.1
	IIIc)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.6	0.2	0.2
	IV	--	--	--	--	0.5	0.7	--	0.6	--	0.3
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		486	363	549	180	206	285	268	317	524	

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
II Sweden	I	--	--	--	--	--	0.6	--	0.4	--	0.3
	II	93.5	90.6	90.9	89.4	96.1	95.1	95.4	89.6	90.9	92.8
	IIIa)	0.3	--	0.4	--	--	0.6	--	--	0.5	0.3
	IIIb)	5.1	8.4	8.7	9.8	3.9	3.8	4.6	7.9	7.6	6.0
	IIIc)	1.0	1.0	--	0.8	--	--	--	1.3	0.3	0.5
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.4	--	0.1
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.4	0.3	0.2
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.2%
		292	287	254	123	155	183	217	240	383	
	Minority Ethnicity: 64 Yugoslavs										
II Others	I	2.4	13.6	11.5	--	--	--	--	6.7	--	1.7
	II	96.5	86.4	84.6	92.9	92.3	100.0	100.0	86.7	100.0	96.7
	IIIa)	1.2	--	3.8	7.1	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIb)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIc)	--	--	--	--	7.7	--	--	--	--	--
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6.7	--	1.7
		100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%
		85	44	26	14	13	33	28	15	37	
IIIa) Italy	I	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	II	--	0.1	0.1	--	0.1	0.1	--	--	0.1	0.1
	IIIa)	99.8	99.7	99.3	99.8	99.6	99.7	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.8
	IIIb)	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	--	0.1	0.1	0.1
	IIIc)	0.1	0.1	0.1	--	0.3	0.2	0.1	--	0.2	0.1
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9	99.9%	100.1%	100.1%
		28242	26564	21040	14352	13951	15589	20720	28397	33977	

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
IIIa) Portugal	I	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	0.1	0.1	--	0.1
	II	0.1	--	--	--	0.1	0.1	--	--	--	--
	IIIa)	99.7	99.4	99.7	99.5	99.2	99.7	99.6	99.5	99.6	99.6
	IIIb)	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIc)	--	--	--	--	0.2	0.1	--	--	--	--
	IV	0.1	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1
		100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		1963	4176	5108	2861	3063	4281	5721	6583	8900	
IIIa) Greece	I	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	II	0.1	0.1	0.1	--	--	--	--	0.1	--	--
	IIIa)	99.6	99.1	99.7	99.8	99.7	99.4	99.6	99.5	99.8	99.6
	IIIb)	0.1	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.1	--
	IIIc)	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	0.1	--	0.1	--	0.2	--	0.1
		100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		5273	4894	4922	3794	4023	5385	4819	6181	7714	
IIIa) Spain	I	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	--	--	--	0.1
	II	0.4	--	--	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3
	IIIa)	96.2	96.3	99.5	98.0	96.4	98.7	98.4	98.7	98.9	98.7
	IIIb)	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	--	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1
	IIIc)	2.7	2.9	0.2	1.1	2.6	0.9	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.8
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	0.2	--	--	--	0.1	0.2	0.1
		99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%
		447	382	603	555	499	1043	1123	1414	1931	

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
IIIb) Yugoslavia	I	--	--	--	--	0.1	0.1	0.1	--	--	0.1
	II	0.9	0.4	1.0	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
	IIIa)	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.7	2.0	2.2	1.4	0.3	0.2	1.0
	IIIb)	98.4	98.3	97.9	98.6	96.5	96.4	97.6	98.6	97.4	97.5
	IIIc)	--	0.4	--	--	1.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4
	IV	--	--	--	--	0.2	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	0.1	--	--	0.1	--	0.1	0.6	0.9	1.9	0.9
		100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%
		935	944	873	1001	1009	978	1519	1886	2897	
IIIb) Poland	I	--	--	0.1	--	0.1	0.1	0.1	--	--	0.1
	II	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
	IIIa)	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIb)	83.7	92.7	94.0	97.8	95.4	97.0	98.5	99.3	98.1	98.2
	IIIc)	15.7	6.8	5.3	2.0	4.1	2.8	1.2	0.3	0.7	1.3
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	0.1	--	--	--	0.1	--	0.2	--	1.0	0.3
		100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%
		2367	3509	2704	2411	1639	1539	1995	2027	1758	
IIIb) Hungary	I	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	II	0.3	1.9	2.2	2.6	0.7	0.5	1.1	0.7	0.8	0.8
	IIIa)	--	0.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.7	0.2
	IIIb)	89.7	81.2	87.5	90.4	95.7	74.0	95.7	96.8	96.0	95.6
	IIIc)	9.9	16.8	10.3	7.0	3.7	5.4	3.3	2.5	2.0	3.3
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.2	0.1
	Other	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.3	0.1
		100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%
		2315	628	534	270	437	551	460	592	265	

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Averages 1963-1966
IIIb) Russia	I	--	--	--	1.0	--	--	1.3	--	--	0.3
	II	3.7	13.9	1.6	7.6	2.5	2.7	8.8	20.8	22.6	13.7
	IIIa)	3.7	--	--	--	--	1.3	2.5	0.6	--	1.1
	IIIb)	85.2	69.4	94.5	90.5	91.4	93.3	85.0	78.0	72.1	82.1
	IIIc)	3.7	16.7	3.3	1.0	6.2	1.3	2.5	0.6	5.3	2.4
	IV	3.7	--	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	1.3	--	--	--	0.3
		100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.1%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%
		27	36	182	105	81	75	80	159	265	
IIIb) Others	I	--	--	--	--	--	4.0	--	4.5	--	2.1
	II	--	--	--	--	--	8.0	3.5	10.1	9.7	7.3
	IIIa)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIb)	--	--	--	--	--	78.0	81.0	82.0	83.9	81.2
	IIIc)	--	--	--	--	--	10.0	15.5	3.4	4.8	8.4
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.6	0.4
							100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%
							50	58	89	62	
IIIc) Egypt	I	2.1	--	--	2.9	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4
	II	2.1	--	6.1	--	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.1	--	0.3
	IIIa)	4.3	8.1	6.1	--	5.3	5.0	4.0	3.8	3.0	4.0
	IIIb)	2.1	5.4	--	--	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	
	IIIc)	89.4	86.5	87.9	97.8	92.2	93.3	94.3	94.4	94.0	94.0
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1
	Other	--	--	--	--	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.9	2.0	0.8
		100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.2%	100.2%
		47	37	33	34	964	1187	1532	1270	1680	

Majority Ethnicity: 608 Egyptians, 451 Armenians, 323 Lebanese, 133 Syrians

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
IIIc) Israel	I	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	II	0.9	0.1	--	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
	IIIa)	--	0.2	0.1	0.1	--	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.4
	IIIb)	2.1	3.9	3.2	1.0	1.5	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9
	IIIc)	97.1	95.6	96.6	98.7	98.3	98.9	98.6	98.6	97.8	98.5
	IV	--	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	0.1	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	0.3	0.1
		100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%
		577	1577	1581	674	527	746	929	837	1455	
	Majority Ethnicity: 1,249 Jewish, 129 Arabian										
IIIc) Lebanon	I	0.3	1.3	--	--	0.3	--	--	--	0.1	--
	II	--	0.5	--	--	0.7	--	0.3	0.3	--	0.2
	IIIa)	0.3	1.6	1.3	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.6
	IIIb)	0.3	0.3	--	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.3
	IIIc)	99.1	96.3	98.7	98.9	97.9	99.0	98.4	97.8	98.4	98.4
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		317	383	305	283	292	488	385	637	892	
	Majority Ethnicity: 620 Lebanese, 136 Armenians, 106 Arabian										
IIIc) Turkey	I	--	--	--	1.0	0.6	--	0.3	--	--	0.1
	II	0.5	0.9	--	--	--	--	0.5	0.5	--	0.3
	IIIa)	15.0	8.8	3.2	2.0	5.6	3.1	12.4	13.1	7.7	9.1
	IIIb)	4.2	0.9	2.3	0.5	4.5	0.6	1.5	2.1	0.7	1.2
	IIIc)	80.4	88.9	94.0	96.7	89.3	96.3	85.1	83.7	90.3	88.9
	IV	--	0.5	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.3	0.6	1.2	0.5
		100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%
		214	217	218	191	177	527	295	662	672	
	Majority Ethnicities: 454 Turks, 148 Armenians. Minority Ethnicity: 50 Greeks										

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
IIIc) Morocco	I	1.9	2.4	--	1.7	1.8	0.7	0.1	--	--	0.2
	II	--	0.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIa)	0.5	--	2.1	2.8	5.5	1.1	0.4	--	--	0.4
	IIIb)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IIIc)	97.1	88.9	93.8	91.0	81.7	85.7	96.7	97.7	85.4	91.4
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	0.5	7.9	4.2	4.5	11.0	12.5	2.8	2.3	14.6	8.1
		100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%
		209	126	48	178	109	287	980	775	309	
IIIc) Brazil	I	--	5.9	1.0	2.3	2.1	--	5.9	0.8	2.4	2.3
	II	23.9	20.6	33.0	20.5	18.8	20.8	17.8	23.8	24.1	21.6
	IIIa)	24.8	35.3	40.0	52.3	27.1	31.2	41.4	43.9	44.1	40.2
	IIIb)	44.0	27.9	22.0	13.6	20.8	21.6	24.3	16.8	16.1	19.7
	IIIc)	7.3	10.3	3.0	11.4	29.2	17.6	4.6	9.0	9.8	10.3
	IV	--	--	--	--	2.1	5.6	3.3	2.5	1.0	3.1
	Other	--	--	1.0	--	--	3.2	2.6	3.3	2.4	2.9
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	99.9%	100.1%
		109	68	100	44	48	125	152	244	286	
	Major Ethnicities: 59 Portugese, 57 Germans, 48 Italians										
IIIc) Argentina	I	3.4	7.1	2.2	1.7	5.0	5.4	4.4	3.2	3.6	4.2
	II	5.8	7.7	6.5	5.0	8.8	17.5	7.9	9.1	7.2	10.4
	IIIa)	46.2	36.8	58.0	50.4	38.8	43.6	48.5	52.6	66.9	52.9
	IIIb)	38.0	36.8	29.0	30.6	32.5	19.5	30.4	24.5	13.3	21.9
	IIIc)	5.8	9.0	4.3	12.4	13.8	13.4	7.9	9.9	5.4	9.2
	IV	--	0.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	1.0	1.9	--	--	1.3	0.7	0.9	0.8	3.6	1.5
		100.2%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.2%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%
		208	155	138	121	80	149	227	253	278	
	Major Ethnicities: 128 Italian, 53 Spanish										

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
IIIa) Iran	I						---	---	---	---	---
	II						1.4	2.1	0.6	---	1.0
	IIIa)						---	---	---	1.2	.0.3
	IIIb)						---	---	1.1	1.2	0.6
	IIIc)						91.3	89.6	94.9	94.7	92.6
	IV						2.9	---	---	---	0.7
	Other						4.3	8.3	3.4	3.0	4.8
							99.9	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%
							69	48	176	169	
IIIb) Czechslovakia	I						---	---	---	---	---
	II						8.0	1.1	1.3	0.8	1.1
	IIIa)						---	2.2	---	3.1	1.8
	IIIb)						84.0	90.2	88.8	89.1	89.4
	IIIc)						8.0	6.5	10.0	3.9	6.8
	IV						---	---	---	---	---
	Other						---	---	---	3.1	1.0
							100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%
							25	58	80	129	
Stateless	I						0.1	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.2
	II						1.4	1.5	2.1	1.6	1.7
	IIIa)						2.3	3.2	1.5	2.1	2.3
	IIIb)						84.2	81.5	81.2	83.8	82.7
	IIIc)						11.2	12.3	12.7	9.9	11.5
	IV						0.7	1.0	1.7	1.1	1.1
	Other						0.2	0.3	0.6	1.0	.5
							100.1%	100.1%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%
							2394	2661	2526	2808	

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
IIIc) Syria	I	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	II	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	IIIa)	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.9	---	1.0	0.7
	IIIb)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	IIIc)	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	95.2	98.1	100.0	99.0	98.1
	IV	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Other	---	---	---	---	---	4.8	---	---	---	1.2
		100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		14	7		13	24	21	53	100	203	
IIIc) Others	I						---	---	---	---	---
	II						---	---	---	---	---
	IIIa)						---	1.5	---	4.5	1.5
	IIIb)						---	---	---	---	---
	IIIc)						97.1	86.1	62.1	70.5	79.0
	IV						---	---	---	---	---
	Other						2.9	12.3	37.9	25.0	19.5
							100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
							35	65	29	44	
IV West Indies	I					99	197	123	126	173	154
	II					9	16	17	18	24	19
	IIIa)					56	94	54	86	89	81
	IIIb)					---	4	---	---	1	1
	IIIc)					16	18	12	17	19	16
	IV					522	1464	1393	2201	3387	Total I-III+Other
	Other					11	10	25	38	38	28
									100.0%	99.9%	
						713	1803	1624	2486	3731	Total

Majority Ethnicities: 2,840 Negroes, 330 East Indians, 216 Chinese
Minority Ethnicity: 140 British

Note: For the West Indies #'s were averaged.

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
IV China	I	---	---	---	0.1	---	---	---	---	0.2	0.1
	II	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	IIIa)	---	---	0.1	---	---	---	---	0.1	---	---
	IIIb)	---	---	0.1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	IIIc)	---	---	---	---	---	0.1	---	---	---	---
	IV	99.9	100.0%	99.8%	99.9%	100.0%	99.8%	100.0%	99.9%	99.5%	99.8%
	Other	---	---	---	---	---	0.1	---	---	0.3	0.1
		79.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		2473	2313	1158	706	545	911	2127	3376	2978	
IV East Indies	I	2.3	3.0	2.8	0.9	1.0	2.5	3.2	2.5	4.7	3.2
	II	2.3	2.2	0.8	1.1	1.2	0.1	1.7	0.3	0.2	0.6
	IIIa)	1.9	1.0	2.3	0.6	0.3	1.7	1.8	2.1	3.9	2.4
	IIIb)	0.2	---	---	---	---	---	0.6	---	---	0.2
	IIIc)	2.8	1.0	2.1	2.6	1.6	3.5	1.4	1.6	2.3	2.2
	IV	90.4	92.5	90.8	94.0	92.7	91.8	89.7	92.4	87.2	90.3
	Other	---	0.1	1.2	0.9	3.1	0.5	1.6	1.0	1.7	1.2
		99.9%	99.8%	100.0%	100.1%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%
		429	670	653	698	669	1022	1694	2997	3627	
		Majority Ethnicity: 2,674 Indian, 361 Pakistani, 117 Ceylonese									
		Minority Ethnicity: 164 British, 137 Portugese (Goa)									
IV Japan	I	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.4	0.1
	II	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	IIIa)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	IIIb)	---	---	---	---	---	0.6	---	---	0.2	0.2
	IIIc)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	IV	100.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.3	99.4	100.0	100.0	98.6	99.5
	Other	---	---	---	---	0.7	---	---	---	0.8	0.2
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		183	190	159	114	141	171	140	188	500	

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
IV South & Central America	I						0.9	1.1	2.6	2.6	2.6
	II						14.1	21.7	22.1	13.7	13.7
	IIIa)						45.0	44.9	49.8	47.5	47.5
	IIIb)						19.3	16.0	12.7	2.6	2.6
	IIIc)						16.4	5.3	5.7	4.1	4.1
	IV						2.3	7.0	3.1	26.7	26.7
	Other						2.0	4.0	3.9	2.7	2.7
							100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%
							347	374	456	845	
	Major Ethnicities: 173 Spanish, 123 Negro, 107 Portugese, 106 Germans, 91 Italians										
IV Asia, other	I						0.9	---	0.4	0.9	0.6
	II						0.2	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.3
	IIIa)						6.8	20.2	11.7	8.4	from Cypress
	IIIb)						1.3	0.2	---	0.1	0.4
	IIIc)						16.2	14.0	8.2	4.9	from Arabia
	IV						74.6	65.0	79.6	85.5	x-(1-36)=flow
	Other						---	---	---	---	---
							100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
							457	520	2163	3652	
	Majority Ethnicities: 2,986 Other (mainly Filippino), 186 Chinese Minority Ethnicities: 300 Greeks, 172 Arabs										
Africa, others	I						57.6	48.5	41.2	35.2	48.9
	II						8.3	3.7	2.5	4.7	4.9
	IIIa)						6.8	3.7	2.5	3.4	6.2
	IIIb)						13.6	7.4	1.7	0.4	II 11
	IIIc)						8.3	12.9	8.4	7.7	II 13
	IV						3.8	20.2	27.8	41.2	x-(48.9+4.9+6.2+11+13+9)
	Other						99.9%	100.1%	100.1%	99.9%	
							132	163	119	233	

*Guyana included in 1966

Majority Ethnicity: 55 Negro, 41 East Indian
Minority Ethnicities: 76 British

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Average 1963-1966
Mexico	I						12.0	7.0	0.8	---	5.0
	II						29.9	10.5	30.0	19.1	22.4
	IIIa)						18.8	55.3	33.1	42.9	37.5
	IIIb)						4.3	---	---	1.0	1.3
	IIIc)						32.5	26.3	53.1	35.2	31.8
	IV						2.6	---	0.8	1.0	1.1
	Other						---	0.9	2.4	1.0	1.1
							100.1%	100.0%	100.2%	100.2%	100.2%
							117	114	130	105	

Chart Series 6: Extrapolated Immigration by Ethnic Status Group: 1967-1970

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group							1967
	FLOW	I	II	IIIa)	IIIb)	IIIc)	IV	Others
Great Britain	65428	55614	523	1916	1851	12225	15234	131
France	7940	7026	71	397	190	206	15	31
New Zealand	1145	1044	42	6	22	3	3	42
Ireland	2761	2719	5	11	8	8	8	--
United States	18013	10267	4629	910	972	828	360	180
Australia	4673	3416	308	266	509	65	18	93
South Africa	1308	693	251	26	23	90	134	88
Germany	8224	16	8117	8	57	16	--	--
Netherlands	4354	9	4192	4	13	13	13	104
Switzerland	2397	24	2341	17	7	10	--	2
Denmark	1236	1	1229	--	2	2	1	--
Belgium	1052	7	1017	9	11	3	--	3
Austria	1044	1	1005	3	28	7	--	--
Finland	930	1	923	--	5	1	1	--
Norway	547	2	540	1	1	1	2	--
Sweden	603	2	560	2	36	3	1	1
Others	26	--	25	--	--	--	--	--
Italy	32108	--	32	32043	32	32	--	--
Portugal	10622	11	--	10580	--	--	21	11
Greece	11169	--	--	11124	--	34	--	11
Spain	1868	2	6	1844	2	15	--	2
Yugoslavia	5366	5	11	54	5232	21	--	48
Poland	1562	2	3	--	1534	20	--	5
Hungary	705	--	6	1	674	23	1	1
Russia	301	1	41	3	247	7	--	1
Czechoslovakia	343	--	4	6	307	23	--	3
Others	66	1	5	--	54	6	--	--
Mexico	264	13	59	99	3	84	3	3
Egypt	1798	7	5	72	11	1690	2	14
Israel	2337	--	5	9	21	2302	--	2
Lebanon	1062	--	2	6	3	1045	--	5
Turkey	764	1	2	70	9	679	--	4
Morocco	749	2	--	3	--	685	--	61
Syria	325	--	--	2	--	319	--	4
Iran	190	--	2	1	1	176	1	9
Brazil	373	9	81	150	73	38	12	11
Argentina	379	16	39	200	83	35	--	6
South & Cent. America	1496	39	205	711	39	61	399	40
Others	66	--	--	1	--	52	--	13
West Indies	8618	154	19	81	1	16	8319	28
China	4044	4	--	--	--	--	4036	4
East India	5972	191	36	143	12	131	5393	72
Japan	858	1	--	--	2	--	854	2
Asia, Others	5151	13	7	399	9	432	4291	--
Africa, Others	341	167	17	21	11	13	103	9
Stateless	2298	5	39	53	1900	264	25	11
	223080	81486	26404	60152	12995	11729	29250	1064
	100.1%	36.7%	11.9%	27.1%	5.9%	5.3%	12.7%	0.5%

Total Extrapolated Immigration: 223,080

Actual Immigration: 222,876

Difference 204

0.1%

1968

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group							
	FLOW	I	II	IIIa)	IIIb)	IIIc)	IV	Others
Great Britain	41944	35652	336	587	545	1426	3356	84
France	6020	5328	54	301	144	157	12	24
New Zealand	1126	1027	42	7	23	3	3	23
Ireland	1871	1843	4	7	6	6	6	--
United States	19059	10864	4898	858	1029	877	381	191
Australia	3380	2471	223	193	368	47	14	68
South Africa	948	502	182	19	17	65	98	64
Germany	5942	12	5865	6	42	12	--	--
Netherlands	3312	7	3189	7	10	10	10	79
Switzerland	1926	19	1882	13	6	8	--	2
Denmark	1061	1	1056	--	2	2	1	--
Belgium	742	5	718	7	8	2	--	2
Austria	787	1	758	2	21	6	--	--
Finland	806	1	800	--	4	1	1	--
Norway	448	2	443	--	--	1	1	1
Sweden	389	1	361	1	23	2	--	1
Others	48	1	46	--	--	--	--	1
Italy	21232	--	21	21190	21	21	--	--
Portugal	8841	9	--	8806	--	17	--	9
Greece	8157	--	--	8124	--	24	--	8
Spain	1683	2	5	1661	2	13	--	2
Yugoslavia	6402	6	13	64	6249	26	--	58
Poland	1250	1	3	--	1228	16	--	16
Hungary	715	--	6	1	684	24	1	1
Russia	221	1	30	2	181	5	--	1
Czechoslovakia	9653	--	106	174	8630	656	--	97
Others	131	3	10	--	106	11	--	1
Mexico	221	11	50	83	3	70	2	2
Egypt	1948	8	6	78	12	1831	2	16
Israel	1503	--	3	6	14	1480	--	2
Lebanon	1314	--	3	8	4	1293	--	7
Turkey	621	1	2	57	7	552	--	3
Morocco	1428	3	--	6	--	1305	--	116
Syria	733	--	--	5	--	719	--	9
Iran	231	--	2	1	1	214	2	11
Brazil	272	1	--	1	--	248	--	22
Argentina	310	13	32	164	68	29	--	5
South & Cent. America	1634	42	223	776	42	67	436	44
Others	97	--	--	1	--	77	--	19
West Indies	7533	154	19	81	1	16	7234	28
China	5259	5	--	--	--	--	5248	5
East India	4809	154	29	115	10	106	4343	58
Japan	628	1	--	--	1	--	625	1
Asia, Others	5221	15	8	278	10	549	4361	--
Africa, Others	326	159	16	20	11	13	98	9
Stateless	1792	4	30	41	1482	206	20	9
	184137	58330	21474	43751	21015	12213	26255	1099
	100.1%	31.7%	11.7%	23.8%	11.4%	6.6%	14.3%	0.6%

Total Extrapolated Immigration: 184,137

Actual Immigration: 183,974

Difference 163

.01%

1969

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group							
	FLOW	I	II	IIIa)	IIIb)	IIIc)	IV	Others
Great Britain	37470	31850	300	525	487	1274	2998	75
France	3995	3536	36	200	96	104	8	16
New Zealand	913	833	34	6	18	3	3	18
Ireland	1503	1480	3	6	5	5	5	--
United States	21474	12240	5519	966	1160	988	429	215
Australia	3074	2247	203	175	335	43	12	61
South Africa	678	359	130	14	12	47	70	46
Germany	3880	8	3830	4	27	8	--	--
Netherlands	2529	5	2435	5	8	8	8	61
Switzerland	1531	15	1496	11	5	6	--	2
Denmark	633	1	630	--	1	1	1	--
Belgium	722	5	698	7	8	2	--	2
Austria	504	1	485	2	14	4	--	--
Finland	758	1	753	--	4	1	1	--
Norway	324	1	320	--	--	1	1	--
Sweden	288	1	267	1	17	1	--	1
Others	85	1	82	--	--	--	--	1
Italy	10884	--	11	10862	11	11	--	--
Portugal	8031	8	--	7999	--	16	8	--
Greece	7134	--	--	7105	--	21	--	7
Spain	995	1	3	982	1	8	--	1
Yugoslavia	5241	5	10	52	5110	21	--	47
Poland	980	1	2	--	962	13	--	3
Hungary	626	--	5	1	598	21	1	1
Russia	145	--	20	2	119	3	--	--
Czechoslovakia	4721	--	52	85	4221	312	--	47
Others	185	4	14	--	150	16	--	1
Mexico	335	17	75	126	4	107	4	4
Egypt	1471	6	4	59	9	1383	1	12
Israel	868	--	2	3	8	855	--	1
Lebanon	985	--	2	6	3	969	--	5
Turkey	423	--	1	38	5	376	--	2
Morocco	377	1	--	2	--	345	--	31
Syria	427	--	--	3	--	419	--	5
Iran	121	--	1	--	1	112	1	6
Brazil	353	8	76	142	70	36	11	10
Argentina	387	16	40	205	85	36	--	6
South & Cent. America	3321	86	455	1577	86	136	887	90
Others	67	--	--	1	--	53	--	13
West Indies	12003	154	19	81	1	16	11704	28
China	5272	5	--	--	--	--	5261	5
East India	7264	323	44	174	15	160	6659	87
Japan	698	1	--	--	1	--	695	1
Asia, Others	5646	15	8	239	10	324	5050	--
Africa, Others	400	196	20	25	11	13	127	9
Stateless	1810	4	31	42	1496	208	20	9
	161808	53435	18116	31733	15054	8576	33965	929
	100.0%	33.0%	11.2%	19.6%	9.3%	5.3%	21.0%	.6%

Total Extrapolated Immigration: 161,808

Actual Immigration: 161,531

Difference 277

0.2%

1970

Country of Citizenship	Ethnic Status Group							
	FLOW	I	II	IIIa)	IIIb)	IIIc)	IV	Others
Great Britain	30568	25982	245	428	397	1039	2445	61
France	3292	2913	30	165	79	86	7	13
New Zealand	969	884	36	6	19	3	3	19
Ireland	1324	1304	3	5	4	4	4	--
United States	23183	13214	5958	1043	1251	1066	464	232
Australia	2916	2132	192	166	318	41	12	58
South Africa	734	389	141	15	13	51	76	50
Germany	3000	6	2961	3	21	6	--	--
Netherlands	1947	4	1875	4	6	6	6	47
Switzerland	1520	15	1485	11	5	6	--	2
Denmark	470	--	468	--	1	1	--	--
Belgium	454	3	439	4	5	1	--	1
Austria	431	--	415	1	12	3	--	--
Finland	681	1	676	--	3	1	1	--
Norway	248	1	245	--	--	--	1	--
Sweden	281	1	261	1	17	1	--	1
Others	63	1	61	--	--	--	--	1
Italy	8731	--	9	8714	9	9	--	--
Portugal	8700	9	--	8765	--	--	17	9
Greece	6506	--	--	6480	--	20	--	7
Spain	912	1	3	900	1	7	--	1
Yugoslavia	6701	7	13	67	6533	27	--	60
Poland	874	1	2	--	858	11	--	3
Hungary	541	--	4	1	517	18	1	1
Russia	136	--	19	1	112	3	--	--
Czechoslovakia	1411	--	16	25	1261	96	--	14
Others	199	2	16	--	162	17	--	1
Mexico	421	21	94	158	6	134	5	5
Egypt	986	4	3	39	6	927	1	8
Israel	816	--	2	3	7	804	--	1
Lebanon	1021	--	2	6	3	1005	--	5
Turkey	319	--	1	29	4	284	--	2
Morocco	290	1	--	1	--	265	--	23
Syria	329	--	--	2	--	322	--	4
Iran	157	--	2	--	1	145	1	8
Brazil	291	7	63	117	57	30	9	8
Argentina	242	10	25	128	53	22	--	4
South & Cent. America	3988	104	546	1894	104	164	1065	108
Others	64	--	--	1	--	51	--	12
West Indies	11932	154	19	81	1	16	11633	28
China	3465	3	--	--	--	--	3458	3
East India	7660	245	46	184	15	169	6917	92
Japan	785	1	--	--	2	--	781	2
Asia, Others	6025	36	18	298	24	359	5290	--
Africa, Others	488	239	24	30	11	13	162	9
Stateless	1642	3	28	38	1358	189	18	8
	147925	47698	16446	29814	13256	7422	32377	912
		32.2%	11.1%	20.1%	9.0%	5.0%	21.9%	

Total Extrapolated Immigration: 147,925
Actual Immigration: 147,713
Difference 212
.01%