

Recent Developments in Immigration to Canada and Australia*

A Comparative Analysis

ANTHONY H. RICHMOND and G. LAKSHMANA RAO

York University, Toronto, Canada

INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION in the modern world is subject to strict legal and administrative controls. In this respect it differs from internal migration which, at least in democratic countries, is free to respond to demographic and socio-economic forces. As a consequence, internal migration gives rise to multi-way exchange movements of population between metropolitan areas, substantial net gains of population by areas of high income and economic growth and contributes to the increasing urbanization of the population (Richmond and Kubat, 1976). If international migration was free from legislative control, there is little doubt that worldwide population movements would exhibit similar patterns. Distance and the cost of moving would have some inhibiting effect but the readiness with which employers, transportation companies, travel agents, friends and relatives will advance the cost of travel, combined with the comparative cheapness of charter flights and other means of transportation today, substantially reduces the deterrent effect of distance. As a consequence, highly urbanized industrial and post-industrial societies feel obliged to control immigration. Failure to do so could mean mass migration on a scale that would threaten the political and social stability of receiving societies and undermine their economically privileged position.

Traditionally, immigration controls have been designed to achieve three main objectives. These include, firstly, the preservation of ideological purity and the maintenance of security. In the case of communist countries this has meant limiting immigration to a select few who are committed to communist dogma. It has also meant exercising control over emigration and the return of politically dissident citizens. In the case of western countries, immigration is generally only encouraged from countries that have compatible forms of government. Exceptions are made in the case of refugees who are considered to

* The authors wish to acknowledge with thanks the helpful comments and criticisms of an earlier draft of this article that were provided by the following persons, who are in no way responsible for any remaining errors of fact or interpretation: Mr. J. S. Cross, Department of Manpower and Immigration, Ottawa; Mr. Alan Barclay, Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Canberra; Professors Freda Hawkins and W. E. Kalbach, University of Toronto; Professors Charles Price and J. Zybrzycki, Australian National University.

be opposed to the regime of the country from which they have fled. Normal immigration selection procedures are aimed to prevent the entry of those who are considered a security risk or potentially subversive. A second major consideration has been to maintain the racial and ethnic homogeneity of the population or, in the case of plural societies, to maintain a balance between major racial, linguistic or religious groupings. This has led in many countries to the adoption of preferential categories based upon nationality and, in some cases, to the exclusion of particular racial or ethnic groups. Thirdly, immigration policies have been designed to maintain and further advance the material standard of living and the rate of economic growth of the receiving society. At times of economic recession, this usually means reducing immigration and de-emphasizing the labour force content of the immigrant flow. At periods of economic prosperity and expansion, it means the deliberate recruitment of immigrants or temporary workers who will enter the labour force in those occupational categories where demand is greatest and the local supply of appropriate skills is insufficient.

Countries of immigration can be divided broadly into two categories. There are those which have adopted a passive attitude, controlling the admission of those who meet certain criteria but not actively encouraging permanent settlement. In many cases visas are only issued on a temporary basis. Most countries of western Europe fall into this category (Rose, 1969). Other countries have taken a more positive and promotional view of immigration while at the same time maintaining a high degree of selectivity. Such countries have generally considered immigration favourably from the point of view of population growth as well as economic expansion. Canada and Australia are typical countries which, until recently, were perceived as underpopulated relative to their size. Australia has been more explicit than Canada in defining long-term population goals and in deliberately promoting immigration as a means toward their achievement. Population growth has been perceived in both countries as increasing consumer demand and contributing to economies of scale, although economists have begun to question these advantages in recent years (Parai, 1974; Raynauld, 1975). In Australia, the belief that a larger population was a prerequisite for adequate defense, particularly against Japan and China, was also a major consideration before and after World War II (Appleyard, 1971: 7). However, in the last decade, both Canada and Australia have reacted to internal and external pressures to modify their respective immigration policies. Although responding in varying degrees and at a different speed, the pattern of change has been similar in both countries. They exhibit the following common denominators:

1. A progressive liberalization of admission criteria gradually removing racial and national criteria of eligibility.
2. Selection related more systematically to the educational, technical and professional qualifications of applicants and to occupational demand in the receiving country.
3. Increased opposition to immigration from professional groups and educated classes, particularly those supporting zero population growth on environmental and ecological grounds.

4. Government-sponsored studies to review immigration policies in the light of broader questions of population growth and future development.

After briefly reviewing the scale and composition of recent immigration to Canada and Australia, each of the above points will be examined in more detail.

Table 1
Canada: Landed Immigrants (by Year of Landing and
by Year of Entry) and Minister's Permits
Granted, 1968-1975

<i>Calendar Year</i>	<i>Landed Immigrants</i>		<i>Minister's Permits Issued C</i>	<i>Total B + C*</i>
	<i>By Year of Landing A</i>	<i>By Year of Entry B</i>		
1968	183,974	187,787	1,210	188,997
1969	161,531	170,561	779	171,340
1970	147,713	160,017	485	160,502
1971	121,900	130,205	642	130,847
1972	122,006	154,830	723	155,553
1973	184,200	132,245	4,392	136,637
1974	218,465	175,355	17,177	192,532
1975	187,881	169,880**	21,202	191,082
Total 1968-75	1,327,670	1,280,880	46,610	1,327,490

* Under certain circumstances a Minister's Permit may be rescinded and landed immigrant status approved, possibly giving rise to some duplication in these statistics.

** Estimated by authors.

Source: Annual Statistical Reports of the Department of Manpower and Immigration and special tabulations prepared by the Program Data Group.

Table 2
Australia: Permanent Settlers and Long Term
Visitors, 1968-1975

<i>Calendar Year</i>	<i>Permanent Settlers</i>	<i>Long Term Visitors</i>	<i>Total Permanent and Long Term Arrivals*</i>
1968	159,270	23,473	182,743
1969	183,416	26,867	210,283
1970	185,325	31,194	216,519
1971	155,525	30,500	186,025
1972	112,468	26,559	139,027
1973	105,003	27,370	132,373
1974	121,324	26,984	148,308
1975	89,147	23,615	112,762
Total 1968-75	1,111,478	216,562	1,328,040

* Excluding returning Australians.

Source: Australian Quarterly Immigration Statistics, March 1975; and Overseas Arrivals and Departures, June 1976.

Trends in Immigration

In the period 1968-75 Australia admitted approximately 1.11 million persons for permanent settlement. In the same period Canada admitted 1.33 million landed immigrants. Unfortunately, the categories "settler arrivals" in Australia and "landed immigrants" in Canada are not precisely comparable. Australia actually admitted some people on temporary visas who remained longer than a year.¹ Between 1968 and 1972 Canada also admitted visitors who were allowed to apply for landed immigrant status after arrival. Others were admitted to Canada under special Minister's Permits and were not recorded in the landed immigrant series.² However, "settler arrivals" plus "long-term visitors" in Australia provide an approximate basis with which to compare "landed immigrants" in Canada. Tables 1 and 2 show that there was considerable fluctuation from year to year in both countries. In Canada, the figures for 1973 and 1974 are somewhat inflated by the number who had been admitted as visitors in earlier years and received landed immigrant status after arrival. Therefore, an adjusted series shows the distribution by year of entry. In absolute terms the numbers admitted to Australia were about the same as those coming to Canada, i.e., 1.33 million between 1968 and 1975. However, as the population of Australia was only 12.8 million in 1971 compared with 21.6 million in Canada, the proportional impact of immigration was greater in Australia.

Comparing the quinquennial period 1965-1970 with 1971-1975, both countries experienced a decline in levels of immigration. The average annual number of landed immigrants to Canada fell from 182,000 per annum in the first quinquennium by 8.2 per cent to 167,000 per annum, 1971-1975. In the same periods Australian settler arrivals fell from an average of 158,600 by 26.4 per cent to 116,700 per annum. In fact, Australia reacted sooner and more

1 According to international convention an immigrant is defined as any person who enters a country with the intention of remaining for more than twelve months, irrespective of the purpose of the move. Therefore, returning Australians, students and others may be included as "long-term arrivals" even if they are not planning to settle permanently. Furthermore, before 1973 many Asian and other non-European immigrants in Australia could only be admitted on temporary visas however long they planned to stay. Canada does not observe the convention in its immigration statistics and there is not regularly published record of returning Canadians and others who are not "landed immigrants". Between 1968 and 1972 many students who entered Canada on student visas subsequently obtained landed immigrant status.

2 A Minister's Permit is issued when an applicant for admission to Canada is a member of a "Prohibited Class" by reason of health or other condition which is not regarded as sufficiently serious to warrant exclusion or deportation. Others, who do not meet current requirements, but are not prohibited under the Immigration Act, may be admitted by special Order in Council and given landed immigrant status. The latter are included in immigration statistics, the former are not (C.I.P.S. 3: 47). However, in 1974 and 1975 a majority of the Minister's Permits issued were to sponsorable dependents who had arrived in Canada as visitors, without pre-clearance. In most cases they have been or will be landed by Order in Council.

firmer than Canada to deteriorating economic conditions, after 1970, by reducing its official immigration "targets" from 175,000 in 1969-1970 to only 50,000 in 1975-1976.

In assessing the impact of immigration on the two countries, allowance must also be made for the outward movement of population. Australia keeps reliable records of emigration but estimates for Canada are more approximate. Settler loss from Australia, that is the remigration of immigrants, was estimated at approximately 20 per cent for the period 1961-1966 and 30 per cent for the period 1966-1974 (Price, 1975: 17). Return migration was probably in the order of 30 per cent for Canada in the period 1961-1971 and may have been higher for the subsequent period, but figures are not available. Allowance must be made also for the emigration of the native populations of the two countries and of long-term residents. Net migration to Australia 1966-1971 is estimated at a little over 500,000 and, for the period 1971-1975, probably did not exceed 140,000. Net migration to Canada 1966-1971 was approximately 350,000 after allowance is made for census underenumeration.³ No reliable figure is available for the period 1971-1975. Because of changes in American legislation and regulations Canadian emigration to the United States declined in that period but this may have been compensated by an increase in the remigration of the foreign-born.

Both countries experienced a substantial decline in fertility over the decade so that net reproduction rates fell below 1.0 by 1975. In the first half of the decade net migration contributed about one-third of the population growth in both countries. In the second half of the decade net migration contributed a somewhat smaller proportion of population growth in Australia and a somewhat higher proportion in Canada. There was an unprecedented net migration loss of population from Australia of about 7,000 in the calendar year 1975 (Australia, Overseas Arrivals and Departures, April 1976, Table 2).

Racial and National Discrimination

Historically both Canada and Australia have exhibited a strong preference for British immigrants. When British immigrants were not available in sufficient numbers, encouragement was given to immigrants from selected European countries (Richmond, 1967). Throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries there was explicit discrimination against non-European immigrants, particularly from Asia. Australia unequivocally pursued a "white" Australia policy

3 Canada does not collect its own statistics of emigration but relies upon information provided by the British, American and some other authorities to estimate the outward movement annually. The census residual method is also misleading if statistics of landed immigrants are used to estimate emigration from net migration, because landed immigrants constitute only part of the inward movement and published data are by year of "landing", not year of entry to the country. A published estimate of net migration for 1966-1971 based on the residual method is 464,000 but this requires adjustment to allow for differential rates of census under-enumeration in 1966 and 1971.

(Price, 1974). In practice, Canadian policies were hardly less discriminatory although token numbers from India, Pakistan and Ceylon were admitted during the 1950's, together with a limited number of close relatives sponsored by Canadian citizens of Asian origin (Corbett, 1957).

Canada took a major step toward removing racial discrimination in 1962. At this time, the system of preferred nationalities was abolished and new regulations introduced that emphasized education, training and skills regardless of the country of origin of the applicant. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stated at the time that the new regulations were designed to ensure that any suitably qualified person, from any part of the world, could be considered for immigration to Canada on their own merit, without regard to race, colour, national origin or the country from which he or she came. However, there were two residual elements of discrimination after 1962. One arose from the distribution of Canadian immigration officers abroad. At that time, comparatively few were outside of Britain and Europe. Furthermore, one section of the regulations limited the range of relatives whom an immigrant from Asia, Africa and the West Indies might sponsor. This particular element of discrimination was removed when further regulations were adopted in 1967 (Hawkins, 1972). Meanwhile, the number of immigration offices in Asia, Africa and South America was gradually increased (Parai, 1975). As a consequence of these changes, the number of non-European immigrants coming to Canada increased substantially. Table 3 shows that in 1968 whereas Britain and Europe contributed 66 per cent of immigrants to Canada, the proportion declined steadily to 39 per cent in 1975. However, country of last permanent residence is not a satisfactory indicator of the racial or ethnic origin of the immigrant. Many Black and Asian immigrants come to Canada after having spent some time in another country such as Britain. After 1966, the Canadian immigration authorities ceased to keep records of the ethnic origin of immigrants. However, a reliable estimate of Black and Asian immigration to Canada (excluding those from Asia Minor and the Middle East), 1956-1974 is 408,000 (Richmond, 1976: 511-12). As a proportion of total immigration to Canada, the Black and Asian group were approximately 14.6 per cent in 1967 and 36.6 per cent in 1974.

The reduction in racial discrimination in Canadian immigration policies was not entirely altruistic. Canada's trade with and investment in Third World countries increased rapidly in the 1960's. After the United States and Britain, Japan moved into third place among trading partners and other countries such as China and India became increasingly important as export markets (Statistics Canada, 1973: 758-9). Canada's role as diplomatic mediator and "peacekeeper" in international relations demanded that it should remove any suggestion of prejudice and discrimination in its dealings with other countries and this meant applying universalistic criteria in immigration. Australia, too, was reappraising its traditional isolation from and fear of the Asian countries which surrounded it. Again, as Britain moved closer to the European Common Market, it was essential for Australia to build new markets for itself

and establish more positive diplomatic relations with neighbouring countries such as Japan, India, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. Australia began to cooperate with Asian powers in mutual defense agreements and economic development. The increasing trade between Australia and Asian countries, the growth of tourism and the increasing number of Asian students all contributed to a more sympathetic attitude to the relaxation of the traditional "white Australia" position (Rao, 1973).

Table 3
Canada: Landed Immigrants by Country of
Former Residence, 1968-1975

<i>Calendar Year</i>	<i>Britain</i>	<i>Other Europe</i>	<i>All Other</i>	<i>Total</i>
			Per Cent	
1968	18.4	47.2	34.4	100.0 183,974 (N)
1969	17.8	36.9	45.3	100.0 161,531 (N)
1970	16.0	35.2	48.8	100.0 147,713 (N)
1971	11.7	31.0	57.3	100.0 121,900 (N)
1972	14.9	27.1	58.0	100.0 122,006 (N)
1973	14.6	24.4	61.0	100.0 184,200 (N)
1974	17.6	23.0	59.4	100.0 218,465 (N)
1975	18.6	20.2	61.2	100.0 187,881 (N)

Source: Department of Manpower and Immigration, Annual Statistical Reports.

Australia's liberalization of its immigration policies was much more cautious than that of Canada. Token steps were taken in 1956 when the Australian government reviewed the policy it had followed since the turn of the century of not admitting anyone of non-European origin for permanent residence. Those already settled in Australia became eligible to be naturalized and the admission for permanent residence of non-Europeans who were immediate relatives of Australian citizens was authorized. Highly qualified Asians and other non-Europeans were allowed to come to Australia for an indefinite stay but under temporary permits. In 1957 it was decided that non-Europeans who had been admitted on temporary permits could be naturalized after 15 years' stay. Another significant development in Australia occurred in 1964 when the rules governing entry of persons of mixed racial descent were eased. As a consequence, a number of Anglo-Indians and others became admissible. However, Australia's assisted passage arrangements still favoured traditional sources, particularly Britain and Europe.

Table 4
Australia: Total Settler Arrivals by Country of
Former Residence, 1968-1975

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>U.K. & Ireland</i>	<i>Other Europe</i>	<i>All Other</i>	<i>Total</i>
	Per Cent			
1967-68	45.5	36.0	18.5	100.0
1968-69	45.9	34.6	19.5	137,525 (N) 100.0
1969-70	42.0	37.6	20.4	175,657 (N) 100.0
1970-71	38.6	35.4	26.0	185,099 (N) 100.0
1971-72	42.0	27.8	30.2	170,011 (N) 100.0
1972-73	45.3	24.1	30.6	132,719 (N) 100.0
1973-74	41.1	22.3	36.6	107,401 (N) 100.0
1974-75	43.0	18.5	38.5	112,712 (N) 100.0
				89,147 (N)

Source: Australian Immigration Consolidated Statistics, 1973; Australian Immigration, Quarterly Statistical Summary, June 1974; and Overseas Arrivals and Departures, Quarterly Reports, 1974-75.

In 1966 the 15-year waiting period with regard to citizenship was reduced to five years' residence, putting non-Europeans on the same basis as other immigrants. However, the Minister of Immigration made it clear that it was not the intention of the Australian government to allow all non-Europeans admitted for temporary residence to stay permanently (Opperman, 1966). In particular, it was emphasized that the 12,000 Asian students in Australia should be encouraged to return to their own countries on completion of their education. Also in 1966, it was decided that applications for entry by well-qualified people wishing to settle in Australia would be considered on the basis of their suitability as settlers, their ability to integrate readily and their possession of qualifications which were regarded as positively useful in Australia. In the case of non-Europeans, after five years' stay on temporary permits, they were able to apply for permanent residence status and citizenship (Rao, 1976).

It was not until 1973 that Australia followed Canada's example in abolishing all ethnic discrimination in its admission requirements. When the Labor Party came to power in 1973, it announced that entry for permanent residence and eligibility for assisted passages would be determined by uniform rules and that there would be no discrimination on the basis of race, nationality or colour (Hawkins, 1975). Henceforward, Australian policy would provide for the immigration of three main categories of people: a) those coming to be reunited with immediate family in Australia; b) those sponsored by non-dependent relatives or others, and c) people selected to meet the national need. It was

made clear that the definition of "need" was in terms of national and economic security and Australia's capacity to provide employment, housing, education and social services. Although non-discrimination on the grounds of race, colour or nationality was a declared basis of the new policy, so also was "the avoidance of the difficult social and economic problems which may follow from an influx of peoples having different standards of living, traditions and cultures" (Grassby, 1973). Table 4 shows that the proportion from Britain and Europe fell from 81.5 per cent in 1967-68 to 61 per cent in 1974-75. Britain remained a more important source of immigrants than in the case of Canada. However, former residence is not a reliable guide to race or ethnicity.

The Australian government has not published records of the racial origin of its immigrants but, of the total settler arrivals, it may be roughly estimated that 53,000 persons of Asian nationality or origin were admitted to Australia between 1959 and 1975.⁴ As a proportion of the total movement, there was an increase from four per cent in 1968 to 12 per cent in the first quarter of 1975. Using birthplace as a basis of classification, Price estimated that, when allowance was made for remigration, Asian immigrants (excluding those from the Middle East) contributed 6.7 per cent of net migration to Australia in the period 1966-1971 and 15.3 per cent of net migration, 1971-1974 (Price, 1975: Table A).

Educational and Occupational Selection

Economic needs have always been a major factor in determining eligibility for admission to Canada. Agricultural settlement was an important consideration even as late as the early 1950's. However, it was increasingly recognized that as an advanced industrial society, Canada's needs were for more highly skilled workers. This was recognized in the formal regulations introduced in 1962 and made quite explicit in the so-called "points" system introduced after 1967. Three categories of immigrants were distinguished *viz.* sponsored dependents; nominated relatives and independent applicants. The latter were required to meet certain standards under an assessment system based on the following factors:

1. Education and Training: Up to 20 assessment units awarded on the basis of one unit for each successful year of formal education or occupational training.
2. Personal Assessment: Up to 15 units on the basis of the immigration officer's assessment of the applicant's adaptability, motivation, initiative and other similar qualities.
3. Occupational Demand: Up to 15 units if the demand for the applicant's occupation was strong within Canada, whether the occupation was skilled or unskilled.
4. Occupational Skill: Up to 10 units for the professional, ranging down to one unit for the unskilled.

4 The term Asian here excludes those from Asia Minor, Middle East and the Mediterranean area who are sometimes included. If the "permanent and long term arrivals" are used as a basis of estimation the total admissions of Asians may be as high as 125,000 between 1959 and 1973 but the majority of these were students and others on temporary visas.

5. Age: Ten units for the applicant under 35 years with one unit deducted for each year over 35.
6. Knowledge of French and English: Up to 10 units depending upon the degree of fluency in French and English.
7. Relative: Up to five units if the applicant had a relative in Canada able to help him/her become established but unprepared or unable to sponsor or nominate.
8. Employment Opportunities in Area of Destination: Up to five units if the applicant intended to go to an area of Canada where there was a generally strong demand for labour.

Until 1974, independent applicants only required a minimum of 50 units to be eligible for admission. In 1974 these requirements were modified. Applicants must have at least one unit for occupational demand and/or previously arranged employment. Unless employment was prearranged, a minimum of 60 points was required for admission. A further category of "designated employment" was also introduced which was intended to encourage immigrants to go to those jobs and those areas of Canada where the need was greatest (C.I.P.S. 2: 60).

Nominated relatives were also subject to occupational and other requirements but on a modified scale according to the degree of proximity of the relationship with the nominator and whether the latter was a landed immigrant or a Canadian citizen. Sponsored relatives were not subject to these criteria.

The system was designed to increase the educational and skill levels of immigrants and to relate qualifications more closely to the requirements of the Canadian economy. To some extent, the purpose was unintentionally defeated by other regulations that were also introduced in 1967. These allowed visitors to Canada to apply for landed immigrant status after arrival. Many people took advantage of this provision to evade pre-selection. By 1972 the numbers arriving in Canada without pre-clearance exceeded the capacity of the Immigration Department and the Immigration Appeals Board to handle. As a consequence, large numbers were admitted under a special adjustment programme using relaxed criteria. Many who were admitted under these arrangements were relatively unskilled. Nevertheless, once given landed immigrant status, they were eligible to sponsor dependents and nominate relatives. As a consequence, new patterns of "chain migration" were established with less skilled immigrants from largely non-traditional source countries.

Except in the case of non-Europeans, selection for admission to Australia was not as systematically related to educational and occupational qualifications as in Canada. After 1966, non-Europeans were admissible if they fell into one of the following categories.

1. Persons with specialized technical skills taking appointments for which local residents were not available.
2. Persons of high attainment in the arts and sciences, or of prominent achievement in other ways.
3. Persons nominated by responsible authorities or institutions for specific important professional appointments, which otherwise would remain unfilled.
4. Executives, technicians and other specialists who have spent substantial periods in Australia – for example, with the branches of large Asian companies – and who had qualifications or experience in positive demand.

5. Businessmen, who in their own countries, were engaged in substantial international trading and, who, if admitted to Australia would be able to carry on trade with other countries which would be of significant value.

6. Persons who had been of particular and lasting help to Australia's interest abroad in trade, or in other ways.

7. Persons who by former residence or their association with Australia had demonstrated an interest in or identification with the country that would make their future residence feasible.

Until 1973 the admission of British and European immigrants, while broadly related to economic conditions in Australia, was not as formalized as the "points" system in Canada. However, in 1973 the Minister of Immigration announced that a "new uniform, detailed, structured selection assessment procedure" would be introduced that would be more comprehensive, penetrating and objective than the previous system. The new selection procedure would give greater attention to the personality of migrant applicants together with the following five basic requirements: 1) be economically viable in Australia; 2) have the personal qualities that will enable them to cope with the trauma of resettlement in a foreign country; 3) be medically fit; 4) have a satisfactory character record; 5) have a sincere intention of making a permanent home in Australia, and joining the Australian family through citizenship. The Minister stated that the new procedure had "taken the best from the points rating system such as that used by Canada" (Grassby, 1973).

Tables 5 and 6 show the intended occupations of immigrants to Australia and Canada, respectively, for the period 1968-1975. Throughout this period the overall educational and skill level of immigrants to Canada was higher than that of Australia. Absolutely and proportionately Australia admitted many more labourers and far fewer persons in professional and technical occupations. However, the long-term trends were somewhat different. In the case of Australia there was a steady increase in the proportion of professionals but, despite the operation of the "points" system, the reverse was the case for Canada. This was due in part to the admission of so many visitors to landed immigrant status, after 1972, on the basis of relaxed criteria. In both countries, craftsmen and production workers, together with construction trades, constituted the largest category. It may be noted also that a larger proportion of immigrants to Canada expected to enter the labour force. Care must be taken in interpreting the occupational data for both countries because they are based on the previous and/or intended occupation of the person concerned. Evidence for Canada shows that in many cases this does not correspond with the actual occupation first pursued in the new country (Richmond, 1967, 1974; C.I.P.S. 4: 32). The unavailability of suitable employment, difficulties with language or with the necessary professional or other licensing requirements may delay recovery of former occupational status. In some cases there may be a permanent change of occupation. Unfortunately, similar information concerning the occupational and social mobility of immigrants is not available for Australia, although the difficulty which refugee doctors had in being admitted to practice in Australia has been documented (Kunz, 1975).

Table 5
Australia: Total Settler Arrivals:
Percentage Distribution by Intended Occupation,
1967-1975

Fiscal Year	Prof. & Tech.	Admin. & Manag.	Clerical & Fin.	Sales & Loggers	Farmers, Fishers, & Etc.	Miners & Quarrymen	Transp. & Comm.	Crafts. & Prod.	La-bourer	Service	Not Stated	Total		Dependents	
												%	No.	%	No.
1967-68	11.0	4.2	11.3	4.1	3.3	0.5	5.7	32.6	12.8	9.1	5.4	100.0	65,151	72,374	52.6
1968-69	12.1	4.0	11.4	4.2	2.7	0.5	5.7	32.9	11.0	8.9	6.6	100.0	81,968	93,689	53.3
1969-70	11.7	4.1	11.0	3.9	2.3	0.4	4.8	34.6	14.1	8.3	4.8	100.0	85,880	99,219	53.6
1970-71	13.8	4.2	10.8	4.0	2.0	0.3	4.4	33.8	11.8	8.6	6.3	100.0	77,144	92,867	54.6
1971-72	16.7	4.7	11.8	4.4	1.6	0.3	4.4	31.5	8.9	9.1	6.6	100.0	60,057	72,662	54.7
1972-73	17.6	4.8	13.8	4.6	1.5	0.2	4.4	31.1	7.8	9.1	5.1	100.0	49,918	57,338	53.5
1973-74	17.4	5.3	13.2	4.2	1.5	0.2	4.5	30.0	8.7	7.5	7.5	100.0	53,058	59,654	53.0
1974-75	23.0	5.5	14.0	3.8	1.2	0.2	3.8	26.3	6.2	6.0	10.0	100.0	43,198	45,949	51.5

Source: Australian Immigration Consolidated Statistics, 1973; and Quarterly Reports 1974 - 5-6.

Table 6
Canada: Landed Immigrants:
Percentage Distribution by Intended Occupation,
1968-1975

Calendar Year	Prof.	Mana- gerial	Clerical	Comm. & Fin.	Farmers, Fishing, Loggers	Miners	Transp. & Comm.	Const. & Mfg.	La- bourer	Service	Others and not Stated	Total		Non-Workers	
												%	No.	%	No.
1968	30.6	2.5	13.2	3.4	3.4	0.5	1.4	32.4	2.8	9.7	0.1	100.0	95,446	88,528	48.1
1969	31.9	3.0	14.5	3.9	2.8	0.5	1.1	27.8	2.4	10.7	1.4	100.0	84,349	77,182	47.8
1970	28.8	4.0	15.6	3.9	2.8	0.4	1.1	28.3	2.1	10.1	2.9	100.0	77,723	69,990	47.4
1971	26.6	5.7	16.2	4.0	3.7	0.4	1.2	26.3	2.2	10.4	3.3	100.0	61,282	60,618	49.7
1972	25.7	7.4	14.4	4.2	3.7	0.2	1.3	25.8	2.0	11.1	4.2	100.0	59,432	62,574	51.3
1973	20.7	5.9	14.6	4.0	3.6	0.2	1.3	28.6	3.0	12.9	5.2	100.0	92,228	91,972	49.9
1974*	20.5	6.0	14.8	3.9	2.8	0.2	35.5	35.5	10.0	10.0	6.3	100.0	106,083	112,382	51.4
1975*	24.6	7.1	14.5	4.1	2.1	0.2		33.1		8.7	5.6	100.0	81,189	106,692	56.8

* Revised basis of classification.

Source: Canadian Immigration and Population Study, Vol. 3, and Department of Manpower and Immigration Annual Statistical Reports.

Canada instituted a system of temporary employment visas in 1973. These may be issued for a maximum of 12 months but, in some cases, are renewed for a longer term. The actual number of visas issued was 80,934 in 1973; 87,353 in 1974 and 95,814 in 1975. The increase was most marked in the construction industry and occurred despite unemployment averaging more than seven per cent. Increasing reliance on temporary workers is partly a response to the growing opposition to permanent immigration.

Opposition to Immigration

In considering opposition to immigration a distinction must be made between those who are against immigrants from any source and those who specifically wish to exclude particular racial, ethnic or national groups. In both Canada and Australia public opinion on immigration questions can best be described as ambivalent. Traditionally, opposition to immigration in general has come from those who have felt economically threatened and hostility has been greatest at times of economic recession. Immigrants were frequently perceived as sources of cheap labour and as threatening the effectiveness of labour unions in their attempts to raise wages and improve working conditions. Predictably, opposition tended to be strongest among manual workers and the less educated. However, as immigration policies become more selective, in terms of the educational and occupational qualifications of immigrants, it might be expected that those with higher education and some professional groups in the receiving countries would now be less favourably disposed toward immigration. Public opinion poll data for Canada support the conclusion that while the better educated are still more in favour of immigration than those with only elementary education the gap between the classes has been closing. Between 1959 and 1971 there was a substantial drop in support by the university-educated for the idea that Canada needs immigrants (Tienhaara, 1974: 26).

In Canada, certain professional groups clearly felt threatened by immigration. Medical doctors in several provinces waged a successful campaign in 1974 to persuade the Federal Government to reduce to zero the number of units of assessment for occupational demand in respect of medically qualified applicants. Except in the case of prearranged employment in designated areas, this was designed to restrict further immigration by medical doctors. Although between 1968 and 1974 over 1,000 physicians and surgeons were admitted annually to Canada, they were faced with stringent licensing requirements in some provinces, which often meant undertaking lengthy periods of internship and requalifying examinations (Richmond, 1975: 13). Medical doctors in Australia experienced similar difficulties in qualifying, if they did not come from a British or Commonwealth country (Kunz, 1975).

The President of the Canadian Medical Association in 1974 expressed concern at the high proportion of foreign (particularly Chinese) medical students at Canadian universities. A similar concern regarding the high proportion of

foreign-born doctors obtaining specialist qualifications in Canada was also expressed by a representative of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada. The latter is a Federally incorporated body whose principal function is the certification of specialist physicians, who have usually done five or more years of study following graduation from medical school. It was noted that about half of the candidates achieving certification were foreign medical graduates, the majority of whom intended to remain in Canada. This situation was regarded as anomalous when admission to Canadian medical schools was restricted by stringent academic requirements. It was argued before the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Immigration Policy that a medical doctor coming from another country:

eventually after five years of training is a specialist and becomes a citizen and functions in Canada, while another man of his own age who happened to come from Essex County in Southern Ontario had an average of 74 per cent and could not get into the University of Western Ontario Medical School because they were cutting off at 78 per cent that year, so he went on and became a biology teacher. It is that kind of discrimination we are pointing out; that the foreign man after he has his M.D. can get in, the Canadian cannot get his original M.D. because he cannot get in (to medical school). (Canada: Senate/ House of Commons, 1975: Proceedings, 48.)

In Canada, university teachers have also expressed growing concern at the number of foreign professors, particularly from the United States, admitted to Canada and employed by Canadian universities and colleges. Not only was this regarded as unfair competition in the face of a potential "overproduction" of Canadian Ph.D.'s but many felt that in the teaching of the humanities and social sciences there was a serious danger of an American cultural bias in teaching and research (Matthews and Steele, 1969). Professional associations, such as the Canadian Association of Sociologists, went on record in opposition to the employment of non-Canadian university teachers.⁵ In Ontario, a provincial government committee also urged universities to move rapidly toward greater Canadianization in the hiring of faculty. So far, there has been no similar reaction in Australia, which has tended to rely heavily upon Britain and the United States as sources for university teachers, but some backlash may be anticipated in the future.

Race Prejudice and Social Darwinism

Opposition to the immigration of non-whites, particularly Asians, has a long history and was widespread in both Canada and Australia until quite recently. In part it was a reflection of the economic factors that generated opposition to immigration in general but it was exacerbated by deep-seated racial prejudices (Price, 1974). At an intellectual level these prejudices were rationalised by Social Darwinistic theories that postulated the genetic superiority of Europeans over other races, supported eugenic arguments for the sterilization of the indigent and advocated the "survival of the fittest" (Banton, 1961).

5 Annual General Meeting held at Edmonton, Alberta, June, 1975.

Extreme racist views of this kind are no longer intellectually respectable although they are still propagated by extremist organizations such as the Western Guard in Canada and the Australian National Socialist Party in Australia.

However, if Social Darwinism is defined as the advocacy of social policies on the basis of false biological analogies, a new manifestation of it has appeared in Canada and Australia, in recent years, and is being used to rationalise exclusionary immigration policies. The underlying premise of the new argument for reducing immigration is an ecological one. Few would deny the reality of population and resource crisis at the global level. An exponential growth of population will put serious pressure on food and energy resources and has revived the Malthusian dilemma (Ehrlich, 1970). Furthermore, it is generally conceded (even by the developing countries where population pressures are greatest) that mass emigration would not solve the population problem. The solution, if any, lies in more effective fertility control, greater productivity and a more egalitarian distribution of resources. However, this does not mean that the existing levels of emigration from the Third World to countries such as Canada or Australia should be stopped, nor does it mean that these countries could not sustain reasonable levels of population growth without serious damage to the environment. Such an inference can only be sustained if it is argued that the environments presently enjoyed (and spoiled) by the affluent must be perpetually protected from habitation by the less advantaged.

The most outspoken opposition to large-scale immigration in both countries has, in fact, come from those who have adopted an environmentalist point of view. Influential lobbyists and spokesmen have argued that, contrary to the traditional view, both Canada and Australia have reached, or will shortly achieve, an optimal level of population relative to the available productive land, energy resources and other ecological considerations. At the same time, in both Canada and Australia, there has been concern at the increasing urbanization and metropolitanization of the population and a desire to avoid some of the worst consequences of population concentration in large cities observable in some other countries.

The argument against immigration on environmental ground was first clearly stated in Australia by the Director of the School of Medical Research at the Australian National University in 1971. In a paper presented to the Australian Institute of Political Science, he presented a biologist's view of population and economic growth. He examined the world population trends in relation to energy and other resources emphasizing the delicate ecological balance that existed. He claimed that "Australia is far more vulnerable than the other large centres of Western culture, North America and Europe, to the damaging effects of large numbers of people, however, for it is by far the driest continent; its arid lands are more extensive, relative to its size and the arid land ecosystems are much more fragile; its other natural resources are far more limited than those of either Europe or the United States" (Fenner, 1971: 46). He went on to argue for a substantial lowering of the rate of population growth in Australia by a reduction in immigration, family planning and abortion "on demand".

At the same conference, the head of the Urban Research Unit of the Research School of Social Sciences in the Australian National University, discussed the growth of Australian cities and also emphasized the economic and social costs of growth in metropolitan areas. He argued for a long-term planning of new medium sized centres rather than the growth of metropolitan areas. In relation to immigration, he concluded "that the problem of growth that I have discussed, and the costs I have attempted to assess, would be smaller if our large cities were growing less rapidly" (Neutze, 1971: 74).

Remarkably similar views were echoed in Canada at seminars held in Toronto in 1972 and 1973, sponsored by the Conservation Council of Ontario. A paper by two biologists from the University of Waterloo considered the need for a population policy for Canada and concluded "Canada is already overpopulated in terms of its sustainable carrying capacity, and this means that a lot of debate about the action alternatives can be avoided if this point is understood" (C.C.O., 1973: 29).

Arguments against immigration were also advanced on behalf of environmentalists at hearings of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Immigration Policy, held in 1975. For example, a spokesman for the British Columbia Wild Life Federation, whose primary objective is to safeguard wildlife, outdoor recreational and environmental quality, argued that the Greater Vancouver and lower mainland areas of British Columbia attracted the greatest number of immigrants and internal migrants. He attributed this regional popularity to the quality of the social and winter climate. He urged the Canadian government to close the door to immigration "until we can reconcile the numbers of people that can be accommodated without destroying our liveable regions." When questioned, he admitted that he would go so far as to exclude refugees as well as other immigrants (Canada: Senate/House of Commons, 1975: Proceedings, 25). Similar arguments were put forward by the president of the Conservation Council of New Brunswick who suggested that "immigration into Canada must be reduced drastically and, eventually, almost to zero." The brief submitted to the parliamentary committee by an organization supporting "Zero Population Growth" adopted a somewhat modified position. In his presentation, Mr. Chris Taylor stated:

First then is the environmental approach to immigration policy; it has brought the fertility levels above replacement in the late 60's and early 1970's. ZPG advocated that Canadian immigration flow be designed to achieve zero net migration, that is the immigration be equal to the emigration. As fertility continued to fall in the seventies and with further study from environmentalists, our recommendations changed to allow for a moderate, positive flow. (Canada: Senate/House of Commons, 1975: Proceedings, 33).

Government Sponsored Studies

In the face of increasing domestic concern with population questions and the need to articulate policies in the context of the United Nations World

Population Year, both Canada and Australia embarked upon a review of immigration policies in the context of broader questions of population growth and distribution. In Australia, an independent body was set up under the direction of Professor W. D. Borrie in 1971. The National Population Inquiry undertook extensive research, conducted public hearings and brought in a substantial preliminary report in two volumes in 1975. Canada's approach was less thorough and more bureaucratic. The Canadian Immigration and Population Study was instituted in 1973 and led to the publication of the "Green Paper" at the end of 1974 (C.I.P.S. 1974: 1-4). In Canada, the publication of the Green Paper was preceded by the submission of innumerable briefs directly to the Ministry of Manpower and Immigration under whose auspices the study was conducted. Following the publication of the study a number of conferences were held. A Joint Parliamentary Committee of the Senate and House of Commons, to which reference has been made, also conducted public hearings and received many briefs from individuals and organizations.

The Report of the Australian Inquiry was bland, uncontroversial and academic in approach. This was in accord with its terms of reference which were to provide the factual basis on which policies might be formulated. In contrast, the Green Paper on Immigration in Canada was more explicit in its statement of policy options and raised considerable controversy. While not going far enough in support of immigration restriction to satisfy the more extreme supporters of zero population growth, the report succeeded in enraging those who considered it was an indirect criticism of immigration from the Third World. Extremists branded the document as "racist" and demanded its retraction by the Government.⁶

The Borrie Inquiry noted the relative lack of sophistication among the Australian general public concerning population questions, but stated that there was fairly general agreement that the rate of population growth should be slowed down.

Such evidence suggests that while concepts of *desirable* population targets may not be well articulated over a large sector of the population, actual practice favours a continuation of moderate growth, but does not favour excessive zeal simply for the sake of reaching defined targets. In contrast, the minority who have advocated zero growth had been very articulate, strongly dominated by elite educational groups, with their argument often backed by a deep understanding of the Australian environment and ecology. The associated aspects of conservation, the onset as quickly as possible of the stationary state, and controlled consumption to minimize the wastage of non-renewable resources, are set not only as the goal for Australia, but for humanity at large (Borrie, 1975: 711).

Concerning immigration specifically, the Borrie Commission considered that net immigration ranging between 50,000 and 100,000 per annum would be manageable in terms of both environment and resources but the higher figure

6 Negative reaction to the "Green Paper" was not confined to extremists. The Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, at its Annual Meeting in June 1975, also condemned it.

would be against the current climate of opinion in Australia. Given the level of emigration a net figure of 100,000 a year would mean recruiting about 160,000 new settlers per annum. The Commission noted that the lower figure, net gain of 50,000 a year, was consistent with Australian government policy at that time. In Australia, during the 1970's those who favoured immigration were less articulate and influential than their counterparts in Canada. Economists and businessmen began to emphasize the costs of immigration and to minimize the benefits. As unemployment rose from less than 1.5 per cent to over four per cent in 1975 and the worldwide inflation began to threaten the Australian economy, employers and labour organizations alike supported the Labor government's earlier decision to reduce immigration targets.

However, following a change of party in power, the new Australian Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs made a statement in the House of Representatives at the end of March, 1976 which modified the policies of the previous administration. He expressed concern at the declining fertility and low levels of net migration. He reconstituted the Australian Population and Immigration Council and indicated his intention to ask the new Council to proceed with the preparation of a Green Paper on Population and Immigration Policies. He made some direct comparisons with Canadian experience and suggested that there was no evidence that immigration had contributed to the exacerbation of unemployment. He also expressed the view that there was no reason to suppose that a shortage of water supplies or other resources would place any constraints on population growth in the foreseeable future. He expressed concern at the consequences of uneven growth and of an aging population, if immigration were to decline. The Minister concluded by stating:

The constraints on our potential for population growth are not so much those of our natural resources but are the need to ensure a continuing improvement in living and working standards. The avoidance of short-term pressures on our infra-structures ... the need to ensure the retention of a cohesive Australian community with scope for cultural, ethnic and individual diversity, and the availability of the sorts of migrants the Australian community requires and wants. There is also the great question of creating new job opportunities in the emerging post-industrial society. Though there is evidence that immigration itself helps to create jobs and to generate economic development. Even making full allowance for these constraints, it is the wishes of the community, rather than the potential to observe population growth that set the limits on our population objectives (Mackellar, 1976).

Recommendations of the Special Joint Committee in Canada

The recommendations of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, which are expected to be the basis of new immigration legislation to be introduced late in 1976, were more liberal than the earlier Green Paper. The Committee upheld the present policies of non-discrimination with regard to race and nationality, argued that Canada still needed immigrants and rejected the view that immigrants were to blame for urban problems. "Canadians worried about the quality of life in our cities should look elsewhere

than to sharply reduced immigration for a solution to the problems of city living" (Riel and O'Connell, 1975: 8).

The Special Joint Committee received representations from individuals and organizations. Both written and verbal submissions were received. Of the individuals who wrote letters, 88 per cent wanted strict controls on immigration and many expressed specific opposition to non-whites from Third World countries. However, only 25 per cent of the organizational briefs and 23 per cent of the persons appearing before the Committee in public hearings expressed such opposition. Of the 275 written briefs from organizations, 35 per cent favoured the maintenance of current policies or a more open door policy. Of the organizations and individuals who made verbal presentations to the Committee, 35 per cent favoured the maintenance of current policies or more liberal admission criteria (Riel and O'Connell, 1975: Appendix A). The supporters of continued moderate immigration, related to Canada's economic needs, included the representatives of employers' organizations, the Canadian Labour Congress and of innumerable ethnic organizations who emphasized family reunion and the contributions of ethnic minorities to the Canadian multicultural community.

In Canada, the Special Joint Committee on Immigration Policy in its report to Parliament, dealt more explicitly with policy questions, legislative aspects and regulations than the Borrie Inquiry. However, its conclusions with regard to the scale of immigration in the future were remarkably similar.

The Committee was impressed by evidence that even if the decline in the fertility rate were to cease and the current fertility rate 1.8 births per woman were to be projected into the future, Canada would require *net* immigration of more than 50,000 a year to prevent a decline in total population after the year 2000. ... It should be noted, moreover, that these are net figures which take account of estimated emigration from Canada. ... Well informed estimates suggest that emigration may amount to about one-third of the gross number of immigrants, so that it would be reasonable to add 50 per cent to net figures. ... On the basis of this calculation, an annual rate of 75,000 immigrants would be needed at current fertility rates to maintain a population level of 28 million during the first half of the 21st century. Even at this figure the population could be expected to decline by two million by the year 2071. If it were desired to have a stable population throughout the next century, it would be necessary to have a gross rate of immigration of 150,000 a year (Riel and O'Connell, 1975: 4-5).

A further study carried out by the Science Council of Canada dealt with population, resources and technology. It favoured an increase in food exports but restriction on immigration to a level equivalent to a net immigration of 50,000 per annum, leading to a population for Canada in the region of 28 to 30 million by the end of the century if fertility remains at its present low level (Science Council, 1976). However, some members of the Council disagreed with the view that Canada should move further toward an even more capital intensive, high technology economy in order to increase its capacity to export food to developing countries. A minority favoured gearing down technology and energy consumption to more modest levels in which case Canada might have room for more people (Dotto, 1976).

However, policy statements by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in Canada suggested that the government favoured a moderate controlled population growth rate which, in terms of immigration, meant a gross inflow in the order of between 75,000 and 150,000 per annum in the foreseeable future, but allowing for some flexibility (Andras, 1976).⁷ Like his Australian counterpart, the Minister drew attention to the effect of an aging population if immigration were curtailed.

While endorsing a policy of moderate growth, the Canadian government expressed concern at the tendency for both internal and external migrants to gravitate toward the major metropolitan centres. "Overheated" metropolitan growth has been regarded as the source of many social and economic problems, including those of housing, transportation, pollution and strain on social services. The government has not been prepared to restrict the mobility of existing Canadian residents or dictate where they should live. However, they considered that it might be possible to influence the pattern of immigrant settlement toward preferred areas and regions where employment was available but where population densities were not too high. The Special Joint Committee went so far as to suggest that permanent residence status might be withheld from immigrants until they have lived in a designated area for two years or more. It is likely that such strict regulations would be opposed on the ground that they interfered with basic civil rights. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether existing regulations, or any that may be introduced in the future, will succeed in reversing the very strong propensity which immigrants have exhibited in the last twenty-five years to settle in metropolitan areas.

Conclusion

Immigration policies like other government decisions are thrashed out in a political arena and are an accommodation to conflicting interests and ideologies. Theories that attribute genetic inferiority to certain races, nationalities and classes are no longer intellectually respectable and command only eccentric support. Furthermore, racial discrimination is not politically expedient when trade and diplomatic relations with the Third World must be promoted. The most influential opposition to immigration in both Canada and Australia now comes from those concerned with the environmental consequences of population growth. There is growing support for the view that high population densities have deleterious consequences and that cities are the repositories of a variety of social evils. Such views have their roots in a misguided form of Social Darwinism, the postulates of which may be used to justify population stabilization, limits to economic growth and stricter controls over immigration so that

7 Due to the systematic under-estimation of emigration from Canada in officially published statistics it is difficult to translate gross immigration targets into actual net migration gains (or losses). Furthermore, the increasing use of temporary employment visas obscures the true demographic character of international population movements.

the environments now enjoyed by a minority shall not be irrevocably damaged by the majority. In this respect, environmental preservation and ecology have replaced eugenics and racism as the ideologies of the "haves" who feel threatened by the "have nots."

Counteracting the influence of those opposed to immigration are those who support moderate growth. They include employers, some labour unions and representatives of ethnic organizations. So far, their views have prevailed at the official level. Even in the face of high unemployment in Canada and Australia, immigration has continued. Greater emphasis has been placed upon "family reunion" meaning the migration of dependents and close relatives but labour force migration has not altogether ceased. It has been maintained at a comparatively high level in Canada and has been supplemented by resort to temporary workers in some industries. Economic self-interest continues to be a major factor favouring selective immigration but the preferred occupations are different in the two countries and are changing with altered economic conditions. Canada is now capable of supplying more of its professional and skilled workers than formerly, although there may be shortages in specific industries and localities, such as those engaged in exploration for and development of energy resources. Immigration is still an important source of labour in some geographic areas and the government is trying to direct immigrants away from areas of high unemployment or where the pressure on housing and other resources is excessive. In both Canada and Australia fertility has fallen dramatically and continued immigration is seen as a means of avoiding future population decline and ameliorating the consequences of an otherwise aging population.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

- ANDRAS, The Honourable Robert
1976 "Population Goals for Canada." *Population Symposium, Population Research Foundation*. Ottawa: Manpower and Immigration (Press release).
- APPLEYARD, R. T.
1971 *Immigration Policy and Progress*. Sydney: Australian Institute of Political Science.
- Australia:
1973 *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics, Department of Immigration, No. 7*. Canberra.
1974 *Australian Immigration: Quarterly Statistical Summary, Department of Immigration*. Canberra.
1974-5-6 *Australia: Overseas Arrivals and Departures, Quarterly Bulletins, Australian Bureau of Statistics*. Canberra.
- Australian Institute of Political Science (A.I.P.S.)
1971 *How Many Australians? Immigration and Growth*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- BANTON, Michael (ed.)
1961 *Darwinism and the Study of Society*. London: Tavistock.
- BORRIE, W. D.
1975 *Population and Australia: A Demographic Analysis and Projection*. First Report of the National Population Inquiry, Vol. 1 and 2. Australian Government Publishing Service.

- Canada: Senate/House of Commons
 1974-5-6 *Proceedings of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on Immigration Policy, First Session, Thirtieth Parliament.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Canada, Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on Immigration Policy
 1975 *Report to Parliament, First Session, Thirtieth Parliament, 1974-75.* (Joint Chairmen: Senator Maurice Riel and Hon. Martin O'Connell, M.P.)
- C.I.P.S. 1
 1974 *A Report of the Canadian Immigration and Population Study: 1 Immigration Policy Perspectives.* Ottawa: Information Canada for Department of Manpower and Immigration.
- C.I.P.S. 2
 1974 *A report of the Canadian Immigration and Population Study: 2 The Immigration Program* Ottawa: Information Canada for Department of Manpower and Immigration.
- C.I.P.S. 3
 1974 *A Report of the Canadian Immigration and Population Study: 3 Immigration and Population Statistics.* Ottawa: Information Canada for Department of Manpower and Immigration.
- C.I.P.S. 4
 1974 *Canadian Immigration and Population Study: Three Years in Canada - First report of the longitudinal survey on the economic and social adaptation of immigrants.* Ottawa: Information Canada for Department of Manpower and Immigration.
- Conservation Council of Ontario
 1972-73 *A Population Policy for Canada? The proceedings of two seminars on the need for a Canadian Population Policy and on the Impact of People on the Environment.*
- CORBETT, D. C.
 1957 *Canada's Immigration Policy: A Critique.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- DOTTO, Lydia
 1976 "Food exports, not immigration, called best form of aid," *Globe and Mail.* Toronto: 20 June, 1976.
- EHRlich, P. R. and A. H. EHRlich
 1970 *Population, Resources Environment: Issues in Human Ecology.* San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- FENNER, F. J.
 1971 "The Environment," in Australian Institute of Political Science (eds.) *How Many Australians? Immigration and Growth.* Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- GRASSBY, The Honourable A. J.
 1973 Statement made by the Minister of Immigration to the Australian House of Representatives, October 11, Canberra.
- HAWKINS, Freda
 1972 *Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
 1974 *Immigration Policy and Management in Selected Countries. A study of immigration policy and management and their implications for population growth in the United States, Australia and Israel.* Ottawa: Information Canada for Department of Manpower and Immigration.
- KUNZ, Egon F.
 1975 *The Intruders.* Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- MACKELLAR, The Honourable M. J. R.
 1976 *Population Policy Statement,* Australian House of Representatives.
- MATTHEWS, R. and J. STEELE
 1969 *The Struggle for Canadian Universities.* Toronto: New Press.
- NEUTZE, Max
 1971 "The Growth of Cities", in A.I.P.S. (ed.) *How Many Australians? Immigration and Growth.* Sydney: Angus and Robertson.

- OPPERMAN, Hubert
1966 Speech delivered on March 9, 1966 in the House of Representatives on changes in immigration policy.
- PARAI, Louis
1974 *The Economic Impact of Immigration (Canadian Immigration and Population Study)*. Ottawa: Information Canada for Department of Manpower and Immigration.
1975 "Canada's Immigration Policy 1962-74." *International Migration Review*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, Vol. IX, No. 4: 449-477.
- PRICE, Charles A.
1974 *The Great White Walls are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australia, 1836-1888*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
1975 *Australian Immigration: A Review of the Demographic Effects of Post-War Immigration on the Australian Population*. Research Report No. 2. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- RAO, G. Lakshmana
1973 *New Labour Government in Australia: A Search for a New Regional Pact*. National Herald, April 17, 1973.
1976 *A Comparative Assessment of the Canadian and Australian Immigration Policies (with special emphasis on the period 1961-1971)*. Toronto: York University, Ethnic Research Programme (mimeograph).
- RAYNAULD, André
1975 *Brief and testimony to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Immigration Policy. Vol. 15*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- RICHMOND, A. H.
1967 *Post-War Immigrants in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
1974 *Aspects of the Absorption and Adaptation of Immigrants*. Ottawa: Information Canada for Department of Manpower and Immigration.
1975 "The Green Paper: Reflections on the Canadian Immigration and Population Study," *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, Vol. VII, No. 1: 5-21.
1975-76 "Black and Asian Immigrants in Britain and Canada: Some Comparisons," *New Community, Journal of the Community Relations Commission*, Vol. IV, No. 4: 501-516.
- RICHMOND, A. H. and D. KUBAT
1976 *Internal Migration: The New World and the Third World*. London and Beverly Hills: Sage.
- RIEL, M. and M. O'CONNELL
1975 Sec: Canada, Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons.
- ROSE, Arnold M.
1969 *Migrants in Europe: Problems of Acceptance and Adjustment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Science Council of Canada
1976 *Population, Technology and Resources; Report No. 25*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Statistics Canada
1973 *Canada Year Book, 1973*. Ottawa: Information Canada.
- TIENHAARA, Nancy
1974 *Canadian Views on Immigration and Population: An Analysis of Post-War Gallup Polls, Canadian Immigration and Population Study*. Ottawa: Information Canada for Department of Manpower and Immigration.