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REFUGEES IN CANADA

Refugees and people needing protection are people in or outside Canada who fear returning to their home country. In keeping with its humanitarian tradition and international obligations, Canada provides protection to thousands of people every year. Canada offers refugee protection to people in Canada who fear persecution or whose removal from Canada would subject them to a danger of torture, a risk to their life or a risk of cruel and unusual treatment or punishment. Groups and individuals can sponsor refugees from abroad who qualify to come to Canada.

Refugees: Resettlement from outside Canada

Resettlement is the term used by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to describe the legal process of bringing a refugee to Canada to live as a permanent resident.

CIC relies on the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), other referral organizations and private sponsorship groups to identify and refer refugees for resettlement in Canada.

Private sponsoring groups are groups or corporations that have signed an agreement with Canada’s Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. In this agreement, they promise to provide funds and carry out certain duties to sponsor refugees who come to Canada.

CIC uses three legal processes, which are divided into refugee classes, for resettling refugees in Canada. The three refugee classes are:
- Convention Refugees Abroad Class

- Country of Asylum Class

- Source Country Class

In unusual circumstances, refugees from some countries may apply directly for resettlement to Canada through the Source Country Class.

What Canada is doing to help Refugees

Canada is recognized around the world for its leadership in resettling refugees and people who need protection.

Through Citizenship and Immigration Canada's (CIC) programs, refugees bring their experiences, hopes and dreams to Canada to help build an even richer and more prosperous society for us all.

Canada resettles refugees from abroad and takes part in international actions to help prevent refugee situations from developing. CIC also works at home to provide protection to those who make asylum claims here.

REFUGEE PROTECTION IN CANADA

There are two means by which Canada provides protection to refugees. Inland Claims are made when refugees flee directly to Canada and claim refugee status here. Refugees are also selected overseas (in a refugee camp or temporary country of refuge) by the Canadian government.

Inland Refugee Claims

A refugee can claim Canada’s protection at a border point (eg. at an airport or border crossing) or from within Canada.
An officer of Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) determines whether or not the claim is eligible to be heard by the Immigration and Refugee Board. A claim is not eligible to be heard if the person:

- has already been recognized as a Convention refugee by another country
- has already been rejected as a refugee by Canada, or has withdrawn or abandoned a previous claim in Canada
- came to Canada from or through a designated "safe third country" where refugee protection could have been claimed
- is deemed "inadmissible" because of serious criminality or security concerns, or the person is a violator of human rights.

If the claim is found to be eligible to be heard, it must be referred within three days to the Immigration and Refugee Board (IRB), a quasi-judicial tribunal that is independent of Citizenship and Immigration Canada. This does not mean that the case will be heard or that the case will be handled within three days; it merely means that the case will be transferred to the IRB from Citizenship and Immigration Canada. The complete processing of a refugee claim usually takes months, or even years.

**Hearing before the IRB**

A refugee claimant may undergo an expedited process or a full hearing. If a claim appears to be very well-founded, it may be accepted under an expedited process or if not, it proceeds to a full hearing. In a full hearing, a claim is heard before a single IRB Member. Every claimant has the right to be represented by legal counsel, although legal aid is not available in all parts of Canada. An interpreter is provided by the IRB where necessary.
The IRB Member can render his/her decision orally at the end of the hearing or send it in writing later by mail. If the decision is negative, it must include the reasons in writing. If the decision is positive, written reasons are not given and the refugee claimant is given the status of “protected person”.

No Right to Appeal an IRB Decision

There is no appeal of a negative IRB decision. Although the new Immigration and Refugee Protection Act does contain a Refugee Appeal Division, its creation has been delayed indefinitely by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

It is possible to request that the Federal Court conduct a “judicial review” of the negative IRB decision. However, this review is restricted to very serious legal errors and a lawyer is needed to prepare and argue the judicial review. The success rate for cases judicially reviewed is very low.

After Determination

A person who has “protected person” status can apply to be a Permanent Resident (also known as “landed immigrant status”). Applicants are charged a processing fee and must produce a “satisfactory identity document” in order to receive Permanent Residence status.

Pre Removal Risk Assessment

A claimant who is found not to be a “protected person” faces removal from Canada. Immediately prior to the removal the Immigration Department conducts a risk assessment to review conditions in the country to which the claimant will be returned.
Humanitarian and Compassionate Review

The only other recourse for an unsuccessful refugee claimant is to apply to Immigration Canada for permission to stay on humanitarian and compassionate grounds. This can be an expensive process (after paying processing and legal fees) and is rarely successful for those refused refugee status.

Overseas Refugee Claims

A small number of refugees living overseas in a country of asylum (e.g. in a refugee camp or in a country where they cannot settle permanently) are sponsored for resettlement to Canada. They can be sponsored in either of two ways; Government-assisted refugees:

Each year the Canadian government undertakes to directly sponsor a limited number of refugees for resettlement to Canada. In 2002, it selected 7,340 refugees. Privately sponsored refugees:

Private groups can also sponsor refugees to be resettled to Canada. They are responsible for those they sponsor for the first year of their arrival, and must ensure that the refugee is both socially and economically supported. In 2002, 3,045 refugees were resettled in Canada through private sponsorships.

In both cases, they must first be determined to be "persons in need of protection" by the Canadian Government.

Settling in Canada

The government of Canada has a number of programs available to refugees once they arrive in Canada. These include loan programs, health insurance and language assistance programs.
Privately sponsored refugees are financially supported by the sponsoring parties for the first year. Those undertaking a sponsorship must ensure that the sponsored refugee is adequately supported in their new home.

Canada's Response to Refugees

Throughout Canadian history, since colonization by France, immigrants have arrived in Canada for political reasons. With curious irony, however, a policy of refugee intake, per se, has existed formally only since the Immigration Act of 1976. Prior to that time, Canada's continuing and sometimes intense involvement with persons who immigrate as refugees required special action of the federal government and the Cabinet. Such political urgencies were considered as non-recurring issues. That a government should establish a policy within which refugee intake would be accommodated was a proposition which dawned only after the waves of post World War II displacements. Political action slowly but inexorably occurred thereafter.

The term "refugee" itself remained a flexible category until the implicit adoption of the U.N. High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) Convention relating to the status of Refugees of 1951. Despite easily recognizable distinctions in social status, the official status of "refugee" was absent in Canadian legislation.

Even large blocs of refugees immediately after the close of World War II required ad hoc measures of Orders-in-Council for admission to Canada. Yet, this cumbersome procedure resulted in Canada's first massive immigration (some 40,000 displaced persons by the end of 1948) in recent history. Efforts in the creation of any coordinated policy on refugees, per se, were halting, despite the creation of a Department of Citizenship and
Immigration in 1946. That department was unable to accede to the provisions of the UNHCR Convention on the Status of Refugees in 1951; rather, it remained an implicit set of working definitions for the Canadian government until final ratification of the Convention in 1969. This movement from a nation-centered to an internationally-centered commitment developed gradually since World War II, but little change would have been noted, had political upheavals not aroused the attention of Western nations in unrelieved succession in the past two decades.

Of signal importance have been the uprisings in Eastern Europe which have resulted in infrequent but large undulations of political refugees. The first such crisis to demand Canada's participation in the international resettlement effort occurred in 1956 in Hungary. Upon the launching of a campaign in the mass media and by pressure groups portraying the refugees as "freedom fighters", just over 37,000 Hungarian refugees landed in Canada within the two-year period ending in 1957. This massive undertaking involved federal and voluntary organizations in an accelerated coordination effort, as the availability of sponsors and delivery of services to refugees depended largely on the nongovernmental sectors.

Canada's subsequent efforts at the time lay in the less visible but structurally significant attentions to rights accorded to immigrants, especially refugees. The establishment of the Immigrant Appeals Board provided a judicial body empowered to quash deportation orders if the country of origination were likely to subject the (would-be) deportee to serious reprisal or recriminations.

Nonetheless, significant undertakings of refugee resettlement occurred immediately after the Czech upheaval of 1968, that in Uganda in 1972, as well as a small but important resettlement of Tibetans contemporaneously.
Some 12,000 Czech refugees represented a large enough number to indicate an affirmative response of Canada to an unambiguous political crisis. The refugees accepted by Canada showed a rather high socioeconomic profile: household heads were disproportionately young, well-educated and skilled; some 70 percent of the household heads fell in the 15-44 age range; 19 percent having more than 12 years formal education; and some 33 percent being either skilled or professional.

A longitudinal study indicated that after three years the unemployment rate of just below 10 percent was somewhat above the national average, and a certain but only moderate occupational deflection had occurred in comparison with jobs held in Czechoslovakia. The proportions in professional and technical occupations were rather high although the level may be accounted for through response biased from low returns (Canada Department of Employment and Immigration, 1975).

Ugandan Asians, who followed some four years later in 1972, had an even higher profile: about half had 12 years formal education or greater; more than half of the prospective workers oriented to commercial or sales jobs. The Ugandan rate of entry into the labor force was rapid and extensive: after one year some 85 percent of the adults (male and female) were participating. Unemployment rates were moderately higher than average—an overall of 10 percent unemployed. The job profile included 24 percent in professional/managerial/technical jobs, and another 36 percent in clerical and sales occupations.

Canada's first experience in receiving refugees from Asian origins occurred in 1970, when the federal government sponsored a group of refugees from Tibet, of whom 228 persons finally arrived. Despite uncertainty in religious and cultural requirements, the Tibetans arrived only to encounter
problems of social adaptation different mainly in degree from those encountered among refugees from other origins. They experienced a rather prolonged adjustment period, being isolated from other Canadians to a greater extent than desired either by the refugees themselves or by their government sponsors.

The job profile after about two years indicated a 65 percent participation rate (male and female) and a 12 percent unemployment rate. The job types centered toward operative blue-collar positions with wage rates generally above the prevailing minimal levels.

The experience of the early seventies provided initial affirmative answers to two disparate but cardinal questions: 1) Do selected refugees adapt well to Canadian society within a relatively short period of resettlement? and 2) Is there a need for a policy initiative especially for refugee assistance? As for the first, it was apparent that not only persons from European origins, but also those from Asiatic and African origins showed initial signs of adaptation similar to those of other immigrants to Canada. In other words, ethnic origin has little or no direct effect on speed or degree of refugee adaptation in Canada.

The affirmative answer to the second question relating to refugee policy remained rather complicated in light of existing practices. Breadwinners were selected on the basis of their youth and education or occupational training, including language facility in English or French. This consistent practice served as a functional equivalent to policy, as these guidelines or operating procedures yielded a type of selectivity of refugees in each cohort. Yet, such practices were not necessarily part of a more broadly articulated plan with regard to numbers and mix of refugees to other immigrants and the population already resident in Canada. The need for a
more clearly articulated policy was manifest. Operating procedures, however standardized over time, remained to be applied in an ad hoc manner on each occasion in which comprehensive aid to political refugees was required.

EVTUON OF REFUGEE POLICY

The evolution of refugee policy in Canada has developed in increasingly broad and detailed ways in recent years. This evolution may be highlighted by the following four points:

1) Adoption of the UN definition of Convention refugee;

2) Differentiation in legislation of refugees into Convention and other "Designated Classes";

3) Development of methods of sponsorship for refugees in both Convention and Designated Classes; and

4) Formulation of annual refugee plans.

Adoption of Convention Refugee Status

Canada did not sign the UN Refugee Convention upon its formulation in 1951. Rather it opted to use the definition as an operating guideline for identifying refugees. Decisions regarding the admission of refugees fell squarely, according to the government of the day, within the terms of national sovereignty. The formal adoption of the Convention refugee definition in 1969 implicated Canada in an international commitment, however tenuous, to assist such refugees as a continuing, rather than ad hoc, undertaking. Correspondingly, the government has responded, since 1969, to ten refugee movements of differing sizes, in comparison with three (very large) movements in the two decades prior. These responses stand largely outside the legal frame of the UNHCR Convention, as they relate to activities
undertaken abroad, whereas the Convention specifications relate to rights and privileges of refugees within the bounds of the country.

Differentiation of "Designated Classes" from Convention Refugees

The specific requirements which conform to the Convention Refugee status cannot be met in every situation in which large numbers of persons experience or perceive political retribution in their home country. As a result, the Immigration Act of 1976 enabled the government to establish "Designated Classes" for persons whose collective situation placed them in a de facto refugee situation, even if the Convention criteria might not all be met. The use of "Designated Classes" overcomes the brittleness of a single definition, so that definitions used by Canadian visa officers can more closely fit the characteristics of the particular group of displaced or persecuted persons.

Refugees under "Designated Class" specifications are examined individually as to whether they meet the specifications for eligibility and admissibility. If both are affirmative, they can be issued a visa as "Landed Immigrant"—the same status as other immigrants to Canada.

Currently there are three different "Designated Classes" in vigor for a two-year period:

1) Indochinese (citizens and residents of Kampuchea, Laos, Vietnam, leaving after April 30, 1975);

2) Latin American (citizens of Argentina, Chile, Uruguay still residing there); and

3) Self-exiled (citizens and residents of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Poland, Romania, USSR, applying outside Eastern Europe).
The categories differ among themselves in specifications. Persons from Indochina and East Europe, for example, need not demonstrate fear of political reprisal but must be residing outside their home country (and for East Europeans, outside the bloc of countries so included). To qualify as Latin American designated class on the other hand, citizens must be residing within their home country and demonstrate fear of some reprisal if they remained. In any case, the specifications are adapted to the particular political exigencies which, in turn, depart from strict Convention refugee terms. In effect, a second stream of refugees can be defined at the pleasure of the government so that total number of refugees is augmented while the conditions for eligibility vary from time to time.

The number of eligible persons of Designated Class would exceed the disposition of Canada to accept them all. In selection of refugees, for admissibility, the government officers use a criterion of likely adaptability to Canadian life measured in a far less precise or exacting way than when applied to ordinary immigrants to Canada. The latter are selected under a system which tests ability to establish successfully in relation to labor market conditions, with points awarded on a series of social and economic indicators. In the case of refugees, the immigration officer must take them into account. Yet, the additional assistance available to refugees by government, sponsors and voluntary agencies mitigate adaptation difficulties. Admissibility, therefore, involves a certain amount of discretion, even though the ultimate criterion remains the potential success of establishment in Canada.

Development of Sponsorship Arrangements

Over and above the intake of Convention and Designated Class refugees planned by the federal government, the legislation has included provisions enabling groups of individuals and organizations to sponsor
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refugee individuals or families. Groups of five or more persons or a corporation may undertake support of the refugee and dependents for a period of one year. In addition national organizations may sign "master agreements" with the federal government enabling their constituent groups (in the case of a church, its local parishes or congregations) to sign sponsorship undertakings with minimal formalities. Policy development has therefore encouraged participation of the private and organizational sectors in sponsorship while maintaining the centralized procedure of admissions. Numbers of refugees admitted to Canada may thereby vary not only with international political conditions but also the level of participation of the private sector within Canada, as private sponsorships are supplementary.

Formulation of Annual Refugee Plans

With the development of attention to refugees as a separate category of immigrants, has come the annual planning exercise specifically addressed to the Canadian commitment to refugee intake in the following year. In the first instance the planning endeavor is conducted independently of other immigration concerns. Assessments are made of prior commitments, their possible extension, and new sources of refugees given the world situation. Quotas for anticipated refugees are attached to each category. The plan announced in early 1979 specified the following for the refugee intake of that year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indochinese</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Europeans</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Refugees (elsewhere)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contingency reserve 2,000

Total 10,000

This plan was revised upwards during summer, 1979, to include 23,000 Indochinese refugees, by absorption of the contingency reserve and an increased ceiling on the quota.

The planning exercise is complicated administratively as it must be related to overall immigration policy, governmental fiscal year planning, and international developments. The levels of overall immigration result from a negotiated plan involving provincial economic and social concerns as well as from forecasts of natural replacement and net immigration. To date, refugees have been considered as one component of net immigration upon augmentation of the refugee intake, as in 1979, the ceilings of immigrants to be received rises correspondingly.

A number of demands, sometimes conflicting, bear upon the determination of the annual refugee plan. The planned intake represents a commitment both internally to Canadian provincial governments and the voluntary sector and externally to the UNHCR. Its budgetary implications have to be secured. Finally, infrastructure has to be arranged both abroad and for resettlement in Canada. Yet, in light of current estimates of numbers of refugees in the world of over 8 million, scattered temporarily in more than 40 countries, the existence of a “contingency reserve” provides latitude only for small if effective reaction to emergencies. Few other alternatives, however, appear immediately obvious for a Western nation. Doubtless policy revision will become as commonplace an exercise as formulation of an annual refugee plan.
REFUGEES ADMITTED TO CANADA

In terms of numbers of refugees admitted to Canada, Canada lacks a continuous record of data all of which are classified according to similar characteristics. Table 1 presents in aggregate form the waves of refugees and displaced persons arriving in Canada for the period 1947-1967, inclusive. Clearly Canada's more vigorous resettlement occurred in the decade immediately succeeding World War II, when a near quarter million persons arrived as refugees, if not officially so described. They were almost entirely of Eastern European origin, although the specific reasons for the movement of each group and wave was preceded by particular political circumstances.

The large number of Hungarian refugees in that period has two distinct origins. Some five thousand were political refugees immediately after World War II. The largest proportion, more than 37,000 refugees, arrived in the two year period, 1956-1957, following the Hungarian uprising during that time.

Canada received comparatively few refugees in the second near-decade, 1959-1967. Most camps of displaced persons had been cleared, with some difficulty, by that time. Only a substantial influx of refugees of Yugoslavian origin intervened before the political events in Czechoslovakia accelerated intake activity in 1968; thereupon, some 12,000 Czech refugees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>42,987</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>45,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>42,533</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>43,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>32,925</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>33,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>20,610</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>20,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslav</td>
<td>19,613</td>
<td>11,320</td>
<td>30,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>17,406</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>17,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other E. Europe (^a)</td>
<td>39,346</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>40,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other W. Europe (^b)</td>
<td>7,502</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>7,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others (^c)</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>223,299</td>
<td>18,913</td>
<td>242,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Canada: Department of Employment and Immigration, 1974.

**NOTES:**

\(^a\) Albanian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Estonian, Finnish, Lettish, Lithuanian, Romanian, Turkish.

\(^b\) Austrian, Belgian, Danish, Dutch, French, Greek, Italian, Norwegian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swiss.

\(^c\) Chinese, Egyptian, Iranian, Lebanese, Syrian and all others.

entered by the end of 1969. These data are specifically detailed, along with refugees through successive years until the present, in Table 2. These data are classified more precisely and allow a year-by-year account of refugee intake over the past decade. It will be noted that until 1975 one refugee
cohort per period predominated the intake of refugees, with relatively small additions from various origins.

The period 1970-71 witnessed relatively low refugee movement to Canada. With the expulsion of ethnic Asians from Uganda early in 1972, however, the intake resumed its increasingly undulating yearly pattern, followed in 1973 by the beginning of reception of Chilean refugees—a flow which has waxed until the present. The ascending totals of refugees from 1975 onwards is attributable to multiple movements from Chile, Indochina (especially Vietnam), Lebanon and Mozambique. Not until early 1979, however, did the movement from Indochina assume its presently predominating influence as a source of refugees. The figure in 1979 of 19,818 refugees from Vietnam represents the largest intake of people from any single country to Canada since 1976, when immigrants from Great Britain totaled over 21,000 persons.

Since World War II Canada has received some 324,660 immigrants as refugees, displaced persons, or "Designated Classes". The largest proportion, 79 percent, were from Central and Eastern Europe, especially immediately postwar. Refugees from Asia accounted for 10 percent of the total; with the exception of Tibetans, they were all very recent arrivals. Africa and South America accounted for 3 and 2 percent respectively, with the remainder, 6 percent from various other parts of the world.

REFUGEES AND DESTINATION IN CANADA

The destination of refugees and "Designated Class" immigrants to Canada is partly the result of agreements struck between the various provinces and the federal government and partly a matter of the wishes of the immigrant. Québec, in particular, has a Ministry of Immigration which sets policies and quotas for reception of refugees. In the case of other provinces,
the policy is pronounced by the federal government after formal consultations with the provinces. Overall, Table 3 indicates that the proportions of refugees received by the province follow the rank, but not proportionate level, of population in the province. Proportionally, Ontario receives a larger share of refugees than its present proportion of total population, although its share of all immigrants arriving in 1979 is even higher. Of the various origins only refugees from Latin America are mostly concentrated in regions other than Ontario. Québec has received the second largest proportion of refugees. These refugees form a larger part of the total number of immigrants received than in most other provinces. Latin American refugees are more heavily represented while those from Eastern Europe are less heavily represented in Québec. Alberta ranks third in proportion of refugees arriving in 1979 while British Columbia ranks closely behind Alberta, with largest proportions arriving from Indochinese origins. All other regions received refugees more or less in proportion with their population and number of immigrants in total.

SOCIAL PROFILE AND INDOCHINESE REFUGEES

As a result of priority selection of families with children, Indochinese refugees arriving in Canada in 1979 clustered in the younger age ranges, with about 15 percent being under school age and another quarter of school age (6-17 years inclusive). On the other end of the age continuum, only two percent was age 60 or over. A dependency ratio, number of young and old as a fraction of those eligible for the work force, of .72 represents a high proportion of dependents.

As one-half the males and about three-fifths of the females age 18 and over are married (although the partners may not have both arrived in Canada in some cases), it can be estimated that couples average more than two dependents each. Thus dependents are by no means evenly distributed over the population of adults: rather almost half the adults arrive with responsibility mainly for themselves, even though they may be part of an extended family group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampuchea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>9,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,875</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>681</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>8,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>9,971</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>11,783</td>
<td>7,353</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>27,740</td>
<td>82,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other immigrants</td>
<td>174,00</td>
<td>157,927</td>
<td>146,352</td>
<td>121,099</td>
<td>116,786</td>
<td>181,817</td>
<td>181,809</td>
<td>181,550</td>
<td>137,646</td>
<td>107,561</td>
<td>82,052</td>
<td>64,149</td>
<td>1,707,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>183,974</td>
<td>161,531</td>
<td>147,713</td>
<td>121,900</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>184,200</td>
<td>184,465</td>
<td>187,881</td>
<td>149,429</td>
<td>114,914</td>
<td>86,313</td>
<td>111,889</td>
<td>1,790,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Refugee Policy Division, Employment and Immigration Canada

NOTES: *preliminary figures.

Latin America refugees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indochina*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East European</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Refugees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Immigrants, 1979</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Refugee Policy Division, Employment and Immigration Canada

**NOTES:**
- *Preliminary figures.
- *Birthplace Vietnam, Kampuchea, Laos, and other former residents of those countries.
- *Citizens of Chile, Argentina and Uruguay.
- *Sellexiles from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Poland, Romania, USSR.
- *Both selected abroad and receiving protection once arrived in Canada.
- *Estimate January 1, 1980
- *No cases
- *Less than 1 percent
While educational background of Indochinese refugees appears low in the overall, a certain amount of those having no formal education experience may be attributable to the unusually young age profile. Thus the data on educational background in Table 4 are classified separately for "principal" arrivals (heads of households and unaccompanied adults) to adjust for the age disparity. Nearly all "principals" have elementary education, with a median of nine years. Roughly about one in five of the "principals" has some trade or professional education. About one in eight have some university education.

By birthplace, the profile for persons born in Vietnam is similar to that discussed above, as refugees from that origin constitute the largest number of refugees to date. Among those from Kampuchea, their numbers are concentrated in the secondary-or-less category, with trade or university training being rare. The profile for persons born in Laos differs in that a greater proportion have taken trade or professional training.

Information about occupation is derived from responses on visa applications. Correspondence between these intentions and occupations which refugees will have obtained either in launching or later on in their careers in Canada is unknown. Yet the data in Table 4 indicate availability and a first approximation as to status levels to which refugees may orient themselves in the Canadian labor market.

Overall, only 27 percent of the 1979 arrivals indicated an occupational intention which was codable according to the codes normally used in occupational classification in Canada. Among "principals" this codability reaches a level of only 54 percent. Thus a substantial majority of persons
destined for labor force participation and a majority of other refugees have no
prima facie orientation in terms of the Canadian occupational structure.

Among the refugees who indicated an occupational intention, blue-
collar occupations, especially relating to repairing and manufacturing,
predominate. By contrast, only small minorities indicated either white-
collar or middle level occupational intentions. By far the largest uncodable category
among "principals" was that of "new worker", a category indicating intention to
join the labor force but with insufficient training or work experience to provide
an occupational orientation.

Variation in intended occupational orientation by birthplace is only
slight. The Vietnamese profile corresponds to that noted above. By
comparison, Kampucheans are "new workers" in greater proportion. Similarly,
among Laotians, the largest single category is that of "new worker", with
proportionally more cases than average falling into blue-collar manufacturing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education (%)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Sec. or Less</th>
<th>Trade School</th>
<th>Univer.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Occupation (%)</th>
<th>White Collar^a</th>
<th>Mid Range^b</th>
<th>Blue Collar^c</th>
<th>New^d</th>
<th>Other^d</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Language Capability (%)</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Eng. &amp; French</th>
<th>Neither Eng. Nor Fr.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Department of Employment and Immigration, Special Tabulations.

**NOTES:**

^a Arrivals January 1, 1979 - January 5, 1980

^b Reads of families or single, unaccompanied adult

^c Managerial, professional

^d Clerical, sales

^e Service, manual, repair

^f No previous job; no stated intention

^g Students, housewives, nonworkers

Refugees who indicated a substantive occupational intention were reflecting a moderate-to-considerable number of years of workforce experience. If "new workers" are excluded, only 11 percent of the prospective labor force entrants had no prior formal work experience. Rather, some 42
percent of them had more than five years work experience, with only slight variation in that proportion by birthplace.

Thus there is only a loose and very much ad hoc "fit" between the profile of occupational intentions expressed by refugees and the present structure of occupations in Canada. The implications of this disjunction are somewhat mitigated by the significant proportions of "new workers" many of whom are young entrants to the labor force. In practical terms, however, the urgency both of occupational training and counseling is paramount. The orientations of the recently-arrived Indochinese refugees appear vague and labile. The resolution into a clearer profile of occupational intentions remains one of the greatest challenges in the resettlement process in Canada. Most refugees face the work world as yet another new experience to encounter.

In terms of language abilities, only about 12 percent of all immigrants could communicate with even minimal proficiency in either of Canada's official languages, English and French: Data in Table 4 indicate that the low levels of knowledge of English or French characterized not only dependents, but also to a lesser extent, the "principals". As only 22 percent of the "principals" could express themselves with any degree of fluency in either of those languages, mainly English, the need for training in either English or French has surfaced as one of the immediate requirements. In all practical terms, all arrivals of school age and beyond were candidates for language classes.³

SPONSORSHIP: GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE

As previously indicated, Canada's refugee assistance for Indochinese refugees especially represents a mix of governmental and private
sponsorship. Although such a combination has occurred in response to earlier refugee movements, notably the Hungarian movement in 1956-57, the present arrangements appear more broadly based both geographically and organizationally. Not only have local groups, religions and voluntary organizations undertaken individual initiatives of sponsorship of refugee families, but they have provided a network of services to sponsors and families over and above that offered from governmental sources. Collaboration with federal, provincial, and local governments has been close enough to coordinate delivery of services with minimal or no overlap; it has been distant enough to permit criticism of policy.

The processing of refugees in camps and until arrival at the final destination is identical for all refugees unless the sponsor has nominated a particular individual or family. Most private sponsors, however, have requested a family group of a certain size with the option of accepting or rejecting any particular refugee family group so matched.

The response of the private sector to sponsorship of Indochinese refugees commenced in quantity midway through 1979, after active encouragement by the federal government, including the agreement which committed the government to sponsor one refugee for each one privately sponsored, as discussed above. Through March, 1980 some 36,000 requests for sponsorship were made by private groups. By the end of December, 1979, some 13,400 privately sponsored refugees had arrived in addition to another 11,200 under governmental sponsorship auspices. As the time lapse between initiation of sponsorship request and arrival has varied from three weeks to
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five months or more, it is not possible to reconcile numbers of requests with numbers of arrivals even in an approximate fashion\textsuperscript{5}.

While the private sponsorship system was widely diffused throughout all provinces of Canada, the proportions of requests follow population size. A month-by-month analysis of applications indicates, however, a definite wave moving from West to East in a period of six months. Requests in 1979 from sponsors in the Prairies and the West were proportionally heavier through June. The wave of sponsorship requests moved easterly within two months, so that Ontario sponsors predominated in the third quarter of 1979. By September the rate of applications had grown considerably in Québec. Applications from private sponsors in the Atlantic regions increased in turn during the fourth quarter. In the first quarter of 1980, the sheer number of sponsorship applications dropped noticeably but evenly across provinces. Presently, the provinces with the higher rates of private sponsorship are those with large metropolitan areas. In overall numbers of private sponsorship applications it appears that they have superseded even the upwardly revised expectations of the federal government. By December, 1980, the private sector will have sponsored more than one half of an expected total of 60,000 Indochinese refugees.

With two exceptions, the distribution of privately and governmentally sponsored refugees corresponds closely in each province. The heavier volume of applications for private sponsorship by groups in Ontario (and to a lesser extent British Columbia and Manitoba) resulted in a somewhat lighter distribution of governmentally sponsored refugees in those provinces\textsuperscript{6}. Privately sponsored refugees arrived in Québec late in 1979. Yet the Québec
provincial government has planned to augment the provincial intake for 1980, possibly up to 10,000 additional cases.

The wave of public enthusiasm was accompanied by a certain backlash of organizational consequence. Advertisements began to appear in Canadian dailies in August, 1979 warning the public of a possible geometric expansion of Indochinese immigration as high as a 15-to-one ratio of current refugee intake (Toronto Globe and Mail, Aug. 24, Sept. 12, 1980)\(^7\). Polls on public reaction to the refugee aid activities taken about the same period revealed mildly negative sentiments on the part of nearly two-thirds of the nationwide sample. In recent months public reaction appears to have dimmed. Likewise, publicity about the refugee aid programs from both governmental and private sectors have deflated to low profile. Thus the activity on refugee assistance appears to proceed more smoothly when the matter does not appear as an issue of wide-scale public concern.

Canada's response to refugee problems has oscillated both in level of intake and in degree of organization of activity since World War II. Positive responses to refugee movements from Central and Eastern Europe following the cessation of hostilities and subsequent political upheavals represented a series of ad hoc responses yet with substantial numbers received.

The notion of refugee as defined by the UNHCR Convention was adopted only in 1969 by Canada, although it had been used implicitly since 1951. Two implications followed from this ambivalence. First, Canada as a government appeared reticent to assume responsibility for refugees as an international commitment, above and beyond national goals, until late in the
sixties. Secondly, and more important, the definition was somewhat maladaptive if used exclusively.

Canada adopted a broader if more complex position. Eligibility may be determined either strictly as a Convention refugee or as a member of a "designated" class—the latter category may relax or set aside entirely the Convention definition and provide an alternative definition appropriate to the circumstances of the group in question. Recent legislation has accommodated both Convention refugees and Designated Class provisions as general categories. The existence of the definition of three different "Designated Classes": Indochinese, Latin American, and Self-Exile (East European), each with differing specifications, indicates a distinctly innovative and flexible governmental approach in determining eligibility for selection under relaxed refugee admissibility criteria.

The approach of determining admissibility of refugees who satisfy one of the above criteria falls more closely under policies of national interest and sovereignty. It follows levels of population growth adopted as yearly policy statements. As refugee movements occur independently of national policy, the degree of fit is uncertain during periods of substantial pressure for refugee intake. Recent developments indicate that overall levels set on a yearly basis have adapted to changing conditions by repeated midcourse adjustment. These adjustments have represented flexibility and responsiveness; they have in turn made the relation between refugee intake, immigration in general, and population levels considerably more fluid.

Analysis of a series of refugee movements during the past decade indicates that success in adaptation, if measured in terms of socioeconomic
adjustment, varies somewhat independently of particular cultural background. Rather, "success" of adaptation depends on a substantial provision of services to refugee arrivals, including language instruction and prolonged, if informal, supervision by sponsors.

More recently, both public and governmental attention has concentrated on Indochinese refugee aid. The arrival of nearly 25,000 refugees in 1979, three-quarters of whom were Vietnamese origin, is the largest yearly refugee intake in recent history. Compared with immigration of persons from all other countries to Canada in the same year, it is the largest identifiable group.

While an Indochinese intake of slightly higher level (over 30,000 arrivals to a total of 60,000 refugees) has been established for 1980, the responsiveness in future years has yet to be determined but will probably be lower. While specific refugee movements wax and wane, the numbers and diversity of refugees in the developing world have augmented dramatically. Which refugee groups will be better served by resettlement in Western nations than in neighboring areas of first asylum remains a much debated question. In that perspective, even an innovative and broadened policy appears woefully ethnocentric and restricted in an international perspective of growing demand for resettlement.
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3. Although services in Cantonese are widely available in Canada, services in Vietnamese were initially available only in larger metropolitan areas. They were quickly diffused as the year progressed. Services in Khmer, Mandarin and Lao were diffused in the larger metropolitan areas only late in the year. Gaps in coverage remain.

The Government of Canada was prepared for provision of English or French classes to refugees upon arrival through a combination of subsidized language classes, special classes in regular schools and some supplementation through volunteers. The Government of Quebec established its own network of French language classes for all immigrants. Private sponsors were assisted in finding these classes both through voluntary organizations and the branches of the Department of Employment and Immigration. They were advised categorically to insist that all adults and school-age children be enrolled in such programs. Refugees who were sponsored by the Government of Canada risked losing their subsidy if they failed to attend language classes regularly.
4. Organizations were vociferous, for example, when the federal government announced in November, 1979, a veritable curtailment of its own sponsorship of refugees on a matching basis with the private sector. This curtailment was rescinded and the governmental sponsorship program augmented in April, 1980, after a federal election brought a change in political party in power. In any case the voluntary organizational sector spearheaded the resistance at the risk of losing a certain margin of popular support.

5. Technically, it has not been possible to obtain a “flow” table which traces the cases from initiation through interview, visa and arrival in Canada to date.

6. Yet services of professional counselors of the federal Department of Employment and Immigration are concentrated in the more heavily urbanized metropolitan areas (Toronto, Vancouver, Winnipeg), so that it is mutually advantageous for governmentally sponsored refugees to be located there.

7. The newly-appointed Minister of Employment and Immigration announced the increased level of Indochinese refugees intake at the Edmonton refugee reception center in April, 1980, when only a small contingent of the national press corps was present. Newspaper accounts were brief and short-lived.