



Employment Equity Program

Programme d'équité en matière d'emploi

c. 7

WORKING PAPER:

COMPARISON OF 1981 AND 1986 CENSUS COUNTS

ON VISIBLE MINORITIES IN CANADA



Statistics
Canada

Statistique
Canada

Canada

C-3

WORKING PAPER:
COMPARISON OF 1981 AND 1986 CENSUS COUNTS
ON VISIBLE MINORITIES IN CANADA

Wendy Wright
Employment Equity Program
Housing, Family, and
Social Statistics Division
Statistics Canada
February, 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I: Executive Summary	7
II: Introduction	8
A: Purpose	8
B: Organization	8
III: Background Information	9
A: Introduction	9
B: Reasons for Asking the Ethnic Origin Question	9
C: Definition of the Ethnic Origin Concept	9
D: Determination of Which Ethnic Origins are Considered a Visible Minority	10
IV: Methodological Comparability Between the 1986 and 1981 Census	12
A: Introduction	12
B: Changes in the Conceptual Measurement	12
C: Methodological Changes	12
1. Question	12
2. Instruction Guide	17
D: Changes in Data Capture and Editing Methodologies	18
1. Coding the Responses	18
2. Changes to the Coding of Selected Write-in Responses	24
3. Regrouping of Selected Ethnic Origins	24
4. Removal of Suspect Native Origins	24
V: Comparison of 1981 and 1986 Visible Minority Ethnic Origin Groups	25
A: Introduction	25
B: Comparison of the Data	29
(i) Indo-Pakistani	29
(ii) Chinese	32
(iii) Korean	34
(iv) Japanese	36
(v) South-East Asian	38
(vi) Filipino	40
(vii) Other Pacific Islander	42
(viii) West Asian and Arab	44
(ix) Caribbean	46
(x) Haitian	51
(xi) Latin American	54
(xii) Black	56

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
VI: Comparison of the 1981 and 1986 Definitions of Visible Minority Groups	58
A: Introduction	58
B: Comparability	58
VII: Reference Notes	70
VIII: Bibliography	92

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Total Population showing the Numerical and Percentage Change in Different Types of Responses of Ethnic Origin between the 1981 and 1986 Census, Canada.	14
Table 2: Visible Minority Groups showing their Percentage Share of the Total Population for 1981 and 1986, Canada.	16
Table 3: Visible Minority Ethnic Origins that were Captured as Write-in Responses at the 1986 Census showing their Write-in Position and Type of Responses, 1986 Census, Canada.	20
Table 4: Population who Reported an Ethnic Origin of Chinese as Part of a Multiple Response (Only in Combination with What would have been Captured as a Write-in in 1981) showing the Coding Decision which would have been taken based on Mother Tongue Data, Canada-1986 Census.	23
Table 5: Alphabetical Listing of the Visible Minority Origins from the 1986 Census showing Their Counterparts in the 1981 Census	26
Table 6: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Indo-Pakistani showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	31
Table 7: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Chinese showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	33
Table 8: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Korean showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	35
Table 9: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Japanese showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	37
Table 10: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is South East Asian showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	39

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 11: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Filipino showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	41
Table 12: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Other Pacific Islanders showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	43
Table 13: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is West Asian and Arab showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	45
Table 14: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Caribbean showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	48
Table 15: Population Whose Reported Ethnic Origin is Black showing Selected Places of Birth by Type of Response Given, Canada-1986 Census.	49
Table 16: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Haitian showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	52
Table 17: Population whose Place of Birth is Haiti Comparing the Numeric and Percentage Distribution of the Ethnic (Selected) Composition for Canada, 1981 and 1986 Census.	53
Table 18: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Latin American showing Various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	55
Table 19: Population Whose Ethnic Origin is Black showing various Statistics by Type of Response Given, Canada.	57
Table 20: Summary of the Differences between the 1981 and 1986 Versions of the Specifications Used to Define Visible Minority Groups.	60
Table 21: Visible Minority Groups as defined by the 1985 Working Committee showing 1981 and 1986 Census Data for Canada.	64

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 22: Population whose Religion is Sikh, Hindu or Islam Showing Selected Ethnic Origins by selected Mother Tongues and by Selected Places of Birth, Canada-1981 Census.	65
Table 23: The Employment Equity Working Group's 1986 definition of Visible Minorities Showing 1981 and 1986 Census Data - Canada.	66
Table 24: The 1981 and 1986 Definitions of Visible Minority Groups Showing 1981 Census Data - Canada.	68
Table 25: The 1981 and 1986 Definitions of Visible Minority Groups Showing 1986 Census Data - Canada.	69
Table 26: Comparison of the Placement of Reported Responses into the Values on the 1986 Census Retrieval Data Base for those Reported Responses Coded as Caribbean on the 1981 Census Retrieval Data Base.	78
Table 27: Definition of Visible Minority Groups as Specified by the 1985 Working Committee for Use with 1981 Census Data.	82
Table 28: Definition of Visible Minority Groups as Specified by the 1988 Interdepartmental Working Group on Employment Equity for Use with 1986 Census Data.	88

I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to document the comparability of the ethnic origin data between the 1981 and 1986 census, especially as it relates to those ethnic origins identified as being "visible minorities". Information is provided with regard to the ethnic origin concept and question to act as a background to the analysis that follows.

As the purpose of this document is to provide a comparison, the focus will be on analysing the differences which occurred between the two census for each of the "visible minority" ethnic groups.

Of interest, is the dramatic increase in the number of multiple responses which were reported at the last census. There has been an increase of 151% in the number of reported multiple responses which can be attributed to the request for an acceptance of more than one write-in. A decrease of 15% occurred in the number of reported single responses.

Another occurrence is the increase in the number of write-in responses which were captured at the 1986 census. This was the prime cause of the significant increase in the number of reported multiple responses. This has resulted in significant increases in ethnic origin populations which are identified as being visible minorities.

As well, there has been a significant increase in the number of individuals who reported Black as their ethnic origin. An increase of 741% has occurred in the total Black population between the two census with an increase of 1,776% occurring in the number of individuals identifying this ethnic origin as part of a multiple response. This dramatic increase has resulted in the decline of the number of individuals who reported an ethnic origin of Caribbean (decrease of 28% in the total population) and Haitian (even though a slight increase of 3% occurred in the total population, a decrease of 29% occurred in the number of reported single responses).

II INTRODUCTION

A: PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide information that will assist the reader in the understanding and utilization of data which are derived from the census ethnic origin variables particularly in the context of identifying individuals in "visible minority" groups.⁽¹⁾ This paper will:

1. establish a degree of familiarity with these variables;
2. provide information with regard to the definition of these "visible minority" groups;
3. provide information with regard to the comparability of these data between the 1981 and the 1986 census; and
4. provide explanations of the differences between the 1981 and 1986 ethnic origin (identified as being a "visible minority") population counts.

B: ORGANIZATION

The outline of the paper is as follows:

1. the difference in the concepts and the methodology used to capture ethnic origin data at both the 1981 and 1986 census is documented. The suspected impact that each of these changes had on the data collected is noted;
2. the determination of which ethnic groups are considered to be "visible minority" groups is documented;

⁽¹⁾ The Employment Equity Legislation (Bill C-62) covers four groups (women, visible minorities, Aborigines and persons with disabilities). The subject of this paper is the "visible minority" population.

3. ethnic origin data from both the 1981 and 1986 census are compared. The increase in each population attributable to natural growth factors such as births and immigration since the last census is documented. As well, the difference between the population change and this aforementioned population is explained (if possible) by the methodological changes which have occurred since the last census. Where possible, these explanations are substantiated by empirical evidence; and
4. the 1981 and 1986 definitions (these definitions were created by users external to STC and will be defined later on in this report) of what constitutes a "visible minority" group is compared to determine the impact caused by the updating (modification) of the specifications.

III BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this section is to provide the reader with information relevant to the census ethnic origin questions. Information is also provided that documents the methodology used to determine which ethnic origins are considered to be "visible minority" groups.

B. REASONS FOR ASKING THE ETHNIC ORIGIN QUESTION⁽²⁾

Data collected by these questions are used extensively by such groups as sociologists, government officials, advertisers, market researchers and ethnic societies. There is a need for these questions because many ethnic cultural groups cannot be identified by the questions on language because many new immigrants soon acquire English or French as their working language. As well, the ethnic origin question also provides information which is used extensively by the many ethnic or cultural associations in Canada to study the size, location, characteristics and other aspects of their respective groups.

C. DEFINITION OF THE ETHNIC ORIGIN CONCEPT⁽³⁾

The concept "Ethnic Origin" is defined as the ethnic or cultural group(s) to which the respondent or respondent's ancestors belong and refers to the "roots" or ancestral origin of the population and is not to be confused with their citizenship or nationality (past or present).

⁽²⁾ 1981 Content Manual and 1986 Census Guide.

⁽³⁾ Catalogue 99-101, page 12.

D. DETERMINATION OF WHICH ETHNIC ORIGINS ARE CONSIDERED A VISIBLE MINORITY

Neither the 1981 nor the 1986 census ethnic origin question was intended to identify the "visible minority" status of Canada's population. According to the 1986 Census Handbook, it is the purpose of the ethnic origin question to collect data on the ethnic or cultural ancestral roots of the Canadian population. Responses may reflect a variety of influences such as ancestry, nationality, race, language and religion.

Except for the inclusion of Mark-in boxes for Chinese (both 1981 and 1986) and for Black (only in 1986), neither question was worded to elicit responses of a racial or "visible minority" nature. As no direct racial question was asked at either census (eg. Do you consider yourself a visible minority? To which group do you identify with?) a definition did not exist at Statistics Canada to determine who was/wasn't a "visible minority". As well, it is not the mandate of Statistics Canada to define a "visible minority" population.

Since the demand for data about the "visible minority" population existed, a group of users external to Statistics Canada⁽⁴⁾ formed a working committee in 1985 to determine what ethnic origins were considered (by their definition) to belong to this special population. This group which consisted of Employment and Immigration Canada (EIC) and Secretary of State⁽⁵⁾ developed specifications to define "visible minority" groups using 1981 census data. These specifications incorporated the variables Place of Birth, Mother Tongue and Religion along with Ethnic Origin to extract only those individuals who appeared (by virtue of their reported responses to these variables) to be "visible minorities".

In 1988, a similar exercise was completed to provide a more specific definition for use with the 1986 census data. The determination of which cultural groups were considered to be in a "visible minority" was specified by EIC as the need for "visible minority" numbers was crucial due to requirements stemming from the Employment Equity Legislation. The detailed specifications which were needed to define each group were established and drawn up as result of meetings of the Interdepartmental Working Group on Employment Equity (EIC, STC, PSC, HRC, TBS).

⁽⁴⁾ Statistics Canada acted as technical advisor to this committee.

⁽⁵⁾ Input was also provided by representatives of the Public Service Commission(PSC), the Human Rights Commission(HRC) and Treasury Board Secretariat(TBS).

Similarities between the two definitions are more frequent than are the differences. The one notable change is the exclusion of the variable Religion due to its unavailability in 1986.

The broad groups defined by the Interdepartmental Working Group on Employment Equity as being in a "visible minority" are as follows:

- Indo-Pakistani
- Chinese
- Korean
- Japanese
- South-East Asian
- Filipino
- Other Pacific Islanders
- West-Asians and Arabs
- Latin American
- Black

The definitions documented in this paper are those which were developed by the two aforementioned working committees to meet their specific needs. It should be noted that these definitions are not intended to be the formal Statistics Canada definition of what constitutes the "visible minority" population.

IV METHODOLOGICAL COMPARABILITY BETWEEN THE 1981 AND 1986 CENSUS

A. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this section is to identify the differences between the concepts and methodology used to capture the 1981 and 1986 ethnic origin data. This is accomplished by noting the differences between the two census especially as they relate to those ethnic origins identified as being a "visible minority" origin. The suspected impact that each of these changes had on the data collected is indicated.

B. CHANGES IN THE CONCEPTUAL MEASUREMENT

Ethnic origin is defined in the 1986 Census Dictionary⁽⁶⁾ as the ethnic or cultural group(s) to which the respondent or the respondent's ancestors belong. In 1981⁽⁷⁾ this concept was defined as the ethnic or cultural group to which the respondent or the respondent's ancestors belonged on first coming to this continent. Although appearing to define the same entity, different information could be elicited by each. One (1986) asks for one or more groups thus leaning toward a multiculturalistic view of Canada's population while the other (1981) indicates by the omission of multiples that one should only report that culture or ethnic identity the individual feels is the most important. Another difference is the leaning toward Old Country origins at the 1981 census with the use of the phrase "on first coming to this continent". This would tend to obliterate the cultural mixtures resulting from inter-cultural marriages. As well, the 1981 question is more limited in the type of responses elicited in that it uses the past tense by asking "to which group did you belong?" while the 1986 question uses both the past and present tense by asking "to which group do you or did your ancestors belong..?"

C. METHODOLOGICAL CHANGES

1. Question

The ethnic origin question appeared on the 2B census questionnaire which was given to 1 in 5 households and to all households living in remote and northern areas of Canada. In 1981, question 26 was used to capture this information while in 1986, question 17 was used. These questions are presented in Section VII, Note #1. Persons could indicate (X) in the Mark-in boxes provided if their ethnic or cultural background was one or

⁽⁶⁾ Catalogue 99-101

⁽⁷⁾ Catalogue 99-901

more of the ethnic origins listed. In both 1981 and 1986 there were 15 such boxes. The origins presented in these questions changed between the two census. In 1986, a box was added for Black and the category North American Indian replaced "Status or registered Indian" and "Non-Status Indian". It should be noted that the origins listed on these questionnaires are presented in order of the frequency of (single) responses collected in the previous census. Due to this criterion, Chinese and Polish changed positions in 1986. For those persons whose background was not fully described by the Mark-in boxes, write-in space(s) were provided. In 1986, three such spaces were provided while in 1981 only one appeared on the questionnaire.

The differences between the questions asked on the 1981 and 1986 census and the suspected impact of these changes are as follows:

- a) Request for Multiple Origins: In 1986 the inclusion of the letter "s" after the word "group" as well as the instruction "Mark or specify as many as applicable" purposely asks respondents to identify more than one ethnic origin. Similar instructions did not appear on the 1981 questionnaire. This acceptance of up to three write-in responses in 1986 has played a significant role in the increase in the number of reported multiple responses. In 1981, 88% of the total population reported a single ethnic origin (12% reported a multiple response) while in 1986, only 72% reported this type of response (28% reported a multiple response).⁽⁸⁾ Table 1 shows the numerical and percentage change in the different types of responses which occurred between the two census. It should be noted that the change in the question is not totally responsible for this increase in the number of multiple responses.

⁽⁸⁾ Source of data is Summary Tabulations of Ethnic and Aboriginal Origins (Release Package), December, 1987.

TABLE 1: TOTAL POPULATION SHOWING THE NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF RESPONSES OF ETHNIC ORIGIN BETWEEN THE 1981 AND 1986 CENSUS, CANADA

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL RESPONSES	SINGLE RESPONSES	MULTIPLE RESPONSES
1986 Census ⁽¹⁾	25,022,005	18,035,665	6,986,345
1981 Census ⁽¹⁾	24,083,495	21,300,030	2,783,470
Numeric Change	938,510	(3,264,365) ⁽²⁾	4,202,875
Percentage Change	4%	(15)% ⁽²⁾	151%

⁽¹⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽²⁾ The use of brackets denotes a negative figure.

- b) **Removal of Phrase:** The exclusion of the 1981 phrase "...on first coming to this continent" from the 1986 question may result in more mixed ethnic origins being reported or a decrease in Old World origins.

- c) **Modification of Native Origins:** The removal of the categories "Status or Registered Indian" and "Non-Status Indian" from the 1986 questionnaire may have eliminated some of the confusion these terms appeared to cause some individuals in 1981.⁽⁹⁾ In 1981, 2,520 individuals whose Place of Birth was either India or Pakistan reported an identification to one of the aforementioned native ethnic origins.⁽¹⁰⁾ As well, individuals other than those mentioned above appeared to have had problems with the reporting of their ethnic origin identification.⁽¹¹⁾ It is likely that these groups of individuals would have reported a non-native ethnic origin in 1986.
- d) **Inclusion of Mark-in Box for Black:** The inclusion in 1986 of the Mark-in box indicating a Black ethnic origin allowed individuals who have an ethnic origin of Black to define themselves more clearly in 1986 than was possible in 1981. This is true for individuals who could identify a Non-Black ethnic origin in combination with a Black ethnic origin. An example would be individuals who could identify themselves as having an American Black ancestry. Since Black is perceived as more of a racial identity than an ethnic origin, it is possible that these individuals when asked their ethnic origin responded with American as their cultural ancestry. With the inclusion of the Mark-in box for Black, it would be clearer that individuals could identify this "racial identity" at the same time that they identified their "cultural ancestry". In 1986, these individuals would likely write-in American and check the Mark-in box of Black. This type of situation could also happen with individuals who have a racial identity of Black but consider themselves also to have an ancestry of British, Canadian or Caribbean, etc. Thus, with having the opportunity to write in their ancestral identity and mark off their racial identity, the number of individuals whose ethnic origin is Black should

⁽⁹⁾ A process was also used during the Edit and Computation (E & I) Phase to remove such inconsistencies. See Part 4. of this section.

⁽¹⁰⁾ The figures appear in Clark W., Evaluation of the 1981 Edit and Imputation Procedures for 2B Cultural Variables.

⁽¹¹⁾ In 1981, the following individuals identified themselves as Native, even though their place of birth would indicate otherwise (1,025 = Caribbean & Bermuda, 1,145 = Africa, 2,615 = Central & South America). (Source is Evaluation of 1981 Census Data on Metis/Non-Status Indians, Status Indians and Inuit by Kralt, Clark, & White, 1983).

TABLE 2: VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS SHOWING THEIR PERCENTAGE SHARE OF THE TOTAL POPULATION FOR 1981 AND 1986, CANADA.

VISIBLE MINORITY ETHNIC GROUP ⁽¹⁾	% OF TOTAL POP. 1986 (25,022,010)	% OF TOTAL POP. 1981 (24,083,495)	% DIF. (1986-1981)
Black	1.04 ⁽²⁾	0.13	0.91
Haitian	0.07	0.07	-
Caribbean	0.26	0.37	(0.11) ³
Indo-Pakistani	1.26	0.86	0.40
Chinese	1.65	1.25	0.40
Korean	0.12	0.09	0.03
Japanese	0.22	0.19	0.03
South East Asian	0.38	0.23	0.15
Filipino	0.43	0.31	0.12
Other Pacific Islanders	0.04	0.03	0.01
West Asian & Arabs	0.61	0.47	0.14
Latin American	0.20	0.09	0.11
Total Visible Minorities	6.31	4.70	1.61

(1) Ethnic groups are identified based upon their reported ethnic origin(s) (except in the case in Indo-Pakistani and South East Asians).

(2) Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

(3) Brackets denote a negative number.

increase significantly. Between the two census, there has been an overall percentage increase of 741% in the Black population with a percentage increase of 562% with regard to single responses and a percentage increase of 1,876% with regard to multiple responses.

As well, it should be noted that in 1981 if an individual wrote in American Black, he/she was captured as having an ethnic origin of American. This is because a multiple write-in response (1. American + 2. Black) was not able to be captured as such in 1981. This response would be captured as a multiple response of (1) American + (2) Black in 1986.

- e) **Increase in the Number of Write-in Spaces:** The inclusion of three write-in spaces on the 1986 question as compared to the one write-in space which appeared on the 1981 question has contributed to a significant increase in the number of multiple responses reported.
- f) **Inclusion of Instructions on the Questionnaire:** In 1981, respondents were referred to the census guide if they needed further information while in 1986, instructions such as "mark or specify as many as applicable" and examples of cultural groups were provided on the questionnaire itself. The provision of these instructions should result in:
 - an increase in the number of multiple responses;
 - a clearer understanding of what an ethnic origin is; and
 - an increase in visible minority groups as the examples provided lean in that direction (of the seven provided, five are visible minority groups).

As can be seen in Table 2, the percentage of the population which has a "visible minority" ethnic origin has increased between the two census.

2. Instruction Guide

The instructions as they appear in the 1981 and 1986 census guides are shown in Section VII Note #2. They are quite similar in nature except for the following:

- a) 1981 includes the phrase "on first coming to this continent" while 1986 does not. The impact of this change is already noted in the section on "conceptual measurement".

- b) the clearer identification in 1986 of East Indian as individuals coming from the subcontinent of India was not available in 1981. This should eliminate some of the confusion that existed in 1981 with individuals identifying themselves as native but with Indo-Pakistani places of birth or mother tongues.

Even though the guide presents a clearer picture in 1986 than in 1981, it may be possible that these revisions may play no part in increasing the understanding of the question content. In a report prepared by Price-Waterhouse⁽¹²⁾ it is stated that the respondents they surveyed consistently did not use the census guide, even though they were aware that it contained instructions.

D. CHANGES IN DATA CAPTURE AND EDITING METHODOLOGIES

1. CODING THE RESPONSES

a) Chinese Single Responses

Due to technical constraints, a response to the Mark-in box of Chinese in 1981 was treated as a write-in response (refer to Diagram 1 in Section VII)⁽¹³⁾ while in 1986 it was treated as a Mark-in.

b) Single Write-In Responses

No difference exists in the treatment of single write-in responses between the 1981 and 1986 census (refer to Diagram 2 in Section VII).

c) Multiple Response-A Mark-In and a Write-In

No difference exists between the 1981 and 1986 census in the treatment of this type of response (refer to Diagram 3 in Section VII).

⁽¹²⁾ Report prepared for STC on "The Design of the 1991 Census Questionnaire", page 13.

⁽¹³⁾ These diagrams which appear in Section VII "Reference Notes" illustrate the differences between the 1981 and 1986 census with regard to the capturing of specific responses.

d) Multiple Write-In Responses

A significant difference exists between the 1981 and the 1986 census in the treatment of multiple write-in responses (refer to Diagram 4 in Section VII). In 1986, it was possible to capture all reported multiple responses as long as they did not exceed more than three write-ins (if four write-ins were reported, only the first three were captured). Since the 1981 question was not set up to elicit multiple responses, the technical mechanisms necessary to store the data (data base variable, etc.) were not designed to capture this type of response. Therefore, if a multiple write-in response was given in 1981, it was possible to capture only the first one reported. Even so, it was possible to capture the following types of multiple responses in 1981:

- (i) Mark-In Box + Mark-In Box (and/or one write-in)
- (ii) Mark-In Box + Write-In

In the case of example (i), it was possible to capture all multiple responses with only Mark-in Boxes as these boxes were set up on the data base as logicals (variables with values of True and False) whereas the write-in space was set up as a variable with a list of coded values. In the case of example (ii) since the 'Mark-in box' variable was separate from the 'write-in' variable, no problem existed in capturing this type of response. Problems arose when respondents wrote-in more than one response in the 'write-in' space. As is seen in Diagram 4, if more than one write-in was given, the first one given was the one that was accepted.

The impact of this change is that with the space to write more origins and the technical capabilities to capture more than one write-in response, the increase in multiple origins between the 1981 census and the 1986 census was significant. Table 3 shows the number of responses that are a "visible minority" ethnic origin which were captured by means of the write-in spaces provided on the 1986 questionnaire showing their placement (1st, 2nd or 3rd). Of these individuals, 885,330 reported a visible minority ethnic origin in the first write-in space. 41,355 and 3,295 individuals wrote in the second and third write-in spaces respectively that they had a visible minority ethnic origin. Of interest is that of these responses, 715,895 were single responses while 214,090 were part of a multiple response⁽¹⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁴⁾ It should be noted that this number does not necessarily reflect the number of real multiple responses as it is likely that double-counting has taken place. For example, an individual who wrote the following responses on his/her questionnaire would be counted twice.

(1) Bengali (2) Tamil

TABLE 3: VISIBLE MINORITY ETHNIC ORIGINS THAT WERE CAPTURED AS WRITE-IN RESPONSES AT THE 1986 CENSUS SHOWING THEIR WRITE-IN POSITION AND TYPE OF RESPONSE⁽¹⁾ - 1986 CENSUS, CANADA.

ETHNIC ORIGIN WRITE-IN RESPONSES	FIRST WRITE IN ⁽²⁾	SECOND WRITE IN ⁽²⁾	THIRD WRITE IN ⁽²⁾	TOTAL	SINGLE RESPONSE	MULTIPLE RESPONSES
Brazilian	2,365	595	80	3,040	1,365	1,675
Chilean	9,615	720	45	10,380	8,070	2,310
Ecuadorian	1,460	100	-	1,560	1,240	320
Mexican	6,955	1,120	60	8,135	3,000	5,130
Other Latin/Central/ South American	18,230	2,220	235	20,685	14,655	6,025
Peruvian	3,840	340	45	4,225	2,620	1,605
Cuban	900	250	30	1,180	405	775
Haitian	16,800	200	5	17,005	10,865	6,140
Jamaican	18,825	855	35	19,715	11,210	8,505
Other Caribbean n.i.e.	1,970	265	100	2,335	950	1,385
Puerto Rican	960	130	5	1,095	380	725
Other West Indian	37,210	2,890	190	40,290	24,670	15,620
African Black	7,940	685	120	8,745	4,630	4,125
Other African n.i.e.	9,050	1,130	80	10,260	4,980	5,280
Egyptian	14,790	825	100	15,715	11,580	4,135
Lebanese	42,670	2,190	175	45,035	29,345	15,690
Palestinian	1,405	175	25	1,605	1,070	525
Syrian	5,990	1,050	140	7,180	3,045	4,135
Arab n.i.e.	34,790	2,430	280	37,500	27,270	10,230
Iranian	15,135	540	70	15,745	13,325	2,420
Turk	6,650	830	75	7,555	5,065	2,490
Armenian	26,390	930	65	27,385	22,525	4,860
Bengali	500	90	-	590	390	200

⁽¹⁾ Source of data = Statistics Canada, Special Tabulations.

⁽²⁾ Includes all responses reported in this write-in space whether it was a single response or one given in combination with other ethnic origins.

TABLE 3: VISIBLE MINORITY ETHNIC ORIGINS THAT WERE CAPTURED AS WRITE-IN RESPONSES AT THE 1986 CENSUS SHOWING THEIR WRITE-IN POSITION AND TYPE OF RESPONSE⁽¹⁾ - 1986 CENSUS, CANADA. (CONT'D)

ETHNIC ORIGIN WRITE-IN RESPONSES	FIRST WRITE IN ⁽²⁾	SECOND WRITE IN ⁽²⁾	THIRD WRITE IN ⁽²⁾	TOTAL	SINGLE RESPONSE	MULTIPLE RESPONSES
Ujarati	985	255	-	1,240	690	550
Punjabi	13,145	2,395	5	15,545	10,870	4,675
Pamil	1,555	630	15	2,200	1,280	920
East Indian n.i.e.	252,525	8,405	500	261,430	220,630	40,805
Bangladeshi n.i.e.	1,590	80	-	1,670	1,485	185
Pakistani n.i.e.	28,915	2,575	160	31,650	24,885	6,775
Sri Lankan n.i.e.	6,990	290	5	7,285	5,830	1,455
Singhalese	1,025	60	-	1,085	745	340
Burmese	1,240	145	20	1,405	600	805
Cambodian	11,575	215	-	11,790	10,365	1,425
Laotian	10,935	155	-	11,090	9,575	1,515
Thai	2,660	240	30	2,930	1,225	1,705
Vietnamese	62,650	325	20	62,995	53,010	9,980
Korean	29,540	165	0	29,705	27,685	2,020
Japanese	53,215	1,160	130	54,505	40,245	14,260
Malay	2,035	230	110	2,375	810	1,565
Other Asian n.i.e.	2,715	290	70	3,075	2,140	935
Pijian	7,320	700	10	8,030	6,030	2,000
Philipino	105,025	1,900	135	107,060	93,285	13,775
Indonesian	3,365	110	55	3,530	1,265	2,265
Polynesian	610	100	25	735	235	500
Other Pacific Islanders	1,275	370	45	1,690	355	1,335
Totals	885,330	41,355	3,295	929,985	715,895	214,090

⁽¹⁾ Source of data = Statistics Canada, Special Tabulations.

⁽²⁾ Includes all responses reported in this write-in space whether it was a single response or one given in combination with other ethnic origins.

If 1981 technologies were applied, 44,650 of these responses would not have been captured as they are information captured from the second and third write-in spaces⁽¹⁵⁾. As well, of the 885,330 responses which were captured in the first write-in space, individuals who also reported a Chinese ethnic origin would be lost. This is because Chinese was treated as a write-in response in 1981.

e) Multiple Response-Chinese Mark-In and A Write-In

Diagram 5 (See Section VII) shows that in 1986 this response combination didn't pose the problem that it did in 1981. Since the Chinese Mark-in box was treated as a write-in and it was not possible to capture more than one write-in response in 1981, the following rules were applied to allocate the responses which fell into this category:

- (i) if the respondent's mother tongue was Chinese, the Chinese response was retained;
- (ii) if the respondent's mother tongue was the same as the other origin (e.g. Japanese), that response was retained; and
- (iii) in all other cases, the response retained was determined by random selection.

Since this problem did not exist with regard to the 1986 data, an increase in the number of Chinese as well as with the other groups involved (e.g. Korean) occurred. As is seen in Table 4 if the same editing procedures were applied to 1986 data 11,830 (4,605 + 1/2 of 14,450) individuals who indicated a Chinese ethnic origin as part of a multiple response would not have been captured as such. As well, the 11,550 (4,325 + 1/2 of 14,450) individuals who would have been coded to Chinese would have been captured as a single response and not part of a multiple as was reported.

⁽¹⁵⁾ If these individuals were part of a multiple response in combination with a response given in the first space (which is presumably the case) they would have been captured as a single response in 1981. Thus, this information on multiple origins would have been lost.

TABLE 4: POPULATION WHO REPORTED AN ETHNIC ORIGIN OF CHINESE AS PART OF A MULTIPLE RESPONSE (ONLY IN COMBINATION WITH WHAT WOULD HAVE BEEN CAPTURED AS A WRITE-IN 1981) SHOWING CODING DECISION TAKEN BASED ON MOTHER TONGUE DATA⁽²⁾, CANADA 1986 CENSUS DATA

WRITE-IN RESPONSE	CODED DECISION		
	CODED AS CHINESE	CODED AS OTHER ETHNIC	RANDOM ASSIGNMENT ⁽³⁾
Welsh	-	185	-
Spanish	40	90	975
Portuguese	110	30	1,640
Norwegian	5	20	275
Swedish	5	-	365
Other European	70	235	1,720
Canadian	-	140	5
Black	Data Unavailable		
Latin American and Caribbean	10	75	1,220
East Indian, n.i.e	80	-	1,510
Other Indo-Pakistani	35	-	70
Korean	15	110	165
Japanese	85	40	720
Cambodian	250	265	160
Laotian	180	290	165
Vietnamese	3,070	2,030	2,195
Other South East Asian	100	115	330
Filipino	195	750	2,180
Indonesian	35	215	335
Other Pacific Islanders	10	-	130
West Asian and Arabs	10	10	100
Other	20	5	190
	4,325	4,605	14,450

⁽¹⁾ First Write-in.

⁽²⁾ Source is unpublished tabulation.

⁽³⁾ Half of these responses would have been coded to Chinese while the other half would have retained the other reported ethnic.

2. Changes to the Coding of Selected Write-In Responses

It is not possible to compare completely certain ethnic groups as the coding of write-in entries (responses provided) was different between the two census. An example of this is shown in Section VII. The example shows the variety of responses which were coded to the value of Caribbean in the 1981 ethnic origin variable. These same responses were coded one of the following values in the 1986 ethnic origin variables:

- (i) Jamaican
- (ii) Other Caribbean
- (iii) Puerto Rican
- (iv) Other West Indian
- (v) Other Latin, South, Central American

This change will not have any impact when looking at the large sub-groups but will be noticeable when studying individual ethnic origins.

3. Regrouping of Selected Ethnic Groups

Table 5 compares the ethnic origins available for the two census. It shows that the 1986 groups of Arab n.i.e., East Indian n.i.e., and Other Asian are equal to more than one in 1981. As well, it shows that the 1981 groups of Black n.e.s., and Caribbean have been desegregated to form more than one group in 1986. The impact of these changes is negligible for the most part as it can be made comparable by adding the necessary groups. This is true except in the case of the 1986 Category 'Other Asian' which combines Asian and Indo-Pakistani origins. This can be solved by using Place of Birth to desegregate the data.

4. Removal of Suspect Native Origins⁽¹⁶⁾

As was noted in part 1(c) of the section on Methodological changes, a problem existed in 1981 with regard to some individuals reporting an ethnic origin of Native even though their reported mother tongue and place of birth indicated otherwise. In 1986, the software program SPIDER removed the aboriginal origins for all respondents who didn't report a mother tongue of English, French, or an Aboriginal language plus a birth place of Canada, the United States or Greenland. Individuals whose reported ethnic origin was Aboriginal, and whose place of birth was West Germany, and who had a citizenship of Canada by Birth were not changed. This editing procedure should provide fewer abnormalities in the native data compared to that which was available in 1981.⁽¹⁷⁾

⁽¹⁶⁾ 1986 RDBC memo, page 4.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Information on the number of individuals who were edited by this program is unavailable at present.

**TABLE 5: ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF THE VISIBLE MINORITY ORIGINS
FROM THE 1986 CENSUS SHOWING THEIR COUNTERPARTS IN THE
1981 CENSUS**

1986	1981
African Black	African Black
Arab n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾	Asian Arab, n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾ North African Arab n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾
Armenian	Armenian
Bangladesh n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾	Bangladesh n.o.s.
Black	Black n.e.s.
Black American ⁽²⁾	Black n.e.s.
Brazilian	Brazilian
Burmese	Burmese
Cambodian	Cambodian
Canadian Black ⁽²⁾	Canadian Black
Chilean	Chilean
Chinese	Chinese
Cuban	Cuban
East Indian n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾	Indian n.o.s. ⁽³⁾ Indian n.e.s. ⁽⁴⁾
Ecudorian	Ecudorian
Egyptian	Egyptian
Fijian	Fijian
Filipino	Philipino

**TABLE 5: ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF THE VISIBLE MINORITY ORIGINS
FROM THE 1986 CENSUS SHOWING THEIR COUNTERPARTS IN THE
1981 CENSUS (CONTINUED)**

1986	1981
Gujarati	Gujarati
Haitian	Haitian
Indonesian	Indonesian
Jamaican	Caribbean
Japanese	Japanese
Korean	Korean
Laotian	Laotian
Lebanese	Lebanese
Malay	Malay
Mexican	Mexican
Other Asian	Other Pakistani-Bangladeshi Other Indo-Pakistani n.e.s. ⁽⁴⁾ Other Far East Asian n.e.s. ⁽⁴⁾
Other Black	Black n.e.s. ⁽⁴⁾
Other Caribbean n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾	Caribbean
Other Pacific Islanders	Other Pacific Islanders
Other West Indian, n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾	Caribbean
Pakistani n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾	Pakistani n.o.s. ⁽³⁾
Palestinian	Palestinian
Peruvian	Peruvian

**TABLE 5: ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF THE VISIBLE MINORITY ORIGINS
FROM THE 1986 CENSUS SHOWING THEIR COUNTERPARTS IN THE
1981 CENSUS (CONCLUDED)**

1986	1981
Polynesian	Polynesian
Puerto Rican	Caribbean
Punjabi	Punjabi
Singhalese	Singhalese
Sri Lankan (Ceylonese), n.i.e. ⁽¹⁾	Sri Lankan (Ceylonese)
Syrian	Syrian
Tamil	Tamil
Thai	Thai
Turk	Turk
Vietnamese	Vietnamese
West Indian Black	Black, n.e.s. ⁽⁴⁾

⁽¹⁾ n.i.e. signifies "not identified elsewhere".

⁽²⁾ In 1981, this ethnic origin was treated as a single ethnic origin whereas in 1986, it is treated as a multiple (1. Black + 2.American)

⁽³⁾ n.o.s. signifies "not otherwise specified".

⁽⁴⁾ n.e.s. signifies "not elsewhere identified".

V: COMPARISON OF 1981 AND 1986 VISIBLE MINORITY ETHNIC ORIGIN GROUPS**A: INTRODUCTION**

This section will compare the data⁽¹⁸⁾ from both the 1981 and 1986 census for those ethnic origins which have been identified as being a "visible minority"⁽¹⁹⁾. The following twelve groups are presented in the order listed below.

- Indo-Pakistani
- Chinese
- Korean
- Japanese
- South East Asian
- Filipino
- Other Pacific Islander
- West Asian and Arab
- Caribbean
- Haitian
- Latin American
- Black

For the most part, these "visible minority" groups represent aggregates of more than one ethnic origin except in the case of Black which even though identified as one group by definition has been desegregated into three groups (Black, Caribbean, Haitian) for the purpose of comparison. This desegregation has been done to provide a clearer picture of the impact that the methodological changes have on each component of this group. It should be noted that all of these groups are defined solely on reported ethnic origin except in the case of Indo-Pakistani and South East Asian. Individuals whose ethnic origin is Other Far East Asian(in 1981)/Other Asian(in 1986) are categorized as being either of these aforementioned ethnic groups based upon their reported place of birth.

⁽¹⁸⁾ The source of the data used to complete the forthcoming analysis is unpublished tabulations showing 1981 and 1986 census data.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Ethnic origin data is used for this purpose as the complexity of using data based upon the definitions assigned by the two working groups (see Section III D) make it virtually impossible to compare between the two census.

The population change (numeric differences) between the two census is provided and the increase caused by natural growth factors (births and immigration since the last census) is presented. More accurate analysis could have been achieved in determining these differences if one (1) took into account populations decreases caused by emigration and death or (2) did cohort analyses.

This is not possible due to data unavailability (the census does not capture statistics on emigrations and deaths) and resource limitations (cohort analysis). Where possible, reasons for this "unexplained" difference are presented. It should be noted that some of the results could be deemed questionable due to errors in the census data⁽²⁰⁾. This is problematic due to the fact that the population under study in some cases is quite small. As well, it should be noted that not all of these reasons can be backed up with empirical evidence as data is not presently available for that purpose.

B: COMPARISON OF THE DATA

(i) The Indo-Pakistani Population

When using 1981 census data, this population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Bengali, Punjabi, Gujarati, Tamil, Sri Lankan, Singhelese, Bangladesh, Pakistani, Indian n.e.s., Other Pakistani-Bangladesh or Indo-Pakistani n.e.s. As well, individuals who reported an ethnic origin of Other Far East Asian, n.e.s. (either as a single response or as a part of a multiple response) and who reported a place of birth of either India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka or Bangladesh are included in this population⁽²¹⁾. When using 1986 census data, this population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Bengali, Gujarati, Punjabi, Tamil, Sri Lankan n.i.e., Singhelese, Bangladesh n.i.e., Pakistani n.i.e. or East Indian n.i.e. As well, individuals who reported an ethnic origin of Other Asian n.e.s. (either as a single response or as a part of a multiple response) and who reported a place of birth of either India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka or Bangladesh are included in this population.⁽²²⁾

⁽²⁰⁾ According to the Census Handbook (Catalogue 99-104) errors can arise from many sources, but can be grouped into a few broad categories: coverage errors, non-response errors, response errors, processing errors, and sampling errors. Refer to pages 85-88 for further information regarding these.

⁽²¹⁾ Refer to note #5^(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽²²⁾ Refer to note #5^(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having an Indo-Pakistani origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) increased substantially between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 6 there has been an overall increase of 51% in this population since 1981. An increase of 35% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a considerable increase of 426% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one or more of the origins was an Indo-Pakistani origin. Of significance, is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total Indo-Pakistani population in 1986 (15%) than they did in 1981 (4%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. Seventy-two (72%) percent (76,725) of the increase in population (106,820) between the two census was explained by these natural growth factors while 28.2% (30,095) was unexplained.

It is felt that for the most part, this "unexplained" population increase is a result of: (i) the request for and acceptance of multiple responses (88%), (26,375) of this "unexplained" population are multiple responses; and (ii) the removal in the editing phase of any individuals who would have reported a native origin and an Indo-Pakistani place of birth or mother tongue.

**TABLE 6: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS INDO-PAKISTANI⁽¹⁾
SHOWING VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN,
CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	314,305	267,060	47,250
B: 1981 Population	207,485	198,500	8,985
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	106,820	68,560	38,265
D: Percentage Difference	51%	35%	426%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	44,455	39,740	4,715
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	32,270	25,095	7,175
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	76,725	64,835	11,890
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	30,095	3,725	26,375

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June, 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from those individuals who reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

(ii) The Chinese Population

This population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was Chinese both in 1981⁽²³⁾ and 1986⁽²⁴⁾

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a Chinese origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has shown a sizeable increase between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 7 there has been an overall increase of 38% in this population since 1981. An increase of 25% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a considerable increase of 400% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one of the origins was Chinese. Of significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total Chinese population in 1986 (13%) than they did in 1981 (4%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. Ninety-one (91%) percent (103,985) of the increase in population (114,055) between the two census was explained by these natural growth factors while 9% (10,070) was unexplained. Of the increase caused by natural factors over two-thirds was a result of immigration since the last census.

It is felt that for the most part, the "unexplained" population is a result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses at the 1986 Census. This is apparent in that even though an overall increase in population occurred which was not explainable by natural growth factors, a decrease occurred in the number of single responses reported. Even though there was an increase of 89,050 by natural growth factors, there was only a difference of 71,075 between 1981 and 1986 in the number of individuals reporting a single response of Chinese. This results in a negative figure of 17,975. It is felt that this decrease is a result of the increase in multiple responses. Even after the population explained by natural growth factors (14,940) is subtracted from the increase between the census (42,980) an increase of 28,040 is still unexplained. These are probably individuals who reported a single response of Chinese in 1981 but a multiple in 1986 or were captured as a single response in 1981 due to technical constraints (see Methodology section).

⁽²³⁾ Refer to note #5^(c) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽²⁴⁾ Refer to note #5^(d) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

**TABLE 7: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS CHINESE⁽¹⁾ SHOWING
VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN, CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	414,045	360,320	53,725
B: 1981 Population	299,990	289,245	10,745
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	114,055	71,075	42,980
D: Percentage Difference	38%	25%	400%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	70,345	64,325	6,025
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	33,640	24,725	8,915
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	103,985	89,050	14,940
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	10,070	(17,975) ⁽⁴⁾	28,040

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based upon the year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census January-June) were subtracted from these. Individuals who reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Brackets denote a negative figure.

(iii) The Korean Population

This population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was Korean both in 1981⁽²⁵⁾ and in 1986⁽²⁶⁾.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having an Korean origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has shown a sizeable increase between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 8 there has been an overall increase of 32% in this population since 1981. An increase of 25% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a considerable increase of 321% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one of the origins was Korean. Of significance, is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total Korean population in 1986 (7%) than they did in 1981 (2%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. Ninety-nine (99%) percent (7,070) of the increase in population (7,135) between the two census was explained by these natural growth factors while only 1% (65) was unexplained. Of interest, is that over 70% of the increase which resulted due to natural growth factors was caused by immigration.

It is felt that for the most part, the "unexplained" population is a result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses which shifted 1981 single responses to multiple responses in 1986. These 1981 responses were either reported as single or were collapsed to single responses due to technical constraints (only one write-in could be captured).

⁽²⁵⁾ Refer to note #5^(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽²⁶⁾ Refer to note #5^(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

**TABLE 8: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS KOREAN⁽¹⁾ SHOWING
VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN, CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	29,705	27,680	2,020
B: 1981 Population	22,570	22,095	480
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	7,135	5,585	1,540
D: Percentage Difference	32%	25%	321%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	4,950	4,765	185
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	2,120	1,735	385
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	7,070	6,500	570
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	65 ⁽⁴⁾	(915) ⁽⁵⁾	970

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from those individuals who reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Probably resulting from sampling error.

⁽⁵⁾ Brackets denote a negative figure.

(iv) The Japanese Population

This population includes those individuals whose reported an ethnic origin of Japanese in both 1981⁽²⁷⁾ and 1986⁽²⁸⁾.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a Japanese origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has increased somewhat between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 9 there has been an overall increase of 18% in this population since 1981. A decrease occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a significant increase of 181% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one of the origins was Japanese. Of significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total Japanese population in 1986 (26%) than they did in 1981 (11%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. Seventy-four (74%) percent (6,260) of the increase in population (8,440) between the two census was explained by these natural growth factors while 26% (2,180) was unexplained. Of interest is that unlike other visible minority populations, the population increase which was a result of natural growth factors was largely caused by births as opposed to immigration. Over 70% of this increase is the result of births since the last census.

It is felt that for the most part, the "unexplained" population is a result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses which shifted 1981 single responses to multiple responses in 1986. These 1981 responses were either reported as single responses or were collapsed to single responses due to the technical constraints (only one write-in could be captured).

⁽²⁵⁾ Refer to note #5(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽²⁶⁾ Refer to note #5(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

**TABLE 9: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS JAPANESE⁽¹⁾ SHOWING
VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN, CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	54,505	40,245	14,260
B: 1981 Population	46,065	40,995	5,070
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	8,440	(750) ⁽⁴⁾	9,190
D: Percentage Difference	18%	(2%) ⁽⁴⁾	181%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	1,920	1,750	170
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	4,340	(1,055) ⁽⁴⁾	3,285
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	6,260	2,805	3,455
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	2,180	(3,555) ⁽⁴⁾	5,735

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from those individuals who reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Brackets denote a negative figure.

(v) The South East Asian Population

This population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Vietnamese, Thai, Burmese, Cambodian, Malay or Laotian in both 1981⁽²⁹⁾ and 1986⁽³⁰⁾. As well, in 1981 individuals who reported an ethnic origin of Other Far East Asian, n.e.s. (either as a single response or as a part of a multiple response) and who reported a place of birth of either India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka or Bangladesh were included in this population. In 1986, individuals who reported an ethnic origin of Other Asian, n.e.s. (either as a single response or as a part of a multiple response) and who reported a place of birth of either India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka or Bangladesh were included in this population.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a South East Asian origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has increased significantly between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 10 there has been an overall increase of 69% in the total population since 1981. An increase of 43% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a substantial increase of 920% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one of the origins was South East Asian. Of significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total population in 1986 (18%) than they did in 1981 (3%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. Even though there has been a large increase in this population as a result of natural growth factors (104% of the population difference) of which that attributable to immigration (80%) is the most noticeable, an overall decline in population has resulted. This phenomenon is attributable to the significant redistribution of the number of single responses into multiple responses. This is a direct result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses at the 1986 Census.

⁽²⁹⁾ Refer to note #5^(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽³⁰⁾ Refer to note #5^(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

**TABLE 10: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS SOUTH EAST ASIAN⁽¹⁾
SHOWING VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE
GIVEN, CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	94,660	77,480	17,180
B: 1981 Population	55,880	54,195	1,685
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	38,780	23,285	15,495
D: Percentage Difference	69%	43%	920%
E: Immigration Since Last Census (3)	32,450	28,255	4,200
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	8,030	5,965	2,060
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	40,480	34,220	6,260
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	(1,700) ⁽⁴⁾	(10,935) ⁽⁴⁾	9,235

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from those individuals who reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Brackets denote a negative figure.

(vi) The Filipino Population

This population includes those individuals whose reported an ethnic origin of Filipino in both 1981⁽³¹⁾ and 1986⁽³²⁾.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a Filipino origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has shown a sizeable increase between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 11 there has been an overall increase of 42% in the total population since 1981. An increase of 28% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a substantial increase of 376% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one origin was Filipino. Of significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total Filipino population in 1986 (13%) than they did in 1981 (4%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. Eighty-five (85%) percent (26,635) of the increase in population (31,530) between the two census was explained by these natural growth factors while 16% (4,895) was unexplained. Of interest is the fact that almost two-thirds of the increase caused by natural growth factors is attributable to immigration since the last census.

It is felt that for the most part, the "unexplained" population is a result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses. This can be seen in the fact that the single response difference between the census was lower than that accounted for by natural growth factors. These individuals probably wrote a multiple response in 1981 but were captured as a single response due to technical limitations.

⁽³¹⁾ Refer to note #5^(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽³²⁾ Refer to note #5^(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

**TABLE 11: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS FILIPINO⁽¹⁾ SHOWING
VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN, CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTICS	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	107,060	93,280	13,775
B: 1981 Population	75,525	72,630	2,895
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	31,535	20,650	10,880
D: Percentage Difference	42%	28%	376%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	16,795	15,430	1,360
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	9,840	7,085	2,755
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	26,635	22,515	4,120
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	4,900	(1,865) ⁽⁴⁾	6,760

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from these individuals reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Brackets denote a negative figure.

(vii) The Other Pacific Islanders Population

This population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Fijian or Polynesian in both 1981⁽³³⁾ and 1986⁽³⁴⁾. As well in 1986, this population includes individuals who reported an ethnic origin of Other Pacific Islanders.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having an Other Pacific Islander origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has shown a significant increase between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 12 there has been an overall increase of 52% in the total population since 1981. An increase of only 8% occurred in the number of individuals reporting these origins as a single response while there was a substantial increase of 460% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one or more of the origins was Other Pacific Islanders. Of significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total population in 1986 (36%) than they did in 1981 (10%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. Sixty two (62%) percent (2,190) of the increase in population (3,525) between the two census, was explained by these natural growth factors while 38% (1,335) was unexplained. Of interest is that the increase in population accounted for by natural growth factors is almost evenly split between births and immigration which occurred since the last census. It is felt that in part, the "unexplained" population is a result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses in 1986. The overall "unexplained" population is a result of a decrease in the single response population and an increase in the multiple response population. It is possible that the latter population reported multiple responses in 1981 but due to technical constraints were captured as a single response. It should be noted however, that since the size of this group is so small, it is likely that the difference is a result of sampling error in both 1981 and 1986.

⁽³³⁾ Refer to note #5(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽³⁴⁾ Refer to note #5(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

TABLE 12: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDERS⁽¹⁾ SHOWING VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN, CANADA

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	10,350	6,625	3,725
B: 1981 Population	6,825	6,160	665
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	3,525	465	3,060
D: Percentage Difference	52%	8%	460%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	945	665	280
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	1,245	610	640
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	2,190	1,275	920
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	1,335	(805) ⁽⁴⁾	2,140

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based upon year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from these individuals reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Brackets denote a negative number.

(viii) The West Asian and Arab Population

When using 1981 census data⁽³⁵⁾, this population includes those individuals who reported an ethnic origin of either Lebanese, Egyptian, Palestinian, North African Arab, Syrian, Armenian, Turkish, Iranian or Asian Arab. When using 1986 census data⁽³⁶⁾, this population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Lebanese, Egyptian, Palestinian, Turkish, Syrian, Arab n.i.e., Armenian or Iranian.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a West Asian or Arab origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has shown a sizeable increase between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 13 there has been an overall increase of 36% in the total population since 1981. An increase of 12% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a large increase of 258% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one or more of the origins was West Asian or Arab. Of significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total population in 1986 (26%) than they did in 1981 (10%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. Ninety-eight (98%) percent (39,375) of the increase in population (40,030) between the two census was explained by these natural growth factors while only 2% (655) was unexplained. Of interest is that the increase in population that is accounted for by natural growth factors is a result mainly of immigration (62%) since the last census.

It is felt that for the most part, the "unexplained" population is a result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses. The overall "unexplained" population is a result of the transfer of responses reported as single responses in 1981 to the category of multiple responses in 1986. This is the result of (i) better reporting; and/or (ii) the fact it was not technically feasible to capture two-three write-in responses in 1986.

⁽³³⁾ Refer to note #5^(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽³⁴⁾ Refer to note #5^(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

**TABLE 13: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS WEST ASIAN AND ARAB⁽¹⁾
SHOWING VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN,
CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	152,640	113,235	39,405
B: 1981 Population	112,610	101,595	11,015
C: Numeric Difference(A-B)	40,030	11,640	28,390
D: Percentage Difference	36%	12%	258%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	24,565	22,130	2,440
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	14,810	7,900	6,910
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	39,375	30,030	9,350
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	655	(18,390) ⁽⁴⁾	19,040

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from these individuals reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Brackets denotes a negative number.

(ix) The Caribbean Population

When using 1981 census data⁽³⁷⁾, this population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Caribbean or Cuban.

When using 1986 census data⁽³⁸⁾, this population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Jamaican, Other Caribbean n.i.e., Puerto Rican, Other West Indian n.i.e. or Cuban.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a Caribbean origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has shown a sizeable decrease between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 14 there has been an overall decrease of 28% in the total population since 1981. A decrease of 54% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response even though there was a substantial increase of 249% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one or more of the origins was Caribbean. Of significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total Caribbean population in 1986 (41%) than they did in 1981 (9%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the changes in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth was subtracted from this decrease. As can be seen in Table 14, a significant overall decline has occurred in the Caribbean population since the last census, even though there has been an increase of 12,815 in this population as a result of natural growth factors.

It is felt that the decline in the number of individuals who reported that their ethnic origin was Caribbean is for the most part, a result of a redistribution of a segment of the 1981 population into another ethnic origin category. It is likely that with the inclusion on the 1986 questionnaire of the Mark-in box indicating Black, individuals who categorized themselves as having an ethnic origin (nationality/ancestry) of Caribbean in 1981 would indicate in 1986 their racial identity. Table 15 shows

⁽³³⁾ Refer to note #5(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽³⁴⁾ Refer to note #5(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

that of the 254,115 individuals who reported a Black ethnic origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) by checking this Mark-in box, almost half (112,120) reported a Caribbean/West Indies place of birth.

As well, it should be noted that even though the overall population and single responses declined significantly, a large increase was experienced in the number of reported multiple responses. This is a direct result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses on the 1986 questionnaire.

**TABLE 14: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS CARIBBEAN⁽¹⁾ SHOWING
VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN, CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	64,175	37,610	26,565
B: 1981 Population	89,565	81,955	7,610
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	(25,390) ⁽⁴⁾	(44,345) ⁽⁴⁾	18,955
D: Percentage Difference	(28%) ⁽⁴⁾	(54%) ⁽⁴⁾	249%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	6,360	4,520	1,840
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	6,455	2,740	3,710
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	12,815	7,260	5,550
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	(38,205) ⁽⁴⁾	(51,605) ⁽⁴⁾	13,405

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from these individuals reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Brackets denote a negative number.

**TABLE 15: POPULATION WHOSE REPORTED ETHNIC ORIGIN IS BLACK⁽¹⁾
SHOWING SELECTED PLACES OF BIRTH BY TYPE OF RESPONSE
GIVEN, CANADA - 1986 CENSUS⁽²⁾**

PLACE OF BIRTH	TYPE OF RESPONSES		
	TOTAL RESPONSES	SINGLE RESPONSE	MULTIPLE RESPONSE
Total Black Ethnic Origin	254,115	170,340	83,775
Anquilla	50	40	10
Antigua	1,160	925	230
Bahamas	290	190	95
Barbados	9,045	7,180	1,865
Cayman Islands	20	---	20
Cuba	145	110	35
Dominica	815	635	180
Dominican Republic	160	100	65
Grenada	2,575	2,055	520
Guadaloupe	30	30	---
Haiti	19,985	15,365	4,625
Jamaica	57,165	44,440	12,730
Martinique	55	25	30
Montserrat	325	260	60
Netherlands Antilles	225	150	70
Puerto Rico	20	15	5
St. Christopher - Nevis	855	740	120

**TABLE 15: POPULATION WHOSE REPORTED ETHNIC ORIGIN IS BLACK⁽¹⁾
SHOWING SELECTED PLACES OF BIRTH BY TYPE OF RESPONSE
GIVEN, CANADA - 1986 CENSUS⁽²⁾ (CONT'D)**

PLACE OF BIRTH	TYPE OF RESPONSES		
	TOTAL RESPONSES	SINGLE RESPONSE	MULTIPLE RESPONSE
St. Lucia	1,125	920	205
St. Vincent & The Grenadines	1,875	1,335	535
Trinidad & Tobago	16,165	12,120	4,045
Turks & Caicos Islands	10	10	---
Virgin Islands	35	20	10
Total Caribbean	112,120	86,665	25,455
All Other	141,995	83,675	58,320

⁽¹⁾ Black is defined as any individual who checked off the Mark-in box of Black (whether by itself or in combination with another response).

⁽²⁾ Data source is unpublished tabulations.

(x) The Haitian Population

This population includes those individuals who reported an ethnic origin of Haitian both in 1981⁽³⁹⁾ and 1986⁽⁴⁰⁾.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a Haitian origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has only increased slightly between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 16 there has been an overall increase of only 3% in the total population since 1981. A sizeable decrease of 29% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a significant increase of 401% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one or more of the origins was Haitian. Of significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total Haitian population in 1986 (36%) than they did in 1981 (7%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the changes to this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth factors was subtracted from this increase. As can be seen in Table 16, an overall decline (-4,280) occurs once the population (4,770) explainable by natural growth is taken into account. This decline is assumed to be attributable to the shift in population identified as being Haitian only (in 1981), to those who reported a Black ethnic origin in 1986.

Table 17 shows the population whose place of birth is Haiti showing the comparison of the numeric and percentage distribution of selected ethnic origins for both the 1981 and 1986 census. Of interest is the large percentage in 1986 (48%) whose ethnic origin is Black as opposed to 5% of the population in 1981. As well the significant decline in single responses should be noted.

⁽³⁹⁾ Refer to note #5(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Refer to note #5(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

**TABLE 16: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS HAITIAN⁽¹⁾ SHOWING
VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN, CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	17,010	10,865	6,140
B: 1981 Population	16,520	15,300	1,225
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	490	4,435	4,915
D: Percentage Difference	3%	(29%) ⁽⁴⁾	401%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	2,980	1,950	1,030
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	1,790	1,125	665
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	4,770	3,075	1,695
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	(4,280) ⁽⁴⁾	(7,510) ⁽⁴⁾	3,220

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from these individuals reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

⁽⁴⁾ Brackets denote a negative number.

**TABLE 17: POPULATION WHOSE PLACE OF BIRTH IS HAITI COMPARING THE
NUMERIC AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ETHNIC (SELECTED)
COMPOSITION FOR CANADA, 1981 AND 1986 CENSUS.**

STATISTIC	TOTAL	HAITIAN	BLACK	RESIDUAL POPULATION
1986 Population				
Numerical Distribution ⁽¹⁾	32,045	11,890 ⁽²⁾	15,365 ⁽³⁾	4,790
Percentage Distribution	100%	37%	48%	15%
1981 Population				
Numerical Distribution ⁽¹⁾	26,865	12,695 ⁽⁴⁾	1,245 ⁽⁵⁾	12,925
Percentage Distribution	100%	47%	5%	48%

Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

As data is presently unavailable regarding the number of Haitian ethnic origin whose place of birth is Haiti, the above number is substituted. This population consists of those individuals whose ethnic origin (single and multiple responses) is Haitian and whose place of birth is Caribbean and Bermuda.

This population consists of Black single responses.

This population consists of all Haitian responses (single and multiple).

This population consists of all Black responses (single and multiple).

(xi) The Latin American Population

This population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Chilean, Other Latin American, Brazilian, Mexican, Ecuadorian or Peruvian in both 1981⁽⁴¹⁾ and 1986⁽⁴²⁾.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a Latin American origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has increased substantially between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 18 there has been an overall increase of 128% in the total population since 1981. An increase of 69% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a significant increase of 529% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one or more of the origins was Latin American. Of some significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total population in 1986 (36%) than they did in 1981 (13%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth was subtracted from this increase. Sixty-three (63%) percent (17,665) of the increase in population (28,095) between the two census, was explained by these natural growth factors while 37% (10,430) was unexplained. Of interest, is that the increase in population which resulted from natural growth factors were largely (over 70%) attributable to immigration since the last census.

It is felt that for the most part, the "unexplained" population is a result of the request for and acceptance of multiple responses (89% of this "unexplained" population are multiple responses).

⁽⁴¹⁾ Refer to note #5^(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽⁴²⁾ Refer to note #5^(b) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

**TABLE 18: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS LATIN AMERICAN⁽¹⁾
SHOWING VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN,
CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	50,030	32,235	17,795
B: 1981 Population	21,935	19,110	2,830
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	28,095	13,125	14,965
D: Percentage Difference	128%	69%	529%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	12,625	10,270	2,360
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	5,040	1,745	3,295
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	17,665	12,015	5,655
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	10,430	1,110	9,310

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from these individuals reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

(xii) **The Black Population**

When using 1981⁽⁴³⁾ census data, this population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was either Black, Canadian Black, Other Black⁽⁴⁴⁾ or African Black. When using 1986⁽⁴⁵⁾ census data, this population includes those individuals whose reported ethnic origin was Black or African Black.

The number of individuals reporting themselves as having a Black origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) has increased substantially between the two census. As can be seen when viewing Table 19 there has been an overall increase of 741% in the total population since 1981. An increase of 562% occurred in the number of individuals reporting a single response while there was a gigantic increase of 1776% in the number of individuals reporting a multiple response of which one or more of the origins was Black. Of some significance is that the number of multiple responses account for a much larger share of the total population in 1986 (33%) than they did in 1981 (15%).

To determine if the methodological changes to the ethnic origin question had any effect on the increase in this population, the population determined to be a result of natural growth and was subtracted from this increase. Twenty-two (22%) percent of the (49,410) increase in population (229,355) between the two census, was explained by these natural growth factors while 79% (179,945) was unexplained.

It is felt that for the most part, the "unexplained" population is a result of: (i) the inclusion of the Mark-in box for Black (of the unexplained population, 65% were a result in an increase in single responses); (ii) the request for and acceptance of multiple responses (35% of this "unexplained" population are multiple responses); and (iii) the shift from other groups due to the availability of the Black box.

⁽⁴³⁾ Refer to note #5^(a) in Section VII for a description of how these origins were reported.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ The value of Canadian Black doesn't exist as a single entity in 1986 as it is treated as a multiple response (1. Canadian + 2. Black). The value Other Black doesn't exist in 1986.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Refer to Note #5 (e) in Section VII for a description of how these ethnic origins were reported.

**TABLE 19: POPULATION WHOSE ETHNIC ORIGIN IS BLACK⁽¹⁾ SHOWING
VARIOUS STATISTICS⁽²⁾ BY TYPE OF RESPONSE GIVEN, CANADA**

TYPE OF STATISTIC	TYPE OF RESPONSE		
	TOTAL	SINGLE	MULTIPLE
A: 1986 Population	260,330	174,970	85,365
B: 1981 Population	30,975	26,425	4,550
C: Numeric Difference (A-B)	229,355	148,545	80,815
D: Percentage Difference	741%	562%	1,776%
E: Immigration Since Last Census ⁽³⁾	24,105	18,345	5,760
F: Non-Immigrant Population Age 0-4	25,300	14,005	11,290
G: Natural Population Increases (E+F)	49,405	32,350	17,050
H: Unexplained Change (C-G)	179,950	116,195	63,765

⁽¹⁾ This population is defined on the previous page.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ This population includes those individuals who immigrated (based on year of immigration data) since the 1981 Census (since June 1981). Individuals who identified themselves at the 1981 Census as immigrating in 1981 (prior to the census (January-June)) were subtracted from those individuals reported at the 1986 Census that they had immigrated to Canada since 1981 (including that year).

VI: COMPARISON OF THE 1981 AND 1986 DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS

A. INTRODUCTION

This section will focus on the differences between the 1981 and 1986 definitions of visible minorities. As was stated previously, the definition created for use with 1981 census data was determined by a group of users in 1985. Individuals representing these departments were responsible for the decisions made in determining which individuals (based upon certain cultural characteristics) would be identified as a "visible minority". The definition created for use with 1986 census data was the result of collaboration by the aforementioned federal departments in meetings of the Interdepartmental Working Group on Employment Equity.

Similarities between the two are more frequent than are the differences. The one notable change is the exclusion of the variable Religion in 1986 due to its unavailability. Little time will be spent on these definitions as it is impossible to comment on the total comparability of them in the same detail which was possible when discussing ethnic origin data. Thus, this section will comment briefly on these differences and the impact that they have on the data. This will be done by imposing the definition for one census on the data from the other census and viewing the resulting differences. The modifications which are needed to do this are documented in the paper "Modification of the Specifications of the Visible Minority Definitions for Use with Both Census Data bases"⁽⁴⁶⁾.

B. COMPARABILITY

As can be seen, the similarities far outweigh the differences in the specifications needed to produce tabulations with these definitions. The differences between the two definitions are highlighted in Table 20. They consist mainly of:

- (1) modifications which were a result of methodological changes to the question and/or data capture;
- (2) the shifting of ethnic origin populations (e.g., Indonesians to South East Asians in 1986 from Other Pacific Islanders in 1981;
- (3) the addition of conditions (e.g., Portuguese in Macao to Chinese in 1986);

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Available upon request.

- (4) the deletion of conditions (e.g., Haitian Assigned in 1986 is more exclusive than it was in 1981); and
- (5) the deletion of specifications in 1986 due to the unavailability of data on religion (e.g., the group Caribbean Assigned in 1981 contained more conditions than it does in 1986).

Table 21 shows that an increase of 411,105 occurred between the two census when the 1981 definition was imposed on 1986 data. This is not surprising considering the dramatic increases documented in the previous section with respect to visible minority ethnic origins. Of interest is the decrease in the Caribbean Assignment and Indo-Pakistani Assignment categories. This is a result of an inability to utilize a religion variable⁽⁴⁷⁾ to identify individuals who have an East Indian religion. Table 22 shows that 61,655 individuals could be identified in 1981 as being of an Indo-Pakistani origin by religion (Hindu, Sikh, Islam) even though their ethnic origin was not an Indo-Pakistani origin, their mother tongue was not an Indo-Pakistani language and their place of birth was not India, etc.

Even though Table 23 shows an increase in the number of individuals identified as being a visible minority when the 1986 definition is imposed on both 1986 data and 1981 data, decreases exist for specific groups. These decreases occur for two reasons:

- (1) the category of multiples within visible minorities captures all individuals who would have reported more than one visible minority origin; and
- (2) the modification to the assigned categories.

Tables 24 and 25 provide this information in a capsulized format for the main visible minority groups.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Religion data was not collected in the 1986 Census.

TABLE 20: SUMMARY OF THE DIFFERENCES⁽¹⁾ BETWEEN THE 1981⁽²⁾ AND 1986⁽³⁾ VERSIONS OF THE SPECIFICATIONS USED TO DEFINE VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS

VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS	DIFFERENCE(S) IN SPECIFICATIONS
Haitian Reported	- none
Haitian Assigned	- exclusion in 1986 of all ethnic origins other than French
Caribbean (Cuban) Reported	- exclusion in 1986 of the ethnic origin of Cuban
Other Black Reported	- the following places of birth are added in 1986 as a condition used to determine the inclusion of individuals whose ethnic origin is Other African: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Algeria Tunisia </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Morocco Mauritania </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> West Sahara </div>
Caribbean Assigned	- inclusion in 1986 of the multiple responses of British and French ethnic origins - inclusion in 1986 of single and multiple responses of the ethnic origin of Dutch - the use of religion as a condition was not available for use in 1986 - exclusion in 1986 of the following places of birth: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Cuba Puerto Rico </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Dominican Republic </div>
Indo-Pakistani Reported	- none

TABLE 20: SUMMARY OF THE DIFFERENCES⁽¹⁾ BETWEEN THE 1981⁽²⁾ AND 1986⁽³⁾ VERSIONS OF THE SPECIFICATIONS USED TO DEFINE VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS (CONTINUED)

VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS	DIFFERENCE(S) IN SPECIFICATIONS																												
Indo-Pakistani Assigned	<p>- exclusion in 1986 of the following groups of individuals:</p> <p>(a) British or French single response ethnic origin and a religion of Sikh, Hindu or Islam and a place of birth of one of the following:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Jamaica</td><td>Trinidad & Tobago</td></tr> <tr> <td>Martinique</td><td>Netherlands Antilles</td></tr> <tr> <td>St. Vincent</td><td>Puerto Rico</td></tr> <tr> <td>Antigua</td><td>Caymen Islands</td></tr> <tr> <td>Dominica</td><td>Guadaloupe</td></tr> <tr> <td>St. Kitts</td><td>French Guiana</td></tr> <tr> <td>St. Lucia</td><td>Dominican Republic</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nevis</td><td>Anguilla</td></tr> <tr> <td>Grenada</td><td>Montserrat</td></tr> <tr> <td>Cuba</td><td>Guyana</td></tr> <tr> <td>Surinam</td><td>Belize</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Turks & Caicos Islands</td></tr> </table> <p>(b) individuals who have Sikh as a religion and who have not yet been identified</p> <p>(c) individuals whose ethnic origin is Native and whose place of birth is other than Canada or the United States</p> <p>- inclusion in 1986 of individuals whose ethnic origin is Portuguese and whose place of birth is one of the following:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Bangladesh</td><td>Pakistan</td></tr> <tr> <td>Sri Lanka</td><td>India</td></tr> </table>	Jamaica	Trinidad & Tobago	Martinique	Netherlands Antilles	St. Vincent	Puerto Rico	Antigua	Caymen Islands	Dominica	Guadaloupe	St. Kitts	French Guiana	St. Lucia	Dominican Republic	Nevis	Anguilla	Grenada	Montserrat	Cuba	Guyana	Surinam	Belize	Turks & Caicos Islands		Bangladesh	Pakistan	Sri Lanka	India
Jamaica	Trinidad & Tobago																												
Martinique	Netherlands Antilles																												
St. Vincent	Puerto Rico																												
Antigua	Caymen Islands																												
Dominica	Guadaloupe																												
St. Kitts	French Guiana																												
St. Lucia	Dominican Republic																												
Nevis	Anguilla																												
Grenada	Montserrat																												
Cuba	Guyana																												
Surinam	Belize																												
Turks & Caicos Islands																													
Bangladesh	Pakistan																												
Sri Lanka	India																												
Chinese Reported	- none																												
Chinese Assigned	- the inclusion in 1986 of individuals whose ethnic origin is Portuguese and whose place of birth is Macao (not available in 1981)																												
Korean	- none																												

TABLE 20: SUMMARY OF THE DIFFERENCES⁽¹⁾ BETWEEN THE 1981⁽²⁾ AND 1986⁽³⁾ VERSIONS OF THE SPECIFICATIONS USED TO DEFINE VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS (CONTINUED)

VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS	DIFFERENCE(S) IN SPECIFICATIONS
Japanese	- none
Vietnamese	- none
Other South East Asian	- inclusion in 1986 of the ethnic origin of Indonesian
Filipino	- none
Other Pacific Islanders	- exclusion in 1986 of the ethnic origin of Indonesian
Lebanese	- none
Arab	- none
Other West Asians Reported	- none
Other West Asians Assigned	- inclusion in 1986 of those individuals whose ethnic origin is African and whose place of birth is one of the following: Algeria Mauritania Morocco Tunisia Western Sahara
Latin American Reported	- the exclusion in 1986 of the ethnic origins of Argentinian and Chilean - the inclusion in 1986 of the ethnic origins of Cuban and Puerto Rican (single and multiple responses) - the inclusion in 1986 of the multiple responses for the following ethnic origins (in 1981 only the single responses were requested): Mexican Peruvian Brazilian Ecuadorian Other Latin American

TABLE 20: SUMMARY OF THE DIFFERENCES⁽¹⁾ BETWEEN THE 1981⁽²⁾ AND 1986⁽³⁾ VERSIONS OF THE SPECIFICATIONS USED TO DEFINE VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS (CONCLUDED)

VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS	DIFFERENCE (S) IN SPECIFICATIONS
Latin American Assigned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the exclusion in 1986 of all places of birth except Brazil for the ethnic origin of Portuguese - the exclusion in 1986 of the following places of birth for the ethnic origin of Spanish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argentina French Guiana Jamaica Guyana St. Vincent Falkland Islands Cayman Islands Dominica St. Kitts Virgin Islands Netherlands Antilles Trinidad & Tobago Turks & Caicos Islands Surinam Grenada Montserrat Barbados Martinique Antigua Nevis St. Lucia Guadaloupe Anguilla
Multiple Visible Minorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this category was included in 1986 but not in 1981

- ⁽¹⁾ These differences do not include any that are a result of revisions, exclusions or inclusions which are of a technical (eg., data capture) nature. As an example, in 1986 the value (ethnic origin) of Arab n.i.e. replaced the values (ethnic origins) of Asian Arab n.i.e. and North African Arab n.i.e. which existed in 1981.
- ⁽²⁾ The 1981 version which was defined in 1985 by the Working Committee (Sec State, EIC, PSC, TBS) is shown in Table 21.
- ⁽³⁾ The 1986 version which was defined in 1988 by the Interdepartmental Working Group on Employment Equity (EIC, TBS, PSC, CHRC, SC is shown in Table 22)

TABLE 21: VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS DEFINED BY THE 1985 (1981 VERSION) WORKING COMMITTEE SHOWING 1981 AND 1986 CENSUS DATA FOR CANADA⁽¹⁾

VISIBLE MINORITY GROUP ⁽²⁾	1986 DATA	1981 DATA	NUMERIC CHANGE
VISIBLE MINORITIES	1,542,930	1,131,825	411,105
BLACK	366,230	239,455	126,775
Haitian	37,200	30,685	6,515
Haitian Reported	17,010 ⁽³⁾	16,520	490
Haitian Assigned	20,195	14,165	6,030
Caribbean & Cuban Reported	64,155	89,360	(-25,205) ⁽⁴⁾
All Other Black Reported	237,100	48,295	188,805
Caribbean Assigned	27,775	71,120	(-43,345) ⁽⁴⁾
INDO-PAKISTANI	306,580	223,235	83,345
Indo-Pakistani Reported	306,290	205,365	100,925
Indo-Pakistani Assigned	290	17,870	(-17,580) ⁽⁴⁾
FAR EAST ASIANS	488,610	368,540	120,070
Chinese	406,050	299,915	106,135
Korean	29,385	22,570	6,815
Japanese	53,175	46,060	7,115
SOUTH EAST ASIANS	84,640	53,910	30,730
Vietnamese	55,555	31,685	23,870
Other South East Asians	29,085	22,225	6,860
PACIFIC ISLANDERS	113,970	84,015	29,955
Filipino	102,555	75,485	27,070
Other Pacific Islanders	11,420	8,530	2,890
WEST ASIANS & ARABS	149,955	112,435	37,520
Lebanese	44,755	32,005	12,750
Arab	56,870	47,765	9,105
Other West Asians	48,330	32,670	15,660
LATIN AMERICANS	32,945	50,230	(-17,285) ⁽⁴⁾
Latin American Reported	28,160	19,265	8,895
Latin American Assigned	4,790	30,965	(-26,175) ⁽⁴⁾

(1) Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

(2) As defined in Table 27. The adjustments needed to use this definition on 1986 data are noted in Wright, W., Modification of the Specifications of the Visible Minority Definitions for Use With Both Census Data bases.

(3) This count includes both single responses and multiple responses. It should be noted that due to the hierarchical nature of producing defined data if an individual gave a multiple response of Haitian and Cuban he will be counted here and not in the category "Caribbean and Cuban Reported". Refer to Section VII, Note 7 for further explanations.

(4) Brackets denotes a negative number.

**TABLE 22: POPULATION WHOSE RELIGION IS SIKH, HINDU OR ISLAM SHOWING
SELECTED ETHNIC ORIGINS BY SELECTED MOTHER TONGUES AND BY
SELECTED PLACES OF BIRTH, CANADA - 1981 CENSUS⁽¹⁾**

ETHNIC ORIGIN & MOTHER TONGUE	PLACES OF BIRTH			
	TOTAL	INDIA, ETC ⁽²⁾	NORTH AMERICA ⁽³⁾	ALL OTHER
Total Ethnic Origin				
Total Mother Tongue	235,375	94,245	57,905	83,225
Indo-Pakistani Mother Tongues ⁽⁴⁾	106,170	70,730	16,110	19,330
All Other Mother Tongues	129,210	23,510	41,790	63,910
Indo-Pakistani Ethnic Origin ⁽⁵⁾				
Total Mother Tongue	159,540	84,775	36,515	38,250
Indo-Pakistani Mother Tongues ⁽⁴⁾	95,350	65,675	14,805	14,870
All Other Mother Tongues	64,205	20,160	21,705	22,340
All Other Ethnic Origins				
Total Mother Tongues	75,835	9,475	21,390	44,970
Indo-Pakistani Mother Tongues ⁽⁴⁾	10,820	4,635	1,305	4,880
All Other Mother Tongues	65,005	3,350	20,085	41,570

Source = unpublished tabulation.

Includes India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh.

Includes Canada, United States.

Includes Bengali, Cingalese, Hindi, Malayalam, Punjabi, Tamil,

Telugu, Urdu, Indo-Pakistani languages n.o.s., n.e.s.

Includes Bengali, Gujarati, Punjabi, Tamil, Singhelese, Bangladesh,
Indian n.o.s., Indian n.e.s., Pakistani, Sri Lanka, Other Pakistani,
Bangladesh, Indo-Pakistani, n.e.s.

TABLE 23: THE EMPLOYMENT EQUITY WORKING GROUP'S 1986 DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITIES SHOWING 1981 AND 1986 CENSUS DATA, CANADA⁽¹⁾

VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS ⁽²⁾	1986 DATA	1981 DATA	NUMERIC CHANGE
TOTAL VISIBLE MINORITIES	1,577,710	1,048,320	529,390
BLACK	355,385	244,995	110,390
Haitian	20,215	28,125	(7,910) ⁽³⁾
Haitian Reported	16,930	16,520	390
Haitian Assigned	3,285	11,605	(8,320) ⁽³⁾
Caribbean Origins	57,275	89,120	(31,845) ⁽³⁾
Black and African Origins	242,415	49,830	192,585
Caribbean Assigned	35,480	77,930	(42,450) ⁽³⁾
INDO-PAKISTANI	300,545	207,795	92,750
Indo-Pakistani Origins	299,310	205,015	94,295
Indo-Pakistani Assigned	1,235	2,780	(1,545) ⁽³⁾
FAR EAST ASIAN	472,670	302,400	170,270
Chinese	390,590	299,770	90,820
Korean	29,205	22,570	6,635
Japanese	52,880	46,060	6,820
SOUTH-EAST ASIAN	86,945	55,860	31,085
Vietnamese	55,480	31,690	23,790
Other South East Asian	31,465	24,170	7,295
PACIFIC ISLANDERS	111,025	82,345	28,680
Filipino	102,360	75,525	26,835
Other Pacific Islanders	8,665	6,820	1,845

(1) Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

(2) Defined as per the specification presented in Table 28 * Wright W., Modification of the Specifications of the Visible Minority Definitions for Use with Both Census Data bases.

(3) Brackets denotes a negative number.

(4) Individuals who report a multiple response containing more than one "visible minority" ethnic origin are counted here.

TABLE 23: THE EMPLOYMENT EQUITY WORKING GROUP'S 1986 DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITIES SHOWING 1981 AND 1986 CENSUS DATA, CANADA⁽¹⁾

VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS ⁽²⁾	1986 DATA	1981 DATA	NUMERIC CHANGE
WEST ASIANS & ARABS	149,665	112,615	37,050
Lebanese Origins	44,610	32,000	12,610
Arab Origins	56,815	47,845	8,970
Other West Asians	48,240	32,770	15,470
LATIN AMERICANS	60,975	42,310	18,665
Latin American Origins	36,140	15,260	20,880
Latin American Assigned	24,835	27,050	(2,215) ⁽³⁾
MULTIPLES WITHIN VISIBLE MINORITIES	40,500 ⁽⁴⁾	0	40,500

Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

Defined as per the specification presented in Table 28 * Wright W., Modification of the Specifications of the Visible Minority Definitions for Use with Both Census Data bases.

Brackets denotes a negative number.

Individuals who report a multiple response containing more than one "visible minority" ethnic origin are counted here.

**TABLE 24: THE 1981 AND 1986 DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS SHOWING
1981 CENSUS DATA-CANADA**

VISIBLE MINORITY GROUP ⁽¹⁾	1986 DEFINITION ⁽²⁾	1981 DEFINITION ⁽²⁾	NUMERIC DIFFERENCE
BLACK	244,995	239,455	5,540
INDO-PAKISTANI	207,795	223,235	(15,440) ⁽³⁾
FAR EAST ASIAN	302,400	368,540	(66,140) ⁽³⁾
SOUTH-EAST ASIAN	55,860	53,910	1,950
PACIFIC ISLANDERS	82,345	84,015	(1,670) ⁽³⁾
WEST ASIANS & ARABS	112,615	112,435	180
LATIN AMERICANS	42,310	50,230	(7,920) ⁽³⁾

⁽¹⁾ These groups are defined as per the specifications presented in Table 20.

⁽²⁾ Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

⁽³⁾ A bracket denotes a negative figure.

TABLE 25: THE 1981 AND 1986 DEFINITIONS OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS SHOWING 1986 CENSUS DATA --- CANADA

VISIBLE MINORITY ETHNIC GROUP ⁽¹⁾	1986 DEFINITION ⁽²⁾	1981 DEFINITION ⁽²⁾	NUMERIC DIFFERENCE
BLACK	355,385	366,230	(10,845) ⁽³⁾
INDO-PAKISTANI	300,545	306,580	(6,035) ⁽³⁾
FAR EAST ASIAN	472,670	488,610	(15,940) ⁽³⁾
SOUTH EAST ASIAN	86,945	84,640	(2,305) ⁽³⁾
PACIFIC ISLANDERS	111,025	113,970	(2,895) ⁽³⁾
WEST ASIANS & ARABS	149,665	149,955	(290) ⁽³⁾
LATIN AMERICAN	60,975	32,945	28,030
MULTIPLES WITHIN VISIBLE MINORITIES	40,500	0	40,500
TOTAL	1,577,710	1,542,930	34,780

(1) These groups are defined as per the specifications presented in Table 20.

(2) Source of data is unpublished tabulations.

(3) Brackets denote a negative figure.

VII: REFERENCE NOTES

1. Questions: The ethnic origin question as it appears on the 1981 and 1986 census questionnaires are as follows:

1981

25. To which ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestors belong on first coming to this continent?
 (See Guide for further information.)

25 <input type="checkbox"/> French	Native Peoples
26 <input type="checkbox"/> English	37 <input type="checkbox"/> Inuit
27 <input type="checkbox"/> Irish	38 <input type="checkbox"/> Status or registered Indian
28 <input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	39 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-status Indian
29 <input type="checkbox"/> German	40 <input type="checkbox"/> Métis
30 <input type="checkbox"/> Italian	
31 <input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian	
32 <input type="checkbox"/> Dutch (Netherlands)	
33 <input type="checkbox"/> Polish	
34 <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish	
35 <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	
36 <input type="checkbox"/> 	
Other (specify)	

1986

17. To which ethnic or cultural group(s) do you or did your ancestors belong? (See Guide)

Mark or specify as many as applicable

- ☐ French
- ☐ English
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Scottish
- ☐ German
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Ukrainian
- ☐ Dutch (Netherlands)
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Inuit
- ☐ North American Indian
- ☐ Métis

Other ethnic or cultural group(s). For example, Portuguese, Greek, Indian (Indie), Pakistani, Filipino, Japanese, Vietnamese. (specify below)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Instructions: The instructions provided to respondents for the ethnic origin question as they appeared on the 1981 and 1986 census are as follows:

1981

Ethnic or cultural group refers to the "roots" of the population, and should not be confused with citizenship or nationality. Canadians belong to many ethnic or cultural groups - English, French, Irish, Scottish, Ukrainian, Native Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Dutch, etc.

If applicable in your case, a guide to your ethnic origin may be the language which you or your ancestors used on first coming to this continent, e.g., Dutch, Japanese. Note, however, that in cases where a language is used by more than one ethnic group, you should report the specific ethnic group, e.g., Austrian rather than German.

For Native peoples, the phrase 'on first coming to this continent' should be ignored.

Metis are descendents of people of mixed Indian and European ancestry who formed a distinct socio-cultural entity in the 19th century. The Metis have gone on to absorb the mixed offspring of Native Indian people and groups from all over the world.

1986

Ethnic or cultural group refers to the 'roots' or ancestral origin of the population and should not be confused with citizenship or nationality. Canadians belong to many ethnic and cultural groups such as Inuit, North American Indian, Metis, Irish, Scottish, Ukrainian, Chinese, Japanese, East Indian (from the subcontinent of India), Dutch, English, French, etc.

Note that in cases where you use language as a guide to your ethnic group, you should report the specific group that you belong to, e.g., Haitian rather than French; Austrian rather than German.

Diagrams Showing Changes in Data Capture Techniques: The diagrams which are presented in this section illustrate how specific responses to the ethnic origin question were handled differently with regard to changes in data capture and editing methodologies between the 1981 and 1986 census.

Changes to the Coding of Selected Write-in Responses

Table 26 shows a comparison of the placement of reported responses into the values of the 1986 census retrieval data base ethnic origin variable for those responses coded as Caribbean on the 1981 census retrieval data base ethnic origin variable.

5. How Certain Responses were Reported

- a) This ethnic origin was reported either as a single response by writing one of these origins in the Write-in space or as part of a multiple response by reporting one of these origins in the space provided and checking one or more of the Mark-in boxes provided (except that provided for Chinese).
- b) This ethnic origin was reported either as a single response by providing one of these origins in the Write-in space or as part of a multiple response by writing one of these aforementioned ethnic origins in one of the Write-in spaces provided and checking one or more of the Mark-in boxes and/or reporting one or more responses in the two other Write-in spaces.
- c) This ethnic origin was reported either as a single response by checking the Mark-in box of Chinese or as part of a multiple response by checking the Mark-in box of Chinese and checking one or more of the other Mark-in boxes.
- d) This ethnic origin was reported either as a single response by checking the Mark-in box of Chinese or as part of a multiple response by checking the Mark-in box of Chinese and checking one of the other Mark-in boxes and/or writing a response in one of the spaces provided.
- e) This ethnic origin was reported either as a single response by checking the Black Mark-in box or reporting African Black in the Write-in space or as part of a multiple response by checking the Black Mark-in box or by reporting African Black in the Write-in space and checking one or more of the Mark-in boxes provided or writing in one or more (up to three) ethnic origins in the Write-in spaces, (three) provided.

6. Hierarchical Inclusion

Due to the nature of the program used to extract data from the census data bases if an individual gives more than one origin he can not be counted in both. He is counted in the first one which appears in the program.

7. Definitions

The definitions for use with 1981 data is shown in Table 27 while the 1986 definitions appears in Table 28.

DIAGRAM 1:- COMPARISON OF HOW A SINGLE MARK-IN RESPONSE OF CHINESE
WAS CAPTURED IN 1981 AND 1986

1981

26. To which ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestors belong on first coming to this continent?
(See Guide for further information.)

25 <input type="checkbox"/> French	Native Peoples
26 <input type="checkbox"/> English	37 <input type="checkbox"/> Inuit
27 <input type="checkbox"/> Irish	38 <input type="checkbox"/> Status or registered Indian
28 <input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	39 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-status Indian
29 <input type="checkbox"/> German	40 <input type="checkbox"/> Métis
30 <input type="checkbox"/> Italian	
31 <input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian	
32 <input type="checkbox"/> Dutch (Netherlands)	
33 <input type="checkbox"/> Polish	
34 <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish	
35 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chinese	
36 <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Chinese</u>	

Other (specify)

1986

17. To which ethnic or cultural group(s) do you or did your ancestors belong? (See Guide)

Mark or specify as many as applicable

- ☐ French
- ☐ English
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Scottish
- ☐ German
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Ukrainian
- ☐ Dutch (Netherlands)
- ☒ Chinese
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Inuit
- ☐ North American Indian
- ☐ Métis

Other ethnic or cultural group(s). For example, Portuguese, Greek, Indian (Indie), Pakistani, Filipino, Japanese, Vietnamese. (specify below)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Even though Chinese was a mark-in box, it was captured as a write-in response during processing. Therefore was assigned a value in the write-in variable.

Captured as a mark-in response. Assigned a value of TRUE in the variable identifying Chinese respondents.

DIAGRAM 2: COMPARISON OF HOW A SINGLE MARK-IN RESPONSE
(HAITIAN) WAS CAPTURED IN 1981 AND 1986

1981

26. To which ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestors belong on first coming to this continent?
(See Guide for further information.)

25 <input type="checkbox"/> French	Native Peoples
26 <input type="checkbox"/> English	37 <input type="checkbox"/> Inuit
27 <input type="checkbox"/> Irish	38 <input type="checkbox"/> Status or registered Indian
28 <input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	39 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-status Indian
29 <input type="checkbox"/> German	40 <input type="checkbox"/> Métis
30 <input type="checkbox"/> Italian	
31 <input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian	
32 <input type="checkbox"/> Dutch (Netherlands)	
33 <input type="checkbox"/> Polish	
34 <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish	
35 <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	
36 <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Haitian</u>	
	Other (specify)

Captured as a single response
and assigned a value in the
write-in variable.

1986

17. To which ethnic or cultural group(s) do you or did your ancestors belong? (See Guide)

Mark or specify as many as applicable

- ☐ French
- ☐ English
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Scottish
- ☐ German
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Ukrainian
- ☐ Dutch (Netherlands)
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Inuit
- ☐ North American Indian
- ☐ Métis

Other ethnic or cultural group(s). For example, Portuguese, Greek, Indian (Indie), Pakistani, Filipino, Japanese, Vietnamese. (specify below)

Haitian

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Captured as a single response and
assigned a value in the first
write-in variable

1986

23 ☐ French

26 ☐ English

27 ☐ Irish

28 ☐ Scottish

29 ☒ German

30 ☐ Italian

31 ☐ Ukrainian

32 ☐ Dutch (Netherlands)

33 ☐ Polish

34 ☐ Jewish

35 ☐ Chinese

36 ☐ Latin American
Other (specify)

Native Peoples

37 ☐ Inuit

38 ☐ Status or registered Indian

39 ☐ Non-status Indian

40 ☐ Métis

☐ French
☐ English
☐ Irish
☐ Scottish
☒ German
☐ Italian
☐ Ukrainian
☐ Dutch (Netherlands)
☐ Chinese
☐ Jewish
☐ Polish
☐ Black
☐ Inuit
☐ North American Indian
☐ Meso

Other ethnic or cultural groups). For example, Portuguese, Greek, Indian (Indo), Pakistani, Filipino, Japanese, Vietnamese. (specify below)

Latin American

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Captured as a multiple response. A value of TRUE was assigned to the variable identifying German while the value of Latin American was assigned in the first write-in variable.

DIAGRAM 4: COMPARISON OF HOW A MULTIPLE WRITE-IN RESPONSE OF TWO WRITE-INS WAS CAPTURED IN 1981 AND 1986

1981

26. To which ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestors belong on first coming to this continent?
(See Guide for further information.)

25 <input type="checkbox"/> French	Native Peoples
26 <input type="checkbox"/> English	37 <input type="checkbox"/> Inuit
27 <input type="checkbox"/> Irish	38 <input type="checkbox"/> Status or registered Indian
28 <input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	39 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-status Indian
29 <input type="checkbox"/> German	40 <input type="checkbox"/> Métis
30 <input type="checkbox"/> Italian	
31 <input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian	
32 <input type="checkbox"/> Dutch (Netherlands)	
33 <input type="checkbox"/> Polish	
34 <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish	
35 <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	
36 <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Japanese Korean</u>	

Other (specify)

1986

17. To which ethnic or cultural group(s) do you or did your ancestors belong? (See Guide)

Mark or specify as many as applicable

- ☐ French
- ☐ English
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Scottish
- ☐ German
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Ukrainian
- ☐ Dutch (Netherlands)
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Inuit
- ☐ North American Indian
- ☐ Métis

Other ethnic or cultural group(s). For example, Portuguese, Greek, Indian (Indie), Pakistani, Filipino, Japanese, Vietnamese. (specify below)

Japanese
Other (specify)

Korean
Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Captured as a single response. Since multiple responses were not anticipated, it was not technically possible to capture multiple write-in responses. Therefore only the first write-in (Japanese) was captured.

Captured as a multiple response. The value Japanese was assigned in the first write-in variable while the value Korean was assigned in the second write-in variable.

DIAGRAM 5: COMPARISON OF HOW A MULTIPLE RESPONSE WITH A MARK-IN
OF CHINESE AND A WRITE-IN WAS CAPTURED IN 1981 AND
1986

1981

26. To which ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestors belong on first coming to this continent?
(See Guide for further information.)

25 <input type="checkbox"/> French	Native Peoples
26 <input type="checkbox"/> English	37 <input type="checkbox"/> Inuit
27 <input type="checkbox"/> Irish	38 <input type="checkbox"/> Status or registered Indian
28 <input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	39 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-status Indian
29 <input type="checkbox"/> German	40 <input type="checkbox"/> Métis
30 <input type="checkbox"/> Italian	
31 <input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian	
32 <input type="checkbox"/> Dutch (Netherlands)	
33 <input type="checkbox"/> Polish	
34 <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish	
35 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chinese	
36 <input type="checkbox"/> <u>KOREAN</u>	

Other (specify)

1986

17. To which ethnic or cultural group(s) do you or did your ancestors belong? (See Guide)

Mark or specify as many as applicable

- ☐ French
- ☐ English
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Scottish
- ☐ German
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Ukrainian
- ☐ Dutch (Netherlands)
- ☒ Chinese
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Inuit
- ☐ North American Indian
- ☐ Métis

Other ethnic or cultural group(s). For example, Portuguese, Greek, Indian (Indo), Pakistani, Filipino, Japanese, Vietnamese. (specify below)

Korean

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Other (specify)

Captured as a single response since Chinese was captured as a write-in response. Decision was based for the most part on language. As reported mother tongue of this individual was Korean, the value of Korean was assigned.

Captured as a multiple response. A value of TRUE was assigned for the variable identifying Chinese and a value of Korean was assigned in the first write-in variable.

TABLE 26: COMPARISON OF THE PLACEMENT OF REPORTED RESPONSES INTO THE VALUES ON THE 1986 CENSUS RETRIEVAL DATA BASE FOR THOSE REPORTED RESPONSES CODED AS CARIBBEAN ON THE 1981 CENSUS RETRIEVAL DATA BASE

RESPONSES CODED AS CARIBBEAN IN 1981 ⁽¹⁾	1986 PLACEMENT OF RESPONSE ⁽²⁾				
	JAMAICAN	OTHER CARIBBEAN NIE	PUERTO RICAN	OTHER WEST INDIAN	OTHER AMER. ⁽³⁾ L/S/C
Antigua Islander		X			
Antiguan		X			
Anguillan		X			
Antillais		X			
Antillais Britannique			X		
Antillais Neerlandaises			X		
Arawak	X				
Aruba Islander		X			
Aruban	X				
Bahama Islander			X		
Bahama(s)		X			
Bahamian(ien)			X		
Barbade		X			
Barbadian(ien)			X		
Barbados		X			
Barbuda Islander			X		
Barbudan		X			
Belice		X			
Bermuda Islander			X		
Bermuda(n)			X		
Bermudas		X			
Bermudian(ien)			X		
Bonaire Islander		X			
Boricua	X				
Borinqueno(a)		X			
British Virgin Islander				X	

⁽¹⁾ 1981 Population Codebook (R-320) for Regional Office Processing

⁽²⁾ 1986 Population Codebook (R-220) for Regional Office Processing

⁽³⁾ Refers to Other Latin, South, Central American

TABLE 26: COMPARISON OF THE PLACEMENT OF REPORTED RESPONSES INTO THE VALUES ON THE 1986 CENSUS RETRIEVAL DATA BASE FOR THOSE REPORTED RESPONSES CODED AS CARIBBEAN ON THE 1981 CENSUS RETRIEVAL DATA BASE (CONTINUED)

RESPONSES CODED AS CARIBBEAN IN 1981 ⁽¹⁾	1986 PLACEMENT OF RESPONSE ⁽²⁾				
	JAMAICAN	OTHER CARIBBEAN NIE	PUERTO RICAN	OTHER WEST INDIAN	OTHER AMER. ⁽³⁾ L/S/C
British Guiana			X		
British Guianese			X		
British Guyanese			X		
British West Indies			X		
Caicos Islander			X		
Caraibien	X				
Carib	X				
Caribbean	X				
Cayenne			X		
Cayman Islander			X		
Caymanian(en)			X		
Cruzan	X				
Curacao Islander		X			
Dominican Islander			X		
Dominica(n)			X		
Dominicain			X		
Dominican Republic		X			
Dominicano(a)		X			
Dutch Guiana		X			
Dutch West Indies				X	
Espanola Islanders		X			
French Guian(ese)				X	
French West Indies		X			
Garifiana	X				
Grand Turk Island				X	

⁽¹⁾ 1981 Population Codebook (R-320) for Regional Office Processing

⁽²⁾ 1986 Population Codebook (R-220) for Regional Office Processing

⁽³⁾ Refers to Other Latin, South, Central American

TABLE 26: COMPARISON OF THE PLACEMENT OF REPORTED RESPONSES INTO THE VALUES ON THE 1986 CENSUS RETRIEVAL DATA BASE FOR THOSE REPORTED RESPONSES CODED AS CARIBBEAN ON THE 1981 CENSUS RETRIEVAL DATA BASE (CONTINUED)

RESPONSES CODED AS CARIBBEAN IN 1981 ⁽¹⁾	1986 PLACEMENT OF RESPONSE ⁽²⁾				
	JAMAICAN	OTHER CARIBBEAN NIE	PUERTO RICAN	OTHER WEST INDIAN	OTHER AMER. ⁽³⁾ L/S/C
D.R.	X				
Grenada Islander			X		
Grenadian		X			
Grendines Islander			X		
Guadeloupe Islander		X			
Guienne				X	
Guyana		X			
Guyanese		X			
Guyenne				X	
Gyane				X	
Gyane Britannique			X		
Jamaica(n)	X				
Jamaicain X					
Martinicois		X			
Martinique Islander		X			
Montserrat Islander			X		
Netherlands Antilles		X			
Netherlands Guiana				X	
Nevis			X		
Nevis Islander			X		
Other British West Indian			X		
P.R.		X			
Porto-Rican		X			
Puerto Rican		X			
Puerto Rico		X			

⁽¹⁾ 1981 Population Codebook (R-320) for Regional Office Processing

⁽²⁾ 1986 Population Codebook (R-200) for Regional Office Processing

⁽³⁾ Refers to Other Latin, South, Central American

TABLE 26: COMPARISON OF THE PLACEMENT OF REPORTED RESPONSES INTO THE VALUES ON THE 1986 CENSUS RETRIEVAL DATA BASE FOR THOSE REPORTED RESPONSES CODED AS CARIBBEAN ON THE 1981 CENSUS RETRIEVAL DATA BASE (CONCLUDED)

RESPONSES CODED AS CARIBBEAN IN 1981 ⁽¹⁾	1986 PLACEMENT OF RESPONSE ⁽²⁾				
	JAMAICAN	OTHER CARIBBEAN NIE	PUERTO RICAN	OTHER WEST INDIAN	OTHER AMER. ⁽³⁾ L/S/C
Puertorriqueño(a)		X			
Redonda Islander		X			
Saba Islander		X			
Santa Cruz		X			
Santa Domingo		X			
Sombrero Islander		X			
St. Christopher Islander			X		
St. Croix Islander		X			
St. Eustatius Islander		X			
St. Kitts Islander			X		
St. Lucia Islander			X		
St. Maarten Islander (Dutch)		X			
St. Martin Islander (French)		X			
St. Thomas Islander		X			
St. Vincent Islander				X	
Surinam(e)			X		
Tobago		X			
Tobagonian			X		
Tortolan			X		
Trinidad(ian)			X		
Turk Islander			X		
Turks & Caicos Islander			X		
U.S. Virgin Islander		X			
West Indian			X		
West Indian Creole			X		
West Indies			X		

⁽¹⁾ 1981 Population Codebook (R-320) for Regional Office Processing

⁽²⁾ 1986 Population Codebook (R-200) for Regional Office Processing

⁽³⁾ Refers to Other Latin, South, Central American

TABLE 27: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1985 WORKING COMMITTEE FOR USE WITH 1981 CENSUS DATA.

-
- (1) **HAITIAN REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or part of a multiple response) is HAITIAN.
- (2) **HAITIAN ASSIGNED:** includes those individuals whose reported PLACE OF BIRTH was Haiti but whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN was other than Haitian.
- (3) **CARIBBEAN & CUBAN REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) was either Caribbean or Cuban.
- (4) **OTHER BLACK REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as part of a multiple response) was one of the following:

CANADIAN BLACK
OTHER BLACK

AFRICAN BLACK

PLUS

Those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response) is OTHER AFRICAN and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is NOT one of the following:

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA RHODESIA
SOUTHWEST AFRICA

- (5) **CARIBBEAN ASSIGNED:** includes those individuals who meet the following conditions:

ETHNIC ORIGIN = BRITISH or FRENCH (as a single response only)

AND

RELIGION is not HINDU, SIKH or ISLAM

AND

TABLE 27: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1985 WORKING COMMITTEE FOR USE WITH 1981 CENSUS DATA. (CONTINUED)

PLACE OF BIRTH is one of the following:

JAMAICA	NETHERLANDS ANTILLES
TRINIDAD & TOBAGO	MARTINIQUE
BARBADOS	VIRGIN ISLANDS (USA)
ST. VINCENT	VIRGIN ISLANDS (BRITISH)
ANTIGUA	PUERTO RICO
DOMINICA	CAYMEN ISLANDS
ST. KITTS	CUBA
ST. LUCIA	GUADALOUPE
NEVIS	TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS
ANGUILLA	GUYANA
GRENADA	FRENCH GUIANA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	SURINAME
MONTSERRAT	BELIZE

- (6) **INDO-PAKISTANI REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) was one of the following:

BENGALI	SINGHELESE
GUJARATI	BANGLADESH
PUNJABI	INDIAN n.o.s.
TAMIL	PAKISTANI
SRI LANKA	INDIAN n.e.s.
OTHER PAKISTANI BANGLADESH	INDO-PAKISTANI n.e.s.

- (7) **INDO-PAKISTANI ASSIGNED:** includes individuals who meet either the conditions listed for Group A or B or C or D:

GROUP A:

ETHNIC ORIGIN = OTHER FAR EAST ASIAN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response)

AND

PLACE OF BIRTH = INDIA, PAKISTAN, SRI LANKA, BANGLADESH

GROUP B:

ETHNIC ORIGIN = BRITISH or FRENCH (as a single response only)

AND

RELIGION = SIKH, ISLAM or HINDU

TABLE 27: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1985 WORKING COMMITTEE FOR USE WITH 1981 CENSUS DATA. (CONTINUED)

AND

PLACE OF BIRTH = one of the following:

JAMAICA	NETHERLANDS ANTILLES
TRINIDAD & TOBAGO	MARTINIQUE
BARBADOS	VIRGIN ISLANDS (USA)
ST. VINCENT	VIRGIN ISLANDS (BRITISH)
ANTIGUA	PUERTO RICO
DOMINICA	CAYMEN ISLANDS
ST. KITTS	CUBA
ST. LUCIA	GUADALOUPE
NEVIS	TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS
ANGUILLA	GUYANA
GRENADA	FRENCH GUIANA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	SURINAME
MONTSERRAT	BELIZE

GROUP C:

Individuals not included in Groups A or B but whose RELIGION = SIKH.

GROUP D:

Individuals not included in Groups A, B or C who meet the following conditions:

ETHNIC ORIGIN = NATIVE

AND

PLACE OF BIRTH = A COUNTRY OTHER THAN CANADA OR THE UNITED STATES

- (8) **CHINESE:** Includes those individuals whose reported Ethnic Origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response is Chinese.
- (9) **KOREAN:** Includes those individuals whose reported Ethnic Origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response is Korean.
- (10) **JAPANESE:** Includes those individuals whose reported Ethnic Origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response is Japanese.

TABLE 27: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1985 WORKING COMMITTEE FOR USE WITH 1981 CENSUS DATA. (CONTINUED)

-
- (11) **VIETNAMESE:** Includes those individuals whose reported Ethnic Origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is Vietnamese.
- (12) **OTHER SOUTH EAST ASIAN:** Includes those individuals whose ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:
- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| THAI | MALAY |
| BURMESE | LAOTIAN |
| CAMBODIAN | |
- PLUS
- Those individuals whose ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is OTHER FAR EAST ASIAN and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is not INDIA, PAKISTAN, SRI LANKA AND BANGLADESH.
- (13) **FILIPINO:** Includes those individuals whose reported Ethnic Origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is Filipino.
- (14) **OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDERS:** Includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:
- | | |
|------------|--------|
| INDONESIAN | FIJIAN |
| POLYNESIAN | |
- (15) **LEBANESE:** Includes those individuals whose reported Ethnic Origin (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is Lebanese.
- (16) **ARAB:** Includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as a part of a multiple response) is one of the following:
- | | |
|---------------------|------------|
| EGYPTIAN | SYRIAN |
| PALESTINIAN | ASIAN ARAB |
| NORTH AFRICAN ARABS | |
- (17) **OTHER WEST ASIAN:** Includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:
- | | |
|----------|---------|
| ARMENIAN | IRANIAN |
| TURKISH | |

TABLE 27: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1985 WORKING COMMITTEE FOR USE WITH 1981 CENSUS DATA. (CONCLUDED)

- (18) **LATIN AMERICAN REPORTED:** Includes those individuals who meet the following conditions:

MOTHER TONGUE = SPANISH, PORTUGUESE, ENGLISH, FRENCH

AND

ETHNIC ORIGIN = one of the following (SINGLE RESPONSES ONLY)

ARGENTINIAN

ECUADORIAN

CHILEAN

PERUVIAN

OTHER LATIN AMERICAN

BRAZILIAN

MEXICAN

- (19) **LATIN AMERICAN ASSIGNED:** Includes those individuals who meet the following conditions:

MOTHER TONGUE = SPANISH, PORTUGUESE, ENGLISH, FRENCH

AND

ETHNIC ORIGIN = SPANISH OR PORTUGUESE (SINGLE responses only)

AND

PLACE OF BIRTH = is one of the following:

MEXICO	PANAMA
GUATEMALA	PANAMA CANAL ZONE
EL SALVADOR	NICARAGUA
HONDURAS	COSTA RICA
BELIZE	ECUADOR
CHILE	COLOMBIA
ARGENTINA	URAGUAY
BRAZIL	PARAGUAY
PERU	BOLIVIA
VENEZUALA	GUYANA
SURINAME	FALKLAND ISLANDS
FRENCH GUIANA	NETHERLANDS ANTILLES
JAMAICA	MARTINIQUE
TRINIDAD & TOBAGO	VIRGIN ISLANDS (USA)
BARBADOS	VIRGIN ISLAND (BRITISH)
ST. VINCENT	PUERTO RICO
ANTIGUA	CAYMEN ISLANDS
DOMINICA	GUADALOUPE
ST. KITTS	CUBA
ST. LUCIA	TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS
NEVIS	ANGUILLA
GRENADA	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
MONTSERRAT	

TABLE 28: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1988 INTERDEPARTMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON EMPLOYMENT EQUITY FOR USE WITH 1986 CENSUS DATA.

-
- (1) **HAITIAN REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is **HAITIAN**.
- (2) **HAITIAN ASSIGNED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN is **FRENCH** (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is **HAITI**.
- (3) **CARIBBEAN REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN is one of the following (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response).

OTHER CARIBBEAN n.i.e.

JAMAICAN

OTHER WEST INDIAN

- (4) **BLACK REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN is either **BLACK** or **AFRICAN BLACK** (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response).

PLUS

Those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN is other **AFRICAN** (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is NOT one of the following:

SOUTH AFRICA

MAURITANIA

ZIMBABWE

MOROCCO

NAMIBIA

TUNISIA

ALGERIA

WEST SAHARA

- (5) **CARIBBEAN ASSIGNED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is either **BRITISH**, **FRENCH** or **DUTCH** and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is one of the following:

ANGUILLA

NETHERLANDS ANTILLES

ANTIGUA

ST. KITTS

BARBADOS

ST. LUCIA

CAYMAN ISLANDS

VIRGIN ISLANDS

DOMINICA

TRINIDAD & TOBAGO

GRENADA

TURKS & CAICOS ISLANDS

GUADELOUPE

ST. VINCENTS & THE GRENADINES

HAITI

BELIZE

JAMAICA

FRENCH GUIANA

MARTINIQUE

GUYANA

MONTSERRAT

SURINAME

NEVIS

TABLE 28: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1988 INTERDEPARTMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON EMPLOYMENT EQUITY FOR USE WITH 1986 CENSUS DATA. (CONTINUED)

-
- (6) **INDO-PAKISTANI REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:
- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| BENGALI | BANGLADESHI n.i.e. |
| GUJARATI | PAKISTANI n.i.e. |
| PUNJABI | SRI-LANKAN n.i.e. |
| TAMIL | SINGHELESE |
| EAST INDIAN n.i.e. | |
- (7) **INDO-PAKISTANI ASSIGNED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is either OTHER ASIAN or PORTUGUESE and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is one of the following:
- | | |
|------------|-----------|
| BANGLADESH | PAKISTAN |
| INDIA | SRI-LANKA |
- (8) **CHINESE REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is CHINESE.
- (9) **CHINESE ASSIGNED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is PORTUGUESE and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is MACAO.
- (11) **KOREAN REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is KOREAN
- (12) **JAPANESE REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is JAPANESE
- (13) **VIETNAMESE REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is VIETNAMESE
- (14) **OTHER SOUTH EAST ASIAN:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:
- | | |
|-----------|------------|
| BURMESE | THAI |
| CAMBODIAN | MALAY |
| LAOTIAN | INDONESIAN |

PLUS

TABLE 28: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1988 INTERDEPARTMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON EMPLOYMENT EQUITY FOR USE WITH 1986 CENSUS DATA. (CONTINUED)

Those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is OTHER ASIAN, N.I.E. and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is NOT one of the following:

BANGLADESH
INDIA

PAKISTAN
SRI-LANKA

(15) **FILIPINO REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is **FILIPINO**.

(16) **OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDERS:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:

FIJIAN
OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDERS

POLYNESIAN

(17) **LEBANESE:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is **LEBANESE**.

(18) **ARAB:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:

EGYPTIAN
PALESTINIAN

SYRIAN
ARAB n.i.e.

(19) **OTHER WEST ASIAN REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:

IRANIAN

ARMENIAN
TURK

(20) **OTHER WEST ASIAN ASSIGNED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is OTHER AFRICAN and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is one of the following:

ALGERIA
MOROCCO

MAURITANIA
WESTERN SAHARA
TUNISIA

TABLE 28: DEFINITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY GROUPS AS SPECIFIED BY THE 1988 INTERDEPARTMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON EMPLOYMENT EQUITY FOR USE WITH 1986 CENSUS DATA. (CONCLUDED)

(21) **LATIN AMERICAN REPORTED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (either as a single response or as part of a multiple response) is one of the following:

BRAZILIAN	PERUVIAN
EQUADORIAN	CUBAN
MEXICAN	PUERTO RICAN
OTHER LATIN/CENTRAL/SOUTH AMERICAN	

AND

Whose MOTHER TONGUE

ENGLISH	FRENCH
SPANISH	PORTUGUESE

(22) **LATIN AMERICAN ASSIGNED:** includes those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (ONLY as a SINGLE response) is PORTUGUESE and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is BRAZIL and whose MOTHER TONGUE is either ENGLISH, FRENCH, SPANISH or PORTUGUESE

PLUS

those individuals whose reported ETHNIC ORIGIN (ONLY as a SINGLE response) is SPANISH and whose PLACE OF BIRTH is one of the following:

CUBA	PANAMA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	BOLIVIA
PUERTO RICO	BRAZIL
BELIZE	CHILE
COSTA RICA	COLUMBIA
EL SALVADOR	ECUADOR
GUATEMALA	PARAGUAY
HONDURAS	PERU
MEXICO	URUGUAY
NICARAGUA	VENEZUELA

AND

WHOSE MOTHER TONGUE is one of the following:

ENGLISH	FRENCH
SPANISH	PORTUGUESE

(23) **MULTIPLE VISIBLE MINORITY CATEGORY:** this multiple visible minority category contains all individuals who have more than one visible minority ethnic origins.

II: BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Clark, W., Evaluation of the 1981 Edit and Imputation Procedures for 2B Cultural Variables
2. Kralt, John; Clark, Warren; White, Pamela, "Evaluation of 1981 Census Data on Metis, Non-Status, Status Indians and Inuit", (internal document) 1983
3. Price-Waterhouse, Qualitative Research Related to the Design of the 1991 Census Questionnaire, Final Report, May 1988
4. Statistics Canada, 1981 Census Dictionary (Catalogue 99-901)
5. Statistics Canada, 1981 Content Manual (No.40)
6. Statistics Canada, 1981 Population Code Book (R-320)
7. Statistics Canada, 1986 Census Dictionary (Catalogue 99-101)
8. Statistics Canada, 1986 Census Handbook (99-104)
9. Statistics Canada, 1986 Population Code Book (R-220)
10. Summary Tabulations of Ethnic and Aboriginal Origins (Release Package), December, 1987
11. White, P., to Earwaker, S., Memo: Subject = Certification of 1986 Census Ethnic Origin Data
12. Wright, W., Modification of the Specifications of the Visible Minority Definitions for Use with Both Census Data bases, 1988.