

Once the new act is proclaimed, the fact that such people are here does not qualify them for citizenship. Consequently, they are postponing the day when they will have the right to vote. They are also postponing the day when they will have the right to hold public office. Another practical consideration is this: they often find themselves in difficulty when they apply for a job because, of course, one of the first questions they are asked is whether they are citizens. When they say they are not, they are asked whether they have landed immigrant status, and their answer must, again, be no. Only two questions remain. One is, whether they are here as visitors, in which case they cannot be employed in Canada; and the other is whether they are here on a minister's permit. The answer, by its nature, indicates that their status is temporary. It indicates that a person does not qualify under the ordinary regulations and his right to hold gainful employment comes into question.

I am sure a number of members have been in correspondence with Mrs. Anderson, a British subject married to a Canadian. She was sponsored as an immigrant by her husband and eventually she came to Canada. Because she suffered from epilepsy, she was not granted landed immigrant status but was given a minister's permit. Mr. and Mrs. Anderson did not consent to this procedure without protest. Mrs. Anderson wrote to me, as well as to other members of parliament, drawing attention to the unfairness of this situation and to the difficulties in which people suffering from epilepsy found themselves. For example, she had difficulty in obtaining a social insurance number when it was found she was here under a minister's permit.

When the joint committee studying the green paper on immigration was touring Canada, representations on this point were made to committee members on a number of occasions. I recall that on one occasion in Vancouver, the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) and I agreed in public—it is on the record—that we would present a motion which would delete section 5 B (iv) from the Immigration Act. We jointly checked with the then minister of manpower and immigration to ascertain whether it would be possible. He indicated that because of the process in which we were then engaged, that of revising the Immigration Act, he did not want to see the legislation opened at that time. I find it strange that while he did not see fit to open up the act and allow these people to get landed immigrant status on that occasion, he did, nevertheless, find it possible to open the act a few weeks later when the regulations were passed regarding deportation in the spring of 1976.

Again, I wish to commend the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre and say that members on this side are in complete agreement with the proposal to remove the restrictions presently in the act concerning epileptics. In other words, we would like to see them here as landed immigrants as opposed to being here on ministers' permits. Having said this, I must draw attention to the method by which the hon. member has chosen to bring this matter before the House. Bill C-237 reads in part:

Subparagraph 10(1)(c)(i) of the Canadian Citizenship Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

### *Citizenship*

"(i) been lawfully admitted to Canada for permanent residence or under section 7 and 8 of the Immigration Act—

If we check section 7 and 8 of the Immigration Act, we find that section 7 is entitled "Non-Immigrants" or "Persons who may enter Canada as non-immigrants". In other words, these are people who are here on minister's permit. If you read section 7 of the Immigration Act you will find it says in part that the following persons may be allowed to enter and remain in Canada as non-immigrants, and under various sections there is reference to persons who are diplomatic consuls or officers, representatives or officials duly accredited with any country or the United Nations, or members of any navy, army or air force who come to Canada for training. As an example I just have to refer to the training of West German armed forces personnel at Shilo, Manitoba. As I understand the act, for the number of months these people are in Canada training at Shilo they will be qualifying under the provisions of Bill C-237; in other words, they are here under the provisions of section 7 of the present Immigration Act.

● (1730)

I could go into various other classifications under section 7, but I will not do that at this time. What I am trying to point out is that while we on this side of the House are in complete sympathy and agreement regarding the intent of Bill C-237, we must put some caveat on the method by which the bill hopes to arrive at the stated purpose.

I do not want to continue the debate too much longer, so in conclusion let me say that I reserve the right to investigate this matter further in committee. We would like to question officials of the Department of the Secretary of State and of the Department of Manpower and Immigration on the practical implications of including sections 7 and 8 of the present Immigration Act in the new Citizenship Act. Having expressed that caveat, we look forward to studying this bill further in committee.

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I will not be very long as our spokesman, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), has placed our party's views before the House.

Let me first congratulate the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) for putting his finger on a very sensitive matter. Many of us in our travels across the country as members of the Joint Senate and House Committee on Immigration found there were archaic provisions in the present act which need to be reconsidered. I am pleased to see one of these points dealt with in this bill as it relates to epileptics. The hon. member, I am sure, has every good intention, and I agree with the position he has taken in terms of giving further consideration to the members of society who happen to be epileptic and separated by a sort of non-status atmosphere. The hon. member said he has been here for eight and a half years, so he should recognize that by changing subparagraph 10(1)(c)(i) to include the words "or under section 7 and 8 of the Immigration Act" he will include not only epileptics but at