

member and he indicated he hoped to reserve his question until later. However, there was a lot of pressure as we got close to three o'clock. I do not know whether the House would want to give its consent to the hon. member putting his question now.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR EARLY DECISION ON APPLICATION OF STEVEN BADGER FOR LANDED-IMMIGRANT STATUS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank hon. members for their indulgence. I should like to remind the Minister of Manpower and Immigration that in a recent ruling by the department concerning Mr. Steve Badger, a student at the University of Manitoba, Mr. Badger was denied landed-immigrant status. As the minister knows, Steve Badger is a world class swimmer who wants to swim for Canada in the 1976 Olympics. In order to achieve his dream, he applied to the immigration department two years ago for landed-immigrant status. In view of the fact that in the last two years the minister has averaged over 18,000 ministerial orders in favour of people who did not qualify for landed-immigrant status, would he give an assurance that if Steve Badger made an application at a Canadian immigration office outside Canada, it would be accepted? In view of the fact that he has been offered many jobs by various swimming organizations, could not a speedy decision be made on his behalf in order that he might swim for Canada, as is the desire of many Canadians?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Unfortunately, there are a few misunderstandings about this situation. Steven Badger is a renowned swimmer. He is a student from Australia taking his studies in Canada. He was admitted as a visitor to Canada on a student visa. He did indeed apply—I am not aware it was two years ago—in September of 1975 from San Francisco, and because he is a student and does not have the necessary certification and other qualifications he was not granted entry.

The real point is this. It is not a question of Mr. Badger being a landed immigrant. It is the ruling of the Olympic committee, who have so advised me, that he must be a citizen of Canada, and to grant him landed-immigrant status, which might be possible, although questionable under the circumstances, does not satisfy that condition. The Citizenship Act, which is administered by my colleague, the Secretary of State, still requires five years of residence in Canada as a condition of becoming a citizen. Even if Bill C-20 receives royal assent within a short time, it will take three years.

Business of the House

That is the first confusion. The second is this. I understand from press reports only that there has been a suggestion that the Olympic committee itself, within its own jurisdiction, has found a possible ruling within its own regulations which women permit what they call a Commonwealth switch. Mr. Badger is, in fact, a citizen of Australia, a member of the Commonwealth, and possibly he could swim for Canada under that banner. But that aspect has nothing whatever to do with immigration or, indeed, citizenship. It is really a matter in the hands of the international Olympic committee. I do not even want to dwell on the propriety of making a visitor an instant landed-immigrant or Canadian citizen for the purpose of winning a gold medal for Canada. That is another matter. I do not even have to address myself to that question because the other situation prevails as I have described.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the acting House leader whether he would take the House into his confidence with respect to the business for the balance of the week? Possibly, in view of the fact that the budget is coming down next Tuesday, he might also indicate what we might be doing in the House next week.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to do so. Today, of course, is an opposition day and we shall be dealing with vote No. 1—agriculture. Tomorrow will also be an opposition day and the nature of the subject to be discussed will be made later on this afternoon in the usual way; we shall then be taken into the confidence of the opposition.

With reference to next week, Monday, of course, is a holiday, and on Tuesday we shall be dealing with Bill C-84 until the budget declaration at eight o'clock. On Wednesday we shall revert to Bill C-84. Thursday is the first day which has been set aside as a day to debate the budget. We shall proceed with the budget debate on Wednesday and Thursday, June 2 and 3, with the first vote on the budget at 5.45 p.m. on June 2. We shall proceed again with the budget debate on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of the following week, June 8, 9 and 10, with votes at 9.45 on June 8 and at 9.45 on June 10.

● (1520)

I might indicate to the House that it is the wish of the government to proceed with Bill C-84 with all due dispatch, that extra time could be made available in the hope that perhaps the opposition would agree in the near future to an extension of the ordinary hours so we can dispose of second reading, refer the bill to committee and then report back, so we might commence our summer recess at a convenient time.