

*Canadian Citizenship Act*

status. They are not here as landed immigrants, nor are they here on visitor's visa, as students, or any of the recognized categories, because of an amendment made in 1953. Now, when they come to apply for citizenship, they are under a disability which this amendment is designed to remove. But, sir, you will observe that the amendment reads in part—perhaps I had better read the whole thing. Subsection 1, paragraph (c) reads:

Subparagraph (i) of paragraph (c) of subsection (1) does not apply to a person who has resided continuously in Canada for a period of one year immediately preceding the 1st day of June, 1956, and had been admitted to Canada for permanent residence prior to that date . . .

It is those last words that I am concerned about. They mean that the status of a person first having been admitted to Canada for permanent residence must be established prior to that date; that is, prior to the 1st day of June, 1956. I understand that the majority of these cases are already known because most of those people have made application for citizenship, and it is as a result of that application that the difficulty has been revealed. Therefore, in nearly every case it will be possible to say, or it may indeed already have been said: you are now granted the status of having been admitted to Canada for permanent residence prior to June 1, 1956. But there may be a residue of cases where either the circumstances have not come to light or the person has not brought his own case to the attention of the department by making application, and therefore those cases are not as yet dealt with.

You will appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that the 1st day of June, 1956, being the deadline, is only a matter of three weeks from now and that seems to me to be crowding it a little bit. If I have stated the case correctly, I want to ask the minister whether he does not think it would be advisable to extend the deadline by a few months, say to December 31, 1956. I am not referring to the place where it is first mentioned but where the words "that date" occur. Would it not be advisable to substitute for those words such words as "December 31"?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I think the hon. gentleman is anticipating what I was proposing to do, anyway. Perhaps it could be done a little more neatly and meet the point if we simply struck out the word "immediately" in line 20, and also changed "1956" to "1957" in the following line. I think that gives a little longer period than the hon. gentleman asked for. That would postpone the time to 1957. If I made the one change I would want to have the other.

When this bill was drafted I did not anticipate—perhaps I was mistaken—that hon.

[Mr. Fulton.]

gentlemen would be so loquacious, and I expected we would have reached it early in March. I would ask the Minister of Finance to move these two amendments.

**Mr. Fulton:** Just before the minister does so, may I ask the hon. gentleman whether his remarks are not a reflection upon the hon. gentleman of the other place whose loquacity I have not heard criticized before?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I withdraw any such reflection.

**Mr. Fulton:** However, this bill was passed by the Senate and we have not had it, to my knowledge, for more than a week.

**Mr. Knight:** Mr. Chairman, I did not think that the fact that one was loquacious could be counted as the subject of reflection in this house where, as I understand our duty, we should be permitted to take all the time that we require to deal with a subject.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I did not suggest that for a minute.

**Mr. Knight:** I shall now deal with my specific case. I take it—it is under subsection 3 to which the minister has referred—that when this becomes law the lady in question, the one to whom I referred, will immediately be granted her certification. In other words the small period of time, the six or seven months that she spent in England with her husband, will not be counted against her, and she will be assumed to have been a resident of Canada for the purposes of this act.

I have a second question. What about the minor children? Is there something in this act which covers their situation?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I think the minor children would be covered automatically, sir. That is within the discretion of the minister and they can be added; if the parents qualify they can be added to the certificate.

**Mr. Knight:** How soon after this act has been proclaimed, if that is the word, would it go into effect?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I do not believe there is any provision for proclamation. I understand this bill goes into effect as soon as it receives the royal assent.

**Mr. Fulton:** Before the minister moves his motion would he permit me to suggest with deference that perhaps his amendment is not quite as good as mine. I say that with deference and for this reason: If he takes out the word "immediately" and then changes "first of June 1956" to "first of June 1957" will it not automatically mean that the section can have no effect until the first of