

All of us should ask ourselves whether we have given immigrants an adequate opportunity to adapt to the Canadian way of life. During the hearings of the joint committee the question of adaptation received a fair amount of attention and discussion. We found, for example, that generally speaking—I know we have to generalize in circumstances such as these—studies show that immigrants have an income equal to or higher than the average income of native born Canadians shortly after they come to Canada. So the economic adjustment that immigrants make is relatively quick and generally painless, and the positive factors are there not only for the immigrants but for Canada as a whole.

● (1510)

On the matter of language, it was found that despite the horrendous problems they were exposed to in places like the Toronto school system—if my memory serves me correctly, at one Toronto school there were about 18 mother tongues represented in one elementary classroom—and despite what one might call the pedagogical problems that situation represents, generally children of immigrants adapted to either one or both of the official languages of Canada in relatively short order.

The government must keep in mind that much more has to be done at the tripartite level. The federal government must assume more responsibility, in my view, and when immigrants come into Canada they should not then say to the provinces and municipalities, "Here they are. You are responsible": the federal government has to go beyond that. I am sure all hon. members recognize that the residency qualifications are really for one purpose, and that is for the immigrant to be able to adapt to the Canadian way of life upon which is based his citizenship. At least to some degree adaptation has to be made.

It was also very clear that we were not very successful in having immigrant women adapt to the Canadian way of life and become part of the social milieu. This was quite clearly pointed out in the immigration brief. I should like to read a portion of it into the record. I am reading from page 53:41 of the report of the Special Joint Committee on Immigration Policy as follows:

Attention was also directed to the particular plight of immigrant women, and especially wives and mothers. When they are not in the work force they have little opportunity to learn the language and make personal contacts, advantages enjoyed by their husbands and their school-aged and working children. Many of them remain in the home isolated by language differences, and can become estranged from the community and even from their own families.

It was pointed out that language training is the single most important need of these women. The committee is aware that federal funds are made available to the provinces to finance courses organized through the adult education division of the schools. But committee members gained the impression that not enough attention has been paid to this program by the responsible authorities and recommends that it be reviewed.

I think the evidence is quite clear that whether it be five years, three years or whatever, we are not doing enough to give members of the immigrant community an opportunity to adapt to the Canadian way of life, specifically with regard to language to which I have already referred. If people come to Canada and take Canada as the country of which they want to become citizens, we must ask ourselves what is the proper waiting time. I fully admit that whether

### *Citizenship*

it be five years or three years, it cannot be argued as an arbitrary time. I recognize that. I think we must consider what we are going to do in the three-year period or the five-year period, whatever the case may be, to make immigrants who are potential citizens feel at home and encourage them to make the contribution of which they are capable.

So often in our society we stress rights; we stress also the rights of immigrants, for instance, when they are being interviewed in the country of which they are citizens. When they come to Canada we also point out their rights. I believe we should stress more the obligations in a democratic society. Not only does this apply to immigrants but also to native born Canadians. I think there has been a glaring deficiency in that part of our educational program. We have not given enough thought, direction and thrust to the training of immigrants and our young people as to the obligations a democracy imposes.

I would like to point out that by the teaching of obligations we will not create negative reactions; I feel that this would do just the opposite. In order to create in our immigrants and our young people a love for Canada, regardless of the period of time we are considering, the minister, the government and Canadians generally should consider this matter seriously and work out a citizenship training period and citizenship courses which will create for all of us a commonalty as to what we think Canadian citizenship means and what its rights and obligations are.

I should like to point out that at the present time we are receiving a number of immigrants who come from countries which do not have strong democratic traditions. It would be for the benefit not only of Canadians but also of immigrants if we taught them not only language, economic adjustment and social adjustment, but also their obligations in their new country. For too long our public schools and citizenship courses have been lacking in this area. I am not preaching an extreme nationalism. I know that for many years Canadians have almost recoiled at the thought that we should try and push nationalism. I am not looking at this matter in terms of negative nationalism or blind allegiance but, rather, as something which should be done in a positive manner.

As we consider Bill C-20 I must be very frank and say that I have certain views on the five-year limit, but when I consider the statistics with regard to people who came before the committee, who wrote to the committee in letter form or prepared a brief, I find that Canadians are rather inconclusive as to whether it should be made five years or reduced to something less or, as the bill suggests, to three years. In respect of that issue I should like to read into the record how the committee thought Canadians generally viewed citizenship requirements and changes which might be possible. I read from page 53:49, paragraph 12 of the same report:

Most persons expressing these concerns felt that government has lost control of the immigration flow. Submissions revealed a lack of public confidence in the ability of government to manage the size of immigration movements, the racial and ethnic composition of the Canadian population, and the settlement of newcomers in underpopulated regions and away from the large cities. The ability of Canadian communities to absorb newcomers, and the role of government in aiding immigrants in their initial settlement and integration, were also primary concerns.