

In my opinion, this is very important since the governor in council will never take this position if he does not have obvious proof that the landed immigrant has become a citizen after the three years provided in the act, if he does not have an obvious proof that this immigrant is an undesirable. But who can give this obvious proof of undesirability? Must the applicant commit an offense under the Criminal Code? How far can this go? This is the question that we must ask.

As concerns the province of Quebec, those who appeared before the committee were reasonable people who seemed to assume their responsibilities. They knew what they wanted to say. For instance, they told us, and I quote:

(a) That any province which receives immigrants may play a role in choosing these immigrants if they wish to live within its territory; this means that the federal legislation and regulations concerning immigration must provide mechanisms for the participation of provincial governments in the selection of immigrants.

(1) That the admission to a province of foreign students be submitted to the approval of the government of this province and not only of the institution or school board concerned;

That permanent consultation mechanisms be established with the government of all concerned provinces in relation to expulsion and deportation procedures;

This paragraph will not be applicable, will have no value if an immigrant becomes a citizen after studying three years in any university. This is why I do not agree on that three year waiting period before granting citizenship. Again I quote:

That the province of Quebec be directly involved in the individual recruiting and selection of immigrants, have access to all immigration requests concerning it and that federal immigration officers consider the advice of Quebec's representative before accepting or rejecting any requests concerning the province of Quebec;

I recognize the value of reasonable and orderly immigration, Mr. Speaker. Our country may have much to give to and receive from immigration but here I should like my comments to show that I am very puzzled concerning the acceptance of some of our immigrants who are today in our country and who should not be here.

There are many immigrants in Canada today and as they have seen here almost five years they will become Canadian citizen but they should never be granted citizenship because they are not ready to become real Canadians. They are not ready to make the necessary sacrifices.

I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that real culture is above race considerations and that the scope of genuine nationalism extends beyond frontiers.

**Mr. Joyal:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal) on a point of order.

**Mr. Joyal:** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the comments of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) and I did not intend to take part in the debate this afternoon but I am afraid I have to recall some facts that the hon. member for Richmond seems to have overlooked.

The hon. member—

### *Citizenship*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member should understand that if he rises on a point of order, he should do so with regard to the proceedings of the House and not the contents of the statement of the hon. member. He may rise in his turn to oppose the hon. member's statements in whatever way he wishes, but he may not, under the cover of a point of order or of a question of privilege, enter a point of debate with the hon. member on the arguments he put forward. Although he may have the right to rectify inaccurate facts which may have slipped into the hon. member's speech, if he proves that it is a matter of importance, if it is just a matter of opinion, he has no right to take part in the debate at this point.

**Mr. Joyal:** Mr. Speaker, with your permission, this is not an opinion but a fact. The hon. member for Richmond mentioned in his speech that some places in universities of the province of Quebec were occupied by foreign students or students who did not have Canadian citizenship. Well, Mr. Speaker, it so happens that the regulations of the five universities in the province of Quebec, Laval, Sherbrooke, Montreal, McGill and the Quebec university fix a 5 per cent quota on those places available for students, and consequently they are not at all—

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** This is an argument, not a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member can rise later and express his views at the time.

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Order!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Richmond on a point of order.

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Since there is someone opposite who does not even ask to be recognized to make a speech, and thinks he is good enough to apply censorship to our speeches, I would like him to stand up and deliver a speech if he disagrees with my statements, instead of criticizing.

**Mr. Olivier:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) on a point of order.

**Mr. Olivier:** I apologize, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal) just wanted to point to the House that the hon. member opposite said something untrue. That is just what he wanted to say.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I hope hon. members will not request the Chair to bear judgments, for it is too cumbersome a burden. I therefore ask the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean), whom I earlier recognized, to proceed with his speech.

[*English*]

**Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on this bill which is important in a special sense. It deals with citizenship. We can get an inkling of what citizenship connotes if we examine the derivation of