

Citizenship

Canada presented a report to the Department of Transport some years ago regarding indoor parking at the Vancouver International Airport?

4. Did a private parking corporation make representations to the government regarding the installation of an indoor parking facility at the Vancouver International Airport?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes. Mirabel's three level parking structure, with two levels covered, has a capacity for 2,500 cars.

2. Yes. Construction has commenced on the first module of a five level parking structure for Toronto's Terminal 2.

3. Neither Transport Canada nor Air Canada have been able to identify the report referred to in connection with indoor parking at Vancouver International Airport.

4. Yes. In 1973 Transport Canada received a proposal for indoor parking facilities at Vancouver Airport. The proposal will be considered during Transport Canada's feasibility study for a parking structure.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CITIZENSHIP ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS GOVERNING CITIZENSHIP

The House resumed from Monday, December 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Faulkner that Bill C-20, respecting citizenship, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, when I called it ten o'clock last Monday I had been complimenting the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) for his sense of history and timeliness in bringing forward this legislation so close to Christmas. I think this shows his great wisdom, as I am sure the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) will agree.

I was about to compliment the Secretary of State for including in this bill recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women. We have, over the years, treated our women with benign neglect, if I may quote from another public document on the status of women. We have neglected them in the work force, in the community,

neglected their education, and not given them their just opportunities. These remarks are pertinent at any time, not merely in International Women's Year. Therefore this bill represents a significant and commendable step forward on the part of the government. I commend it for adopting at least part of the recommendations of the royal commission.

The bill improves the position of husbands or wives of Canadian citizens and their children. Indeed in that regard this bill is a significant advance and brings the law into line with thinking in the community.

The bill deals with something else important, to which the minister referred in passing, the question of the British subject. I think it is correct to say that, by virtue of this bill, we are to treat those who are not British, and not member of the Commonwealth of Nations, in the same way as we treat British subjects. On May 21 the minister dealt with this matter when he said, as reported on page 5985 of *Hansard*:

... a British subject... is not questioned on his knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship. He is not tested on his knowledge of the English or French language. No interview is conducted to determine his character. He does not appear before a judge to take the oath of allegiance unless he himself requests it. Normally, he simply takes the oath before an examiner at the time of application.

By that statement the minister implied that we were wrong to treat the British subject differently. But I suggest there was good reason for treating him differently, as I suggested previously. The British subject, by virtue of the accident of history, birth, geography, and familiarity with traditions, was aware of our basic institutions, of our parliamentary system which, basically, was and still is modelled on the British system. So there was some justification for treating him differently. Yet the minister seemed to question this practice. From my reading of his speech, and the bill, the minister seems to think there should not be that difference.

The Minister does distinguish between those from Commonwealth countries and those from non-Commonwealth countries, as the bill refers to citizens of the Commonwealth. Perhaps in that he is saying he does not completely move away from the position that there is a matter of tradition, training, background, and education in Commonwealth countries which would not make it alien for special consideration to be given to those people.

We must bear in mind that many people who come to this country have enjoyed the British parliamentary system, British justice, and other protections of the law as a matter of tradition. An advantage is enjoyed by the citizen from Great Britain, a Commonwealth country, or any other democratic country, English or French speaking, in terms of the necessity of absorbing new traditions.

● (1520)

We briefly touched on the question of the potential one-year credit for what might be termed, in parentheses in the sense of the Citizenship Act, legal residence in Canada. I did not deal with the question of the three or five-year period.

I reviewed the minister's speech of May 21, 1975, to see if there was anything other than a sense or principle of