



**MOSAIC**

1522 COMMERCIAL DR., VANCOUVER, B.C. CANADA V5L 3Y2 • TEL: 604-254-0244 • FAX: 604-254-3932

**HOUSE OF COMMONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION**

*A Submission re  
A New Citizenship Act*

*By*

**MOSAIC**

April 7, 2005

## INTRODUCTION

1. MOSAIC is a non-profit organization dedicated to providing settlement and integration assistance to newcomers to Canada. MOSAIC's goal is to support and guide immigrants and refugees through the integration process, and to assist them in achieving their full potential to contribute to Canadian society.

2. Since 1976, MOSAIC has provided settlement services, English language training, employment programs, family counselling, and interpretation and translation programs in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. MOSAIC provides these settlement and integration services through its dedicated staff of 100 and our more than 500 volunteers.

3. MOSAIC has previously made written and oral submissions in respect of Bill C-18, the previously proposed *Citizenship Act*. Our written submissions can be found on the MOSAIC website at: <http://www.mosaicbc.com/Bill%20C-18%20submissionsI.pdf> (a hard copy is also enclosed as an Appendix to these submissions). We will not repeat the presentation of these submissions, but we maintain and reiterate the positions set out therein.

4. In light of the detailed submissions previously provided, MOSAIC will focus on the particular issues for which the Standing Committee has requested input, namely:

- (a) Should new citizenship legislation include a preamble setting out the rights and responsibilities of citizenship?
- A preamble should be included and should refer to the rights of citizenship and the overarching principle of equality of all citizens.
  - Referring to responsibilities of citizenship is problematic in that it may create an unwarranted and unfair distinction between naturalized citizens and citizens by birth.
  - Only naturalized citizens are likely to be involved in a process in which fulfilment of the responsibilities of citizenship is assessed, imposing a separate standard of conduct with different consequences for naturalized citizens than for citizens by birth.
- (b) Should there be limits placed on the way citizenship can be obtained by birth?
- No. Any effort to make meaningful distinctions as a basis to deny citizenship to someone born in Canada will necessarily be arbitrary and result in unfairness.
  - Such limits may also result in creating stateless individuals, an outcome that should be assiduously avoided to the greatest extent possible.
  - These negative ramifications are not justified by the negligible benefits, if any, to denying citizenship to some people born in Canada.

- (c) What should be the criteria for granting citizenship to newcomers?
- A period of residency based on the flexible approach proposed in prior draft legislation.
  - A level of knowledge of an official language of Canada and of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, which can be reasonably expected in light of the government programs made available to provide lower income immigrants with this knowledge.
- (d) What are the appropriate reasons to remove citizenship and what process would be most appropriate?
- The only appropriate reason to remove citizenship is in cases where citizenship has been obtained by fraudulent misrepresentation of a fact that would materially affect the considerations whether to grant the applicant citizenship.
  - There should be no other distinction in the treatment and potential consequences facing naturalized citizens *vis a vis* citizens by birth.
  - All other misconduct by a citizen can and should be dealt with through our legal system, not the immigration system.
  - Given the seriousness of the consequence of revoking citizenship, the process should be judicial rather than political, and should be analogous to a criminal prosecution with all of the safeguards inherent in that process.
- (e) What should be the text of a new citizenship oath?
- The form of pledge proposed previously by the Standing Committee with a few non-substantive revisions.
- (f) What sort of citizenship engagement strategy does Canada need to make sure that citizenship is recognized and celebrated?
- Among other things, retain citizenship judges rather than moving to a more political and less meaningful citizenship commissioner.
  - Restore funding to community provided education programs for newcomers and new citizens.

## THE INFORMING PRINCIPLE

5. In responding to the Committee's queries, MOSAIC's responses are guided by an overarching principle which we submit should be applied in all deliberations regarding a new *Citizenship Act*:

**Canadian citizenship should be an indivisible class within which only those distinctions which are absolutely necessary are made.**

6. All citizens must be and must be treated as equal whether they are citizens by birth, or by naturalization. It is imperative that a new *Citizenship Act* does not create a second class citizenship for those who are naturalized, rather than born citizens.

7. Many of the newcomers MOSAIC serves, go on to become naturalized Canadian citizens. The joy expressed at becoming a Canadian citizen is nearly universal. Unfortunately, there is also a commonly expressed feeling among "naturalized citizens" that they are not "full citizens" equal to those who are citizens by birth. Numerous systemic reminders exist for those who are not born Canadians that they are *merely* naturalized citizens, emphasizing the sense that they are not equal citizens.

8. The nagging threat of revocation of citizenship is omnipresent, notwithstanding that for the vast majority of naturalized citizens these fears are entirely unfounded.

9. The distinction between naturalized citizens and citizens by birth is unnecessary and unwarranted. Yet it stands as a barrier to full integration of naturalized citizens into Canadian society. Consequently, to the largest extent possible the distinction should be eliminated.

## PREAMBLE FOR CITIZENSHIP LEGISLATION

10. Generally, it is wise to include a preamble which sets out the purpose and principles which underpin a statute. That having been said, the benefit of a preamble depends entirely on the actual words used. Any new *Citizenship Act* should set out in the preamble the guiding principle of equality among citizens whether born or naturalized, and ought to state in general terms the rights which accompany citizenship.

11. The inclusion of a statement of responsibilities of citizenship is a more problematic issue.

12. Theoretically, a statement of responsibilities of citizenship may be appropriate in a preamble, particularly if accompanied by the proposed espousal of the equality of all citizens. Practically, however, such a statement may unnecessarily create a distinction between naturalized citizens and citizens by birth.

13. The statement of responsibilities is unnecessary because to the extent the "responsibilities of citizenship" are enforceable legal obligations they can already be addressed within our legal system; for example through the criminal law or human rights legislation.

14. Presumably only naturalized citizens would have occasion for the issue of their responsibilities of citizenship to be examined and assessed. Consequently, a statement of responsibilities in the preamble of the *Citizenship Act* implicitly creates a standard of conduct applicable only to naturalized citizens and not to citizens by birth. Such circumstances would undermine the fundamental principle of equality of citizenship, and aggravate the perception that naturalized Canadians are second class citizens.

#### **SHOULD THERE BE LIMITS PLACED ON THE WAY CITIZENSHIP CAN BE OBTAINED BY BIRTH**

15. MOSAIC understands the impetus behind the suggestion that there be limits placed on the way citizenship can be obtained by birth, in order to ensure citizenship is not granted to those with only a temporary and superficial connection to Canada.

16. However, MOSAIC submits that implementing limitations on citizenship by birth will create more problems than it will resolve.

17. Whatever manner is devised to distinguish between those born in Canada who are “deserving” of citizenship and those who are not, the distinction will by its nature be arbitrary and give rise to unfairness for some.

18. Also, such limitations will raise practical problems such as how an infant is to be effectively advised of the decision to deny citizenship and how that decision could be reviewed or challenged. Denial of citizenship without notice and without an opportunity to be heard would be unfair in the extreme.

19. In light of Canada’s need to maintain its population and workforce by means other than its domestic birthrate, and given the absence of evidence of any harm by the policy of granting citizenship as of right to those born in Canada, it appears placing limits on citizenship by birth is likely to cause more problems than it would resolve.

#### **WHAT SHOULD BE THE CRITERIA FOR GRANTING CITIZENSHIP TO NEWCOMERS**

20. MOSAIC previously submitted that the proposal contained in previous draft legislation with respect to the requirements for citizenship were appropriate, subject to remedying certain concerns.

21. The requirements proposed in Bill C-18 included that an applicant for citizenship has resided in Canada for 1,095 days in the previous six years, and that the applicant have adequate knowledge of one of the official languages of Canada and adequate knowledge of Canada and the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship.

22. MOSAIC supports the approach to the residency requirements set out in the previously proposed legislation subject to the following:

- (a) No distinction should be drawn between a permanent resident and a refugee claimant, temporary resident or protected person in calculating the days of residency for the purposes of citizenship applications. There is no principled basis for making this distinction and it unnecessarily penalizes refugee applicants. If a person is ultimately granted refugee status, there is no reason to discount the time spent in Canada awaiting that decision in respect of a subsequent application for citizenship.
- (b) Lower income immigrants and refugees are dependent upon government funded programs to obtain the necessary language skills and knowledge of Canada in order to qualify for citizenship. Consequently, the opportunity to apply for citizenship is in large part constrained by the availability and funding of these programs. Additionally, the availability and quality of programs may vary from province to province. Given the linkage between the availability and quality of training programs and the ability to acquire the requisite knowledge for citizenship, it is appropriate that the standard of knowledge also be linked to the programs provided. Thus, MOSAIC recommends that a new Citizenship Act require:

Knowledge of one of the official languages of Canada and knowledge of Canada and responsibilities and privileges of citizenship, *commensurate with the standards which could be reasonably achieved by an applicant considering the educational resources made available by the federal government.*

Both of these concerns are dealt with in greater detail in MOSAIC's previous submissions which are attached.

## **WHAT ARE THE APPROPRIATE REASONS TO REMOVE CITIZENSHIP**

23. In accordance with the principle of equality among all citizens, the only basis for removal of citizenship should be in cases where citizenship has been obtained by a fraudulent misrepresentation of a fact that would materially affect the considerations whether to grant the applicant citizenship.

24. Citizenship cannot be stripped from a citizen by birth for misconduct, as that may render the person stateless, and may be contrary to the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

25. Naturalized citizens should not face consequences for misconduct different and more onerous than citizens by birth (other than the exception for fraudulently obtaining citizenship) as that would create unequal classes of citizenship. Misconduct by a naturalized citizen should be addressed in exactly the same manner as a citizen by birth.

26. Allowing for revocation of citizenship for misconduct by naturalized citizens not only creates inequality but also robs citizenship of the aura of permanency and acceptance which

ought to define one's status as a citizen. Such an approach would foster the existing sense that naturalized citizens are lesser citizens whose citizenship may be revoked on a whim.

### **WHAT PROCESS IS MOST APPROPRIATE FOR THE REMOVAL OF CITIZENSHIP**

27. Loss of citizenship is an extremely serious consequence, at least analogous to a sentence of imprisonment. In both cases an individual is stripped of fundamental rights as a result of malfeasance.

28. Consequently, a process akin to a criminal prosecution is the most appropriate, including:

- (a) a right to counsel;
- (b) a process on the record, before a fair and impartial decision maker, such as a judge of the Federal Court of Canada;
- (c) an evidentiary burden on the Crown to establish the factual basis for removal of citizenship;
- (d) a right of appeal or judicial review.

29. These procedural protections are warranted as safeguards against injustice, but also may be necessary to withstand scrutiny pursuant to the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

30. Additionally, given the limited circumstances in which revocation of citizenship ought to be at issue, hearings will be relatively rare. Therefore, the cost of ensuring sufficient procedural safeguards are provided to someone accused of fraudulently obtaining citizenship will not be overly onerous.

### **WHAT SHOULD BE THE TEXT OF A NEW CITIZENSHIP OATH**

31. The oath proposed previously by the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration is appropriate:

From this day forward, I pledge my loyalty and allegiance to Canada and Her Majesty Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada. I promise to respect our country's rights and freedoms, to defend our democratic values, to faithfully observe our laws and fulfil my duties and obligations as a Canadian citizen.

32. MOSAIC has only a few non-substantive comments in regard to this text. First, the promise to respect "our country's rights and freedoms" is not grammatically correct. This should be a reference to the rights and freedoms guaranteed to Canadians and not to "our country". The phrase should be replaced with the promise to respect "the rights and freedoms enshrined in our country's Constitution..." or some similar phrase.

33. The proposed text, appropriately, uses “pledge” and “promise” rather than the confusing choice offered in the prior oath between swearing and affirming. To reflect this change, the promise should be called the Pledge of Citizenship, as “oath” carries with it the cultural and religious assumptions that made necessary the option to affirm rather than swear.

34. While MOSAIC does not take issue with the inclusion of a pledge of loyalty and allegiance to the Queen, we feel obligated to point out that some immigrants have expressed concern or unwillingness to pledge allegiance to a monarch. Thus, we are aware of the preference among some newcomers to pledge their loyalty simply to Canada.

35. In light of the fact that the Queen is formally the head of state of Canada, MOSAIC does not contend it is inappropriate to include a reference to the Queen in a Pledge of citizenship.

36. However, MOSAIC does submit such a reference to the Queen is unnecessary, and may dissuade otherwise qualified newcomers from seeking Canadian citizenship. Since the competition for new citizens will only grow as industrialized nations seek to maintain and grow their workforce and population, MOSAIC submits that all unnecessary barriers to recruiting new citizens should be removed.

37. Consequently, it may be preferable to remove the reference to the Queen from the Pledge.

## **HOW CAN CANADA ENSURE THAT CITIZENSHIP IS RECOGNIZED AND CELEBRATED**

38. As suggested in the attached prior submissions, MOSAIC submits that one manner of highlighting citizenship as an event worthy of celebration is to retain the office of citizenship judge, rather than replacing judges with citizenship commissioners.

39. Previously there was greater federal funding, largely through the Department of Canadian Heritage, to support programs to educate new Canadians with respect to issues of rights and responsibilities and active participation in Canadian society. Funding for such programs has declined, and as a necessary consequence the availability of these programs has also declined.

40. A return to dedicating resources for the purpose of engaging and educating immigrants and new citizens would go a long way to ensure that Canadian citizenship is recognized and celebrated.

41. Finally, adopting the approach suggested by MOSAIC in response to the preceding queries will help inculcate naturalized citizenship with the sense of permanency and acceptance that will allow new citizens to unreservedly seek and celebrate citizenship status.

42. MOSAIC appreciates the opportunity to provide input on these topics, and is happy to provide any further information which would assist the Standing Committee.

# APPENDIX

House of Commons Select Standing Committee on  
Citizenship and Immigration

Public Hearings

Bill C-18, The Citizenship of Canada Act

**Submissions of MOSAIC**

Submitted February 14, 2003

## **Table of Contents**

Introduction .....	3
Summary of Recommendations .....	4
Length of Residency Requirements .....	5
Statelessness .....	7
Denial or Revocation of Citizenship.....	8
Knowledge of language and social history.....	9
Move to Commissioners .....	10

## Introduction

1. MOSAIC is among the largest organizations in British Columbia helping immigrants and refugees settle into their new Canadian homes. MOSAIC provides community counseling, family counseling, ESL classes, interpretations and translation services, and employment training to its numerous clients. MOSAIC also works with all levels of government to develop settlement and orientation policies and programs for immigrants and refugees.
2. MOSAIC last appeared before this Committee when it made written and oral submissions on Bill C-11, the new Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. It appreciates the opportunity to present its concerns about Bill C-18, the Citizenship Act (*C-18*).
3. As a member of the Canadian Council of Refugees, MOSAIC adopts and supports the Council's submissions on C-18. MOSAIC focuses its submissions on some of the practical consequences that will arise because of the changes to the citizenship regime proposed in C-18.
4. MOSAIC raises five specific concerns about C-18:
  - how the length of time within which a person must reside in Canada before he or she becomes eligible for citizenship is calculated;
  - the arbitrary removal of citizenship from citizens born of parents who acquired citizenship after naturalization;
  - the change from citizenship judges to Commissioners;
  - the vague definition of the circumstances under which the Minister may revoke a person's citizenship; and,
  - the practical consequences of government cutbacks have had on immigrants and refugees' ability to achieve the level of language and social knowledge proficiency required by the Act.

## Summary of Recommendations

- delete s. 7(1)(b)(ii) and amend s. 7(1)(b)(i) by inserting the words “protected person, convention refugee, refugee claimant, and temporary resident, if that person was formerly a convention refugee” at the end of that clause
- delete s. 14
- amend s. 21 and other consequential amendments by defining more precisely the kinds of behaviours and actions that the Minister may consider when revoking membership; examples of such behaviours may include international conventions against war crimes, terrorism, and human rights violations
- enhance and protect funding to ensure that all immigrants and refugees, regardless of their ability to pay, have a substantively equal opportunity to receive education and training to meet the language and social knowledge requirements of citizenship

## Length of Residency Requirements

5. MOSAIC supports the government's attempt to clarify how it will calculate the length of time that a person must reside in Canada before they can obtain citizenship. The current proposal in C-18 to require a person to reside in Canada 1,095 days in the previous six years is a fairer and more flexible requirement than that which exists in the current Act. However, MOSAIC raises two concerns how the proposed Act recognizes those days.
6. First, C-18 maintains the distinction existing in the current Act between a person who has acquired permanent resident status versus a refugee claimant, temporary resident, or protected person when one calculates the length of time that the claimant has resided in Canada. Specifically, a person is credited for only half a day for each day they are in Canada, up to a maximum of one year. This unprincipled distinction causes practical difficulties for people.
7. For example, the IRB has traditionally taken a long time to decide whether a person is a convention refugee. MOSAIC has dealt with clients who have waited for five years for their claim to be recognized. During this time, refugee claimants in B.C. are only eligible to receive hardship assistance, this is social assistance that is even less than income assistance. They have more limited opportunities to learn English, obtain job training, and work. For the whole period until they become permanent residents, those clients cannot travel in Canada to pursue job or educational opportunities and, they cannot leave Canada except with permission from CIC, or else CIC may deem those clients to have abandoned their claims. Even after those clients obtain their determinations as convention refugees, they can wait years before they obtain their permanent resident status.
8. For all of those years that our clients reside in Canada, they will only receive credit for one year for the entire time that they reside in Canada, even if by that time they will have acquired the language and social skills necessary for citizenship.
9. CIC will have determined a refugee's identity and potential threat to Canada when they grant that person refugee status. The claimant should receive full credit for each day that he or she resides in Canada, including the days that the applicant resides in Canada while they await determination as convention refugees and while they wait for their landed status. MOSAIC submits that crediting refugees, protected persons, and temporary residents with only half a day for every day they are in Canada unfairly penalizes them.
10. Further, no time limit should be placed on the credit that they can receive. Once a person is determined to be a legitimate refugee, then there is no principled reason why that person should not receive full credit for residency. In MOSAIC's example, even though the claimant had resided in Canada for over five years (and most likely more since they had to stay in Canada for years as a convention refugee before they obtain their permanent landed status) the claimant would have to stay still at least an extra 730 days (or two years) to prove their attachment to Canada. This is an absurd result.

11. Second, many of MOSAIC's clients may need to return to their former countries to deal with family, property, or other issues that may require them to be outside of Canada. Our clients wait a long time before they obtain their residency and cannot leave Canada until they obtain such status. However, the Act provides for no explicit exception for certain compelling reasons why a person may want to leave the country, such as traveling for work, an overseas illness that requires a longer convalescence period than expected, or caring for sick relatives.
12. C-18 grants the Minister broad powers to waive some of the residency requirements that a person applying for citizenship if the applicant can demonstrate compassionate grounds. However, such powers are not well defined and MOSAIC submits that they ought to be included in the Act, or at the very least by regulation under s. 7(2) of C-18.

**Recommendation:**

Delete s. 7(1)(b)(ii) and amend s. 7(1)(b)(i) by inserting the words "protected person, convention refugee, refugee claimant, and temporary resident, if that person was formerly a convention refugee" at the end of that clause.

## Statelessness

13. MOSAIC joins the Canadian Council for Refugees in opposing s. 14 of C-18. Under that section, a young person outside of Canada born after February 14, 1977 to parents who acquired citizenship other than by being born in Canada in certain circumstances (“second generation citizens”) may lose their citizenship if they fail to apply to the Minister to retain their citizenship and have resided in Canada for 1,095 days in the previous six years before so applying.
14. This provision will affect most of the children of our current and future clients. As our clients achieve citizenship, some of them will travel outside of Canada for various reasons. Those reasons may include employment, caring for family, or choosing to give birth to children close to overseas family. In those cases, the children born under those circumstances will automatically face the jeopardy of losing their citizenship without notice. The children of those clients may return to Canada to live most of their lives in Canada, but go abroad to pursue post-graduate studies. During that time, many of them will turn 28 and may lose their citizenship automatically without even knowing it!
15. There are no apparent or legitimate government objectives justifying this extreme measure. The purposes of C-18 as defined in s. 3 include a purpose “to require strong attachment to Canada for the reception of citizenship”. Section 14 penalizes those young adults who may have demonstrated an attachment to Canada but who have chosen to live abroad at a certain time in their lives. This is an arbitrary means of ensuring that a person has an attachment to Canada.

Recommendation:

Delete s. 14.

## Denial or Revocation of Citizenship

16. C-18 empowers the Minister to deny a person citizenship if they have demonstrated a “flagrant and serious disregard for the principles and values underlying a free and democratic society”. MOSAIC submits that this provision inadequately defines the Minister’s power and provides no standard against which one can evaluate the Minister’s exercise of discretion.
17. The government backgrounder states that the courts have interpreted and defined the meaning of this phrase. This is not entirely true. The courts have not given that phrase any real normative meaning. The courts have not defined any precise behavior a person would engage in to violate those principles. C-18 does not refer specifically to the rights such as the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Canadian Bill of Rights, and other legal and political instruments that define individual rights and freedoms. In short, the Minister could deem a person to be a threat to a “free and democratic” society in many ways.
18. For example, South Africa, a democratic, Commonwealth state, jailed Nelson Mandela for political crimes and participating in the ANC which at the time was labeled by the government as a terrorist organization. The ANC has been accused of numerous other crimes, including those involving violent demonstrations and other acts of sedition. Nelson Mandela is a person whom the Minister could find was a threat to the values and principles of a free and democratic society for his political crimes. Canada recently granted Mr. Mandela honorary citizenship.
19. This example, while extreme, illustrates several problems with the way in which C-18 purports to allow the Minister to protect Canada’s national security. What principles and values are we talking about? What is a free society? What is a democratic society? These are broad concepts that do not define or control the Minister’s discretion and provide little substantive guidance to courts on any potential judicial review

### **Recommendation:**

Amend s. 21 and other consequential amendments by defining more precisely the kinds of behaviours and actions that the Minister may consider when revoking membership. Examples of such behaviours may include international conventions against war crimes, terrorism, and human rights violations.

## **Knowledge of language and social history**

20. The Bill maintains the requirement that citizens have adequate knowledge of one of the official languages of Canada and adequate knowledge of Canada and responsibilities and privileges of citizenship. Two groups are vulnerable to these requirements for reasons beyond their control.
21. Lower income immigrants and refugees attend government-funded programs to learn one of the official languages, to learn about Canada, and to acquire employment skills and knowledge. The ability of these people to acquire such skills is therefore dependent on government funding that may not always be there. Certainly, under the current delegation of responsibility for training immigrants from the federal to the provincial government, immigrants and refugees in B.C. may be in danger of losing further opportunities to pass these tests. In practice, many immigrants and refugees may find it difficult to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to become citizens no matter how hard they try due to the lack of funding and community support for these programs.
22. Second, seniors and individuals who have come from countries where education systems are failing are particularly at risk of being denied citizenship because they lack the ability, through age or lack of training, to obtain such skills with any reasonable degree of success in a reasonable amount of time.

### **Recommendation:**

The Committee must report to Parliament that funding must be in place to ensure that all immigrants and refugees, regardless of their ability to pay, have a substantively equal opportunity to receive education and training to meet the language and social knowledge requirements of citizenship.

## **Move to Commissioners**

23. C-18 has created the office of the Citizenship Commissioner, and it purports to delegate the authority to preside of citizenship to those individuals rather than through citizenship judges. MOSAIC submits that the government will undermine its purpose of “heighten[ing] the awareness of citizens that the acquisition of citizenship is a significant event worthy of celebration” by removing the judicial quality from citizenship proceedings.
24. The creation of the Citizenship Commissioner removes the appearance that the grant of citizenship is made by an objective, impartial, and fair process. This reinforces the appearance that the government intends to subject the process of granting citizenship to individuals who are more beholden to the government of the day.
25. Many of our clients come from countries where the privileges of citizenship are granted by corrupt politicians and government bureaucrats. There is a greater appearance of justice when such an important status is granted to a person in a judicial process and MOSAIC submits that the grant of citizenship will acquire greater legitimacy in the eyes of many of our clients if a judge rather than a non-judicial Commissioner granted it.

## Conclusion

26. MOSAIC applauds the government's attempt to reform the citizenship regime. Respectfully however, the government has reacted to perceived security risks after September 11, 2001 by enacting several provisions in the new Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, and now under C-18 that will impose further hardship on qualified and willing claimants without an appreciable improvement in Canada's security.
27. C-18 focuses so much on ensuring that citizenship claimants have a physical attachment to Canada through extensive residency requirements. The 2001 census confirms that Canada's workforce and economic growth will come from its immigrants, particularly in areas that require skilled workers and professionals. Unprincipled residency requirements will discourage potential immigrants and refugees to choose Canada as their country of choice. Unfortunately, C-18 uses those requirements as the prime determinant of who acquires the privileges to participate fully in Canadian civic life.
28. MOSAIC submits that the Committee should recommend loosening the residency requirements in C-18, refining the discretion that the Minister may use to deny or revoke citizenship, and report to Parliament that Cabinet should allocate further resources towards processing and assisting refugee claimants to help them focus on becoming productive citizens. By employing legislative and administrative reforms, C-18 will help Canada attract and maintain a productive, active, and loyal citizenry.