

Date: 20080218

Docket: T-1099-07

Citation: 2008 FC 205

Ottawa, Ontario, February 18, 2008

PRESENT: The Honourable Madam Justice Tremblay-Lamer

BETWEEN:

MARIA CAROLINA SANTOS

Applicant

and

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP
AND IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT

[1] This is an appeal by the applicant pursuant to s. 14(5) of the *Citizenship Act*, 1974-75-76, c. 108, s. 1 (the “Act”) and s. 21 of the *Federal Courts Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. F-7, as amended, respecting a decision rendered by a citizenship court judge, dated 20 April 2007, wherein he concluded that the applicant had not met the knowledge requirement of s. 5(1)(e) of the Act.

[2] The applicant and her family, all citizens of Colombia, were landed immigrants on August 24, 2000.

[3] On June 23, 2004, the applicant submitted an application for Canadian citizenship.

[4] The applicant was sent a booklet, *A Look At Canada “Applying for Citizenship”* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2006) containing all the information regarding the tests which a citizenship applicant must take to prove their knowledge of official languages and their knowledge of Canada and of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship as provided for in ss. 5(1)(d) and 5(1)(e) of the Act.

[5] Subsequently, the applicant and her husband sold their house in Canada and returned with their children to Colombia, remaining there in 2006.

[6] On February 7, 2006, the applicant took a written test, the purpose of which is to determine if an applicant meets the minimum language requirements for citizenship and has sufficient knowledge of Canada and of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship pursuant to ss. 5(1)(d) and 5(1)(e) of the Act. The applicant passed the written test.

[7] On February 7, 2006, the applicant met with a citizenship officer, and subsequently completed her Residence Questionnaire on February 23, 2006.

[8] A notice for a hearing before a citizenship judge was sent to the applicant on January 3, 2007.

[9] The applicant appeared before the citizenship judge for a hearing of her application for Canadian Citizenship on January 17, 2007. During the interview she was given an oral test evaluating her knowledge of Canada and the responsibilities and privileges associated with citizenship.

[10] In a decision dated April 20, 2007, the Judge found that the applicant had not fulfilled the knowledge requirement of s. 5(1)(e) of the Act and therefore denied the applicant's citizenship application.

[11] The applicant submits that the citizenship judge erred by re-testing her knowledge of Canada after she had passed a written test the previous year. In support, she cites the cases of *Liu (Re)*, [1998] F.C.J. No. 1816 (QL), and *Huang v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2005 FC 861, [2005] F.C.J. No. 1078. However, these decisions cannot be taken to stand for the proposition that applicants cannot be re-tested.

[12] In *Liu (Re)*, *supra*, while Evans J., as he then was, stated that there is nothing in the Act or Regulations requiring applicants to pass both the written and oral tests, he concluded that “[o]n the basis of the facts of this case I need not decide whether the citizenship judge erred in law in requiring Ms. Liu to pass both the written and the oral interview.”

[13] Furthermore in *Huang, supra*, at para. 6, Mosley J. indicates that both “parties agree that, as Mrs. Huang had previously passed that portion of the requirements, she should not have been re-tested on her knowledge.” The case did not turn on the question of re-testing but rather, as stated in para. 7, whether the Judge erred with respect to the dates used to calculate residency and in the application of the *Koo (Re)* test.

[14] Therefore, the issue of whether a citizenship applicant may be re-tested remains an unsettled question.

[15] The question raised by this application relates to a procedural matter: the propriety of re-testing applicants’ knowledge of Canada in the evaluation of their citizenship applications. I note that pursuant to *Canadian Union of Public Employees (C.U.P.E.) v. Ontario (Minister of Labour)*, [2003] 1 S.C.R. 539, [2003] S.C.J. No. 28 (QL), at para. 100, “it is for the courts, not the Minister, to provide the legal answer to procedural fairness questions.” Indeed, questions of procedural fairness do not undergo a pragmatic and functional analysis, it is solely the ultimate decision of whether an applicant fulfills the requirements of citizenship that is subject to the standard of review (*C.U.P.E., supra*, at para. 100).

[16] The content of procedural fairness is eminently variable and depends on the context of the particular decision (*Baker v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, [1999] 2 S.C.R. 817, [1999] S.C.J. No. 39 (QL), at paras. 21-22). In *Baker, supra*, at paras. 23-28, L’Heureux-Dubé

J. established five factors to be taken into consideration when assessing the content of procedural fairness in a given situation: 1) the nature of the decision; 2) the statutory scheme; 3) the importance of the decision to the individual affected; 4) legitimate expectation; and 5) the choice of procedures.

[17] First, the nature of the decision to grant citizenship involves an assessment of multiple considerations pertaining to the knowledge, language and residency requirements of the Act. In *Chiau v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) (C.A.)*, [2001] 2 F.C. 297, [2000] F.C.J. No. 2043 (QL), at para. 42, the Federal Court of Appeal indicated three factors which point to imputing a relatively high procedural content: if the decision was based on reasonably objective criteria, rather than pursuant to an open-ended and subjective discretion; if the decision was based on facts concerning the individual; and if the decision applied only to the individual party. Citizenship determinations are based on reasonably objective criteria set out by the Act and Regulations, pertain to individualized facts, and apply only to the specific applicant.

[18] Second, the nature of the statutory scheme indicates that decisions to deny citizenship applications are not intended to be final. An avenue of appeal is open to the Federal Court of Canada pursuant to s. 14(5) of the Act.

[19] With respect to the underlying fairness of re-testing, s. 11(7) of the Regulations provides that the citizenship judge will review the application and, where it appears that it may not be possible on the basis of the information available to approve the application, a notice of interview will be sent to the applicant.

[20] Policy manuals, while not binding, are instructive in establishing the nature of the statutory scheme. Section 5.3 of the CP 4 “Grants” policy manual provides that all applicants between the ages of 18 and 54 years must write the citizenship test and those who fail must pass an oral interview with a citizenship judge on the knowledge and language requirements. Similarly, s. 3.8 of CP 2 “Decision-Making” policy manual states that a citizenship judge does not “have” to interview applicants when “the applicant passes the written test and is not a residence case.” Thus, a citizenship judge has a wide margin of discretion in the choice of procedures used to gather the information necessary to “satisfy” himself that applicants possess the requisite knowledge of Canada. However, the discretion to request an interview is usually exercisable where it is *not possible* to approve the application on the basis of the material available.

[21] With respect to the importance of the decision in question, the granting of citizenship is obviously of great importance to the applicant. It affects her rights, privileges and responsibilities in this country as well as those of her dependent children.

[22] On the issue of reasonable expectation, in *Baker, supra*, at para. 26, the Court indicated that the doctrine of reasonable or legitimate expectation “is based on the principle that the “circumstances” affecting procedural fairness take into account the promises or regular practices of administrative decision-makers.” Regular administrative practice suggests that an individual who passes the written test will not be required to re-write that test. This finding is bolstered by the information contained in the materials available to applicants. Specifically, on page 6 of the study

guide, “A Look At Canada” the document indicates “If you pass the test and meet all the other requirements, you will receive a “Notice to Appear to Take the Oath of Citizenship.”[...] This is the final step in becoming a Canadian citizen.” Thus, there was a reasonable expectation that re-testing would not occur where a positive result was obtained on the first exam.

[23] Finally, the choice of procedures open to citizenship judges is broad. Indeed, the statutory scheme affords a wide measure of discretion to the citizenship judge to decide on proper information gathering procedures in order to satisfy himself that the applicant possesses the requisite knowledge.

[24] Based on the totality of factors, fairness requires that, at minimum, applicants be re-tested solely where there is a valid reason to do so and where adequate notice of the impending second test has been given.

[25] The wide measure of discretion granted to citizenship judges must be exercised fairly and in accordance with common sense. In determining whether an applicant possesses the statutorily required knowledge of Canada, it is clear that the exam is meant to act as the benchmark in this regard. Thus, successful completion of the knowledge exam should usually be sufficient to permit a citizenship judge to approve the application. There may be situations where, despite successful completion of the exam, it is not possible for the citizenship judge to approve the application on the basis of the material submitted. However, fairness requires the existence of a valid reason

precluding the Judge from making this approval, and that where such a reason does exist, that clear notice be given to the applicant of the impending *de novo* exam.

[26] In the present case, it is uncontested that the applicant passed the first written knowledge exam. Thus, in the absence of a valid reason indicating why the citizenship judge would need to re-test the applicant, it appears that such an examination was not required. Further, while it is true that the applicant received a notice of interview indicating that some knowledge questions may be asked, the notice was vague and did not specify that re-testing would occur. Thus, in light of the fact that the applicant had successfully passed the written test, she had reasonable grounds to believe that the subject of the interview would be her absences from the country and not a *de novo* exam.

[27] For these reasons, the appeal is granted. The decision of the citizenship judge rendered on April 20, 2007 is quashed. The matter is returned before a different citizenship judge to be decided in accordance with these reasons, the whole without costs.

JUDGMENT

[28] **THIS COURT ORDERS that** the appeal is granted. The decision of the citizenship judge rendered on April 20, 2007 is quashed. The matter is returned before a different citizenship judge to be decided in accordance with these reasons, the whole without costs.

“Danièle Tremblay-Lamer”

Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: T-1099-07

STYLE OF CAUSE: MARIA CAROLINA SANTOS

Applicant

and

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP
AND IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

PLACE OF HEARING: Montreal, Quebec

DATE OF HEARING: February 4, 2008

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT: TREMBLAY-LAMER J.

DATED: February 18, 2008

APPEARANCES:

Deborah Mankovitz

FOR THE APPLICANT

Michèle Joubert

FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

GREY CASGRAIN
Montreal, Quebec

FOR THE APPLICANT

John H. Sims, Q.C.
Deputy Attorney General of Canada
Department of Justice
Montreal, Quebec

FOR THE RESPONDENT

ANNEX

<p><i>Citizenship Act, 1974-75-76, c. 108</i> [...]</p> <p>Grant of citizenship</p> <p>5. (1) The Minister shall grant citizenship to any person who</p> <p>(a) makes application for citizenship;</p> <p>(b) is eighteen years of age or over;</p> <p>(c) is a permanent resident within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, and has, within the four years immediately preceding the date of his or her application, accumulated at least three years of residence in Canada calculated in the following manner:</p> <p>(i) for every day during which the person was resident in Canada before his lawful admission to Canada for permanent residence the person shall be deemed to have accumulated one-half of a day of residence, and</p> <p>(ii) for every day during which the person was resident in Canada after his lawful admission to Canada for permanent residence the person shall be deemed to have accumulated one day of residence;</p> <p>(d) has an adequate knowledge of one of the official languages of Canada;</p> <p>(e) has an adequate knowledge of Canada and of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship; and</p> <p>(f) is not under a removal order and is not the subject of a declaration by the Governor in Council made pursuant to section 20.</p>	<p><i>Loi sur la citoyenneté, 1974-75-76, ch. 108</i> [...]</p> <p>Attribution de la citoyenneté</p> <p>5. (1) Le ministre attribue la citoyenneté à toute personne qui, à la fois :</p> <p>a) en fait la demande;</p> <p>b) est âgée d'au moins dix-huit ans;</p> <p>c) est un résident permanent au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la Loi sur l'immigration et la protection des réfugiés et a, dans les quatre ans qui ont précédé la date de sa demande, résidé au Canada pendant au moins trois ans en tout, la durée de sa résidence étant calculée de la manière suivante :</p> <p>(i) un demi-jour pour chaque jour de résidence au Canada avant son admission à titre de résident permanent,</p> <p>(ii) un jour pour chaque jour de résidence au Canada après son admission à titre de résident permanent;</p> <p>d) a une connaissance suffisante de l'une des langues officielles du Canada;</p> <p>e) a une connaissance suffisante du Canada et des responsabilités et avantages conférés par la citoyenneté;</p> <p>f) n'est pas sous le coup d'une mesure de renvoi et n'est pas visée par une déclaration du gouverneur en conseil faite en application de l'article 20.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Examen par un juge de la citoyenneté</p>
--	---

<p>[...]</p> <p>Consideration by citizenship judge</p> <p>14. (1) An application for</p> <p>(a) a grant of citizenship under subsection 5(1),</p> <p>(b) a retention of citizenship under section 8,</p> <p>(c) a renunciation of citizenship under subsection 9(1), or</p> <p>(d) a resumption of citizenship under subsection 11(1)</p> <p>shall be considered by a citizenship judge who shall, within sixty days of the day the application was referred to the judge, determine whether or not the person who made the application meets the requirements of this Act and the regulations with respect to the application.</p> <p>Interruption of proceedings</p> <p>(1.1) Where an applicant is a permanent resident who is the subject of an admissibility hearing under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, the citizenship judge may not make a determination under subsection (1) until there has been a final determination whether, for the purposes of that Act, a removal order shall be made against that applicant.</p> <p>(1.2) [Repealed, 2001, c. 27, s. 230]</p> <p>Advice to Minister</p> <p>(2) Forthwith after making a determination under subsection (1) in respect of an application referred to therein but subject to section 15, the citizenship judge shall approve or not approve the application in accordance with his determination, notify the Minister accordingly and provide the Minister with the reasons</p>	<p>14. (1) Dans les soixante jours de sa saisine, le juge de la citoyenneté statue sur la conformité — avec les dispositions applicables en l’espèce de la présente loi et de ses règlements — des demandes déposées en vue de :</p> <p>a) l’attribution de la citoyenneté, au titre du paragraphe 5(1);</p> <p>b) la conservation de la citoyenneté, au titre de l’article 8;</p> <p>c) la répudiation de la citoyenneté, au titre du paragraphe 9(1);</p> <p>d) la réintégration dans la citoyenneté, au titre du paragraphe 11(1).</p> <p>Interruption de la procédure</p> <p>(1.1) Le juge de la citoyenneté ne peut toutefois statuer sur la demande émanant d’un résident permanent qui fait l’objet d’une enquête dans le cadre de la Loi sur l’immigration et la protection des réfugiés tant qu’il n’a pas été décidé en dernier ressort si une mesure de renvoi devrait être prise contre lui.</p> <p>(1.2) [Abrogé, 2001, ch. 27, art. 230]</p> <p>Information du ministre</p> <p>(2) Aussitôt après avoir statué sur la demande visée au paragraphe (1), le juge de la citoyenneté, sous réserve de l’article 15, approuve ou rejette la demande selon qu’il conclut ou non à la conformité de celle-ci et transmet sa décision motivée au ministre.</p> <p>Information du demandeur</p> <p>(3) En cas de rejet de la demande, le juge de la citoyenneté en informe sans délai le demandeur en lui faisant connaître les motifs de sa décision</p>
--	--

<p>therefore.</p> <p>Notice to applicant</p> <p>(3) Where a citizenship judge does not approve an application under subsection (2), the judge shall forthwith notify the applicant of his decision, of the reasons therefore and of the right to appeal.</p> <p>Sufficiency</p> <p>(4) A notice referred to in subsection (3) is sufficient if it is sent by registered mail to the applicant at his latest known address.</p> <p>Appeal</p> <p>(5) The Minister or the applicant may appeal to the Court from the decision of the citizenship judge under subsection (2) by filing a notice of appeal in the Registry of the Court within sixty days after the day on which</p> <p>(a) the citizenship judge approved the application under subsection (2); or</p> <p>(b) notice was mailed or otherwise given under subsection (3) with respect to the application.</p> <p>Decision final</p> <p>(6) A decision of the Court pursuant to an appeal made under subsection (5) is, subject to section 20, final and, notwithstanding any other Act of Parliament, no appeal lies therefrom. R.S., 1985, c. C-29, s. 14; 1995, c. 15, s. 23; 2001, c. 27, s. 230. [...]</p> <p>Citizenship Regulations, SOR/93-246 [...]</p> <p>PROCEDURE</p> <p>11. (1) On receipt of an application made in accordance with subsection 3(1), 6(1), 7(1) or</p>	<p>et l'existence d'un droit d'appel.</p> <p>Transmission</p> <p>(4) L'obligation d'informer prévue au paragraphe (3) peut être remplie par avis expédié par courrier recommandé au demandeur à sa dernière adresse connue.</p> <p>Appel</p> <p>(5) Le ministre et le demandeur peuvent interjeter appel de la décision du juge de la citoyenneté en déposant un avis d'appel au greffe de la Cour dans les soixante jours suivant la date, selon le cas :</p> <p>a) de l'approbation de la demande;</p> <p>b) de la communication, par courrier ou tout autre moyen, de la décision de rejet.</p> <p>Caractère définitif de la décision</p> <p>(6) La décision de la Cour rendue sur l'appel prévu au paragraphe (5) est, sous réserve de l'article 20, définitive et, par dérogation à toute autre loi fédérale, non susceptible d'appel. L.R. (1985), ch. C-29, art. 14; 1995, ch. 15, art. 23; 2001, ch. 27, art. 230. [...]</p> <p>Règlement sur la citoyenneté, DORS/93-246 [...]</p> <p>PROCÉDURE</p> <p>11. (1) Sur réception d'une demande visée aux paragraphes 3(1), 6(1), 7(1) ou 8(1), le greffier fait entreprendre les enquêtes nécessaires pour déterminer si la personne faisant l'objet de la demande remplit les exigences applicables de la Loi et du présent règlement.</p> <p>(2) Si la personne qui présente une demande visée au paragraphe 3(1) ne fournit pas les documents prévus au paragraphe 3(4), l'agent de</p>
--	--

<p>8(1), the Registrar shall cause to be commenced the inquiries necessary to determine whether the person in respect of whom the application is made meets the requirements of the Act and these Regulations with respect to the application.</p> <p>(2) Where an applicant who makes an application referred to in subsection 3(1) fails to provide the materials described in subsection 3(4), the citizenship officer with whom the application was filed or to whom the application has been forwarded under subsection 3(5) shall send a notice in writing by ordinary mail to the applicant, at the applicant's latest known address, advising that the applicant is required to provide the materials to that citizenship officer by the date specified in the notice.</p> <p>(3) Where an applicant who makes an application referred to in subsection 6(1), 7(1) or 8(1) fails to provide the materials described in subsection 6(3), 7(3) or 8(2), as the case may be, the Registrar shall send a notice in writing by ordinary mail to the applicant, at the applicant's latest known address, advising that the applicant is required to provide the materials to the Registrar by the date specified in the notice.</p> <p>(4) Where an applicant fails to comply with a notice given pursuant to subsection (2) or (3), the citizenship officer or the Registrar, as the case may be, shall send a second notice in writing by registered mail to the applicant, at the applicant's latest known address, advising that the applicant is required to provide the materials described in subsection 3(4), 6(3), 7(3) or 8(2), as the case may be, to the Registrar or to the citizenship officer, as the case may be, by the date specified in the notice.</p> <p>(5) After completion of the inquiries commenced pursuant to subsection (1), the Registrar shall</p>	<p>la citoyenneté auprès de qui la demande a été déposée ou à qui elle a été transmise conformément au paragraphe 3(5) lui envoie un avis écrit à sa dernière adresse connue, par courrier ordinaire, l'informant qu'elle doit lui fournir ces documents dans le délai qui y est précisé.</p> <p>(3) Si la personne qui présente une demande visée aux paragraphes 6(1), 7(1) ou 8(1) ne fournit pas les documents prévus aux paragraphes 6(3), 7(3) ou 8(2), selon le cas, le greffier lui envoie un avis écrit à sa dernière adresse connue, par courrier ordinaire, l'informant qu'elle doit lui fournir ces documents dans le délai qui y est précisé.</p> <p>(4) Si le demandeur ne se conforme pas à l'avis donné en application des paragraphes (2) ou (3), l'agent de la citoyenneté ou le greffier, selon le cas, lui envoie un second avis écrit à sa dernière adresse connue, par courrier recommandé, l'informant qu'il doit lui fournir les documents prévus aux paragraphes 3(4), 6(3), 7(3) ou 8(2), selon le cas, dans le délai qui y est précisé.</p> <p>(5) Une fois que les enquêtes entreprises en vertu du paragraphe (1) sont terminées, le greffier :</p> <p>a) dans le cas d'une demande et des documents déposés auprès de l'agent de la citoyenneté conformément au paragraphe 3(1) ou transmis au greffier selon le paragraphe 3(3), demande à l'agent de la citoyenneté auprès de qui ils ont été déposés ou à qui ils ont été transmis conformément au paragraphe 3(5) d'en saisir le juge de la citoyenneté;</p> <p>b) dans le cas d'une demande et des documents déposés conformément aux paragraphes 6(1), 7(1) ou 8(1), les transmet à l'agent de la citoyenneté du bureau de la citoyenneté qu'il juge compétent en l'espèce et lui demande d'en</p>
---	--

<p>(a) in the case of an application and materials filed with a citizenship officer in accordance with subsection 3(1), or forwarded to the Registrar under subsection 3(3), request the citizenship officer with whom the application and materials have been filed or to whom they have been forwarded under subsection 3(5) to refer the application and materials to a citizenship judge for consideration; and</p> <p>(b) in the case of an application and materials filed under subsection 6(1), 7(1) or 8(1), forward the application and materials to a citizenship officer of the citizenship court that the Registrar considers appropriate in the circumstances, and request the citizenship officer to refer the application and materials to a citizenship judge for consideration.</p> <p>(6) A citizenship officer with whom an application and materials have been filed under subsection 3(1), or to whom they have been forwarded under subsection 3(5) or paragraph (5)(b), shall enter in the records of the citizenship court the date on which the officer received the application and materials.</p> <p>(7) Where it appears to a citizenship judge that the approval of an application referred to the citizenship judge under subsection (5) may not be possible on the basis of the information available, that citizenship judge shall ask the Minister to send a notice in writing by ordinary mail to the applicant, at the applicant's latest known address, giving the applicant an opportunity to appear in person before that citizenship judge at the date, time and place specified in the notice.</p> <p>(8) Where an applicant referred to in subsection (7) fails to appear in person at the specified date, time and place, the Minister shall give the applicant at least seven days notice in writing by registered mail, at the applicant's latest known</p>	<p>saisir le juge de la citoyenneté.</p> <p>(6) L'agent de la citoyenneté inscrit aux registres du bureau de la citoyenneté la date à laquelle il a reçu la demande et les documents déposés selon le paragraphe 3(1) ou transmis conformément au paragraphe 3(5) ou à l'alinéa (5)b).</p> <p>(7) Lorsque le juge de la citoyenneté saisi de la demande conformément au paragraphe (5) estime qu'il lui est impossible d'approuver celle-ci sans de plus amples renseignements, il demande au ministre d'envoyer un avis écrit au demandeur à sa dernière adresse connue, par courrier ordinaire, l'informant qu'il a la possibilité de comparaître devant ce juge aux date, heure et lieu qui y sont précisés.</p> <p>(8) Si le demandeur visé au paragraphe (7) ne comparait pas devant le juge de la citoyenneté aux date, heure et lieu précisés, le ministre lui envoie, au moins sept jours à l'avance un avis écrit à sa dernière adresse connue, par courrier recommandé, l'informant qu'il peut comparaître devant ce juge aux date, heure et lieu qui y sont précisés.</p> <p>(9) Si le demandeur ne se conforme pas à l'avis donné en application du paragraphe (4), ou ne comparait pas aux date, heure et lieu visés au paragraphe (8), sa demande et les documents d'accompagnement sont transmis au greffier qui inscrit la demande comme étant abandonnée, après quoi il n'est plus donné suite à celle-ci.</p> <p>(10) Une fois la demande abandonnée conformément au paragraphe (9), le demandeur peut présenter une nouvelle demande.</p> <p>DORS/94-442, art. 2. [...]</p> <p>CONNAISSANCES DU CANADA ET DE LA CITOYENNETÉ</p>
--	--

<p>address, advising that the applicant may appear in person before the citizenship judge at the new date, time and place specified in the notice.</p> <p>(9) Where an applicant fails to comply with a notice given pursuant to subsection (4) or fails to appear at the new date, time and place set pursuant to subsection (8), the applicant's application and any materials relating to it shall be forwarded to the Registrar, who shall record the application as having been abandoned, and no further action shall be taken with respect to the application.</p> <p>(10) Where an application has been recorded as abandoned pursuant to subsection (9), the applicant may make a new application. [...]</p> <p>KNOWLEDGE OF CANADA AND CITIZENSHIP CRITERIA</p> <p>15. The criteria for determining whether a person has an adequate knowledge of Canada and of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship are that, based on questions prepared by the Minister, the person has a general understanding of</p> <p>(a) the right to vote in federal, provincial and municipal elections and the right to run for elected office;</p> <p>(b) enumerating and voting procedures related to elections; and</p> <p>(c) one of the following topics, to be included at random in the questions prepared by the Minister, namely,</p> <p>(i) the chief characteristics of Canadian social and cultural history,</p> <p>(ii) the chief characteristics of Canadian political</p>	<p>15. Une personne possède une connaissance suffisante du Canada et des responsabilités et privilèges attachés à la citoyenneté si, à l'aide de questions rédigées par le ministre, elle comprend de façon générale, à la fois :</p> <p>a) le droit de vote aux élections fédérales, provinciales et municipales et le droit de se porter candidat à une charge électorale;</p> <p>b) les formalités liées au recensement électoral et au vote;</p> <p>c) l'un des sujets suivants, choisi au hasard parmi des questions rédigées par le ministre :</p> <p>(i) les principales caractéristiques de l'histoire sociale et culturelle du Canada,</p> <p>(ii) les principales caractéristiques de l'histoire politique du Canada,</p> <p>(iii) les principales caractéristiques de la géographie physique et politique du Canada,</p> <p>(iv) les responsabilités et privilèges attachés à la citoyenneté autres que ceux visés aux alinéas a) et b).</p> <p>DORS/94-442, art. 3. [...]</p>
--	---

<p>history,</p> <p>(iii) the chief characteristics of Canadian physical and political geography, or</p> <p>(iv) the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship, other than those referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b).</p> <p>SOR/94-442, s. 3. [...]</p>	
--	--