

Earlier in this debate the question of the Japanese was raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South. At that time I placed myself on record as favouring the implementing of the government's policy with respect to deportation of the Japanese. I did, however, declare that I felt this matter should be decided before the present bill becomes law, because if this bill becomes law the Japanese have the right to become Canadian citizens. I made that clear at the time.

If, however, the government's policy is changed, or for any other reason they do not implement that policy, and the Japanese remain in Canada, then, although I personally regard that as a mistake, as I have said we live in a democracy and presumably would have to abide by the decision of the majority. We, however, from British Columbia have asked for a fair chance first to state our case against the Japanese. If it should be decided, nevertheless, that they remain in Canada, then that decision can only be based on the fact that they are fit to become Canadian citizens, because they can be allowed to remain in Canada only if they are fit to be Canadian citizens. If, then, they stay in the country, my position would be that they must be given full rights to citizenship, much as I may disagree with the original decision to allow them to remain in the country.

Mr. REID: Even though they hold Japanese citizenship?

Mr. FULTON: That is an argument against allowing them to remain. But if the decision is to allow them to remain, then I am afraid my position is that we must give them full citizenship. That is why I supported the amendment previously suggested by the hon. member for Lake Centre as to elimination of racial distinction.

However, to return to the point made by the Minister of Mines and Resources about the feeling now being indicated in the country against this method of deportation of citizens by orders in council, let me point out that he said it would be an evil principle to admit that a man who had acquired Canadian citizenship could be deported in one year, or at any time after having acquired citizenship. I am wondering if the Minister of Mines and Resources has consulted with the Secretary of State in the matter, because if he will look at section 21 in the present bill he will find it is there provided that the governor in council may order that any person other than a natural-born Canadian citizen

[Mr. Fulton.]

shall cease to be a Canadian citizen if upon a report he is satisfied that certain conditions exist.

It is provided in the bill that the governor in council shall have power to revoke a grant of Canadian citizenship, and therefore the righteous horror of the Minister of Mines and Resources at the suggestion advanced by the hon. member for Eglinton loses a great deal of its effect. If he supports the bill, that means that he wants it carried into effect as it now stands; if he supports the bill, he is supporting that very principle against which he protested, namely that the governor in council shall have the right to revoke a grant of Canadian citizenship.

Therefore I think that the Minister of Mines and Resources must either modify his opposition to the amendment offered by the hon. member for Eglinton or, at the proper time, suggest to the Secretary of State that he amend the bill by deleting section 21. I shall be most interested to see what course he follows when we come to section 21.

The minister based his further argument against the present amendment on his objection to the possibility of admitting physically unfit and mentally unfit people into the country to become citizens and to become a liability upon Canada. I would point out to the minister and to other hon. members that full power will be left either to the Minister of Mines and Resources, to the Secretary of State or to whoever is administering affairs having to do with immigration, to send those people out of the country exactly as he has power now to do. It will be recalled that my first point was that nothing in the amendment involves any change to the Immigration Act, because the two acts are directed toward entirely different objects. The Immigration Act will stand and should stand as it is to-day. However, even if the minister does not accept that point, there is still ample power under section 21 of the bill to deport any person found to be suffering from certain complaints indicated, or to be guilty of certain crimes which would now render him liable to deportation under the Immigration Act.

Let me read some of the relevant parts:

21 (1) The governor in council may order that any person other than a natural-born Canadian citizen shall cease to be a Canadian citizen if, upon a report from the minister, he is satisfied—

Of a number of things. And one of those things is "that such person has obtained a certificate of naturalization or of Canadian citizenship by false representation or fraud or by concealment of material circumstances". I submit if it were found two years after the