

ions. I see no reason, in equity and in justice to the other members of the empire, why we in Canada should take that right away from British subjects from those parts of the empire.

It sometimes helps if we bring these things down to concrete, simple examples, and I should like to give one in this instance. It may seem far-fetched, but if it is thought over carefully I think some force will be found in it. I give the committee the example of Hitler, Mussolini and Churchill arriving to-morrow on a ship at Montreal and applying for Canadian citizenship. Under the terms of this bill as they now stand each of these gentlemen would have to go through the same procedure to become Canadian citizens. Churchill would have to go through exactly the same formalities and be subjected to the same delay as the other two. In the course of the debate it has been pointed out it is not necessary that the non-Canadian British subject should wait for five years. He shares our language, our ideas of government, our British traditions of freedom and democracy, and he requires no training in those principles. Sometimes, of course, when I examine the trend of government in Canada to-day, government by order in council; when I examine some of the opposition to the suggestions which are advanced by hon. members on this side, I think possibly that is put in the wrong way. Perhaps, after all, an immigrant from another part of the British empire does need some training when he comes to Canada. If the present trend is continued he will soon be needing training in dictatorship before he can become a full-fledged Canadian citizen. However, we on this side are fully convinced that after the next three or four years, after the people have had another opportunity to express their will at the polls, the position will be reversed, and the non-Canadian British subject arriving here once more will need only his traditions of democracy to be qualified to become a full Canadian citizen.

To deal for a moment specifically with some of the points raised by the Minister of Mines and Resources, the first contention he advanced was that if the amendment now before the committee were to be adopted it would necessitate a corresponding amendment in the Immigration Act. I think the first answer to that contention is that the hon. member for Eglinton made it abundantly clear that his amendment contemplated no change in the provisions of the Immigration Act. He dwelt at some length on the reasons behind that statement and, I think, showed conclusively that no change need follow. I shall not repeat his grounds, but would simply

direct the attention of hon. members to that portion of the Immigration Act cited by the Minister of Mines and Resources in support of his contention. He read from section 2(b), which defines the meaning of Canadian citizens. In section 2 (b) (ii) it is stated that a Canadian citizen means a British subject who has Canadian domicile. Under section 2 (e) it is stated that "Canadian domicile can only be acquired for the purposes of this act" by a person having his domicile for at least five years in Canada.

The minister's point was that a British subject coming to Canada under this bill, as it is proposed to amend it, would require only one year of residence before he might be admitted to citizenship. He said that there is conflict, because under the Immigration Act he requires five years before he can acquire domicile. Therefore I wish to emphasize that part of the Immigration Act which says that Canadian domicile "can only be acquired for the purposes of this act", and so on. It is specifically stated that this provision is directed only to what is contemplated in the Immigration Act. Therefore it does not necessarily follow because we pass any other act whatsoever, or because we amend the present bill, that we must amend the Immigration Act.

This passage which states that Canadian domicile can only be acquired after five years "for the purposes of this act" clearly has reference to section 40 of the Immigration Act which gives the minister power to deport any person other than a Canadian citizen or person having Canadian domicile, for certain offences, and also if it may be found that such persons are suffering from lunacy or from certain contagious diseases. It is designed to protect the right in the minister to deport a person with residence of less than five years who may be found guilty of certain offences, or suffering from any of these complaints. Therefore, as I say, that provision as to domicile in the Immigration Act is clearly directed solely to that particular purpose contemplated in the Immigration Act, and is not affected by the present bill or by the present amendment before the house. That is my first point.

The Minister of Mines and Resources went on to refer to a feeling which he stated has become prevalent throughout the country against orders in council providing for the deportation of certain Japanese citizens. Here I should like to put myself clear for the record, and for the benefit of the hon. member for New Westminster who took me to task this afternoon for supporting another amendment.