

define the status and to make the acquisition of rights dependent upon the acquisition of that status. Therefore, if you place an obstacle, whether it be a temporal obstacle or a physical obstacle such as actual restriction, in the way of the acquisition of the status, then you impose that obstacle in the way of the acquisition of those rights and duties.

I am not going to repeat the arguments which have been advanced as to the desirability of maintaining a uniform status of British subjects throughout the commonwealth. I think we have seen a great deal of unanimity this afternoon as to that point. Therefore what I am trying to say is that we have good grounds for our contention that by this bill we in Canada are discriminating against the British subject as no other part of the empire has so far done. I realize that is not a pleasant thing to say about a bill introduced by this government, and I did say the other evening that I thought it was done inadvertently. But in support of my contention that so far Canada alone is imposing this restriction, this obstacle to British subjects, I should like to read a newspaper article I came across the other day, in order to contrast our attitude and our actions with those of the United Kingdom government. In the Victorian *Daily Colonist* of February 1, under the date line of London, England, January 31, appears a report that Mr. E. Thurtle, labour member at Westminster, asked whether the British government intended to continue admitting citizens of Eire to the British civil service. His question was asked in view of the recent announcement by Mr. De Valera that citizens of Eire were not British subjects. The report in the *Colonist* continued:

Glanvil Hall, financial secretary to the treasury, in a written reply said: "According to the law of the United Kingdom, citizens of Eire, with few exceptions, are British subjects and His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom does not propose to discriminate against them in making appointments to the civil service."

There I think you have a definite distinction between the attitudes adopted by the two governments. You have the one country, Eire, going so far as to say her citizens are not British subjects; yet you still have the government of the United Kingdom saying that because they are British subjects they will not discriminate against them, that all they have to do is come to the United Kingdom and they may become civil servants immediately. I submit that no one could criticize any government for making appointment to the civil

service, for instance, dependent upon the acquisition of Canadian citizenship. The moment that is done it means that a British subject coming from the United Kingdom cannot be appointed to the civil service for a period of five years. Without for the moment entering into the question of whether that is a good or bad thing, it means that a British subject coming to this country from any other part of the commonwealth must wait for five years before he can receive that appointment. Then it is quite logical to assume that the bar society of British Columbia, for instance, may restrict the enrolment of students to those who are Canadian citizens. Then a British subject from Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom would have to wait for five years after coming to this country before he could be enrolled as a law student. There are many ways in which it would be quite possible for this bill to be made the basis of discrimination against British subjects, as compared with the rights they now enjoy. As I have said, at the present time a citizen of Eire, whose government has said it does not regard its people as British subjects, may become a civil servant as soon as he arrives in the United Kingdom.

That being the case, I suggest that we in Canada in justice can do no less than the same thing that is being done in the United Kingdom and all the other parts of the empire; that is, to continue to give British subjects their right to acquire citizenship on entry. No one on this side of the house, and I imagine no one in any part of the house, would have any objection to requiring a British subject to file a formal declaration of intention. I think it would be perfectly proper to require him to declare his intention of residing in Canada for the necessary period, but I submit it is inescapable that as long as we retain the five-year clause in this bill and make it apply to British subjects just as it applies to emigrants from other parts of the world, then we in Canada are open to the charge that we have been derogating from the status of a British subject.

One objection advanced by the Minister of Mines and Resources was that he requires this five-year period because he must be able to deport undesirable immigrants. That objection, I believe, can be met in section 21 of the present bill. The minister has said that if a person is allowed to become a citizen at the end of a year, that right is irrevocable. I would point out that under section 21 there is provision for the revocation of a certificate of naturalization.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.