

subjects from other parts of the commonwealth, men now with equal status in the commonwealth, in the invidious position where their allegiance to a common sovereign means nothing when it comes to the matter of securing Canadian citizenship? That is the issue raised by the bill, and that issue is inescapable.

I have asked what we would lose by accepting the amendment. My answer is that we would lose nothing. I ask, in conclusion, what we would lose by enacting the section as it stands. I suggest that, in effect, it reduces the value and store we place in a common allegiance to a common sovereign. I suggest that in putting the alien and the British subject from other parts of the commonwealth in precisely the same position we are saying in effect, "Well, that common allegiance means very little to us." It would seem that it means much less to us than I had hoped it meant. Is this any time to be reducing the value we are putting upon our rights throughout the commonwealth as citizens and as British subjects in common allegiance? This is no time for that. We have nothing to lose and we have everything to gain by strengthening those bonds. As to preserving our autonomy—certainly there is no thought of yielding one inch or iota of our autonomy. Let us exercise some common sense in the use to which we are going to put those rights which we possess as Canadians and as equal partners in the commonwealth.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Time.

Mr. FLEMING: The issue in this debate on section 10 is this: What value do we place upon our common allegiance with our fellow citizens in all parts of the commonwealth?

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Chairman, it is an interesting fact in dealing with a matter of this kind that, as one of the thirty-two immigrants in the chamber, in the course of events I am the minister of the department of which the immigration branch is a part. I remember distinctly when I left the old country, and I suppose I had in my mind then the thought that was expressed by the old Scotsman in his prayer when he said, "I do not ask Thee, Lord, that Thou shouldst give me wealth, all that I ask is that Thou showest me where it is." I may have had that thought in my mind; yet I recall most vividly that when I left Glasgow a very close friend of mine shook my hand and said, "You will not be able to forget Scotland when you get to Canada, but when you get there I want you to be a Canadian." I have endeavoured to be a Canadian. I just introduce that little personal note so that my remarks my not be taken to

be prejudiced and it may be realized that I am dealing with this subject from the point of view of Canada and not from the point of view of the old country or with the idea of there being any discrimination against her.

Therefore I have to take exception to many of the things that have been said by the hon. member for Eglinton in his able presentation. When I came to this country I could have been a member of parliament within one year. After I had lived in Canada for a year and six months in a constituency I had the right to vote and was therefore able to be a representative of the people of Canada. There has been no deprivation of any of my rights during the years I have been here.

The hon. member speaks of the autonomy of Canada, but in my mind there is no question of the autonomy of Canada when it comes to those she will permit to come within her borders. No one can gainsay the right of this parliament to exercise its powers over immigrants and to impose any conditions of entry that it desires. When the hon. member says that this is a matter of strengthening the bonds between this country and the old country by the loosening of the provisions and restrictions against immigrants, I take clear issue with him.

Mr. FLEMING: I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Mr. GLEN: I understood my hon. friend to say that the passing of the amendment which he has proposed would mean the strengthening of the links between the old country and this country.

Mr. FLEMING: I am sure the minister wants my remarks to be correctly understood. What I said in that respect was that the passing of section 10 (1) (c) in its present form would have the effect of saying to persons from other parts of the commonwealth with a common allegiance that that allegiance has little or no meaning. I did not suggest that it had any bearing whatever on the Immigration Act. What I said was predicated on the assumption that there will be no change in the Immigration Act. I think he will recall that I supported the provisions of the Immigration Act all the way through.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. member in his explanation has not dealt with what I had in mind. He was dealing with and speaking of the Immigration Act. I was referring to the fact that no immigrant was deprived by this bill of anything that he had not already under