

mittee a moment ago that when the minister suggested his amendment I hoped he would go a step farther and not ask the British subject to be here five years before being able to get those papers. I just do not grasp why that is necessary. I remember what was said the other evening by the Minister of Mines and Resources about people with diseases and people not right in the head, and all that, but they can all be deported under the Immigration Act.

Mr. MARTIN: Just as an indication of what the Minister of Mines and Resources had in mind the other evening, Hon. Mr. Calder was Minister of Immigration in the government of Sir Robert Borden in 1919. Before 1910 the period was two years. In 1910 it became three years, at the request of the provinces, who have to maintain many of these institutions in which mental cases are cared for. They requested that the period be extended from two years to three, because they could not possibly cope with the problem. Then they asked the government of Sir Robert Borden to increase the period from three to five years, the period we are maintaining now. In giving an explanation Mr. Calder said, in volume II of *Hansard* for 1919, at page 1872:

It is the intention to extend to five years, as is the case in the United States, the time during which undesirables who may get into the country, or who may prove to be undesirable after they have entered, may be deported. Heretofore the period has been only three years, but I am sure the house will agree that the extension is proper. We are going to adopt that five-year period here, not because they have it in the United States, but simply because we think it is necessary that there should be a longer period than three years in which to ascertain whether or not many of these people who get into the country are desirable.

That is the only reason we are continuing it. We are not doing anything that has not been done previously; we are simply continuing that principle. I would only point out, as the Minister of Mines and Resources pointed out so ably the other evening, that many individuals come here with diseases that are not ascertained at the time, and which medical people say cannot be ascertained. We feel that these people who have spent most of their lives elsewhere should not be saddled on our provincial institutions simply because they have been here for two, three or four years. That is the only reason for the period of five years. I can only repeat that it does not interfere with the privileges they have enjoyed up to now.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not want to worry the minister.

Mr. MARTIN: You are not worrying me.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am heartily in accord with the provision which I believe is now in the Immigration Act, that anyone coming into this country can be deported within five years if he develops a disease which if it had been observable when he made application to come here would have prevented his coming in. But I just do not grasp why this provision should be in a citizenship bill. At the time of Sir Robert Borden there was no such thing as a citizenship certificate. I am in accord with the necessity of having a citizenship paper, but I keep asking myself why the period of five years should be made applicable to Britishers by the citizenship bill. That provision is still in the Immigration Act, and I imagine it will remain there. I do not see why a man who develops a disease after five years which is attributable to some condition which existed before he came here, should have indefinite protection. As the minister has stated so well, things like this have cast a great burden upon the country. People have been admitted who should never have been admitted.

As the section is at present, as far as the five year period is concerned the Britisher is in the same position as a non-Britisher. Otherwise he is in a somewhat better position in that he does not have to go before a judge. To all intents and purposes he is a citizen, but he is not a registered citizen. I can see this section passing immediately if the period be reduced. This question of deportation is covered by the Immigration Act; I cannot understand why it is in the citizenship bill.

Mr. MARTIN: I will explain why. We regard, and I am sure the hon. member does likewise, evidence of citizenship as being a very important matter. I think it would be the most un-British thing in the world, and I am saying that with all sincerity, to say to a person, "We will give you a certificate of citizenship, but if you develop tuberculosis we are going to send you back." That is the sort of thing certain dictators have done. Once a man is given citizenship it seems to me that he should be deported only for disloyalty to the crown, fraud and other similar reasons. Once you have given a man evidence of citizenship, once you have given him a certificate which he can show to the whole world, I do not think you should be in position to deport him because of one of those things. It has been suggested that no change should be made in the Immigration Act. Under that act the causes for deportation include becoming a public charge. I know my hon. friend