

shall have to vote for it the way it is unless somebody brings forward something better than has been offered up to date.

Mr. FULTON: I realize that the committee is anxious to come to a vote on this subject, but possibly an opportunity should be given to the hon. member for Temiscouata to bring another definition before the committee.

I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Swift Current because I think he will receive his answer. It is contained within the bill. Further than that, I understand that he will receive his answer from the hon. member for Eglinton. At that time I shall be interested in seeing which way he votes on this amendment.

Judging from the remarks of the last few speakers, I believe it is generally agreed that if we could arrive at an agreement as to the importance of this amendment, then we might achieve unanimity either in adopting or rejecting it. As the arguments developed it became apparent to my mind that hon. gentlemen opposite felt that we had failed to make out a case to show that if the section carries as it stands unamended, then the condition of the British subject coming to Canada in the future will be in no way prejudiced. I should like to revert to that question for a moment. If we were convinced that the lot of the non-Canadian British subject coming into Canada in the future were not to be changed by the section, if we were convinced after all that has been said as to the desirability of unanimity in this connection, we would most certainly not prolong our advocacy of this amendment; but we are not convinced.

I should like to refer the Secretary of State to his words as they appear on page 503 of *Hansard*, which he used on introducing the bill for second reading. He said:

Under this bill we are seeking to establish clearly a basic and definite Canadian citizenship which will be the fundamental status upon which the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend.

I referred to these words two nights ago and asked the minister to explain them in view of his later statement that this bill will make no difference to the rights of the British subject coming into Canada. The minister said that I was trying to put an interpretation on his words. I do not think that is strictly accurate. I merely quoted his words and asked him to explain them. I repeat my request to the Secretary of State. I ask him what he means by "rights and privileges of Canadians"? It seems to me that these words, as he used them, can only mean that the rights and privileges of Canadians will depend upon the acquisition of Canadian citizenship.

[Mr. Bentley.]

In the debate so far it has been generally agreed that up until the time this bill becomes law the British subject coming to Canada has all the rights and privileges of other Canadians, at least within a year, and probably has them when he lands. Now, however, his rights and privileges are to be dependent upon the acquisition of citizenship, and that is going to take him five years. The minister does not agree. I can see that we are still not at one on this question.

Mr. MARTIN: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to state the situation again? Let it be clearly understood so that there will be no question about it. Under this bill every right, every privilege which the British subject had and has to-day will continue. Need there be any more affirmation on that point?

Mr. GREEN: It is not quite that simple.

Mr. MARTIN: Will the hon. gentleman show me what right or privilege the British subject will lose after the passage of this bill?

Mr. FULTON: Mere constant repetition does not constitute proof. The minister has stated that over and over again. He has stated that under this bill the British subject is not losing a right. On one occasion I agreed with him. I said: "Not under this bill." This bill does not take anything away from the British subject now in the country, but it does impose an obstacle on British subjects coming into the country in the future.

Some hon. MEMBERS: What obstacle?

Mr. FULTON: That obstacle is that they will have to wait for five years before they can acquire Canadian citizenship. It is generally agreed that at present, to all intents and purposes, they acquire it the day they land or, at the most, after having established domicile for one year.

This five-year provision will have an effect the moment an act is passed making any of these fundamental rights and duties dependent upon Canadian citizenship. We have been assured it is not the intention of this government to pass such an act, but many of the rights and duties which Canadians enjoy are dependent upon provincial statutes. Personally I think it would be quite right, once having defined the status of Canadian citizenship, to make the rights and duties of Canadians dependent upon the acquisition of that status. I think that would be a right and proper thing to do. The avowed purpose of this bill, in the words of the minister, is to