

sion. We have been striving, we are told, after unanimity, but if in order to achieve unanimity it is necessary to substitute a set of brains in the minister's head for what he has now, we shall never achieve it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Another red herring.

Mr. GILLIS: I have no intention of delaying the committee on this matter. We have sat here for weeks and weeks now discussing the question of citizenship and my impression this evening is that some of the lawyers in this house should go and get a legal opinion on it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: From you?

Mr. GILLIS: You can consult a good firm. We have listened to at least a dozen lawyers and the interpretation which each places on this very simple matter is different. They lack either intelligence or expert legal training and that is why I say they should go and consult some good lawyer and find out where they stand. I am going to be frank about this matter. I have read this clause carefully and I cannot find anything wrong with it. I think this simple amendment injected into it is merely a matter of giving some free legal training to some young aspiring lawyers; and, taking advantage of the fact that the Secretary of State is an old practising lawyer, we are getting some pointers on this, because there is no doubt that some of them in the future, under this bill, will be extracting some pretty nice fees. After they have the necessary expert advice from the Secretary of State they will be able to use it to good advantage. Personally I believe we are wasting a great deal of valuable time. Someone is trying to make a lot of cheap political capital out of this. I see no reason in the world why we should change the bill from what it is. I suggest that we get down to business and take a vote on this matter, so that we can begin to deal with matters which are of more importance.

Mr. McGREGOR: Well, sit down.

Mr. GILLIS: In the nine weeks that my Tory friends have been rising in their places making cheap political capital out of this measure—

Mr. McGREGOR: The hon. member has done his share.

Mr. GILLIS: This is the first time that I have risen to say anything on the subject.

Mr. BROOKS: The hon. member is a good judge of cheap political capital.

Mr. GILLIS: I would not have taken part in this debate at this time were it not that I have become disgusted with the line of

chatter that has come from my right. I am sure that if the people of the country read the press and think of the many matters that are of pressing importance in Canada at the present time, such as employment, taxes and all these things that affect them directly, they must think that this House of Commons is becoming merely a debating society, that we lack common sense and that we are wasting too much time on the subject matter of this bill.

In my opinion the amendment is irrelevant. It is unnecessary; it is a lot of nonsense, and it is about time that we got down to business and voted.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amendment will please say, "yea".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yea.

The CHAIRMAN: Those opposed will please say, "nay".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the "nays" have it. The amendment is lost.

Mr. HLYNKA: I should like to bring up two matters in connection with paragraph (d) of subsection 1 of section 10, and paragraph (f) of subsection 1 of the same section. These are matters in regard to which I should like to obtain some information from the minister. My first point has to do with applicants who apply for naturalization certificates and who unfortunately at one time or another happened to have been on relief. From personal knowledge I know that in Edmonton a number of people, through no fault of their own, were forced to go on relief in the thirties. They were refused naturalization certificates when they applied because there was an outstanding relief debt marked against them.

A resident of Canada who is a good citizen should not be penalized or discriminated against when it comes to a matter such as relief. I have personal knowledge of a number of these cases. I tried to see that these people got fair treatment. I endeavoured to assist them in whatever way I could, and yet in practically every case the judge would refuse to grant an application unless the applicant wiped out the outstanding relief payments which he had drawn. I know there is nothing in the bill requiring an applicant to repay the debt, but the judges take it