years provided by the Immigration Act; you are adding another five years. Thus the minister is asking this parliament for power to take away from one who has received Canadian citizenship under this act, for a period of ten years after his lawful entry into Canada, all the rights he has acquired as a Canadian citizen. In the second place, that right is vested in the minister in case of conviction for an offence for which the person has been sentenced to imprisonment for a term of not less than twelve months. In some courts it does not take a tremendously serious offence to lead to the imposition of a sentence of twelve months' imprisonment. That is going a great deal farther than the relevant sections of the Immigration Act, which are principally sections 40 and 43. It will permit the Secretary of State to take away everything in the way of rights of citizenship that has been acquired by a person under this act because of offences in many cases much less serious than those which must be proved before the Minister of Mines and Resources would have the right to exercise his power of deportation under the Immigration Act.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. FLEMING: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I yielded to a number of interruptions.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

The CHAIRMAN: With the unanimous consent of the committee the hon. member may continue.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. FLEMING: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank hon. members for their courtesy. So much for what might be said by way of introducing exceptions into the bill. The exceptions are there now; and if it is so important in the view of the minister that you should not have any exceptions cutting across the principle for which he is arguing in the light of the Immigration Act, then how does he justify the two exceptions that already exist in section 10 (1) (c)? I am simply adding an exception for which there is ample justification and without which a grave injury will be done.

Shall I be repeating if I again remind the committee that an exception exists already in section 10 (1) in respect of British subjects? I pointed out that the exception in the consequences which flow from it is of no importance, because all that is waived in the case of the British subject is the filing of his declaration of intention. Nevertheless there is a distinction drawn in section 10 (1) (a), and is drawn by the minister himself. What possible justification is there for the exception made in section 10 (1) (a) if the arguments he has been bringing before this chamber for the past two days are sound? There is no justification for it in principle.

I shall leave this question with the committee. The minister has indicated that as far as the government is concerned the British subject with one year's residence in Canada—no domicile, it will be noticed, but just one year's residence—is good enough to enjoy the great privilege of the franchise; but the British subject to whom is accorded what most of us consider to be the highest right of citizenship, namely the franchise, is, by the minister's argument, not qualified, for some reason or another, to enjoy the other rights of citizenship. Is there any consistency in that? I submit there is none. The committee will notice that my amendment calls for equating the residence requirements under this bill with those already existing under the elections act. In addition, domicile will be required; that is, the intention of making Canada the applicant's permanent home. But if that provision in the elections act which the minister supports is sound, then how can my amendment be other than sound in principle and deserving of the minister's full support?

I have heard some people say, "Well what about communists?" Some communists in Canada to-day are people who hailed from the British isles. Is that a reason for the discrimination which I say this section proposes to apply to all British subjects from other parts of the commonwealth in relation to their present status? It is clear from what has been said already that the full power enjoyed by the government under the Immigration Act is to be continued. There has been no suggestion from any quarter of the house that the Immigration Act should be amended. Section 41 of that act gives the government ample power to deport those who attempt to promote in this country the overthrow of the government by force. That power will still exist. If hon. members will look at section 21 (1) (e) of the bill they will see that the minister has reserved to himself the power, even after the granting of a certificate of citizenship, to revoke that citizenship and to withdraw the certificate in the case of any citizen who shows himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty.

Are not those powers adequate? I submit they are adequate if the government will use them. There is nothing in the contention that because the odd or exceptional immigrant from the British isles has blossomed forth in Canada