

a pig in his pen had more freedom than a lot of Canadian people. He said that the pig had freedom from want because it was never denied food. It had freedom from care because all it had to do was to stay in his sty and be fed. It had freedom from rain because it was protected from the weather. When the hon. member had finished his story, I said to him, as I say to the minister, that the only thing the pig did not have, in spite of all these freedoms, was Freedom itself. That is the answer I make to the minister. It is a parallel case. So that the minister's pretence is torn aside.

I go on now to the series of other pretences which have been put up as the ostensible reasons for the wording of this section. First of all, we on this side claim that this will infringe the right of a British subject to vote. The minister said that nothing like that was intended. But he has practically admitted it. He challenged some member on this side to say that he would like to see the franchise act amended to restrict it to Canadian citizens. Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see any good reason, once we pass a Canadian citizenship act, why anybody but Canadian citizens should be granted the franchise; and I am prepared to say that that is one of the inevitable consequences of this bill, whether or not the Secretary of State intends at this particular moment to bring in any such amendment. Do not let us fool ourselves about this thing; it is too obvious. The Secretary of State may not do it, but somebody will do it and perhaps before very long.

Mr. MARTIN: Twenty-seven years.

Mr. MERRITT: The minister must have a copy of my notes and know what I was going to say.

The second pretence that is being advanced is the pretence that the provisions of the Immigration Act defining "Canadian domicile" have anything to do with this bill. The Immigration Act and the citizenship bill are two entirely different things. I shall not add to what the hon. member for Eglinton has said on that point except to comment that it is significant that the minister did not attempt to answer him.

The next strawman that was put up by the minister was his challenge to the hon. member for Eglinton to say that no citizen who has been granted Canadian citizenship should be deported. The minister forgot at the time he made that challenge—which the hon. member for Eglinton met by the frank statement that he would be in favour of granting the right to deport—that he had in his own bill that

very provision in section 21, as has been pointed out several times. That was the next strawman to be knocked down.

I come to another thing. There has been talk as if section 10 by itself granted Canadian citizenship. Section 10 does nothing of the sort. It only provides the means by which application shall be made and the conditions under which application shall be made for the granting of citizenship. There is no reason in the world why, if my hon. friend the Minister of Mines and Resources—who is so full of these boogies that he will not admit anybody into this country anyhow—is so frightened on health grounds, he could not have the officials of the immigration branch appear in court at the time application for citizenship was made, and oppose the application if they were not satisfied with the physical or mental health of the candidate for citizenship. Even if the minister's officials did not turn up to do that, we already have in section 21 ample procedure for the revocation of a certificate. If necessary, a further subsection could be added providing that the certificate could be revoked for any of the reasons so laboriously read out by the Minister of Mines and Resources. Any government wishing to do more than pay mere lip-service to the status of British subjects, could have found procedural ways to get around procedural difficulties and procedural strawmen, which they have set up in order to support a section which strikes deeply at a status which a very large number of Canadians, although they do not talk about it a great deal, value very deeply indeed.

I have noticed that the Secretary of State several times, when the status of a British subject has been eulogized, has called loudly and vigorously, "hear, hear."

Mr. MARTIN: Because I believe in it.

Mr. MERRITT: Yes, the Secretary of State believes in it. I call upon the Secretary of State for more than lip-service to a status in which he believes.

I go on one step further. We showed good reason for differentiating between the status and the treatment of someone coming into Canada who was a British subject, and someone coming into Canada who was an alien. I am not going to restate the reason; it has been stated over and over again; and I have heard nobody on the other side claim that a British subject coming into Canada has not a start in training in our democratic methods over an alien coming into Canada. That is our stand, and it is not based on anything but