

the end of one year, would need to be revoked. In many cases such as I gave in the list submitted to the committee, there was eminent reason why the persons involved should be deported because, as I pointed out, the effects on the country of procreation by persons mentally unstable created problems with which we would have to deal. Again, if a person who had been here a year was recommended for deportation, he would be in the position of not having a state elsewhere.

Mr. GREEN: Would he not still be a British subject?

Mr. GLEN: He has acquired Canadian citizenship.

Mr. GREEN: He is still a British subject.

Mr. GLEN: He is still a British subject, of course, but that does not give him the same privileges of going back to Britain as he had before.

Mr. GREEN: It does, under present British law.

Mr. GLEN: If he had Canadian citizenship and he went back to Britain he would have to comply with the requirements of the law with regard to immigrants.

Mr. GRAYDON: Has not the minister now touched upon the very point which has been raised on this side time after time, that the giving of Canadian citizenship does interfere and may sometimes derogate from the position of a British subject?

Mr. GLEN: The point I am making is that if a man who comes here is given a certificate after one year, and if the immigration authorities find him unacceptable under the provisions of the immigration law and want to deport him, they cannot do so, assuming the hon. member's amendment is passed. We would have two laws in conflict. The hon. member for Eglinton does not think it will be necessary to alter the provisions of the immigration law, but the law officers and the officers of the department are convinced that if this amendment should pass we shall have to alter the immigration law to accord with it.

Mr. FLEMING: Let us do so.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. member said he did not want that.

Mr. FLEMING: I said I did not think it was necessary, but if it is, we are all of one mind, surely.

Mr. GLEN: The hon. member has been discussing the matter from one point of view, but I am discussing it from another. I am discussing it from the point of view of immigration, and I wish to reserve and preserve the

provision of the Immigration Act whereunder we can deal with undesirable citizens who come to this country, for the reasons which I have given, and which I think are satisfactory to all hon. members. But by this amendment we would be giving absolute citizenship to all immigrants after one year, and that citizenship would have to be revoked in order that they could be deported to their country of origin.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister have any objection if a provision were inserted in this bill to enable the Department of Immigration to deport, up to a period of five years, people who should be deported?

Mr. GLEN: Then what is the use of the alteration?

Mr. GREEN: Would he have objection if that were done?

Mr. GLEN: The point is that all these laws should be related. We cannot have conflict between two laws—the Immigration Act enabling men to enter the country, and another law saying we cannot deport them.

Mr. GREEN: If that provision were inserted in the citizenship bill we could still deport them.

Mr. GLEN: I do not see the necessity for it at all. I believe the bill as now framed gives exactly the same rights and privileges to a British subject as he has had for twenty-seven years. As the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out, any immigrant to this country from the British isles can obtain the privilege of voting or of being nominated to any office in the country after one year, but he has not absolute citizenship until the lapse of five years, during which time his record may be investigated and he would be subject to deportation if he had not conformed with our immigration laws during that period of five years. This law does no more than that. It takes nothing away from a citizen coming from the old country; he is in exactly the same position as he was in before. The only difference is on the question of procedure and the fact that he can now obtain documentary evidence of his citizenship, whereas before he did not. I take a strong position in this matter, because naturally I shall be faced with the duty of dealing with immigrants coming to this country and if the powers of the immigration law are removed by the bill we are now discussing, by virtue of an amendment such as is proposed by the hon. member for Eglinton we shall defeat the very purposes of