

Mr. MARTIN: Oh, yes; that is the law now.

Mr. GREEN: If they have been here only four years and eleven months they are not in the same position as we are?

Mr. MARTIN: That is right. The law is the same as it has been for twenty-seven years, under a provision introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden.

Mr. FLEMING: The minister is begging the same old question.

Mr. BRYCE: I have been listening, but it gets more complicated. I am a layman and I do not follow this lawyer's argument. I was an immigrant thirty years ago. Had I come in after this bill was passed, would I have the same status as I have through coming here before, and if I were living here would I get Canadian citizenship papers at once, or only after five years' residence in Canada?

Mr. MARTIN: Take the specific case. If the hon. gentleman came in after the passage of this bill, then in one year, as a British subject, he would have the right to vote. Under this bill that right is confirmed. He would also have under this bill the right to any privilege which a British subject now enjoys.

Mr. POULIOT: The only difference is that his passport will indicate, I presume, that he is a Canadian citizen.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. POULIOT: A British subject who comes here and has not been here a year would also have a passport describing him as a British subject.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. POULIOT: And therefore the only difference between the two would be the description in the passport according to their liking. One would be here for a year and he would be described as "Canadian citizen", and if less than a year, he would be described as "British subject".

Now I will ask another question of the minister. If a British subject comes here and stays here more than a year, will he be bound to accept a passport describing him as a Canadian citizen, or will he be allowed to have a passport describing him as a British subject?

Mr. MARTIN: The situation continues as at present.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes. Therefore there is no change. I wonder why some hon. members are so bitter about it, and others so enthus-

iastic. Why be bitter against nihil and be enthusiastic for nihil? It is shadow-boxing. I thought there was something in it until the minister said that there was no change. It is a compilation, the same as the revised statutes, where the commissioners have not the right to change a single provision of the law. We are in a strange position. As for me, I am a Canadian citizen and at the same time I am a British subject. When I am asked who I am I say I am a Canadian, and officially I am described as a British subject; but now, when I travel, I shall have the privilege of receiving a passport describing me as a Canadian citizen. That is all. I do not think there is anything else. Because all the gentlemen who come from all over the empire—not only those of British stock, but every British subject—will be described as a British subject. That is all. I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will not waste energy in fighting a measure which was acceptable to Sir Robert Borden, to Mr. Arthur Meighen, perhaps to Doctor Bruce, since he never objected to it when he was in the house; and Doctor Shields made no speech about it. Now I will tell the minister one thing in all candour.

Mr. MacNICOL: Doctor Shields is away in the south.

Mr. POULIOT: I was not informed as to his whereabouts.

Mr. MacNICOL: It was in the newspapers.

Mr. POULIOT: The Liberal party is an imposing group in the house. The Liberal party has the majority in the house. A small turbulent minority is always complaining about what is done—and sometimes I am one of them.

Mr. MacNICOL: Most of the time.

Mr. POULIOT: When I speak on my own behalf as a Liberal. But I am surprised that concessions should be made to appease that small and noisy crowd. And why? Why do that? Why disappoint all the supporters of the Liberal party to appease—no, not to appease but to try to appease—those who will never be appeased? It is useless. It only hurts someone's head on the rock. They are good fellows with genial dispositions, but sometimes they are bitter, and so persistent that finally concessions are made to them. Why? They build skyscrapers on pinheads and then they describe the skyline—the skyline of skyscrapers built on pinheads. Let me say this to the younger set, the younger smart set of the Progressive Conservative party: they will be astonished to know how ungrate-