

be very simple for him to introduce the requisite amendment to make that perfectly plain beyond the shadow of doubt. So let us not have this question confused by raising these points about immigration.

As I followed the remarks of the Secretary of State to-day, he said that one reason why he could not give support to this amendment was the problem raised by the Immigration Act. If we are to amend the provisions of the Immigration Act, there cannot be any objection in principle to my amendment.

The one point remaining is that raised by the Secretary of State as to deporting someone to whom a certificate of citizenship has already been granted. We have had it from the Secretary of State himself that, after all, no change is made by this bill in the status of a British subject coming to this country.

**Mr. MACKENZIE:** We heard the opposite from the hon. member for Kamloops just before six o'clock, because he said that the rights and privileges of Canadians were absolutely destroyed by this bill.

**Mr. FLEMING:** I do not know what the Minister is referring to. I am dealing with the statement made by the Secretary of State.

**Mr. MACKENZIE:** The hon. member for Kamloops said before six o'clock that the rights and privileges of Canadians were taken away by this bill.

**Mr. FLEMING:** I am dealing now with the point raised by the Secretary of State, the question of deporting those now enjoying the rights of citizenship. The right of deportation at the present time is being exercised in the case of those who, according to the argument of the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon and on the reasoning of the two ministers are to-day citizens in the eyes of our law.

On the next question which has been advanced, the Secretary of State, I suggest, has raised for himself a dilemma in the course of the argument on the bill. He has said that it is in effect the same citizenship as now exists. He has said that in substance we are only legislating what is the practice. If that is the case; if the rights of citizenship are in effect, continuing the right of franchise as heretofore, the only difference created by the bill is the grant of a certificate. Why make that exception in the position of the British subject for that one mere trifle? If that is the only difference the bill is making, why raise this distinction against British subjects in the bill?

[Mr. Fleming.]

The other horn of the dilemma is—and this is the basis on which I understood the bill was first put before the house—that this was said to be a measure of far-reaching importance, that it would make a substantial change, that it was something of a new advent in legislation in this country. If that is the case—and I think the earlier contributions to the debate from the other side were in that vein rather than in the vein in which later remarks have been made—this new possession, this new citizenship, is not to be enjoyed by British subjects coming to this country from other parts of the commonwealth, except on substantially the same basis as aliens.

We have one new point, and I welcome it, because it led me to hope that we might arrive at some unanimity with respect to the question raised by the amendment. The ministers who spoke—particularly, in this respect, the Secretary of State and the Minister of Agriculture—indicated this afternoon a desire to preserve what they regarded and described as the present status of the British subject resident in this country, his present citizenship. That is precisely the desire to which this amendment seeks to give legislative effect. It has been assumed by the ministers that no other changes are to be made in existing legislation, whether federal or provincial, and that no practical difference will arise between the Canadian citizen as he will be created under this bill and the man who has enjoyed the right to call himself a citizen heretofore, the man who has had all the rights of citizenship, as we are told, namely a British subject resident in this country for a lesser period than five years.

I say that we now are in agreement that it is desirable that the full rights of citizenship now enjoyed by the British citizen from another part of the commonwealth who is in this country during the five-year period should be preserved to him. There is no argument left against this amendment of the bill, because a British subject of the kind I have mentioned will lose something under this bill; he will lose the right to call himself a citizen of this country, because once this bill becomes law the position is inescapable that there are only three classes of persons within the scope of this present discussion. There is the Canadian citizen; there is the alien; there is the British subject resident in this country who is waiting for the expiration of five years in order to qualify himself for citizenship. The man who is a British subject from another part of the commonwealth after taking up domicile here is no citizen; he has no right to call himself a citizen. This bill deprives such a person, compared with people who came to the country prior to the enactment