

paint, "Reserved—No. 1," "Reserved—No. 2," "Reserved—No. 3", indicating parking areas for east block officials.

I have seen what some of the British newspapers are saying about section 10(1) (a). It is an insult to the British people coming to this country. This particular section is of no more value than some of the other clauses. Section 10(1) encircles, so to speak, every other section in the bill. It is a sort of omnibus section. In my opinion it is a gesture to certain influences, to the foreign-born against the British-born. It is, of course, a political bill and is designed as such. In my opinion it is also a most mischievous bill, and has caused a lot of discussion in the old land. It puts us as Canadians in much the same position as when, in 1887, in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's day, we were first in the diamond jubilee procession and the last dominion to send a contingent to the South African war. That movement was opposed on all sorts of grounds. It was said to be against the British North America Act, against the constitution, perhaps against the Immigration Act. But these arguments did not appeal to the loyal people of this country, who, fortunately, are not all in one political party. They decided this particular issue once and for all, as Sir John Macdonald expressed it years ago.

I may tell the government that I felt some annoyance, although my feeling was more of sorrow than of anger, against the minister for inserting in his bill a section like this one. Consider the effect of this and other sections referred to by the hon. member for Marquette, the Minister of Mines and Resources, who is responsible for immigration. It is an impossible bill. It is a political bill, an election bill.

In the period between the two great wars, according to a return presented to the house nearly a million of our citizens had to leave Canada and go to the United States to get employment in a new country—among them many soldiers who fought for us at the hazard of their lives.

The more I consider this bill the less I am in favour of it. Here is the return indicating the public interest in this legislation. Nobody is asking for it. I have looked through this small return and I can find no evidence that any religious denomination is in favour of it. Why is such a bill brought forward, to the exclusion of measures relating to fuel and housing and other matters of primary importance? Who is concerning himself about citizenship? The subject is largely a provincial one, although the federal power has jurisdiction over naturalization and immigration laws.

[Mr. Church.]

This bill should go to a committee, as the flag bill did. We hear all about citizenship on a public holiday, but hon. members seem to be afraid of it. Civic holiday is set aside in nearly all the provinces to discuss citizenship and the elements which make a good citizen.

I am very much surprised at the principle of the bill. It will do untold harm. Section 10 is an illustration of putting the cart before the horse. The first thing to do before having any citizenship bill is to decide by an immigration policy who shall come to the country now that the war is over. The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, in an admirable speech the other day, alluded to opinions on all sides of the house as to what constitutes a good Canadian. As regards hon. members, they are all good Canadians or they would not be elected to the House of Commons.

I say to the government that this bill should be withdrawn, or it should stand over for a year. The government has no mandate to pass one section of the bill. It was not discussed in the last election, either in my constituency or in any other so far as I know. Why should it be sprung on the house at the present time, when so many pressing questions are before us?

Finally, it seems to me that this matter is one for the dominion-provincial conference. It deals with perhaps the most important matter which can come before them, namely immigration. What is the sort of citizenship they want? Whom do they want in this country?

This bill will do untold harm in the old country. I have talked with hundreds of soldiers returning from the present war, and that is their opinion. People from the old land will go as immigrants to Australia, or to New Zealand, to countries where they will be welcomed. We are told what South Africa is doing. But what have we to do with South Africa? The South African union will not even give the black man a vote, and what they want is a republic; they are for isolation and separation. Are we to imitate a dominion like that?

Under the law, once a British subject always a British subject, but the whole policy under international law affecting domicile will have to be rewritten in the light of this bill. The law regarding domicile of origin, domicile of choice and the rest, all the law books and all the case law will have to be reviewed and revised. This measure is another of the offspring of that mischievous empire-wrecking act known as the statute of Westminster. In New Zealand and Australia they recognized the Statute of Westminster only in part; they were exempted from