

group or nation, and I think that those who come to this country should be treated on exactly the same basis without any distinction or differentiation being made between them.

The other day I took exception to some remarks made by the hon. member for Kamloops. Speaking of the Japanese on Tuesday in this debate he said something which I admired very much. It is on page 1082 of *Hansard*:

If, then, they stay in the country, my position would be that they must be given full rights to citizenship, much as I may disagree with the original decision to allow them to remain in the country.

That was an honest and forthright statement, especially from one who holds the views he does. But he mentioned something else, on which I should like a little enlightenment. Discussing a British subject, and the hope of arriving at a concept of world citizenship, he said:

We have an approach to it in the concept of a British subject . . . It is a brotherhood which is shared by all the members of the empire.

We are talking about the immigration of British subjects to this country. Are hon. gentlemen to my right willing to grant to British subjects coming here from Hong Kong or India the same rights as human beings coming from the United Kingdom? If they are, they will be logical, which would be a change for them, although I would still disagree with them on this amendment.

Mr. REID: Arising out of the remarks just made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, may I, as one coming from the old country, say a word on behalf of the British subject. I come to this parliament from the province of British Columbia, a territory which was taken over one hundred years ago by the British people. No other race in this country had anything to do with the development of British Columbia from its early days.

May I point out why we from British Columbia think as we do? When I left Scotland to better my position in life—and I am pleased and proud to say that I did benefit myself by coming to Canada, and I am proud to be a Canadian—I brought with me a love of Scotland which I still have. But this thought must be kept in mind by those who are inclined to ridicule the British stock, that were it not for the British people this country would not be a confederation and I doubt whether we would be sitting here to-day. In British Columbia, eighty per cent of the people come from the British race. They took over that territory in the first place and they

have developed it all the way along with the help of British people. Hence you can understand that the people who come from that province and whose forefathers developed it think that in this year 1946 some little further consideration should be given to the British people in the matter of citizenship.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have spoken in the long debate on this bill. I had hoped to speak on the second reading but unforeseen circumstances prevented me.

I am in a little different position from that of the two last speakers, the hon. member for Winnipeg North and the hon. member for New Westminster. I was born a Canadian, but that was purely an accident so far as I was concerned. I think the way it happened was that a certain duke in the Highlands of Scotland wanted to get his tenants off the land and start raising sheep. So that my people had no other course open to them than to go somewhere else to better their condition. They came to this country, and I imagine that they did better their condition, although they passed through some hard times.

The point I rose to make was that I do not agree with the point of view put forward by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North. The people of the British commonwealth, a term I would rather use than the British empire, have something in common with the people of Canada because we are all a part of the British commonwealth. Consequently when people from other parts of the British commonwealth come here they come here not as foreigners from alien lands. This does not mean that they are any better than the people who come here from any other country. It is simply a recognition that they are in a different position from immigrants from countries outside the commonwealth, because in the commonwealth we all have allegiance to the same king and we are all members of the one family as it were. I see no reason in the world why we should try to alter that position. I do not think it would help us as a nation to do so, nor do I think it would be beneficial to the world in its present state.

Let me say again that I am not boasting of the fact that I am a Canadian or a British subject or anything like that because that was something with which I had nothing to do. I can only consider it my good fortune that it did happen in that way. But there are certain factors, intangible perhaps, that are important. I do not know whether the point has been made but I think it is a good one that the status of a person coming to