

germane to the amendment, and I strongly urge that there should be no suggestion about disposing of the amendment in the light of the current discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member for Eglinton misunderstood me. I intended to suggest that the speeches should be with respect to the amendment in order that the amendment may be disposed of, not that we should dispose of the amendment at this minute. I was suggesting that all speeches be directed to the amendment rather than generally to the section.

Mr. CHURCH: I am very much surprised at the minister, who comes from a city in Ontario, bringing in a bill like this, with this most mischievous section 10(1). I believe it will cause more widespread disunity than anything else I know of, not only amongst the British citizens referred to in 10(1)(a) but amongst other immigrants coming here from other countries. I doubt whether the minister who has talked so much about the bill understands it himself. The minister and his officials seem to think they should be something like Mr. Byrnes in Washington, with a large department, spending money like water. And on what? On citizenship. I believe that under the British North America Act part of this bill is *ultra vires*, because it concerns provincial matters which cannot be changed without the consent of the province.

On the second reading of the bill I referred to a legal opinion which had been given by the privy council, under which 10(1)(a) would be declared *ultra vires*. It was made clear in the case of *Williams v. Howarth* that there is only one king ruling over the empire and not a separate king for each dominion, which this bill sets up. That case was referred to by Lord Bennett in the House of Lords, where he stated that nothing in the Statute of Westminster alters the law made clear in the case of *Williams v. Howarth* that there is only one king ruling over the empire. This bill attempts to alter the law regarding that and the status of a British subject. A British subject is one by origin, or by domicile, or by later choice. This bill alters the whole principle of British citizenship, and it is brought down just on the eve of an election—for don't forget, we are going to have an election next July over the dominion-provincial conference—as to who is right on it. Coming events cast their shadows before.

This bill should have gone to a committee. The flag question was sent to the committee; why was not this bill sent to a committee? As I said on the second reading of the bill, I believe section 10(1)(a) would be declared

*ultra vires* of this parliament. This is no time to bring in such a bill. It is putting the cart before the horse. We have no mandate for passing such a bill. We should first decide on our immigration policy. When did the minister get a mandate from his constituency to bring in this bill? Who is asking for it? Are the soldiers who fought for the mother country asking for it? No. This bill is much misunderstood, it is so complex and involved. If passed it will throw a load of work on the county court judge, and ten times the number of judges will have to be appointed to deal with nothing else but citizenship.

Who is worrying about citizenship? One newspaper said it was the Orange order. I belong to that order myself, and our principles are: equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Shades of Clarke Wallace and McCarthy and John Ross Robertson and other stalwarts occupying the Conservative benches in the olden days—to think of an Ontario minister bringing in a bill like this! The people are beginning to wake up to the meaning of this bill. The largest number of those in Ontario came from Great Britain. Many of them fought and died in the defence of our country. We have also a large number of fine citizens who have come here under the law permitting aliens to enter Canada.

I would like to see this bill given the six months' hoist. Let it wait until next year. It is an insult to the British soldiers. I want to give the government credit for having done well in granting a loan to Britain. That was most admirable and they have done a good deal of good work in that connection. I want to be fair and say that. But this bill is not timely. We are now in the eighth week of the session and six weeks have been spent on secondary matters—the flag, change of status, isolationism. One hon. gentleman has told the house that those who come here from the British isles are aliens, but I can tell you this, that but for our soldiers standing by the side of the mother country at Dunkirk not only the maritime provinces but Quebec and Ontario would have been overrun by the Germans. Section 10(1) (a) is an insult to the soldiers who served overseas. I am beginning to get a little doubtful of some of our Conservative friends when I hear them talking status, autonomy, isolationism and the change of anthem and flag. One or two newspapers are referring to the Orange order, of which Sir John A. Macdonald was a member. All we see of the Orange order now on parliament hill is around the east block where compartments are marked off on the pavements with orange