

coming to these shores from an alien land. The only advantage that is given to the British subject coming here from another part of the commonwealth is that he is absolved from the mere detail of filing a declaration of intention, which is no material difference at all.

Mr. MARTIN: Does my hon. friend not think he should add that the British subject will continue to have certain privileges—the right to vote, the right to old age pension, the right to be appointed to a civil service position, and so on? Those are privileges not given to any other group.

Mr. FLEMING: We are talking about citizenship, and I am pointing out, and it is incontrovertible, that if section 10(1) is adopted in its present form there is no material difference between the position of a British subject from another part of the commonwealth and the position of an alien from any other land when it comes to applying for Canadian citizenship. That is incontrovertible.

We are told that it is not the intention of the government to interfere with the franchise in the case of a British subject who has been here for one year and has qualified. But is that a guarantee that it will not be changed? The minister would not go any farther last night, when asked if he would clarify the government's position, than to say that it is not the intention of the government to introduce an amendment to the election act.

Mr. MARTIN: What more could I say?

Mr. FLEMING: Presumably the law can be changed even apart from an intention on the part of the government.

I come back to the Immigration Act. The Immigration Act is an act dealing with a particular field. It does not at all purport to be an act defining "Canadian citizenship" or the status of a Canadian citizen. The Secretary of State was much closer to the law, may I say with great respect, when he said this afternoon in reply to a question by the hon. member for Lake Centre that the definition of "Canadian citizenship" under the Immigration Act applies only to a limited number of those in this country who have the rights of citizenship. Are we to be told that the limited definition of "Canadian citizen" under the Immigration Act, put there for a very limited purpose in relation to immigration and not at all for the purpose of defining the rights and status of a Canadian citizen, and applying to a very limited class of those properly entitled to the rights of citizenship in this country, is an answer to those who say that if you enact section 10 in its present form you

are to all intents and purposes putting the British subject coming here from some other part of the commonwealth in practically the same position as an alien?

Let us bear in mind that there is no proposal to interfere with the Immigration Act. Whatever is to be said in justification of the provision of the Immigration Act which makes persons admitted under that act liable to deportation within five years of their entry in certain events—whatever is to be said in support of that will continue to be said because that act is not to be interfered with. But we are not here dealing with the Immigration Act but rather with the question of establishing the terms of citizenship, those who are to qualify for it and the terms on which they should qualify and the rights and privileges which flow from Canadian citizenship. So let us not drag in any red herrings about the Immigration Act because the term "citizen" is not used at all in that act in the same sense in which it is used in this bill. So let us have no confusion. The two acts are separate and distinct.

Even in the face of the provisions of the Immigration Act, what was the position of a British subject coming to this country? On lawful admission he had the rights and privileges of any other citizen of this country. After a year's residence he acquired the right to the franchise. He had everything in the way of citizenship rights that any Canadian-born citizen had. The only distinction was that, in certain clearly defined events, under the Immigration Act he was subject to deportation within five years. What were those events? One was the health condition mentioned yesterday in the debate: if, for instance, he appeared to be insane and had to be confined to a mental institution, or if he was convicted of offences involving moral turpitude. Under those conditions he was liable to be deported within five years. But within that time he had the rights of citizenship. Therefore let it not be said that the position of a British subject, if section 10, subsection 1 comes into effect in its present form, will be the same as it is now or as it has been for the past twenty-nine years; because that is not so; that has not been the law.

Let us be very careful about immigration. I would be the last person in the world to suggest that we ought to relax in any way the restrictions of the kind referred to in the Immigration Act. Certainly we do not want the kind of restrictions to which I have referred to be relaxed, and we must be very careful in our selection of immigrants at the source. But I am putting this forward to