

Canadian Citizenship Act

be able to do this. However, if we are going to take away all the other reasons, why leave this one? The main purpose of this whole exercise, as I take it—and I think the house is not divided on this point any longer—is to give complete equality, the psychological feeling of equality. If a natural born person is a traitor, we cannot divest him of his citizenship. Therefore are we really going to be losing very much if once in a generation there happens to be a naturalized person who is charged with treason and is outside of Canada and whom we cannot strip of his citizenship? It does not seem to me that the country is going to suffer very much compared with what we are trying to do in this legislation. In other words, we are trying to give to the naturalized citizens of this country a feeling that once they are naturalized they are equal of the natural born citizens.

I think I have made my point and I do not want to trespass further on the time of the committee. I have tried to make this suggestion in a completely non-controversial way because I think all of us are looking to the achievement of the same objective. I may say that if the Minister of Justice finds any technical defect in the amendment, I should be happy indeed to yield to his very much superior knowledge of these matters in making any textual changes in it. But I would hope that in principle it would be acceptable to the government.

Mrs. Fairclough: I am sorry to say that this amendment which is proposed by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate is not acceptable. I think that one of the things we hope our new citizens will acquire, along with their citizenship, is a pride in that citizenship. I think they realize when they take the oath of allegiance that by so doing they owe that allegiance to the crown and that having done that voluntarily they must abide by the oath they have taken. Unlike the natural born Canadian, the naturalized Canadian is a person who comes to this country owing allegiance to a foreign power. On acquiring Canadian citizenship a naturalized person, by his very act, deliberately forsakes his allegiance to the foreign power and by oath gives his allegiance to the crown. If that person chooses then, in deliberate violation of his oath, to do acts which lead to his being charged with treason, surely it is not expecting too much that he will return at least voluntarily to answer to charges before the court. The natural born person on the other hand automatically owes allegiance to the crown from birth. If by his deliberate act he declares allegiance to a foreign power, he thereupon loses his Canadian citizenship also. Mr. Chairman, I do

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

not want to prolong this debate. This is a point on which I feel rather strongly. I am sorry, but I cannot accept the hon. member's amendment.

Mr. Crestohl: I should like to ask the minister a question. The minister speaks in terms of a naturalized citizen who has committed an offence, leaves the country and does not come back for trial and therefore should lose his citizenship. I agree with that. But assuming that a natural born citizen also commits the offence, also leaves the country and also does not come back to trial, why treat him differently from the way in which you treat a naturalized citizen? He has committed the same offence. He has left the country the same as has the naturalized citizen, and he does not come back for trial. They are both on an equal footing. They have done the same thing. Why differentiate as between the one and the other?

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the amendment?

Amendment (Mr. Pickersgill) negatived: Yeas, 17; nays, 55.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mrs. Fairclough moved the third reading of the bill.

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Leader of the Opposition): Before the bill passes, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two observations I wish to make. We moved an amendment which was ruled out of order but we were told it could be moved in committee, which was done. More important, however, we could not vote for a bill which included section 19(c). True, the minister indicated that this objectionable clause would be removed, but it was there when we were asked to vote and therefore we could not support second reading.

However, that section has now been removed and, as this bill does go some distance, though not as far as we think it should go, towards achieving the objectives we have in mind, we will vote for it on third reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

BROADCASTING

ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS—
CONTINUANCE OF C.B.C.—CONCURRENCE IN
SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Minister of National Revenue) moved the second reading