

referring to an editorial which appeared in *Saturday Night*. I can only say that the observations in that connection are clearly not in accordance with the fact, because the statement in the editorial that the intention of the present bill is to exclude East Indians from the status of British subject is clearly erroneous.

Mr. COLDWELL: Why not make it clear in our own bill? Why depend upon a British act to clarify the definition of "a British subject." Why should we refer to the United Kingdom and make the United Kingdom inclusive of a great dependency like India, for example?

Mr. MARTIN: There is a good historical reason. The list of countries included in the schedule are countries having their own nationality acts, and this arrangement not only is the result of several conferences but is conceived from the point of view of draftsmanship to be the effective way of dealing with the situation. My hon. friend will appreciate that this is a complicated measure. We gave consideration to that point, and after great consideration we thought this was the best and most effective way of dealing with it. When we come to another section I will show why that is so.

Mr. COLDWELL: The reason I have difficulty in my own mind in approving this particular method of dealing with it is this. Here we are setting up an act dealing particularly with Canadian citizenship. We are looking forward to establishing something which has been implicit for a long time, so they say, but which has never had statute law to support it.

Mr. MARTIN: Implicit for limited purposes.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, for limited purposes. If we are doing that, then should we not go the whole distance and decide ourselves under this, our own bill, who shall be regarded as British subjects for the purposes of our own legislation?

Mr. MARTIN: That is specifically what we have done. These other countries have no acts of their own.

Mr. COLDWELL: Why refer to an act of the United Kingdom?

Mr. MARTIN: Because we are dealing with the question of common status. Perhaps on reflection my hon. friend will see that I am right, if he will think the matter over.

Mr. COLDWELL: I shall be glad to think it over.

Mr. MARTIN: I suggest that my hon. friend do so.

Mr. COLDWELL: But the minister says it is a complicated matter, and one's thoughts are not always clear on complicated matters.

Mr. LESAGE: I only wish to contradict the hon. member for Temiscouata, who said there was in the bill no definition of a Canadian citizen. In my opinion there is a definition in too many words. It is covered by sections 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9. It takes five sections to cover the definition.

Mr. POULIOT: Not a definition; a description.

Mr. LESAGE: The only true definition—and my colleague is right—that we can find is in section 2 (a), which says:

"Canadian citizen" means a person who is a Canadian citizen under this act.

Mr. MacNICOL: Surely that is clear.

Mr. LESAGE: If hon. members of the committee will follow me, I might as well say, "Apple tree" means a tree which is an apple tree in Canada." That is exactly the sort of definition we have here. It is completely useless and, to use the words sometimes used by the hon. member for Temiscouata, it is ridiculous. So that I move, seconded by the hon. member for Outremont:

That subsection (a) be removed and that the following subsections (b) to (n) inclusive be re-lettered (a) to (m) inclusive.

I say that subsection (a) should be removed; it does not mean a thing. After all, it costs money to print these bills.

Mr. MARTIN: All I can say is I agree with what my hon. friend says. However, he probably knows there is before the judicial committee a case which deals with this matter. This is a matter of drafting, and I have to rely upon the drafting officials, and the law officers of the crown. They have said that while there were definitions of a particular status by way of description in sections 4, 5, 9 and 10, in the interpretation section there should be some reference. The purpose of paragraph (a) is to satisfy that exigency of draftsmanship as conceived by the judicial committee in that particular case.

Mr. LESAGE: Could we not say: a "Canadian citizen, under this measure, is defined by sections 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9." That would mean something. But what we have here is ridiculous, where it simply states that a Canadian citizen means a person who is a Canadian citizen under this act. If the privy council