

privileges and be subject to all obligations, duties and liabilities to which a natural-born Canadian citizen is entitled . . .

I listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. member for Humboldt. He spoke with feeling, great wisdom and with a full realization of a situation which prevailed, as he said, twice in the lifetime of many people, particularly in western Canada. I think of my own constituency and of one particular part of it where 175 people, whose fathers came from Germany, served overseas in the late war in the armed forces of this country. That is why I pressed so strongly the other day, but without success, to have done away with once and for all this regulation under which at each succeeding census those who are Canadians are required to register on the basis of race. That is why I introduced the amendment, which was defeated, to do away once and for all with the one thing which in my judgment and in the judgment of many others does not contribute to the unity of Canada.

The Secretary of State has just made the statement that so far as this section is concerned, regardless of ethnical origin, once a person becomes a Canadian citizen he has all the rights, powers and privileges of a natural-born Canadian citizen. Is that strictly true? Last night just before adjournment I brought up the situation respecting the Japanese, which comes directly within the ambit of this section. I shall read the section again:

A Canadian citizen other than a natural-born Canadian citizen shall, subject to the provisions of this act, be entitled to all rights, powers and privileges . . .

Not subject to the provisions of orders in council that were passed last fall. After this bill becomes law, and I reiterate what I said last evening more strongly now after listening to the explanation of the Secretary of State—so far as section 27 is concerned, any Canadian citizen other than natural-born, regardless, to use the Secretary of State's own words, of ethnical origin, is entitled to all rights, powers and privileges of a natural-born Canadian citizen. What are these rights? They are clear. They certainly do not permit of deportation except under paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 21. I point out to the Minister of Veterans Affairs that this section is much stronger in support of the contention I raised last night than was the section to which I referred earlier. Section 21 provides that a person can only lose his citizenship under paragraph (a) if he is disloyal. In other words he has:

—during any war in which Canada is or has been engaged, unlawfully traded or communicated with the enemy; (b) has obtained a cer-

tificate of naturalization or of Canadian citizenship by false representation or fraud, or concealment . . .

He has committed a crime or has shown himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty. There is one other provision that has no application at all. May I make myself clear? I agree with the Secretary of State when he says that Canadian citizenship does mean something. I ask him how by any stretch of the imagination he can argue that these orders in council passed in October last can be effectual as against section 27 when it is passed? I repeat: subject to the provisions of this bill any Canadian citizen other than natural-born is entitled to all rights. Does the Secretary of State suggest now that any law officer of the crown will give the opinion that an order in council passed before this bill is passed can have any effect as against section 27; or is this a means of affording a fortuitous circumstance whereby the government will not be forced to continue with its policy?

Mr. MARTIN: This section is now the law and has been the law for thirty-three years.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is all right; it has been the law, but not as far as a citizenship act is concerned. You see, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend takes two or three different positions. One day he says there is nothing in this, that it has been the law for thirty years. In the next breath he says we are creating a new citizenship in this country, with new rights and new responsibilities. He cannot have it both ways. I am not going to carry on that argument; my hon. friends may continue it, but I am pointing out plain words which do not require any lawyer or any judge for their interpretation. A Canadian citizen shall, subject to the provisions of this bill, be entitled to all rights, powers and privileges. To interpret those words does not require any of the special knowledge that the hon. member for Cape Breton South suggested was possessed by the legal fraternity; and let me say that I have often thought what a wonderful lawyer he would have made, because even without that training he is able to argue as few lawyers can. But it does not require any legal interpretation; it does not require any splitting of hairs. There are the words; and I ask now not only that the Secretary of State place before the committee the general legal opinion that was given by the Department of Justice, but also in what way plain words are to be interpreted differently from their plain import and meaning.