

Mr. GREEN: You do that under section 21.

Mr. MARTIN: That is a different situation. These are not natural-born people. This deals with natural-born citizens. The way to deal with the case to which my hon. friend has referred is through the courts of justice. They should be dealt with vigorously in that way. That is the proper way to do it. I am not saying this to be flippant, and I am sure my hon. friend will recognize that. That is the British way. Everyone in this committee will recall the case which came up in Great Britain recently of a certain person—I do not want to identify him. He was the son of a well-known public figure who had committed a serious crime against the crown. That person was a natural-born citizen of the United Kingdom. His citizenship was not taken away from him in spite of his act; but he was dealt with effectively and completely by the courts. That is the only way, in my opinion, to deal with this matter. I do not know of any other way. We have thought of this problem and given it a great deal of attention. We talked about the very situation that my hon. friend has in mind and argued about it. We discussed this matter in relation to the nationality laws of the commonwealth. I think in only two countries of the world will it be found that there is a provision by which the citizenship of natural-born people can be taken away from them.

Mr. GREEN: The United States do it.

Mr. MARTIN: No, they do not do it. They do it in one small country; I think it is San Salvador.

Mr. HACKETT: Does any country do it when the citizen is in his own country?

Mr. MARTIN: No, except the two countries I have in mind.

Mr. HACKETT: Do they take the man's citizenship from him when he is in the country?

Mr. MARTIN: No; only when he is out.

Mr. REID: I wonder whether the minister is correct. I hold in my hand a section of the United States act entitled, "Chapter IV, loss of nationality." Section 401 reads:

A person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization shall lose his nationality . . .

Then there is a whole page in which reasons for loss of nationality are outlined, whether born in the United States or not.

Mr. MARTIN: What are the reasons?

[Mr. Martin.]

Mr. REID: One is voting at a political election in this country. If he does that they take away his citizenship and forbid him to enter.

Mr. MARTIN: We do the same thing under section 16 which reads:

A Canadian citizen who, when outside of Canada and not under a disability, by any voluntary and formal act other than marriage, acquires the nationality or citizenship of a country other than Canada shall thereupon cease to be a Canadian citizen.

Mr. REID: That is not a natural-born person.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: Outside of Canada.

Mr. GREEN: This section refers to Canadian-born persons outside of Canada. Surely the minister does not contend that a Canadian-born person who serves in the army of our enemy should retain his citizenship?

Mr. MARTIN: That is a case of treason on a par with the case I referred to in England.

Mr. GREEN: Here is a man who served in the Japanese army.

Mr. MARTIN: He may have acquired foreign nationality.

Mr. GREEN: Why should he have any right to retain Canadian citizenship?

Mr. MARTIN: Because there is an effective way of dealing with such natural-born people, the way they do it in Great Britain. The hon. gentleman will recall the case to which I refer. The question was put to the Home Secretary in the British house. I wish I had his reply here. I should have brought it down. Recognizing the difficulty, he said in substance that the main purpose of the provision was to avoid the danger of people becoming stateless. If a Canadian citizen or a natural-born Canadian citizen does something along the lines referred to by my hon. friend it seems to me the effective way to deal with the situation is to bring him before the courts, and, if he is found guilty, give him the justice and ignominy which he deserves. That is the British system and I think it is the system we must follow.

Mr. GREEN: What about Canadian-born persons who go to Japan in peace time and take military training in the Japanese army? Hundreds of them did that, and then applied to come back to Canada as British subjects. What happens in cases like that? I want an answer to my question.