

ject." If that is so I do not see why we should limit our own rights in other parts of the British commonwealth, as I am inclined to think we should do if the bill were amended in the way suggested. I am not sure, but that is the way it appears to me.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should like to ask the minister if there is the limitation that the hon. member for Vancouver East suggests. Is it not a fact that we are all subjects of His Majesty the King, and that under the statute of Westminster and the development of our constitutional position the king is regarded as the king of the United Kingdom, a person; the king of Canada, a person; the king of South Africa, a person, and so on. In other words, there is a divisibility of the crown in that respect; but in the commonwealth we are all subjects of a common king. Therefore when we receive a passport, for example, it is His Majesty or his representative in Canada who prays another country or another government that we may be afforded all the privileges which the possession of such a passport gives to the holder of it. We have not the right, if I may put it that way, to say who shall be a British subject, but we have the right to say who shall be a subject of His Majesty the King, who is also king of the United Kingdom and of other parts of the British commonwealth. I am not wedded to any particular phraseology; none of us is. But I should like to see this bill worded in such a way as to indicate clearly the position which Canada occupies among the nations of the world, and the exact relationship that a Canadian citizen has to His Majesty the King. It seems to me that the phraseology suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North takes nothing from us as British subjects, takes nothing from us as subjects of His Majesty the King who is the common sovereign of all the people of all the nations of the British commonwealth, but on the other hand does confer something, because it confers upon a Canadian citizen the right of citizenship, and expresses his exact relationship to His Majesty the King and to the commonwealth of which the king is the common head.

Mr. HANSELL: If the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart is correct in his interpretation, then I suggest to the hon. member for Winnipeg North that he leave section 26 as it is and insert another section 27 and move the others on. I suggest that his amendment become section 27, which will read:

A Canadian citizen is a subject of His Majesty as the sovereign of Canada.

Does my suggestion meet with his approval? Does he want the term "British subject" cut out?

Mr. PINARD: I think there is another way—

Mr. HANSELL: The hon. member should answer my question. If it is all right, go ahead.

Mr. PINARD: There is another way to solve the problem, namely, by giving a definition in this bill to a British subject. I have already on second reading of this bill given the reason why I cannot accept the principle contained in this section. I said then that this provision should be changed because we do not find anywhere in our statutes a definition of a British subject. It is true that we still have that definition contained in subsection (i) of section 2 of the Naturalization Act; but this act is to be repealed by section 45 of the bill, and with it the only definition we ever possessed of a British subject will disappear from our statutes. Moreover, that definition of a British subject was introduced in our legislation in 1914, when we adopted the Naturalization Act. Such a definition could not be accepted to-day in Canada because it is not in accordance with our evolution and the progress we have made as a nation.

If that definition as it is were incorporated of the imperial conferences and the statute ignore the rights we have acquired as a result in the present citizenship bill it would simply of Westminster. It would be a definition which would render our legislation on citizenship retrogressive. Here is the definition in the Naturalization Act. It is contained in subsection (d):

"British subject" means a person who is a natural born British subject, or a person to whom a certificate of naturalization has been granted; or a person who has become a subject of His Majesty by reason of any annexation of territory.

We cannot be satisfied to-day with such an incomplete definition. I do not think that it is within the power of this parliament to define a British subject unless we define a British subject in Canada. Such definition could have been included in section 2 of this bill, and if this had been done I would have had no objection to section 26 as it is now drafted. Here is the way in which a British subject in Canada could have been defined for the purposes of this measure: "In this act, unless the context otherwise requires, a British subject means a subject of His Majesty in the right of Canada." In view of the fact, however, that in the present bill we have not been given any definition of a British subject and since our statutes do not