

Mr. GREEN: The Prime Minister at the session last fall made a statement outlining the policy of the government on this Japanese question. Will the minister assure the committee that if this bill becomes law it will in no way affect the carrying out of that policy?

Mr. MARTIN: All I can say is that this bill has nothing to do one way or the other with these orders. The responsible minister in connection with that matter will have to answer on behalf of the government. I am not particularly charged with that matter, but this bill does not affect one way or the other that situation. This bill stands by itself.

Mr. GREEN: The minister has not given the assurance for which I asked. Will the Minister of Veterans Affairs, who is leading the house at the moment, give that assurance?

Mr. MACKENZIE: My understanding is that the measure now being considered by this committee will not and cannot alter in any way the policy of the government with respect to the issue raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. MARTIN: This bill was introduced long before these orders were passed.

An hon. MEMBER: In that case it will have been passed after the event.

Mr. MacINNIS: In view of certain matters which were raised in connection with this bill, the question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver South is certainly a most amazing one. The hon. member for Lake Centre attacked and slashed the government in a really fine way over certain orders in council by which a few individuals were picked up and confined and later brought to trial, and then over one case of a man who had deserted from the Canadian army, where there was an order passed getting him under control. I imagine that the hon. member for Lake Centre was talking for the Progressive Conservative party when he denounced—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Would the hon. member forgive me for rising on a point of order. I understand that the minister in charge agreed, at the suggestion of the hon. member for Vancouver South, to have sections 16 and 17 stand over for further discussion. So that I think we might possibly postpone the discussion of this issue to another occasion.

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not think it is quite fair to ask me to postpone my discussion.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We could not hope for it.

Mr. MacINNIS: I listened to the hon. member for Lake Centre dealing with one question, and to the hon. members for Vancouver South, Kamloops, Vancouver-Burrard and Nanaimo dealing with a definitely opposite principle. One of these principles is right. Either orders in council which take away the liberty of the Canadian citizen are wrong, or orders in council which take away the freedom of Canadian citizens are right.

Mr. FULTON: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he define the difference between these principles?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I think there was agreement that sections 16 and 17 would stand for further consideration.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I object to that ruling, although I bow to it. The point I made is this. If I am wrong, then the hon. member for Vancouver South should not be allowed to ask his questions. As a matter of fact, for days and days the whole discussion on this point was out of order, because it had nothing to do with the question. I was anticipating that, the moment I would rise to speak on it, I would say things and then I would be out of order. So it has turned out. But before this is finished I am going to have my say on this question, and I am going to show the contradictions in the policies of my hon. friends to my right.

Mr. GRAYDON: Meanwhile you are wasting a lot of time.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am not wasting any time. I do not waste any time.

Sections 16 and 17 stand.

On section 18—Child of parent ceasing to be a Canadian citizen. Declaration for resuming Canadian citizenship.

Mr. GREEN: Would the minister explain this section?

Mr. MARTIN: This is not new; it has been in the act for thirty-one years.

Section agreed to.

On section 19—When loss of Canadian citizenship involves loss of British nationality.

Mr. REID: May I ask the minister if we have the right to declare that a person "thereupon ceases to be a British subject"? The minister might explain that. Have we the right to take away the status of a British subject if a person takes out foreign citizen-