

Americans served in the armed forces of Canada and that has placed United States citizens in an extremely difficult position. I do not want to go too far on that. Perhaps the committee will understand to what I refer. Numbers of Americans did serve in the armed forces of Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): May I ask what happened to Canadian citizens who served in the Spanish republican army in 1936?

Mr. MARTIN: I do not really know, I shall have to give an answer to-morrow.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Is the minister aware that United States citizens who served in the R.C.A.F. did not take the oath of allegiance.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes, because special action was taken in that case. I have to be careful in commenting on difficulties other countries have had. They have had to use other methods. I should like to be able to say exactly what they have told us about their difficulties in the United States. They had difficulties not only in the last war but in the first great war because certain countries which fought against the United States this time were their allies last time. That creates all sorts of difficulties, and one has to be extremely careful.

In Australia—we have been in touch with Australia—they have had the same problem and they are dealing with this problem as I think we should deal with it, in the British way. Take the case of Captain Baillie Stewart. He was a citizen of Great Britain and was convicted of aiding a foreign power, was discharged from the British army and imprisoned. Later he went to Germany. Nothing further was done until he was recaptured after the war. Then he was tried and convicted of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. FULTON: Was it proven or alleged that he had acquired German citizenship or nationality?

Mr. MARTIN: I really do not know.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is an important question.

Mr. MARTIN: It is in one sense, but not as far as the principle is concerned. In other words, Britain regards citizenship once obtained through natural-born process as a thing which can be dealt with in the case of disloyalty in

[Mr. Martin.]

the most effective and the most humiliating way possible, and that is by disposition at the hands of the courts.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Will the minister permit a question?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He mentioned the fact that Britain considers that of the utmost importance. Has he any reason to believe that Japan does not also consider it of the utmost importance?

Mr. MARTIN: I may say in answer to that that my hon. friend knows that we are not, or certainly I hope we are not, to be governed in this parliament or this country by the methods—the diabolical methods—of our enemies.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, no, that is no answer at all.

Mr. FULTON: I asked that question because I have been informed that, in the hearing of the case, it was held that Baillie Stewart had not completed the formalities of acquiring German citizenship and nationality, and it was for that reason that he was dealt with as a British subject and a traitor to Great Britain.

Mr. MARTIN: What about the case of "Lord Haw-Haw"? There have been many others, and Britain has dealt with them in the effective way I mentioned.

Mr. FULTON: We should look up the record, but I think that "Haw-Haw", or William Joyce, was dealt with on the same basis.

Mr. MARTIN: You are quite right. I am wrong in that case. "Lord Haw-Haw" was declared to be a United States citizen. I suggest that we let section 16 pass, and I will hold section 17 over and give it consideration.

Mr. GREEN: What about section 16?

Mr. MARTIN: I think we should allow section 16 to pass. I do not think it covers the issue.

Mr. GREEN: In the ordinary course, in this house, where the suggestion is made in good faith that a section stand over, the practice is for the government to let it stand over and not try to force it through.

Mr. MARTIN: I will agree to let them both stand over, so that we can get on. I know that from now on I can expect complete cooperation.