

the right is not in the elections act it must depend upon becoming a Canadian citizen. The minister said it is not his intention—

Mr. MARTIN: I said it was not the intention of the government.

Mr. FULTON: —to change the elections act. Is he prepared to retract the words I have read to him or to give them some explanation? At the moment I cannot reconcile his earlier words with the statement that it is not intended to change the elections act.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has placed an interpretation upon previous words of mine. That is his privilege. I do not think there is any difficulty at all. It is a difficulty which I am sure exists at the moment largely in his own mind. If there is an anomaly, and I do not deny that there is, it is an anomaly that has existed for twenty-seven years. It has been a definition of "Canadian citizenship" in the Immigration Act of this country. Under that act non-British subjects who have come to Canada and have been here for a year can vote at the end of that time under the Dominion Elections Act, although they do not acquire Canadian domicile under section 2 of the Immigration Act until they have been here for five years. That was an anomaly if you like. It was also perhaps anomalous—my hon. friend was not in the house when I referred to the case where the Lord Chancellor pointed out that the franchise is not necessarily—

Mr. FULTON: I was here.

Mr. MARTIN: I think he goes so far as to say it is not necessarily an inherent right or corollary or ancillary to the designation of citizenship. I may say that we have individuals in this country who will be citizens of Canada under this bill, but who will not be allowed to vote. They are judges and other officials. In the district of Columbia in the United States citizens of the United States are debarred from voting. These are anomalies, but they do not destroy the fundamental situation to which I have referred. If my hon. friend has words that I have used recently on another occasion I would want to look at them, and perhaps to-morrow or the next day I shall say whether the high refinement he mentions is or is not justified by the language.

Mr. FLEMING: In dealing earlier with the communications between this government and the governments of the other nations of the commonwealth, the Secretary of State did not mention specifically, as I recall it, Ireland. He is probably aware that

[Mr. Fulton.]

it is suggested, and perhaps more than suggested, that certain sections of the bill had been drafted not merely in consultation with the government of Ireland or Eire, but at its request and that certain provisions had accordingly been inserted. Would the Secretary of State clear up that point because it is a matter of interest to the house in the light of information given thus far?

Mr. MARTIN: I can only say that no section of this bill was put in at the instigation of anyone outside the constituted authorities of the government of this country.

Mr. FLEMING: That statement in the paper was quite wrong?

Mr. MARTIN: To what statement is the hon. member referring?

Mr. FLEMING: I am referring to the *Winnipeg Free Press*. There was an article there on the subject.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I wish to make one comment on the point raised by the hon. member for St. John-Albert which, in my opinion, the Secretary of State brushed aside too lightly. I should like to come back to what was said by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, when he spoke about consultation and agreement. I do not suppose any of us will accuse Mr. Lapointe of derogating from the rights of anybody in this country. I would think that these two words which he used and which I think were clearly used in connection with this particular thing we are talking about were not used lightly. The minister says that we did have consultation. I am, like my seatmate, a new member here and probably I do not understand these high matters. All I have to say is that if this were a business transaction nothing that has been said would suggest that we have had the kind of consultation which business friends would have with each other. I will admit that a good deal depends on what was in the cable which was sent. If the cable was a full disclosure drawing attention to these points which I think are points of substance, then maybe I would find it satisfactory, and no answer having been received, probably it would cover the matter. It does seem to me that in the troubled state of the world at the present time this is a poor time to be showing anything but the greatest courtesy to those with whom we are associated. I come back to these words, used, I think, not lightly by Mr. Lapointe, and I wish to say that to me it seems like playing with words to say that we have had anything that can properly be called consultation.