

cover South has mentioned, but I have not yet had a chance to see that amendment, and I do not want to say to the committee that it will be accepted. I think I have gone as far as I could. It certainly will not affect section 27.

Mr STIRLING: It certainly does in our view.

Section 27 agreed to.

On section 28—British subjects under the laws of other countries of the British commonwealth.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): May I ask for elucidation of one point? The hon. member for Eglinton has one idea with respect to a British subject and I have another. A British subject is one who was born in the British dominions or British possessions. Section 2(g) provides that "country of the British commonwealth" means:

For the purposes of this act a country listed in the first schedule to this act.

In the first schedule the United Kingdom appears. Does that include crown colonies and dependencies and India?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes. There is no doubt about that. The hon. member for Swift Current asked a question on that last night.

Mr. HACKETT: Will the minister say whether Ireland which is mentioned in the first schedule includes Eire as well as Northern Ireland?

Mr. REID: That is a \$64 question.

Mr. MARTIN: Northern Ireland comes under the United Kingdom.

Mr. GREEN: Would a person born in India who has come to Canada and been here the necessary time to acquire Canadian domicile be considered a Canadian citizen under the terms of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. STIRLING: Even though India is not mentioned in the schedule?

Mr. MARTIN: India is not a country with nationality laws of her own. These matters are determined for India by United Kingdom statutes.

Mr. BENTLEY: Yesterday afternoon and evening the hon. member for Eglinton corrected the statement I made about some of these people. The Secretary of State has now corrected him and shown that my statement was correct.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. BENTLEY: That is just for the record. Section agreed to.

[Mr. Martin.]

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I think the committee should return to section 21. I must apologize to the hon. member for Winnipeg North for neglecting to bring his amendment before the committee. Just before eleven o'clock last night he had proposed to amend section 21 by deleting subsection 1(d) and substituting the following therefor:

has been convicted of treason or sedition by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Section 21(1)(d) reads:

(d) has, since becoming a Canadian citizen or being naturalized in Canada, been for a period of not less than six years ordinarily resident out of Canada and has not maintained substantial connection with Canada.

The amendment proposed is:

has been convicted of treason or sedition by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Is the committee in favour of the amendment?

Mr. GREEN: I wish to ask the minister a question with regard to this section.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): This is section 21, subsection 1 (d). This is the clause we renumbered. The clause reads as follows:

has shown himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty.

The amendment reads:

has been convicted of treason or sedition by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to support the government in connection with this amendment.

Mr. MARTIN: May I thank the hon. gentleman? It is a relief.

Mr. GREEN: It is a terrible thing to have to agree with the minister, but I think he is quite right in this case. This provision has stood in our naturalization law for at least thirty years, and I believe it is necessary, to deal with exactly the type of cases to which the minister referred last night. I would point out to members of the committee that a new provision has been added in this section under which the minister and the governor in council cannot act to deprive a person of his citizenship without first giving him notice and without the appointment of a commission to inquire into all the facts. In other words, the person whose citizenship is under attack is given a very wide power of making his case, and I do not think there is the slightest chance of his losing his citizenship unfairly. I suggest that the government be supported in maintaining the clause as it appears in the bill.