

be the most undesirable time to try to change this principle, particularly in view of conditions in Europe.

Mr. REID: Suppose a child was born in China, whose father had been born on a ship of Canadian registry. Is there no time limit in a case of that kind? Naturally China would confer citizenship on that child, owing to the fact that it was born in that country. Would that child retain Canadian nationality all the days of its life? Is there no time limit?

Mr. MARTIN: There is a time limit of two years in regard to registration. The birth must be registered within two years.

Section agreed to.

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 8—Child born after the death of his father.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is just one point in connection with this section. It seemed to us in discussing this matter, that something else should be added in connection with giving this status to a child. At the moment a person born on board a foreign ship in Canadian territorial waters would be considered to have been born in Canada. Is that not right?

Mr. MARTIN: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would mind repeating that question; I am sorry, I was otherwise engaged.

Mr. COLDWELL: A child born on board a ship in Canadian territorial waters—

Mr. MARTIN. A ship of Canadian registry?

Mr. COLDWELL: No, of foreign registry. Technically it would be born in Canada. There is nothing in the bill, it seemed to us when we were going through it, to cover that point. Should there not be something in the bill which would state that a child born on board a foreign ship in Canadian territorial waters should not be regarded as a Canadian citizen? It is quite conceivable that at some future time, under certain conditions that might exist, a child so born in Canadian territorial waters on a foreign ship might claim to be Canadian when it would not serve the interests of this country to recognize that person as of Canadian nationality. I raise that point because when we were going through the bill we thought it was not covered.

Mr. MARTIN: It is very funny that our minds should be working in the same direction.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is not very funny.

Mr. MARTIN: No, it is not, because up to a point the hon. gentleman and I have the same type of liberalism. We cannot agree on

[Mr. Martin.]

everything, but one thing on which we do agree is that the hon. member for Peel is a very genial member; as to that there is no argument. What the hon. gentleman has said really applies to section 5. The point is interesting and not without some merit. I have in my hand an amendment which I have been thinking about, but according to the officers of the immigration department such cases are very rare. I think there have been two in about sixty years, and it would be perhaps the wrong thing to include a principle which seems to strike particularly at what Hudson says in his treatise. In view of the fact that the cases are very rare, perhaps I should not proceed with what I have been toying with to cover the particular case. Sometimes more is to be gained by dealing with broader questions than by trying to cover many things which in themselves are important but which in their context may not be so important. I think I had better leave it that way.

Mr. DORION: I believe there is a time limit missing from this section. As it reads now, if a child is born five years after the death of his father he is deemed to have been born before his father's death. I suggest to the minister that in our civil code we have a section which settles the question. I believe this section should be amended along the lines of section 218 of the civil code, which says:

A child born on or after the one hundred and eightieth day after the marriage was solemnized or within three hundred days after its dissolution is held to have been conceived during marriage.

So that in this section I think after the word "father" should be added, "but within three hundred days after such death." That would mean something, I think.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has raised a point which I am afraid is away beyond my imagination. I do not see how a person could be the child of a father when that child is born five years after the father's death, though there may be something in medical science with which the Minister of Veterans Affairs has not yet made me acquainted. I believe the section is satisfactory as it stands.

Mr. DORION: I move that amendment, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is necessary.

Mr. MARTIN: Perhaps I had better explain why the section is there. As the committee will note, this is a new section. In the comments made about this bill in the "American Journal of International Law" some months ago it will be noted that this section was praised as an advanced section in