

to create British subjects for their own country and for all other countries of the commonwealth. That act is to be revoked by the present measure before the house. I would ask the minister to explain how he can say that this act makes no fundamental change in the status of a British subject when that is the effect of this bill. One may say that a Canadian citizen will be a British subject, but if we revoke the Naturalization Act I submit that he is not a British subject in the other countries of the empire; and that is a fundamental change made in the status of a British subject.

Mr. MARTIN: When we come to section 28 I think I can show that it is not a change in result but in method.

Mr. HAZEN: Under our present act a woman marrying a British subject becomes a British subject. But under the proposed legislation that is not the case. Surely that is a fundamental change. I think the Secretary of State was playing with words a little when he replied to me a moment or two ago.

I should like to refer again to the preparatory conference that was held in 1929. At that conference certain recommendations were made. A resolution was brought into this house by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe to approve those recommendations, some of which will be found on page 713 of *Hansard* of this year. In 1930 the imperial conference was held. That conference approved those recommendations, and the conclusions which the conference reached were contained in a certain memorandum. The second conclusion is this, and I quote from page 713 of *Hansard* of this year:

That, if any changes are desired in the existing requirements for the common status, provision should be made for the maintenance of the common status, and the changes should only be introduced (in accordance with present practice) after consultation and agreement among the several members of the commonwealth.

It will be noted that it says not only after consultation but after consultation and agreement among the several members of the commonwealth. It is quite apparent from what the Minister of State said to me a moment or two ago that there has not been consultation and agreement among the several members of the commonwealth, and while perhaps it may not be absolutely legally necessary for that to be done, yet there is, I submit, a moral responsibility on the government to have not only consultation but an agreement with the other members of the commonwealth. It is quite apparent that that was not done. It seems to me that that step should have been taken before this bill was introduced

[Mr. Fulton.]

into this house, and the Secretary of State and the government have slipped up in that respect.

Mr. MARTIN: I can quite appreciate my hon. friend's anxiety.

Mr. HAZEN: It is not anxiety.

Mr. MARTIN: Let us say his persistence, but the fact is that we sent a telegram to each of the responsible parties advising them of the principles of our bill and we sent them the bill itself on October 12 last. The hon. gentleman will appreciate that there are many things done, many exchanges, many acts by the various dominions. For instance, Australia has passed an act dealing with the status of women, providing for separate status. Australia did not advise Canada of that; Australia decided not to. South Africa made changes; South Africa did not consult Canada. All this was done since the conference of 1929. Consultation and agreement between the dominions do not mean that you have to have an airtight agreement such as you would have perhaps between Canada and a country outside the commonwealth. There is not that barrier between the countries of the commonwealth that exists between ourselves and certain other national groups, and consultation and agreement between the dominions have come to mean not an agreement under seal or anything of that sort but exactly what we have done. We have notified all the parties. One of them has had discussions with us and has mentioned that it regards the bill as a model one. We have also had intimations of the views of Australia in statements from their Prime Minister. I might point out that the United Kingdom amended their act in 1942 or 1943 and they followed exactly the practice that we followed here. They asked us by cablegram if we had any objection, and that is the course we have followed here. My hon. friend may be assured not only that the government has not slipped but that every precaution has been taken to live up to the constitutional practice in this matter.

Mr. POULIOT: Somebody one day was showing movies, but one thing had been forgotten. They forgot to turn the lights on inside the projector. I am reminded of that by this bill. What is it? It says:

This act may be cited as the Canadian citizenship act.

What is citizenship? No one knows. It is not mentioned there. The title of the act reads:

An act respecting citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens.