

On section 4—Born before the commencement of the act.

Mr. MacNICOL: What about Indians who have left their tribes and have established themselves like the rest of us, or Indians who have served in His Majesty's forces? Are they automatically Canadian citizens by virtue of the fact that they were born here?

Mr. MARTIN: They are Canadian citizens. If an Indian was born in Canada he is a Canadian citizen. The section is clear.

Mr. COLDWELL: What about the Six Nations Indians around Brantford? Are they regarded as Canadians? I believe they have some international status which enables them to cross the boundary with their own passports.

Mr. MARTIN: If they were born in Canada, then under the act they are Canadian citizens. There are two principles by which most countries determine citizenship, law of blood and law of the place of birth. We have a combination of both principles.

Section agreed to.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6—Conditions for retention of Canadian citizenship by persons born outside of Canada.

Mr. REID: Some explanation should be given of this section. When I spoke before I took exception to the fact that a child born outside the country is made a naturalized Canadian merely because either of its parents happened to have been born on a Canadian ship. It is certainly carrying national status pretty far when we confer it upon a child, making that child equal with a person born in Canada. I should like to see us adopt some regulation such as they have in the United States with regard to children born outside that country. After all, we are conferring Canadian nationality upon a child born in another country simply because one of its parents was born on a Canadian ship, and as I say, that is going too far. Let me read the provision that exists in the United States:

A person born outside the United States and its outlying possessions of parents one of whom is a citizen of the United States who, prior to the birth of such person, has had ten years' residence in the United States or one of its outlying possessions, at least five of which were after attaining the age of sixteen years, the other being an alien; provided—

And here is the point I wish to emphasize.

—that in order to retain such citizenship the child must reside in the United States or its

outlying possessions for a period or periods totaling five years between the ages of thirteen and twenty-one years.

They stipulate there that a child cannot attain American citizenship at birth but must have had some residence, at some period, in the United States before it reaches the age of twenty-one. We should be careful in extending citizenship. I would ask the minister the reasons for extending citizenship as far as this bill goes.

Mr. MARTIN: The principle involved in the section to which the hon. member has referred is not a new one. It was in the old naturalization act even before 1914. In the act as it now stands it is found in section 3, subsection 5, so that it is not new. The principle is one that is recognized by most countries. I would refer to the "Consolidation of Nationality Laws", prepared by Hudson, which is recognized as the best English text on nationality laws, wherein the principle is discussed. The hon. member will find that in almost all countries which were represented at the Hague conference of 1930, the principle is accepted. It is accepted in all the dominions, and we consider the principle is too important to drop. The reason for it, in theory, I think is sound. The desire is, as far as possible, to keep the members of a family within the same national status group, without in any way imposing nationality upon them. It seems desirable that minor children, until such time as they have attained their majority, should have the nationality or the national status of their parents. As to the use of the words "Canadian ship", the hon. member will note that in paragraph (b) of the interpretation section that is defined to mean a ship of Canadian registry, which is a slight change. I can only repeat that the rule is an effort to keep members of the same family within the same national group as far as that is possible, without compulsion and without interfering with their rights, until they attain their majority. When we come to discuss subsequent sections of the bill it will be apparent that this does not mean that nationality acquired in this way cannot be rejected or withdrawn by the parties concerned. One of the main reasons for the section, and one of the most difficult things to administer in this kind of act, is the question of statelessness. In the Department of the Secretary of State and in the department of my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources we have thousands of pitiable cases of statelessness among children, and I should think this would