

Mr. GREEN: Earlier in the evening I asked the minister a question as to what was to be done in connection with nationals of an enemy country and he requested me to repeat the question on section 21. Will he give an answer now?

Mr. MARTIN: There is nothing I can say on that. Perhaps I did not quite understand the question. It is obviously a matter for the courts if I understand what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. GREEN: After the last war a special amendment was introduced into the Naturalization Act putting a restriction on applications for naturalization by subjects of enemy countries for a certain length of time—ten years, I believe.

Mr. MARTIN: I know.

Mr. GREEN: Subsequently, when that period expired the provision was repealed. I can find nothing in this bill which deals with enemy nationals. Has the minister given consideration to inserting a provision of that kind? If not, why not?

Mr. MARTIN: That provision was inserted and shortly after it was removed. It was felt to have no value. We shall have to deal with that situation when it arises.

Mr. GREEN: Does that mean that a citizen of Germany has the same right of Canadian naturalization as a citizen of France?

Mr. MARTIN: If he is a deserving person, certainly. If he is not, no. All I can say is there are many being turned down and many being granted because there are many good German citizens in this country. Professor Einstein in the United States is an illustration. We have to deal with these cases in an *ad hoc* manner, and we are dealing with them carefully.

Mr. FLEMING: I should like to commend the amendment proposed by the minister. To say the least, I think it would have been a grave misfortune if this section had passed with paragraph (c) in it. I do not need to elaborate what I said about it the other day. Before we deal finally with the amendment, would the minister explain what meaning he attaches to certain words in paragraph (d) which, under the amendment, will be relettered paragraph (c)?

Mr. MARTIN: Could we deal with the amendment first?

Mr. FLEMING: My question has to do with paragraph (d) which is being relettered. If the Chairman would leave the question open I do not mind waiting.

[The Acting Chairman.]

Mr. MARTIN: Let us deal with the amendment first.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I do not like this section. I do not think there is any doubt that it is discriminatory.

Mr. FLEMING: My question has to do with the concluding words in paragraph (d). In the course of administration of this bill I should like to know what meaning the minister proposes to attach to these concluding words: "and has not maintained substantial connection with Canada." Take the case of a Canadian citizen who leaves this country and is absent for six years; let us say, he takes up ordinary residence outside Canada and has not maintained substantial connection here. What meaning is to be attached to these words? There is nothing in the bill that gives any clue to the meaning of them.

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend knows that the section substantially means exactly what it says, and the courts will so interpret it.

Mr. FLEMING: This is not a court; this is the governor in council.

Mr. MARTIN: I will give the reason, and the courts may easily construe it in construing the action of the governor in council. First of all, the period has been reduced from seven years to six. In the existing act it is seven years. Since Canadian citizenship will hereafter give a right of entry, whereas status as a British subject does not at present, it was thought desirable to shorten the period that a person could be abroad. This provision is needed because there may be cases where revocation of naturalization is desirable even though a person is not subject to automatic loss. For example, a person may be abroad for years with a purely nominal agency from a Canadian company. This agency would protect him from automatic loss. However, if it were merely a deliberate blind or shield, it would be desirable to be able to revoke his naturalization if he has maintained no substantial connection with Canada.

We have had a number of cases of individuals who left Canada prior to the war and went to Germany. They were away beyond the prescribed period. These people alleged that they had connection with Canada and that they were acting for certain companies. We were able to find out that these companies were blinds, that they were just fictitious agencies. In fact they were not really employed by them at all. Certainly that is no