

has rendered a decision of that kind, then I am one who would want abolition of appeals to the privy council.

(Translation):

To elaborate on what I was saying a few moments ago, let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that we have for many years made a laughing stock of ourselves. There are ridiculous things in our statutes; this is a striking example of the sheerest absurdity, and we are going to leave it in our legislation.

Mr. POULIOT: I appreciate what has been said about sections 4, 5, 9 and 10, but that is not what I want. What I want is a definition of "citizenship", and there is none in the bill. What I want is a definition of nationality, and there is none in the bill. What I want is a definition of naturalization, and there is none in the bill. What I want is a definition of "status of aliens," and there is none in the bill. I think it is necessary to have these definitions. If it is not too late to-morrow, with the assistance of my able colleagues we may try to draft something to be offered at that time. In the meantime I should hope that the section might stand, to give us an opportunity to have those definitions.

Mr. MARTIN: One other very important reason, which I omitted to point out, is that there is a definition of "Canadian citizenship" under existing law, in the Immigration Act. This bill simply says that "Canadian citizen" means a person who is a Canadian citizen under this act.

Mr. LESAGE: How does it read?

Mr. MARTIN: It defines "Canadian citizenship." At a later time the minister in charge will introduce a bill to amend section 2 of the Immigration Act. But at the present time that section is still law.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): One of the purposes of the bill, it is said, is to clarify the definition of "Canadian citizenship". If one refers to the Immigration Act he will find a definition of "Canadian citizen" which is much clearer than the one before us in this bill; because if one wishes to find the definition of "Canadian citizen", as set out in this bill, he must read practically the whole of it. In the Immigration Act one finds a clear definition.

Mr. LESAGE: Read it.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I will read it. It states:

"Canadian citizen" means

(i) a person born in Canada who has not become an alien;

(ii) a British subject who has Canadian domicile; or

[Mr. Lesage.]

(iii) a person naturalized under the laws of Canada who has not subsequently become an alien or lost Canadian domicile.

Mr. LESAGE: A man is a man who is not dead.

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): A man is a man, and a woman is a woman.

Mr. MARTIN: The definition my hon. friend has just read from section 2 of the Immigration Act is not a full definition. It does not deal with the hundreds of situations which will arise, where we shall have to determine whether or not a person is a citizen. The reason we bring in this provision lies in the very inadequacy of the definition in the Immigration Act.

I do not wish to deal with the sections we have not yet reached, but I must point out that section 4 deals with one group of people who, on the passage of this measure, become Canadian citizens. Other citizens are in the same category. But the Immigration Act does not deal with them, and because it does not we have this section. So that I cannot agree with my hon. friend when he states that the Immigration Act contains a satisfactory definition. It is simply a general statement which, when one comes to apply it to a specific case, does not help at all.

Mr. LESAGE: A definition by contrast is not a definition, and a definition by similitude is not a definition. Can we not say that "a Canadian citizen" is defined by sections 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9 of the bill? That would mean something.

Mr. HAZEN: That is limiting.

Mr. LESAGE: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: Why refer to them, then? You refer only to those sections which relate to the definition of "Canadian citizen." Therefore you do not need to specify.

Mr. MARTIN: That is right.

Mr. POULIOT: Canadian citizen is a composite, taking all of us together.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I refer to the first name in the first schedule, namely the United Kingdom. What does that include? I understand it is now known as the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. If so, should not "Northern Ireland" come after, "United Kingdom?" Then, does it include the Shetland islands, the Orkney islands, the Channel islands and the Isle of Man.

Mr. MARTIN: I have to rely upon the officials who give me this information when they tell me that in this classification we are using the proper drafting term.