

queen naturalized by act of parliament of Great Britain, or the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and so on. So I can say there is no reference to "British subject" in any of the acts which have gone to form a constitution of Canada.

Secondly: It gives a clear definition of Canadian citizenship. After listening to the many speeches delivered by hon. members since the beginning of this discussion, I came to the conclusion that many of the members were not speaking of exactly the same thing when they referred to a British subject. For instance, the hon. member for Vancouver South, as reported at page 615 of *Hansard*, spoke of "commonwealth citizenship". Then the hon. member for Broadview, as reported at page 599 of *Hansard* said:

I am a Canadian, but I also am a British subject. They are both the same and always have been.

The same hon. member at page 600:

We all owe allegiance to one sovereign and one empire.

That means empire citizenship. Later the hon. member for Kamloops is reported in this way at page 625 of *Hansard*, when he referred to what he considered a misconception of what is involved in the expression "British subject":

Being a British subject . . . means nothing more or less than being a citizen of the British empire.

And at page 626 he adds:

It simply means that we have all the advantages of citizenship in a larger and more widespread organization as well. We are citizens of Canada, subjects of His Majesty, and we are citizens of the British commonwealth.

And I could agree with that opinion.

And again at page 628:

At present we have an empire citizenship.

So after speaking about British commonwealth citizenship he returns to empire citizenship.

A third expression of opinion makes reference to "our kith and kin", the exponents of which obviously have in mind the inhabitants of the British isles, and their racial descendants, and no other species of the king's subjects whatsoever. It is the type of reference mentioned in *Saturday Night* of April 20. A fourth kind of citizenship was made abundantly clear to me during the debate on the Japanese problem, and the deportation of Canadian citizens of Japanese descent.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask a question? Does the hon. member not think that in addition to a Canadian citizenship there is some value in having a commonwealth citizenship?

Mr. BELZILE: Of course. I have just said I could agree with the hon. member for Kamloops when he said that we are citizens of Canada, subjects of His Majesty and citizens of the British commonwealth. But as we cannot get the real meaning of the words "British subject", which are not defined in the act, I do not agree with anybody, yet. I think we must first have a complete definition of all the advantages and obligations entailed in that status.

It is a well established principle in all British institutions that there should be no rights without corresponding obligations, no privileges without equal duties, and no advantages without equal ties. Canada as a nation has always refused to recognize any imperial ties, any commonwealth obligations, and this has been confirmed by the statute of Westminster. I am afraid that the retention of the status of "British subject" might impose certain obligations with respect to the commonwealth, and form certain ties with the empire. I humbly submit that our only obligation should be an allegiance to the crown. For these reasons I shall support the amendment.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): May I answer the hon. member for Macleod? I am as jealous as anyone of the status of "British subject", but I do not think my amendment takes away from that position. Rather it adds to it, in the sense that, as well as British subjects, we shall be subjects of His Majesty as the King of Canada. And if the minister's contention is correct, namely that section 26 is *intra vires* of the parliament of Canada, then I should be quite willing to have my amendment moved as a new section.

Mr. MICHAUD: I rise to support this amendment, which meets with my entire approval. I thought of it myself before discussing the matter with the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

To my mind the term "British subject" is somewhat misleading. It is true that many hon. members, including the Secretary of State, take the view that it simply means "subject of His Majesty". My knowledge of constitutional law is so limited that I would not dare disagree with my friend of the bar. On the other hand for the man on the street the term "British subject" means a subject of Great Britain, just as surely the term Italian means a subject of Italy, and the term Belgian a subject of Belgium. I dare say that the mass of Canadians, and particularly those who are not of Anglo-Saxon stock, take the view that a British subject means a subject