

that had been written in their favour. They would have been ashamed to repeat in this House of Commons what had been written by their scribes in their own papers.

Since last evening I have discovered that science can be very weighty, and I did not attempt to bring with me the large Webster's dictionary which a friend of mine was kind enough to send over to me last evening. I shall try to make a contribution to this debate by putting on *Hansard* some of the definitions which I found in Webster's dictionary, and I think they will astound hon. members. When you put them all together it gives you a *vue d'ensemble* of the whole matter of citizenship, of nationhood and so on. The first definition is of "nation", and it reads as follows:

Nation: (2) People connected by supposed ties of blood generally manifested by community of language, religion and customs, and by a sense of common interest and inter-relation; thus, the Jews and the Gypsies are often called nations.

3. Popularly, any group of people having like institutions and customs and a sense of social homogeneity and mutual interest. Most nations are formed of agglomerations of tribes or peoples either of a common ethnic stock or of different stocks fused by long intercourse of single language or closely related dialects, a common religion, a common tradition and history, and a common sense of right and wrong, and a more or less compact territory, or typically characteristic;

That reminds me of the speech made in Boston by the former minister for air when he said that we should have one language. The definition continues:

—but one or more of these elements may be lacking and yet leave a group that from its community of interest and desire to lead a common life is called a nation.

Is it not agreeable to hon. members that they should consider seriously these definitions from Webster's?

4. Loosely, the body of inhabitants of a country united under a single independent government; a state.

7. One tribe of a group of Indian tribes; as, the Six Nations.

The next definition is of "nationality", and it reads as follows:

Nationality: 2. State, quality, or fact of belonging to, or being connected with a nation or state as by nativity or allegiance; as, nationality acquired by birth may be lost through naturalization in another country.

Nationality and citizenship may be different. The definition of "citizen" is as follows:

Citizen: 1. An inhabitant of a city or town, esp. one who enjoys its freedom and privileges as free man or burghess.

2. A member of a state; a person, native or naturalized, of either sex, who owes allegiance to a government, and is entitled to reciprocal protection from it;—opposed to alien.

Between the word citizen, answering in meaning to the Latin *civis* and the Greek *polites*, and the word subject, there is a fundamental distinction in meaning. Subject implies a master or lord to whom the subject owes a personal allegiance; citizen does not, but implies membership of, and the tie of loyalty to, a state, with the reciprocal right to the enjoyment of the privileges and protection flowing from these. A citizen as such is entitled to the protection of life, liberty, and property at home and abroad, but is not necessarily vested with the suffrage or other political rights. In the construction of statutes, citizen is sometimes made to include corporation.

That is very interesting. According to the definition of "citizen" given by Webster, it is a man who is endowed with civilian rights of a private character rather than public rights. The word has different meanings and the definition is not clear. The definitions I have given probably do not satisfy the minds of the hon. gentlemen who are honouring me by listening to me at the present time. The definition of "subject" is as follows:

Subject: 2. Under the power or dominion of another; specif., in international law owing allegiance to, or being a subject of a particular sovereign or state; as, Jamaica is subject to Great Britain. "Esau was never subject to Jacob." (Locke)

And then "alien":

Alien: 1. A person of another family, race, or nation; a foreigner, stranger.

2. One owing allegiance to another state, a foreign born resident of a country in which he does not possess the privileges of a citizen; also, loosely, a foreign born citizen.

And then "naturalization" and "naturalized":

Naturalization: 1. An act or process of naturalizing or state of being naturalized.

Naturalized: 2 (a) to confer the rights and privileges of a native subject or citizen on; to make as if native; to adopt (as an alien) into a state and place in the condition of a native subject or citizen.

Those are the definitions that I found in Webster's. I draw the attention of the committee to the fact that a distinction is made between the word "citizen", which is used often in connection with republics, and the word "subject", which is used mostly in connection with the inhabitants of kingdoms or possessions of a kingdom. We are a long way from the middle ages, but there are still many people who are subjects of a king. A subtle distinction drawn between these two expressions, and I suggest to my colleagues that they have a look at them and endeavour to discuss this matter with an open mind and in the best possible spirit.

Some hon. members may be surprised at our insisting upon a definition, but there is a reason. I want this bill to satisfy my own mind and expectations. My idea of citizen-