

Then there is the French "naturaliser". If hon. members are satisfied with that, they are easy to please. Let us see the definition of "status". I am not wasting time; I am just showing the trouble that every good Canadian, whether he is a citizen or not, will have when he goes to his dictionary to look up the meaning of "status". This is a new word referring to an autonomous nation under the Statute of Westminster. The definition given here is:

Social position, rank, relation to others, relative importance, (his s. is a matter of doubt, their s. is wholly different, his s. among novelists); (Law) person's relation to others as fixed by law; position of affairs, esp. s. (in) quo, unchanged position.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Chairman, while the hon. member for Temiscouata is mumbling to himself might we not proceed with the bill? I wonder whether it matters a great deal whether the term "citizenship" is defined any more than it is here? My hon. friend has been talking about the man on the street wanting to know what is a Canadian citizen. I doubt whether any man on the street wants any definition of it. A man comes to Canada from some other country. He finds that he is not able to partake of all that is involved in citizenship; perhaps he finds that he cannot vote or that there is some other legal technicality to his disadvantage after he has begun his life in this country, and so he decides to become a Canadian citizen. He does not look through the bill to see what a Canadian citizen is because his own common sense tells him that he is not one; so he makes application. I think we are straining at a lot of little gnats that do not amount to a great deal. My hon. friend has now a bigger dictionary and it appears that he is going to read definitions out of that dictionary until eleven o'clock. Then, when he gets through with that dictionary I am sure that there is a bigger one somewhere, and if we go on in that way we shall never get through with this bill. I do not think the definition matters a great deal.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does the minister not think it may be confusing to leave the definition of "domicile" as it is now in paragraph (j)? The common law definition of "domicile" has nothing to do with duration of time at all. Therefore I suggest, in order to avoid any possible confusion, that the words "for the purposes of this act" be introduced after the first word "domicile" in paragraph (j). I suggest that the introduction of these words would remove any possibility of confusion.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. MARTIN: I am prepared to accept that amendment. The words were in there originally, but the Justice Department thought they were not necessary.

Mr. FLEMING: They will do no harm in there.

Mr. MARTIN: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) agreed to.

Mr. MacNICOL: I would refer to paragraph (i), which reads:

(i) "disability" means the incapacity of a minor, a lunatic or an idiot.

And then "minor" is defined in paragraph (l). I object to the inclusion of "minor" with lunatics and idiots.

Mr. MARTIN: This simply means that a minor, a person who has not reached the age of twenty-one, cannot apply for citizenship. They can acquire it through the father or the mother.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does not paragraph (l) cover minor sufficiently?

Mr. MARTIN: That merely defines one of the groups who are classed as a disabled group.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not like that definition of the word "minor". We have just had a war in which young persons, eighteen, nineteen and twenty years of age have borne arms for this country, and yet under this bill they are disabled from becoming citizens of the country.

Mr. FULTON: If they have borne arms they are eligible.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is true of those who have already borne arms, but I was thinking of minors who in the future might be made liable to bear arms. It seems to me that persons who are liable to bear arms ought not to be put under a disability under this bill. That is the point I was making. In some provinces in Canada, in Saskatchewan and Alberta, persons may vote before they are twenty-one years of age, at eighteen years in Saskatchewan and nineteen in Alberta. Yet under this bill they are disabled.

Mr. MARTIN: This would not affect the act in Saskatchewan.

Mr. COLDWELL: I know it would not but I say that in this bill I do not like the inclusion of a minor, who is a person under twenty-one years of age, in the same class with lunatics or idiots. I do not like that at