

shades of opinion to make their discussion to the same effect, instead of discussing racial origins; it will serve a much better purpose. I hope in all earnestness for the good of the country that this will be done, and I hope the minister will be broad enough to accept the suggestion which will be supported by a majority of the members of parliament. It will be sent to the senate. Perhaps it will pass there; perhaps it will not. But the effect of getting together to find a formula will be an example of national unity to the people of Canada. How many times the people complain that nothing is done in the House of Commons. The other day my hon. friend the ex-leader of the opposition spoke of spiritual values. A clear enunciation in a limpid definition of "citizenship" will do more for national unity than one might suppose at first sight. The question has been considered seriously, I think, and I hope it will bear fruit.

Mr. McMASTER: This discussion has arisen, perhaps, unexpectedly. I would call the attention of the Secretary of State to the Statistics Act, chapter 190 of the revised statutes of Canada, in which provision is made for a census to be taken in June, 1931, and every tenth year thereafter. In section 19, provision is made as follows:

Each census of population and agriculture shall be so taken as to ascertain with the utmost possible accuracy for the various territorial divisions of Canada, or of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta as the case may be.

(a) their population and the classification thereof, as regards name, age, sex, conjugal condition, relation to head of household, nationality, race, education. . . .

So that the particular forms used by the census enumerators have the authority of statute. Again, I wish to say, because I have been opposed to this bill from the beginning as being unnecessary, that in the instructions given to the enumerators they were told that there was a Canadian citizenship. That is why I think this bill is not necessary to provide a Canadian citizenship—but for some other reason, which we shall probably discuss further.

Mr. CASE: A great deal of emphasis seems to be placed upon the census feature in relation to the bill. I take it that the object of Canadian citizenship is to seek to have Canadian citizens recognized under international law as Canadian citizens and to give them a greater sense of appreciation of their own country. I fail to see what objection there can be to declaring racial origin or national status. I look upon the census as a statistical record, and the more information it contains the better it will be for record

purposes. I do not see that the provision is objectionable from the point of view that is being emphasized here to-day. As a matter of fact, almost everyone, surely, must be proud of his racial origin, and it is declared with the object of having the record that much more complete.

Mr. REID: I should like to say a word on this matter; I am inspired to do so by the remarks made by the hon. member for High Park.

A great deal has been said this afternoon regarding races and racial origins. But let us consider what we are intending to do; let us keep in mind as well the people in this country; for it is advisable, to my way of thinking, that we should take note of this amendment and be careful about letting it go through. There are in this country some thirty-six different races. I suppose someone will say that all are of the same race because all came from Adam, but hon. members know what I mean when I say that there are in Canada people from thirty-six different countries, and I can see nothing wrong, nothing detrimental to the idea of Canadian citizenship, that a man from Japan or China or Scotland should be asked to state from what country he comes. As a matter of fact, when one speaks of racial prejudice what do we actually find in this country? We find people whose ancestors came from Scotland or England or Germany, two, four, or five generations back who are more proud of the lands of their forefathers than even I, who come from Scotland. It is a well known fact, and it need no longer be concealed, that Great Britain during the recent war wished to move in on the south of Ireland. Britain would have had possession of the south of Ireland but for one thing—the great numbers of people in the United States whose forefathers came from the south of Ireland. Every second policeman in New York is an Irishman, and the political influence of these people, the second, third and fourth generations of Irishmen in the United States, had more effect on policy relating to the south of Ireland than any other factor. Great Britain was afraid to move in and take charge of the south of Ireland, as she should have done, for the safety of the country, at that time.

Consider, too, what Great Britain does. Those of us who come from the British isles know that, whether we are Scottish, English, Northern Irish, or Welsh, the births of the children are not registered as British, but Scottish children are registered as Scots, English children as English, Irish children as Irish, and Welsh children as Welsh. Has that caused any great discord in the British