

would have wished to answer that they were Canadian citizens. Racial lineage, after all, was something not at all germane to the purpose of the national registration at that time. It seems to me to indicate the necessity for some broadening of the provisions of the section. If we are to confine the scope of the section simply to national status in a narrow sense, we shall not give to the term "Canadian citizen" its full significance. One can think also of questions arising in connection with the census. There has been undue emphasis, it seems to me, in the questions put to residents of Canada, on racial lineage. There may be good reasons from a statistical or other point of view why racial lineage should be given as an answer to a question in connection with the census. But as this section stands it is too narrow in its scope. We are giving too narrow a significance to the term "Canadian citizen" and to the status of Canadian citizenship if we confine the section to questions of national status as applied to any individual resident in Canada. There is need for broadening the scope of the section or for introduction into the bill of some definition of national status which will give a more appropriate signification than ordinarily attaches to the term.

Mr. LALONDE: I have no objection to the amendment proposed, but my contention was that in our parliamentary language "may" and "must" have the same meaning. I have every respect for the opinion quoted by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, and I am sorry that I have not before me the opinions of the high legal authorities cited by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe at the time of the discussion I mentioned. But if the Secretary of State has no objection to making the change proposed, I shall not take up any more of the time of the committee.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: I remember very well the discussion to which the hon. member for Labelle has referred. When private individuals are enjoined by the word "may", it is permissive but as applied to the governor in council, or a department or an official of government, whether provincial or federal, "may" is not permissive but obligatory. On the basis of Maxwell and the interpretations referred to by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, "may" is always permissive when it refers to the individual.

With regard to the matter referred to by the hon. member for Eglinton, I should like to ascertain from the minister how he defines "national status" under this section, what definition the draftsman had in mind. "Status" might be legal condition, or legal position—

these are the only definitions I can think of at the moment, but no doubt the Secretary of State will be able to give us the last word in the interpretation of this expression.... [If I understand it aright it does not cover the situation which arises from the census. Under the census—I have the forms here—every person, regardless of the number of generations he and his forbears have been in this country, is required to set out, first, his nationality or citizenship, and second, his racial origin. The hon. member for Eglinton says he thinks that to ask for racial origin for census purposes may have some value. But I cannot see it; because according to instructions given by the appropriate officers during the last census, if a woman of French origin marries a man of English origin she thereupon ceases to register as of French origin and becomes of English origin. I have the instructions here. If we are able to change our racial origin by the simple expedient of marriage, the statistics become valueless. As a matter of fact we have carried this question of racial origin so far that, if the Duke of Windsor had been in Canada when the last census took place and had had domicile by reason of his ranch in Alberta, he would have been required to register as a German in Canada while he would be English in the United Kingdom. A person coming back to Canada, regardless of the number of generations his people have been in this country, is required to register his paternal ancestry with the immigration authorities upon entering the dominion. Most hospitals in Canada require a person, on entering the hospital, first to give his citizenship and then his racial origin, as though there would be a difference in treatment according to his racial origin. In the United States that has been done away with, except as to colour or race. Racial origin is asked for only of a person who has been naturalized. "Race" is asked for as signifying the white race or the various coloured races; otherwise no information in regard to race is required.]

[If we allow this section to remain as it is, using the words "national status," the census authorities will be able to ask at the next census a question on racial origin, I suggest that, in order to clarify this matter once and for all, there be added to the words "national origin," the words "or racial origin." In other words, any person required to declare his national status or racial origin will be able to answer except so far as colour is concerned, or so far as naturalized citizens are concerned, by describing himself as "Canadian citizen". If this amendment were accepted it would clarify the section, and the amendment of the