

That does not alter the circumstances at all.

Mr. FLEMING: It broadens it.

Mr. DIFENBAKER: Yes, as the hon. member for Eglinton points out, it actually broadens it, because it makes it more general, and does not restrict it to an act of parliament or an order or a regulation. It covers every possible contingency.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, all this discussion reminds me of the German theories respecting the Aryan race, which they say is superior to all other races. What do we care about the race of a man if he is a good citizen? A man may be born of parents who are in gaol, and still be an excellent citizen. He may suffer because of his parentage, but still be a good citizen—not always, of course, because there are some cases of heredity. But we must consider this matter from a different point of view, because we are supposed to show a democratic spirit. Here we are discussing this matter along exactly the same lines as were followed by Hitler's general staff, when they were organizing Hitler Germany.

There are some races to whom people in some parts of Canada object. Some of the people in British Columbia do not like the Japanese, and this is a controversial question in that part of Canada. In eastern Canada some other people are not interested in living with people from continental Europe. That, too, is a controversial matter. I am wondering if the best possible way to find new citizens would not be to consider their turn of mind, their disposition or inclination to help us make something out of this country. To my mind this is a vital and crucial point, although I respect the views of those who have discussed the matter of racial origin.

I would refer to my hon. friend from Vegreville, who is not of British or of French stock. But he is proud of his race, and his nationality is Canadian—period. He is a good Canadian, and the type of desirable citizen we need in this country. He is not the only one; there are many others. I wonder if he has any objection to the discussions of racial origin which inevitably result in discrimination. And those discussions of racial issues are carried on by whom? It is done by the master race, which has the privilege of telling all other races, "You do not belong to our master race." That is the German attitude. It can be said in English; it can be said in French; it can be said in Ukrainian; it can be said in Russian—it can be said in any other language. But as a democrat I do not care for it. I believe the time spent in discussing anyone's racial merits is lost time.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

The best speech made in this debate was made by the hon. member for Saskatoon City, when he discussed the intermingling and mixing of races. I have been in Europe, and have known many people in England. There were a very few who thought that at the time of the coronation their only equals were the bombastic Germans. Blomberg was there, with his big chest, and was considered their equal by some of the English. But that was not the mentality or the opinion of the majority of the English people who were there. There is however a group of individuals who recognize the master race. There is a German point of view and there is an English point of view in some heads in England—and unfortunately in some heads in Canada, too.

This, precisely, is the main obstacle to national unity—the attitude of superiority on the part of men who think they are better than others, or who think that because they were born of certain parentage they are of better stock. This reminds me of the foolishness of the English clergyman who, writing a genealogy of the present king, stated that King David was his ancestor, and that he was a cousin of our Lord. This was distributed at the time of the coronation, and I believe all hon. members who were there received a copy of it. Well, that may be so; but we are now in the twentieth century, and far from King David. We have to live with our contemporaries and we must make the best of it. Opinions are free, and of course matters connected with racial origin may be discussed. All hon. members have the same rights, and they may enter into the discussion if they wish. But I find that the basis of that discussion is wrong, and that it is dangerous and explosive. It will create animosity throughout the country. When one man says, "I am a big man and you are a little man," conditions are not good. If he is a big man because he belongs to a certain race, and the other fellow, who in fact may be greater than he is, is a minor fellow because he belongs to another race, then we have friction and trouble which may end in civil war. Very often such things are not said here in the house but they are written in papers which are circulated among the ignorant in an effort to create prejudices.

This sort of thing is seldom done in the old country. Even the leaders of the Orangemen, whom I have known and who were members of this parliament, would not do this sort of thing. One of these men whom I knew intimately wrote me a letter in French in his own handwriting. I knew him very well and I was about to convert him. Neither of them ever quoted in this house anything