

Hon. Miss LAMARSH: I am informed that citizenship once was separate for a long time from immigration. Immigration recently was considered to be so closely allied to the manpower policy of the country that one could not do much in the ebb and flow of demand for labour if one could not control immigration. That part was added to the Labour Department to make the Manpower Department.

Citizenship, we felt is a very different kind of thing and should be separated so that more attention could be paid to it. We hope to do many things to improve the idea of citizenship in the minds of the people.

Senator POULIOT: In relation to the other matter, it is very difficult to discuss citizenship without speaking of immigration.

Hon. Miss LAMARSH: In the narrow sense, as to obtaining the grant of citizenship, that is so; but citizenship, as it presently is under the Secretary of State Department, means a lot more than the grant of citizenship. We hope to evolve programs of activity which will interest people in becoming good citizens, not just citizens.

Senator POULIOT: I believe that "citizenship" is not the right definition or description of our triple status. Canada is a Kingdom, we have a Queen, and the Queen cannot be the head of a republic. The word "citizen" applies mostly to those who live in a republic. For example, the Kennedys are American citizens. We never heard the word "citizen" applied to a British subject. We do not speak of British "citizens" but of British "subjects," by way of consideration for the Queen. My idea is that the appellation "Canadian citizen" is all wrong. We are Canadian subjects of the Queen of Canada. Does the minister agree with that?

The CHAIRMAN: Parliament has seen fit to name such people "citizens".

Senator POULIOT: The minister is a personal friend of mine and I have a great deal of sympathy for her. The Act has been wrongfully drafted from the start. We are not Canadian citizens; we are Canadian subjects of the Queen of Canada. Saying that we are Canadian citizens is an encouragement to separatism.

Hon. Miss LAMARSH: I am informed that in the United Kingdom they speak of "British citizenship". It is my recollection that they passed a regulation on immigration, using this model.

I recall seeing the sign over an airport door, on entry to the United Kingdom in the last two or three years, "U.K. Citizens" and next to it is a sign which says "others" through which all other British subjects may enter, as well as aliens.

Senator POULIOT: I was born a British subject, because there was no citizenship act at the time. Then, on account of the putting into force of the Canadian Citizenship Act, I became a Canadian citizen. Not only that, I became a citizen of the Commonwealth, too. I wonder how many Canadians know that they have that triple status—Canadian citizens, British subjects, and citizens of the Commonwealth.

The CHAIRMAN: You cannot have too much of a good thing, senator.

Senator POULIOT: That is a question of opinion. I have sympathy for the minister, being in charge of an act which is absurd.

Hon. Miss LAMARSH: This is not the first absurd thing I have been in charge of.

Senator MOLSON: I would like to come back to clause 9, dealing with the proposed new section 19. Why is it that the Governor in Council "may, in his discretion. . ."? Why is it not obligatory or automatic, if a person has obtained citizenship by false representation or fraud, or by these other conditions mentioned in the section there? Why would it not be better if it were automatic? Why the discretion?

Hon. Miss LAMARSH: I think fraud or misrepresentation might not be a very important thing in the public interest. It might be, as was the case of this Chinese who came into Canada, a matter of entry into Canada under a false name; but then the person might subsequently become a good individual, live in the country and behave as