

the citizenship act of the United States to give us the benefit of some of their experiences, and we also profited by the experience of others in other parts of the commonwealth. While I have no right to say what the United States will do by way of its laws, I have every assurance that our wishes in this matter will hereafter be fully respected.

Mr. McMASTER: I have often heard politicians on the hustings make statements which they do not believe to be true and do not intend to abide by, but when it comes to enacting law, surely we must mean what we say. If the bill is amended as suggested, this might result. A man comes, say from Poland, and after four years of intensive education, which the learned Secretary of State has said he will get, he has learned enough English and enough about our laws to become a Canadian citizen. How can he say that his racial origin is Canadian, seeing that he is only a naturalized Canadian citizen anyway? We should not say something which even an act of parliament cannot make true.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman has expressed what I should have stated. It is a fuller answer than I gave to the member for Lake Centre. I agree with much that he says.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not think it is any kind of answer, with due respect to both hon. gentlemen. There is no difference to-day in national status in this country by reason of this legislation. That was stated by the Secretary of State. People who were Canadian citizens before this bill was introduced are still Canadian citizens. Canadian citizen was accepted as a description of Canadians before this bill was introduced.

Mr. MARTIN: Only for a limited purpose.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: For what limited purpose?

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman was not here last night.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I read what the minister said.

Mr. MARTIN: Section 2 of the immigration act did define citizenship for a limited group of persons. Citizenship under the immigration act was a definition of citizenship for those who came to Canada from outside. This bill goes beyond that and touches people who were born here, and British subjects who have acquired domicile here and will become citizens automatically on the passing of the bill. It covers a whole series of individuals who are not affected by section 2 of the immigration act.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I fully realize that. A Canadian nationality was accepted by departments of government. You could register as a Canadian when you enlisted in the army, provided you were born in this country. Does the minister negative that suggestion? I see him bowing his head in a way which indicates that he does not agree.

Mr. MARTIN: Do you object to my bowing my head?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: After last night's experience and after reading *Hansard* it is difficult to know whether the minister wants any suggestions or wants any help in connection with the bill. I read what he said last night and it did not indicate that cooperation which he asked the house to give him in putting through the measure.

Mr. POULIOT: He thanked me for what I did for him.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Oh, well; I read the hon. gentleman's contribution—

Mr. POULIOT: I did very little, and he appreciated it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Has the minister had any conversations with those in charge of the census which would indicate that from now on they will not ask native-born Canadians their racial origin at the time of registration? Because unless that assurance is given, this section is meaningless and the hopes of many people across the country as to what will result from the passing of the measure will be denied. If the minister has the assurance that that is going to follow, I do not care whether it says national status or what it says. If however he has not that assurance, then we shall be placing before the people of the country a bill translated into law which will lead them to believe that there will be a new citizenship without regard to racial origin, while at the same time retaining the one thing that has caused more difficulty than any other in attaining Canadian unity. The minister waved aside the suggestion when I raised it at first and said that it had been answered by the hon. member for High Park. I do not think it was answered. The minister is being praised across the country for doing away with a condition which holds back unity in Canada, and now when an opportunity is given to clarify the situation, since there is no definition of national status, he says: I cannot accept that at all, because apparently it would be going too far. My hon. friend mentioned the question of race a while ago. That is what I have in mind. If under the census the question of race is asked, as in the