

*Canadian Citizenship*

isles? I know there are those who would control one's even getting up to speak about racial origin, but have we no trust in the people? I come from a land where a man can stand on the street corner and talk about the churches, criticize the Roman Catholic church, denounce the Pope, talk about the Jews, or anything else under the sun, in full freedom. Does it arouse any animosity in the minds of the people of Great Britain? Where has there been fairer treatment for all nationalities than in Great Britain? Where has the Jew found surer rest for his feet and greater peace than in Great Britain? Yet you can go to the street corners or the parks and hear now, as for the last fifty years, people denouncing the Jews and talking against many other people; no one prevents them.

I am one of those who have faith in the people, and I am surprised at any member from British Columbia taking any other stand. Particularly I am surprised that the hon. member for Kamloops supports this amendment, in view of the stand he took regarding the Japanese. In my opinion there is no undue interference in the present procedure; we must have some guide or record regarding the thirty-six different peoples represented in this country.

Mr. MARTIN: I wish to rise for just one moment. The hon. member for Temiscouata raised the point which he discussed last night and since that time he has put a great deal of research on the matter. I would not want that research to go without some comment from me. He is to be commended for once again showing great industry, and the suggestions he has made will receive the fullest consideration at my hands. I want him to know that his words have been listened to with close attention and will receive further close study by me. Once again the hon. member has shown his capacity for deep research, and I commend him for it.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank the minister very much for his kind words, and I will say that the Prime Minister must be congratulated upon having appointed him to the cabinet at the same time as the Minister of Transport was appointed. Both of them are doing very well; and I shall have something finer to tell the minister if he accepts the suggestion of any member of the committee who will come with a good definition of "citizenship" to give a real backbone to the bill.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): An immigrant, on going to the United States, within twenty-four hours of landing can say with justifiable pride "I am an American". An

[Mr Reid.]

immigrant coming to this country has little chance to say, "I am a Canadian". That is going to stop and I hope that we shall all be known as Canadians. One of the most divisive forces we have is insistence on racial origin. I see no reason and no necessity for it at all. We are told that it is necessary for the purposes of the census. I doubt that. I have friends in western Canada who are of the third or fourth generation and who are still, as far as the census is concerned, referred to as Germans, Ukrainians, Scots and so on. They are Canadians. The steady insistence by governments as well as by business on this aspect of racial origin is, I think, detrimental to what we wish to see prevail in Canada, namely, genuine unity. I hope the minister will accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Lake Centre and add the three words "or racial origin" to this clause.

Mr. RICHARD (Gloucester): Is this discussion really necessary? Must we on this section go into the question of national status or racial origin? It seems to me that the section as it reads is clear enough. A man is asked what his national status is and he must state whether he is a Canadian citizen or not. It has no reference to racial origin. If there are other acts or regulations under which a man is asked what his racial origin is and he replies "Canadian citizen" he is not complying with that particular act or regulation. He is not answering the question there asked. That is all. As the section stands, it serves a purpose. A man in Canada is asked whether he is a Canadian subject; he is asked about his national status, and he need not go into the question of racial origin, because if he does so he is going into another sphere altogether. The clause should remain as it stands.

As to differentiating between racial origins, I am proud to be a Canadian citizen, but I am also proud to be of French origin, and I do not think we should drop that distinction altogether. For certain purposes we should retain it. There is no reason why, for the purposes of the census, our population should not be divided according to racial origin. I do not think there is any harm in that, nor do I believe it makes a man less a Canadian citizen simply because we divide the population according to racial origin purely for purposes of the census. I do not think the bill needs any amendment in that regard because the section is quite clear. For other purposes, so far as other acts are concerned, people can be guided by the provisions therein set out.

Amendment (Mr. Diefenbaker) negatived on division.

Section agreed to.