

sovereign, such as a monarch. This is our case. Therefore, being loyal to my oath of allegiance to Her Majesty, I believe that the Canadian Citizenship Act should be changed and that in future Canadians should be called Canadian subjects of Her Majesty. Since the Statute of Westminster was passed, we hear so much about states like Canada and Australia being independent—in the Commonwealth, naturally—that I do not see why the time has not come for Canadians to be described as Canadian subjects of Her Majesty the Queen instead of British subjects and Canadian citizens.

At present we do not know what we are. A Canadian citizen, according to Section 21 of the Canadian Citizenship Act, is a British subject. Then, Section 23 reads:

23. (1) Every person who, under an enactment of a country listed in the First Schedule, is a citizen of that country, has in Canada the status of a British subject.

(2) Every person having in Canada the status of a British subject may be known as a British subject or as a Commonwealth citizen; and in this Act and in any other enactment or instrument, the expression "British subject" and the expression "Commonwealth citizen" have the same meaning.

Therefore, each one of us is at the same time a Canadian citizen, a British subject, and a citizen of the Commonwealth. What are the parts of the Commonwealth which are referred to in subsection (1) of Section 23? They are Australia, Canada, Ceylon, India, New Zealand, Pakistan, Southern Rhodesia, The Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom. And then in small type, as a footnote to the First Schedule, I read:

Under authority of s. 34 (2) (a) Ghana, the Federation of Malaya and the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland have been proclaimed to be countries of the British Commonwealth for the purpose of this Act.

What I cannot understand is that all those people enjoy public rights in Canada. No one could complain that they, and even aliens, enjoy private rights in this country. The usual rights that are recognized all over the world are rights to buy and sell, and to own property, but those private rights are not in question. However, when it comes to public rights it is a different proposition. My contention is that no one who comes from Pakistan, Australia, Ceylon, or anywhere else, and who has not been in this country for five years should be qualified to vote with residence here of two or three months. I do not find that just.

He may call himself a British subject, he may be a British subject, but I do not see why he should have the right to be nominated as a candidate in an election or to vote for a candidate who runs for public office in this country. The act should make a distinction between private and public rights, and that would make it much easier to understand.

At the present time I challenge anyone to give a clear answer to some questions about citizenship. We are not in the United States; we are not in the British Isles. We are in the realm of Canada, and our Sovereign happens at this time to be the Sovereign of the British Isles, and when I took the oath of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth II it was to her in her capacity as Queen of Canada. My contention is that we have all done the same implicitly.

This leads me to another matter which has been controversial to a certain extent but about which no decision has been made by the Government. I refer to a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which reads:

As another means of making manifest the Canadian identity, my Government will invite the provinces to a conference for consultation regarding the choice of a national flag and other national symbols.

My suggestion, honourable colleagues, is that a flag, a national flag, a distinctive flag, should give to all people who see it the knowledge that it represents Canada. When you see a distinctive Canadian flag you must think of Canada just as the Americans think of the United States when they see the Stars and Stripes, and as the French think of France when they see the Tricolour, and as the British think of Great Britain when they see the Union Jack.

At the present time, until the Citizenship Act is amended, we are not ready to recognize the fact that we are Canadian subjects of Her Majesty, and it will be useless to discuss a Canadian flag between ourselves. Look, for instance, at all the triangular flags there are. You know, I presume, what a triangular flag represents. According to the rules of heraldry it represents the illegitimate branch of a family. If we were to have a flag with two triangles, one red representing the English-speaking Canadians, and one white representing the French-speaking Canadians, would that mean that both English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians belonged to illegitimate branches of the great Canadian family? That is not very flattering.

I do not see how by prodigy of imagination one could attribute a colour to a race. By that I mean white or red to represent and designate the French or the English.