

they gave was a very cogent one. I think it quite unrealistic to suggest, as someone did, that while you may be born with a colour which you cannot throw off, you cannot always change your religion.

The real truth is that we are talking about groups. Group life has as much inertia about it, in religious terms, as it has in any other terms. One does not think of groups forsaking the whole religious identification with any degree of, say, voluntariness, as a real of social fact. It does not happen that way. But identification happens that way. The real source of the trouble is in identification, not in removal of identification, of particular groups. If one is speaking about legislation for identifiable groups, then there are groups which may be identifiable in religious terms, and the Jewish group is one of those which, for historical reasons, has mixed sociological attributes. There is its ethnic tradition, its religious tradition—as the Congress brief points out, (they are authorities in these matters and I am only a layman)—but I would assume that the most profound stream of identification of all is the original religious stream of identification, even though the association with religion by individual members of the Jewish community may be nominal. The historical impetus, the historical pattern, the fund of ideas, tends to be an original religious fund and these are the bases of the original historical patterns, which really have defined the story of Jews, as a particular segment of the human community, for the last two thousand years.

The Chairman: May I say at this point that I hope everyone realizes that, when I explained why religion had been left out, I was not expressing a personal opinion.

Hon. Senators: That is so.

The Chairman: I was merely passing on the explanation given to me by the people who drew the bill.

Senator Choquette: Which we agree is lame.

Dean Cohen: I think it would increase my sense of confidence in the correctness of the legislation if the word "religion" were restored. There was a grave sense of disquiet in the United Kingdom when that word was left out. There is no doubt that the pressure to return the word "religion" to the definition there is very strong indeed, and for a very good reason, for without the word it does not cover the problem.

Mr. Hopkins: Do they not use the word "creed"?

Dean Cohen: Yes. The suggestion was made that they had "creed", "colour", "national origin". They have kept "national origin" in the United Kingdom, and I notice that in our bill we had three things left out—language, national origin, and religion.

You have not asked me, sir, what I think of the other two.

The Chairman: I was about to ask you that.

Dean Cohen: The argument we had in committee was a very severe one over the question of language. In the peculiar Canadian context "ethnic groups" in this country have a rather significant political role at the moment. When one thinks of the French- and the English-speaking dialogue, what would these do if you had the definition "language"? What would it do to the classic Canadian debate between the French- and the English-speaking Canadians?

The Chairman: It may keep it in polite language.

Dean Cohen: We had two very distinguished members of the committee, the Honourable Mr. Trudeau and the Rev. Abbé Dion, and they are signatories to this report. They had no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the definition would be better with these phrases in there. So that, to use the chairman's quite proper observation, it would get rid of some of the older inclination to be rougher than a decent democratic society really should tolerate—in the story of attacks that language groups have made on each other at one time or another in the life of Canada.

I would, however, say, in all frankness, that if I took a priority of the things that are important in this definition, I would say that, in worrying about these three phrases left out—national origin, language, religion—by far the most important one to put back in would be "religion".

The other two—"national origin" and "language"—do not have quite the role to play in protecting really vulnerable segments of the community that "religion" does.

Religion really protects some of the very vulnerable minorities. To be very blunt about it, such a large part of the Jewish community self-image is a religious self-image, that you can hardly have this legislation bear on them without the word "religion" in the definition.