

“Anglo-Conformity”: Assimilation Policy in Canada, 1890s–1950s¹

Abstract

In the late nineteenth century Canada started to receive large waves of non-British migrants for the very first time in its history. These new settlers arrived in a country that saw itself very much as a British society. English-speaking Canadians considered themselves a core part of a worldwide British race. French Canadians, however, were obviously excluded from this ethnic identity. The maintenance of the country as a white society was also an integral part of English-speaking Canada's national identity. Thus, white non-British migrants were required to assimilate into this English-speaking Canadian or Anglocentric society without delay. But in the early 1950s the British identity of English-speaking Canada began to decline ever so slowly. The first steps toward the gradual breakdown of the White Canada policy also occurred at this time. This had a corresponding weakening effect on the assimilation policy adopted toward non-British migrants, which was based on Anglo-conformity.

Résumé

À la fin du 19^e siècle, pour la première fois de son histoire, le Canada commençait à accueillir des vagues importantes d'immigrants non britanniques. Ces nouveaux arrivants entraient dans un pays qui se percevait en grande partie comme une société britannique. Les anglophones canadiens se considéraient en effet comme une composante centrale de la « race » britannique mondiale. Les francophones, en revanche, étaient de toute évidence exclus de cette identité ethnique. Par ailleurs, une autre composante essentielle de l'identité nationale canadienne anglophone était la pérennité du pays en tant que société blanche. Les immigrants blancs non britanniques étaient donc tenus de s'assimiler sans délai à la société anglophone anglocentrique. Mais dans les années 1950, l'identité britannique des anglophones du Canada a commencé à s'effriter lentement. La politique du « White Canada » a aussi commencé à se fissurer à ce moment-là, et cela a affaibli conséquemment la politique d'assimilation reposant sur « l'angloconformité » adoptée envers les immigrants non britanniques.

Heidi Bohaker and Franca Iacovetta (2009) have explored citizenship policy in Canada in the twentieth century. However, their study focuses on the 1940s and 1960s. In contrast, I will examine the period from the 1890s to the 1950s. This longer period will enable citizenship policy to be put in a broader historical context; this context relates to English-speaking Canadian identity being based on Britishness and whiteness. Furthermore, Bohaker and Iacovetta compare

citizenship policy toward both indigenous people and migrants, whereas I will concentrate on migrants alone. This is mainly because, in terms of official policy, governments treated Aboriginal and ethnic groups separately, even though policies adopted toward them might have had similar names, such as assimilation.

Britishness, the French Canadians, and Whiteness during the 1890s and 1940s

The predominantly French-speaking province of Quebec complicated the British national identity of Canada. The French-Canadian attitude toward British race patriotism was ambiguous. They could not embrace it because it did not apply to them, and by definition they were excluded from it. Furthermore, they had their own “pre-national” identity centred in the province of Quebec, which was based on the Roman Catholic Church and a French tradition inherited from the *ancien régime*. English-speaking Canada’s pre-national identity was based on patriotism—love of the land.

Nevertheless, in the late nineteenth century and for most of the twentieth century, the majority of English-speaking Canadians regarded Canada as a “British” nation and asserted that its culture and society, and its legal and political institutions, could be appreciated only within the context of its lengthy past as a British settlement. In their eyes, Canada was the largest and most important dominion and formed an integral part of the British world. Although they celebrated their own relationship to the land and their own experience, English-speaking Canadians did not question the basic premise that in some way Canada was a “British country” (Buckner and Francis 2006, 1, 6–7).

This powerful identification with Britishness took several forms and was manifest in school textbooks, cultural traditions, and, of course, the celebration of Empire Day, itself a Canadian creation. Speaking on Empire Day 1909, Governor General Lord Earl Grey gave expression to a deeply inscribed set of beliefs about Canada’s membership of the wider British world:

Empire Day is the festival on which every British subject should reverently remember that the British Empire stands out before the whole world as the fearless champion of freedom, fair play and equal rights; that its watchwords are responsibility, duty, sympathy and self-sacrifice; and that a special responsibility rests with you individually to be true to the traditions and to the mission of your race. (*Toronto Globe*, 22 May 1909, quoted in Francis 1997, 66)

Empire Day was an organized celebration of Britishness, introduced as a means by which to encourage nationalism among schoolchildren. The concept originated with Clementine Fessenden, a Hamilton clubwoman, who contacted

the Ontario minister of education, George Ross, in 1897, recommending that a special day in the school year be set aside to enable students to participate in organized displays of devotion to Queen and country. As a result of the growth in popular support for this idea, Ross introduced Empire Day in Ontario on 23 May 1899. The date chosen was the last school day before the 24 May holiday for Queen Victoria’s birthday, known as Victoria Day.² Empire Day soon became a national celebration, however, as support for it spread throughout English-speaking Canadian homes (Francis 1997, 65).

Canadians gave powerful voice to this British identity through the songs that were sung on these occasions. “The Maple Leaf Forever” was penned by a Toronto schoolteacher, Alexander Muir, on the occasion of Confederation in 1867; it wove the story of Canada into a larger narrative of imperial expansion:

In days of yore, from Britain’s shore,
Wolfe the dauntless hero came,
And planned firm Old England’s flag,
On Canada’s fair domain!
Here may it wave our boast, our pride,
And joined in love together,
The Thistle, Shamrock, Rose entwine,
The Maple Leaf forever! (quoted in Francis 1997, 66)

It showed that Empire Day was an unapologetic display of the freedom of the British race, a day on which English-speaking Canadians basked in their inclusion in the greatest empire the world had ever seen (Francis 1997, 66).

The French-Canadians, however, adopted an extremely ambivalent position toward the identification of Canada as an integral part of a wider British world. Kenneth McRoberts argues,

From the beginning, English-speakers and French-speakers have seen Canada in fundamentally different ways . . . At the time of Confederation, most anglophones (English-speaking [Canadians]) saw themselves as members of a British nationality that transcended the boundaries of the new Dominion, whereas most francophones (French-speaking [Canadians]) identified with a *canadien* nationality that fell considerably short of these boundaries. (1997, 2)

Along with Britishness, a White Canada policy was also an integral part of English-speaking Canadian national identity. This emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century. Though whiteness was primarily centred on the West Coast province of British Columbia, its importance lies in demonstrating that English-speaking Canada at this time saw itself as not only British but also

white. That is the extent to which it identified with the white empire. The British Columbian government as well as its representatives in Ottawa were quite successful in persuading the federal government to enact restrictive immigration legislation, which excluded Asian immigration. One of the earliest examples of this was a “Gentleman’s Agreement” with Japan in 1907. The main features of the agreement were that Japan would on its own initiative limit emigration and allow only previous residents, domestic help employed by the Japanese, and contract labourers approved by the Canadian government to depart for Canada. The latter two types of immigrants were restricted to 400 yearly. Furthermore, in early 1908 all migrants to Canada were banned from entering the country unless they arrived from the nation of their citizenship or birth by “a continuous journey and on through tickets” (Ward 2002, 75) obtained in their home country. While the measure was applicable to all migrants to Canada in theory, in practice it was directed solely at East Indians and Japanese who came from Hawaii. As there was no straight steamship route from India, practically all Indian migration was hence ended (Ward 2002, 76).

The legislation was based on the long-standing belief that cheap Asian labour was “unfair” and built on the understanding that Asians could not assimilate to white Canadian society (Roy 1989, 230). As British Columbian premier Richard McBride declared to the provincial Conservative convention in 1909, “We stand for a white British Columbia, a white land, and a white Empire” (*News-Advertiser*, 14 December 1909, quoted in Roy 1989, 230; see also Roy 2012). According to Patricia Roy, “Few British Columbians doubted the ‘right’ of white men to ‘dominate the destiny of this country.’ . . . The question, according to H.H. Stevens, the Conservative M.P. for Vancouver (1911–30), was no longer merely a matter of protecting ‘the white workmen from cheap Oriental labour, but it was a question of the future of Canada as a nation’” (1989, 231).

Fear of the foreigner was one thing. But it was at times of national crisis, particularly when war came, that these wider British loyalties came especially to the fore. Canada’s involvement in the South African War of 1899–1902 is a prime illustration of the strength of Britishness in English-speaking Canada at this time. Though some English-speaking Canadians were reluctant at first to send troops to fight in South Africa despite the justness of the war, any resistance dissipated quickly after the Canadian volunteers set off for that country. The Canadian people also demonstrated their commitment to the imperial war effort through their financial support. The government allocated \$2,000,000 for sending the first and second contingents to South Africa, where they were then the responsibility of the imperial government, but most provinces and local governments also sent generous bonuses to the soldiers. From mid-July 1900, a constant stream of wounded soldiers arrived back in

Canada. Even one soldier would be met by the local militia, a band, and nearly the whole population of their local community (Buckner 2002, 238–39).

Within the country, English-speaking Canadian and French-Canadian identities came into constant conflict. First, as mentioned above, at the start of the century the British government requested Canadian troops for the South African War. English-speaking Canadians were supportive, while French Canadians were vociferously against this, fearful of being sucked into a far-off imperial conflict. Second, as a result of British pressure, Liberal Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier established a small Canadian navy in 1910. English-speaking Canadian Conservative politicians criticized it as being too small, while French-Canadian nationalists considered it a perilous action that would make involvement in imperial conflicts unavoidable (McRoberts 1997, 19; see also Coates 2008; Kennedy 2013).

Most importantly, however, during the First World War the federal Conservative ministry of Robert Borden announced its intention to introduce conscription for overseas service, precipitating a swarm of protest in Quebec. During the parliamentary conscription debates French-Canadian members of parliament (MPs), the vast majority belonging to the Liberal Party, expressed their opposition to the measure. Their position illustrated French Canadians' exclusion from British race patriotism, and in direct contrast English-speaking Canadians on the whole expressed strong support for conscription. In mid-1917 Charles Marcil through his opposition to the measure demonstrated the strong patriotism French Canadians felt toward the country:

I was born in the province of Quebec . . . My ancestors came here nearly three centuries ago, and I hope to die and be buried on Canadian soil . . . I belong to this country and am faithful and loyal to it, and since the outbreak of war I have done everything it was possible for me to do in company with ministers of the Crown and others to stimulate recruiting and bring about the effort which I think Canada should make in the great contest before us.³

Rodolphe Lemieux built on this and pointed out that the UK had accepted that Canada was under no legal obligation to take part in any conflict outside its own borders, although he was glad that she had joined the Allies:

On this grave issue I stand upon the bedrock of our constitution, and I claim that England has accepted the Canadian contention that there is no constitutional obligation upon us to take part in wars outside of Canada, except for the defence of our territory . . . I am proud to say that we have taken part in this stupendous struggle for liberty, but it is on the principle of the voluntary system, and it is on that principle that I, as a Canadian, desire that Canada shall continue to the end to be with the Allies.⁴

Therefore, Lemieux was not opposed to Canada's involvement in the war as such, but he was adamant that this contribution should be based on the voluntary enlistment of its people, not their conscription. Lemieux along with Marcell argued that if the Conservative government wanted to introduce conscription for military service, then it should first secure the support of the people in a referendum. Lemieux maintained that if this took place and the majority of Canadians were supportive of it, then the people of his province of Quebec, of whom the vast majority were opposed, would respect the will of the majority and fall into line.⁵

The Liberal French-Canadian parliamentarians were so insistent about the need for a referendum primarily because the government had previously unambiguously promised it would not introduce conscription, a point reinforced by Ernest Lapointe: "This proposal," he fumed, "is a flagrant and direct violation of all the pledges given by the leaders and public men of this country to the Canadian people since the beginning of the war, upon the strength of which pledges so many sacrifices have been made."⁶

However, the government ignored the pressure and introduced the *Canadian Military Service Act* in 1917. Once that occurred, the majority of English-speaking Canadians were supportive. But attitudes continued to divide along ethnic lines, with nearly all opposition to the issue coming from French-speaking Canada. In the federal election called after the introduction of conscription, Borden gained only three seats in Quebec.

The importance of maintaining Canada as a white country continued in the 1920s. The level of anti-Japanese and broader anti-Asian feeling in British Columbia was on show at a public meeting in Penticton, British Columbia. The title of the meeting was "Keep Penticton White." The meeting was advertised as being aimed at considering "ways and means of making our town unattractive for the Yellow man" ("Notice of meeting, Penticton, 1920," quoted in [Ward 2002](#), 125). It was a clear case of grassroots action to preserve Canada's whiteness.

Provincial politicians picked up on this anti-Asian feeling and did everything within their power to preserve a white British Columbia. One of the most prominent figures was A.M. Manson, the attorney general and minister of labour. He argued vociferously for the exclusion of Asian migrants during the spring and summer of 1922 ([Ward 2002](#), 130–31).

By the early 1920s provincial efforts toward racial exclusion had largely been exhausted. Attention therefore now turned to Ottawa and the federal government. British Columbian federal MPs such as Conservative H.H. Stevens and Unionist W.G. McQuarrie were particularly instrumental in this regard. These politicians found allies in the senior levels of the federal Department of Immigration and Colonization who recognized that the current

restrictive immigration legislation had in certain ways failed. The Chinese Head Tax⁷ in particular had not reduced immigration to the extent desired. Thus, pressure from the British Columbian provincial government, combined with that of its federal MPs, encouraged the department to put its weight behind calls for more extensive legislation restricting Chinese immigration. Hence, in 1923 the *Chinese Immigration Act* was passed, which effectively ended Chinese migration to Canada. Nonetheless, despite achieving the much-desired aim of Chinese exclusion, white nativists in British Columbia were not content, as the problem of Japanese immigration still remained (Ward 2002, 131–32, 134).

The nativists carried on arguing their case through the mid-1920s, even though the hostility toward Japanese migration declined in British Columbia. Provincial MPs were most assertive in the cause on this front; prominent among them was independent A.W. Neill. The Mackenzie King government for its part, considerate of this lobbying and largely supportive of its goals, resumed negotiations with Japan on the issue of immigration in April 1925. The Japanese government in a revised “Gentleman’s Agreement” in late May 1928 agreed to restrict the number of immigrants headed for Canada to 150 per year and also to end the movement of picture brides (Ward 2002, 138).

During the Second World War, conflicting English-speaking Canadian and French-Canadian ideas of national identity led to another embittered conflict over conscription for overseas military service. As a 1942 nationwide referendum unequivocally demonstrated, anglophones were strongly supportive, while francophones were against; the latter argued that they had no responsibility to fight Britain’s wars (McRoberts 1997, 24).

The conscription issue in the Second World War and the loss of Quebec’s autonomy as a result of a federal government which was intent on greater centralization led to the rise of the Bloc Populaire Canadien in 1942.⁸ Though the Bloc achieved very little political success, it laid the foundations for what would later emerge as French-Canadian neo-nationalism. The Bloc’s policies actually originated from the Action Libérale Nationale of the 1930s. Maxime Raymond, MP for Beauharnois-Laprairie from 1925 and a passionate anti-imperialist in the Bourassa tradition,⁹ declared on 9 September 1942 the establishment of a new political movement that would contest the traditional parties at the federal as well as the provincial levels (Behiels 2002, 443–44).

English-speaking Canada’s identification as an integral part of a wider British world continued into the immediate post-Second World War period. The dominance of this British myth in all aspects of English-speaking Canadian society is shown in newspapers, parliamentary debates, and political speeches (see Igartua 2006). Perhaps the best expression of this idea can be found in the debates surrounding the adoption of the *Canadian Citizenship Act* of 1946.

These debates also highlight the problems associated with Britishness as a national idea in Canada, particularly in relation to French Canadians.

In introducing the Citizenship Bill in early 1946, Paul Martin, the secretary of state for Canada, argued that one of the key motivations behind the legislation was to produce a common denominator for all of the population in the country that would help to unite them as Canadians.¹⁰ In his second reading speech in April 1946, he asserted that the legislation would strengthen Canadian nationhood: "This measure parallels the development of Canada as a nation . . . The bill arises from the fact of pride, common pride, in the achievements of our country, based upon the great exploits of our people . . . I would suggest that it symbolises our aspirations as a nation for the future."¹¹ Canada's prominent role in the Second World War was certainly an important factor in the introduction of the Citizenship Bill. The fact that at the end of the war it had the third largest navy in the world, combined with the industrial and financial contribution it had made to the Allies' victory, gave it a greater sense of confidence.¹²

However, Martin also made clear that the proposed citizenship legislation would still incorporate Canadians' status as British subjects:

Sections 26 and 28 are complementary and provide for the continuation of the common status of British subjects that has always prevailed through the commonwealth. Another provision provides that Canadian citizens are British subjects, while another provision provides that subjects or citizens of another part of the commonwealth, who are considered to be British subjects under the law of that part, shall be recognised as British subjects in Canada.¹³

So, although Martin had emphasized the importance of the new Citizenship Bill in terms of nationhood, he still had to acknowledge the prevalence of Britishness in Canada and the importance for many Canadians of maintaining links to the "mother country."

Though supportive of the general principle behind the new Citizenship Bill, future Progressive Conservative¹⁴ prime minister John Diefenbaker, who would also emerge as one of the greatest exponents of Britishness in Canada in the late 1950s, was heavily critical of the provisions that British subjects from other parts of the empire would have to follow the same naturalization procedures as non-British migrants:

I ask the minister to explain why at this time when we in all parts of the empire are desirous in the interests of our own security to bind still closer the various parts of the empire together, should a British subject coming into Canada and properly entering this country under our immigration

law be required to go through the same formalities as persons coming from other parts of the world?¹⁵

He believed it would strike at the unity of citizenship in the empire. Diefenbaker also emphasized the importance of the Canadian action. It would lead to British subjects under a common king and with a common loyalty being required, when arriving in Canada, to go through the same processes as those coming from foreign countries.¹⁶ These processes involved residency requirements, a declaration of intention to apply for citizenship, and an appearance before a magistrate to actually gain citizenship.

In contrast to Diefenbaker, a Progressive Conservative backbencher, Thomas L. Church, rejected the bill outright: “I believe it has been asked for by only a few people, almost all of whom are from one province (a veiled reference to Quebec) . . . In my view this measure represents a notice to the mother country, that we do not want any more of them over here, that we have a ‘to let’ sign out, so far as they are concerned.”¹⁷ He argued that the bill indicated a great lack of appreciation of the value of British citizenship and that being a Canadian and being a British subject were the same thing.¹⁸ Church, like Diefenbaker, was strongly opposed to the provisions regarding the naturalization of British subjects coming from other parts of the empire. He took the strong view that the measure was “one of the most untimely, un-needed, mischievous bills introduced into this parliament for a long time . . . It is separatism *in excelsis*.”¹⁹ As a result of this strong opposition, Martin finally relented and agreed to remove the requirement for a British subject to appear before a judge and make a declaration for citizenship.²⁰

On the other hand, Liberal French-Canadian parliamentarians attacked what they perceived to be the dual loyalties of many English-speaking Canadians. Leon-Joseph Raymond, probably one of the most critical of this group, argued that the maintenance of a Canadian citizen as a British subject would result in a dual nationality, which was unacceptable in principle. In addition, this would, in his opinion, undermine the principle of nationhood eloquently articulated by Martin during the introduction of the legislation. What is more, he maintained that the granting of Canadian citizenship under the bill would be reserved only for those willing to become British subjects. Raymond’s most important objection to the bill, though, was that it “gives as much importance to British nationality as it does to Canadian nationality . . . It submerges it in British nationality.”²¹ This underlines the divergence of views between the majority of English-speaking Canadians and French Canadians on the issue of the Canadian Citizenship Bill. It would have been unacceptable to the former if it did not include some references to British nationality, whereas this was the very foundation for the criticisms by the latter.

Another French-Canadian parliamentarian, Liguori Lacombe, a Liberal member for Laval-Deux Montagnes, while agreeing with many of his compatriots that all references to a British subject should be excised from the bill, supported the general principle behind the measure of establishing a new Canadian citizenship.²² This was not opposed by Raymond. So, despite French-Canadian views regarding the retention of British nationality, most of them were willing to compromise, as the Citizenship Bill in their opinion represented a step in the right direction. And French-Canadian parliamentarians, like their English-speaking counterparts, reflected their constituents' perspective and were ultimately accountable to them.

Dominion Day, which took place on 1 July every year and commemorated the Confederation of the majority of the British North American Empire (New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the Province of Canada [formerly Lower and Upper Canada, which became the provinces of Ontario and Quebec]) to form the Dominion of Canada in 1867, also offered an opportunity to express sentiments of British race patriotism in English-speaking Canada. On Dominion Day in 1947, Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King affirmed that the Canadian people should take pride in "[t]he extent to which Canada's voice and influence has come to be felt for good in the many relations of nations; particularly is this true of relations within the British Commonwealth, where Canada's part in the development and shaping of the Commonwealth and its spirit has been what it has."²³ This reflected the long-standing Canadian view that as the first British overseas possession to attain self-government within the empire through evolution, not revolution, it was a model to the rest of the present-day Commonwealth.

Along with Britishness, whiteness also continued to be an integral part of English-speaking Canadian identity in the immediate post-Second World War period. In a parliamentary speech on immigration policy, Mackenzie King emphasized that Canada was "perfectly within her rights in selecting the persons whom we regard as desirable future citizens." He claimed that the Canadian people did not want to make a major change in the nature of the population as a result of large-scale immigration.²⁴ But it was his concluding comments on the issue that unequivocally demonstrated his position that the White Canada policy was here to stay:

I wish to state quite definitely that . . . the Government has no intention of removing the existing regulations respecting Asiatic immigration unless and until alternative measures of effective control have been worked out. Canada recognizes the right of all other countries to control the entry or non-entry of persons seeking to become permanent residents. We claim precisely the same right for our country.²⁵

Nevertheless, a series of amendments to immigration regulations were introduced. Because of complaints of discrimination made by the Chinese government, but also, more importantly, as a consequence of Canada’s new obligations to avoid racial discrimination under the *Charter of the United Nations* (UN) in 1947, the *Chinese Immigration Act* was repealed. Furthermore, the wives and unmarried children under 18 years of age of all Asiatics who were Canadian citizens were also allowed to enter Canada. It was pointed out, though, that this was mainly directed at the Chinese, as all other Asiatics were already admissible under the current law.²⁶ These were notable changes, especially the repeal of the *Chinese Immigration Act*. They represented the first major amendments of the White Canada policy.

In September 1948 the Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy deliberated on representations that Syrians, Armenians, and Lebanese were not of “Asiatic race” and thus should not be included within the restrictions on Asian migration.²⁷ But it was not until the middle of the following year that a final decision was reached on the issue. There was some support for the suggestion that they should be excluded from the restrictions against Asians, but there were concerns that this would highlight the position of Turks and Palestinians and would possibly reopen the question of the situation of Indians under the immigration regulations. Instead, it was decided that the provisions of the immigration regulations which applied to European countries, apart from the UK and France (who received preferential treatment), would be extended to Syria and Lebanon. Armenia was excluded as it was pointed out that it was currently a republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), and therefore in the context of the Cold War easier immigration terms for it were not possible.²⁸ So, better immigration terms were extended to those “Asian” countries that were most like European countries.

Mackenzie King’s successor as prime minister, Louis S. St. Laurent (who was of mixed French and British ancestry) in a national broadcast in early 1949 emphasized national unity and the importance of maintaining both British and French traditions in Canada:

Canada was planned to be one united nation, and we have become one united nation . . . What is more, we have become an adult nation with a high place and heavy responsibilities for the peace and welfare not only of Canada, but of the free world . . . To discharge those responsibilities and to keep our high place in the world, we Canadians must realize that our traditions—those of both partners—are worth preserving.²⁹

St. Laurent’s emphasis on the preservation of both the British and French cultures signalled a new focus on issues of national identity compared to the previous Mackenzie King period. St. Laurent did, however, reiterate

Mackenzie King's comments on Canada's relationship with the Commonwealth in a Dominion Day address during the same year:

Since 1867 we have become a fully autonomous nation within the Commonwealth and have assumed responsibility for all our own affairs . . . The development of our independent status did not mean that we were breaking away from our British associates. Canada has valued its membership in the Commonwealth and has helped to bring about the steady development of that association of nations.³⁰

This continued a long-standing theme regarding Canadian conceptions of its position in, and relationship with, the Commonwealth.

There were also developments in Quebec in the post–Second World War period. These largely related to relations with the federal government. The determined postwar effort of Ottawa to take a more active role as the national government strengthened Quebec City in its traditional position as the government of French Canadians, which had become well established in the first couple of decades of the twentieth century (McRoberts 1997, 27). The most prominent illustration of Quebec's position as the national government of French Canada was actually an immediate reaction to a federal move. The Massey Commission³¹ led the Duplessis ministry in Quebec to in turn establish the Royal Commission on Constitutional Issues, generally known as the Tremblay Commission. This commission's strongly conservative opinion of French Canada set the tone of the report in general, which was founded on the view that French Canada was an inherently Catholic society in which the position of the state should be confined by the long-standing dependence on private bodies (McRoberts 1997, 28). Having established the context of Britishness in English-speaking Canada, French-Canadian responses to this establishment, and whiteness in Canada, I will now turn to exploring immigration and assimilation policy in the country.

Immigration and Assimilation Policy during the 1890s and 1940s

The Canadian Prairies were largely settled between 1901 and 1914. Nonetheless, the initial burst of migrants began after 1896. Between 1880 and 1920 almost 4.5 million migrants were admitted to Canada, predominantly from the US and Europe. In the peak decade of migration (1905–14), almost 2.8 million settlers arrived in Canada, with the figures pretty much shared equally among those from the British Isles, the US, and Central and Eastern Europe (Bumsted 2003, 254). This included Britons, Germans, and Scandinavians. However, the most important migration program at this time was that undertaken by Clifford Sifton, the minister of the interior, to move migrants from Central and Eastern Europe to Canada. This group consisted notably of Ukrainians but also Poles, Hungarians, and Russians.³² It was to

these latter groups that Sifton’s infamous euphemism of “stalwart peasants in sheepskin coats” referred.

The second main wave of non-French and non-British migrants to Canada began in the 1920s. Continuing its efforts to secure British migrants, the government of Mackenzie King in September 1925 signed a “Railways Agreement” with the Canadian National Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway that resulted in the arrival of larger numbers of Eastern and Central Europeans (Palmer 1984, 29).

As English-speaking Canada’s identity was based on Britishness and whiteness, a policy of assimilation was adopted toward these non-British migrants. They arrived in a country that was extremely Anglocentric and required the migrants to discard the culture and language of their home countries. If the migrants themselves did not assimilate wholly into the English-speaking Canadian dominant culture, then their children would (Thompson and Weinfeld 1995, 187–88).

Anglocentrism required migrants to abandon the traditions and cultures of their homelands and instead adopt the values and behaviours of English-speaking Canadians (Palmer 1984, 21). Evelyn Kallen maintains that “the basic premise of the concept [of Anglocentrism] was that immigrants would assimilate to the British institutional and cultural model, which included the English language and the Protestant religion” (1982, 51).

The social gospel and evangelism were both regarded as a means of incorporating the migrant into Canadian society, and nationalism was hence a prominent collective force in this work. This was in the sense of uniting disparate groups from diverse origins into a national community. Therefore, Britishness offered something all migrants could aspire to and become a part of. It did not matter whether they were Hungarians, Russians, or even Swedes; in time they could all become Canadians who were part of a wider British world. It was widely accepted that it was crucial for the future well-being of the country that migrants should become English-speaking Christian Canadians (Barber 1975, 222).

Very little had changed by the First World War, and there were attempts to persuade all “New Canadians” that allegiance to the British Empire and the Canadian nation were one and the same (Friesen 1993, 6). During the First World War Britishness was most pronounced. An unfaltering loyalty to the empire meant that “hyphenated Canadianism” was suspect. All the key secondary sources on immigration written before 1920 were based on the assumptions of all newcomers assimilating to Britishness. A prominent example of this was J.S. Woodsworth’s *Strangers within Our Gates* from around 1909 (Palmer 1984, 25–26).

The following example gives an idea of the more overt and active aims behind the assimilation process:

In 1919, the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire (IODE)³³ passed resolutions advocating a “Canadianization Campaign” to “propagate British ideals and institutions,” to “banish old world points of view, old world prejudices, old world rivalries and suspicion” and to make new Canadians “one hundred percent British in language, thought, feeling and impulse.” (Berry, Kalen, and Taylor 1977, 10, quoting the *Lethbridge Herald*, 29 May 1919)

So, non-British migrants were expected to abandon their native cultures and completely embrace the Anglocentric culture as soon as possible.

The assimilation of migrants was also achieved through education. However, Canadianization was not a secret program of study. Instruction in the “Canadian way of life” was expressed in all aspects of the school’s curriculum. In addition, schools’ assimilation efforts went beyond the official classroom scheme. Students were encouraged to turn to the schools for help with personal difficulties and future plans (Harney and Troper 1975, 110).

The Toronto Board of Education emphasized the importance of education in the assimilation process in a report in 1913 (Toronto Board of Education, Chief Inspector’s Report, *Annual Report*, 1913, quoted in Harney and Troper 1975, 115). The central role that principals and teachers had, in particular, in Canadianizing migrant children from Central Europe was highlighted in a further report in 1928: “The teachers of this school are teaching English to their students, but they are also not losing sight of the broader aim, the Canadianizing of our foreign population” (*Annual Report*, 1928, quoted in Harney and Troper 1975, 118).

A.D. McRae of the Canadian Club³⁴ of Toronto made a clear link between assimilation policy and English-speaking Canada’s identification as a British nation in 1921:

It is apparent that the government on account of the large immigration we are to receive, must give very close attention to the education of the masses, not only with the view of developing a Canadian spirit, a love for our country and an appreciation of our system of government, but also so far as possible to inculcate our new citizens with the spirit of the empire . . . The children of our new immigrants, in the natural course of events, may be expected to become good Canadians, but it will require education if they are to appreciate the advantages of imperial unity so patent to most of us who come from British stock. (A.D. McRae, “Canadian Citizenship of the Future,” quoted in Harney and Troper 1975, 123)

So, education was the key in assimilating non-British migrants into the Anglocentric society as well as developing a love of country. However, a distinction was made between migrants and their children, in that the latter were expected to become “good Canadians” as a matter of course. However, they would still need education to appreciate Canada’s membership in a wider British world.

The Conservative prime minister R.B. Bennett reaffirmed the government’s commitment to assimilating non-British groups into the dominant Anglocentric culture in the 1930s: “The people [Continental Europeans] have made excellent settlers . . . but it cannot be that we must draw upon them to shape our civilization . . . We must still maintain that measure of British civilization which enables us to assimilate these people to British institutions rather than assimilate our civilization to theirs” (quoted in Harney 1989, 54). Therefore, non-British migrants continued to be expected to incorporate themselves into the Anglocentric culture.

Prime Minister Mackenzie King called for a revival of mass immigration to Canada in 1947. This had been curtailed during the Depression and the Second World War. Mackenzie King stated, “The policy of the government is to foster the growth of the population of Canada by the encouragement of immigration . . . [W]e cannot ignore the danger that lies in a small population attempting to hold so great a heritage as ours.”³⁵ In his opinion, what peoples might best serve Canada’s need to expand its population without causing a fundamental alteration in the character of the country remained remarkably consistent over his long and influential career (Harney 1989, 54). These were British migrants. Hence, the Canadian government focused its immigration efforts on securing British migrants first and foremost.

The policy of assimilation continued to be pursued toward migrants in the post-Second World War period as Britishness and whiteness were still at the core of English-speaking Canadian national identity. The government recognized that there were various stakeholders involved in the successful assimilation of new settlers; therefore, a committee was established, comprising a representative from each of the Departments of the Secretary of State for Canada, Labour, National Health and Welfare, and Mines and Resources (Immigration), along with a representative from the Canadian Citizenship Council and the Canadian Welfare Council.³⁶ The goal of the committee was to “advise the Government on matters pertaining to the establishment of new settlers, their assimilation, and instruction in the responsibilities of citizenship, and to co-ordinate the activities of the various Departments and organizations engaged in this work.”³⁷ This demonstrated a new, greater organization in assimilation efforts—a reflection of the large mass of non-British migration that Canada received in the period after the Second World War. In contrast to its first

experience of this at the end of the nineteenth century, the majority of the migrants were better educated and went to urban areas.

The main instruments of assimilation policy after the Second World War were radio broadcasts and films aimed at migrants. Citizenship radio broadcasts by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation began in 1949.³⁸ The subjects of these radio broadcasts included languages, contracts with employers, money, and adjustment to jobs.³⁹

Films were also commissioned to assist in the assimilation process of migrants. Fifteen filmstrips were produced as part of a published Canadian Citizenship Series. The first three were *Our Land, Our History, and Our Government*. The goal of these was to make Canadian geography, government, and history better understood by migrants in night classes.⁴⁰ However, these provided only general practical information for migrants; they would have been directed at all migrants, not just non-British ones. The lack of information on Canada's British heritage, institutions, and even way of life gives the impression that Canada's Britishness was perhaps more nuanced and problematic than the official political statements or policies suggested.

Britishness, the French Canadians, and the White Canada policy during the 1950s

From the early 1950s the first signs of the waning of English-speaking Canada's identification as a British nation appeared. In a citizenship broadcast in May 1950, Prime Minister St. Laurent, who, as pointed out earlier, was of mixed French and British ancestry, placed greater emphasis on the importance of Canadian patriotism rather than a broader Britannic nationalism on the occasion of Citizenship Day. Citizenship Day replaced Empire Day, which had been celebrated since the late nineteenth century:

Right from the start one of the main purposes of Empire Day was to increase our pride in Canada . . . The greater Canada becomes and the greater our pride in Canada the greater our value to the Commonwealth. Everything we do to increase our pride in Canada contributes to the importance of our place in the partnership of Commonwealth nations.⁴¹

He built on this in an actual Citizenship Day speech in which he reiterated the importance of the day in educating children about the empire, but he placed greater emphasis on it providing a special opportunity for children to learn more about Canadian citizenship:

In the past fifty years there has been a great change in our status . . . What was then a colony in an empire is now an independent nation in a commonwealth . . . We have by act of parliament established our own

citizenship. Consequently, . . . I approached the provincial premiers with the result that they all agreed to have arrangements made to the end that some occasion might be found today in the schools for exercises having in mind, in respect of the position of Canada in the commonwealth, the rights, the privileges, the duties and the responsibilities of Canadian citizenship.⁴²

This shift is noteworthy as the day was now about Canadian citizenship. This reflected quite well the difficult position that French Canadians, particularly national politicians, found themselves in during this period, as they could not relate to British race patriotism and preferred to emphasize home-grown symbols. This also highlights the differences between the Liberal and Progressive Conservative parties, as the latter, unlike the former, did not really incorporate French Canadians and hence did not have to be sensitive to their positions.

St. Laurent returned to his theme of the prevalence of Canadian citizenship over British traditions in an address at the Golden Jubilee of the IODE, also in May 1950:

Just as the British Empire of 1900 has been transformed into a Commonwealth of free and equal nations in 1950 without losing anything of its beneficent character for the world, so the I.O.D.E. while striving always to preserve all that is best in our British tradition in Canada, has grasped the great truth that the strength of the Commonwealth depends on the strength of its members and the Order has worked hard and well for a greater and a better Canada and for a growing pride by Canadians—regardless of origin—in their common citizenship.⁴³

It showed St. Laurent presenting his view of Canadian identity to one of the oldest institutions of Britishness in the country.

But even as these British ties were being reinforced, a new language of “nation” was coming to the fore. In a speech to the Canadian Club of Montreal in April 1951, St. Laurent argued that there were “certain basic features, and fundamental Canadian attitudes and sentiments, which are widely and generally held and which justify us in speaking of a Canadian nation.”⁴⁴ The most important of these, in his opinion, was the diverse nature of the Canadian population. He pointed out, “No one knows better than you in Montreal, that in addition to those of the original stocks, thousands of newer Canadians have come to live among us and to make their contributions to our common life.”⁴⁵ This is a notable statement and clearly shows the extent to which ideas of Canadian identity were beginning to shift.

A recurring theme in St. Laurent's speeches in the early 1950s was the idea of Canada as an "Adult Nation." In an address to the Diamond Jubilee of the Association of Canadian Clubs in September 1952 he argued that "The fact that Canada has reached the age of maturity among the family of nations is now of course universally recognized . . . It should be a matter of pride for us that we have been able to reach adult status."⁴⁶ But the most distinctive feature of Canadian identity in his opinion was the bilingual and bicultural nature of the country: "The men who founded our nation did so on one principle that stands out above all others, the principle that the new nation should enable the English-speaking and French-speaking partners to keep their essential characteristics, their religion, their language, their culture."⁴⁷ This speech encapsulates St. Laurent's views on Canadian identity, in terms of Canada having matured as a nation and encouraging its bilingual and bicultural nature.

The complete transformation of Empire Day into Citizenship Day was also highlighted by St. Laurent in a statement about Citizenship Day in early 1953:

First observed in 1950, Citizenship Day is set aside as an occasion when the people of Canada are asked to give thought to the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship . . . It also provides an opportunity for emphasizing the importance to Canada of its place in the Commonwealth and of its role in the United Nations.⁴⁸

Now, for the first time, Canadian citizenship was brought right to the fore, whereas Canada's relationship to the Commonwealth was now grouped together with other links to international organizations such as the UN.

In French Canada the Duplessis government showed clearly how the federal government's attempts to introduce nationwide schemes could be destabilized by Quebec's efforts to establish its own national position. In the 1950s the Quebec government did not take part in a series of conditional grant schemes that the federal government offered to the provinces (McRoberts 1997, 28–29). McRoberts maintains that "[t]he Duplessis government's refusal to participate in federal programs demonstrated the potential for conflict that lay in the federal government's post-war assumption of the mantle of national government" (29). It also clearly highlighted how the view of Canada held by French-Canadian elites contrasted with that of their English-speaking Canadian counterparts. In the postwar years the federal government contested the long-standing French-Canadian view of Canada as a nation in a way it had never done before (McRoberts 1997, 29).

From the beginning of the 1950s the White Canada policy also began to be gradually broken down. This mainly resulted from international developments, with the newly independent nations of Asia calling for an end to racially based immigration policies (Knowles 1990, 128–29). In 1950 there was a

liberalization of regulations, which broadened the admissible classes of Asians to include the husbands of Canadian citizens and unmarried children up to the age of majority.⁴⁹ Toward the end of 1950 Lester B. Pearson, the secretary of state for external affairs, reported to the Cabinet that the Indian government had made representations repeating their request for the removal of discrimination in the Canadian immigration regulations against Indians and other Asians. He pointed out that they were not calling for actual immigration entry to be given but solely for the removal of direct discriminatory provisions. Walter Harris, the minister of citizenship and immigration, stated that the problem was “essentially one of amending the provisions so that they appeared to place Asians on the same basis as other persons but without, in fact, extending a right of entry.”⁵⁰ In December 1950 Pearson suggested it would be a good idea to look into the option that a treaty might be agreeable to the Indian government. He thought it would be a positive step to give the three Asian Commonwealth countries a preferential position. At the beginning of 1951, agreements were concluded with the governments of India, Pakistan, and Ceylon whereby 150 Indians, 100 Pakistanis, and 50 Ceylonese might be admitted to Canada each year, in addition to the wives, husbands, unmarried children under 21, fathers over 65, and mothers over 60 of Canadian citizens, resident in Canada, of these countries of origin.⁵¹ Although the numbers involved in the 1951 agreements with India, Pakistan, and Ceylon were not large, their importance lies in the fact that they represented the first time that Canada had concluded an immigration agreement with an Asian country apart from Japan.

Immigration and Assimilation Policy during the 1950s

Despite the emergence of the first signs of the decline of English-speaking Canada’s Britishness and whiteness, the preference for British migration continued in the 1950s. The *Saturday Night* publication of Toronto asserted that “British labor is wanted because it is highly skilled, politically acceptable, and easily assimilated.” However, it did acknowledge that “western European farm and factory hands are also in demand.”⁵² Similarly, the *Kingston Whig-Standard*, while arguing that British migrants were ideal, did state that “a ban against any race or region, on purely racial or regional grounds would result in a loss to Canada.”⁵³ It shows how much the ground was beginning to shift in regard to views toward immigration. On the other hand, the *Montreal Gazette* suggested introducing assisted passages for British migrants to increase their numbers in the immigrant intake. Otherwise, it warned of the steady decline of the British proportion of the population, which it felt should be avoided at all costs.⁵⁴

Assimilation policy toward non-British migrants also continued into the early 1950s, though changes were beginning to emerge. St. Laurent in an address to the Canadian Club of Montreal in April 1951 maintained that Canadians “had to learn to accommodate themselves to views, often strongly

held, of other Canadians whose culture, language, religion and outlook may be quite different from their own.”⁵⁵ This is a remarkable statement and illustrates the shifts in assimilation policy that were taking place.

In an explanatory memorandum on citizenship classes submitted to the Cabinet at the start of 1953, Harris outlined the main features of assimilation policy as he saw them: “Knowledge of the English or the French language, and of the facts of Canadian life is essential to the smooth and full adaptation of the newcomer to [the] Canadian environment . . . It enhances the value of his personal contribution to the development of this country.”⁵⁶ He went on to elaborate on the efforts of the Citizenship Branch, in conjunction with certain provincial governments, universities, local school boards, and benevolent societies to promote the holding of citizenship classes where French or English was being taught.⁵⁷ Hence, the continuing importance of language in the assimilation process was stressed.

From the late nineteenth century, Canada identified itself as an integral part of a wider British world. This of course excluded the French Canadians. The White Canada policy also reinforced this idea of Britishness. Therefore, the large numbers of white non-British migrants Canada received at the turn of the century were expected to incorporate themselves into this English-speaking Canadian or Anglocentric society. These new settlers had to abandon their home cultures and become close to English-speaking Canadians as quickly as possible. However, from the early 1950s the first indications of the slow unravelling of British race patriotism in English-speaking Canada began to appear. At the same time, the initial steps toward the dismantlement of whiteness also took place. This resulted in subtle shifts in the policy of assimilation toward non-British migrants, which was founded on Anglo-conformity.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Carl Bridge, Matthew Jordan, Neville Meaney, and James Curran for all of their advice, comments, and suggestions on earlier forms of this article as well as the anonymous reviewers for the *International Journal of Canadian Studies* for their comments.
2. This was another Canadian creation. It has never been commemorated anywhere else. It started as an annual public holiday in Toronto in 1849 and steadily spread to other urban areas and other provinces until by the close of the century it was treated as the official beginning of summer (Francis 1997, 65).
3. Hon. Charles Marcil, MP, 18 June 1917, *House of Commons* (hereafter *H of C Debates*, Canada, 2428).
4. Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, MP, 19 June 1917, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 2467.
5. Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, MP, 20 June 1917, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 2479.
6. Hon. Ernest Lapointe, MP, 20 June 1917, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 2514.
7. This was a prohibitive levy of \$500 placed on Chinese migrants entering Canada to discourage them from coming to the country (Li 2004, 128).

8. This began as a protest against the 1942 referendum that asked Canadians to relieve the federal government of its commitment not to introduce conscription. A plurality of Canadians gave their support, but in Quebec 80 percent of French Canadians said “non.” The leadership of the Quebec campaign subsequently decided to create a political party to call for Canadian independence, provincial autonomy, English–French equality in Ottawa, and social changes in Quebec (Neatby 2004, 75).
9. Henri Bourassa was one of the earliest French Canadians who articulated anti-imperialism and instead emphasized Canadian nationalism. The first major display of this was his passionate opposition to Canada’s participation in the South African War in 1899.
10. Hon. Paul Martin Sr., MP, 20 Mar. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 131.
11. Hon. Paul Martin Sr., MP, 2 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 502.
12. For more on the introduction of the *Canadian Citizenship Act*, see Mann (2012).
13. Hon. Paul Martin Sr., MP, 2 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 508.
14. This was an amalgamation in 1942 of the Conservative Party (which had originated in the mid-nineteenth century and dominated federal politics for the first 25 years of Confederation) and the Progressive Party, which was a Western-based party.
15. Hon. John Diefenbaker, MP, 2 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 513.
16. Hon. John Diefenbaker, MP, 2 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 513.
17. Hon. Thomas L. Church, MP, 5 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 598.
18. Hon. Thomas L. Church, MP, 5 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 599.
19. Hon. Thomas L. Church, MP, 5 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 600.
20. Hon. Paul Martin Sr., MP, 2 May 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 1114.
21. Hon. Leon-Joseph Raymond, MP, 5 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 620–21.
22. Hon. Liguori Lacombe, MP, 5 Apr. 1946, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 608.
23. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, MP, 30 June 1947, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 4888.
24. Canada’s Immigration Policy—Statement by the Prime Minister, House of Commons, 1 May 1947, Library and Archives Canada (LAC), MG26-J/Speeches/Vol. 80/Reel H-3054, D50917, D50918.
25. Canada’s Immigration Policy—Statement by the Prime Minister, House of Commons, 1 May 1947, LAC, MG26-J/Speeches/Vol. 80/Reel H-3054, D50919.
26. Memorandum to the Cabinet: Report from Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy: Legislation and Regulations concerning Asiatic Immigration and the Admission of Additional Classes of Immigrants, 20 Jan. 1947, LAC, Records Group (RG) 2/Series B-2/Vol. 65/Cab. Doc. 370/1947, 1; Immigration policy; report of Cabinet Committee, 23 Jan. 1947, LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2639, 4, 5.
27. Immigration; Admission of Lebanese, Syrians and Armenians, 29 Sept. 1948, LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2642, 5.
28. Immigration; Exception of Armenians, Lebanese and Syrians from “Asiatic race” prohibition; inclusion in admissible classes, 3 May 1949, LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2643, 6, 7.
29. “Canada: An Adult Nation”—Broadcast by Louis S. St. Laurent, 3 Feb. 1949, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 257, 4.
30. Dominion Day Message, 1 July 1949, 2, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 263, 4–5.

31. Its full title was the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, and it was established in 1949 by the St. Laurent government. It produced a program for a national cultural policy for postwar Canada. It was contentious in Quebec as it recommended direct federal funding for universities when education was a provincial responsibility (Litt 2004, 393).
32. The Other Ethnic Groups in Canada—Schema and principal recommendations—Part I—Chapter I, Introduction, 27 Feb. 1967, LAC, RG33-80/Acc. 1974-75-039/Box 12, 3.
33. This was the first imperial organization in Canada to be established by women. Established in February 1900, and initially named the Federation of British Daughters of the Empire, it became the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and established its base in Toronto in October 1901.
34. These were civic organizations that aimed to encourage Canadian patriotism and interest in citizenship. The first club was established in Hamilton, Ontario, in 1892 and was soon followed by clubs in major cities across the nation. The majority of their membership was composed of young businessmen, who met for monthly luncheons to hear speeches by local or visiting dignitaries (Vipond 2004, 104).
35. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, MP, 1 May 1947, *H of C Debates*, Canada, 2644–45.
36. Memorandum to the Cabinet—Immigration; Advisory Committee on Immigration Welfare, 11 Sept. 1948, LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 66/Cab. Doc. 740/1948.
37. Memorandum to the Cabinet—Immigration; Advisory Committee on Immigration Welfare, 11 Sept. 1948, LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 66/Cab. Doc. 740/1948.
38. News release on “Citizenship Radio Broadcasts,” 12 Oct. 1949, LAC, RG26/Vol. 66/File 2-18-1/Part 1, 30.
39. Memorandum for the Advisory Committee on Citizenship by Frank Foulds, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, n.d., LAC, RG26/Vol. 67/File 2-18-2.
40. Memorandum for the Advisory Committee on Citizenship by Frank Foulds, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, n.d., LAC, RG26/Vol. 67/File 2-18-2.
41. Citizenship Broadcast by Louis S. St. Laurent, 22 May 1950, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 267, 1.
42. Debates, *H of C*, vol. 3, 23 May 1950, Mr. St. Laurent, 2743.
43. Golden Jubilee I.O.D.E., Montreal—Notes for remarks by Louis S. St. Laurent, 27 May 1950, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 267, 1.
44. Notes for Address by Louis S. St. Laurent to the Montreal Canadian Club, 23 Apr. 1951, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 270, 3.
45. Notes for Address by Louis S. St. Laurent to the Montreal Canadian Club, 23 Apr. 1951, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 270, 3–4.
46. An Address by the Prime Minister at the Diamond Jubilee of the Association of Canadian Clubs, Hamilton, Ontario, 12 Sept. 1952, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 276, 2–3.
47. An Address by the Prime Minister at the Diamond Jubilee of the Association of Canadian Clubs, Hamilton, Ontario, 12 Sept. 1952, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 276, 2–3.
48. Office of the Prime Minister, Canada—Press Release—Citizenship Day, 10 Mar. 1953, LAC, MG26-L/Personal Clippings/Vol. 302/File No. S-4.

49. Immigration regulations; Admissible classes, 23 May 1950, LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2645, 2–3.
50. Immigration; Entry of East Indians, 29 Nov. 1950, LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2646, 17.
51. Immigration; East Indians and Chinese, 21 Dec. 1950, LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2646, 6.
52. Extract from the *Saturday Night*—“What’s Holding Up U.K. Immigrants?” 23 Jan. 1951, LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 315.
53. Extract from the *Kingston Whig-Standard*—“Is the ‘Melting Pot’ Plan Perilous?” 4 July 1951, LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 315.
54. Extract from the *Montreal Gazette*—“Financial Aid to U.K. Migrants Needed to Keep Canada British,” 12 Nov. 1952, LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 315.
55. Notes for Address by Louis S. St. Laurent to the Montreal Canadian Club, 23 Apr. 1951, LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 270, 9.
56. Memorandum to Cabinet: Financial Assistance to Citizenship Training by W.E. Harris, minister of citizenship and immigration, 22 Jan. 1953, LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 1894/Cab. Doc. 18/1953, 1; Citizenship; Observance of Citizenship Day; Financial assistance for citizenship classes, 22 Jan. 1953, LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2652, 8.
57. Memorandum to Cabinet: Financial Assistance to Citizenship Training by W.E. Harris, minister of citizenship and immigration, 22 Jan. 1953, LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 1894/Cab. Doc. 18/1953, 1; Citizenship; Observance of Citizenship Day; Financial assistance for citizenship classes, 22 Jan. 1953, LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2652, 8.

References

- Barber, Marilyn. 1975. “Nationalism, Nativism and the Social Gospel.” In *The Social Gospel in Canada*, edited by Richard Allen, 186–226. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.
- Behiels, Michael D. 2002. “The Bloc Populaire Canadien and the Origins of French-Canadian Neo-nationalism, 1942–48.” In *Quebec since 1800: Selected Readings*, edited by Michael D. Behiels, 443–55. Toronto: Irwin.
- Berry, J.W., R. Kalen, and D.M. Taylor, with L. Lamarche and J. Christian. 1977. *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Bohaker, Heidi, and Franca Iacovetta. 2009. “Making Aboriginal People ‘Immigrants Too’: A Comparison of Citizenship Programs for Newcomers and Indigenous Peoples in Postwar Canada, 1940s–1960s.” *Canadian Historical Review* 90 (3): 427–62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/chr.90.3.427>.
- Buckner, Phillip. 2002. “Canada.” In *The Impact of the South African War*, edited by David Omissi and Andrew S. Thompson, 233–50. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Phillip Buckner, and R. Douglas Francis, eds. 2006. *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Bumsted, J.M. 2003. *A History of the Canadian Peoples*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

- Coates, Colin M. 2008. "French Canadians' Ambivalence to the British Empire." In *Canada and the British Empire*, edited by Phillip Buckner, 181–99. Oxford History of the British Empire series. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Francis, Daniel. 1997. *National Dreams: Myth, Memory and Canadian History*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.
- Friesen, John W. 1993. *When Cultures Clash: Case Studies in Multiculturalism*. 2nd ed. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises.
- Harney, Robert F. 1989. "'So Great a Heritage as Ours': Immigration and the Survival of the Canadian Polity." In *Search of Canada*, edited by Stephen R. Graubard, 51–98. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Harney, Robert F., and Harold Troper. 1975. *Immigrants: A Portrait of the Urban Experience, 1890–1930*. Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Igartua, Jose. 2006. *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945–1971*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Kallen, Evelyn. 1982. "Multiculturalism: Ideology, Policy, and Reality." *Journal of Canadian Studies / Revue d'études canadiennes* 17 (1): 51–63.
- Kennedy, James. 2013. *Liberal Nationalisms: Empire, State, and Civil Society in Scotland and Quebec*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Knowles, Valerie. 1990. *Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540–1990*. Toronto: Dundurn.
- Li, Peter S. 2004. "Chinese." In *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, edited by Gerald Hallowell, 128–29. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Litt, Paul. 2004. "Massey Commission." In *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, edited by Gerald Hallowell, 393. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Mann, Jatinder. 2012. "The Evolution of Commonwealth Citizenship, 1945–48 in Canada, Britain and Australia." *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 50 (3): 293–313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14662043.2012.692923>.
- McRoberts, Kenneth. 1997. *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Neatby, H. Blair. 2004. "Bloc populaire." In *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, edited by Gerald Hallowell, 75. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, Howard. 1984. "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century." In *Cultural Diversity and Canadian Education*, edited by John R. Mallea and Jonathan C. Young, 21–40. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Roy, Patricia E. 1989. *A White Man's Province: British Columbia Politicians and Japanese and Chinese Immigrants, 1858–1914*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Roy, Patricia E. 2012. *Boundless Optimism: Richard McBride's British Columbia*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Thompson, J.H., and M. Weinfeld. 1995. "Entry and Exit: Canadian Immigration Policy in Context." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 538 (1): 185–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002716295538000015>.
- Vipond, Mary. 2004. "Canadian Clubs." In *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, edited by Gerald Hallowell, 104–05. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Ward, W. Peter. 2002. *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy towards Orientals in British Columbia*. 3rd ed. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Woodsworth, J.S. [c. 1909]. *Strangers within Our Gates*. Toronto: Stephenson.