RBTH
1335

RARE BOOKS LIB.

The University of Sydney

Copyright and use of this thesis

This thesis must be used in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

Reproduction of material protected by copyright may be an infringement of copyright and copyright owners may be entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright.

Section 51(2) of the Copyright Act permits an authorized officer of a university library or archives to provide a copy (by communication or otherwise) of an unpublished thesis kept in the library or archives, to a person who satisfies the authorized officer that he or she requires the reproduction for the purposes of research or study.

The Copyright Act grants the creator of a work a number of moral rights, specifically the right of attribution, the right against false attribution and the right of integrity.

You may infringe the author's moral rights if you:

- fail to acknowledge the author of this thesis if you quote sections from the work
- attribute this thesis to another author
- subject this thesis to derogatory treatment which may prejudice the author's reputation

For further information contact the University's **Director of Copyright Services**

Telephone: 02 9351 2991
e-mail: copyright@usyd.edu.au

The search for a new national identity: A comparative study of the rise of multiculturalism in Canada and Australia, 1890s-1970s

By J. Mann

Ph.D. Thesis – Arts (History)
2011
University of Sydney

Abstract

This thesis examines the key question of **why and how did multiculturalism replace Britishness as the defining idea of community for English-speaking Canada and Australia, and what does this say about their respective experiences of nationalism in the twentieth century?** In contrast to the majority of existing literature, the thesis does not see the rise of multiculturalism as a 'natural' response. Instead it focuses on the specific historical contexts in both nations to explain the emergence of multiculturalism. These contexts relate to the change from Britishness to the 'new nationalism', to multiculturalism as the basis of the national identities of both nations. Furthermore, the transition from 'whiteness' as the foundation of immigration policies to its abandonment, and the adoption of non-discriminatory immigration policies was also an integral part of the national identities of Canada and Australia. In terms of official government policy towards migrants, the thesis focuses on the shift from assimilation to integration, to a multicultural policy as the basis of the approach in both countries. Therefore, there is much commonality in the experiences of Canada and Australia. However, the major differences arose due to the presence of the French-Canadians in Canada. They were a competing founding group to the British, one that moreover arrived before them. There was no experience like this in Australia. In addition, the arrival of mass non-British migration to Canada at the end of the nineteenth century, which was much earlier than what happened in Australia was another major distinction between the two countries. Both of these differences explain time and time again the subtleties and variations in the history of national identity and the course of policy towards migrants in both English-speaking Canada and Australia.

I dedicate this thesis to my loving father, Bahadur Singh Mann and my dear friend, Sarah Goh who both sadly passed away before the completion of this work. Their encouragement and belief in me were always a source of immeasurable strength.

Contents

Acknowledgements v

Abbreviations vii

Introduction 1

Assimilation policies in Canada and Australia: 1890s-1960s

Chapter One – Assimilation Policy in Canada, 1890s-1953 22

Chapter Two – Assimilation Policy in Australia, 1890s-1962 71

Chapter Three – 'Anglo-conformity' and 'Incorporation into the Anglo-Celtic culture': A comparison of assimilation policies in Canada and Australia, 1890s-1960s 111

Integration policies in Canada and Australia: 1950s-1970s

Chapter Four – Integration Policy in Canada, 1953-1963 124

Chapter Five – Integration Policy in Australia, 1962-1972 176

Chapter Six – 'Retaining migrant cultures' and 'Leavening British traditions': A comparison of integration policies in Canada and Australia, 1950s-1970s 217

Multicultural policies in Canada and Australia: 1960s-1970s

Chapter Seven – The introduction of a multicultural policy in Canada, 1963-1971 230

Chapter Eight – The introduction of a multicultural policy in Australia, 1972-1978 280

Chapter Nine – 'Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework' and 'A cohesive, united, multicultural nation': A comparison of the introduction of multicultural policies in Canada and Australia, 1960s-1970s 317

Conclusion 329

Bibliography 349

Acknowledgements

I have many people and institutions to thank for their assistance in some way in the writing of this thesis. Firstly, I would like to express my immense gratitude to my supervisors Prof. Neville Meaney and Dr. James Curran for all their advice, guidance and constructive criticism throughout my candidature. I would especially like to thank Neville for taking me under his wing when I first arrived in Australia and making me feel so welcome when I was so far away from home. In particular, the dinner seminars he held at his home were always an encouraging and supportive academic environment, and it was like having a ready group of friends waiting for me when I first got to Sydney. Neville's influence on my work will also be quite obvious to readers. I would like to thank him for steering me in the right direction. And James, I will always be grateful to you for kindly taking over from Neville in his supervisory capacity after his retirement. I am sure that you feel you got more than you bargained for when you agreed to initially become my Associate Supervisor. James' influence on my thesis will also be quite clear. I am also grateful to Dr. John Hirst for his advice on improving my writing style. However, any shortcomings in the thesis are mine and mine alone.

Now moving on to institutions that I would like to thank. Firstly, I express gratitude to the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) (now the Department of Education, Employment and Work Relations - DEEWR) for awarding me an Endeavour International Postgraduate Research Scholarship (EIPRS) which paid for my tuition fees in Australia. I would also like to thank the University of Sydney for giving me an International Postgraduate Award (IPA) which helped with my living costs. Suffice to say I would not have even entertained the possibility of going to do my Ph.D. in Australia if it were not for this considerable financial support. Gratitude is also due to the Faculty of Arts at the University of Sydney for their financial assistance through the Ph.D. Research Travel Grant Scheme and Postgraduate Research Support Scheme (PRSS) for my research in Australia and Canada.

Throughout the course of the Australian research for my thesis I spent a considerable amount of time at the National Archives of Australia (NAA) and the National Library of Australia (NLA) in Canberra. The staff members at both institutions were always courteous and helpful in every way. I would especially like to thank Kerri Ward at the NAA and the Manuscripts Division at the NLA for all their assistance. All of my research in Canada took place at the Library and Archives Canada (LAC) in Ottawa and I would like to thank all the staff I came into contact with, both in the Library and Archives divisions for all their help with my research while I was there. I would particularly like to mention Neysa McLeod. I am also very grateful to the late Prof. George 'Jerzy' Zubryzcki for giving me permission to look at the restricted parts of his papers. Dr. Mary Elizabeth Calwell deserves thanks for allowing me to consult certain sections of the Arthur Calwell papers that were not available to the public. The Honourable Marc Lalonde also kindly gave me permission to consult some restricted parts of the Pierre Elliott Trudeau fonds.

Gratitude is also due to the staff at Fisher Library at the University of Sydney, especially the Interlibrary Loans Section. I would particularly like to mention Bruce Isaacs who had the unfortunate task of dealing with the majority of my many interlibrary loan requests over the course of my work. I would also like to express my thanks to International House, University of Sydney which became my home while I was in Australia. Living on campus certainly made my life a lot easier, but more

importantly having a safe and supporting home environment was a great help. Financial support through the Women's Committee Bursary and Ian Hudson Scholarship also assisted me in being able to afford to stay at the college. The staff members at the International Student Support Unit (ISSU) at the University of Sydney were also a great help throughout my time, especially Maria Pirrello. I would also like to thank the Menzies Centre for Australian Studies, King's College London for their seminar series which enabled me to continue to be a part of the academic world when I came back home to the United Kingdom (UK) to finish writing up my thesis, and to be honest just got me out of the house, as I was working from home.

On a more personal note I would like to thank all of my friends in Australia, Canada and the UK for their encouragement and emotional support throughout my Ph.D. The former two in particular became my Australian and Canadian families and our many coffees, lunches, drinks and dinners kept me going (and sane) through what was probably one of the hardest things I have ever done in my life. I am especially grateful to those friends who were also doing Ph.D.s or had recently completed one when I met them for all their pearls of wisdom. It was just so encouraging to know that people had actually finished their theses and passed.

Lastly and certainly not least, I would like to thank my family for all their support, both financial and emotional over the course of this thesis. It would not be an exaggeration to say that without them I would not have been able to complete my thesis. I would especially like to mention my mother, Charn Kaur Mann whose financial support enabled me to go out to Australia in the first place, carry out my research in Australia and Canada, as well as allow me to finish writing up the thesis back home in the UK. My eldest sister, Dr. Parminder Mann was the inspiration for my love of history at a very young age and for that I will forever be grateful. Both her and my other sister, Inderjit were a constant source of support and encouragement. I would particularly like to thank Inderjit for advising me to stick in there when I was feeling so very home sick during my first few months in Australia. If I had not taken her advice I would most certainly not be writing these acknowledgements today. My nephews and nieces; Amrit, Sabrina, Nanaki and Sahib deserve thanks for always making me laugh and reminding me not to take things too seriously and for putting things in perspective.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my dear friend Erin Semon in Sydney for kindly agreeing to print, bind and hand in my thesis on my behalf, which otherwise would have been quite difficult and expensive to do from London.

Jatinder Mann
London, UK, June 2011

Abbreviations

Archives, Libraries and Sources
CPD – Commonwealth of Australia Parliamentary Debates
LAC – Library and Archives Canada
NAA – National Archives of Australia
NLA – National Library of Australia
PRO – Public Record Office
TNA – The National Archives, UK

Countries and Geographic Groupings
EEC – European Economic Community
UK – United Kingdom
UN – United Nations
US – United States
USSR – Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Institutions and Government Departments
AGPS – Australian Government Publishing Service
ANU – Australian National University
DFAT – Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DIAC – Department of Immigration and Citizenship
DIMA – Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs
DIMIA – Department of Immigration, Multiculturalism and Indigenous Affairs
H of C – House of Commons
H of R – House of Representatives
MUP – Manchester University Press
NORAD – North American Air Defence Command
OMA – Office of Multicultural Affairs
UBC – University of British Columbia
UNSW – University of New South Wales

Journals and Newspapers
AFAR – Australian Foreign Affairs Record
AHS – Australian Historical Studies
AJPH - Australian Journal of Politics and History
ANZJS – Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology
CES – Canadian Ethnic Studies
CHR – Canadian Historical Review
IJCS – International Journal of Canadian Studies
JCS – Journal of Canadian Studies
JICH – Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History
SMH – Sydney Morning Herald

Organisations
ADQ – Action Démocratique du Québec
AEAC – Australian Ethnic Affairs Council
AIF – Australian Imperial Force
AIMA – Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs
ALP – Australian Labor Party

CCF – Co-operative Commonwealth Federation
CNR – Canadian National Railway
CPR – Canadian Pacific Railway
IAC – Immigration Advisory Council
I.C.E.M. – International Commission for European Migration
I.O.D.E. – Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire
I.R.O. – International Refugee Organisation
NMAC – National Multicultural Advisory Council
TLC – Trades and Labour Congress
UNEF – United Nations Emergency Force
UNESCO – United Nations Education, Social and Cultural Organisation
Y.M.C.A. – Young Men's Christian Association
Y.W.C.A. – Young Women's Christian Association

Others
MP – Member of Parliament
NSW/N.S.W. – New South Wales

Introduction

This thesis will explore the profound social, cultural and political changes which affected the way in which Canadians and Australians defined themselves as a 'people' from the late nineteenth century to the 1970s. Taking as its central theme the way each country responded to the introduction of new migrants, this thesis will ask a key historical question: **why and how did multiculturalism replace Britishness as the defining idea of community for English-speaking Canada and Australia, and what does this say about their respective experiences of nationalism in the twentieth century?**

The thesis begins from a simple premise, namely that the path towards the adoption of multiculturalism as the orthodox way of defining national community in English-speaking Canada and Australia in the latter half of the twentieth century, was both uncertain and unsteady. It followed a period in which both nations had looked first and foremost to Britain to define their national self-image. In both nations however following the breakdown of their more formal and institutional ties to the 'mother-country' in the post-war period there was a crisis of national meaning, and policy makers and politicians moved quickly to fill the void with a new idea of the nation, one which was the very antithesis to the white, monolithic idea of Britishness.

At the core of this study is a broader argument about the problem of nationalism and Britishness in both nations, and in particular the problems that both have had in adjusting to the post-imperial era. Although there has been considerable disagreement among scholars on the question of nationalism and its meaning, in nearly all cases, recent studies agree on two core ingredients, namely that nationalism emerged in the late nineteenth century and was primarily associated with Europe and the United States, and secondly that there is a fundamental connection

between nationalism and history. This connection is most often found in the myth or story of the nation, which holds that from time immemorial the 'people' have been engaged in struggles against an alien 'other' in order to achieve their national destiny.

This thesis draws on Benedict Anderson's definition of the nation as an 'imagined community',[1] one which is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.[2] As Anderson elaborates 'It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their family-members, meet them or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.'[3] He argues that 'The nation is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations.'[4] It is imagined as sovereign since the idea itself came to prominence in an era in which revolution and enlightenment were tearing down the authority of the 'divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm'.[5] Finally, it is imagined as a community because, in spite of the real exploitation and inequality that may occur in each, the nation is always regarded as a 'deep, horizontal comradeship'.[6]

Anderson's definition of nationalism draws much from Ernest Gellner's *Nations and Nationalism*[7], Hugh Seton-Watson's *Nations and States*[8] and especially

---

[1] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised Edition (London, UK: Verso, 1991).
[2] *Ibid.*, 4, 6.
[3] Quote taken from Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6.
[4] *Ibid.*, 7.
[5] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 7.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983).
[8] Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism* (London, UK: Methuen, 1977).

Hans Kohn's *The Idea of Nationalism*.[9] Seton-Watson makes a distinction between states and nations. He claims that while 'A state is a legal and political organisation, with the power to require obedience and loyalty from its citizens'[10], in contrast 'A nation is a community of people, whose members are bound together by a sense of solidarity, a common culture, a national consciousness.'[11] In Seton-Watson's view 'Nationalism' is a term to be approached with even more uncertainty, being usually employed to designate any kind of collective self-interest or aggression which the speaker or writer disagrees with. Indeed he argues that it has turned into a derogatory word, employed instead of the reputable term 'patriotism'.[12] Seton-Watson asserts that nationalism has two basic meanings, 'One of these meanings is a doctrine about the character, interests, rights and duties of nations...The second meaning is an organised political movement, designed to further the alleged aims and interests of nations.'[13] He argues that a nation exists when a large number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation, or act as if they form one. It is not a prerequisite that all of the group should feel like this, or behave like this, and it is not possible to specifically establish a minimum proportion of a population that must be this way inclined.[14]

Britishness was a broad nationalism which originated in the late nineteenth century in the United Kingdom and its white settler communities. The core of the identity was a belief that all the peoples of these different countries were 'British' and an integral part of a wider British world. Duncan Bell in his *The Idea of Greater*

---

[9] Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1944).
[10] Quote taken from Seton-Watson, *Nations and States*, 1.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] Seton-Watson, *Nations and States*, 2.
[13] Quote taken from Seton-Watson, *Nations and States*, 3.
[14] Seton-Watson, *Nations and States*, 5.

Britain[15] studies the relationship between the idea of 'Greater Britain' and imperial federation in the late nineteenth century. He asserts that 'The relationship between Greater Britain and imperial federation was complex and often confused...While virtually all federalists employed the language of Greater Britain, not all of the proponents of Greater Britain were federalists.'[16] Bell draws attention to Britishness in the British Isles which is a hitherto little studied dimension of the concept. There have been various studies on the rise of British race patriotism in the settler societies but not many that have looked at the opposite side of the coin. Ultimately the proponents for imperial federation failed, but the study of their efforts is not a worthless one as they illustrate the broader political issues prevalent at the time in Britain and its settler societies.[17]

James Belich's *Replenishing the Earth*[18] explores the settler revolution and the emergence of an Anglo-World from the end of the eighteenth century to the mid-twentieth century. He links the rise of Britishness with 'changes in attitudes to empire, or at least to the white empire.'[19] Belich attributes the rise of the term 'Greater Britain' to writers such as Charles Dilke[20] and J. R. Seeley[21] in the mid to late nineteenth century.[22] He also discusses the problem of outlining the histories of the former white Dominions as independent nations due to their identity being based on Britishness for such a long period, 'The histories of Australia, New Zealand, and Canada as independent nations share a curious characteristic: nobody knows when

---

[15] Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007).
[16] Quote taken from Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, 12.
[17] Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, 18.
[18] James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the rise of the Anglo-World, 1783-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
[19] *Ibid.*, 457.
[20] Charles Wentworth Dilke, *Greater Britain: A record of travel in English-speaking countries during 1866 and 1867* (New York, NY, 2005) (Originally 1868).
[21] J. R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England* (London, UK: Macmillan, 1931) (orig. 1883).
[22] Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*, 457, 458.

they began..."If asked when and how their country became independent, most Australians can only cough and stammer...some will point to the federation of the Australian colonies in 1901, some to Gallipoli in 1915, some to Australia's turn to the United States for protection in 1941."'[23]

The works by Bell and Belich are the most recent in the transnational 'British world' field or perspective. This began initially with the work of Buckner and Carl Bridge in their article 'Reinventing the British World' in 2003. They argued that the vast majority of the histories of Canada and Australia and other former British settler societies focused predominantly on their specific 'national' stories, epitomised by their struggle for autonomy within the British Empire. Bucker and Bridge argued instead that these British settler societies formed part of a wider 'British world', in which each member regarded themselves as essentially a British people, albeit with variations according to local geography and demography. Any study of their broader connection to the British Empire was undertaken by imperial historians in the UK and the metropolis-periphery relationship was the focus of their efforts, not their self-identification as 'British'. Therefore, Buckner and Bridge advocated the study of this fascinating but hitherto largely neglected history by historians from the former British settler societies themselves.

Douglas Cole in his 'The Crimson Thread of Kinship'[24] established that the national identity of Australia for much of the twentieth century was based on British race patriotism and the belief it was an integral part of a wider British world. According to Cole, 'Assuming the unique value of British stock and civilisation, the Britannic ethnocentric strand stressed the kindred nature of Australians and

[23] Quote taken from Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*, 461.
[24] Douglas Cole, '"The Crimson Thread of Kinship": Ethnic Ideas in Australia, 1870-1914', *Historical Studies*, vol. 14, no. 56, April 1971.

Britons...Commonality of ancestry, heritage, history, language, and literature were used to confirm the common identity of the British race.'[25] Cole also makes a strong link between Britishness and whiteness, 'The ethnic consciousness of being British was never sharply distinguished from that of being white..."Scratch White Australia and you find British Australia" wrote W. D. Forsyth.'[26]

Neville Meaney built upon Cole's ideas in *The Search for Security in the Pacific, 1901-1914*, arguing that in order to understand what he called the 'riddle of Australian nationalism', scholars had to differentiate between Australia's overwhelming sense of cultural identification with Britain – its 'community of culture' – and its own political interests arising out of its particular geopolitical circumstances – what Meaney called the 'community of interest'.[27] Meaney asserts that 'In the nationalist era (1870s-1960s) Britishness was the dominant cultural myth in Australia, the dominant social idea giving meaning to "the people"' and he even goes so far as to suggest that 'Britishness was more pervasive in Australia than in Britain itself.'[28] He demonstrates the prevalence of Britishness in Australia by citing an opinion poll in 1947 in which 65 per cent of Australians opted for being British when asked whether they wanted to have British or Australian nationality.[29]

---

[25] Quote taken from Cole, '"The Crimson Thread of Kinship"', 514.
[26] *Ibid.*, 516.
[27] Neville Meaney, *The Search for Security in the Pacific, 1901-14. A History of Australian Defence and Foreign Policy 1901-23: Volume 1* (Sydney, NSW: Sydney University Press, 1976) vii-xi.
[28] Quote taken from Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography', *AHS*, vol. 116, 2001, 79.
In between these two works Meaney explored his ideas about Britishness in *Under New Heavens: Cultural Transmission and the Making of Australia* (Melbourne, Vic.: Heinemann Educational Australia, 1989). He has subsequently written on the subject in 'Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections', *JICH*, vol. 31, no. 2, May 2003, '"In History's Page": Identity and Myth' in Deryck Schreuder and Stuart Ward (Eds), *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) in Roger Louis (general editor), *The Oxford History of the British Empire series* and most recently in *Australia and World Crisis, 1914-1923. A History of Australian Defence and Foreign Policy 1901-23: Volume 2* (Sydney, NSW: Sydney University Press, 2009).
[29] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 80.

Like Meaney, Stuart Ward[30] asserts that British race patriotism not only formed the foundation of Australian national identity, it provided Australians with a greater sense of importance than any local nationalism could ever provide. By the end of the twentieth century however, British race patriotism no longer existed as a credible means of defining Australia's idea of community. Explanations offered for this transformation have centred on the eventual victory of a distinct Australian nationalism, which had its origins in the late nineteenth century.[31] According to these 'radical nationalist' historians, who include Brian Fitzpatrick and Russel Ward, Australian nationalism was thwarted by those who emphasised complete loyalty to the Empire abroad and at home.[32] These historians have tended to focus on areas of discord between the United Kingdom and Australia, and the advancement of self-government as Australia became a nation from a colony. These include the fight for responsible government, the Eureka Rebellion of 1854, the achievement of federation, the apparent 'waste' of Australian lives at Gallipoli and in Greece and the fall of Singapore in 1942.[33]

Against this tendency to ransack the past for the precise moment of 'independence', Ward argues that the shift in outlook and assumptions in Australian political culture centred on one single major event: Britain's decision to seek membership of the European Economic Community from 1961-63. Britain's difficult choice between joining its European neighbours, which in effect meant abandoning the notion of a wider 'British world' led to a crisis of British race patriotism in Australia

---

[30] Stuart Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal* (Carlton South, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2001).
[31] Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 2-3.
[32] Brian Fitzpatrick, *The British Empire in Australia: An Economic History, 1834-1939* (Melbourne, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1941).
Russel Ward, *Concise History of Australia* (Brisbane, Qld.: University of Queensland Press, 1992).
[33] Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 3.

and elsewhere.[34] Ward suggests that British race patriotism 'promoted a sense that Australia's long-term interests, and ultimate survival as a nation, were organically tied to the fortunes of the British world...It is the fate of this core assumption – that the interests of Australia and Great Britain ought ultimately to be reconciled – that holds the key to understanding the demise of British race patriotism in Australian political culture.'[35] Therefore, the EEC crisis signalled the final realisation among Australians that the two worlds of sentiment and self-interest could not be reconciled. There was finality to this particular decision and Australians realised once and for all that there could be no rushing back to the protective imperial bosom.

James Curran[36] has also explored the problem of Britishness and Australian national identity. Looking at the intellectual lives and political rhetoric of national leaders, he asserts that Australian national identity pre-1960s was based firmly on the fundamental belief that they were a British people. Loyalty to Britain and a commitment to a white Australia were the two pillars of Australian national identity. From the early 1960s, under the weight of changing domestic and international circumstances, including Britain's resolution to withdraw militarily from the 'East of Suez', this commitment to Britishness had to be completely revised. Almost overnight Australia was defined as a 'multicultural community'.[37]

These profound psychological shocks affected the very credibility of the British race idea. Examining the response of Australian Prime Ministers Harold Holt and John Gorton to these developments, Curran concludes that 'Following the weakening of the British identity both were aware that something akin to nationalism

---

[34] Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 4.
[35] Quote taken from Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 9-10.
[36] James Curran, *The Power of Speech: Australian Prime Ministers defining the national image* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2004).
[37] *Ibid.*, 3-4, 7, 8.

was needed in order to foster a new sense of national cohesion, but neither leader was sure about what form it should take.'[38]

In Canada too the question of how a sense of Britishness shaped Canadian identity has provoked a lively historical debate in recent years. A historiographical divide between Douglas Cole, Daniel Francis, Philip Buckner, Jose Igartua and 'nationalist' historians such as Carl Berger[39] has similarly been centred on the question of whether the idea of British race patriotism was at the centre of English-speaking Canadian national identity up to the 1960s. Douglas Cole[40] claims that a distinction needs to be made between nationalism and patriotism, where 'Nationalism is the consciousness of being an ethnically differentiated people and expresses itself as loyalty to an ethnic nation...Patriotism is a loyalty...to a political state and the geographic territory circumscribed by that state.'[41] But Cole acknowledges that problems exist with defining patriotism. English-speaking Canadians did possess a very strong ethnic identity, a nationality. Yet, it was strongly and passionately British, not Canadian. This is best seen as Britannic or pan-Anglo-Saxon nationalism. At the core of this ideology was a deep sense of British race patriotism and identification with the British race.[42]

Looking at the prevalence of Britishness in English-speaking Canada, Daniel Francis[43] has used a study of school textbooks to show that Canada's place in a wider British world was stressed to schoolchildren from a very young age.[44] He

---

[38] Quote taken from Curran, *The Power of Speech*, 38-9.
[39] Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914.* (Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1970).
[40] Douglas L. Cole, 'The Problem of "Nationalism" and "Imperialism" in British Settlement Colonies', *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, May 1971.
[41] Quote taken from Cole, 'The Problem of "Nationalism" and "Imperialism" in British Settlement Colonies', 164-5.
[42] Cole, 'The Problem of "Nationalism" and "Imperialism" in British Settlement Colonies', 171, 173.
[43] Daniel Francis, *National Dreams: Myth, Memory and Canadian History* (Vancouver, BC: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1997).
[44] *Ibid.*, 52.

demonstrates that 'Two important elements of the master narrative of Canadian history as it used to be taught in the schools were the superiority of the British form of government and way of life, and the gradual evolution of Canadian society to equal partnership in the imperial enterprise.'[45] However, Francis makes clear that, 'Self-government in the Canadian context was not to be confused with independence...Early textbooks made clear that Canada's destiny was to be a member of the imperial flock, not a solitary bird flying alone.'[46]

Phillip Buckner[47] claims that Canadian historians like their Australian counterparts have tended to view Canadian history from a nationalist perspective. They have presented the relationship between Canada and Britain as being based on mutual antagonism, and assume there was an irresistible pressure to put an end to the imperial relationship. But Buckner takes issue with this interpretation. Until well after the Second World War, most English-speaking Canadians (and Australians, New Zealanders and English-speaking South Africans) were descended from immigrants from the British Isles and they wanted to re-create a form of British society.[48] Buckner asserts that 'They saw themselves as both British and Canadian, and they saw the Empire as belonging to them as well as to the British who lived in

---

[45] Quote taken from Francis, *National Dreams*, 54.
[46] *Ibid.*
[47] Phillip Buckner, 'Introduction' in Phillip Buckner (Editor), *Canada and the End of Empire* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2005).
Buckner first explored Canada's relationship with the British world in his 'Whatever happened to the British Empire?', *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, vol. 4, 1992 and later with Carl Bridge, 'Reinventing the British World', *The Round Table*, vol. 92, issue 368, 2003 as well as with R. Douglas Francis, *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary Press, 2005). He has subsequently written on the subject again with R. Douglas Francis, *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2006) and as the sole author, *Canada and the British Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor), *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.
[48] Buckner, 'Introduction' in Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the End of Empire*, 2.

the mother country.'[49] Hence, the two identities were mutually reinforcing, although Britishness had the greatest hold.

Canadian nationalist historians (like their Australian counterparts) also regarded the imperial relationship as a handicap that held Canada back, and so tended to focus on areas of conflict between Canada and Great Britain. These include the Rebellions of 1837, the 'struggle for responsible government', Britain's betrayal of Canadian interests in the Treaty of Washington and the Alaska boundary dispute, and the apparent waste of Canadian lives at Vimy Ridge and Dieppe.[50]

According to Buckner, however, this was not how the events were viewed by contemporary Canadians. British sentiment and commitment to the 'mother-country' remained strong in English-speaking Canada well after the Second World War. There was a dawning realisation, though, from the end of the Second World War that the British world was declining in its power and influence. This was illustrated by the Canadian government's introduction of a *Citizenship Act* in 1946. Through this Act Canada became the first country in the British Commonwealth to differentiate its people as Canadian citizens as opposed to British subjects, which had previously been the case. The Suez crisis and Britain's application for entry to the EEC weakened the sense of a shared British identity among many English-speaking Canadians.[51] Buckner asserts that 'The critical period was the decade from 1956 to 1967, when most English-speaking Canadians were compelled – some very reluctantly – to come to grips with the lingering death of the empire.'[52]

---

[49] Quote taken from Buckner, 'Introduction' in Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the End of Empire*, 3.
[50] Buckner, 'Introduction' in Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the End of Empire*, 3-4.
[51] *Ibid.*, 4, 5, 6, 7.
[52] Quote taken from Buckner, 'Introduction' in Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the End of Empire*, 9.

Other Canadian scholars have tackled the problem of Britishness in Canada. In *The Other Quiet Revolution*,[53] Jose Igartua points out that prior to 1960 British symbols were an article of faith for English-speaking Canadians. He maintains that 'The different angles provided by newspapers, public opinion polls, and history textbooks point to a broad picture...In the postwar period, national identity in English-speaking Canada continued to be represented as resting on British political tradition and culture.'[54]

John Darwin's *The Empire Project*[55] also explores Britishness in Canada. He maintains that 'Between 1890 and 1914, the most forceful and articulate champions of Canadian nationhood were those who insisted that Canada's future lay as a British or "Britannic" country...Only as a British country, they argued, could Canada forge a cohesive identity at home – around a common language, institutions and history.'[56] Furthermore, Darwin argues that a lot of the anger in Canadian politics after 1890 arose from the fear that the goal of Britannic nationhood for Canada would be hindered by French Canadian opposition. Up to the 1890s, the readiness of British Canadians to '"tolerate" the "peculiar institutions" of French Canada – especially the entrenched power of the Catholic church – rested on the assumption that Quebec was (largely) an inward-looking "reserve" whose population (a minority in the dominion) would not obstruct the "progress" of the British majority.'[57]

C. P. Champion's recent study *The Strange Demise of British Canada*[58] looks at the crisis of Britishness between the period 1964 and 1968. This work primarily

---

[53] Jose E. Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2006).
[54] Quote taken from Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution*, 12.
[55] John Darwin, *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830-1970* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
[56] Quote taken from Darwin, *The Empire Project*, 159.
[57] *Ibid.*, 153.
[58] C. P. Champion, *The Strange Demise of British Canada: The Liberals and Canadian Nationalism, 1964-1968* (Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010).

focuses on the cardinal position of religion and war in framing the Anglo-Canadian Identity; the rite of passage that many young Canadian scholars enjoyed at Oxford University; the courting of non-British ethnic groups; the Canadian flag debate; and the unification of the armed forces. However, Champion tends to over-emphasise the cultural differences between Canadians of English, Scottish or Irish (mainly Protestant) descent. But this flies in the face of overwhelming evidence which shows that despite these differences they nevertheless considered themselves first and foremost as 'British' for most of the twentieth century. Moreover, he underestimates the popular nature of Britishness in Canada. While it is true that quite a few prominent English-speaking Canadians studied at Oxford, the ubiquity of Britishness in Canada is perhaps better displayed by the public celebrations on Empire Day or the oaths that schoolchildren took for the British Empire. Champion criticises Igartua for writing 'the most recent polemical obituary of British Canada' which is 'tinged with admiration for Pearson and dripping with anti-British *schadenfreude*'.[59] But equally it might be said that Champion exhibits signs of an anti-Pearson agenda, and therefore plays down the importance of a newer, more robust idea of distinctive Canadian nationalism.

Turning to the historiography of multiculturalism in Australia and Canada, the tendency of many scholars has been towards comparative studies which by their very nature have not studied in depth the policies or the context in which they emerged. My thesis will aim to explore both these factors. In addition, the general surveys make certain key assumptions. The most prominent amongst these is that multiculturalism was the only 'moral and rational alternative' to assimilation.

[59] Quotes taken from Champion, *The Strange Demise of British Canada*, 6, 7.

However, those that would give multiculturalism its own teleology need to be critiqued. The story of this transition is not as *natural* or *inevitable* as some would have it. This is an extremely flawed picture of the past and the aim in this study is to look in more detail at the previous period, especially the 1950s and 1960s for Canada and the 1960s and 1970s for Australia.

Louis-Jacques Dorais, Lois Foster and David Stockley[60] have suggested that 'The evolution of the concept, policy and practice of multiculturalism was, in large part, a response to increasing ethnic and racial diversity, especially in Australia.'[61] Diversity of the population was accelerated in both countries by the introduction of official immigration programmes since 1947.[62] As the example of the experience of the US demonstrates, its response to diverse migration has been completely different. New immigrants were (and still are) expected to assimilate and become American citizens as quickly as possible, with no supposed difference between Americans. A policy of monoculturalism, not multiculturalism, prevails.

Alternatively, according to Freda Hawkins,[63] the adoption of multicultural policies in Canada and Australia reflected recognition of the need for the political parties in power to adapt to a changing domestic political environment.[64] This was attributed mainly to the fact that migrants formed a large proportion of working-class voters. Yet this argument is surely problematic, since if followed logically it would have made more sense for both the Canadian and Australian governments to introduce policies which appealed to the majority of their electorate, which during the

---

[60] Louis-Jacques Dorais, Lois Foster and David Stockley, 'Multiculturalism and Integration' in Howard Adelman, Allan Borowski, Meyer Burstein and Lois Foster (Eds), *Immigration and Refugee Policy: Australia and Canada Compared*, vol. II (Melbourne, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1994).
[61] Quote taken from Dorais et al., 'Multiculturalism and Integration', 374.
[62] Dorais et al., 'Multiculturalism and Integration', 375.
[63] Freda Hawkins, *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared*, 2nd edn. (Montreal, QC and Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queens University Press, 1991).
[64] *Ibid.*, 214.

1970s was still predominantly English-speaking in Canada and of British descent in Australia.

Hawkins argues that '[Multiculturalism] policy was adopted by both Canada and Australia in the early seventies for the same reasons and with the same objectives, but with rather different means of implementation developed over the subsequent years.'[65] Though there were some common motivations in the introduction of multiculturalism in the two countries, there were also some prominent differences. The most important is the absence of a competing 'charter group', the French-Canadians, in Australia, and partly as a consequence of this, multiculturalism there is only considered relevant to immigrants and their children, as opposed to all groups in theory in Canada. However, in practice Anglo-centric culture dominated and still dominates the majority of institutions and media in the country.

Indeed Lois Foster and Paul Bartrop[66] suggest that there are some important differences between Canada and Australia. The presence of two charter groups, the British and the French, and a large influx of non-British migrants in the early twentieth century to open up settlement of the West in Canada have no parallel in Australia.[67]

Therefore Canada experienced large-scale non-British immigration considerably earlier than Australia in the late nineteenth/early twentieth century (compared to the post-Second World War period in Australia), and thus its periods of assimilation, integration and ultimately multiculturalism took place earlier. No study of multicultural policy in Canada and Australia has examined this phenomenon in a

---

[65] Quote taken from Hawkins, *Critical Years in Immigration*, 214.
[66] Lois Foster and Paul R. Bartrop, 'The Roots of Multiculturalism in Australia and Canada' in Kate Burridge, Lois Foster and Gerry Turcotte (Eds), *Canada-Australia: Towards a Second Century of Partnership* (Montreal, QC: International Council for Canadian Studies, Carleton University Press, 1997).
[67] *Ibid.*, 272.

broader historical continuum. The link between the demise of British race patriotism, the need for a new national identity and the adoption of multiculturalism is a subject only touched on by previous scholars, but it has not been examined in depth. This thesis aims to fill that gap.

The vast majority of scholarship on multiculturalism in Canada and Australia has also tended to be sociological in theory and approach. This has resulted in more emphasis on the theoretical foundations of the policy rather than focusing on its historical roots and context.

Mark Lopez's *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics*[68] is the most comprehensive account of the emergence of a policy of multiculturalism in Australia. However it lacks contextual detail and a developed historical argument. Lopez does not offer broader historical reasons as to why multiculturalism became the dominant discourse in Australian politics in the 1970s.

Anna Haebich[69] explores assimilation policy in Australia between 1950 and 1970. However, her focus is on Aborigines as well as migrants, whereas this thesis will only be studying assimilation policy in relation to migrants.[70] Haebich argues that assimilation policy lasted until the 1970s and was then replaced by multicultural policy. But what follows in the chapters below demonstrates that there was an important period of integration from the 1960s to the 1970s, which differed in major ways from the preceding era of assimilation and the upcoming one of multiculturalism. Haebich too is not centrally concerned with how this historical

---

[68] Mark Lopez, *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics: 1945-1975* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2000).
[69] Anna Haebich, *Spinning the Dream: Assimilation in Australia, 1950-1970* (North Fremantle, WA: Fremantle Press, 2007).
[70] This is because with very few exceptions Aboriginal policy and Migrant policy were always treated separately. Furthermore, when both Canada and Australia introduced official multicultural policies in the 1970s, Aboriginal groups in both countries were very keen to keep their distance, as they did not consider their cultures one of many, but as the first in their respective countries.

problem relates to the broader issue of the changing contours of Australian community following the demise of the British idea.

Eric Richards' *Destination Australia*[71] surveys the history of Australian immigration from 1901 to the current day. It attempts to explain how Australia changed from a White British nation to a multicultural one. However, Richards' primary focus is on immigration rather than the problem of national identity. He charts the major different waves of immigration that came to Australia over the course of the twentieth century: British, European and then Asian. Richards makes a distinction between the British race and Australian race. It is the contention of this thesis that such a distinction is dubious. Australian patriotism reinforced this sense of British identity and was not a competitor. As Meaney has emphasised, nationalism is a jealous god and simply will not allow for competing loyalties.[72]

This thesis draws on new archival material in exploring this historical problem. Previous studies of the origins of multiculturalism in Australia and Canada have concentrated too much on the examination of government reports. Parliamentary debates, newspapers, ethnic and government journals will provide considerable new insight into the questions that this work seeks to explore. These sources will be especially useful in illustrating the way in which ideas of national community changed over the course of time.

The thesis will compare Canada and Australia because they both have similar political systems and are major immigrant receiving nations. However, most importantly, English-speaking Canada and Australia both identified themselves as British nations for a large part of their history. Furthermore, this identity came under

[71] Eric Richards, *Destination Australia: Migration to Australia since 1901* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2008).
[72] Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 78.

considerable strain in both countries, a strain which was primarily due to the shock of external events. Secondly, Canada and Australia also adopted discriminatory immigration policies which aimed to create white, British countries. Moreover, they both also gradually dismantled these practices. Thirdly, Canada and Australia experienced large waves of non-British migration to their shores and had to formulate official migrant policies to deal with them.

The French presence in Canada was an important point of difference between that country and Australia. It was an important factor in the Canadian experience of the three main developments above. This was something Australia had no comparable experience of.

Immigration or more precisely 'whiteness' is also another integral part of the thesis. Specifically, both Canada and Australia had White Canada or White Australia policies for a majority of the period under study. Whiteness was closely linked with Britishness, as both countries wanted to preserve themselves as white, British nations. However, over time, non-discriminatory immigration policies were adopted in both Canada and Australia and eventually post-White immigration policies were introduced.

This leads to the third overarching theme of the thesis, which is official migrant policy. As both Canada and Australia received non-British migration, official policy had to be formulated to deal with it. Both countries adopted a policy of assimilation in the first instance. This was replaced by integration and then by a policy of multiculturalism as Canada and Australia's national identities were transformed as outlined above.

This underlines the importance of specifying working definitions of assimilation, integration and multiculturalism for the thesis. Assimilation expected

migrants to incorporate themselves completely into the dominant Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic culture in English-speaking Canada and Australia as soon as possible. In this endeavour, learning the official language/s of the country was paramount.

On the other hand, integration acknowledged that the incorporation of migrants into the dominant culture actually took time, usually by the second generation, and allowed migrants to retain certain elements of their home cultures, especially languages. However, it has to be recognised that integration meant different things at different times. So, when it was first used in the political lexicon there was more emphasis on the fact that the incorporation of migrants into the Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic culture would take time. Later on, this emphasis changed to allow migrants to retain aspects of their home cultures as a means of enriching the host culture.

Multicultural policy instead encouraged migrants to retain their cultures. Indeed it saw such retention as a positive thing and envisaged that a new national culture would emerge. However, multicultural policy came to mean very different things for Canada and Australia, which will be discussed and explored later in the thesis.

Change occurred first in Canada for three main reasons. Firstly, in terms of national identity, Britishness was always a problematic concept due to the presence of a competing founding group in the country: the French. English-speaking Canada's identification as a British nation was fine so long as French-Canada did not have a competing nationalism of its own. However, when this began to change in the 1960s it became clear that a new, overarching 'Canadian' identity was required to counter French-Canadian separatism.

Secondly, the abandonment of 'whiteness' happened earlier in Canada because of the weaker hold the policy had on the national psyche of the country. This was demonstrated by the White Canada policy primarily being centred on the province of British Columbia, compared to the White Australia policy, a national policy which was conceived at the very foundation of the new nation-state. This was a consequence of British Columbia, as it bordered the Pacific Ocean and was the only part of Canada that felt truly threatened by Asia. Australia, on the other hand, was characterised by a much more pervasive fear of Asian 'invasion'. Thus, these different geo-political circumstances certainly go a long way towards explaining why Canada was able to dismantle its White Canada policy much earlier than Australia.

Thirdly, Canada adopted official migrant policies considerably earlier than Australia due to it receiving large mass non-British migration around fifty years before Australia received comparable numbers. It had to formulate a way with which to deal with these migrants. It chose assimilation because it identified itself as a British country at this time. Hence, non-British migrants were expected to incorporate themselves into the Anglo-centric culture as soon as possible.

In terms of structure the thesis will be divided into three sections: assimilation policies, integration policies and the introduction of multicultural policies in Canada and Australia. Within each of these parts first there will be a Canadian chapter, followed by an Australian chapter and then a comparative chapter comparing the experiences in the two countries. In terms of time periods the assimilation policies section will span the 1890s-1960s, the integration policies part will range from the 1950s to the 1970s, and lastly the introduction of multicultural policies section will look at the period of the 1960s-1970s.

However, there is a problem with comparing Canada and Australia's assimilation policies, and also their subsequent integration and multicultural policies, which is due to the two countries adopting assimilation in different time periods. Canada adopted a policy of assimilation during the 1890s and 1953; and Australia instead had an assimilation policy between 1945 and 1962. Hence, Australia's periods of integration and multiculturalism were also much later. Nevertheless the two countries offer fruitful comparisons. So, the thesis will still compare the policies of assimilation, integration and multiculturalism in both Canada and Australia. However, the comparisons of their respective historical contexts will have to be limited to issues which have been explored in both previous national chapters by that point, i.e. Britishness and 'whiteness'; the 'new nationalism' and non-discriminatory immigration policies; and multiculturalism and post-whiteness. So, the first comparative chapter on assimilation policies in Canada and Australia (Chapter Three) will only compare the historical contexts of Canada and Australia between the 1890s and 1953, the common period that has been covered in the two previous national chapters. Therefore, discussions about Britishness and Whiteness in Canada and Australia will only cover the years 1890s-1953 in this chapter. To clarify, for example, the Suez Crisis of 1956 will not be discussed in the first comparative chapter, as it was not mentioned in both of the previous two national chapters. The discussion of it will have to wait until the subsequent comparative chapter. Consequently, the second comparative chapter on integration policies in Canada and Australia (Chapter Six) will look at the following period of 1953-63 in terms of the historical contexts of Canada and Australia. Lastly, the final comparative chapter on multicultural policies in Canada and Australia will compare and contrast the historical contexts of Canada and Australia between 1963 and 1978.

Chapter One – Assimilation Policy in Canada, 1890s-1953

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 very much saw itself 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 Britishness. Thus, the non-British migrants were required to assimilate into this English-speaking Canadian society without delay. But in the early 1950s the British identity of English-speaking Canada began to decline ever so slowly. The first steps towards the gradual breakdown of the White Canada policy also occurred at this time. This had a corresponding weakening effect on the assimilation policy adopted towards non-British migrants.

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 towards 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 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 legal and political institutions could only be appreciated 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'.[73]

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.[74]

In his study of school textbooks from this period, Francis draws a contrast between the education of his generation (born in the 1950s) and that of his parents. For those of his parents' generation, studies about Great Britain and the Empire were at the forefront of their schooling. The Union Jack was proudly raised above all the schools, as Canada did not have its own flag at this time, and students sang 'Rule Britannia' and 'Soldiers of the Queen' and pledged allegiance to the monarch. It was through the study of history in particular that British race patriotism was stressed. Two major features of the Canadian history narrative at this time were the gradual evolution of Canadian society to equal partnership in the imperial enterprise and the superiority of the British form of government and way of life. There was a

---

[73] Buckner and Francis, 'Introduction' in Buckner and Francis (Eds), *Canada and the British World*, 1, 6-7.

[74] *Toronto Globe*, 22nd May, 1909 cited in Francis, *National Dreams*, 66.

preoccupation in this imperialist version of history with outlining the transition of Canada from a dependent colony to a self-governing Dominion. However, self-government should not be confused with separatism. Canada's destiny as a prominent part of the Empire was the image presented in textbooks.[75] A common textbook of this mould was *A History of Canada for High Schools and Academies* by Charles G. D. Roberts, published in 1897.[76]

Igartua builds upon Francis' work, and draws on newspapers, public opinion polls, and textbooks to show that the national identity of English-speaking Canada was fundamentally based upon British culture and political tradition.[77] He maintains that 'The defenders of a "British" definition of Canada conceived of the country as blessed with the wisdom and greatness of British tradition embodied in its political and judicial system, in its educational and literary traditions, and in its manly defence of democracy and decency on the world stage.'[78] Taking this further, Buckner places Canadian Britishness in historical context, as he argues that '[A] sense of British identity [was] held by a majority of the colonial population and an overwhelming proportion of the non-Francophone population...When [Prime Minister] John A. Macdonald declared for partisan purposes in 1891 "A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die", he was expressing a desire widely held, even by a substantial majority of those who voted against him in the election that followed.'[79]

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

---

[75] Francis, *National Dreams*, 52, 53, 54.
[76] Charles G. D. Roberts, *A History of Canada for High Schools and Academies* (Toronto, Ont.: Morang Educational, 1897).
[77] Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution*, 12.
[78] Quote taken from Jose E. Igartua, '"Ready, Aye, Ready" No More? Canada, Britain, and the Suez Crisis in the Canadian Press' in Buckner (ed.). *Canada and the End of the British Empire*, 50.
[79] Quote taken from Buckner, 'Whatever happened to the British Empire?', 21.

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 organised 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 23rd May, 1899. The date chosen was the last school day before the 24th May holiday for Queen Victoria's birthday, known as Victoria Day.[80] Empire Day however soon became a national celebration, as support for it spread throughout English-speaking Canadian homes.[81]

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, and 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!"[82]

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.[83] R. B. Bennett, a future Conservative prime minister, was a backbencher in Parliament in 1914 when he explained his dream of the imperial ideal at an Empire Day banquet in Toronto:

> We are the only colonizing race that has been able to colonize the great outlying portions of the world and give the people the priceless boon of self-government, and we have educated men year after year until at last those who were once subjects become free, and those who

---

[80] 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, *National Dreams*, 65.
[81] Francis, *National Dreams*, 65.
[82] Cited in Francis, *National Dreams*, 65.
[83] Francis, *National Dreams*, 66.

> were free become freer, and you and I must carry our portion of that responsibility if we are to be the true Imperialists we should be.[84]

This reflected the Canadian belief that as the most senior Dominion it was its responsibility to take leadership of the Empire in the future. It is also an example of the language of the "White man's burden". This was the view that the 'white race' had the responsibility to bring civilisation to the 'other races' of the world. The actual term originated in a poem by British imperialist writer and poet Rudyard Kipling in *McClure's* magazine in February 1899 in the US, and was published in the context of the American take-over of the Philippines following the Spanish-American War.[85]

The French-Canadians however adopted an extremely ambivalent position towards the identification of Canada as an integral part of a wider British world. Kenneth McRoberts argues that '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.'[86]

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 that it identified with the white Empire. The British Columbian government as

---

[84] Cited in Francis, *National Dreams*, 63.
[85] Rudyard Kipling, "The White Man's Burden: The United States & The Philippine Islands, 1899", http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5478/ (Accessed 18/03/09).
[86] Quote taken from Kenneth McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity* (Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1997) 2.

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 only allow 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" 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.[87]

The idea behind 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.[88] 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.'[89] 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

---

[87] W. Peter Ward, *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Towards Orientals in British Columbia*, 3rd edn. (Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002) 75, 76.
[88] Patricia E. Roy, *A White Man's Province: British Columbia Politicians and Japanese and Chinese Immigrants, 1858-1914* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 1989) 230.
[89] *News-Advertiser*, 14th December, 1909 cited in Roy, *A White Man's Province*, 230.

workmen from cheap Oriental labour, but it was a question of the future of Canada as a nation.'"[90]

The White Canada policy was primarily aimed against the Japanese. While for most of the later nineteenth century Japan had been praised for attempting to embrace Western civilisation, after its defeat of Russia in 1905 it began to be seen as much more ominous: a threat to both geopolitical stability and racial purity. The fact that a European power was defeated by an Asian one for the very first time in modern history brought these fears of Asia to fever pitch. The same fundamental shift in attitudes towards Japan also took place in British Columbia. The image of a militaristic, aggressive Japan was not to be dislodged once fixed in the West Coast mind. These assumptions about Japanese militarism during the 1920s and 1930s persisted in the US and Canada, especially along the Pacific Coast, which obviously was closest to Japan. That Japan had designs upon Western North America and also the military strength to achieve them was generally believed.[91]

The interracial contact, which followed Japanese migration, was the second major source of British Columbia's Japanese image. Japanese migrants in the province left an even greater impression than Western perceptions of Japan upon the beliefs of British Columbia's white population. The most durable of all Japanese stereotypes was the view that they imperilled the economic interests of white British Columbia. This impression was quickly fixed in West Coast racial thought soon after the Japanese first arrived in the province. When immigrants from Japan were relatively few during the 1890s, it generally appeared that their competition only affected individuals or small groups of white workingmen. But as they arrived in

[90] Quote taken from Roy, *A White Man's Province*, 231.
[91] Ward, *White Canada Forever*, 98-102.

growing numbers after the turn of the century, this rivalry began to seem considerably more worrying.[92]

Another common belief was that aggression was intrinsic to the Japanese character. Evidence of this was the economic activities of the Japanese migrant. There were two clear features to this mindset. The view of the immigrants as unswerving Japanese nationalists, steadfastly loyal to the Emperor and therefore disloyal to Canada was one of them. These immigrants could never be woven into the social fabric of the province as they were imbued with the aspirations of modern Japan.[93]

Secondly, that Japanese land acquisition also threatened the white community was another common belief. When the first few Japanese immigrants began to purchase land from the early 1900s, the extension of Japanese landholding was a cause of continued concern. White British Columbians were convinced that, as with the Chinese, the Japanese could never be incorporated into West Coast society.[94]

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 the 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

[92] Ward, *White Canada Forever*, 102, 103.
[93] *Ibid.*, 104.
[94] *Ibid.*, 106.

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 solider would be met by the local Militia, a band, and nearly the whole population of their local community.[95]

All across the nation, local communities raised money to erect plaques, ornamental gates, or more grand monuments to those who died in South Africa. The South African War also led to the formation of the first imperialist organisation in Canada to be run 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.[96]

The issue of Canadian trade with its southern neighbour was a recurring thorny issue in Canadian politics. The debate surrounding the Canadian-American Reciprocity Proposals of 1911 in particular demonstrates the prevalence of Britishness in English-speaking Canada during this period. On 26th January 1911 the Canadian and US governments announced a draft reciprocal trade agreement lowering and removing tariffs on a series of products. There was subsequently a fierce debate in Canada over the benefits of the reciprocity proposals. This was mainly between Western farmers and Eastern manufacturers. However, large parts of the Conservative press responded to the reciprocity plans with strong hostility, accusing the Liberal Laurier government of desiring economic and ultimately political union with the US, consequently betraying Canada's imperial heritage.[97]

---

[95] Phillip Buckner, 'Canada' in David Omissi and Andrew S. Thompson (Eds), *The Impact of the South African War* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002) 238, 239.
[96] *Ibid.*, 240, 244.
[97] Simon J. Potter, 'The Imperial Significance of the Canadian-American Reciprocity Proposals of 1911'. *The Historical Journal*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2004, 81, 92.

As the debate in Britain on this issue became increasingly heated, the Canadian government was forced to intervene. Anxious that bad publicity would damage Canadian credit interests in the London money markets, William Fieldings, the Minister of Finance made an official statement in the UK aimed at countering criticisms that his government had betrayed the Empire.[98]

In Canada, the debate over reciprocity ultimately led to the premature dissolution of parliament, a fierce interlude of public campaigning, and a hotly contested election that resulted in a resounding Conservative victory.[99] Simon Potter asserts that 'During the debate over reciprocity Canadian Conservatives and British constructive imperialists became more closely aligned than ever before...Indeed, if anything, reciprocity seemed to show that empire was becoming more, not less, of a force in Canadian affairs.'[100]

Within the country, English-speaking Canadian and French-Canadian identities came into constant conflict. Firstly, 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, fearful of being sucked into a far-off imperial conflict. Secondly, as a result of British pressure, Liberal Prime Minister Wilfred Laurier established a small Canadian navy in 1910. English-speaking Canadian Conservative politicians on the one hand criticised it as too small, whilst French-Canadian nationalists considered it a perilous action that would make involvement in imperial conflicts unavoidable.[101]

---

[98] Potter, 'The Imperial Significance of the Canadian-American Reciprocity Proposals of 1911', 96.
[99] *Ibid.*
[100] Quote taken from Potter, 'The Imperial Significance of the Canadian-American Reciprocity Proposals of 1911', 98, 100.
[101] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 19.

Most importantly however, during the First World War the federal Union 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 MPs, all 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 towards 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.[102]

Rodolphe Lemieux built upon 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.[103]

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 Marcil 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

---

See also Colin M. Coates, "French Canadians' Ambivalence to the British Empire" in Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the British Empire*, 181-99.

[102] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1917, 18th June, 1917, Mr. Marcil, 2428.

[103] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1917, 19th June, 1917, Mr. Lemieux, 2467.

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.[104]

The major reason why Liberal French-Canadian parliamentarians were so insistent about the need for a referendum was 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.'[105]

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 before enacting the measure, Borden only gained three seats in Quebec.

In addition to this crisis, the question of French-Canadian minority rights outside Quebec again rose to the political surface. In 1912, just before the war, Ontario introduced Regulation 17, which limited French-language education, and in 1916 Manitoba put an end to its bilingual schools.[106] Hence, it is clear that in the first fifty years of Confederation English-speaking Canadians and French-Canadians had opposing ideas of their country. For a majority of English-speaking Canadians, Canada was just the North American manifestation of a British nationality. In contrast, the Francophones of Quebec carried on regarding Canada in relation to

---

[104] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1917, 20th June, 1917, Mr. Lemieux, 2479.
[105] *Ibid.*, 2514.
[106] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 19.

their own identity as French-Canadians or *Canadiens*. This identity was strongly founded in the political institutions and territory of Quebec.[107]

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 in 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.'[108] 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 the Minister of Labour. He argued vociferously for the exclusion of Asian migrants during the spring and summer of 1922.[109]

By the early 1920s provincial efforts towards 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 recognised that current restrictive immigration legislation had in certain ways failed. The Chinese Head Tax[110] 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

---

[107] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 23.
[108] 'Notice of meeting, Penticton, 1920' cited in Ward, *White Canada Forever*, 125.
[109] Ward, *White Canada Forever*, 130-1.
[110] This was a prohibitive levy of $500 placed on Chinese migrants entering Canada to discourage them from coming to the country. Peter S. Li, 'Chinese' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History* (Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004) 128.

behind calls for more extensive Chinese immigration restriction legislation. 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.[111]

The nativists carried on arguing their case through the mid 1920s, even though the hostility towards Japanese migration declined in British Columbia. Provincial members of Parliament 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 supportive largely 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.[112]

To maintain Canada as a white, British society the White Canada Association was formed in late 1929 in Vancouver. It brought together elements from a wide cross-section of society. This included municipal governments, ratepayers' associations, farm organizations, businessmen's groups, and patriotic societies. Its formation highlights the widespread support for the preservation of Canada as a white society. Contrarily, the defence of Asiatics by whites was very rarely expressed outside the Church. Indeed at no time did the anti-oriental movement face a viable opposition.[113]

During the Second World War, English-speaking Canadian and French-Canadian conflicting ideas of national identity led to another embittered conflict over

[111] Ward, *White Canada Forever*, 131, 132, 134.
[112] *Ibid.*, 138.
[113] *Ibid.*, 136, 139.

conscription for overseas military service. As a 1942 nation-wide referendum unequivocally demonstrated, Anglophones were strongly supportive while Francophones were against, the latter arguing that they had no responsibility to fight Britain's wars.[114]

The conscription issue in the Second World War and the loss of Quebec's autonomy due to a federal government which was intent on greater centralisation led to the rise of the Bloc Populaire Canadien[115] in 1942. 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,[116] declared on 9th September, 1942 the establishment of a new political movement that would contest the traditional parties at the federal as well as provincial level.[117] According to Michael Behiels however 'The Bloc Populaire was, from the outset no more than a volatile coalition encompassing less than a handful of disenchanted federal MPs under the guidance of Maxime Raymond and three highly disgruntled and disillusioned Quebec-oriented nationalists.'[118]

The Bloc Populaire's federal platform was a meticulously written combination of old and new nationalist concerns and goals. To English-speaking Canadians, the

---

[114] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 24.

[115] 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 per cent 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. H. Blair Neatby, 'Bloc populaire' in Hallowell (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, 75.

[116] Henri Bourassa was one of the earliest French-Canadians who articulated anti-imperialism and instead emphasised Canadian nationalism. The first major display of this was his passionate opposition to Canada's participation in the South African War in 1899.

[117] Michael D. Behiels, 'The Bloc Populaire Canadien and the Origins of French-Canadian Neo-Nationalism, 1942-1948' in Michael D. Behiels (ed.), *Quebec Since 1800: Selected Readings* (Toronto, Ont.: Irwin Publishing, 2002) 443-4.

[118] Quote taken from Behiels, 'The Bloc Populaire Canadien and the Origins of French-Canadian Neo-Nationalism', 444.

most important part of the Bloc's federal platform was its foreign policy, particularly its vociferous and in some ways antiquated anti-imperialism. To this political nationalism was added a good dose of economic nationalism. The third, and perhaps most prominent part of the Bloc's federal platform was the considerably complicated and politically controversial issue of provincial autonomy.[119]

At the core of the Bloc's provincial goals was the continuous reaffirmation that Quebec, and Quebec alone, was the homeland, *la vraie patrie*, of the French-Canadian nation. The Bloc Populaire also strongly encouraged the nationalisation of specific major industries.[120] Behiels asserts that 'while paying lip service to the tenets and values of traditional French-Canadian clerical nationalism, the Bloc Populaire was beginning the process of articulating a secular, socio-economic, and state-oriented neo-nationalism.'[121]

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. 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

---

[119] Behiels, 'The Bloc Populaire Canadien and the Origins of French-Canadian Neo-Nationalism', 445-7.
[120] *Ibid.*, 449, 452.
[121] Quote taken from Behiels, 'The Bloc Populaire Canadien and the Origins of French-Canadian Neo-Nationalism', 459.

help to unite them as Canadians.[122] 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.'[123] 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.

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.[124]

So, although Martin had emphasised 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 the links to the mother country.

Though supportive of the general principle behind the new Citizenship Bill, future Progressive Conservative[125] 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

---

[122] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 20th March, 1946, Mr. Martin, 131.
[123] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 2nd April, 1946, Mr. Martin, 502.
[124] *Ibid.*, 508.
[125] 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.

Empire would have to follow the same naturalisation 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?[126]

He believed it would strike at the unity of citizenship in the Empire. Diefenbaker also emphasised the importance of the Canadian action. It would lead to British subjects under a common king and with a common loyalty, when arriving in Canada, being required to go through the same processes as those coming from foreign countries.[127] These processes involved residency requirements, making a declaration of intention to apply for citizenship, and appearing before a magistrate to actually gain citizenship. To hit home his critique that the Citizenship Bill would undermine Canada's British identity he declared that 'Canada to me means more than the ownership of acres; it means a citizenship which maintains in this part of North America the highest heritage of British peoples everywhere in the world.'[128]

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.'[129] He argued that the Bill indicated a great lack of appreciation of the value of British citizenship and that being a Canadian and a British subject were the same thing.[130] Church, like Diefenbaker, was strongly

---

[126] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 2nd April, 1946, Mr. Diefenbaker, 513.
[127] *Ibid.*
[128] *Ibid.*, 514.
[129] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 5th April, 1946, Mr. Church, 598.
[130] *Ibid.*, 599.

opposed to the provisions regarding the naturalisation 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.*'[131] 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.[132]

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. This would, in addition 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 who were willing to become British subjects. Raymond's most important objection to the Bill was though that it 'gives as much importance to British nationality as it does to Canadian nationality...It submerges it in British nationality.'[133] 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 of the criticisms by the latter.

Another French-Canadian parliamentarian, Liguori Lacombe, 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

[131] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 5th April, 1946, Mr. Church, 600.
[132] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 2nd May, 1946, Mr. Martin, 1114.
[133] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 5th April, 1946, Mr. Raymond, 620-1.

principle behind the measure of establishing a new Canadian citizenship.[134] This was not opposed by Raymond. So, despite French-Canadian views towards the retention of British nationality, most of them were willing to compromise as the Citizenship Bill in their opinion represented a step forward in the right direction.

Édouard-Gabriel Rinfret, another Liberal French-Canadian MP drew attention to what he perceived to be an irreconcilable situation of a citizen of one country at the same time being the subject of the King of another country. He argued that what was required was legislation to change the bifocal mentality of so many Canadians. That is he wanted English-speaking Canadians to abandon their 'Britishness'. Moreover, he encouraged people to think less in terms of the French and British components of the country, but instead to focus on those of non-British and non-French origin, whose proportion of the population was steadily increasing. This was a unique view at this time, especially for a French-Canadian. In this sense he was one of the earliest advocates of this perspective. He also expressed a view which reflected a broader French-Canadian opinion 'I am at ease...in talking about true Canadians, because I feel that I am a true Canadian...The majority of the population of the province of Quebec feel that we are the true settlers of this country.'[135] This was a perspective that suggested that the French tradition of Quebec was the true source of Canadian identity.

Anthony Hlynka, a Social Credit[136] MP expressed the perspective of non-British and non-French Canadians towards the proposed citizenship legislation:

> Although we have drawn upon Great Britain for most of what we possess in the way of culture, traditions, history, institutions, our way of life, and centuries of experience in practical statecraft, we nevertheless have now arrived at the stage where we must begin to develop our own distinctive character.[137]

---

[134] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 5th April, 1946, Mr. Lacombe, 608.
[135] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 5th April, 1946, Mr. Rinfret, 591-2, 594, 595.
[136] This was a social conservative political party that originated in Alberta in the 1930s.
[137] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1946, 5th April, 1946, Mr. Hlynka, 591.

This showed a Canadian nationalism emerging out of a distinct British heritage.

The continued centrality of Empire Day in expressions of British race patriotism in the post-Second World War period was drawn attention to in Toronto's *Globe and Mail* in May 1945, in an editorial on Ontario Premier, George Drew. The newspaper highlighted the fact that Drew was a World War I veteran who had fought for the honourable ideals of the Empire. He now continued his public service as leader of a province which had fought shoulder to shoulder with other loyal British subjects across the Empire (Ontario was a particular British bastion in Canada), an Empire which consisted of 25 per cent of the world's population. Hence, the newspaper believed it was very fitting that it was the Ontario Department of Education that took the lead in the establishment of an educational program to explain to schoolchildren the importance of Empire Day, which had been commemorated in the province for nearly fifty years.[138] So, the introduction of an education programme in Ontario to teach children the importance of Empire Day demonstrated the government's commitment to propagate English-speaking Canada's identification as a British nation. The Second World War undoubtedly played a part in this effort, as it had shown the whole British world fighting together to combat a common enemy.

Solon Earl Low articulated the Social Credit Party's identification of English-speaking Canada as a British society when he recalled that 'When I was a mere boy at school it was impressed upon me that the 23rd of May was a day for special thanksgiving that we were born in Canada, or privileged to live in Canada, under the

[138] 'An Empire United for World Good', *Globe and Mail*, Wednesday, 23rd May, 1945, 6.

flag and under the traditions of the great empire of which we form a part.'[139] This illustrates that Canadians of his generation were very much creatures of their culture.

Both of the references to Empire Day above refer to the past. There is almost a nostalgic quality to them. This implies that things were perhaps not what they once were.

Dominion Day, which took place on 1st 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 'The 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.'[140] 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. He also emphasised the actual act of Confederation itself as an attempt to solidify future British power in the North American continent:

> May I draw attention to the rather unique circumstance that while eighty years ago four provinces were uniting to form confederation and to fulfil the dream that some day there might be a vast power of the combined British communities in the northern half of this continent which would strike across space and time and include all the territory between the waters of the Atlantic and those of the Pacific.[141]

---

[139] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1950, 23rd May, 1950, Mr. Low, 2744.
[140] Debates, *H of C*, vol. V, 1947, 30th June, 1947, Mr. Mackenzie King, 4888.
[141] *Ibid.*

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 emphasised 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.[142] 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.[143]

Nevertheless, a series of amendments to immigration regulations were introduced. Due to complaints of discrimination made by the Chinese government, but more importantly as a consequence of Canada's new obligations to avoid racial discrimination under the UN charter 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.[144] These were notable changes, especially the repeal of the Chinese Immigration Act. They represented the first major amendments of the White Canada policy.

---

[142] LAC, MG26-J/Speeches/Vol. 80/Reel H-3054, Canada's Immigration Policy - Statement by the Prime Minister, House of Commons, 1st May, 1947, D50917, D50918.
[143] *Ibid.*, D50919.
[144] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 65/Cab. Doc. 370/1947, 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, 20th January, 1947, 1.
LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2639, Immigration policy; report of Cabinet Committee, 23rd January, 1947, 4, 5.

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 against Asian migration.[145] 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 in the USSR and therefore in the context of the Cold War easier immigration terms for it was not possible.[146] So, better immigration terms were extended to those 'Asian' countries 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 emphasised 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.[147]

St. Laurent's emphasis on the preservation of both the British and French cultures signalled a new focus in issues of national identity compared to the previous

---

[145] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2642, Immigration; Admission of Lebanese, Syrians and Armenians, 29th September, 1948, 5.
[146] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2643, Immigration; exception of Armenians, Lebanese and Syrians from "Asiatic race" prohibition; inclusion in admissible classes, 3rd May, 1949, 6, 7.
[147] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 257, 'Canada: An Adult Nation' - Broadcast by Louis S. St. Laurent, 3rd February, 1949, 4.

Mackenzie King period. St. Laurent did though 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.[148]

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

Canada had been at the forefront, along with Ireland and South Africa, in pushing for greater Dominion autonomy. The culmination of these efforts was the Balfour Report of 1926 which stated that the Dominions were 'autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any respect of their domestic or external affairs.' Furthermore, the declaration also went on to say that Britain and the Dominions were 'united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.'[149] The Statute of Westminster built on this and declared the Dominion Parliaments of Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand and South Africa to be equal to that of Westminster and provided for as much legal independence as the Dominions desired.[150] Although Canada had pushed for greater autonomy it still regarded itself as an integral part of the Commonwealth, and as the most senior member of the organisation after the UK, a model for other countries to follow.

---

[148] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 263, Dominion Day Message, 1st July, 1949, 2, 4-5.
[149] Quotes taken from Francine McKenzie, 'Balfour Report' in Hallowell (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, 60.
[150] Norman Hillmer, 'Statute of Westminster' in Hallowell (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, 598.

There were also developments in Quebec in the post-Second World War period. These largely related to relations with the federal government. The determined post-war effort of Ottawa to take a more active role as the national government strengthened Québec 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.[151] 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 Commission[152] led the Duplessis ministry in Quebec to in turn establish a 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.[153]

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 amongst those from the British Isles, the US and Central and Eastern Europe.[154] This included Britons, Germans

---

[151] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 27.
[152] 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 post-war Canada. It was contentious in Quebec as it recommended direct federal funding for universities when education was a provincial responsibility. Paul Litt, 'Massey Commission' in Hallowell (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, 393.
[153] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 28.
[154] J. M. Bumsted, *A History of the Canadian Peoples* (Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2003) 254.

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 consisted notably of Ukrainians, but also Poles, Hungarians and Russians.[155] It was to these latter groups that Clifton's infamous euphemism of 'stalwart peasants in sheepskin coats' referred.

In correspondence with a Canadian-Jewish aid society, which desired to assist European Jews to migrate to the Prairies in 1891, the Department of the Interior made it clear that it was not government policy to encourage groups of people of the same nationality to settle together.[156] Nonetheless despite this, by the end of the century, many migrants to the Prairies had formed interconnected communities, usually based on shared origins.[157]

Ukrainians were in certain ways quite representative of the migrants that arrived in Canada after Confederation, at a time when official support for large-scale immigration to populate the 'empty' Prairies and to keep the Americans out was regarded as in the best interests of the new nation. The Ukrainians were the model of Sifton's 'peasant in a sheepskin coat', of the kind of migrant streaming into the West in the early years of the twentieth century.[158]

Sifton's successor Frank Oliver was constantly criticising his policies, asserting that considerably more attention needed to be paid to the selection of races. Like numerous others at the time he suggested that Sifton's preference for

---

[155] LAC, RG33-80/Acc. 1974-75-039/Box 12, The Other Ethnic Groups in Canada - Schema and principal recommendations - Part I - Chapter I, Introduction, 27th February, 1967, 3.
[156] LAC, RG15/Vol. 651/Reels T-13818-13819/File 269180, Acting-Deputy of the Minister of the Interior to John Lowe, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, 21st July, 1891.
[157] Michael R. Hudson, 'Multiculturalism, Government Policy and Constitutional Enshrinement – A Comparative Study' in *Multiculturalism and the Charter: A Legal Perspective* (Toronto, Ont.: Carswell, 1987) 60.
[158] Elizabeth Wangenheim, 'The Ukrainians: A Case Study of the "Third Force"' in Peter Russell (ed.), *Nationalism in Canada* (Toronto, Ont.: McGraw-Hill, 1966) 78, 80.

'Galacians'[159] over British labourers was destroying the national fabric. On the other hand, Sifton was no supporter of a Canada with a multitude of cultures, regardless of his backing of non-British settlers.[160]

The second main wave of non-French and non-British migrants to Canada began to arrive 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.[161]

As English-speaking Canada's identity was based on Britishness and whiteness a policy of assimilation was adopted towards these non-British migrants. They arrived in a country that was extremely Anglo-centric 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 dominated culture, then their children would.[162] This is expanded upon by Jean Burnet and Howard Palmer, who suggest that 'The reason for the isolation of the Native peoples on reserves and for the restriction or exclusion of blacks and Asians was that they were considered unassimilable, the south and central European groups whose admission was grudging were thought to be assimilable but only with difficulty.'[163]

---

[159] This was a term used to describe migrants from the broad region of what is now the Ukraine.

[160] D. J. Hall, 'Clifford Sifton: Immigration and Settlement Policy, 1896-1905' in Howard Palmer (ed.), *The Settlement of the West* (Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary, Comprint Publishing, 1977) 76-7, 79.

[161] Howard Palmer, 'Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century' in John R. Mallea & Jonathan C. Young (Eds), *Cultural Diversity and Canadian Education* (Ottawa, Ont.: Carleton University Press, 1984) 29.

[162] J. H. Thompson and M. Weinfeld, 'Entry and Exit: Canadian Immigration Policy in Context', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 538, March 1995, 187-8.
W. H. Sheridan, *Canadian Multiculturalism* (Ottawa, Ont.: Library of Parliament, Research Branch, 1990) 2.
Will Kymlicka, 'Canadian multiculturalism in historical and comparative perspective' in Matthew Zachariah, Allan Sheppard and Leona Barratt (Eds), *Canadian Multiculturalism: Dreams, Realities, Expectations* (Edmonton, Alta.: Canadian Multicultural Education Foundation, 2004) 158.

[163] Quote taken from Jean R. Burnet and Howard Palmer, *"Coming Canadians": An Introduction to a History of Canada's Peoples* (Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1989) 223.

Anglo-centeredness required migrants to abandon the traditions and cultures of their homelands and instead adopt the values and behaviour of English-speaking Canadians.[164] Palmer asserts that 'Since at this time the British Empire was at its height, and the belief in "progress" and Anglo-Saxon and white superiority was taken for granted throughout the English-speaking world, a group's desirability as potential immigrants varied almost directly with its members' physical and cultural distance from London (England) and the degree to which their skin pigmentation conformed to Anglo-Saxon white.'[165] Evelyn Kallen maintains that the basic premise of the concept [of Anglo-centeredness] 'was that immigrants would assimilate to the British institutional and cultural model, which included the English language and the Protestant religion.'[166]

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 if 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 wellbeing of the country that migrants should become English-speaking Christian Canadians.[167] Marilyn Barber cites the report of the Methodist Missionary Society in 1910: 'Our objective on behalf of European foreigners should

---

[164] Palmer, 'Reluctant Hosts', 21.
Yasmeen Abu-Laban and Christina Gabriel, *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment Equity, and Globalisation* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2002) 105.
[165] Quote taken from Palmer, 'Reluctant Hosts', 23.
[166] Quote taken from Evelyn Kallen, 'Multiculturalism: Ideology, Policy, and Reality', *JCS*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1982, 51.
[167] Marilyn Barber, 'Nationalism, Nativism and the Social Gospel' in Richard Allen (ed.), *The Social Gospel in Canada* (Ottawa, Ont.: National Museums of Canada, 1975) 222.

be to assist in making them English-speaking Christian citizens who are clean, educated, and loyal to the Dominion and to Greater Britain.'[168]

On the surface the Prairie West seemed to be Protestant, and assimilationist programs were most popular in Protestant circles. Such programs were aimed at creating an unvaryingly Protestant and English-speaking society, British in its allegiance politically but in its social attitudes resoundingly American.[169] The latter was in the sense of not having a rigid class based society. Yet, this emphasis on a Protestant Canada excluded not only French-Canadians, who were predominantly Catholic, but also Irish-Catholics, who formed a sizeable community in Canada.

The Mennonites provide a useful case study that demonstrates the experience of non-British migrants in Canada at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. According to John Friesen, 'The Mennonites who migrated to Canada, with a few exceptions, represented an economically depressed community in Russia, and they were more conservative in orientation...The privileges which they procured at the hands of Canadian government officials assisted them in their preoccupation with maintaining their way of life.'[170]

However, direct interference into Mennonite affairs in Manitoba began in 1907 when the Roblin government declared that the Union Jack flag should be raised over every public school building.[171] The directive was aimed to 'inculcate feelings of patriotism and materially assist in the blending together of the various nationalities in

---

[168] *Annual Report of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Church*, 1909-10 cited in Barber, 'Nationalism, Nativism and the Social Gospel', 222-3.
[169] L. G. Thomas, 'The Umbrella and the Mosaic: The French-English Presence and the Settlement of the Canadian Prairie West' in John Alexander Carroll (ed.), *Reflections of Western Historians* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1969) 150.
[170] Quote taken from John W. Friesen, 'Preserving a religious-turned cultural identity: Mennonites in Canada' in Christopher Bagley and John W. Friesen (Eds), *The Evolution of Multiculturalism* (Calgary, Alta.: The Calgary Institute for the Humanities, The University of Calgary, May 1988) 8.
[171] Friesen, 'Preserving a religious-turned cultural identity', 9-10.

the province into one common citizenship, irrespective of race and creed.'[172] A further danger to Mennonite autonomy came about in 1916 when a Liberal government came into power in Manitoba with educational assimilation as a top priority. Their School Act of that same year declared that there would be compulsory education in the province with teaching in English alone.[173]

Very little had changed by World War I, and there were attempts to persuade all 'New Canadians' that allegiance to the British Empire and the Canadian nation were one and the same.[174] 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 prior to 1920 were based on the assumptions of all newcomers assimilating to Britishness. These included J.S. Woodsworth's *Strangers Within Our Gates* (1909)[175], J.T.M. Anderson's *The Education of the New-Canadian* (1918)[176], C.A. Magrath's *Canada's Growth and Some Problems Affecting it* (1910)[177], C.B. Sissons' *Bilingual Schools in Canada* (1917)[178], and W.G. Smith's *A Study in Canadian Immigration* (1920).[179]

Those promoting Anglo-centeredness were not just the conservatives of their day. Protestant Social Gospellers, including J. S. Woodsworth, later one of the founders of the CCF (a socialist labour and agrarian movement) also played a major part in nearly all the reform movements of the pre-World War One period, including

---

[172] Cited in Friesen, 'Preserving a religious-turned cultural identity', 10.
[173] Friesen, 'Preserving a religious-turned cultural identity', 10.
[174] John W. Friesen, *When Cultures Clash: Case Studies in Multiculturalism*, 2nd edn. (Calgary, Alta.: Detselig Enterprises, c1993) 6.
[175] J. S. Woodsworth, *Strangers Within Our Gates* (Toronto, Ont.: Stephenson, c1909).
[176] J. T. M. Anderson, *The Education of the New-Canadian: A Treatise on Canada's Greatest Educational Problem* (London, UK; Toronto, Ont.: J. M. Dent, 1918).
[177] C. A. McGrath, *Canada's Growth and Some Problems Affecting it* (Ottawa, Ont.: The Mortimer Press, 1910).
[178] C. B. Sissons, *Bilingual Schools in Canada* (London, UK; Toronto, Ont.: J. M. Dent, 1917).
[179] William George Smith, *A Study in Canadian Immigration* (Toronto, Ont.: Ryerson Press, 1920) Palmer, 'Reluctant Hosts', 25, 26.

women's rights, temperance, and labour, farm and penal reform. They also argued that migrants needed to adapt to these Protestant Anglo-Canadian values.[180]

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): 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."[181]

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

The assimilation of migrants was also achieved through education. Robert Harney and Harold Troper maintain that 'The official task of Canadianizing the foreigner fell to an unspecified coalition of educators, civil servants, social workers, religious leaders and public health officials...With rare exceptions, these guardians of the Canadian way worked with but one goal in mind: to remake the foreigner in their own image.'[182] However, 'Canadianisation' was not a secret programme 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 making future plans.[183]

Settlement houses took over the role of assimilating children after school. The three Toronto settlement houses carrying out activities in areas of large migrant concentration, St. Christopher House, University Settlement and Central

---

[180] Palmer, 'Reluctant Hosts', 26.
[181] *Lethbridge Herald*, 29th May, 1919 cited in J. W. Berry, R. Kalen & D. M. Taylor, *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada*. With the assistance of L. Lamarche and J. Christian (Ottawa, Ont.: Ministry of Supply and Services, Canada, 1977) 10.
[182] Quote taken from Robert F. Harney and Harold Troper. *Immigrants: A Portrait of the Urban Experience, 1890-1930* (Toronto, Ont.: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1975) 109-10.
[183] Harney and Troper, *Immigrants*, 110.

Neighbourhood House, were manned by small groups of qualified social workers, assisted by a committed body of volunteers. Despite each of these Toronto settlement houses being dedicated to the goal of 'Canadianisation', they were different from each other in attitude. Most prominently, Central Neighbourhood House, unlike its two sister institutions, was non-sectarian, having no affiliation to any Protestant faith. It walked 'a thin philosophic line between forceful assimilation as the best method to ensure the immigrant's adjustment, and respect for continuity of ethnic identity as to the best method to prevent social breakdown in the New World.'[184] In practice though, all three settlement houses regarded ultimate and total 'Canadianization' as inevitable and desirable. A program of English-language night school classes for adults was also offered.[185]

The Toronto Board of Education emphasised the importance of education in the assimilation process in a report in 1913.[186] The central role 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.'[187]

A. D. McRae of the Canadian Club[188] of Toronto made a clear link between assimilation policy and English-speaking Canada's identification as a British nation in 1921:

---

[184] Quote taken from Harney and Troper, *Immigrants*, 111.
[185] Harney and Troper, *Immigrants*, 112.
[186] Toronto Board of Education, Chief Inspector's Report, *Annual Report*, 1913 cited in Harney and Troper, *Immigrants*, 115.
[187] Toronto Board of Education, Chief Inspector's Report, *Annual Report*, 1928 cited in Harney and Troper, *Immigrants*, 118.
[188] These were civic organisations that aimed to encourage Canadian nationalism 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. Mary Vipond, 'Canadian Clubs' in Hallowell (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*, 104.

> 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.[189]

So, education was the key in assimilating non-British migrants into the Anglo-centric 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 of a wider British world.

The Conservative Prime Minister, R. B. Bennett reaffirmed the government's commitment to assimilating non-British groups into the dominant Anglo-centric 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.'[190] Therefore, non-British migrants continued to be expected to incorporate themselves into the Anglo-centric culture.

Nonetheless, between 1867 and 1945 the federal government did not adopt an overt assimilation policy, which either gave pre-eminence to English-speaking Canada or fostered a bi-cultural policy of assimilation to the dual founding elements in Canadian society.[191] Due to its biculturalism, Canada had two distinct societies,

---

[189] A. D. McRae, 'Canadian Citizenship of the Future,' *Proceedings of the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1919-20* (Toronto, Ont., 1921) cited in Harney and Troper, *Immigrants*, 123.

[190] Cited in Robert F. Harney, '"So Great a Heritage as Ours": Immigration and the Survival of the Canadian Polity' in Stephen R. Graubard (ed.), *In Search of Canada* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1989) 54.

[191] Palmer, 'Reluctant Hosts', 24.
Ivana Caccia's *Managing the Canadian Mosaic in Wartime: Shaping Citizenship Policy, 1939-45* (Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010) explores citizenship policy towards migrants during the Second World War period.

which in practice meant it had two assimilation policies, one to English-speaking Canada and the other to French Canada.

Prime Minister Mackenzie King called for a revival of mass immigration to Canada in 1947. This had been curtailed during the depression and World War II. Mackenzie King stated 'The policy of the government is to foster the growth of the population of Canada by the encouragement of immigration...we cannot ignore the danger that lies in a small population attempting to hold so great a heritage as ours.'[192] In King's 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.[193] These were British migrants. Hence, the Canadian government focused its immigration efforts on securing British migrants first and foremost. Like the Australian government, the Canadian government noted the numbers of British migrants its sister Dominion had received.[194] This reflected the fact that both countries were competing for the same source of migrants. British migrants were preferred as Canada, like Australia, viewed itself as essentially a British country. For that reason, migrants from the UK would not alter the fundamental character of the population but would adjust easily to their new environment.

The Canadian government did not immediately conclude an Assisted Passage Agreement with the UK (it eventually introduced a unilateral Assisted Passage Loan scheme, but this was not until the 1950s).[195] This is partly explained

---

[192] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1947, 1st May, 1947, Mr. Mackenzie King, 2644, 2645.
[193] Harney, '"So Great a Heritage as Ours"', 54.
[194] LAC, RG26/Vol. 142/File 3-40-16/Part 1, Memorandum by the Deputy Minister to the Minister of Immigration and Citizenship, 2nd March, 1950.
[195] However, Ontario in the immediate post-Second World War period took its own initiative in signing an agreement with the British government to transport migrants by air. This was known as the 'Drew Plan' after its architect, George Drew, the Conservative Premier of Ontario between 1943 and 1948. But this was only a limited provincial scheme.

in practical terms, as Britain was physically close to Canada. Consequently, the cost of transport was not overly expensive. On the other hand, it is more a fundamental reflection of the bicultural nature of Canada. The French-Canadians would have been opposed to any Assisted Passage Agreement with the UK, as it would represent preferential treatment for one of the founding groups over the other. Also, they may have responded with a call for a similar agreement to be concluded with France. The latter though, would have been unlikely as most French-Canadians did not have a strong affinity with Republican France, as Quebec had been founded before the French Revolution and had an unbroken tradition based largely on the Ancien Régime.

Nevertheless, the federal government in September 1948 did, in the hope of countering French-Canadian criticism, put French citizens on an equal basis to British and American nationals in terms of admission into Canada. It was not expected however that this would have any large impact on the actual numbers arriving in the country.[196] But federal bureaucrats halted the policy in its infancy, claiming that a great number of potential French migrants were either Communists or former Nazi collaborators.[197]

The policy of assimilation continued to be pursued towards 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 recognised that there were various stakeholders involved in the successful assimilation of new settlers and

---

[196] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2642, Immigrants from France; arrangements for admission, 15th September, 1948, 7.
LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 66/Cab. Doc. 744/1948, Memorandum to the Cabinet - Report from the Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy - French Immigration, 15th September, 1948.
LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2642, Immigration; Regulations governing admission to Canada from France, 16th September, 1948, 4-5.

[197] *Valerie Knowles, Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-1990* (Toronto, Ont.: Dundurn Press, 1990) 136.

so 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.[198] 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.'[199] This demonstrated a new, greater organisation in assimilation efforts - a reflection of the large mass non-British migration that Canada received in the post-Second World War period. 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 in the post-Second World War period were radio broadcasts, and films aimed at migrants. Citizenship radio broadcasts by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation began in 1949.[200] The subjects of these radio broadcasts included languages, contracts with employers, money and adjustment to jobs.[201]

Films were also commissioned to assist in the assimilation process of migrants. Fifteen filmstrips were produced on the basis 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

---

[198] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 66/Cab. Doc. 740/1948, Memorandum to the Cabinet - Immigration; Advisory Committee on Immigration Welfare, 11th September, 1948.
[199] *Ibid.*
[200] LAC, RG26/Vol. 66/File 2-18-1/Part 1, News release on 'Citizenship Radio Broadcasts', 12th October, 1949, 30.
[201] LAC, RG26/Vol. 67/File 2-18-2, Memorandum for the Advisory Committee on Citizenship by Frank Foulds, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch.

history better understood by migrants in night classes.[202] However, these only provided 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, give the impression that Canada's Britishness was perhaps more nuanced and problematic than the official political statements or policies suggested.

This was due to the bicultural nature of Canadian society, in that there were two possible models of assimilation for migrants to follow: the English-speaking and French Canadian. As a result of this, the former could hardly be emphasised at the expense of the latter. The French Canadians would have been deeply opposed to this. Rather it appears a compromise was reached in that the information migrants received through film and other forms was very general, and not specific to either community. This reflects the delicate balancing act that had to be followed in the country where English-speaking Canadians desired that migrants assimilate into an Anglo-centric culture, while French-Canadians continued to oppose this at the national level.

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 above, 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,

[202] LAC, RG26/Vol. 67/File 2-18-2, Memorandum for the Advisory Committee on Citizenship by Frank Foulds, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch.

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.[203]

He built upon this in an actual Citizenship Day speech in which he reiterated the importance of the day in educating children about the Empire, but 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.[204]

This shift is noteworthy as the day was now about Canadian citizenship. This reflected quite well the difficult position French-Canadians, particularly national politicians, found themselves in during this period, as they could not relate to British race patriotism and preferred to emphasise 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.

George Drew, now the Leader of the Progressive Conservative opposition in his Citizenship Day address highlighted English-speaking Canada's membership of a wider British world 'It is appropriate that as we celebrate the wider association of which Canada has formed a part for so many years, and of which we undoubtedly shall continue to form a part throughout the years ahead, we should emphasize the

---

[203] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 267, Citizenship Broadcast by Louis S. St. Laurent, 22nd May, 1950, 1.

[204] *Debates, H of C, vol. III, 1950, 23rd May, 1950, Mr. St. Laurent, 2743.*

act of citizenship and all that has gone into the making of it.'[205] But the reference to Canadian citizenship at the end illustrates how the appeal of Britishness was slowly starting to shift, even in the Progressive Conservative Party, which had been a long-standing bastion of Britishness in English-speaking Canada.

The *Toronto Star* while explaining the depth of British race patriotism in Canada, at the same time acknowledged that things were slowly shifting:

> It is not easy for this generation to understand the love and reverence with which their elders regarded Queen Victoria...Victoria's reign was a period of extraordinary prosperity and expansion for Britain...The British Empire spread over the earth and became known as the greatest empire in history, one on which the sun never set...Since the death of Queen Victoria in 1901, the British nations have passed safely through two crippling word wars. The motherland saved human liberties on both occasions but at terrible cost to herself.[206]

This is reminiscent of the earlier nostalgic commentary in regard to Empire Day in the immediate post-Second World War period.

The *Globe and Mail* reflected on the changing position towards Britishness in Canada in May 1950. But this time on the occasion of Victoria Day:

> Victoria Day is one of Canada's oldest national holidays, and one of the most popular...But can we claim to be better Canadians because we have abandoned or forgotten the traditional aspects of the day?...Victoria Day should have a community and national purpose in underlining the values of Canadian and British citizenship. It should provide an opportunity to advance and uphold the advantages of our association with the unique family of peoples and nations which owe a common allegiance to the British idea.[207]

Both of the editorials above demonstrate recognition that there was not the same sense of feeling towards being a part of a wider British world as there had been with previous generations.

St. Laurent returned to his theme of the prevalence of Canadian Citizenship over British traditions in an address to the Golden Jubilee of the I.O.D.E. 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

---

[205] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1950, 23rd May, 1950, Mr. Drew, 2744.
[206] 'The Day We Celebrate', *Toronto Star*, Tuesday, 23rd May, 1950, 6.
[207] 'This Holiday', *Globe and Mail*, Wednesday, 24th May, 1950, 6.

> 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.[208]

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.'[209] The most important of these in his opinion was the diverse nature of the Canadian population. He pointed out that '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.'[210] This is a notable statement and clearly shows the extent to which ideas of Canadian identity were beginning to shift.

There was considerable controversy over St. Laurent's appointment of a Canadian as Governor-General for the first time at the beginning of 1952. The issue according to the *Victoria Times* came down to two questions: Firstly, was the Crown to be dragged into partisan politics? Secondly, did the presence of a Canadian in Rideau Hall[211] weaken the links between Canada and the UK? The newspaper favourably commented on St. Laurent's remarks that 'the nation is growing up but it is not growing away from Britain.'[212] The *London Free Press* asserted that one day it 'would like to see an interchange of governors with the other members of the

---

[208] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 267, Golden Jubilee I.O.D.E., Montreal - Notes for remarks by Louis S. St. Laurent, 27th May, 1950, 1.
[209] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 270, Notes for Address by Louis S. St. Laurent to the Montreal Canadian Club, 23rd April, 1951, 3.
[210] *Ibid.*, 3, 4.
[211] The official residence of the Governor-General in Ottawa.
[212] LAC, MG26-L/Personal Clippings/Vol. 302/Press Statements & Releases -14th Jan. 1952-27 Feb. 1952, Extract from the *Victoria Times* – 'The Real Issues', 30th January, 1952.

Commonwealth, and again someday a distinguished Englishman come to Canada – it would all help to bind the Commonwealth together.'[213] Both of these editorials, from areas of Canada that were bastions of Britishness, illustrate how the shift in identity was a very slow process, with many reluctant to shed their more traditional ideas of national community.

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.'[214] St. Laurent though returned to more traditional messages of national community in his comments on the monarchy, 'This rich diversity of local loyalties is blended together in a common loyalty to the Crown, a loyalty which was dramatically and enthusiastically demonstrated by the reception given to our Royal visitors a year ago by Canadian citizens of all provinces and of all ethnic origins.'[215] 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.'[216] This speech encapsulates St. Laurent's views on Canadian identity, in terms of Canada having matured as a nation, while at the same time paying homage to its

---

[213] LAC, MG26-L/Personal Clippings/Vol. 302/Press Statements & Releases – 14th Jan. 1952-27 Feb. 1952, Extract from the *London Free Press* – 'Prime Minister St. Laurent Clears the Air', 30th January, 1952.
[214] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 276, An Address by the Prime Minister at the Diamond Jubilee of the Association of Canadian Clubs, Hamilton, Ontario, 12th September, 1952, 2-3.
[215] *Ibid.*, 8.
[216] *Ibid.*

British heritage, through the links to the monarchy, but most importantly encouraging its bilingual and bicultural nature.

In a speech to the Canadian Club and Empire Club of Toronto in early 1953 St. Laurent returned to his theme of the development of a Canadian identity strengthening Canada's links with the Commonwealth:

> I am sure...there is no member of the Toronto Canadian Club who does not wish Canada to remain an integral and influential member of the Commonwealth, and I am equally sure there is no member of the Empire Club who does not feel that the strength of the Commonwealth depends upon the strength of its members, and that the greater we make our own country, the more we advance the cause of the Commonwealth.[217]

This address again demonstrates St. Laurent's emphasis on a Canadian identity taking precedence over a wider British one.

The complete transformation of Empire Day to 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.[218]

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 organisations such as the UN.

In French-Canada the Duplessis government showed in a clear way how the federal government's attempts to introduce nation-wide schemes could be destabilised by Quebec's own 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.[219] McRoberts maintains that 'The Duplessis government's refusal to participate in federal programs

---

[217] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 277, Speech by the Prime Minister, Louis S. St. Laurent, to the Canadian Club and Empire Club of Toronto, 9th March, 1953, 1-2.
[218] LAC, MG26-L/Personal Clippings/Vol. 302/File No. S-4, Office of the Prime Minister, Canada - Press Release - Citizenship Day, 10th March, 1953.
[219] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 28-9.

demonstrated the potential for conflict that lay in the federal government's post-war assumption of the mantle of national government.'[220] It also clearly highlighted how the view of Canada held by French-Canadian elites contrasted to that of their English-speaking Canadian counterparts. In the post-war years the federal government contested the long-standing French-Canadian view of Canada as a nation in a way it had never done before.[221]

This was in the sense of French-Canadians regarding Canada as a compact of two nations: the French and British, coming together and both being equal. In contrast the federal government in the context of the expanded role it had taken during the Second World War began to emphasise the *Canadian* nation. It started to form new symbols of a unique Canadian nation, to build a foundation of cultural, economic and social programs aimed at developing and strengthening the country, and to put in place national guidelines of social services that all Canadians, as *Canadians*, could demand as an essential right. Unsurprisingly, this meant encroaching on areas which had traditionally been the preserve of the provinces. While most of English-speaking Canada welcomed these developments, it was resisted in Quebec.[222]

From the beginning of the 1950s the White Canada policy also began to be gradually broken down. This was mainly due to international developments with the newly independent nations of Asia calling for an end to racially based immigration policies.[223] In 1950 there was a liberalisation of regulations, which broadened the admissible classes of Asiatics to include the husbands of Canadian citizens and

---

[220] Quote taken from McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 29.
[221] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 29.
[222] *Ibid.*, 29-30.
[223] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 128-9.

unmarried children up to the age of majority.[224] Towards 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.'[225] The following month 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. The Cabinet agreed to allow the entry into Canada of a Canadian citizen of Asian origin together with unmarried children of a Canadian citizen between the ages of 18 and 21.[226] 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, and unmarried children under 21, fathers over 65, and mothers over 60 of Canadian citizens, resident in Canada, of these countries of origin.[227] Although the numbers involved in the 1951 agreements with India, Pakistan and Ceylon were not large, their

---

[224] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2645, Immigration regulations; admissible classes, 23rd May, 1950, 2-3.
[225] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2646, Immigration; entry of East Indians, 29th November, 1950, 17.
[226] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2646, Immigration; East Indians and Chinese, 21st December, 1950, 6.
[227] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 138/Cab. Doc. 25/1951, Memorandum to the Cabinet: Immigration from India, Pakistan and Ceylon, 23rd January, 1951, 1-2.
LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2647, Immigration from India, Pakistan and Ceylon, 24th January, 1951, 7.

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.'[228] 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.'[229] It shows how much the ground was beginning to shift in regard to views towards immigration. On the other hand, the *Montreal Gazette* suggested introducing assisted passages for British migrants to increase their number 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.[230] According to the *Globe and Mail* the reason the government was not actively encouraging British immigration was because of sensitivities to French-Canadian opinion in Quebec. It summed up the basic premise behind the French-Canadian view:

> It is the declared policy of the present Government at Ottawa not to disturb or alter the fundamental character of the Canadian population. As this is understood in some circles in

[228] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 315, Extract from the *Saturday Night* – "What's Holding Up U.K. Immigrants?", 23rd January, 1951.
[229] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 315, Extract from the *Kingston Whig-Standard* – 'Is the "Melting Pot" Plan Perilous?', 4th July, 1951.
[230] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 315, Extract from the *Montreal Gazette* – 'Financial Aid to U.K. Migrants Needed to Keep Canada British', 12th November, 1952.

> Quebec, it means that the French-Canadians must continue to form a substantial fraction of the nation and must not be submerged by a heavy influx of English-speaking people.[231]

This would have been compatible with an active immigration policy from both the UK and France, if migrants could be encouraged to come from the latter. But the problem was France did not have population pressures and its birth rate was actually low. Contrarily, large numbers of British people were ready and willing to migrate to Canada. The newspaper argued that French-Canadians should not be worried about the possible effects of a large influx of British migrants into the country as 'Quebec would be just as secure in its ways and its local autonomy as it is now.'[232]

The value of British migration was displayed in a letter by the I.O.D.E. to Harris in 1952. Against the background that the percentage of British migrants as a part of total immigration had decreased considerably, and the view that this should be considered an issue of national concern, the organisation urged '"Therefore be it resolved that the National Chapter of Canada, Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, urge the Dominion Government to encourage and assist British immigration to Canada by whatever means will prove most effective."'[233] Harris attempted to defend the government's record on British migration, 'It has been the consistent policy of the Government to encourage immigration from the United Kingdom...The Immigration Branch maintains a substantial and active immigrant recruiting service in the United Kingdom.'[234]

Assimilation policy towards non-British migrants also continued into the early 1950s, though changes were beginning to emerge. St. Laurent in an address to the

---

[231] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 314, Extract from the *Toronto Globe & Mail* - 'Quebec and Immigration', 16th September, 1952.
[232] *Ibid.*
[233] LAC, RG26/Vol. 80/File 1-24-1/Part 1, Mrs. J. G. Spragge, Past National Secretary, The Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (Junior Branch) to Walter E. Harris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, 27th June, 1952, 2.
[234] LAC, RG26/Vol. 80/File 1-24-1/Part 1, Walter E. Harris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to Mrs. J. G. Spragge, Past National Secretary, The Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (Junior Branch), 14th July, 1952, 2.

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.'[235] This is another remarkable statement and illustrates the shifts in assimilation policy that were taking place.

In an explanatory memorandum submitted to the Cabinet at the start of 1953 on Citizenship Classes, 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.'[236] 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 were being taught.[237] 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 non-British migrants Canada received at the turn of the century were expected to incorporate themselves into this English-speaking Canadian society. These new

---

[235] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 270, Notes for Address by Louis S. St. Laurent to the Montreal Canadian Club, 23rd April, 1951, 9.
[236] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 1894/Cab. Doc. 18/1953, Memorandum to Cabinet: Financial Assistance to Citizenship Training by W.E. Harris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, 22nd January, 1953, 1.
LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2652, Citizenship; observance of Citizenship Day; financial assistance for citizenship classes, 22nd January, 1953, 8.
[237] *Ibid.*

settlers had to abandon their home cultures and become as 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 towards the dismantlement of whiteness also took place. This resulted in subtle shifts in the policy of assimilation towards non-British migrants. The thesis will now turn to assimilation policy in Australia.

Chapter Two – Assimilation Policy in Australia, 1890s-1962

In the post-Second World War period the Australian government adopted a mass migration program which brought large numbers of non-British settlers to its shore for the first time in its history. The 'Australia' these migrants encountered when they arrived was very much a British society and an integral part of a wider British world. The White Australia policy was also a crucial capillary of this British race patriotism. Consequently, these new non-British migrants were expected to assimilate into this white, British society immediately and become near identical to Anglo-Celtic Australians. However, in the early 1960s the first signs that Australia's Britishness and whiteness were beginning to wane started to emerge. This led to subtle changes in the assimilation policy adopted towards non-British migrants.

Britishness and Whiteness during the 1890s and 1950s

Since the breaking of ties with Britain in the 1970s a number of historians have attempted to understand the way in which the idea of Britishness defined Australia's experience of nationalism. According to Douglas Cole, a Canadian scholar working in this field in the early 1970s, 'The key assumption of Britannic ethnocentrism was the greatness, even the superiority, of the Anglo-Saxon stock...The very existence of Australia confirmed for many the colonizing capacity and the indominable energy of the race.'[238] Accepting the special importance of British civilisation and stock, British race patriotism emphasised the familial ties between Britons and Australians. Literature, language, history, heritage and common ancestry were employed to reinforce the shared character of the British people.[239]

---

[238] Quote taken from Cole, '"The Crimson Thread of Kinship"', 513-4.
[239] Cole, '"The Crimson Thread of Kinship"', 514.

Drawing on Cole but also the work of American historian David M. Potter, Meaney also explores the predominance of British race patriotism in Australia 'Australians had, in the words of the original "Advance Australia Fair", composed in 1878 by Peter Dodds McCormick, a "British soul".'[240] In the 1870s, Australia like other Western nations was experiencing modernisation which involved the introduction of new communication, transportation and long work hours. During the social upheavals that this caused, the colonists, like those in other Western societies were looking for emotional safety through redefining a sense of community in more exclusive, intense terms. At this point a set of English historians, including J.A. Froude, J.R. Green, E.A. Freeman and Sir John Seeley, predisposed by the thinking at the time, emphasised as their major theme the special nature of the Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Celtic or British people and their unique history of freedom expressed formally through parliamentary government.[241]

In this vein Henry Parkes, probably the most prominent Australian statesman of the nineteenth century took the lead. By the 1880s he had moved away totally from thoughts of separation from Britain and had taken up the vision of 'Greater Britain' as expounded by Seeley. However, although the colonists took on this British race identity, quite a few still retained what Parkes called a 'local patriotism', based on affection for their new land.[242] Yet this love of country did not take the place of pride in race. Writing in 1930, Keith Hancock maintained that 'Among the Australians pride of race counted for more than love of country...Defining themselves as "independent Australian Britons" they believed each word essential and exact, but laid most stress upon the last.'[243] Parkes recognised that folk culture and folk songs

---

[240] Quote taken from Meaney, 'Britishness and Australia', 121.
[241] Meaney, '"In History's Page"', 367, 368.
[242] *Ibid.*, 368, 369.
[243] Quote taken from W. Keith Hancock, *Australia* (Melbourne, Vic.: Jacaranda, 1966) 49-50.

in Australia could be compared to those which had arisen in other settlement colonies, or were even to be seen in the various parts of the British Isles, including the English counties. But the support for Empire and Britishness varied amongst English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish Australians, with those of English and Ulster Irish Protestant origin largely the most positive and those of Irish Catholic descent the most detached.[244]

Along with Britishness at the core of Australian national identity was a sense of whiteness. That is, Australians saw themselves as 'white' and 'British'. At the end of the nineteenth century when Australian ideas about race began to take hold, opposition to Asian migration in the Australian colonies first centred on the Chinese. Queensland was the first state to call for Australia-wide support for upholding its discrimination against the Chinese. This was precipitated by the Imperial government querying sections of its anti-Chinese legislation of 1876. This arose from concerns over the potential damage colonial discriminatory immigration legislation could have on the trading relationships and agreements the Imperial government had secured with the Chinese. Inter-colonial conferences were subsequently held on this question. Despite there being some divergence in opinions amongst the representatives of the colonies, they were united when expressing to Westminster their opposition to unrestricted Chinese immigration. This opposition emerged largely from a goal to maintain and propagate the British nature of the populations of the various colonies.[245] This was reaffirmed by New South Wales Premier Parkes who emphasised 'the need for building a homogeneous British-type nation.'[246] The admission of settlers from such a vast population so close to the North represented a

[244] Meaney, '"In History's Page"', 369, 370.
[245] Charles A. Price, *The Great White Walls are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australasia, 1836-1888* (Canberra, ACT: The Australian Institute of International Affairs in association with ANU Press, 1974) 145-6, 168-9.
[246] Quote taken from Price, *The Great White Walls are Built*, 172.

direct threat to this aim.[247] This geopolitical anxiety meant that Australia took on this racial identity in a most intense and absolute form.

The growth of anti-Chinese feeling in Victoria at this time was highlighted by the revival of the Anti-Chinese League of 1879-81 by the United Furniture Trade Society. It also enjoyed support from many other trade unions. The League arranged public meetings in country towns and suburbs, and sent representatives to Parliament in July and August 1887. The primary goal of the League was to persuade every member and voter that the Chinese were undesirable socially and dangerous economically. It called for any future Chinese immigration to be banned; any Chinese residents in Victoria to be forced to pay a residence tax of twenty pounds; that no more Chinese should be naturalised; and that any naturalised Chinese leaving the colony, even for a short period, should immediately be stripped of their citizenship. Consequently, from 1888-9 onwards, Australia had very nearly identical and close to complete immigration bans on the Chinese in Queensland, Victoria and South Australia (including the Northern Territory), a practically blanket ban on Chinese immigration in New South Wales, and a less stringent law in Tasmania.[248]

Australian colonial parliaments passed legislation during the 1890s that for the very first time restricted the entry of Asian races other than the Chinese into Australia. According to A. T. Yarwood, 'Politicians,...though primarily concerned with the Japanese question, took the opportunity of completing the statutory wall behind which an essentially Anglo-Saxon society could be nourished.'[249] The question remains though as to why the colonial governments adopted such measures so

---

[247] Price, *The Great White Walls are Built*, 172.
[248] *Ibid.*, 187, 197.
[249] Quote taken from A. T. Yarwood, *Asian Migration to Australia: The Background to Exclusion, 1896-1923* (Parkville, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1964) 6.

quickly against an influx that had not yet begun. The main reason for this was the rise of Japan. It had previously been a source of curiosity, but with its defeat of China in the late nineteenth century it took on a much more menacing look.[250]

All of the parties involved in the first federal elections in March 1901 emphasised the attainment of a White Australia in their manifestos. It had become such an integral part of Australian identity that it was not an issue in the election in any state, except Queensland, where the Griffith government restarted importing 'Kanaka' (Pacific Island) labour from 1892. At no point in his campaign was Edmund Barton, Australia's first prime minister, asked to defend the exclusion of Asians. The only concern that emerged, and this subsequently became prominent in the debates in Parliament, was the question of how it should be done. The final Act did not explicitly restrict the migration of specific races, although it achieved the same result.[251]

Representatives of all parties attested to the strength of the community's objection to non-European immigration during the 1901 debates. Furthermore, key members of the House of Representatives; T. Brown (Labor), J. Page (Labor), J. Wilkinson (Protectionist) and J. C. Watson (Labor) made similar statements about the need for a racially restrictive measure.[252] Alfred Deakin, a future prime minister, asserted that 'no motive power operated...more powerfully in dissolving the technical and arbitrary political divisions which previously separated us than the desire that we should be one people and remain one people without the admixture of other races.'[253] Australian daily newspapers also backed this proposal to establish total exclusion of coloured migrants, and believed that the aim of racial homogeneity was

---

[250] Yarwood, *Asian Migration to Australia*, 7.
[251] *Ibid.*, 19, 22.
[252] *Ibid.*, 23.
[253] CPD, *H of R*, vol. 4, 12th September, 1901, Mr. Deakin, 4804 cited in Yarwood, *Asian Migration to Australia*, 23.

fundamental. In terms of the method of achieving this goal, the press overwhelmingly supported the Barton government's plan to use a language test, which was considered a practical middle road between imperial prescriptions and Australian demands.[254]

So, the White Australia policy was adopted for the single goal of stopping non-Europeans from arriving in Australia. It emerged out of the racial idea of society that had begun to dominate colonial political culture in Australia at the end of the nineteenth century. These ideas were supported across Australian society and were prominent in the formation of the Commonwealth's discriminatory immigration policies. The young nation was so keen to preserve its 'racial purity' that the newly created federal parliament passed the Immigration Restriction Act as its very first major piece of legislation.[255] According to Hancock, 'The policy of White Australia [wa]s the indispensable condition of every other Australian policy.'[256] Australians were relatively immune from any Asian pressure to reassess these absolute racial assumptions for the first half of the twentieth century. Japan did, however, use its rising position as a global power to secure some concessions from the Australians on a number of occasions. For example in 1904 the Australian government consented to allow Japanese merchants, students and visitors to enter the country for 'temporary residence'.[257]

The belief that Australia was an integral part of a wider British world survived and was even strengthened to some extent by the upheavals of both the First and Second World Wars, despite the efforts of some historians to argue to the

---

[254] Yarwood, *Asian Migration to Australia*, 32-3.
[255] Matthew Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia, 1945-67', *AJPH*, vol. 52, no. 1, March 2006, 228.
[256] Quote taken from Hancock, *Australia*, 59.
[257] Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 228, 229.

contrary.[258] Meaney maintains that 'David Day...who had started out wanting to tell the story of World War II as the *Great Betrayal* which led to national emancipation, had at the end to concede, despite himself, that Australia was the *Reluctant Nation*: that Australians in the face of the greatest provocation, were unwilling still to cut the British ties, affirm their own separate identity and embrace what he called a "possible independent destiny".'[259]

The prevalence of Britishness as a defining social, political and cultural idea in Australia in the post-Second World War period is clearly illustrated by parliamentary speeches, debates, newspapers and government journals aimed at migrants. Empire Day, a Canadian invention celebrated on 24th May each year, was the one of the most important vessels for the expression of Britishness throughout Australia. Prime Minister Curtin's Empire Day speech in 1945 is an excellent illustration of this:

> In the southern hemisphere, 7,000,000 Australians carry on a British community as trustees for the British way of life in a part of the world where it is of the utmost significance to the British-speaking race that such a vast continent should have as its population a people and a form of government corresponding in outlook and in purpose to Britain.[260]

The above quote is noteworthy as it was an Australian Labor Party Prime Minister affirming Australia's Britishness after the 'great betrayal' (this was the British decision to insufficiently garrison Singapore, which after its loss to Japan in 1942 left Australia extremely vulnerable during the Second World War).

The *Sydney Morning Herald* in an Empire Day editorial that same year emphasised the strength of imperial ties and the unity of the 'British peoples' in carrying out the war effort.[261] Celebrations of Empire Day continued unabated until

---

[258] Prominent examples of this are David Day, *The Great Betrayal: Britain, Australia & the onset of the Pacific War, 1939-42* (North Ryde, NSW: Angus & Robertson, 1988) and *Reluctant Nation: Australia and the Allied defeat of Japan, 1942-45* (Melbourne, Vic.: Oxford University Press, 1992).
[259] Quote taken from Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian Identity', 77-8.
[260] 'Empire Day' speech by Prime Minister Curtin, 24th May, 1945, Transcript, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet Library, 74.
[261] 'Empire Unity Vital to Peace', *SMH*, Friday, 25th May, 1945, 4.

the 1960s, although the name was changed to Commonwealth Day in the mid-1950s.

The parliamentary debates which led to the passage of the British Nationality and Australian Citizenship Act in 1948[262] are also a prime example of where Australia's Britishness came to the fore. Australia certainly did not take the initiative in introducing a separate citizenship and was actually quite reluctant to do so. Instead it was compelled to act after Canada unilaterally passed its Citizenship Act in 1946, which undermined the foundation of the previous collective imperial system, which had as its main principle the common status of a British subject across the Empire and Commonwealth.

Introducing the Nationality and Citizenship Bill, Arthur Calwell, the Minister for Immigration, emphasised that it would in no way disadvantage British subjects who did not become Australian citizens. British subjects already present in Australia, or those that arrived at a future date would be free from the restrictions and disabilities that applied to aliens.[263] A clear demonstration of Australia's identification as a British nation, as well as the existence of Australian patriotism was Calwell's statement that 'We shall try to teach the children that they are fortunate to be British, and even more fortunate to be Australian.'[264]

Eric J. Harrison, Acting Leader of the Opposition was even more forthright in his statements about Britishness and his criticisms of the Bill, warning that in taking such a step 'we do not impetuously impair our allegiance to the Motherland.'[265] He also maintained that the legislation would contribute to a weakening of the ties of

---

[262] This Act introduced an Australian citizenship for the very first time. It followed Canada and the UK in introducing a separate local citizenship from the wider status of British subject.
[263] These were non-British subjects.
CPD, *H of R*, Session, 1948, vol. 198, 30th September, 1948, Mr. Calwell, 1062.
[264] *Ibid.*, 1066.
[265] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1948, vol. 200, 18th November, 1948, Mr. Harrison, 3228.

Empire and move Australia further away from the 'mother-country'.[266] This was because it was clarifying in statutes issues which in the eyes of the conservatives did not need to be clarified. They 'felt' British.

Harrison quite rightly argued that the impetus for the current legislation was the Citizenship Act adopted by the Canadian government in 1946. However, he pointed out that the Canadian legislation was introduced as a consequence of that country's distinct racial problems; the large French proportion of its population.[267] On the contrary Australia had no such racial problems, and therefore he could not see why it needed to adopt equivalent measures, 'I have referred to Canada's racial problems...We in Australia have no such problems...We are essentially British...We take pride in the fact that 96 per cent of our people are of British stock...Why should we be forced, as an essentially British community, to tail along with Canada?'[268]

John T. McEwen, Acting Leader of the Country Party supported the Liberals in the fear that the proposed legislation would undermine imperial unity 'I can imagine no greater disaster to the entire human race than any step which is calculated further to dismember the British peoples...The verdict of historians is that the establishment of American independence was more fateful to the world than the outcome of the Battle of Waterloo.'[269] This is an incredible statement and illustrates the extent to which some were ready to rewrite history for the British world.

Oliver H. Beale, an opposition backbencher contradicted Calwell's claim that the Nationality and Citizenship legislation would in no way disadvantage British subjects:

> It is a mistake to impose on citizens of the British Commonwealth who desire to acquire Australian citizenship by registration the same onerous conditions as we impose on foreigners

---

[266] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1948, vol. 200, 18th November, 1948, Mr. Harrison, 3229.
[267] *Ibid.*, 3231.
[268] *Ibid.*, 3231, 3232.
[269] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1948, vol. 200, 18th November, 1948, Mr. McEwen, 3253.

> who seek Australian citizenship by naturalization. This clause provides another illustration of the way in which British subjects coming to Australia from abroad will be worse off in future than they have been in the past when they could simply move from one part of the British Commonwealth of Nations to another by the one sign and symbol that they were British subjects.[270]

Beale's criticism was a recurrent one made by others and it reflected the fact, as pointed out above, that Australia had never been pro-active in wanting to introduce a separate citizenship in the first place. It was more of a reaction to events in Canada rather than a conscious decision on its part. However, the retention of British Nationality in the Citizenship Bill and the fact that the final Act was actually called the 'British Nationality and Australian Citizenship Act' demonstrated that Australia would only do the bare minimum that was required, and more importantly continued to emphasise a *British Nationality* over an *Australian Citizenship*.

Nevertheless, Calwell had made it clear that British subjects in Australia who decided not to become Australian citizens would not be disadvantaged in any *major* way. But if they desired to, they could register to become a citizen and do this after a year of residence in most cases. By contrast, all aliens would have to wait five years.[271] The passage of the Nationality and Citizenship Act was by no means a glorious moment of 'independence'.

The Labor and non-Labor positions on the Nationality and Citizenship Bill are worth highlighting here. In contrast to the Canadian case, there was no major difference between the conservative and non-conservative parties on the issue. Both affirmed their Britishness and the Labor government continued to underplay the importance of the changes that they were making. Therefore, there was consensus in the Australian political community on this question. This reflected the monocultural nature of Australia compared to the bicultural nature of Canada.

---

[270] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1948, vol. 200, 30th November, 1948, Mr. Beale, 3666.
[271] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1948, vol. 200, 30th November, 1948, Mr. Calwell, 3664-5.

The idea of Australians as a 'British' people continued well into the 1950s. In an opening address to the Third Australian Citizenship Convention[272] at the start of 1952 Sir William John McKell, the Governor-General commented on how the second half of the twentieth century would place upon all Australians the 'tremendous individual and collective responsibility of making this, our land, a strong, secure and developed British stronghold of the Pacific.'[273] McKell's phrase 'British stronghold of the Pacific' is reminiscent of Curtin's Empire Day Speech in 1945; both emphasised the importance of preserving this British community which was so far from the 'mother-country'.

At the same convention Harold Holt, the new Liberal-Country coalition government Minister for Immigration acknowledged that Australian immigration policy included a notable element of restriction. This was a reference of course to the White Australia policy. He explained the reasoning behind the policy in the following terms 'Our policy of restriction is not based on any notion of racial superiority, but on a frank and realistic recognition that there are important differences of race, culture, and economic standards which make successful assimilation unlikely.'[274] This explanation of the policy had been given from its inception.

The coronation of Queen Elizabeth II also offered Australia a prime opportunity to display its British credentials. *The New Australian*, a government journal aimed at migrants to assist in their assimilation[275] commented in a special coronation edition in mid-1953 on how new migrants had come to the freedom of a

---

[272] These brought together all interest groups who had a stake in the settlement of migrants. They took place annually, usually the week after Australia Day. (This was celebrated on 26th January and commemorated the arrival of the First Fleet at Sydney Cove in 1788).

[273] NAA, M2607/31, Extract from Digest: Report of proceedings of Australia's Third Citizenship Convention, Canberra, 1952 – 'We are pioneers of our future', 7.

[274] NAA, M2607/31, 'Immigration is Building a Nation' - Addresses by H. E. Holt, Minister for Immigration, Third Citizenship Convention, Canberra, 1952, 20-1.

[275] Thus, this journal is an excellent source for determining government attitudes towards settlers. It employed simple language and articles were restricted in length so as to make it easier for settlers whose first language was not English.

British nation from a troubled Europe. They received the liberty and justice of a British life, and lived under British law as they were welcomed to the land. From the day they set foot on the Australian continent they possessed the rights of freedom to worship, speech, action and freedom from fear.[276] The central role of the monarch in the British world was further clearly outlined, 'Like the kindly head of a large family, the Sovereign had been the central figure unifying the many members of the British family of nations, and the Sovereign had stood as the personification of the principles of British justice and freedom enjoyed by all British lands wherever they may be.'[277] It was an emphatic illustration of how the migrant was being introduced to the Crown as the uniting symbol of the 'British world'.

The prevalence of British Nationality in Australian Citizenship and the rights and obligations this entailed were emphasised by Sir William Joseph Slim, the new Governor-General in a speech to the Australian Citizenship Convention in 1955:

> When you possess Australian citizenship you also possess British nationality, with the status, privileges and loyalties that implies. Citizenship makes us part of the British family with the inspiring figure of the Queen at our head. A Queen who reigns not merely by right of birth, but because she was anointed and dedicated before God to lead us in the way of honour. Makes us heirs to the wealth of honourable tradition and the centuries of world esteem that are Britain's. And in doing so imposes the obligations that we shall never do anything that would be deemed "not British".[278]

Thus, Slim saw no distinction between Australian citizenship and British nationality. He actually regarded Australia's heritage as being based on British traditions. This heritage however placed certain responsibilities and obligations on Australians as a British people.

Prime Minister Robert Menzies was the greatest exponent of the British idea of identity. Judith Brett asserts that in his writings on the British Empire and Commonwealth, Menzies constantly used the language of community, kinship and

---

[276] 'Day of Rejoicing', *The New Australian*, no. 54, June 1953, 1.
[277] *Ibid.*
[278] NAA, M2607/34, For His Excellency the Governor-General - Notes upon the opening of the Sixth Australian Citizenship Convention, Albert Hall, 25th January, 1955, 3.

family, in which relations were based on shared views and an unspoken agreement, sentiment, as opposed to more legal, abstract means of comprehending Britain's links with her former possessions.[279] This was shown by Menzies' suggestion after the Second World War for a redistribution of the population in the Empire, from Britain to the Dominions. He argued that 'a migrant from Britain to Australia is not lost to Britain; he merely serves the true interest of Britain in another part of the British Empire; those who see migration to the dominions as a loss to Britain fail to see the indissoluble unity of the British people everywhere.'[280]

In Menzies' view, links of kinship, history, language, race and blood connected British people all over the world, regardless of the economic and political circumstances of the relationships between the nation states in which they resided.[281] In an Australia Day broadcast to the nation in 1950 Menzies stated that 'Let me on this occasion say a few words about the British Commonwealth, our ancient family association, unique in history, the love of which is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.'[282] For him the British family, headed by the much revered King, was not just a business association. The world required the British Empire, by whatever title it was referred to.[283]

Menzies elaborated on the importance of the Crown to the Commonwealth in late 1953. He believed that the people of the Commonwealth should be on guard against the non-maintenance of the common relationship of all British peoples to the monarch.[284] This comment was made in the context of newer members of the

---

[279] Judith Brett, *Robert Menzies' Forgotten People* (Sydney, NSW: Sun Australia, 1993) 145.
[280] Cited in Brett, *Robert Menzies' Forgotten People*, 145-6.
[281] Brett, *Robert Menzies' Forgotten People*, 147.
[282] NLA, MS 4936/Series 6/Box 254/23, Australia Day Broadcast by Prime Minister over National, Regional and Short Wave Stations, 26th January, 1950, 1.
[283] *Ibid.*, 2.
[284] NLA, MS 4936/Series 6/Box 259/55, 'The British Crown' – Speech by the Prime Minister at the Luncheon given by the Constitutional Association of New South Wales, at the Trocadero, Sydney, 9th October, 1953, 3.

Commonwealth becoming republics. A prominent example of this was India, which had become a republic in 1950 and hence no longer had the British monarch as its head of state, but still retained its membership in the Commonwealth.

On the occasion of the Royal Tour of 1954 Menzies used the opportunity to express what he saw as the familial connections between the British monarchy and the Australian people:

> Your Majesty you come to us, not alone as a Queen entitled to our instant loyalty and our enduring service, but as our Sovereign Lady rejoicing, as I know you must be, in our deep and warm and unaffected love...Your Majesty, I hope you will allow as one whose public life has given him the privilege of serving under four monarchs, to say that, seeing you here and remembering those who have gone before you, we feel this gathering tonight to be essentially a family one.[285]

Australia's identification with the British race myth found its most powerful expression in the widespread outpouring of sentiment and emotion over the Queen's royal visit.[286]

Newspapers also continued to stress Australia's British heritage. In the *Age* in May 1955 support was given for Menzies' position that there was no need for a new national anthem as Australia already had one; *God Save the Queen*.[287] The issue had arisen in Parliament when a backbencher, Arthur E. Greenup, had addressed a question to Menzies as to whether Australia should have a national anthem of its own, especially in light of the upcoming Olympic Games in Melbourne.[288] The newspaper made the argument that notable national anthems were not just created, they emerged over time from national tradition. It recognised the importance of folk songs, for example *Waltzing Matilda*, but maintained that these were not appropriate for expressing pride in the nation. The newspaper also doubted whether there was

---

[285] NLA, MS 4936/Series 40/Box 575/29, Royal Visit – State Banquet – Parliament House, Canberra, Tuesday, 16th February, 1954 – Speech by the Prime Minister, R. G. Menzies, 1.
[286] Jane Connors, 'The 1954 Royal Tour of Australia', *AHS*, vol. 25, no. 100, April 1993, 371-2, 375.
[287] 'Australia has an Anthem', *Age*, Tuesday, 24th May, 1955, 1.
[288] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1954-55, vol. 6 (New Series), 25th May, 1955, Mr. Greenup and Mr. Menzies, 1049-50.

any real desire on the part of the average Australian for a new national anthem as it asserted 'God Save the Queen is a song he absorbed at his mother's knee, and it means something to him.'[289] This included Menzies. Hence, calls for a new national anthem were given short shrift by Menzies and others.

One of Menzies' most famous statements in relation to British race patriotism was 'Being myself British to the boot-heels, I say that...I go through life with my head high with pride in what we have done.'[290] So, not only did Menzies consider himself completely British but his use of 'we' at the end illustrates that he saw no distinction between himself and other British people in the 'mother-country'.

On a visit to Canada in July 1956 Australia's greatest British race patriot affirmed that:

> Although we derive in that way from quite different sources and sometime from quite different tongues, we do, in the most substantial sense, all speak the same language, the same language of the heart, the same language of the mind, the same language of freedom and of democracy and of the great institutions that have derived from these sources.[291]

Menzies' reference to a 'common language' is of particular interest, as he was of course referring to Canadians of non-British descent in this statement, mainly French-Canadians. But in Menzies' view they all still possessed the British heritage along with English-speaking Australians.

The Suez Crisis of 1956[292] was a further demonstration of Australia's identification as an integral part of a wider British world. Throughout the episode the Australian government fully supported the UK's position of overturning Egyptian

---

[289] 'Australia has an Anthem', 1.
[290] NLA, MS 4936/Series 40/Box 575/30, Speech by the Prime Minister, R. G. Menzies, at the Australia Club Dinner, Savoy Hotel, London, 31st January, 1955, 4.
[291] NLA, MS 4936/Series 40/Box 575/31, Address by R. G. Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia, at a Dinner in his honour given by Mr. James S. Duncan, Chairman, Australian-Canadian Association, Ottawa, Canada, Thursday, 26th July, 1956, 5.
[292] This was a crisis precipitated by the nationalisation of the Suez Canal by Egyptian President Gamal Abdul Nasser in July 1956, which in turn led to the UK and France, who had substantial commercial interests in the canal, entering into a clandestine agreement with Israel to invade Egypt in October 1956, thus giving the two powers the opportunity to in turn send troops into the canal zone on the pretext of 'separating the warring parties'.

President Nasser's decision to nationalise the Suez Canal. W. J. Hudson highlights the importance of this support as he maintains that no obvious Australian diplomatic or practical advantage was gained by this unfailing backing for the British position.[293] Nonetheless, he does concede that 'In seeking an explanation for the Australian Government's blind loyalty to the United Kingdom in 1956, it must certainly be noted that Australia knew nothing of the United Kingdom's late conspiracy with France and Israel; Australia was as coldly deceived as the United Kingdom's enemies.'[294]

Australian ministers did though have their own reasons for backing the British. Firstly, there was a high level of resentment towards Egyptians and a lack of faith in their capability to manage anything, let alone a major international waterway. Secondly, there were some economic risks if Egypt decided to increase canal costs. Thirdly, there were also some defence concerns if a non-aligned Egypt, in the context of the Cold War at the time between the US and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, was prejudiced against certain canal users. And lastly there were potential industrial consequences if the canal was closed and tanker fleets had to use the longer Cape of Good Hope route.[295]

However, it was not concerns of this kind that prompted Menzies and the majority of his ministers to take the action that they did. Instead, Australia offered unequivocal support for the UK as it considered itself a British country. The UK was still the centre of a wider British world, and therefore backing the UK was still regarded as supporting the 'mother-country'. Menzies illustrated this in a cable to British Prime Minister Anthony Eden towards the end of 1956: 'you must never

---

[293] W. J. Hudson, *Blind Loyalty: Australia and the Suez Crisis, 1956* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1989) 6.
[294] Quote taken from Hudson, *Blind Loyalty*, 6.
[295] Hudson, *Blind Loyalty*, 7.

entertain any doubts about the British quality of this country.'[296] Hudson takes this even further, 'While they might have seen Australia as a British state like the United Kingdom, ministers in Canberra did not see themselves as being the equals of ministers in London nor as having an equal right to say how best a British interest might be protected or advanced.'[297]

On the other hand, the ALP opposition headed by Dr. H. V. Evatt was critical of the British in Suez and actually supported the United Nations' position which called for the withdrawal of all British, French and Israeli forces from Egypt.[298] The ALP position on Suez is important as it demonstrates a divergence of opinion between it and the governing Liberal-Country coalition on an issue of major international importance. In contrast to the Liberal-Country coalition the ALP supported the majority of world opinion, including the US government, in demanding that the British and its allies leave Egypt immediately. So, 'Australian' support for the British must be qualified as it was only the Liberal-Country coalition government that offered unqualified support.

However, a connection should not be made between the ALP position on Suez and its relationship to British race patriotism. The chapter will go on to show that the ALP continued to affirm its Britishness in other ways. Thus, its criticism of the British government was exactly that; opposition to the British *government's* Suez policy, not a reaction against Australia's identification as a *British* nation.

In his inaugural address to the Eighth Australian Citizenship Convention at the beginning of 1957 the new Minister for Immigration, Athol Townley reaffirmed Australia's Britishness 'Ours is...a British country, and we have a degree of kinship

---

[296] Cited in Hudson, *Blind Loyalty*, 118.
[297] Quote taken from Hudson, *Blind Loyalty*, 14.
[298] Neville Meaney, *Australia and the World: A Documentary History from the 1870s to the 1970s* (Melbourne, Vic.: Longman Cheshire, 1985) 623-4.

with the "old country" which we do not have with other countries, no matter how highly we regard individual new citizens from those other countries.'[299] In his official opening speech to the convention Holt, in his new role as Minister for Labour and National Resources and former Minister for Immigration built on Menzies' earlier call for the redistribution of British people from the UK across the British Commonwealth, especially to the older Dominions:

> In an age with its awful potentialities for atomic destruction and bacteriological warfare, it seems suicidal policy for so great a proportion of the industrial strength of the British Commonwealth to be concentrated in the British Isles. Good sense and national survival both dictate, I believe, a very much greater movement of people and resources than ever before from the heart of the British Commonwealth to its outlying parts.[300]

The use of the words 'national survival' should be highlighted as this clearly illustrates the way in which Australian politicians regarded the wider British world; as a nation.

On the other hand, the expression of British race patriotism in Australia was not just confined to the conservative side of politics. The Liberal-Country coalition government's policy of greater European immigration was heavily criticised by Evatt at the start of 1958 'One thing we must not forget is that Australia is basically and fundamentally a British community and must remain so.'[301] This was reiterated by his successor as leader of the ALP opposition, Calwell who asserted that Australia's immigration program should essentially maintain the homogeneity of its population and the basic British nature of the nation.[302]

---

[299] NAA, M2607/36, 'Immigration in a Changing World' - Addresses by Athol Townley, Minister for Immigration, Australian Citizenship Convention, 1957, 19.
[300] NAA, M4299/5, Notes for Citizenship Convention Speech by H. E. Holt, Minister for Labour and National Service, 22nd January, 1957, 20.
[301] NLA, MS 4738/Box 191/526, Extract from the *Mercury*, Wednesday, 22nd January, 1958 – 'Menzies, Evatt in clash on migration: Bitter attack on current plan; More British sought'.
[302] NLA, MS 4738/Box 177/413, 'Australian Labor Party – Immigration Policy' by Arthur Calwell, Leader of the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party, Undated, 1.

Immigration and Assimilation Policy during the 1940s and 1950s

Because the national identity of Australia was based on being white and British, the primary focus of the post-Second World War immigration program was actually on securing British migrants first and foremost.[303] This is epitomised by Calwell's famous pronouncement that 'It is my hope that for every foreign migrant there will be ten people from the United Kingdom.'[304] To this end, free and assisted passage schemes for migrants from the UK to Australia began on 31st March, 1947.[305] However, the government quickly realised that it could not secure the number of migrants it desired from the British Isles. It also needed to look at Europe as a source of potential migrants, although the UK would supply the vast majority. The earliest foreign migrants to arrive were displaced persons in 1948. Calwell had facilitated their arrival through an agreement he signed with the I.R.O. (A subsidiary of the UN) in 1947.[306] An agreement was also made with the government of Malta on 31st May, 1948. Under this, residents of Malta who were British subjects and complied with certain conditions of eligibility and selection were granted assisted passages to Australia for the purposes of settlement.[307] Immigration agreements were also signed with other European countries. The first was with The Netherlands in February 1951 and Italy followed in March of that same year. Agreements with Austria, Belgium, West Germany, Greece and Spain followed the next year. Under

---

[303] Russell McGregor, 'The necessity of Britishness: ethno-cultural roots of Australian nationalism'. *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2006 discusses the conventional wisdom regarding the post-Second World War migration boom.

[304] Immigration – Government Policy. Ministerial Statement, 22nd November, 1946, *1946-47-48, The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia: vol. II. Papers Presented to Parliament (and ordered to be printed)*, 1049.

[305] Immigration – Government Policy. Ministerial Statement, 6th March, 1947, *1946-47-48 – The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia: vol. II. Papers Presented to Parliament (and ordered to be printed)*, 1059.

[306] NAA, A434 (A434/1)/1950/3/7188, Extract from the *Telegraph*, 29th December, 1947, 'Look to Europe for people we need' by Arthur A. Calwell, Minister for Immigration.

[307] NAA, A445/124/6/15, Memorandum by T.H.E. Heyes, Secretary, Department of Immigration to The Commonwealth Migration Officers, All States on "Commonwealth Government's Immigration Plans", including "Notes on the Commonwealth Government's Immigration Program", 18th July, 1949, 9.

these agreements the costs of transporting the migrants were shared by Australia and the home countries.[308]

The Menzies government in 1950 affirmed its commitment to securing British migration to Australia:

> We attach importance to ensuring that British immigration is first and foremost, in order to retain, as closely as we reasonably can, the present balance of our population. This is a British community, and we want to keep it a British community living under British standards and by the methods and ideals of British parliamentary democracy.[309]

To this end, the government announced plans to bring to Australia 'non-nominated' British migrants, those who did not have any friends or relatives in the country that could nominate and house them. Furthermore, specific existing Immigration Centres (which were at the time used for Displaced Persons) would be transferred for the reception and temporary housing of British settlers, and a scheme of workers' hostels to house British migrants in particular would also be initiated.[310]

The Australian government recognised as early as 1945 that attitudes towards non-British migrants needed to change if Australia really wanted to increase its population while maintaining its homogeneous British identity. Foreign migrants had to be encouraged to assimilate into the 'Australian way of life' and become Australians.[311] Migrants were expected in due course to become as proud of being an Australian as Anglo-Celtic Australians were.[312] Therefore, non-British migrants would only be admitted on the basis of how easily they could be assimilated.[313] The

---

[308] Ann-Mari Jordens, 'Post-War non-British Migration' in James Jupp (ed.), *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins* (Melbourne, Vic.: Cambridge University Press, 2001) 67.

[309] NAA, M2607/29, Statement on migration policy of Menzies government by Harold Holt, Minister for Immigration, 23rd January, 1950, 2.

[310] *Ibid.*, 1.

[311] Immigration – Government Policy. Ministerial Statement, 2nd August, 1945, *1944-45 – The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia: vol. IV. Papers Presented to Parliament (and ordered to be printed)*, 1218.

[312] NLA, MS 4738/Box 191/527, Part 7, New Australians, 4.

[313] Immigration – Government Policy. Ministerial Statement, 22nd November, 1946, *1946-47-48 – The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia: vol. II. Papers Presented to Parliament (and ordered to be printed)*, 1049.

earliest foreign migrants, displaced persons, although small in comparison to the large numbers of British migrants received, were nevertheless expected to assimilate into the Anglo-Celtic culture and be made into good Australian citizens.[314]

The Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council, which advised the Australian government on all matters regarding immigration, offered guidance on what direction assimilation policy should take in 1947 'It is felt that generally the following guiding principles should be applied in determining the classes of persons to be granted permanent admission:...Persons who by reason of their age and nationality and general qualifications would be likely to be readily assimilated.'[315] The Council also contemplated a proposal, taking into account the goal of achieving assimilation, that an appropriate publication should be produced for foreign settlers' use during their wait for transport to Australia.[316] The government acted upon these suggestions. While waiting for ships to transport them to Australia, displaced persons were housed in transit camps where they were educated about their future lives in their adopted country. Particular attention was given to knowledge about the 'Australian way of life'. This education continued on the ships.[317]

However, what was actually meant by migrants assimilating and becoming 'Australian' was not explicitly outlined at the time of the policy. This reflects the prevailing belief that there was no need to define what it consisted of, as it was simply taken for granted that assimilation into the 'Australian way of life' meant the

---

[314] Immigration – Government Policy. Ministerial Statement, 6th March, 1947, *1946-47-48 – The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia: vol. II. Papers Presented to Parliament (and ordered to be printed)*, 1059.

[315] NAA, A2169 (A2169/3)/1947, Minute No. 34, Department of Immigration, Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council, Minutes of Second Meeting, held in the Cabinet Room, 8th Floor, Commonwealth Offices, Sydney, on 2nd and 3rd April, 1947, 1.

[316] NAA, A2169 (A2169/3)/1947 - Minute No. 54, Department of Immigration, Commonwealth Immigration Council, Minutes of Third Meeting, held in the Senate Committee Room, Parliament House, Canberra, on 7th and 8th May, 1947, 6.

[317] Immigration – Government Policy. Ministerial Statement, 28th November, 1947, *1946-47-48 – The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia: vol. II. Papers Presented to Parliament (and ordered to be printed)*, 1068.

full abandonment of migrants' former cultures and the adoption of the Anglo-Celtic culture, which was based on Britishness. Richard White links the 'Australian way of life' firmly with the government policy of assimilation towards migrants in the post-Second World War period. However, he also comments on the vagueness and ambiguity of the term.[318] White does assert however that it 'presupposed homogeneity and a status quo which had to be defended.'[319]

Official government assimilation policy was outlined by Prime Minister Ben Chifley himself in a letter to E. M. Hanlon, the Premier of Queensland towards the end of 1947 'In the administration of the [immigration] scheme, particular attention is being given to the careful selection of migrants who will be readily assimilated into our community, both from the aspect of nationality and of employment.'[320] This was actually supported by opposition Liberal Senator Neil O'Sullivan who argued that the government should be commended on its effort to obtain suitable immigrants to Australia, especially those of British stock, but also others who were willing to assimilate into Australian society. This included adopting its way of life and adhering to its laws.[321]

It was also an integral component of the government's program to ensure that migrants who were allowed to enter Australia should be sent as geographically widely as possible throughout the country, so that their assimilation into the population was expedited. The government maintained a consistent policy against encouraging or allowing an unreasonable concentration of migrants in any specific centres or towns.[322]

---

[318] Richard White, 'The Australian Way of Life', *Historical Studies*, vol. 18, 1979, 535.
[319] Quote taken from White, 'The Australian Way of Life', 540.
[320] NAA, A461 (A461/8)/A349/3/1 PART 3, J. B. Chifley, Prime Minister to E. M. Hanlon, Premier of Queensland, 10th November, 1947.
[321] CPD, *Senate*, sess. 1946-47, vol. 193, 22nd October, 1947, Senator O'Sullivan, 1054.
[322] NAA, A461 (A461/9)/Y349/3/5, Notes on European Refugees - Admission to Australia, 2.

The policy of assimilation was continued by the successive Liberal-Country coalition governments from 1949 onwards. In his official opening address to the First Australian Citizenship Convention at the beginning of 1950 Menzies outlined the direct link between assimilation and Britishness 'We must say to them [migrants]...that, whatever may be the circumstances of the past, when they have lived here for a few years they will all be Australians, they will all be British, and they will all be, as we are, the King's men and the King's women.'[323] It is an important speech on various levels. Firstly, it expressed Menzies belief that being Australian and British were the same thing, and that you could become both even if you were not born in Australia. Secondly, the reference to migrants becoming 'the King's men and the King's women', like other Anglo-Celtic Australians illustrates the importance Menzies placed on the role of the monarchy in the British world.

At the same convention Holt defined assimilation as a two-way process 'We hear much about the need for migrants to become assimilated quickly, and it is, of course, most desirable that the migrants should do so...But assimilation is a two-way process.'[324] However, this did not involve Australians adopting migrant customs or languages. Instead, Australians were simply encouraged to be welcoming and receptive to assisting migrants.

There were various ways in which the migrant was encouraged to embrace the 'Australian way of life'. These included broadcast lessons, continuation classes and instructions in classes to circumvent the first obstacle to assimilation, an insufficient understanding of the English language and the Australian way of living; guidance on how to meet Australian customs and laws and motivation to take the

---

[323] NAA, M2607/29, Extract from Immigration in Action: Digest of the Australian Citizenship Convention held in Canberra from January 23rd – 27th, 1950 – 'Case for Migration is irresistible says Prime Minister', 3.

[324] NAA, M2607/29, 'Migration A Great Adventure' - Speech by Harold Holt, Minister for Immigration at the opening of the Australian Citizenship Convention at Canberra, 23rd January, 1950, 1.

initial moves towards naturalisation as an Australian citizen.[325] It was also stressed towards the end of the year how the assimilation of British migrants was relatively easy, as they were so similar to the Australian people. In contrast, the assimilation of European migrants was much more difficult. The major problem was the difference of ideas.[326] Thus, British migrants assimilated easily into Australian society compared to their European counterparts because of their 'Britishness'. Despite coming from different hemispheres British migrants and Australians were essentially the same people; they were all 'British'.

At the close of 1950 Holt introduced the premiere of an Australian film entitled 'No Strangers Here', which was aimed at assisting migrants to assimilate into Australia. He asserted that the building of the population rapidly through immigration was something that Australians generally agreed upon. However, it was not sufficient for Australia to accept migrants only for what they could offer. Holt ended with expressing his belief that 'I am confident that the Australian people, with their natural friendliness and tolerance, appreciate the need and will by their goodwill ensure that all newcomers to this land find themselves among friends.'[327] 'No Strangers Here' was a documentary film based on the story of a displaced family, the Stalskis that migrated to Australia. The overarching theme of the film was the family's quest for acceptance by the Australian community, which was epitomised at the end of the film by a community picnic in which the Stalskis were warmly welcomed. The central characters were a bricklayer father, a cook mother and a trainee nurse daughter. The film illustrated Australians assisting the newcomers and how the Stalskis 'accept

---

[325] 'What is assimilation? We must meet the migrant half-way', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 2, September 1950, 2.
[326] 'What is assimilation? A mutual desire for friendship', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 4, November 1950, 2.
[327] NAA, A445 (A445/1)/261/5/1, 'No Strangers Here' Programme – A Message from the Minister for Immigration, the Hon. H. E. Holt.

and are accepted in their new life'.[328] Hence, both Holt and the film stressed the need for Australians to welcome the migrants so as to assist in their assimilation into the Anglo-Celtic society.

In a speech to the Second Australian Citizenship Convention at the start of 1951 Governor-General McKell first attempted to outline exactly what the Australian culture consisted of:

> Concurrently with its growth in national status, Australia has been working out during the last hundred years a distinctive culture and way of life, which, while sharing fully the traditions and way of life of the great British family of nations, has its own characteristics. In the nineteenth century period of rapid growth, a sense of "mateship," fair play, independence of spirit and self-reliance was engendered which forms a vital part of our tradition of nationhood.[329]

He then summarised what the assimilation process of non-British migrants entailed:

> It is all these qualities, which are amongst the best in the Australian character, that we must seek to pass on to the newcomers. By a wise handling of assimilation our migrants will not only conform to our standards of citizenship, but will add their own contribution. There will be give and take; assimilation will be a two-way process, demanding much of both the migrants and ourselves, and the result will be mutual enrichment.[330]

The reference to assimilation as a two-way process built on earlier comments of the same sort made by Holt.

The importance of naturalisation in the assimilation process was elaborated upon in the early 1950s.[331] Along with the symbolic meaning of Australian citizenship, which at this time incorporated British nationality, there were also many practical advantages of becoming a citizen. During this period the non-British subject experienced many disadvantages in Australia. Firstly, they had to legally notify every change of employment and address and could be fined or sent to prison if they failed

---

[328] NAA, A445 (A445/1)/261/5/1, Report from London: "Today's Cinema" December 18th 1950 "No Strangers Here".
See also NAA, A8139/VOLUME 7, No Strangers Here – Stills from film on Migration – CU1105/1-CU1105/112.

[329] NAA, M2607/30, Extract from Commonwealth Jubilee Citizenship Convention: Report of Proceedings, held at Canberra, January 22nd – 26th 1951 – 'The Governor General opens Jubilee Citizenship Convention', 8.

[330] *Ibid.*

[331] 'Many may now file citizenship papers – Declaration is first step', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 10, May 1951.

to do so. Secondly, they could not cast votes in state and federal elections and could not become a Member of Parliament. Furthermore, they were not eligible for invalid or old-age pensions and the widows' pension was not available to non-British women. Moreover, they could not gain employment in the permanent Public Service of the states or commonwealth. Certain professions were barred to them unless they were naturalised and certain companies in the private sector also did not recruit non-British subjects.[332] They were effectively barred from participation in the civic life of the nation. This underlines the position of naturalisation in the assimilation process, but it is also a prime example of the British identity of Australia, as British migrants were given preferential treatment over other settlers due to their 'Britishness'.

The government's policy towards national migrant organisations was largely negative. It strongly discouraged them as they were seen as a hindrance to migrants' assimilation into mainstream Australian society.[333] In situations where the Department of Immigration was informed of a plan for the creation of a group with goals similar or identical to those of current Australian organisations, it was always recommended to the organisers that it would be better for new settlers to try to join the current Australian group. For this reason, Australian groups were encouraged to try their utmost to motivate new settlers to apply for membership and provide them with the means to contribute in the activities and administration of such groups.[334]

At the grassroots level assimilation policy was manifested in a variety of ways. In the early 1950s, for example, the International Clubs of the Young Men's Christian Association (Y.M.C.A.) arranged social gatherings for newcomers. They supplied a venue where they could meet both Australians and co-nationals. However, the clubs

---

[332] 'Many may now file citizenship papers', 1.
[333] NAA, A446 (A446/165)/1962/65632, T. H. E. Heyes to J. Chappel, State Secretary, R.S.S. and A.I.L. of Australia (W. A. Branch), 8th February, 1952.
[334] *Ibid.*

emphasised a completely Australian perspective.[335] By this it was asserted that 'Migrants must forget their former national ties and concentrate on cultivating an all-Australian outlook.'[336] But language was still a prominent problem. This resulted in New Australians grouping together in national factions. In response, the clubs re-emphasised their goal of combating this unwanted difficulty of migrants not mixing fully with Australians.[337]

In his address to the Third Australian Citizenship Convention at the beginning of 1953 Holt set out the main features of assimilation policy:

> Through the efforts of Good Neighbour Councils and New Settlers Leagues[338], thousands of Australian homes have been opened to the newcomers, and social and cultural functions enabling Australians and migrants to fraternise on common ground are now daily events...Young organisations have arranged holiday camps, outings to the country, and many other activities which bring migrant and Australian youth together in healthy recreation.[339]

So, interaction between migrants and Australians was regarded as a crucial part of the assimilation process. Holt also pointed out that settlers were now actually sharing the responsibilities of organising Good Neighbour activities with Anglo-Celtic Australians.[340] This was in contrast to the beginning of assimilation policy, in which migrants were given no responsibility whatsoever to organise Good Neighbour functions.

In the same speech the extent to which assimilation policy was slowly changing was also illustrated in relation to the government's position towards migrant national clubs:

---

[335] 'International Club teaches Australian way of life', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 23, June 1952, 4.
[336] *Ibid.*
[337] *Ibid.*
[338] These were state organisations (although there was also a national co-ordinating council) that were supported by the federal government to co-ordinate the voluntary activities of various groups in putting assimilation into practice within each state. They were known as Good Neighbour Councils in all of the states except New South Wales and Queensland, where they were referred to as the New Settlers' Leagues.
[339] NAA, M2607/32, 'Advance Australia' - Addresses by H. E. Holt, Minister for Immigration, Australian Citizenship Convention, 1953, 14.
[340] *Ibid.*

> I regard such associations as links in the chain between the old world and the new. Indeed, it would be both unrealistic and unsympathetic on our part to expect our new settlers to abandon overnight their traditional customs, their friendships with people here from their own country, or their friendships with people still in their own country or with those, like themselves, refugees from political persecution living in other parts of the world...It would be quite unreasonable for us to expect them to react differently from the way in which we would ourselves react if we had been uprooted and taken to another country.[341]

This was in stark contrast to the Australian government's view at the start of the mass immigration program in 1947. Instead there were signs of recognition now that assimilation actually took time and could not be expected to happen overnight. The generational differences in assimilation were also highlighted 'Anyone who has come in contact with the children of new Australian settlers will appreciate that, although the assimilation of their parents may sometimes appear slow, the children are fast growing up to be "dinkum Aussies".'[342] This is a fundamental statement, especially the reference to the children of migrants becoming 'dinkum Aussies'. This was in the sense that it reflected the new prevailing belief regarding the generational nature of assimilation, but more importantly that through assimilation the children of migrants could become indistinguishable from their Anglo-Celtic counterparts. Another example of the subtle changes in assimilation policy was New Australians being invited to the Australian Citizenship Convention for the very first time in 1953.[343]

The government regarded the Royal visit of 1954 as another means of furthering assimilation. This was to be the Queen's first visit to Australia, the first of any reigning British monarch. Both old and New Australians were encouraged to join in the honour of demonstrating their affection and making her welcome. The importance of the Crown in uniting all Australians was also underlined:

> The Crown...is perhaps the most important factor uniting the component parts of the Australian community. Differences of religion, social class, political persuasion and way of life disappear in the atmosphere of loyalty to Her Majesty. Similarly, differences of racial origin

---

[341] NAA, M2607/32, 'Advance Australia' - Addresses by H. E. Holt, Minister for Immigration, Australian Citizenship Convention, 1953, 32.
[342] *Ibid.*, 32-3.
[343] NAA, M2607/32, Text of Broadcast by Minister for Immigration over the National Network at 6.30pm on 19th January, 1953, 3.

> and period of residence in Australia will find no place in the common affection for the Queen.[344]

The government actually hoped that New Australians would dress up in the national costumes of their former homelands at the lines of the route of the Royal tour. However, this was only to bring a bit of additional 'colour' to the crowds welcoming the Queen.[345] It was not an embracing of different cultures by any means. The Commonwealth Migration Office in Sydney noted that during the Royal tour of 1954, the Royal couple were received enthusiastically, not just by Australians and British migrants, but also by foreign migrants. In the opinion of the Office, whether the reaction of the migrants to the Queen illustrated a desire on their part for a monarch, or whether it highlighted their assimilation did not matter that much.[346] They were united with old Australians[347] in their embrace of the young Queen.

The essence of assimilation policy was encapsulated by Holt in a message in the ethnic publication, *Neue Welt* (New World) in July 1954 'It is my hope that the time will be short until you have all become acquainted with our language and speaking English freely with us, until you have become fully absorbed into the warmth of the Australian community, used to the Australian way of life and adding to it.'[348] So, along with outlining the main features of assimilation policy Holt also expressed the long-standing desire that the assimilation of migrants would happen as quickly as possible.

The link between assimilation and industry was also explored by Holt, now the Minister for Labor and National Service in an article for *Production News* in the same

---

[344] "Queen's visit will assist assimilation", *The Good Neighbour*, no. 2, February 1954, 1.
[345] 'Australians, new and old, are hosts to Royal guests', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 2, February 1954, 3.
[346] NAA, A445 (A445/1)/112/1/24, Memorandum by B.C. Wall, The Secretary, C.M.O. Sydney to Mr. Kearns, Department of Immigration on Assimilation Activities – Sydney Branch – Quarter Ended 30.3.54, 11th May, 1954, 1.
[347] I am not referring to aged Australians here but Australians of British descent.
[348] NAA, M2607/11, Message from Harold Holt, Minister for Immigration for 'Neue Welt' ('New World'), 2nd July, 1954.

month. He maintained that assimilation began when the new settler started his employment in industry. Holt further went on to argue that 'there rests on industry a special responsibility to assist migrants in adapting themselves to their industrial and employment environments, and so that they can not only make the greatest contribution to the efficiency of industry, but also to ensure that they become happily and permanently settled in Australia.'[349] Thus, he recognised that migrant assimilation was not only within the control of government, but also relied on other key players, especially employers.

Britishness and the White Australia Policy during the 1950s and 1960s

From the mid-1950s the White Australia policy began to be incrementally dismantled. Matthew Jordan argues that changing relations with Asia during this time were the main force behind the abandonment of the policy. The two key figures responsible for this major shift were Sir Tasman Heyes, Permanent Head of the Department of Immigration and John Horgan, his deputy. They were the first to suggest that an extensive re-evaluation of the White Australia doctrine was required if Australia was to avert harming relations with the Asian region.[350]

Heyes cited the examples of the US and Canada, both of which were about to adopt legislation that would extend quotas to several Asian nations and remove racial bars against naturalising non-Europeans. He firmly believed that Australia's inability to follow their example would only highlight the discriminatory aspects of the White Australia policy. Holt was persuaded by this argument and subsequently submitted the Department of Immigration's proposals to the Cabinet in July 1956. In

---

[349] NAA, M4299/3, Article by Harold Holt, Minister for Labour and National Service for 'Production News' – "New Australians and Industrial Development", July 1954, 3.
[350] Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 233.

line with Heyes' position, Holt maintained that by making resident Asians citizens and allowing highly qualified non-Europeans to become semi-permanent residents, the government would do much towards allaying Asian hostility to the White Australia policy.[351]

These changes were the first step in a series of incremental adjustments that were aimed at weakening the racial character of the policy while at the same time increasing Asian goodwill towards Australia. Heyes took little time to come up with new plans for the Cabinet. A few months later, he and Holt were successful in securing the government's support for the permanent admission and naturalisation of Australian citizens' non-European spouses. Nonetheless, these adjustments were quite careful. The ending of the 'dictation test' simply removed the most offensive aspect of the policy without decreasing the Commonwealth's power to keep non-Europeans out. By the end of the decade, Heyes had taken his approach of incremental changes to their limit without equivocally abandoning the White Australia policy. He informed Alexander Downer, the new Minister for Immigration that these adjustments had contributed to easing the harsh effects of the policy and lessening their impact on Asian opinion.[352]

So, one half of Australia's long standing national identity as a white, British nation was gradually changing, although the main structure still remained. The demise of the other half would start in much more dramatic fashion, although the actual process took place over time as well.

The first application of the UK government for entry into the EEC in 1961 marked the beginning of the unravelling of the belief that Australia was part of a wider British world. It came as such a psychological shock to the Australians as they

[351] Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 234, 236.
[352] *Ibid.*, 236, 237.

had previously received repeated assurances from the British that there was no question of them making a choice between Europe and the Commonwealth. The Australian government though became increasingly concerned by the lack of communication from London during 1960 and 1961, when the UK was reconsidering its position towards the EEC. Despite repeated requests for information, the British refused to indicate which way they were thinking until a more solid agreement had been secured with the Six (this was the six original members of the EEC – France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg. The latter three were collectively known as Benelux).[353]

There were increasing rumours and speculation about a reversal of British policy in early 1961. This led to a sudden interest in European economic matters in the Australian government. McEwen, now the Minister for Trade announced to the Cabinet in February that although the entire picture was not clear, it appeared as if the UK was shifting closer and closer towards something along the lines of full membership of the EEC. Menzies expressed the deep concerns of the Australian people about this eventuality. He specifically drew attention to the political and strategic effects Britain's decision would have on the Commonwealth. If Britain were to join the EEC how would it then consider Australia, Canada and the rest of the Commonwealth?[354]

But unlike the UK, Australia did not have an alternative geographic grouping that it could redirect its interests to. Thus, the Australian government decided to use whatever means it could to ensure that British entry into the EEC would not lead to a fundamental shift in Australia's long-standing political and economic ties to the UK. Menzies' subsequent tough probing of the British government illustrated the level of

---

[353] Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 69, 70.
[354] *Ibid.*, 71, 79.

Australia's concerns. The issue of Britain and Europe, rather than being seen as just a temporary conflict of interest between Australia and Britain, had initiated a re-evaluation of the very concept of 'British interests'. Menzies increased the pressure by stating that the UK had a very hard choice between the Commonwealth and Europe. On 31st July, 1961, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan announced the decision of his government to seek membership in the EEC.[355] Macmillan's EEC statement resulted in a diverse range of responses in Australia. The *Sydney Morning Herald* represented the general feeling however, announcing that the British action was one of the most historic statements of the century.[356]

Immigration and Assimilation Policy during the 1950s and 1960s

From the mid-1950s to early 1960s a preference for British migrants continued to be maintained. A Personal Nomination Scheme was introduced in the mid-1950s whereby Australians could nominate migrants from Britain to come over to Australia and temporarily house them until they found their feet. This supplemented the existing Commonwealth Nomination and Group Nomination Schemes. It was reiterated that with British migrants assimilation was already half completed. The importance of maintaining the 'essentially British character of the nation' was also stressed.[357]

Two more plans to increase the level of British migration to Australia were also announced a few years later. The first was a variation of the Commonwealth Nomination Scheme whereby British migrants who did not possess the required occupational qualifications could still come to Australia but would have to work at the

---

[355] Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 81, 85, 86, 88.
[356] *SMH*, 2 August, 1961 cited in Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 89.
[357] NAA, M2607/34, Sixth Australian Citizenship Convention - Address to Delegates by the Minister for Immigration, H. E. Holt, 26th January, 1955, 3-4.

government's discretion, most likely away from their families. The second was an effort to greatly increase the level of personal nominations of British migrants by Australians, through state government immigration officials actively taking lists of potential British settlers to local areas to secure their support.[358]

Holt responded to criticism that his government was not doing enough to attract British migrants to Australia by pointing out that Australia had received more migrants from Britain than any other of the Commonwealth nations over recent years, the sum was on a par with that of Rhodesia, South Africa, New Zealand and Canada all together.[359] He reemphasised his point 'I do not know of any country which has done more financially, or by way of organisation and advertisement, to attract migrants from the British Isles than has Australia.'[360]

In May 1962 a new five-year migration agreement was signed between Australia and the UK. It allowed British migrants aged 19 and older to come to Australia at a heavily subsidised cost of only £10. Those under 19 travelled free. These were the more commonly known '£10 Poms'. The Australian and British governments shared the costs of transportation and the former agreed to pay all other expenses.[361]

By the mid-1950s more subtle shifts could be detected in the government's approach to assimilation policy. A prime example of this was a report in *The Good Neighbour* about national groups of migrants forming associations for social purposes. However, rather than being seen as part of the recognition that assimilation took time, it was actually considered an assistance to assimilation, as

---

[358] NAA, M2607/36, 'Immigration in a Changing World' - Addresses by Athol Townley, Minister for Immigration, Australian Citizenship Convention, 1957, 19-22.
[359] NAA, M2607/36, Notes for Citizenship Convention Speech by H. E. Holt, Minister for Labour and National Service, 22nd January 1957, 2.
[360] *Ibid.*
[361] NAA, A4940 (A4940/1)/C1954, Statement by the Acting Minister for Immigration, Mr. Leslie Bury - New Migration Agreement signed with Britain, 28th May, 1962.

these groups had united together to form a broader associate committee of migrants, instead of becoming racial cliques. They also assertively assisted voluntary organisations in English instruction for migrants.[362]

In an article for *Optima* at the close of 1955, Holt outlined the main features of assimilation policy:

> We know that the successful migrants are the happy men and women who feel they "belong", who know that they have more than their labour to contribute to the community, and who will, in due time, seek full Australian citizenship...Knowledge of the English language is accepted as the first need in assimilation. Preliminary instruction is given to migrants on their sea journey to Australia...A migrant is encouraged, but not pressed, to become a naturalized Australian citizen and so enjoy full partnership in the task of nation building.[363]

So, the major aspects of assimilation were a sense of belonging, naturalisation and understanding of the English language. These were long-standing characteristics from the beginning of the policy in 1947. However, Holt did go on to explicitly comment on the impact of migrant cultures on the 'Australian way of life', 'The new Australians have brought other benefits that cannot be measured in material terms...Their cultures, their contribution to Australian art and music, the variety they have brought to our diet and living habits have had an exciting and beneficial influence on the Australian way of life.'[364] Though, he qualified these comments with 'And yet the newcomers, too, have, for the most part, quickly taken on some of the most desirable Australian characteristics.'[365]

Townley, the Minister for Immigration, discussed the generational differences in assimilation in his address to the Australian Citizenship Convention at the start of 1957: 'In the field of migration it may be that we get a group which takes a little longer to settle down and has more difficulty in settling down than do other groups;

---

[362] 'N.S.L. of N.S.W. may change its name to G.N.C.', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 23, November 1955, 2.
[363] NAA, M2607/15, Article for Optima – 'Advance Australia - an Adventure in Nation Building', by Harold Holt, Minister for Immigration, December 1955, 125.
[364] *Ibid.*, 126.
[365] *Ibid.*

but that difficulty is largely confined to the first generation.'[366] He also reiterated Holt's earlier substantive comments about the contribution that migrants had made to the 'Australian way of life', 'Immigrants are making a great contribution to aspects of national development that have nothing to do with economics, because their presence among us tends to broaden our outlook and add to our culture and our way of life.'[367]

However, more traditional assimilation messages continued to be made into the 1960s. In early 1961, Alexander Downer, the new Minister for Immigration, strongly encouraged New Australians to avoid joining or forming migrant specific trade unions or other such groups.[368] This reflected political concerns over migrants becoming organised against the government. In his opinion their assimilation would be facilitated if they became a part of current associations with their fellow Australians:

> I am strongly of the opinion that the migrants should join existing Australian organisations with Australian members so that they can increase the feeling of unity and become part of the community...This objective can best be achieved by joining institutions such as sporting bodies, church organisations and other groups in which they can play their part and, if necessary, present the migrant viewpoint in a most effective way.[369]

But the government did acknowledge as in the past that it was natural and desirable for New Australians to come together in national groups for social and cultural purposes, but not political. Again building on earlier small steps, the preservation of migrant traditions was explicitly seen as potentially enriching Australian society. Downer, however, ended with his view that separate migrant unions would be

---

[366] NAA, M2607/36, 'Immigration in a Changing World' - Addresses by Athol Townley, Minister for Immigration, Australian Citizenship Convention, 1957, 9.
[367] *Ibid.*, 13.
[368] 'Minister warns on exclusive migrant unions', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 74, March 1960, 1.
[369] *Ibid.*

harmful as it would set the New Australian apart from his workmate. It made them 'different', which was the single thing the government had tried so hard to avoid.[370]

Changes in the definition of assimilation were also illustrated by Downer. He asked the Australian people to cease using such terms as 'New Australian', 'assimilation' and 'refugees'. Downer admitted that they were commendable when created, and had functioned well. But they had now served their purpose and instead had become a source of resentment on the part of migrants. He believed this was because 'They designate a differentiation from the Australian community, and that is bad...What we are all aiming at is just the opposite: a harmonisation of a multitude of [cultures] into one Australian nation, which in turn is one of the bulwarks of the British Commonwealth.'[371] This is a fundamental statement as it shows perhaps one of the earliest, even if tentative grasps at a new language of national community.

Downer yet again demonstrated the slowly shifting position on assimilation on the part of the government by arguing that the benefits of Australia's current immigration policy counterbalanced whatever changes in traditional outlook and difficulties could emerge from the existence of foreign people in Australia. If Australia was to continue to exist in the way the majority of its population desired, then it had to, contrarily, experience shifts in customs and outlook that European migrants would bring. Though Downer conceded that the growing number of European migrants would, over time, weaken Australia's links with Britain, he did not see Australia's current immigration policy as necessarily leading to a breakdown in its British and Commonwealth relationships. Instead he believed that the onus was on Australians of British descent that still made up between 85 and 90 per cent of the population to display the qualities of their British heritage to the newcomers. Hence, they were to

[370] 'Minister warns on exclusive migrant unions', 1.
[371] '"Prisoner of Words" – Minister warns on the "jargon of migration"', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 78, July 1960, 2.

be encouraged to become more active on this front. While conceding that European migrants had a lot to offer Australians, Australians of British descent should not forget that they also had great gifts of institutions, background, language and ideas to give to them.[372] He specifically highlighted 'The place of the Queen and Royal Family in our legal and political systems as well as in our affection; Our traditional association with Britain politically, commercially and intellectually; [and] the importance we attach to our position in the British Commonwealth.'[373] Downer reemphasised this point through quoting figures that showed that half of Australia's 1,545,000 post-war migrants came from the UK. What is more, he did not believe it likely that they had brought pre-dispositions and allegiances with them that varied largely from the overarching pro-British sentiments that had typified Australia's overseas perspective for the previous 150 years. Nor did he envisage any considerable change in this regard.[374] Therefore, although he could talk about a multitude of cultures this did not represent a fundamental departure from the notion of Australia as essentially 'British'.

So, to summarise Australia identified itself as a British country from the late nineteenth century to the 1960s. It was an integral part of a wider British world. This was illustrated through various newspaper editorials, parliamentary debates and speeches. However, with the UK's first application for entry into the EEC this self-identification of Australia as British began to unravel. It demonstrated to Australia that the UK no longer saw its future in the British world but rather in the European mainland. Thus, the British action was a tremendous psychological shock to Australia.

---

[372] 'Gains outweigh difficulties in migration', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 80, September 1960, 1.
[373] *Ibid.*
[374] *Ibid.*

Alongside Britishness, the second pillar of Australian national identity was whiteness. The White Australia policy reinforced and was interwoven with the idea of Australia as a British nation. But with growing numbers of Asian countries becoming independent in its region Australia started to remove the most offensive aspects of the policy gradually over time. This process began in the 1950s.

Due to Australia considering itself a white, British nation non-British migrants were required to assimilate themselves into this Anglo-Celtic culture immediately, abandoning their home cultures. However, assimilation policy went through some subtle changes over the period under study in this chapter. Slowly, it was recognised that assimilation did not happen overnight and migrant associations might be allowed to exist in the first instance. Furthermore, the prospect of migrant cultures adding to the Anglo-Celtic culture was also mentioned in very general terms. But over time the Australian government began to actually see migrant organisations as a useful player in the assimilation process. Moreover, substantive comments began to be made as to what exactly migrant cultures contributed.

Australia in the post-Second World War period was essentially a white, British nation. It strongly identified itself as a core part of a worldwide British race. Therefore, the large numbers of non-British migrants who arrived after the Second World War were expected to assimilate into this Anglo-Celtic culture. They had to abandon their native cultures and languages and start speaking English immediately. However, from the mid-1950s the White Australia policy, which was one of the two pillars of Australian national identity, started to be dismantled. The UK's decision to seek membership in the EEC in 1961 also signalled the unravelling of Britishness in

Australia. Consequently, assimilation policy began to slowly shift. The next chapter will compare and contrast the assimilation experiences in Canada and Australia.

Chapter Three – 'Anglo-conformity' and 'Incorporation into the Anglo-Celtic culture': A comparison of assimilation policies in Canada and Australia, 1890s-1960s

Policies of assimilation were adopted in Canada and Australia during what may be called the 'nationalist era'. Towards the end of the nineteenth century modern English-speaking Canada and Australia came to define their national identities based on the myth of British race patriotism. This was reinforced and complemented by an emphasis on preserving both countries as white nations. They then both received mass non-British migration and consequently assimilation policies were adopted to incorporate these migrants into the Anglo-conformist or Anglo-Celtic cultures.

Britishness and Whiteness

From the preceding two chapters it can be seen therefore that Britishness or British race patriotism formed the foundation of the national identities of both English-speaking Canada and Australia. From a wide range of speeches, parliamentary debates and newspaper articles in the two nations, we can see how in this period both English-speaking Canada and Australia saw themselves as members of a worldwide British race. A prime illustration of this is Empire Day, which although a Canadian invention, was the annual focal point for both nations in their celebration of being 'British'.

Canada and Australia both experienced industrialisation in the late nineteenth century. As a consequence of this there was rapid change and associated social trauma. English-speaking Canadians and the Australian colonists along with other Western societies at the time sought emotional security through an intense sense of identity which could locate them as a people in this new social order. British race patriotism emerged in both nations as a means by which to answer the questions of

'Who are you?' and 'To whom do you belong?' Both nations also had a local patriotism which was defined through identification with and attachment to the land. But this more localised sense of identity was both compatible with and subordinate to the wider attachment to Britishness, a belief in seeing themselves as part of a worldwide community of Britons.

However, British race patriotism was more problematic in Canada due to the French-Canadian factor in that country. In contrast to Australia, Britishness was not relevant to the whole population. A large proportion of the Canadian people – the French-Canadians – felt, at the very least, excluded, and, at the worst, hostile to this belief in Canada as a 'British' people. This ethnic identity did not apply to them. They instead preferred to stress a local *Canadien* identity which was predominantly based on the territory, traditions and customs of Quebec.

This uneasiness over British race patriotism was epitomised by the Liberal Party, which drew a large part of its core support from Quebec and consequently had supplied a large number of the Liberal Party MPs and not an insignificant number of Liberal ministers, even prime ministers. On the other hand, Conservative politicians held very similar positions towards Britishness to Australian politicians of all types. This was because they were largely, if not wholly a party of English-speaking Canadians.

Whiteness was at the core of Britishness in both English-speaking Canada and Australia. The restrictive immigration policies in Canada and Australia had widespread popular support. This was demonstrated by the existence of anti-Asian immigration organisations in both countries; the White Canada Association in

Canada, and the Anti-Chinese League in Australia, which represented a wide cross section of the population.[375]

However, the White Australia policy had more of a national focus in Australia. In Canada, anxiety over the preservation of a White Canada was centred largely in the West Coast province of British Columbia. This can largely be explained through the whole of Australia being potentially affected by Asian migration due to its geographical position. But the Canadian federal government did after considerable lobbying from British Columbia take action to restrict the inflow of Asian migrants. Provincial pressure was compounded by federal politicians from British Columbia, from both sides of politics arguing their case.[376]

The establishment of the White Canada policy was achieved however over a long period, between the turn of the nineteenth century and the late 1920s. In contrast, the Australian colonies were united in their desire to end Asian migration to their colonies immediately. Farmers in North Queensland though were opposed to excluding Pacific Islanders as they relied on 'Kanaka' labour for their sugar plantations. The colony though accepted the majority opinion, and restricting Asian immigration was actually the first major piece of legislation of the newly created Commonwealth Parliament of Australia.

The distinction between the strength of whiteness in the two Dominions was also evident in the method used to exclude Asians. Firstly, in Canada, the introduction of restrictive immigration legislation was, as stated above, a long process, which began with a "Gentleman's Agreement" with Japan in 1907. This was subsequently revised in May 1928.[377] Contrarily in Australia, the White Australia

---

[375] Price, *The Great White Walls are Built*, 187.
Ward, *White Canada Forever*, 136.
[376] Ward, *White Canada Forever*, 138.
[377] *Ibid.*, 75, 138.

policy was introduced through one major piece of legislation, the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901, and was absolute in who it excluded and therefore who it included in the 'nation'. This reflected an intense and widespread geopolitical anxiety in Australia. The Immigration Restriction Act reaffirmed earlier colonial legislation which had gradually limited Asian migration. It was also amended and built upon in subsequent decades.

The White Australia policy was the bedrock of all other Australian policies. This was not quite the case in Canada. The 'dictation test' was employed in Australia to exclude all undesirable migrants. On the other hand, Canada chose legislation which actually prevented the arrival of Asian migrants in the first place. This was achieved through a 'continuous journey' provision for Indian migrants in 1908, whereby they had to sail directly from India to Canada, which at the time was not possible, as there was no direct steamship line. To discourage Chinese migration Canada introduced a prohibitive head tax and then ultimately ended this flow through the Chinese Immigration Restriction Act of 1926. In the case of the Japanese, as mentioned above, Canada signed an agreement whereby the numbers of them migrating to Canada was severely limited. In contrast Australia did not even entertain the possibility of such concessions. This was again largely a reflection of its closer geographic position to Asia, and its consequent 'siege mentality'. In Australia there was a total embrace of the idea of the inability of different races to mix.[378]

The English-speaking/French-speaking divide over British race patriotism was most clearly highlighted at times when the country was called upon to contribute troops to imperial war efforts, such as the Sudan Conflict, the Boer War, or the First and Second World Wars. The conscription debates, especially during the First World

[378] Robert A. Huttenback, *Racism and Empire: White Settlers and Coloured Immigrants in the British Self-Governing Colonies, 1830-1910* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976) 13, 15-18, 23-4, 317-22, 325.

War, brought this tension to the surface. French-Canadians were overwhelmingly against Canada's involvement. In direct contrast, English-speaking Canadians strongly supported giving all aid to the 'mother-country'. In Australia however, although the debates were rancorous and politically devastating for the Labor party, nevertheless those who opposed conscription did not have an alternative, competing myth to that of British-Australia. Irish-Australians did express opposition to Australia committing troops to the imperial war effort, but it was not to the same extent as French-Canadian opposition in Quebec. As Meaney has shown, Irish-Australians signed up to the First Australian Imperial Force in numbers proportionate to their representation in the population. The agitation on the part of some Irish-Australians during the war towards the British government after the Easter rebellion in Ireland in 1916 was exactly that, an expression of anger *at* the British government, not a reaction *against* being British. When Ireland was made a Dominion in 1922 this opposition largely faded away.

Some scholars have argued that the general position of the French-Canadians in Canada can be compared to that of the Irish-Catholics in Australia.[379] Though some similarities can be made, the key difference between the two is that French-Canadians were, and still are, geographically largely concentrated in one area of the country, the province of Quebec. On the other hand, Irish-Catholics were spread across Australia. In addition, unlike the Irish-Catholics, the French-Canadians actually arrived before the British. Consequently, the strength of this unique identity and thus the negotiating position and influence of the French-Canadians was considerably stronger, and their reservations about, or hostility to, Canada's Britishness needed to be taken seriously.

---

[379] Foster and Bartrop, 'The Roots of Multiculturalism in Australia and Canada', 271.

Most importantly however the issue of language goes a long way towards explaining the differences in the two experiences. The fact that Irish-Australians spoke English meant that they could identify with the British Anglo-Celtic identity. Britishness included Celts. Moreover, Ireland was a part of the Empire and later Commonwealth. In contrast, the French-Canadians firstly through having their own language could not relate to British race patriotism, and their ancestral homeland of France was not a part of the British Empire.

Towards the end of this founding period in which English-speaking Canadians and Australians had adopted a British identity, this self-definition began to unravel. This took place first in Canada, where the initial signs began to emerge in the early 1950s. In contrast, the Australians' commitment to Britishness only started to change in the early 1960s. An indication of this difference is the reference in Canada to the evolution of that country's role in the Empire and Commonwealth, and her growing independence. This was articulated by Prime Minister St. Laurent in Citizenship Day speeches in the early 1950s, in which he stressed Canada's progress within the Commonwealth over a long period of time to emerge as an independent country.[380] Contrarily in Australia, political leaders continued to avow their country's British identity. The consistent theme was Australia's integral role in the British Empire and her strong links to the 'mother-country'.

The fact that Britishness began to erode in Canada ten years earlier than it did in Australia is extremely important. It is a fundamental difference between the two countries and goes to the very heart of how they saw themselves as a people. The

---

[380] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 267, Citizenship Broadcast by Louis S. St. Laurent, 22nd May, 1950, 1.
Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1950, 23rd May, 1950, Mr. St. Laurent, 2743.
LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 267, Golden Jubilee I.O.D.E., Montreal - Notes for remarks by Louis S. St. Laurent, 27th May, 1950, 1.
LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 276, An Address by the Prime Minister at the Diamond Jubilee of the Association of Canadian Clubs, Hamilton, Ontario, 12th September, 1952, 2-3.

difference can largely be explained by the French-Canadian factor in Canada. From its very origins Canada had always had to balance between being a part of the British Empire and then the Commonwealth, and accommodating its very large French-Canadian minority. On the whole it was able to maintain this balance. However, in the post-Second World War period this began to change. French-Canadians became even more critical of Britishness and instead emphasised a Canadian patriotism, as demonstrated by the Parliamentary debates surrounding the Canadian Citizenship Act.

The Canadian Citizenship Act of 1946 itself was a clear matter of Canada's intent to create a Canadian identity at the expense of Britishness. The passage of this legislation meant that Canada was the first Commonwealth country to differentiate its people from other British subjects. This unilateral action forced other Commonwealth countries to adopt similar laws; the UK and New Zealand, soon followed by Australia. In the debates surrounding the British Nationality and Australian Citizenship Act of 1948 it was pointed out that Australia had only taken this action because of the Canadians. It was recognised that the main reason Canada had done so was due to its large French-Canadian population.

Even earlier, in the 1920s and 1930s Canada and Australia also took contrary positions towards greater Dominion autonomy as was illustrated by their different attitudes to the Balfour Declaration of 1926 and the Statute of Westminster of 1931. Canada joined Ireland and South Africa in calling for greater autonomy or decentralisation, while Australia, with New Zealand, concerned to keep imperial ties as close as possible was dismayed by these developments.

This whole issue arose from the effect of the First World War. Through the experience of the Imperial War Cabinet, South Africa, Ireland and Canada feared

that the UK might want to control their foreign policies. In contrast, Australia and New Zealand actually desired a common foreign policy.[381] This distinction reflected the different geographical positions of the two groups of countries, with Australia and New Zealand being small outposts of several million British people in a region of many more millions of Asians. Contrarily, Ireland was safe due to it being part of the British Isles. Canada was protected by the Monroe Doctrine[382] and South Africa did not face any real threats in its region. Therefore, Australia and New Zealand's geo-political considerations had a major bearing on their desire for closer imperial defence. Emphasis though should also be placed on the 'British' nature of Australia and New Zealand's populations. They were predominantly made up of those of British descent. On the other hand, Canada and South Africa also contained large non-British or anti-British elements; French-Canadians and Afrikaners.

Canada's British-French ethnic composition led French-Canadian politicians to consistently criticise their English-speaking Canadian counterparts for having a dual-loyalty, to Canada and to the British Empire. The French-Canadians saw themselves as the true settlers of the country, real *Canadiens*. They saw themselves as putting Canada first, they who were strong patriots. Thus, they were at the forefront of demands for greater autonomy and imperial decentralisation. Liberal Party Prime Ministers, some of British, and some of French descent, that were in power for the vast majority of Canada's existence as a nation, had to respond to these concerns for the reasons outlined previously. Nonetheless, French-Canadians

---

[381] This is explored further by John Darwin, 'A Third British Empire? The Dominion Idea in Imperial Politics' in Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis (Eds), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume IV, The Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor), *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*, 64-87.

[382] This was a statement made by US President James Monroe to Congress in December 1823 in which he essentially announced that all European powers should no longer interfere in the affairs of countries in the Americas, with the exception of any nation who had colonies at that point in time. If any power attempted to do so, the US would consider it as an attack on its own territory. http://www.ushistory.org/documents/monroe.htm (Accessed 23rd July, 2008).

were not alone in calling for Canada to be more independent. There were English-speaking Canadians who also held this position. This can largely be explained through the Liberal Party's dependence on French-Canadian support in order to govern.

The tension between French and English-speaking Canada had its origins in the actual act of Confederation in 1867. The French-Canadians had always regarded this as a compact between two equal nations: the British and French. Contrarily, most English-speaking Canadians considered Confederation as just the coming together of the majority of the British North American Empire. This fundamental difference in the understanding of the origins of the country would be a long-running national problem, even up to this day. In any case, Confederation as a compact between two different languages and cultures was possible because it was entered into in a pre-nationalist era. Hence, no nationalism existed at this time which would have necessitated all Canadians to be one people, one race.

Immigration and Assimilation Policy

Canada experienced mass non-British migration much earlier than Australia; in the 1890s. It received a second wave in the post-Second World War period, at the time Australia was receiving its first. Despite Australia receiving non-British migrants before 1945, mainly Germans and Italians, the numbers involved were relatively small, and are not comparable at all with the mass non-British migration that Canada received. This is an extremely important difference between the experiences of the two countries. Moreover, although the Canadian government was officially opposed to the bloc settlements of migrants, this was largely the pattern of settlement of its

first mass non-British migration at the close of the nineteenth century in the Prairies. In comparison, in Australia there were no similar bloc settlements of groups.

Following the Second World War both Canada and Australia introduced immigration programs, which brought in large numbers of non-British migrants, for the first time in the case of Australia. Despite this not being the first time Canada had received large numbers of non-British migrants, it was the initial instance that they were encouraged and assisted by the government to come to settle and the migrants went to urban areas rather than rural ones.

Nevertheless, both nations' migration programs gave first preference to British migrants. This reflected the British character of both English-speaking Canada and Australia, and their desire to maintain the essential nature of their populations. This was of course qualified in Canada, with its large French-Canadian element. Thus, only Australia initially concluded Assisted Passage Agreements with the UK to this end. Canada just relied on the voluntary migration of people from the UK to Canada, until it introduced a unilateral Assisted Passage Loan scheme in the 1950s. The Ontarian government did though introduce a limited provincial scheme to transport British migrants by air in the immediate post-Second World War period. However, this was not comparable to the national program adopted in Australia. This is partly explained by the closer proximity of the UK to Canada, than to Australia. On the other hand, it is more so a fundamental reflection of the bicultural nature of Canada compared to Australia.

Both Canada and Australia adopted policies of assimilation to deal with non-British migrants. They were expected to incorporate themselves completely into the white Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic culture of their adopted nations and since the great majority of these migrants settled into English-speaking provinces the French-

Canadians could do little to resist this policy. However, Protestant Christianity was emphasised in the model of what non-British migrants were expected to assimilate into in Canada.[383] No evidence has been found to suggest a similar experience to this in Australia, which is most likely explained by its very large Irish-Catholic population.

There was a major difference though between Canada and Australia in terms of their assimilation policies. In Canada, non-British migrants were expected to assimilate either into English-speaking Canadian or French-Canadian society, depending on which part of Canada they migrated to. This reflected the fact that Canada was a bicultural society. In contrast, Australia was mono-cultural and non-British migrants there could only incorporate themselves into the Anglo-Celtic society. Though there was a choice in Canada, since most migrants actually went to English-speaking provinces they, like their Australian counterparts, assimilated into the Anglo-centric culture.

Naturalisation was an important element in the assimilation process in both Canada and Australia. Naturalisation was seen as the epitome of assimilation as it brought together all the major components of the process. Migrants had to have a basic understanding of English (or French in Canada) in both countries in order to become citizens. Along with English instruction they also had to receive education about the rights and duties of citizenship. However, the creation of national citizenships as opposed to British subjecthood meant not belonging to one people, culture or race. Both Canadian and Australian citizenship though retained the status of British nationality as well. But this involved more symbolism rather than any substance, particularly in the Canadian situation. When it actually came to formally

[383] Kallen, 'Multiculturalism', 51.
Barber, 'Nationalism, Nativism and the Social Gospel', 222.

becoming citizens at the Citizenship ceremonies though, migrants had to pledge loyalty to the British monarch, which reaffirmed the identification of English-speaking Canadians and Australians as British peoples.

Voluntary organisations played a prominent role in both Canada and Australia in assimilating migrants. They were often the first line of contact for many migrants in their daily lives, and hence had a large responsibility in assisting New Canadians or New Australians to adjust to the Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic society. The importance of the part played by voluntary organisations was recognised by both governments. This was demonstrated by the national Citizenship conventions held in both countries, at which voluntary organisations made up the majority of participants. Australia took the lead in this, but generally voluntary organisations were of more importance in Canada than Australia. This is because the Australian government was much more active itself in the assimilation process than its Canadian counterpart.

Government films and radio broadcasts for newcomers were also used to help assimilate migrants in both Canada and Australia. These attempted to express the key messages about assimilation. This included the core principle of migrants abandoning the culture and values of their former homelands and embracing the way of life in their new home. Through this, migrants would be welcomed warmly and accepted into the community. They also drew attention to successful examples of assimilation in both countries. Nevertheless, they lacked explicit references to the British character of both of the countries. The reasons for this though were very different. In the Australian situation there was no need to specify the British nature of the country as it was just assumed that everyone knew. On the other hand, in the Canadian experience, taking into account all that has been said about the strong

influence of the French-Canadian factor above, the lack of detail on British race patriotism was due to the problematic nature of this concept in a bicultural society.

Both Canada and Australia had similar institutional structures in place to coordinate the assimilation activities within the two countries. In Australia these were the Good Neighbour Councils (in Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia) or New Settlers' Leagues (in Queensland and New South Wales). They were responsible for directing the assimilation activities of voluntary organisations within their jurisdictions. There was also a national co-ordinating council. The Canadians saw the advantages in the Australian system and set up equivalent Canadian Citizenship Councils. They performed a very similar role to their Australian counterparts. Therefore, both countries saw the benefits of having umbrella organisations which could facilitate their assimilation policies.

Policies of assimilation were adopted in both Canada and Australia after they received large numbers of non-British migrants. These policies were based on migrants incorporating themselves into Anglo-conformist or Anglo-Celtic societies in the two countries. This was because both English-speaking Canada and Australia identified themselves as British peoples. Whiteness was also a core part of this myth of Britishness. However, there were differences in the experiences of the two countries. These largely related to the presence of a competing founding group in Canada, and its earlier experience of mass non-British migration compared to that of Australia. But signs of the slow decline of British race patriotism and the gradual breakdown of whiteness in the two countries started to emerge. In the 1950s in Canada official government policy began to shift from that of assimilation to one of integration. The reasons for this shift will be the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter Four – Integration Policy in Canada, 1953-1963

As the foundation of English-speaking Canadian national identity began to unravel and break down, integration replaced assimilation as official government policy in dealing with migrants in Canada. Integration encouraged migrants to retain their own cultures as well as incorporate themselves into the Canadian one. The culmination in the demise of the belief in Canada as an integral part of a wider British world was the UK's decision to seek membership in the EEC. Growing US dominance and the Quiet Revolution in Quebec added to these pressures.

The demise of Britishness, the French-Canadians and the unravelling of the White Canada Policy

> Ready, aye, ready no more.[384]

The above quote by Pearson, the Minister for External Affairs (and future prime minister) during the Suez Crisis of 1956 famously marked the end of Canada's automatic loyalty to the British Empire.

Alongside the unravelling of Britishness, whiteness was also slowly broken down. Building on the 1950 reforms, which allowed limited numbers of Indian, Pakistani and Ceylonese citizens to migrate to Canada, and the 1952 Immigration Act, the government continued to gradually dismantle the racial assumptions behind the White Canada immigration policy. However, this was very much a slow process, and more traditional pronouncements continued to be made. For instance in late 1954 Jack Pickersgill, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration made clear that whilst the government did not discriminate against any single person due to his race,

---

[384] Igartua, '"Ready, Aye, Ready" No More?', 47.
The original quote of 'Ready, aye, ready' is attributed to Sir Wilfred Laurier who as Leader of the Liberal Opposition at the outbreak of the First World War summed up the feelings of most Canadians at the time who were ready to support the UK at any cost. Prime Minister Andrew Fisher's famous quote of supporting Britain 'To our last man and our last shilling' was the parallel of this in Australia.

it was not going to allow any 'major' movement of British West Indian or Asian people into the country.[385] When prompted as to why the government took this position he recalled a statement made by the late former Prime Minister Mackenzie King in 1948 in which he had stated that '"We don't want immigration to change the character of our population."' Pickersgill talked about the arrival of large numbers of Europeans of non-British or non-French descent into Canada after the Second World War. However, their traditions were very similar to those of the Canadians and after very little time in the country they had become indistinguishable from 'native' Canadians.[386] So, the difference in the assimilability of Europeans and non-Europeans was emphasised. The *Victoria Times* wholeheartedly supported Pickersgill's desire to maintain Canada's character, through a racial preference. They approved of his plan to seek migrants that would fit most easily into Canadian life and take up the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship.[387] This is hardly surprising as the newspaper was from a particular British bastion in Canada.

In the mid-1950s British race patriotism began to unravel as the core of the national identity of English-speaking Canada. In a speech in London in early 1955 on the occasion of his receiving the freedom of the city, St. Laurent made reference to the long-standing French-Canadian belief that they were the original pioneers of

---

[385] LAC, M626-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jul. 1954 – 31st Dec. 1954, Extract from the *Toronto Star* – 'Influx from West Indies Banned – Ottawa', 25th November, 1954.
LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jul. 1954 – 31st Dec. 1954, Extract from the *Winnipeg Tribune* – 'Pickersgillism', 18th December, 1954.

[386] I am not referring to First Nation, Inuit or Métis (Aboriginal) Canadians here, but Canadians of British or French descent.
LAC, M626-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jul. 1954–31st Dec. 1954, Extract from the *Toronto Star* – 'Influx from West Indies Banned – Ottawa', 25th November, 1954.
LAC, M626-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jul. 1954 – 31st Dec. 1954, Extract from the *Ottawa Journal* – 'John Dickey Off Committee On Immigration', 25th November, 1954.

[387] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 329/File No. 313, Extract from the *Victoria Times* – 'Keeping Canada's Character', 19th November, 1955.

Canada.[388] However, his most notable comments concerned the heritage Canada and other Commonwealth countries had received from the UK:

> In a sense, you in this City and these islands, are trustees for a larger generation than your own descendents...All of us in the Commonwealth overseas – and in the United States of America – share in degree in your inheritance of ways of governing yourselves, of ways of transacting fair and honest business, and of traditions of tolerance and good faith.[389]

This reflected the changing English-speaking Canadian perspective towards Britishness. They were now no longer seeing themselves as British per se, but possessing a heritage of British democracy, institutions and values; one that was not only confined to the Commonwealth, but also the US.

The decline of British race patriotism was also illustrated by a growing lack of observance of traditional celebrations, such as Victoria Day. This had been an important anniversary for English-speaking Canadians to express their pride in membership of a wider British world. But now newspapers reported that on Victoria Day in Toronto in 1955, one of the quietest parts of the city was at the Queen Victoria statue in Queen's Park. They lamented that a few strollers stopped to inspect it but there were no wreaths or any official commemorations.[390] Therefore, the day had changed from being an expression of Canada's integral membership of a wider British world to just another public holiday.

On this same day the identification of English-speaking Canada as a British country erupted as a contentious issue between the two major political parties. The Liberals had traditionally adopted a nuanced position towards Britishness mainly due to their large French-Canadian constituency. They very often stressed patriotism to Canada rather than any nationalism towards the British race. The Progressive Conservatives by contrast, were a bastion of British race patriotism in English-

---

[388] LAC, MG26-L/Vol. 287, Statement of the Prime Minister of Canada on the occasion of receiving the freedom of the City of London, 7th February, 1955, 1.
[389] *Ibid.*, 3.
[390] '...But Few Remembered Her', *Globe and Mail*, Tuesday, 24th May, 1955, 1.

speaking Canada. In Parliament Liberal Prime Minister St. Laurent, himself of mixed French and British ancestry designated *God Save the Queen* as the 'royal anthem' and by extension *O Canada* as the new national anthem.[391] The anthem issue had been a long-running controversy which had erupted sporadically over the decades. French-Canadians were generally in favour of *O Canada* and most English-speaking Canadians preferred *God Save the Queen.*

The Progressive Conservative Leader of the Opposition, George Drew objected to what the Prime Minister had done. He reported that St. Laurent had approached him informally to ask whether he supported the singing of *God Save the Queen* on the occasion of Victoria Day. Drew agreed but was then surprised that St. Laurent referred to it as the 'royal anthem' with the implication that it was no longer the national anthem. He asked the Prime Minister directly 'what was the significance of the words "royal anthem" used on this occasion.'[392] Diefenbaker, who was to become Progressive Conservative prime minister, asked St. Laurent if *God Save the Queen* was not in actual fact the national anthem.[393] St. Laurent defended his position, saying '"God Save the Queen" has never to my knowledge been adopted by any act of parliament or any resolution or any proclamation...Whether it should be called a national anthem or whether it should be called a national prayer, I really do not know.'[394] Thus, St. Laurent was highlighting the fact that the usage of *God Save the Queen* as the national anthem had never been legislatively enshrined, instead it had emerged through precedent.

---

[391] Debates, *H of C*, Volume IV, 1955, Monday, 23rd May, 1955, Mr. St. Laurent, 4001.
[392] Debates, *H of C*, Volume IV, 1955, Tuesday, 24th May, 1955, Mr. Drew, 4047.
[393] Debates, *H of C*, Volume IV, 1955, Tuesday, 24th May, 1955, Mr. Diefenbaker, 4047.
[394] Debates, *H of C*, Volume IV, 1955, Tuesday, 24th May, 1955, Mr. St. Laurent, 4047.

The *Globe and Mail* believed that this was the first time that what had previously been considered the national anthem had been so classified.[395] The newspaper drew out the implications of the parliamentary debate more clearly than the Prime Minister had 'If Mr. St. Laurent was intentionally leading the way out of a long standing controversy, then by elimination O Canada has become by default the National Anthem and God Save the Queen will be reserved for occasions when it is required to sing the "Royal Anthem"'.[396]

By the end of 1955 St. Laurent was reported as saying that he believed *O Canada* was becoming the national anthem by general acceptance and did not need to be designated by legislation, as the case had been with *God Save the Queen*. He also told the TLC that he would be happy if someone could suggest a national flag that would be accepted by an overwhelming majority of Canadians. The Prime Minister addressed the TLC's annual legislative delegation, which had asked for legislation to designate *O Canada* as the national anthem and to approve a national flag. With regards to the flag, he stated that it would not be a good idea to divide the Canadian people by picking a flag that some of them might be against.[397] This was primarily a reference to French-Canadians who were strongly opposed to any new flag that retained the Union Jack in any part of it.

The first major step in the breakdown of whiteness in Canada at this time was a joint memorandum by Pickersgill and M. F. Gregg, the Minister of Labour to Cabinet in mid-1955, recommending the admission of 100 domestic workers from the British West Indies on an experimental basis. The impetus for the scheme

---

[395] 'Did I Say That? – PM Calls The Queen Royal Anthem', *Globe and Mail*, Tuesday, 24th May, 1955, 1.

[396] *Ibid.*

[397] LAC, MG26-L/Personal Clippings/Vol. 303/File No. S-4/Press Statements/1st Sep. 1955 – 31st Dec. 1955, Extract from the *Toronto Globe & Mail* – 'O Canada Already National Anthem, St. Laurent Feels', 15th December, 1955.

however came from representations made by the governments of Jamaica and Barbados to the Canadian government. Concerns over trade with the Caribbean led to the consideration of the issue.[398] The Cabinet approved the recommendation the following month. It was agreed that 75 female migrants would be admitted from Jamaica and 25 from Barbados. The effectiveness of the plan would be reviewed a year later.[399] The West Indian domestic worker scheme was extremely important, as though the numbers involved were relatively small, it represented the first government sanctioned and sponsored movement of non-white migrants into the country.

Some Canadian newspapers began to question the White Canada policy and whether it was sustainable or even relevant in the current world. The issue was regarded as particularly topical as the level of immigration to Canada from long-standing source countries was beginning to decline. A majority of the newspapers understood the need for limits on immigration but felt that the government's regulations were excessive and inflexible. Examples of Asian students who had successfully settled into the country being deported, a British Guianese girl who had been adopted by a Canadian couple being sent home because she may have had Indian ancestry, as well as the lengths the Chinese Benevolent Association of Vancouver had to go to get a small number of refugees admitted from Hong Kong were commonly cited.[400] Therefore, with the use of these examples Canadian

---

[398] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 253/Cab. Doc. 131/1955, Memorandum to Cabinet: Admission of Domestics from the B.W.I., 7th June, 1955, 1.
LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2657, Immigration; admission of domestics from Jamaica, 6th May, 1955, 14-15.

[399] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2658, Immigration; admission of British West Indians for domestic service, 8th June, 1955, 14.

[400] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 329/File No. 313/1st Jan. 1955 – 30th Sep. 1956, Extract from the *Ottawa Citizen* – 'Immigration: Whom Do We Bar and Why?', 28th February, 1956.
LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 329/File No. 313/1st Jan. 1955 – 30th Sep. 1956, Extract from the *Ottawa Citizen* – 'The Vagaries Of Immigration Policy', 18th May, 1956.

newspapers attempted to draw attention to the human effects and injustices of the White Canada policy.

In early 1956 Pickersgill and Gregg reported to the Cabinet that the experimental West Indian domestic worker scheme had proved highly successful. This had been determined from a survey that had been carried out to 'determine the success of the experiment from the standpoint of suitability, adaptability and integration.' All of the 100 women and all but nine of the employers were interviewed. On the basis of this success both ministers suggested not only the continuation of the scheme for another year, but a doubling of numbers, from 100 to 200. Furthermore, they recommended that the source countries should be extended to include British Guiana and Trinidad alongside Jamaica and Barbados.[401] However, when the issue was discussed in the Cabinet the following week Pickersgill did express concerns over the potential creation of a 'coloured problem' for the future. But for the sake of bettering relations with the West Indies, especially in terms of trade, he felt it best to proceed with the proposal. The Cabinet approved the recommendations. The scheme would be continued but with 200 migrants to be admitted. This was divided between 100 domestics from Jamaica, 40 from Barbados, 30 from Trinidad and 30 from British Guiana.[402] The West Indian domestic worker scheme demonstrates how diplomatic considerations, especially trade concerns, were starting to take precedence over the racial foundations of the White Canada policy. The *Globe and Mail* praised the government's scheme. However, it did question whether male as well as female domestic workers should be brought

---

LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 329/File No. 313/1st Jan. 1955 – 30th Sep. 1956, Extract from the *Hamilton Spectator* – 'Peculiar Customs', 12th June, 1956.

[401] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 5830/Cab. Doc. 77/1956, Memorandum to Cabinet: Admission of Coloured Domestics by J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and M. F. Gregg, Minister of Labour, 23rd March, 1956, 1-2.

[402] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 5775, Immigration; admission of coloured domestics, 29th March, 1956, 3, 4.

into the country to provide a better balance of migrants.[403] This illustrated the limitations of the government's new policy in that it was willing to allow female domestic workers to migrate, but not potential families.

Yet another symbol of the decline of Britishness in English-speaking Canada was the official replacement of Empire Day with Citizenship Day in mid-1956. Pickersgill had submitted a memorandum to the Cabinet the previous month in which he suggested that a proclamation be made that the last school day before Victoria Day should be fixed as Citizenship Day (this had previously been celebrated as Empire Day). He stressed that the day would not be a holiday, but would afford 'private citizens, public bodies, school authorities and voluntary organizations across Canada the opportunity to hold special ceremonies, educational exercises and other observances with a view to stressing the value of Canadian citizenship.'[404] Although in practice this had already been taking place for a few years, the minister decided to take the step to make it official. The Cabinet approved the Minister's recommendation.[405] Hence, Empire Day was officially and completely eclipsed by Citizenship Day. The day was now all about Canadian Citizenship, there was not even any mention of Canada's links to the Commonwealth.

The political skirmish over the national anthem by the Liberals and Progressive Conservatives the previous year was but a preparation for their disagreement over the Suez Crisis in July 1956. According to Igartua 'The Suez incident became a litmus test of Canada's sense of place on the international scene, of Canadian values, and of national unity...It provoked both defenders and opponents of the Canadian position at the United Nations into arguments based on

---

[403] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 329/File No. 313/1st Jan. 1955 – 30th Sep. 1956, Extract from the *Toronto Globe & Mail* – 'Out of Balance', 22nd June, 1956.
[404] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 5830/Cab. Doc. 122/1956, J.W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to the Governor General re: Citizenship Day, 23rd May, 1956.
[405] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 5775, Citizenship Day, 1957; selection of date, 21st June, 1956, 2, 3.

varying conceptions of what Canada was as a country, and what it should be.'[406] The Liberal government did not support the Anglo-French action. Though St. Laurent saw Nasser as a dictator, he believed that to respond to aggression with aggression, except under the auspices of the UN, would lead to an estrangement in relations with neutral nations such as India, and would offer the Soviet Union an excuse to interfere even more in the Middle East.[407] The US was also firmly opposed to the Anglo-French action, partly for the same reason. This consequently also influenced the Canadian government's position as Canada was a core ally of the Americans in the context of the Cold War and the threat of communism.[408] In contrast Diefenbaker, now the Progressive Conservative spokesman on external affairs expressed his party's position of being solidly behind the UK on the issue. He called on the St. Laurent government to support the UK in criticising Nasser's action as the abrogation of an international contract.[409]

After the British and French had invaded Egypt, the position of the Canadian government shifted from lack of support for the Anglo-French action to open criticism and condemnation of it. But the Progressive Conservative Shadow Minister for Foreign Affairs, Howard Green, scathingly maintained that 'The United States would have far more admiration for Canada...if this government stopped being the United States chore boy...Now this government, by its actions in the Suez Crisis, has made this month of November, 1956, the most disgraceful period for Canada in the history of this nation.'[410] The Progressive Conservatives hence argued that the Liberal government was taking such a firm line against the Anglo-French action in Suez

---

[406] Quote taken from Igartua, '"Ready, Aye, Ready" No More?', 48.
[407] Dale C. Thomson, *Louis St. Laurent: Canadian* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1968) 459.
[408] Robert Bothwell, *The Penguin History of Canada* (Toronto, Ont.: Penguin Canada, 2006) 381-3.
[409] Thomson, *Louis St. Laurent*, 459.
[410] Debates, *H of C*, 1956-57, 27th November, 1956, Mr. Green cited in Igartua, '"Ready, Aye, Ready" No More?', 47.

because it was keen to be seen as following the US position. They instead believed that Canada should support the UK one hundred percent.

The English language press, usually loyal to Britain, was now divided. A survey of the twenty-six English-language dailies displayed a fifty-fifty split between those who agreed with the government and those who supported the Anglo-French intervention.[411]

The positions of the two parties were polarised even further when Canada took a leading role in UNEF (which the US sponsored) into Egypt, which signalled an embarrassing retreat for the UK and France, and symbolised to the whole world that they were no longer global superpowers.[412] To the Progressive Conservatives it appeared to be only yet another instance of the Liberal government's readiness to follow American policy, but once they themselves were in power they came to realise that the ties with the 'mother-country' were not as strong as they once were.[413]

During this period the White Canada policy also continued to be slowly reformed. In a Cabinet meeting in August 1956 Pickersgill suggested that the quota for migrants from India be increased. He argued that 'as a result of the recent revision of the regulations, East Indians had come to feel that there was discrimination in favour of people from certain Middle East countries compared with people from India, Pakistan, and Ceylon.'[414] Pickersgill maintained that the entire East Indian group was not excessive and India always took up its quota. Moreover, the Indian quota was small in comparison to Pakistan's when the huge difference in population was taken into consideration. The Cabinet agreed that negotiations

---

[411] Igartua, '"Ready, Aye, Ready" No More?', 61-2.
[412] *Ibid.*, 58.
[413] Jack L. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation* (Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1986) 43.
[414] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 5775, Immigration; Admission of fiancés of citizens of Chinese origin; enlargement of quota for India, 8th August, 1956, 3.

should take place with the Indian government regarding enlarging the quota of Indian migrants.[415] In the second review of the West Indian domestic worker migration scheme in early 1957 a positive appraisal was again given. Pickersgill and Gregg asked for the programme to be continued for another year and a further thirty domestic workers to be admitted from the West Indies on top of the current number of 200. The governments of both St. Lucia and St. Vincent had made strong representations to be included in the scheme. Pickersgill and Gregg therefore suggested that both be added to the source countries, and they receive an entitlement of fifteen domestic worker migrants each.[416] Although the Cabinet agreed with these suggestions, it did point out that once the West Indies Federation[417] was a reality it was hoped that the programme would be abandoned and an immigration quota instead established, as in the case of the South Asian members of the Commonwealth.[418] This demonstrates how much the White Canada policy was changing. It had moved from restricting non-Europeans from entering the country to actually establishing an increasing number of quotas for these people to migrate.

In April 1957 Roch Pinard, Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs reported that as per the Cabinet's decision the previous year the Canadian High Commissioner in New Delhi had conducted negotiations with the Indian government to increase the quota of Indians to be admitted into Canada. They had agreed on a figure of 300 Indians a year, which would double the current number of 150. In addition, Pinard pointed out that in an attempt to counter accusations by East Indian

---

[415] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 5775, Immigration; Admission of fiancés of citizens of Chinese origin; enlargement of quota for India, 8th August, 1956, 3.
[416] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 1891/Cab. Doc. 53/1957, Memorandum to Cabinet: Admission of coloured domestics from British West Indies by J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and M. F. Gregg, Minister of Labour, 7th March, 1957, 1, 2.
[417] This was a federation of the majority of former British West Indian colonies. It was established in 1958 and lasted for four years.
[418] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 1892, Immigration; admission of coloured domestics from British West Indies, 14th March, 1957, 4-5, 6.

groups in Canada and the Indian government that they would not be allowed to bring in as many relatives to Canada as Europeans, Americans, Turks, Lebanese, Israelis and Egyptians (who were in a separate and more privileged category), the agreement would be drafted so as to actually allow them to bring in the same type of relatives.[419] He requested the Cabinet's permission to finalise the agreement through an Exchange of Notes with the Indian government.[420] The Cabinet approved all of the suggestions. They were particularly concerned about removing any 'appearances of discrimination.'[421] This continued efforts that had began in the late 1940s and early 1950s to remove the most offensive aspects of the White Canada policy.

There were also some developments in French Canada between the early and mid-1950s. Maurice Duplessis continued to be Premier of Quebec under a Union Nationale government. But in his second term of 1944-59 he consolidated his three-pillar power base (the church, big business and the farmers), expanded the patronage system (this involved the government making political appointments and giving economic contracts to those who supported its position), and maintained an almost complete dominance of the basis of Quebec nationalism.[422] Though the government's description of Quebec as 'the new industrial giant' was overstated, the period 1944-59 certainly witnessed consistent expansion. Annual mining-generated production grew in wealth from $90 million to $480 million; iron-ore extraction itself increased from nil to 11,500,000 tonnes per year.[423]

---

[419] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 1891/Cab. Doc. 93/1957, Memorandum to the Cabinet: Proposed Amendment to the Immigration Agreement with India of 26th January, 1951 by Roch Pinard, the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs includes Annexes, 24th April, 1957.
[420] *Ibid.*
[421] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 1892, 1951 Immigration agreement with India; amendment to increase quota to 300, 25th April, 1957, 6, 7.
[422] Dale C. Thomson, *Jean Lesage & The Quiet Revolution* (Toronto, Ont.: Macmillan of Canada, 1984) 12.
[423] Thomson, *Jean Lesage & The Quiet Revolution*, 14.

According to Behiels 'The image most often associated with Quebec's French-Canadian people during the 1940s and 1950s was that of a church-ridden, agricultural society outside the mainstream of the urban-industrial North American way of life.'[424] Neo-nationalism emerged after the Second World War to contest the long-standing position of traditional French-Canadian nationalism over the secular and clerical elites. However, neo-nationalism was the result of ideological and socio-economic changes that had taken place in Quebec since World War I.[425]

This transformation of French-Canadian nationalism had its beginnings in the Bloc Populaire Canadien movement, 1942-48, that was unsuccessful in accommodating the conflict between the older, established group of federally-focused and socially conservative nationalists and a younger group of liberal-centred, secular Québécois nationalists.[426] Pushed into action by the sudden socio-economic evolution of Quebec and the rise of a 'new federalism,' a younger group of urban-centred, well-educated French-Canadian nationalists began to question the fundamental premises of the old nationalism, considering them to be ineffective and lacking.[427]

The neo-nationalists advocated the increased democratisation and secularisation required of a modern urban-industrial social system. The working-class was the largest social class in modern Quebec. Insistent that this class would continue to be Francophone in culture and language, the neo-nationalists turned into powerful supporters of an improved deal for the 'fourth estate'. However, neo-nationalists did not envisage the emergence of a social democratic society in Quebec. Instead, they believed that the Quebec economy should become a mixed

---

[424] Quote taken from Behiels, *Prelude to Quebec's Quiet Revolution*, 3.
[425] Behiels, *Prelude to Quebec's Quiet Revolution*, 5.
[426] *Ibid.*, 5-6.
[427] *Ibid.*, 271.

economy within a growing Francophone-majority private sector working together with an active state.[428] So, Britishness was declining in English-speaking Canada at the very same time that a French-Canadian nationalism was being defined.

During the late 1950s and early 1960s the belief that English-speaking Canada was an integral part of a wider British world began to unravel even further. Nonetheless, the election of the Diefenbaker Progressive Conservative government in 1957, the first Progressive Conservative ministry after over two decades of uninterrupted Liberal rule initially promised a strengthening of links between Canada and the UK, as the Progressive Conservatives had always been considered the protectors of the British tradition in Canada, and Diefenbaker was a renowned Anglophile. According to Granatstein "John Diefenbaker was exhilarated by his attendance at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in the days immediately after the election of 1957...To be in London as the first Conservative prime minister of Canada since 1935 was the fulfilment of long-held dreams."[429]

Diefenbaker's belief in English-speaking Canada as an integral part of a wider British world was demonstrated during the same visit in a Dominion Day Address to the Canada Club in London:

> I am happy to be here in London, at the heart and fountain head of the Commonwealth of Nations, to meet here in the shadow of the Mother of Parliaments other creators and guardians of those traditions of freedom which are based on the recognition of the concept of the dignity of the human person, the respect for the rule of Law and all those things which under Her Majesty the Queen unite us together in whatever part of this Commonwealth that is our home and habitation.[430]

He went on to elaborate upon Canada's place in the Commonwealth. Diefenbaker argued that the reason Canada placed so much importance on the Commonwealth was partly due to sentiment. But it was more a result of the fact that Canada was the

---

[428] Behiels, *Prelude to Quebec's Quiet Revolution*, 274.
[429] Quote taken from Granatstein, *Canada, 1957-1967*, 43.
[430] LAC, MG26-M VII/Vol. 62/Reel M-9156/File A/507, 'Canada and the Commonwealth' - Text of a Speech delivered by Honourable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada to the Canada Club Dominion Day Dinner at the Savoy Hotel, London, England, 1st July, 1957, 35640-1.

first in the association to make the transition to nationhood, slowly and consciously, by evolution, not revolution.[431] This last comment is reminiscent of the speeches of Diefenbaker's predecessor, former Prime Minister St. Laurent, on the subject, and continued a long trend in Canada's thinking towards its place in the Commonwealth.

Diefenbaker also reflected on discussions he had with Asian and African representatives at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference on Canada's immigration policy:

> He had got the impression that the coloured members of the Commonwealth would not press for wholesale admission of their nationals to Canada, provided Canada restricted immigration from these countries on the grounds that these people could not readily be assimilated into the Canadian economy and way of life and not on grounds that they were coloured people.[432]

So, Asian and African countries would not oppose restrictions on their admission into Canada as long as they were not based on race. This appeared to justify the efforts that had been made in the past decade to remove the most offensive aspects of the White Canada policy.

The focus on Canada becoming a nation in its own right was illustrated in an article by Diefenbaker entitled 'Canada Within the Commonwealth' in 1957. He maintained that recently Canada had gone back to marking the 24th May as the Queen's birthday, not the official commemoration of Queen Victoria's birthday, but of Queen Elizabeth II. This was now a celebration of the birthday not of the Queen of England and the Empire, but of the birthday of the Queen of Canada.[433] This was an illustration of localising what had previously been an imperial symbol and of establishing a more mature, direct relationship between the monarchy and the Canadian people.

---

[431] LAC, MG26-M VII/Vol. 62/Reel M-9156/File A/507, 'Canada and the Commonwealth' - Text of a Speech delivered by Honourable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada to the Canada Club Dominion Day Dinner at the Savoy Hotel, London, England, 1st July, 1957, 35641, 35642.
[432] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 1892, Immigration policy; Ghana, Malaya, British West Indies etc., 25th July, 1957, 3.
[433] LAC, MG26-M VII/Vol. 61/Reels M-9155 – M-9156/File A/506.1 – 'Canada Within the Commonwealth', 1957, 35309-10.

In May 1958 the Cabinet agreed to start holding major celebrations on the occasion of Dominion Day each year on Parliament Hill. Previously Confederation had only been commemorated in any large-scale fashion on the 50th and 60th anniversaries in 1917 and 1927. Ellen Fairclough, the new Minister of Citizenship and Immigration suggested that the time had now come for this to be rectified, a move which the Cabinet approved.[434] This new emphasis on celebrating the birth of the nation so to speak illustrated the emergence of the first sparks of what would later emerge as the 'new nationalism'.

Further steps in the breakdown of the White Canada policy took place a few months later. Fairclough submitted a memorandum to the Cabinet in which she recommended that an additional 398 Indian migrants be admitted into Canada that year on top of the existing quota of 300. This additional number consisted of applications from relatives of Indians who were Canadian citizens from the past several years. They had made repeated representations to the government that their relatives should be allowed into the country. Their criticisms were hard to refute as they quite rightly pointed out that migrants from non-Commonwealth countries had an easier time bringing their relatives into Canada than Indian settlers. Therefore, Fairclough thought the admittance of the outstanding 398 migrants would be a goodwill gesture. However, she emphasised that this was an exceptional case and would not be repeated, and the current quota of 300 Indian migrants would be maintained from then onwards. The Cabinet approved Fairclough's plan in late

---

[434] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 1898, Dominion Day; proposed annual observance on Parliament Hill, 15th May, 1958, 2.
LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 1898, Dominion Day; proposed annual observance on Parliament Hill, 20th May, 1958, 5-6.
See also Matthew Hayday, 'Fireworks, Folk-dancing, and Fostering a National Identity: The Politics of Canada Day', *CHR*, vol. 91, no. 2, June 2010, 287-314 and 'Variety Show as National Identity: CBC Television and Dominion Day Celebrations, 1958-1980' in Gene Allen and Daniel Robinson (Eds), *Communicating in Canada's Past: Essays in Media History* (Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, c2009) 168-93.

1958.[435] This episode though was noteworthy in that it showed the Canadian government acknowledging how Canadians of East Indian descent might feel discriminated against in contrast to some of their counterparts of non-Commonwealth descent.

When Diefenbaker was about to go on an international tour towards the end of the year the issue of whether *God Save the Queen* or *O Canada* or both should be played on his visits arose in the Cabinet. It had been recommended by some ministers that the latter alone should be played in France, Germany and Italy. However, Diefenbaker was adamant that *God Save the Queen* should also be played. In the end the Cabinet agreed on a very complicated programme. In the UK for obvious reasons *God Save the Queen* would be played. *O Canada* and *God Save the Queen* would be played in France, Germany and Italy. In Ceylon, India, Pakistan and the Malay Federation *O Canada* alone would be played. And lastly *God Save the Queen* would of course also be played in Australia and New Zealand.[436] This illustrated the Progressive Conservative government's grudging acceptance that things were starting to change when it came to English-speaking Canada's British identity. But it also showed certain sensitivity to Canada's image in the eyes of the world.

Viscount Hailsham, Lord President of the Privy Council, speaking to the Canada Club in London, UK in November 1958 elaborated upon the organic nature of Britishness: 'Viewed in the light of its origin and history, it is difficult not to see in this community of sentiment between members of the Commonwealth, a bond born

---

[435] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 2741/Cab. Doc. 237/1958, Memorandum to Cabinet: Immigration Policies and Procedures (Immigration from India, Pakistan and Ceylon) by Ellen Fairclough, Chairman, Cabinet Committee on Immigration, 11th August, 1958.
LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 1899, Immigration; India, Pakistan and Ceylon, 24th October, 1958, 12-13.

[436] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 1899, Prime Minister's tour; national anthem, 8th October, 1958, 4-5.

of our common loyalty to liberty under the law, fostered by individual relationships and economic ties but rendered possible by adherence to this living tradition no less than common origin.'[437] However, Hailsham was very much playing to his audience here, as comments of this type were becoming increasingly rare in Canada.

In April 1959 Fairclough submitted a memorandum to the Cabinet on Immigration from the West Indies. She outlined that immigration from the region to Canada had steadily been increasing since 1949. This was a combination of Canadian citizens of West Indian origin being allowed to bring in immediate relatives, the domestic worker programme initiated in 1955 and meritorious cases. Fairclough recommended that the domestic worker programme continue for the time being, with 250 migrants in total from the West Indies Federation and 30 from British Guiana being allowed into the country. However, she did suggest that Canada enter into discussions with the West Indies Federation as soon as possible to negotiate an immigration agreement along similar lines as the one with India.[438] The Cabinet approved all of Fairclough's recommendations the following month.[439] This again highlights the important changes in the White Canada policy. The Canadian government was actually very keen to negotiate an immigration agreement with the West Indies Federation. Its policy had certainly moved a great deal from just allowing Canadians of West Indian descent to bring in a limited range of relatives.

The problem of nationalism per se in Canada was explored in the *Montreal Gazette* on Dominion Day in 1960. It maintained that as a consequence of history, nationalism, when it arrived in Canada, was more negative than positive and it arose

---

[437] LAC, MG26-M VI/Vol. 536/Reel M-8902/File 810 – Speech by Viscount Hailsham, Lord President of the Council, at the Dinner of the Canada Club, Savoy Hotel, London, on Tuesday, 18th November, 1958, 409079.

[438] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 2742/Cab. Doc. 127/1959, Memorandum to Cabinet: Re: Immigration from the West Indies by Ellen L. Fairclough, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, 23rd April, 1959, 1-3.

[439] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2744, Immigration from the West Indies, 5th May, 1959, 11-12.

at a point when nationalism was not in vogue in the West. So, it was 'nationalism' that had been the problem, not Canadian identity. The newspaper argued that Canadians should cease viewing themselves in negative ways, as neither British nor American. This whole period was dominated by intense soul searching on the part of commentators to define Canadian national identity, and it often ended up focusing on what the country was not, as opposed to what it actually was. The newspaper instead suggested concentrating on the beneficial worth of nationalism.[440] The newspaper asserted that 'Canadianism is love of country – an old-fashioned phrase but it has strength and simplicity.'[441] It vociferously disputed those who said that the burden of nationalism was too heavy, and instead emphasised its positive benefits. An appeal was made for a 'more positive "Canadianism"' on the cusp of Dominion Day.[442] It hence wanted nationalism but without a nationalist history.

Anxiety over growing US interference in Canada was reflected in the *Vancouver Sun* around Dominion Day in 1960. It commented that national days were an opportunity to take stock. However, the fundamental perennial Canadian problem remained the avoidance of absorption by its massive Southern neighbour. The primary motivation behind Confederation was a determination not to be swallowed up by the expansionist republic to the South. Managing Canada's relationship with the US was the most important feature of the political careers of notable former Prime Ministers Macdonald, Laurier, Borden, King and St. Laurent.[443]

The *Vancouver Sun* maintained that Canadian nationalism was the primary cause of Diefenbaker's victory. He had campaigned on a more assertive position towards the US. Diefenbaker specifically committed to the diversion of one-fifth of

---

[440] '"Positive Nationalism" Urged For Canadians', *Montreal Gazette*, Friday, 1st July, 1960, 16.
[441] *Ibid.*
[442] *Ibid.*
[443] 'Cloudy Birthday', *Vancouver Sun*, Saturday, 2nd July, 1960, 4.

Canada's imports to the UK. But ironically according to the newspaper there had been no greater level of Americanisation in Canadian history than there had been under the Diefenbaker government since 1957. Canada's signing of the NORAD agreement with the US was particularly criticised. This put Canadian air forces in Canada under the direct command of American generals in the US. The scrapping of the Avro Arrow project (this was a Canadian fighter considered as potentially one of the best interceptors in the world) and instead a reliance on the US to provide for the air defence of Canada, as Canadian air forces were tied down in Germany, was also highlighted.[444] The newspaper ended with the stern warning that 'Time is running out for the Canadian nation...Unless Canadians call a halt to the deliberate dribbling away of our national sovereignty in the name of continental defence we won't have many more birthdays to celebrate.'[445] There is almost an alarming tone to this editorial. This reflected the long-standing Canadian fear of being swallowed up by its much larger Southern neighbour.

There was a definite increase in US economic investment in Canada during the post-Second World War resource boom. In contrast, in earlier periods, foreign investment had come from more diverse origins, and a large part was British portfolio investment, which English-speaking Canadians did not view as 'foreign'.[446] So, Canada was becoming increasingly integrated with the US, economically and strategically.

Nevertheless, Diefenbaker continued to pay homage to the British heritage and its role in the making of modern Canada in a speech to the St. George's Society Dinner in Toronto in April 1961:

---

[444] 'Cloudy Birthday', 4.
[445] *Ibid.*
[446] John Herd Thompson and Stephen J. Randall, *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2004) 253.

> As one who has no English blood in his veins (Diefenbaker was of mixed German and Scottish heritage) that does not deny me to standing humble tribute to the greatness of the English people and the imperishable heritage which they have given to the world...The genius of British political institutions is that they have maintained tradition with the necessary flexibility...The Commonwealth comprises nations which have been raised in the English family, and have emerged as free and independent states desiring to retain a voluntary political association with one another and with the Mother Country.[447]

Therefore, Diefenbaker was emphasising the importance of the Commonwealth here. There is no talk of Canada being a British country however. This illustrates that despite his own personal feelings Diefenbaker realised that Canada's relationship with the UK was not what it once was. Rather he was now stressing a more liberal view of the British Commonwealth, one which extended the genius of British institutions to all regardless of race or colour.

Views on the relationship between Canada, the monarchy and the Commonwealth were expressed by Georges Vanier, the Governor-General in a Dominion Day message in 1961 'We love our Sovereign and her Crown, not only as the symbol of our national unity but also as the personification of our patriotism, as the incarnation of the spirit of the land...It is well to recall that Her Majesty is the Head of the free association of the member nations of the Commonwealth.'[448] These comments by Vanier are reminiscent of Menzies' speeches on the monarchy in Australia in Chapter Two.

In the context of concerns over US dominance in Canada, the UK's decision to seek membership in the EEC that same year was a death blow to British race patriotism in English-speaking Canada. British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan's European ambitions were in no way the first disagreement between the UK and Canadian governments in terms of their own interests. However, it represented a clash of interests in a completely different league from those that had affected the

---

[447] LAC, MG26-M VII/Vol. 62/Reel M-9156/File A/507, Notes for an Address by the Prime Minister, John G. Diefenbaker, at the St. George's Society Dinner, Toronto, Ontario, 21st April, 1961, 35736, 35737, 35739.

[448] 'A Dominion Day Message from the Governor-General', *Citizen*, vol. 7, no. 3, June 1961, 2.

harmony of the Commonwealth in the past. As Andrea Benvenuti and Stuart Ward make clear 'The prospect of British adoption of a European common tariff, and the long-term political implications of European unity, raised fundamental questions about the material and ideological foundations of a "Greater Britain."'[449] The Macmillan government's justification for directing its energies to Europe has been well studied.[450] The decision to seek membership in the EEC essentially came down to a belief that the UK's future outside of Europe would involve an ever declining world position, both economically and politically. Most importantly, Macmillan believed it necessary to maintain publicly the facade that the UK would never ascend to the EEC under conditions that were detrimental to the economic interests of the Commonwealth. Hence, before proclaiming any formal decision to seek membership, the Macmillan government believed it necessary to make some moves towards 'consulting' Commonwealth governments. In late June 1961 it was decided that senior ministers should be sent to the far ends of the Commonwealth to explain Britain's situation. Unsurprisingly, Duncan Sandys, the Secretary of State for the Colonies and Commonwealth Relations met with a cool reaction in Ottawa, and evidently failed to persuade the Diefenbaker government. Regardless of his reassurances that the UK cabinet had not yet made a firm decision to seek membership in the EEC, the Canadian ministers got the general view that the UK had in fact already decided to open negotiations.[451]

---

[449] Quote taken from Andrea Benvenuti and Stuart Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada' in Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the End of Empire*, 168.

[450] This includes R. T. Griffiths and S. Ward (Eds), *Courting the Common Market: The First Attempt to Enlarge the European Community* (London, UK: Lothian, 1996); Wolfram Kaiser, *Using Europe, Abusing the Europeans: Britain and European Integration, 1945-1963* (London, UK: Macmillan, 1996); Jacqueline Tratt, *The Macmillan Government and Europe: A Study in the Process of Policy Development* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1996).

[451] Benvenuti and Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada', 169, 170.

Canadian irritation with British methods arose more clearly a few months later at the Commonwealth Economic Conference in Accra, when Canada's Finance Minister Donald Fleming and Trade Minister George Hees carried out a direct attack on the UK's promises to the Commonwealth, made openly over several years, which they argued were plainly set to be broken. But the Canadian ministers were in no way met with unflagging praise at home for their strong advocacy of Canadian concerns. In contrast, there was an apparently endless stock of faith in the promises of the UK government that crucial Commonwealth interests would be defended.[452]

The Liberal opposition, headed by Pearson, accused the government of leading the criticism of the UK, and announced their unqualified backing for the UK's EEC membership application. However, Pearson's position was nuanced as he added that Canada should in some undefined way be 'associated' with the British action. In this uncomfortable political atmosphere, Fleming was made to openly refute the view that Canada had acted in an aggressive way against the UK.[453] He justified his government's reaction to the EEC question in an address at Winnipeg: 'Like all families, we have had our differences; like all human associations ours is not a perfect one, but by and large our aims have been common, and where they have diverged we have brought our differences to the conference table and discussed them as members of a family.'[454] The language used by Fleming illustrates how Britishness still had some resonance in English-speaking Canadian society.

It is very clear though that the British government's resolve to enter the EEC resulted in a philosophical and resigned view in Canada. The majority of the press started to stress the uselessness of believing British guarantees, and the necessity

---

[452] Benvenuti and Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada', 171.
[453] *Ibid.*, 172, 173.
[454] TNA, PRO, DO 159/52, Fleming, speech at Winnipeg, 19th January, 1962 cited in Benvenuti and Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada', 173.

of a different strategy. It was about this time that the Canadian government started to realise the unavoidability of the sacrificing of Canadian trade interests in the discussions at Brussels. This highlighted the political difficulty of the manner in which Canada could go along with Britain's EEC entry without laying itself open to the criticism of conceding Canadian economic interests.[455] Therefore, in an astonishing act of political pragmatism, the Canadians agreed to be less vocal publicly in their criticisms, in exchange for British assistance in turning the EEC into a mute factor in Canadian electoral politics.[456]

Though Diefenbaker had agreed to not officially attack the British government publicly, he did however take the chance to express his worries to Macmillan privately. One such opportunity arose when Macmillan visited Ottawa in April 1962. On this visit Diefenbaker emphasised the impact of trade preferences 'in maintaining the cohesion of the Commonwealth' in its entirety, and for Canada specifically 'as a means of staving off United States domination.' He stressed that the Canadian government 'was keenly concerned with the preservation of the Commonwealth and feared that its future would be endangered by the political implications of United Kingdom entry.'[457] Benvenuti and Ward argue that 'These comments reveal the extent of Canadian anxieties concerning the less tangible aspects of British entry into Europe – the unravelling of the British world raised acute awareness of the "other quiet revolution," and posed difficult questions about Canada's sense of place and purpose in the post-imperial world.'[458]

---

[455] Benvenuti and Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada', 175.
[456] *Ibid.*
[457] LAC, RG25, vol. 5519, file 12447-40 (pt. 51), record of meeting between Prime Minister Macmillan and Prime Minister Diefenbaker, Ottawa, 20th April 1962 cited in Benvenuti and Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada', 176-7.
[458] Quote taken from Benvenuti and Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada', 177.

By the conclusion of July 1962, the Macmillan government had officially given up any chance that Commonwealth trading schemes might be maintained in an expanded EEC. Sandys wrote to all three Dominion prime ministers that the British were grudgingly made to see that there was no real chance of keeping the current Commonwealth preferences after the intermediary period and that they should most likely have to acknowledge that they would be finished by 1970. The last obstacle for the Macmillan government in gaining Commonwealth acceptance of its decision to seek membership in the EEC was the Prime Ministers' Conference a few months later. In the weeks before the conference, the Cabinet gave Diefenbaker free rein to use his own judgement in arguing Canada's position.[459]

Diefenbaker gave some fiery speeches at the Conference, but was reluctant to ruin British entry entirely. British officials were glad to discover that when it came to drafting the final communiqué for the conference, Diefenbaker did not put up much of a fight and in particular declared that he would not insist on the insertion of his earlier suggestion for another conference of prime ministers. In other words he too, despite himself, accepted the reality. Though the UK government achieved its major goals in terms of the EEC negotiations, this came at an immense cost to the future success and even integrity of the Commonwealth organisation. In this changing atmosphere, the debate about crucial Commonwealth concerns and the importance of British promises changed to a far-reaching sense of resignation.[460]

Nevertheless, Diefenbaker still elaborated upon the genius of the British race in an article in 1962:

> We in Canada are heirs of a great tradition and a great body of common law that comes from Great Britain, or from England, which that great orator, John Bright, described as the Mother of Parliaments. If we look at the growth of political organizations in the last few centuries, we

[459] Benvenuti and Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada', 177-8.
[460] *Ibid.*, 178-9.

> will find that the British model of democratic government was uppermost in the minds of all those who framed political institutions of the modern states.[461]

But his emphasis here was on Canada's British heritage rather than on Canada being a British country. This clearly demonstrates the uncertainty that Canada was experiencing in terms of its national identity at this time, and its difficulty in trying to define a sense of national community without the unifying British race idea.

At the same time as the unravelling of Britishness, whiteness also continued to be dismantled. A notable achievement of the Diefenbaker government in terms of immigration policy was the virtual abolishment of the White Canada policy. But this was presaged by the Bill of Rights that Diefenbaker announced with considerable pride in 1960. The Bill abandoned prejudice in terms of national origin, ethnicity, religion or gender. The government could therefore hardly defend selecting migrants in terms of national origin or ethnicity.

One of the key figures responsible for the changes in immigration policy was Dr. George Davidson, the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and previously Executive Director of the Canadian Welfare Council. Recognising that Canada's prejudiced immigration policies hindered her actions in the UN and the multiracial Commonwealth, he and other prominent Canadian officials called for their abandonment. The decision to introduce the new immigration position in the form of rules instead of statutes was determined by political pragmatism, as rules could be put into practice quickly, whereas a new complicated immigration act, one incidentally assured on many occasions by the Progressive Conservatives, needed time to guide through Parliament.[462]

---

[461] LAC, MG26-M VIII/Vol. 127/Reels M-9369 – M-9370/File 810/Canada and the Commonwealth – General, 'Between Two Worlds', 1962, 106222.
[462] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 144.

Fairclough submitted a memorandum to the Cabinet on the Immigration Regulations in September 1961. She emphasised that the main objective behind revising the regulations was the 'elimination of any valid grounds for arguing that they contain any restrictions or controls based on racial, ethnic or colour discrimination.'[463] Specifically Fairclough pointed out that the current literacy test was no longer acceptable and therefore would be removed from the regulations.[464] Regulation 20 was the key rule to be revised:

> The new Regulation 20(a) lays primary stress on selectivity based on skills and qualifications as the main conditions of admissibility, without regard to any other factor...Likewise, if a person has the requisite skills and potential ability to establish himself in Canada, he (or she) may also be sponsored by a parent, parent-in-law, or fiancée already in Canada, provided the sponsor is a Canadian citizen.[465]

On the surface this appears to be quite a technical change. However it was extremely important as the whole basis of immigration policy shifted from limiting the number of non-Europeans allowed into Canada, to admitting all people on the basis of the skills they possessed. According to Fairclough, the main effects of the revision of the regulations were:

> To eliminate all grounds for charges of discrimination; to treat Chinese, Japanese, Indians and other Asians, Africans and nationals of the Middle Eastern countries somewhat more generously than at present; to treat Italians, Portuguese and Greeks, in particular, somewhat less generously; to make it more difficult for persons in Canada to bring to this country a wide range of unskilled relatives; and to place the major emphasis henceforth on the skills, ability and training of the prospective immigrant himself, and on his ability to establish himself successfully in Canada.[466]

So, the emphasis of the new regulations was very much on the *skills* which migrants possessed. Unskilled migration, mainly through the sponsorship of relatives was starting to be seen as very problematic. The Cabinet agreed the following month that

---

[463] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6180/Cab. Doc. 383/1961, Memorandum to Cabinet: Re: Immigration Regulations, 16th October, 1961, 1.
[464] *Ibid.*, 2.
[465] *Ibid.*, 4.
[466] *Ibid.*, 6.
LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6180/Cab. Doc. 383/1961, The Immigration Regulations, Second Draft, 6th September, 1961, 14, 17.

the proposed Immigration Regulations be sent to the Department of Justice to be put into proper legal form.[467]

The primary aims of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration were made relatively apparent in an internal memorandum by Davidson, produced on the 3rd January 1962, two weeks before the new rules were announced in the House of Commons:

> Our prime objective in the proposed revision is to eliminate all discrimination based on colour, race or creed. This means that, if we continue to allow Greeks, Poles, Italians, Portuguese and other Europeans to bring in the wide range of relatives presently admissible, we will have to do the same for Japanese, Chinese, Indians, Pakistanis, Africans, persons from the Arab world, the West Indies and so forth.[468]

The two different ways in which this goal could be achieved were also outlined:

> (1) By opening the doors to close relatives from the "coloured" parts of the world to the present level accorded to Europeans. This will greatly increase (probably double within a very few years) the influx of unskilled persons as close relatives: or (2) By a compromise, as proposed in the Draft Regulations, reducing to some extent the categories of European close relatives who can be admitted, regardless of skills, and then raising the "coloured" countries to a level of equality with the European.[469]

The government decided to go with the latter of the two options. Through these new regulations European and non-European migrants were treated on an equal basis for the very first time in terms of selection.

Shortly after Fairclough submitted another memorandum to the Cabinet on the Draft Immigration Regulations approved from the Justice Department. The main difference between the draft and the previous proposals was the restoration of preferential treatment to Europeans, Turks, Egyptians, Israelis and Lebanese in terms of the sponsorship of relatives. They were still allowed to sponsor a broader range of relatives compared to other migrants.[470] This change most likely came about after concerns over the potential backlash from Italian-Canadians especially,

---

[467] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6177, Revision of Immigration Regulations, 18th October, 1961, 7.
[468] Cited in Hawkins, *Canada and Immigration*, 130.
[469] *Ibid.*, 131.
[470] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6189, Cab. Doc. 24/1962, Memorandum to Cabinet: Re Draft Immigration Regulations, 15th January, 1962, 1, 2.
LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6189, Cab. Doc. 24/1962, Immigration Regulations, Part I, 10.

who were now a notable proportion of the population. In the Cabinet discussion a few days later some ministers expressed their displeasure at this preferential treatment. However, others warned of the greater electoral risk of removing it. The Cabinet ultimately approved the draft regulations in their current form.[471] Therefore, the government was forced to compromise on the restriction of the sponsorship of relatives, who were mainly unskilled migrants. Consequently older and larger migrant groups continued to receive preferential treatment over their newer and smaller counterparts.

So, on the 19th January, 1962 Fairclough announced new rules in the House of Commons that removed racial prejudice as a main component of Canada's immigration policy. From then onwards any unsponsored settler who could convince the Department of Citizenship and Immigration that they possessed the adequate education, skills or other qualifications, regardless of colour, national origin or race, was to be regarded as appropriate for migration, as long as they could maintain themselves until they secured employment, or were arriving to take on a particular job.[472] This was a fundamental step and represented the all but complete abandonment of the White Canada policy.

The 1962 immigration rules kept only one benefit for European migrants over the majority of other settlers; the ability to sponsor a broader span of relations. This included brothers, sisters, nephews and nieces. Nevertheless, the rules did, as stated above, clearly emphasise skill as the major qualification in the selection of unsponsored settlers.[473] According to Valerie Knowles 'When the new regulations were implemented on 1 February 1962, Canada became the first of the three large

[471] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6192, Immigration Regulations, 18th January, 1962, 4-5.
[472] Debates, *H of C*, vol. I, 1962, 19th January, 1962, Ms. Fairclough, 9-11.
[473] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6192, Immigration Regulations, 18th January, 1962, 4.

receiving countries in international migration – the others were the United States and Australia – to dismantle her discriminatory immigration policy.'[474]

At the same time as these changes, major developments were taking place in Quebec. The Quiet Revolution took place from the early 1960s onwards, and involved the mass modernisation of Quebec, economically, politically and socially. Thus, it put into effect the major aims and goals of the neo-nationalists that had emerged in Quebec in the late 1950s. Quebec transformed from a society that was dominated by Anglophone Canadian and American big business interests economically; the Liberal Party for much of its history politically; and the Roman-Catholic Church socially, to one that embraced nationalisation of major industries, with greater access to and representation by Francophone Canadians; the rise of a more assertive French-Canadian nationalism; and secularisation of the education system and society generally.

The deaths of Premier Duplessis in September 1959 and Paul Sauvé, his successor, in January 1960 were actually regarded by many English-speaking Canadians as the final nails in the coffin of French-Canadian nationalism. The triumph of Jean Lesage's Liberal party was signalled as the end of the Ancien Régime and the start of the Quiet Revolution, in which Quebec's out of date and antiquated socioeconomic and political institutions would be completely modernised. On the other hand, the Quiet Revolution meant something very different to French-Canadians. During the 1950s and early 1960s French-Canadian elites and intellectuals viewed the Duplessis regime as the era of 'la grande noirceur' (great

[474] Quote taken from Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 143.

darkness), a period marked by social and political subjugation and growing foreign control of Quebec's economy.[475]

The Quiet Revolution gained impetus under the leadership of the Liberal team led by neo-nationalists like Premier Lesage, Georges-Émile Lapalme, René Lévesque (future founder of the Separatist Parti-Québécois and its first premier of the province) and Paul Gérin-Lajoie, to mention but a few. Extensive reforms took place in education, social welfare, health care, and crucial services like hydro-electricity.[476]

Some scholars have viewed the Quiet Revolution largely as a change in attitudes and values among French-Canadians in Quebec. Thomson argues that 'Jean Lesage and most members of his entourage did not challenge the basic values of their society, but they did condemn some attitudes and practices which they found anachronistic and harmful...One such practice was the system of political patronage; another was the defensive, often sterile attitude to federal-provincial relations adopted by the Duplessis government.'[477]

One of the most famous slogans associated with the Quiet Revolution is 'maîtres chez nous', which means 'masters in our own house'.[478] This largely encapsulated the view of the Lesage government. Economically, this was illustrated by the state nationalisation drives the government initiated, especially of the hydro-electricity industry. Politically, Quebec became much more assertive in advancing its own interests in relations with the federal government. In contrast to the previous Duplessis regime it took the initiative in this regard, rather than just reacting to the federal government. But the greatest change in Quebec was social. The Roman

---

[475] Behiels, *Prelude to Quebec's Quiet Revolution*, 4.
[476] *Ibid.*, 5.
[477] Quote taken from Thomson, *Jean Lesage & The Quiet Revolution*, 3.
[478] McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada*, 33.

Catholic Church, once dominant in all aspects of many French-Canadian lives, was now relegated to the margins.[479]

Benvenuti and Ward argue that 'By 1963, the "other Quiet Revolution" had firmly taken hold, subtly undermining the relevance and resonance of Britishness in Canadian political culture...But unlike the "Quiet Revolution" in Quebec, it did not entail any assertive cultural revival, self-consciously shedding the trappings of an alien Britishness in favour of a new, more localized Canadian nationalism.'[480] Therefore, English-speaking Canadians were experiencing difficulty in defining who they were at the exact same time as French-Canadians were distinguishing themselves as a distinct people. This is a fundamental point and goes a long way towards explaining the rise of the 'new nationalism' in Canada in the early 1960s. The federal government was concerned enough to develop a locally based nationalism so as to counter the growing Separatist tendencies emerging from certain quarters in Quebec. However, this took place during the subsequent Pearson government, which will be explored in Chapter Seven.

In light of the above developments in the early 1960s there was a national debate over unity and national identity in Canada. Pearson in a Parliamentary speech at the close of 1962 commented on the fact that Canada was becoming increasingly reliant on the US culturally, economically and even politically, and that this understandably concerned the Canadians. However, his major comments were reserved for the relationship between British and French-Canada. Pearson maintained that 'Confederation may not have been technically a treaty between

---

[479] Michael Gauvreau however argues that the Roman Catholic Church was not as monolithically conservative as it appeared and elements of it actually played a role in the Quiet Revolution. Michael Gauvreau, *The Catholic Origins of Quebec's Quiet Revolution, 1931-1970* (Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007).

[480] Quote taken from Benvenuti and Ward, 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada', 180.

states, but it was an understanding, a settlement, between the two founding races of Canada made on the basis of an acceptable and equal partnership.'[481]

Confederation formed a bicultural and bilingual nation to French-Canadians. Contrarily, in the view of English-speaking Canadians, the Confederation agreement preserved the rights of French-Canadians in Quebec, the federal parliament and courts.[482] Therefore, Pearson believed that 'we have now reached the stage where we should seriously and collectively review the bicultural and bilingual situation in our country; our experiences in the teaching of English and French and in the relations existing generally between our two main racial groups.'[483] He asserted that a joint enquiry of this type should also look at the contribution to Canada by those of other than British or French descent. Pearson ended with the statement that vitality, colour and strength had been added to Canadian national life by these New Canadians from very old cultures.[484] This formed the basis of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism that Pearson established when he came to power in April 1963, which will be explored in a later chapter.

According to George Grant's *Lament for a nation* 'Lamenting for Canada is inevitably associated with the tragedy of Diefenbaker...His inability to govern is linked with the inability of this country to be sovereign.'[485] He further maintains that 'The 1957 election was the Canadian people's last gasp of nationalism.'[486] Diefenbaker considered his role as rejuvenating Canadian nationalism. However, Grant is heavily

---

[481] LAC, MG26-N9/Vol. 23, Office of the Leader of the Opposition - Press Release, 17th December, 1962, 'The Canadian Partnership' - Portion of remarks by Lester B. Pearson in the House of Commons, on Monday, 17th December, during the Debate on Interim Supply, 1, 2.
Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1962, 17th December, 1962, Mr. Pearson, 2722, 2723.
[482] *Ibid.*
[483] *Ibid.*, 6.
Ibid., 2725.
[484] *Ibid.*, 7.
Ibid., 2725.
[485] Quote taken from George Grant, *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1970) 4.
[486] *Ibid.*, 5.

critical of his results, especially his failures in economic nationalism, with growing US control of the Canadian economy under his prime ministership. But Grant's greatest criticism of Diefenbaker is of his inability to cultivate successful French-Canadian allies. This was due to his emphasis on 'one Canada', in which people would have the same rights regardless of ethnicity and faith. Although this was a laudable goal in itself, it was anathema to many French-Canadians who believed that they had a unique and distinctive culture in Canada which should be maintained at all costs. Grant does concede though that Diefenbaker and his closest colleagues belonged to a generation that had regarded Canadian nationalism and pro-Britishness as intertwined. But the problem was that Diefenbaker came to power at a time when the Suez debacle had hit home to the British their declining capacity to influence world affairs.[487] Thus, 'In this context, the appeal of the Conservatives to the British connection carried an air of unreality.'[488]

William Morton also reflects on the Diefenbaker period and beyond. He maintains that 'The decade which began in 1961 tested every assumption of the Canadian identity and tried every fibre of the national body.'[489] Morton moreover argues that 'Both English and French Canadians...were to be indicted, one for a parochial and rather shabby nationalism, the other for a provincial obtuseness and personal coldness, both unworthy of a people raised in the Canadian heritage.'[490] He also emphasises the impact that the US had on Canada during the Diefenbaker period, in terms of economics, politics and strategic matters.[491] Morton does concede though that 'The fervour of pure nationalism, linguistic, racial, or chauvinistic, could

---

[487] Grant, *Lament for a Nation*, 12, 15, 20, 21, 23, 34.
[488] Quote taken from Grant, *Lament for a Nation*, 34.
[489] Quote taken from W. L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972) 115.
[490] Quote taken from Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 122.
[491] Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 125.

have no other result in Canada but, at the least, the separation of French and English.'[492]

Immigration and Integration Policy during the 1950s and 1960s

In the early to late-1950s, Canada still focused on securing British migrants compared to any other source. Consequently, the UK and also the US carried on supplying large numbers of settlers. On the other hand, they ceased to be the major source of migrants in practice. The majority of Canada's new settlers were now provided by mainland Europe, particularly Germany, Italy, and The Netherlands.[493] However, the desire for British migrants first and foremost reflected the hold that Britishness still had on the national psyche. The *Globe and Mail* in July 1956 commented on the fact that about 6,000 British automobile workers had been made redundant. It argued that these workers possessed skills that could be utilised in Canada. The newspaper maintained that this would not weaken the UK as it was overpopulated, in contrast to Canada which was underpopulated. It suggested that a large number of British people should be relocated from the UK to Dominions like Canada and Australia.[494] These comments are of the same mould as those of Holt in Australia on the redistribution of the population of the British Commonwealth from the British Isles to its outlying parts.

The *Financial Post* expressed concern over the declining level of British migration to Canada in terms of the British proportion of the population:

> Canada has not...had enough people from the U.K. to maintain the existing proportion of its population who are of British stock. On the present trends, the percentage of British stock in

[492] Quote taken from Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 132.
[493] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 135.
[494] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 314/Immigration – British to Canada – Editorials/26th Mar. 1951 – 21st Mar. 1957, Extract from the *Toronto Globe & Mail* – 'On the Dole', 4th July, 1956.

> Canada will have fallen from 47% to 32% by the end of the century; in the postwar years only some 33% of all immigrants have come from the U.K.[495]

The *Toronto Star* was unambiguous in its support for greater British migration 'Those Britons who choose Canada as their new home will be warmly welcomed...We have room for them, we need them, we want them.'[496] The *Vancouver Province* explained the motivation behind the desire for greater British migration to Canada at the start of 1957 'Many Canadians want to see a good balance of British stock maintained in this country...Most of our ideas of law and government are an inheritance from the British system, and many of the people who established our pattern of life were of British stock.'[497] The *Halifax Chronicle-Herald* also expressed strong support for greater British migration to the country.[498] Therefore, there was considerable support in the Canadian press for continued British migration and thus maintaining the British proportion of the population. The *Toronto Star* building on its earlier support expressed unabashed admiration for British migrants:

> The British are among the best kind of immigrants for Canada. They speak one of our two official languages (just as naturally as if it were their own!); they are imbued with parliamentary democratic traditions; their standards of education are high; their codes of conduct are good; they are the kinsmen of 60 percent of all Canadians. Let us fling wide the gates to British people wishing to come here – and roll out a carpet or two.[499]

Hence, British migrants were preferred because they were most like the largest proportion of the Canadian population, who was of British descent.

---

[495] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 314/Immigration – British to Canada – Editorials/26th Mar. 1951 – 21st Mar. 1957, Extract from the *Financial Post* – 'Pattern of Immigration', 20th October, 1956.

[496] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 314/Immigration – British to Canada – Editorials/26th Mar. 1951 – 21st Mar. 1957, Extract from the *Toronto Star* – 'Let Them Come Here', 19th December, 1956.

[497] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 314/Immigration – British to Canada – Editorials/26th Mar. 1951 – 21st Mar. 1957, Extract from the *Vancouver Province* – 'More Britons for Canada', 5th January, 1957.

[498] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 314/Immigration – British to Canada – Editorials/26th Mar. 1951 – 21st Mar. 1957, Extract from the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald* – 'Opportune Time', 10th January, 1957.

[499] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 330/File No. 314/Immigration – British to Canada – Editorials/26th Mar. 1951 – 21st Mar. 1957, Extract from the *Toronto Star* – 'Bring In The British', 8th February, 1957.

Integration policy also replaced assimilation as the government's approach to migrants. This represented a prominent turning point both in the way in which governments considered settlers, but also in the perception of what it meant to be Canadian. One of the earliest indications of the new direction in policy was given by a government review undertaken of the foreign language press in Canada in 1953, for the purposes of determining how it could be employed in furthering the integration of migrants. It was decided that the report of the review would be distributed to the heads of voluntary organisations, social workers and others who dealt with the integration of migrants, and who could consequently take advantage of the knowledge on ethnic associations and the activities in their field.[500] Its author Eugene Bussiere even recommended that relevant articles collected from the foreign language press could be included in the government journal *Citizen*.[501] This was a shift from the previous policy of assimilation. Under that policy the foreign language press was considered a hindrance to the successful incorporation of migrants into the Anglo-centric culture.

Another example of the shift in policy from assimilation to integration was a speech by St. Laurent in May 1954 to the National Convention of the Young Liberal Federation 'We Canadians can be proud of a citizenship which does not require us to forget our racial origins, and the ancestral traditions which link us to the past.'[502]

---

[500] LAC, RG26/Vol. 75/File 1-5-11/Part 1, Memorandum by Eugene Bussiere, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration to Deputy Minister, Department of Citizenship and Immigration on 'Progress Report on Foreign Language Press Review and Press Digest', 9th September, 1953, 1.

[501] This was a government publication aimed at assisting both migrants and voluntary organisations that were involved in their integration. Thus, it is an invaluable source for exploring government integration policies aimed at migrants.
LAC, RG26/Vol. 75/File 1-5-11/Part 1, Report of a Meeting of Staff Officers on the Foreign Language Press, 3.

[502] LAC, MG26-L/Speeches/Vol. 284, Notes for an Address by the Prime Minister, Louis S. St. Laurent, to the National Convention, Young Liberal Federation, Chateau Laurier, 29th May, 1954, 10.

This was certainly a change in rhetoric from the assimilation period in which migrants were expected to abandon their ancestral cultures.

In the *Handbook for Newcomers*[503] in 1954 the importance of voluntary organisations in the integration process was emphasised to migrants. Particular attention was drawn to the Citizenship Councils and Citizenship Committees.[504] These were the Canadian equivalent to the Good Neighbour and New Settlers' Leagues in Australia.

Pickersgill, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration encapsulated the essence of integration policy that same year 'I think most of us would agree we want the newcomers to be integrated, not merely into our economy, but into our society as quickly as possible and that this will happen more quickly if we respect and appreciate the background of the newcomers.'[505] So, Canadian officials were tentatively grappling for a new basis to migrant policy.

Pickersgill went on to outline the government's position towards migrant clubs in his comments on German migrants in early 1955 'I understand and sympathize fully with the desire and the need of newcomers in a strange land for the companionship of those who can speak their own language and who have shared their own past associations.'[506] He added that he believed that the majority of Canadians desired new settlers to maintain their heritage of culture to contribute something new and unique to Canadian society. But Pickersgill did qualify his comments with 'Of course you want to preserve your traditions but I trust your primary objective will not be the preservation of the links with the old country but the

---

[503] This was a government publication aimed solely at migrants that offered quite basic information on the essential, every day aspects of Canadian life.
[504] 'Voluntary Organizations', *Handbook for Newcomers* (Ottawa, Ont., 1954) 74-5.
[505] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jul. 1954 – 31st Dec. 1954, Extract from the *Hamilton Spectator* – 'Minister Looks Toward Future', 7th October, 1954.
[506] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jan. 1955 – 31st Aug. 1955, Extract from the *Toronto Star* – 'Pickersgill Lauds German Immigrants', 11th February, 1955.

creation of links with the new homeland.'[507] Therefore, although there was a shift in rhetoric regarding maintaining migrant cultures and these adding to the Anglo-centric culture, the emphasis was still on migrants first and foremost becoming a part of their adopted society.

However, Pickersgill illustrated the distinction between assimilation and integration policy in a speech to the Ontario Canadian Club in London in March 1955. In his remarks he emphasised that there was no plan to make Englishmen, Irishmen or Scots out of the many migrants that had arrived, but instead to make them good Canadians, 'attached to our British political institutions.'[508] So, again there was a move from expecting migrants to assimilate into an Anglo-centric society to now integrating into a 'Canadian' culture, based on British institutions. However, he did concede that 'it is these British institutions and British traditions that we have naturalized here in Canada, that have become part of our environment, that we want all Canadians wherever they come from to cherish.'[509] Thus, British ideas and traditions had been localised to create a unique 'Canadian' identity. The closest Pickersgill came to actually elaborating what this new Canadian identity entailed was that Canada was a bilingual country with two official languages, with an acceptance for all faiths and a willingness to admit people irrespective of their origins. This he believed gave Canadians a distinctive character.[510]

The rise of a distinct Canadian nationality was discussed by Pickersgill in July 1955 in a Dominion Day speech to the Kiwanis Club of Montreal. He argued that

---

[507] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jan. 1955 – 31st Aug. 1955, Extract from the *Toronto Star* – 'Pickersgill Lauds German Immigrants', 11th February, 1955.
[508] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jan. 1955 – 31st Aug. 1955, Extract from the *London Free Press* – 'Pickersgill Explains How Canada Has Grown', 10th March, 1955. LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jan. 1955 – 31st Aug. 1955, Extract from the *London Free Press* – 'Make Good Canadians Aim For Immigrants', 10th March, 1955.
[509] *Ibid.*
[510] *Ibid.*

New Canadians had to adapt themselves to the Canadian nation if they wanted to become citizens. His most prescient point however was 'The mere fact that a collection of human beings of widely varied origins live together in a particular country does not make a nation.'[511] However, he did qualify his remarks by saying that 'We are learning more and more every year that these newcomers of many races, from many lands, are enriching our national life.'[512] Therefore, Pickersgill's speech reflected the concern that the government had towards uniting so many disparate groups into one cohesive society.

The role of over-arching organisations in co-ordinating the activities of voluntary groups engaged in integration was illustrated in *Citizen* a few months later. It discussed the establishment of the New Canadians Service Association of Ontario a few years previously, with its base in Toronto, to assist migrants with putting down roots in the country and to speed up their integration into Canadian society. These aims could be best secured by close co-operation between old and New Canadians. The many ethnic groups of Canada were represented in both the voluntary and paid members of staff of the association.[513] This demonstrated the contrast between assimilation policy and integration, in that under the former ethnic groups would not have been a part of the organisation of voluntary bodies whose goal was to incorporate migrants into Canadian society.

The importance of being a Canadian first and foremost was stressed by St. Laurent in a speech in Regina, Saskatchewan on the occasion of that province's Golden Jubilee in September 1955 'The majority of you are migrants or the descendents of migrants from other lands...Yet I know that each of you thinks of

---

[511] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jan. 1955 – 31st Aug. 1955, Extract from the *Montreal Gazette* – 'Immigrants Must Adapt to Canada', 1st July, 1955.
[512] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 382/File No. 2253/1st Jan. 1955 – 31st Aug. 1955, Extract from the *Montreal Star* – '"Common Nationality" Stressed by Pickersgill', 30th June, 1955.
[513] 'New Canadians Service Association of Ontario', *Citizen*, vol. 1, no. 3, September 1955, 8.

himself first and foremost as a Canadian.'[514] This highlights the concern with maintaining national cohesion during this period.

Integration was defined as a belief which combined unity and diversity in a report on the integration of migrants in Canada at the beginning of 1956 by the Canadian Citizenship Branch. This was the section of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration that was responsible for migrant integration. This was a remarkable statement for this time as it was much later that 'unity through diversity' became a catchphrase of multiculturalism. Migrants were unrestricted in adhering to religious customs and cultural and social norms. Hence, integration was based upon the mutual acceptance of both Canadians and settlers of the core values of participation, loyalty, tolerance and sympathy in their relations with one another. In addition, voluntary organisations in Canada carried out a large proportion of the educational and charitable work of integration, which in many other countries was the responsibility of governments. Australia was a chief example. The important role of ethnic group associations in the integration process was also emphasised.[515] This marked a direct contrast to the preceding period of assimilation, where ethnic group organisations were not envisaged as having any role in dealing with migrants.

A case study of the integration of a prominent migrant community was explored by Eugene Bussiere, Director of the Canadian Citizenship Branch in a departmental memorandum in early 1956 on Italian Associations of Montreal. He highlighted how one particular development had been the setting up of Italian branches of large non-ethnic organisations that went beyond the local community. This development reflected a move in the direction of a new kind of integration with

---

[514] LAC, MG26-L/General Clippings/Vol. 329/File No. 313, Extract from the *Toronto Telegram* – 'Newcomers An Asset To Canada', 30th September, 1955.

[515] LAC, RG26/Vol. 81/File 1-24-24/Part 1, United Nations Education, Social and Cultural Organization General File, 'The Integration of Immigrants in Canada' by Canadian Citizenship Branch, January 1956, 1, 2, 6, 7.

the rest of Canadian society. A distinction was also made between organisations set up by newer Italian migrants and longer-established ones. The organisations set up by newer Italian migrants to a large extent strengthened the difference between pre- and post-war migrants. A notable example of a group established by longer-established Italian settlers though was the Italo-Canadian Businessman's Association. This was a lot more 'Canadianized', in that a large proportion of its members were born in Canada. The policies of this organisation were aimed at integrating Italians into Canadian society by lobbying for Italian representation at all levels of administration and government.[516] It was organisations such as these that the Canadian government held up as a model for others to follow, as their primary focus was actively integrating their members into Canadian society as much as possible, as opposed to just wanting to preserve their cultural traditions.

A further example of integration in practice in April 1956[517] was 'Canadians Unlimited', a community project of the Edmonton Y.M.C.A. It was then in its third year. Canadians Unlimited was a scheme aimed at greeting and integrating the new settler into the community. It had expanded into an association incorporating hundreds of volunteers, with a dedicated efficient organisation. Like other Canadian cities, Edmonton had witnessed a steady flow of settlers from Europe arrive from 1946, settlers who knew little English, who had few friends, and who were not used to Canadian customs and way of life. A usual Sunday afternoon's events included a Spanish baritone singing songs from their original homeland, followed by two short films, 'Eskimo Summer', and 'Niagara Frontier'. The basic idea behind the Sunday afternoon programmes was to help the new settler understand the 'Canadian way of

[516] LAC, RG26/Vol. 68/File 2-24-12, Memorandum by E. Bussiere, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration on Italian Associations of Montreal, including report by Dr. Garigue, 14th March, 1956, 8, 9, 10.
[517] 'Citizenship Projects', *Citizen*, vol. 2, no. 2, April 1956.

life', and to become accustomed to the country he was in.[518] The meaning of the 'Canadian way of life' was not elaborated upon however. This was because with the decline of Britishness there was considerable questioning and uncertainty over who the Canadians were as a people.

Official government integration policy was outlined by Bussiere in a report in May 1956 on the UNESCO Conference on the Cultural Integration of Immigrants held in Havana 'From a Canadian viewpoint, it presented an opportunity for us to outline our approach to the problems of immigrants and to present to the Conference our views on the question of integration as opposed to assimilation.'[519] The complete integration of settlers did not happen overnight, but actually took time, in some situations even generations. This was in direct contrast to the preceding period of assimilation, in which migrants were expected to abandon their home cultures and assimilate into the Anglo-centric culture immediately. The idea of assimilation, which was understood to mean the absolute absorption of the people of one culture by a more powerful one, was no longer the goal of the Canadian government.[520] Instead, Bussiere asserted that 'The concept of integration, as defined and practised by Canada, was considered a more realistic and desirable approach, as it recognizes the benefit derived from cultural pluralism for both the immigrants and the receiving country.'[521] (This reference to 'cultural pluralism' should be noted, particularly at this time, as it was actually in the 1960s that cultural pluralism became a dominant concept in policy).

---

[518] 'Citizenship Projects', 11, 12.
[519] LAC, RG26/Vol. 81/File 1-24-24/Part 1, Report on the UNESCO Conference on the Cultural Integration of Immigrants held in Havana, Cuba, 18th – 27th April, 1956 by Eugene Bussiere, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, 11th May, 1956, 7.
[520] *Ibid.*, 2, 3.
[521] *Ibid.*, 3.

An approach such as this suggested the realisation and acknowledgement of differences between old and New Canadians, the right to be different, however only as long as national unity was maintained and the cultural customs of both old and New Canadians were not conflicting. Settlers were expected to adhere to the social, political, economic and legal system. It was emphasised that immigrant receiving countries had the right to maintain their political and social customs, as well as the essential nature of their populations. On the other hand, the cultural integration of migrants was a long and complicated process which could not be managed by the state alone, but instead needed the assistance of both New and old Canadians[522] alike.[523] So, differences between migrants and Canadians were accepted, but the emphasis was above all on national cohesion.

The integration policy at the grassroots level in Quebec was also explored through a survey of the activities of the New Canadian Service Association of Montreal[524] in mid-1956.[525] The arrival of a large number of settlers into a society did not happen without numerous problems. Firstly, the overarching aim of the Catholic School Commission, which was a member of the association, was to help migrants as painlessly as possible to settle into the educational, religious and social life of the society. The church's responsibility for education at this time reflected its long-standing dominant position, power and influence in Quebec society. However, another organisation, the Service des neo-Canadiens was responsible for actually meeting new settlers at the railway stations and ports, where they were welcomed by

---

[522] I am not referring to aged Canadians here but Canadians of British or French descent.
[523] LAC, RG26/Vol. 81/File 1-24-24/Part 1, Report on the UNESCO Conference on the Cultural Integration of Immigrants held in Havana, Cuba, 18th – 27th April, 1956 by Eugene Bussiere, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, 11th May, 1956, 3-4.
[524] This was the sister organisation to the New Canadian Service Association of Ontario. The fact that this was instead a province wide organisation compared to the city organisation in Montreal is explained by the fact that in contrast to Ontario nearly all of the post-Second World War migrants to Quebec went to Montreal alone.
[525] 'New Canadian Service Association of Montreal', *Citizen*, vol. 2, no. 3, June 1956.

interpreters and information booklets produced in ten languages promoting their services were handed out. But the most important task of the Service was the organisation of evening courses that had been occurring for nearly a decade in all sections of the city.[526] Thus, in Quebec there was a division of responsibilities between Catholic organisations which handled the long-term integration of migrants and other associations which dealt with more practical, short-term migrant issues, particularly their arrival in the country. What is more, the distinction between assimilation and integration was illustrated: 'The "Service" is convinced that newcomers will contribute all the more to the enrichment of their adopted country if they develop their own aptitudes and cultural values at the same time as they become more conscious of the "Canadian way of life."'[527] Again, what this consisted of was not defined.

In an address to the Canadian Jewish Congress in late 1956 St. Laurent discussed the positive impact that migrant cultures were having on Canada:

> So long as we, as individual citizens or ethnic groups maintain our vigilance towards the exercise of these prime elements of co-operation, mutual respect, understanding and moderation we can be justifiably proud that our Canadian citizenship is not one that forces us into a single mould, is not a citizenship which requires us to forget our racial origins and the ancestral traditions which link us to the past and which, at the same time, though their diversity each add to and enrich that composite heritage which is the joint patrimony of the whole nation.[528]

This illustrates the new emphasis of integration on the incorporation of migrant cultures into the Canadian one to create a new and distinctive identity. St. Laurent also expressed his gratitude to the Jewish community in Canada for its role in immigration that had led to the 'most efficient reception, settlement, adjustment and

---

[526] 'New Canadian Service Association of Montreal', 12.
[527] *Ibid.*, 13.
[528] LAC, MG26-L/Vol. 290, Address by Louis S. St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada to the Canadian Jewish Congress, Montreal, 19th October, 1956, 2.

integration of new arrivals in this land of ours.'[529] This highlighted the reliance of the Canadian government on voluntary organisations in the integration process.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s heavy Italian migration to Canada continued, primarily through the sponsorship programme. The sources of settlers also broadened to include Egypt, South America, Lebanon and Turkey. But the Diefenbaker government did attempt to curb the large numbers of largely unskilled migrants arriving through the sponsorship scheme. However, a fierce backlash, mainly from Italian-Canadians, forced the government to backtrack. Consequently, by 1962 Italian migration outstripped that from the UK.[530]

Integration also continued as the main focus of government policy in dealing with migrants, as well as shifting the way in which Canadians perceived themselves. Over this period the policy was developed further. Initially though, there was still very much an emphasis on more traditional messages. In a notice to prospective migrants produced by the Immigration Branch of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in 1958, it was argued that if migrants adapted themselves to the Canadian way of life they would make a success of themselves in Canada.[531] Nonetheless, again what the 'Canadian way of life' consisted of was not explained.

An example of integration at the grassroots level was a pilot project undertaken by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in the Ottawa Valley early that same year, whereby New Canadians were put in Canadian homes.[532] The aim of the project was to assist with the integration of migrants into Canadian

---

[529] LAC, MG26-L/Vol. 290, Address by Louis S. St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada to the Canadian Jewish Congress, Montreal, 19th October, 1956, 4.
[530] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 139-40.
[531] LAC, RG76/Vol. 922/File 586-25/Part 1, Department of Citizenship and Immigration - Immigration Branch - Notice to Intending Immigrants, 1.
[532] LAC, RG76/Vol. 922/File 586-25/Part 1, Walter Gray, the *Globe and Mail*, Toronto to Mr. George Benoit, Director of Publicity, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Ottawa, 27th March, 1958.

society.[533] The basic idea behind the scheme was that New Canadians would pick up Canadian customs more easily through living with old Canadians, and also gain a daily source of knowledge and be assisted.

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration also produced a series of publications to assist in migrant integration. The *Canadian Scene* provided short descriptions of Canadian geography, government, history, public services and other aspects of Canadian society. There was also the *Canadian Citizenship Series*. The pamphlets in this collection gave basic knowledge for new settlers on the topics suggested by the titles: *Our Land*, *Our Systems of Government*, *Our Resources* and *The Arts in Canada*. There were editions in English and French, and they were obtainable for no charge to new settlers and to voluntary associations for use in planned discussion and study groups.[534] This continued methods employed during assimilation in which printed material would be distributed to voluntary organisations (and migrants themselves) involved in the incorporation of migrants into Canadian society.

The role of the foreign language press in migrant integration was revisited in late 1958.[535] It was maintained that to explore the part played by the foreign language press it would be useful to undertake a brief study of the importance and role of ethnic organisations in the life of the new settlers and their experience of integration. It had been found that when migrants arrived in their new nation they tended to turn to their own ethnic group for assistance.[536] It was asserted that 'The foreign language press in helping to overcome the isolation of newcomers, and

---

[533] LAC, RG76/Vol. 922/File 586-25/Part 1, Memorandum on Ottawa Citizenship Council Housing Project by Chief, Liaison Division to Chief of Operations, Immigration Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, 17th April, 1958, 1.
[534] 'Citizenship Branch Publications for the Use of Newcomers', *Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 3, June 1958, 12-13.
[535] 'The Foreign Language Press in Canada', *Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 4, October 1958.
[536] *Ibid.*, 10.

particularly of those who are having difficulty in learning English or French, plays a similar role [to ethnic organisations] and one that is important both to the immigrants and to the country in which they have settled.'[537] It was acknowledged that all foreign language publications, while they aimed to educate new settlers about life in Canada, they were also concerned about maintaining the ethnic cultures of their audience. The large readership of the foreign language press, which was over a million people, was also recognised, and for this reason it was believed that their editors had a critical role to play in the 'Canadian nation'.[538] This was in marked contrast to the preceding period of assimilation in which the foreign press was frowned upon. It was certainly not regarded as having a useful role to play in the settlement of migrants into Canadian society as it was now.

What integration actually meant in practice was explored by John P. Kidd, the Executive Director of the Canadian Citizenship Council in a publication called *New Roots in Canadian Soil* towards the end of 1958. The overarching theme of the booklet was how to help migrants become whole-hearted members of the Canadian community. The first section presented an image of the migrants, their background, arrival in Canada, and contribution to the cultural and economic life of the nation.[539] But most importantly the author drew attention to the fact that integration was a two-way process of '"immigrants adjusting to Canadian society and Canadian society adjusting, to some extent at least, to the immigrants and accepting some of the colour, flavour and customs, as well as ideas and skills, the immigrants have brought with them."'[540] This was a prominent break with the previous policy of assimilation. Nevertheless, there was still more emphasis placed on migrants integrating into their

[537] 'The Foreign Language Press in Canada', 11.
[538] *Ibid.*, 12, 13.
[539] 'Publications', *Citizen*, vol. 4, no. 4, October 1958, 29.
[540] *Ibid.*, 29-30.

adopted country rather than the other way round. Furthermore, the entire community was in charge of assisting the new settlers become integrated, and it was asserted that every concerned group and individual should have the chance to shoulder part of the responsibility and work.[541] This demonstrated the Canadian government's realisation that it could not ensure the integration of migrants into Canadian society on its own.

A definition of integration in this period was given in mid-1959:[542]

> By this policy [integration], minority groups are encouraged to retain their cultural traditions. It is believed that all groups have something to contribute to society and that in a new country like Canada, the resulting culture will be enriched through diversification and freedom of expression. All groups share, of course, a common allegiance to the nation and must obey the laws.[543]

So, integration combined English-speaking Canada's British institutions with migrant cultures to form a new distinctive Canadian culture.

A further picture of integration in practice at a local level was given through a study of settlement houses at the end of 1959.[544] In the major Canadian cities where thousands of migrants had settled, local settlement houses had given a congenial welcome and had initiated citizenship schemes for the new settlers. At St. Christopher House, Toronto there was a focus on the social elements of integration throughout the adult scheme. A council made up of one representative from each of the groups of new settlers met weekly to organise and offer collective activities such as camping trips, dances, dinners, excursions to places of interest and parties. Moreover, the Board had a special New Canadian Committee that made decisions about the direction of the scheme.[545] Hence, New Canadians were not only

---

[541] 'Publications', 30.
[542] 'My Neighbour and Me: A Programme Outline on Intergroup Relations', *Citizen*, vol. 5, no. 3, June 1959.
[543] *Ibid.*, 20.
[544] 'How Two Settlement Houses Help Newcomers', *Citizen*, vol. 5, no. 5, December 1959.
[545] *Ibid.*, 9, 10.

continuing to participate in organising integration activities, but were now also taking on responsibility for the direction of policy in the organisations.

Fairclough, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration gave further expression to integration policy when speaking at the opening of International House in London, Ontario at the beginning of 1960. She reaffirmed that there was nothing more important than facilitating constructive communication between old and New Canadians, by group and dedicated facilities that helped migrants turn into content citizens. Their acceptance by fellow citizens, and membership in the community, were prominent goals in new settlers' lives. In the course of time, individuals faded into the background and were no longer recognisable as migrants.[546] This certainly highlights the distinction between integration and what would later emerge as multiculturalism. However, Fairclough ended with pointing out the mutual benefits of integration, posing it as a question to give it more emphasis 'As we look around our country and see the scores of new industries that immigrants have brought us, at the hundreds of once-idle farms they are tilling, and realize the great cultural contribution they have made to our nation, we may well ask ourselves: "Are we indeed their benefactors – or their beneficiaries?"'[547] This was a noteworthy statement, despite the comments that preceded it, as it encapsulates the change in rhetoric towards migrant cultures.

This is but one in a series of references to the 'Canadian nation' during this period. With the rise of an increasingly assertive French-Canadian nationalism the federal government became concerned about preserving the unity of the country and constantly reminded new migrants that they were a part of *one* Canadian nation.

---

[546] LAC, RG26/Vol. 75/File 1-1-8/Part 2, An address by the honourable Ellen L. Fairclough, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, at the opening of International House, London, Ontario, 10th January, 1960, 2, 5, 6.
[547] *Ibid.*, 7.

Through the unravelling of Britishnesss during this period, English-speaking Canadians found themselves in the unfamiliar position of not having a real sense of identity at the very same time as French-Canadians were beginning to form a distinctive national identity of their own.

Another example of integration at the local level was given by a survey of the Windsor, Ontario Young Men's-Young Women's Christian Association (Y.M.-Y.W.C.A.) in late 1960[548] 'Practising the language, learning about Canada and the mingling of new and "old" Canadians – these are the ingredients that have combined to make the New Canadian Program of the Windsor YM-YWCA a notable success.'[549] Every Thursday evening, throughout the year, some thirty or more new settlers to Canada went to the YM-YWCA at Windsor for an evening of English conversation and a programme of cultural, educational, recreational or social activities followed by refreshments. It was not only the New Canadians who found the evenings useful, but also old Canadians. The conversation classes were in addition to the official language classes for new settlers that took place in the schools. A 'conversation sheet' was produced beforehand by the staff of the YM-YWCA, to act as a manual for the groups. The conversation groups lasted for ninety minutes. Special days were also organised occasionally. At Christmas for instance, new settlers brought cakes that were popular in their native countries for a special gift-exchange party.[550] So, the main features of integration were the intermingling of old and New Canadians, understanding of the official languages and sharing elements of migrant cultures.

---

[548] 'New Canadian Program at Windsor Y Proves Popular', *Citizen*, vol. 6, no. 4, October 1960.
[549] *Ibid.*, 30.
[550] *Ibid.*, 30, 31, 32.

Integration replaced assimilation policy towards settlers because Britishness and the White Canada policy which had been the basis of English-speaking Canadian national identity were unravelling and breaking down. This led to an intense period of questioning and uncertainty between the early and late 1950s. Added to these pressures in the late 1950s and early 1960s were the growth of US dominance in Canada, the Quiet Revolution in Quebec and the UK's decision to seek membership in the EEC. This led to English-speaking Canada struggling to define its national identity without the unifying British race idea. The next chapter will turn to integration policy in Australia.

Chapter Five – Integration Policy in Australia, 1962-1972

During the period 1962-72 integration replaced assimilation as official government policy in dealing with migrants in Australia. Migrants were now encouraged to incorporate themselves into the dominant Anglo-Celtic society but also to retain elements of their own culture. The policy emerged in response to the unravelling of Britishness and the incremental dismantling of the 'White Australia' policy as the twin pillars of Australian national identity. The 'new nationalism', which stressed a more independent and home grown Australian image, arose as a possible replacement to British race patriotism towards the end of this period. At the same time whiteness was also broken down. .

The demise of Britishness and the unravelling of the White Australia Policy during the 1960s and 1970s

In the 1960s Britishness or British race patriotism progressively lost much of its appeal as a national ideal. This had been precipitated by the UK's decision to seek membership in the EEC in 1961. But the complete move away from the belief that Australians were a British people was a slow process. It did not culminate until the late 1960s, or even the early 1970s. According to Curran 'From World War II until the resignation of Sir Robert Menzies in January 1966 there existed a consensus and certainty about Britishness as the defining idea of Australian national community...But in the mid-1960s, following a set of destabilising events and unsettling circumstances, this idea lost much of its potency and not a little of its virtue.'[551]

[551] Quote taken from Curran, *The Power of Speech*, 19.

Together with the unravelling of British race patriotism, this period also saw the breaking down of racially based immigration legislation. This was primarily due to changing international circumstances and moral criticisms of the policy. The changing international circumstances were related to increasing numbers of Asian countries gaining their independence from former colonial powers and voicing their opposition to racially based immigration policies at the UN. This process which had begun in the 1950s gathered momentum. With the appointment of Peter Heydon as Permanent Head of the Department of Immigration in November 1961 the thrust for change gained a strong advocate. Heydon was a career diplomat, and while acting as Australian High Commissioner in India had developed strong doubts about the White Australia policy. He regarded the policy as an awkward relic of the past which damaged Australia's relations with Asian people in the post-colonial era.[552]

Like his predecessor, Tasman Heyes, Heydon emphasised resolving the so-called 'anomalies' of the policy. Aware that his minister, Downer, was not receptive to change, he couched his suggestions to overcoming these anomalies in words that would cause least offence to his superior. These proposals included the admittance of non-Europeans on a selective basis for permanent residence, and their subsequent eligibility to apply for citizenship after five years residence, as in the case of Europeans. Secondly, he also recommended that non-Europeans who were already resident in Australia on a temporary basis be allowed to qualify for naturalisation after five years.[553]

In the first half of the 1960s Britishness in Australia began to decline. Prime Minister Menzies while making reference to shifting British attitudes towards Europe in a speech at an Australia Club Dinner in London in mid-1962 affirmed that 'We, in

[552] Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 238.
[553] *Ibid.*, 239.

Australia are Her Majesty's subjects, and whatever politicians, whether they are you or somebody else, or myself or somebody else, may do, nothing will separate the people of Australia from the allegiance to the Crown.'[554] He added that he did not believe that the UK would choose Europe over the Commonwealth.[555] But the fact that the UK had applied for membership in the EEC the previous year, although unsuccessful, indicated that it had already made its choice, and it was not in favour of the Commonwealth. Menzies' comments reflect his inability to accept the collapse of the wider British world, of which Australia considered itself an integral part, because it formed such a crucial element in his own self-identity.

When, however, Hubert Opperman replaced Downer as the Minister for Immigration in November 1963 Heydon found a more sympathetic ear to his proposals for reform of the White Australia policy. Nevertheless, Opperman was not able to convince his cabinet colleagues who rejected Heydon's submission to admit 'distinguished' non-Europeans for permanent residence. This was extremely disheartening. Opperman and Heydon had to wait until Menzies' retirement as prime minister in January 1966 to gain acceptance for their reforms.[556]

Though the new government led by Harold Holt agreed to extend to 'distinguished' non-Europeans the right that European migrants had to become naturalised after five years, the essence of the long-standing race based policy remained in place. The Cabinet, concerned about possible abuse and results of the change, directed in March 1966 that 'the Minister [Opperman], for a few years at

---

[554] NLA, MS 4936/Series 40/Box 575/34, Australia Club Dinner, London, 12th June, 1962 - Speech by the Prime Minister, R. G. Menzies, 2.
[555] *Ibid.* 5.
[556] Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 240, 241.

least, provide an annual statement of the number of non-European admissions'.[557] The government's desire for limits on numbers and its reluctance to allow non-Europeans into the country specifically for permanent residence indicated that there were some remaining doubts about their capacity to integrate. Opperman did nevertheless concede to Parliament in March 1966 that as a consequence of the new regulations 'the number of non-Europeans settling in Australia would be somewhat greater than previously.'[558] So, cracks in the policy were starting to appear.

The following month the date of Commonwealth Day (24th May), which replaced Empire Day a decade earlier, was moved to coincide with the Queen's Official Birthday in June.[559] This symbolised the slow decline of British race sentiment, as what had previously been celebrated as pride in Britishness on two separate occasions in the national calendar, was now condensed into one.

Another symbol of the decline of Britishness in Australia was the introduction of a new Ensign for the Royal Australian Navy at the end of the year. Previously all Royal Australian Navy ships had sailed under the White Ensign of the Royal Navy. This was a flag with the cross of St. George in the centre, and the Union Jack in the top left-hand corner. The new Australian White Ensign replaced the St. George cross with the stars from the Australian flag. Prime Minister Holt explained the change in the following terms 'we have come to feel that it is now appropriate to adopt a flag which, while indicating our allegiance to the Crown, is distinctively the flag of the

---

[557] NAA, A5841/2, Submission 31, Cabinet Decision 52, 'Entry and Stay of Non-Europeans', 2nd March, 1966 cited in Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 241.
[558] CPD, *H of R*, 9th March, 1966, 69, Mr. Opperman cited in Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 242.
[559] NAA, M4295/21, 'Changed Date for the Observance of Commonwealth Day' - Statement by the Prime Minister, Harold Holt, Friday, 1st April, 1966.

Royal Australian Navy.'[560] So, the adoption of the new Ensign was an attempt to differentiate the Australian navy from its British counterpart, while still acknowledging Australia's British heritage.

If the UK's application to apply for membership in the EEC in 1961-63 hastened the unravelling of Britishness in Australia, its decision in 1967 to end its military role East of Suez was the last nail in the coffin. This action was important in itself as it signalled the end of Britain's military world role. To observers in both the UK and Australia it seemed that the demise of one of the last emblems of the Anglo-Australian relationship would consequently lead to the decline of Australia's long-standing British identity. This was because British race patriotism in Australia was based on the belief that Britons in Australia and the UK had a community of interest, which the British decision to withdraw from the East of Suez acted directly against. However, quite some time before the UK made its decision, there had been growing difficulties in the British-Australian relationship which had pushed Australia increasingly into the sphere of the US. Nevertheless, this had not affected Australia's British identity in any major way as it had always (with a few notable exceptions) maintained a distinction between sentiment and interest, especially when it came to foreign policy. What is more, although the UK was not yet a member of the EEC, its failed application in 1961-63 had most certainly led to Australia questioning their future relationship and had precipitated initiatives to diversify Australian trade.[561]

Unsurprisingly there were Australian protests to the British over their decision. Downer, who was now Australian High Commissioner in London, tried to convince the British government that it would be a travesty of history if the UK was to become

---

[560] NAA, M4295/21, 'A New Ensign for the Royal Australian Navy' - Statement by the Prime Minister, Harold Holt, 23rd December, 1966.

[561] Jeppe Kristensen, '"In Essence still a British Country": Britain's withdrawal from East of Suez', *AJPH*, vol. 51, no. 1, March 2005, 40, 43.
Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 135-44.

merely a European power.[562] Nevertheless, on the whole, Downer's emotive response was not representative of most Australians' views in 1967, or indeed of those of the new Holt government. Though Paul Hasluck, the Foreign Minister did advise Holt that connections of familial ties and shared wartime experiences should be stressed in communications with the British, this was only a small part of the overall Australian strategy.[563] Jeppe Kristensen argues that 'Harold Holt's theme that Australia, in turning towards Asia, the Pacific and the United States, would somehow remain "in essence" a British country, encapsulated this dilemma perfectly...It seemed to offer a way of moving forward without confronting the vexing question of what held Australians together as a community.'[564]

Even the most fervent believers in the British heritage had been forced to accept the reality of this new world. This was clearly demonstrated in a Parliamentary speech by Henry B. Turner, a government backbencher in early 1968. This was one of the few speeches he made in his long career as member for Bradfield:

> [Through] the...withdrawal of the British from east of Suez...[w]e have witnessed nothing less than the fall of an empire in our part of the world – something that greatly concerns us. Generations of dedicated British men have brought peace and justice to peoples bordering on all the seven seas and the oceans of the world but that is gone and finished. We have to adapt ourselves to a new situation and we have not even time to weep.[565]

Thus, British withdrawal from the East of Suez highlighted the UK's greatly diminished world role to Australians. However, Turner did acknowledge that Australia had to accommodate itself to these new circumstances.

---

[562] Kristensen, '"In Essence still a British Country"', 45.
See also Stuart Ward, 'Sir Alexander Downer and the embers of British Australia' in Carl Bridge, Frank Bongiorno and David Lee (Eds), *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010* (Australia: DFAT, 2010) 145-63.
[563] Kristensen, '"In Essence still a British Country"', 46.
[564] Quote taken from Kristensen, '"In Essence still a British Country"', 52.
[565] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1968, vol. 58, 19th March, 1968, Mr. Turner, 239-40.

Holt attempted to articulate a unique Australian identity based on both a British heritage and the European migrant cultures. In an Australia Day speech in 1967 he acknowledged that 'Ours is not a long story as the history of many other nations is counted but in that time we have evolved our distinctive national identity and character...We have been assisted to do so by our heritage of British democracy and the cultures of European civilisation.'[566] But he did not elaborate upon what this apparently special Australian character and identity the country entailed. The influence of migrants upon the development of a distinctive Australian identity was also discussed in May 1967[567] 'Migrants were playing an important part in the development of Australia as a nation not only through their work skills, but through their contribution to such things as an Australian culture and an Australian way of life.'[568] Again though it was not specified exactly what this consisted of; there was a lack of substance to this new language. In contrast to the era of Britishness, which was characterised by absolute conformity, the period of the 'new nationalism' involved a lot of uncertainty and questioning of orthodoxies. Australians struggled to find a new and credible idea of community that did not have race at its core.

At the same time as the 'new nationalism' was attempting to replace Britishness as the centre of Australian national identity, whiteness was abandoned in all but name. Lord Richard G. Casey, the Governor-General expressed his view towards the broadening immigration intake in his Australia Day message in 1967. He maintained that Australia would benefit from the growing ethnic diversification of its population in the future.[569] But he did not go into detail on what these advantages would be. Bill Snedden, the new Minister for Immigration articulated the

---

[566] NAA, M4295/22, 'Australia Day Message' from the Prime Minister, Harold Holt, 25th January, 1967.
[567] 'Attitude causes concern', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 160, May 1967.
[568] *Ibid.*, 1.
[569] '"Help migrants to settle in" says Gov.-Gen.', *The Good Neighbour*, no, 157, February 1967, 1.

government's public position in an address to Monash University Liberals that same year:

> Australia's aim is to maintain a predominantly homogeneous population – neither exclusive nor multi-racial...It seems likely that the community will continue to prefer a society substantially the same as we have now; that Australians will continue to want a largely homogeneous society and will not set out deliberately to create a multiracial one.[570]

The numerous references to homogeneity illustrate an emphasis on national cohesion during this period. On the other hand, they also demonstrate the government's concern with allaying public fears over the legislative changes they were making to the White Australia policy.

The continued demise of Britishness during this period was illustrated by moves to remove the word 'British' from the covers of Australian passports in August 1967. A cabinet submission by Snedden on the issue pointed out that Australia was now the only country apart from the UK that had the term 'British' on its passports. The UK government had also made the decision to use the word 'British' to describe all matters relating to the UK. Furthermore, it was emphasised that "Our passports are in fact issued as Australian passports by the Australian Government to Australian citizens; citizens of other Commonwealth countries, wishing to obtain passports in Australia, apply to their own High Commissioners' Offices."[571] Moreover, Australians were under the false impression that as holders of 'British passports' they could gain entry to the UK for any purpose. Most importantly the submission maintained that 'Australia's own national identity is much more manifest today throughout the world and especially in Asia.'[572] This last comment should be highlighted as it demonstrates the extent of the demise of Britishness in Australia. Political rhetoric was now all about an 'Australian national identity' and the importance of Asia. The

---

[570] NLA, MS 3155/Box 12/101, 'Looking at some aspects of Australia's Immigration Policy' An address to Monash University Liberals by the Hon. B. M. Snedden, Q.C., M.P., 1967, 9, 10.
[571] NAA, A5842 (A5848/2)/433, Cabinet Submission No. 433 - Use of the Word "British" on Covers of Australian Passports by B. M. Snedden, Minister for Immigration, 1967, 1, 3.
[572] *Ibid.*, 3, 4.

Prime Minister's Department, though finding the minister's arguments for dropping the term 'British' convincing, was concerned about the timing of the move. They felt that 'Following the issues of Britain's application to join the E.E.C. and Defence Policy East of Suez, the change in the Australian passport might be interpreted as yet another weakening of the tie with the United Kingdom or even as a positive step by Australia to point this up.'[573] But the Cabinet decided to support Snedden's proposal and went further by suggesting that he look into removing the words 'British subject' from the inner page of the passports.[574] So, although on the surface the dropping of 'British' from the cover of Australian passports may seem like a technical change, it was actually quite an important symbolic one.

In September 1967 Snedden proposed the admission of a slightly increased number of highly qualified non-European migrants for residency in Australia on the same basis as European migrants. Previously they had only been admitted on a temporary basis in the first instance. In his cabinet submission he summarised the main priorities as he saw them, of Australian immigration policy 'I see our policy as predicated on the necessity...to maintain the homogeneity of our people; to preserve intact our institutions; to remain free of intolerance and discrimination...[and] to retain our characteristic Australian identity.' What this 'Australian identity' entailed was not specified. Snedden believed that the 'number of well-qualified non-Europeans permitted to settle in Australia could increase marginally without prejudicing these essentials.'[575] This encapsulates the main approach of the reform of the White Australia policy at this time: the removal of discriminatory provisions while stressing

---

[573] NAA, A5842 (A5848/2)/433, Note on Cabinet Submission No. 433 - Use of the Word "British" on Covers of Australian Passports by Prime Minister's Department, 1967, 1-2.
[574] NAA, A5842 (A5848/2)/433, Cabinet Minute - Decision No. 517 on Cabinet Submission No. 433 - Use of the Word "British" on Covers of Australian Passports, 22nd August, 1967.
[575] NAA, A5842 (A5842/2)/478, Cabinet Submission No. 478 - Report on Entry and Stay of Non-Europeans by B. M. Snedden, Minister of State for Immigration, September, 1967 includes Appendices, 5, 6.

the need to maintain the homogeneous nature of Australian society. The Cabinet approved the minister's recommendations towards the end of 1967.[576]

But the consequences of the government's reforms of the White Australia policy were clearly evident. By the end of the year, more than 5,000 non-Europeans had been received as permanent residents under the new regulations. Thus, the critical rupture with White Australia took place through reforms brought in by the Liberal-Country Party coalition in 1966 and 1967.[577]

The government's views on race were hence clearly shifting by this time. This was due to policy-makers who, while trying to assuage non-European and particularly Asian hostility, initiated changes which resulted in a consequent reassessment of the racial principles at the core of the policy. In other words, the shift in ideology in political culture in Australia was a consequence of a long process of reappraisal during which adjustments to White Australia were explained time and time again in terms of diplomatic considerations.[578]

In terms of the specific circumstances of the abandonment of the policy though, by the late 1960s, the political strength of some of White Australia's strongest advocates was waning. Sir John Latham, former Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia, who in 1961 had defended the policy vehemently from criticism by the Immigration Reform Group,[579] had passed away, Menzies had retired and Calwell had resigned as leader of the ALP. Nevertheless, prominent sectors of

---

[576] NAA, A5842 (A5842/2)/478, Cabinet Minute, 4th October, 1967 - Decision No. 625, 1-2.
[577] Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 242, 243.
[578] *Ibid.*, 243.
[579] This was a small group of predominantly middle-class professionals in Melbourne that had produced a booklet in 1960 demanding an end to the White Australia Policy. The impact of the booklet's suggestions led to the creation of a series of immigration reform organisations across the country. Though the different organisations did not unite, they possessed the same beliefs and goals. Gwenda Tavan, 'Immigration: Control or Colour Bar? The Immigration Reform Movement, 1959-1960', *AHS*, vol. 32, iss. 117, October 2001, 181.

support continued, strengthened predominantly by anxiety over persistent race riots in the UK, South Africa, and the US.[580]

Nonetheless, international pressure continued to be applied on the policy, although not to the same extent as before the 1966 reforms. This was especially humiliating at a time when Australia's relations with Asia were under scrutiny as a result of the Vietnam War, and when developing closer relations with Southeast Asia continued to be an important aim of the Australian government. The policy had also begun to affect relations with long-standing English-speaking Western allies, all of whom now had multi-ethnic populations and could not be expected to turn a blind eye to prejudice directed against some of their own population.[581]

The primary task for political leaders during the late 1960s and early 1970s was how to respond to the swift changes of the period. Menzies' successor, Holt, appeared to be more suited to the times. The Holt government was so pleased with the short term results of the 1966 reforms that it assented to further reforms in 1967. These liberalised the family reunion criteria with regards to the admission of migrants of 'mixed descent'. The policy evaluations of 1967 laid the foundation for a further increase in numbers over the subsequent few years. Part-European and non-European immigration rose from a figure of 7381 in 1968 to 9410 in 1969, 9055 in 1970, and 9666 in 1971.[582] The growth in numbers was not wholly without problems however. Snedden's decision in 1967 to change the regulations relating to the admission of people of mixed descent in terms of 'close family relationships' meant

---

[580] Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Carlton North, Vic.: Scribe, 2005) 172, 173.
[581] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 174.
[582] *Ibid.*, 175, 176, 177.

that, instead of having to have a majority of family members residing in Australia, it would now be sufficient for an applicant to have just one.[583]

The demise of British race patriotism and the question of whether an Australian nationalism could be found to replace it came together in the late 1960s under Prime Minister John Gorton. While Holt asked important questions, Gorton's public pronouncements on this question were an expression of the perplexities and problems faced by national leaders in the late 1960s. Acknowledging that they were now able to develop a home grown national identity, but at the same time wanting to hold onto the British connection, they found themselves on the horns of a dilemma. Therefore, Gorton attempted to push an idea of 'Australianism'. In his opinion, the development of a sense of national pride represented a central goal for his government.[584] According to Curran 'it has become common to assert that Gorton brought a much needed touch of "Aussie" larrikinism to the Lodge and that his leadership represents the triumph of a new-found sense of Australian nationalism breaking free from the stultifying conformity of the Menzies era...But such an analysis does not give due weight to the relationship between the collapse of the British race idea and the search for a more assertive sense of national self-worth.'[585]

The Whitlam period has often been identified with a sudden rise of a more independent and self-assured Australian nationalism, but Gorton can be seen as a progenitor of this movement, especially in his arts policy programme. Through setting up the Australian Council for the Arts, encouraging the re-emergence of the Australian film industry and laying the foundation for the creation of an Australian Film and Television School, Gorton was associating himself and his government with

---

[583] *Ibid.*, 177.
[584] Curran, *The Power of Speech*, 46, 47.
[585] Quote taken from Curran, *The Power of Speech*, 48.

a rising belief in Australia's cultural distinctiveness.[586] Stuart Ward maintains that 'If Gough Whitlam's "It's Time" campaign represented the political apogee of the national revival, its cultural equivalent was undoubtedly the creation of the Australian Council for the Arts in 1967.'[587] While Holt had laid the foundation for a federal arts programme, Gorton took it up and supported it not so much because of a newly discovered love of the arts, but instead due to his political search for a 'new nationalism'. Hence, he promoted home-grown dance, music, opera and above all television and film.[588] He had limited success in the achievement of this goal however.

Snedden elaborated on the Gorton government's new immigration policy in Parliament in September 1968. The government would be willing to allow non-European migrants to Australia but this would be dependent on their ability to settle and integrate into Australian society and their possession of skills which were of value to the country. Reiterating a previous address he made the year before, he stated that the goal of the policy was to maintain the homogeneous nature of Australia. This would in his opinion be a goal which the majority of Australians would support.[589] Furthermore, he maintained that 'I am quite sure that the Australian people would not wish the Government's policy to be aimed at creating a multi-racial society...It certainly does not do this.'[590] Therefore, the government was ever conscious of reassuring the public that the changes they were making to the White Australia policy would not fundamentally alter the character of the Australian population.

---

[586] Curran, *The Power of Speech*, 48.
[587] Quote taken from Stuart Ward, '"Culture up to our Arseholes": Projecting Post-Imperial Australia', *AJPH*, vol. 51, no. 1, March 2005, 53.
[588] Ward, '"Culture up to our Arseholes"', 57.
[589] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1968, vol. 60, 24th September, 1968, Mr. Snedden, 1359.
[590] *Ibid.*, 1359-60.

Edward St. John, a government backbencher, explained the dilemma that the government was in, one which it could not itself articulate due to fears of public hostility. He argued that emotional statements on the preservation of a White Australia only offended Australia's neighbours. Australia should be careful of this as its future was very much in Asia. It needed to develop good relationships with its neighbours. Talk of maintaining a 'White Australia' however risked damaging the cultivation of those good relations. St. John asserted that Australia was now a part of Asia.[591] Thus, he captured perfectly the major motivation behind the reforms of the White Australia policy.

'A Survey of Australia' undertaken by *The Economist* in August 1970 explored the main features of the 'new nationalism'. It argued that 'it no longer makes much sense to look at Australia mainly in terms of British ideas and British history and Australia's past connection with Britain.'[592] Vast economic expansion was an integral part of the 'new nationalism'. The magazine maintained that the 'rediscovery of economic self-confidence has coincided with the growth of a new sense of Australian identity.'[593] According to the magazine, for a country to start taking an active part in the world three things were required. Firstly, its people must have a consciousness of themselves as a distinct nation. The magazine believed Australia had this now. Secondly, the presence of a challenge that tested their newly discovered sense of identity was also required. The problems posed by a post-colonial Asia provided this. Lastly, you needed 'some stroke of pure luck'. Australia's rich mineral deposits and a ready market in Japan for them met this third and final requirement as well.[594] That *The Economist* was undertaking a survey of this kind in Australia at this time is

---

[591] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1968, vol. 60, 24th September, 1968, Mr. St. John, 1401.
[592] NLA, MS 7984/Series 6/Box 36/Cuttings, 1968-1975, 'A Survey of Australia', *The Economist*, 22nd August, 1970, vii.
[593] *Ibid.*, viii.
[594] *Ibid.*, li.

testament to the wide ranging and pervasive debates that centred on how the nation's identity and outlook were in a state of flux.

In late 1970 Phillip Lynch, the Minister for Immigration introduced proposals to place the residence requirements in terms of citizenship for highly qualified non-European migrants on the same basis as their European counterparts. It was currently fixed at five years for the former, whilst for the latter it ranged from five years to just one. He argued that highly qualified non-European settlers made important contributions to Australian society and their limited numbers did not damage the primary goal of maintaining a homogenous population. Lynch also pointed out that he had the support of the Department of External Affairs which from the perspective of Australia's foreign relations was keen for the discriminatory practice to end.[595] But the Cabinet decided not to adopt the Minister's suggestions and instead voted for the status quo to continue.[596] It showed that there were limits to where the Australian government was yet willing to go in its reform of the White Australia policy.

However, at the Singapore conference at the beginning of 1971, Gorton gave a speech to the Australian Alumni Association in which he was quoted as declaring that Australia's ideal was to 'provide the world with the first truly multi-racial society with no tensions of any kind possible between any of the races within it'.[597] Moreover, he outlined his goal to remove prejudice in terms of race within Australia, while conceding that a move such as this could face determined public hostility: 'I

---

[595] NAA, A5869 (A5869/1)/586, Cabinet Submission No. 586 - Residence Requirements for Grant of Citizenship to Non-European Settlers in Australia by Phillip Lynch, Minister of State for Immigration, 19th October, 1970, 1, 2, 4.

[596] NAA, A5869 (A5869/1)/586, Cabinet Minute - Decision No. 869 on Cabinet Submission No. 586 - Residence Requirements for Grant of Citizenship to Non-European Settlers in Australia, 9th February, 1971.

[597] NLA, MS 7984/Series 3/Box 7/Speeches and statements, 1971, Speech by the Prime Minister at the Australian Alumni Dinner in Singapore, 18th January, 1971, 7.

cannot say that feeling won't exist because that is not under the control of Governments.'[598] Gorton while acknowledging that Australia could be multi-racial also emphasised that it could still continue to be homogenous like Singapore. In addition, he expanded on his concerns about national cohesion in Australia in relation to international developments which had been a long running theme in political speeches on the subject 'Looking around the world, I see social problems between Negro and European in England, I see grave danger to normal living in the split between the races in the United States...I am not going to allow that kind of danger to occur in Australia.'[599] This highlights the emphasis on homogeneity during this period and directly links to the 'new nationalism', as Australian national identity was still much undefined at this time and one of the few things it could cling on to was maintaining the cohesion of Australian society. Due to extensive political pressure, Gorton was forced to qualify his comments. He asserted that his remarks were simply an expression of the diverse nature of the Australian population in the early 1970s, and denied suggestions that any major reform of immigration policy was being considered.[600]

Though there was some anxiety, there was no obvious rush over the issue in the succeeding McMahon government. Jim Forbes, the new Minister for Immigration in May 1971 gave an overall positive account to the Cabinet on the impact of the policy changes of the previous few years. These largely related to the admission of non-Europeans of mixed descent. Forbes maintained that 'the people in question are English-speaking and essentially British in education, traditions and customs...They

---

[598] *Ibid.*
[599] NLA, MS 7984/Series 3/Box 7/Speeches and statements, 1971, Speech by the Prime Minister at the Australian Alumni Dinner in Singapore, 18th January, 1971, 6.
[600] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 187.

seem to have had no problems in settling in Australia.'[601] A further submission followed in June the following year.[602] The Cabinet's reaction on these occasions was just to acknowledge the submissions, although it believed that events in Perth, where the first groups of migrants of mixed-descent had arrived, should continue to be observed, especially in light of some resentment in the city towards the increase in the numbers of these groups.[603] Therefore, in line with its coalition predecessors in the late 1960s, the McMahon government was content to accept a growth in the admission of mixed-descent settlers and a certain level of public resistance against the policy, as long as the general number and kind of people coming into Australia continued to be controllable, and the mainstay of public opinion was kept onside.[604]

The *Sunday Australian* encapsulated the essence of the 'new nationalism' at the end of this period in early 1972 'A splendid opportunity exists to build a multi-national society, rich and diverse in its origins but cohesive in its identity...Australia must be a country in which our people are concerned with a common purpose and a sharing of common identity.'[605] This discussion of Australia as a multi-national society but with a strong emphasis on national cohesion, together with somehow also possessing a strong sense of community and identity brought together the main ideas and contradictions of the 'new nationalism'.

Forbes responded to concerns in the Australian public over the continued homogeneity of the population in May 1972. He affirmed the government's

---

[601] NAA, A446 (A446/158)/1970/95164, Cabinet Submission No. 95 - Report on Immigration to Australia of Non-Europeans and Persons of Partly Non-European Descent by A. J. Forbes, Minister of State for Immigration, May, 1971 includes Appendices, 8.
[602] NAA, A5908 (A5908/1)/713, Cabinet Submission No. 713 - Report on Immigration to Australia of Non-Europeans and Persons of Partly Non-European Descent, 15th June, 1972, 1-5.
[603] NAA, A446 (A446/158)/1970/95164, Cabinet Minute - General Administrative Committee, 25th May 1971 - Decision No. 177(GA).
NAA, A5908 (A5908/1)/713, Cabinet Minute - General Administrative Committee, 12th July, 1972 - Decision No. 1071(GA).
[604] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 178.
[605] NLA, MS 6690/Series 12/Box 40/22, Immigration Advisory Council, Extract from the *Sunday Australian*, 13th February, 1972 – 'Pride and prejudice', 8.

commitment to maintain a 'predominantly homogeneous society'. Forbes even went so far as to define the concept: 'The expression "homogeneous society" when applied to the aims of immigration policy, is intended to mean a cohesive integrated society, one that is essentially undivided, without permanent minorities and free of avoidable tensions.'[606] This is yet again another example of the importance of national cohesion during this period and the concerns over fragmentation due to a more diverse population.

A further sign of the waning of Britishness and Australia's view of the world centred on the relationship with Britain was the McMahon government's decision in 1972 to transfer responsibility for the management of Australia House, the Australian High Commission in London, from the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet to the Department of Foreign Affairs. This highlighted that Anglo-Australian relations were no longer considered any different to those with other foreign countries.[607] However, as Stuart Ward points out "McMahon retained responsibility for ties to the Crown, Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conferences (but not general matters pertaining to the Commonwealth Secretariat), and the right to appoint the high commissioner (in consultation with the minister for foreign affairs)."[608] Nevertheless, the previous intimacy of the relationship which had led to its being the personal purview of the Prime Minister was gone.

The demise of the belief that Australia was part of a wider British world was assisted by the long drawn-out process of the UK's entry into the EEC, which took place in 1973, twelve years after the original application. It was also helped by the recognition among Australian leaders that the nation's trading future laid in the Asian

---

[606] NAA, A5882 (A5882/2)/CO1076, News Release from the Minister for Immigration - Press Statement by the Minister for Immigration, A.J. Forbes on 'Homogeneous Society', May 1972.
[607] Curran, *The Power of Speech*, 55, 56.
[608] Ward, 'Sir Alexander Downer and the embers of British Australia', 161.

region, which for most of its history had been its psychological adversary. A white British Australian identity was no longer desired and no longer acceptable as the nation tried to come to terms with its existence in a different world.[609]

Immigration and Integration Policy during the 1960s and 1970s

The sources of Australia's migration began to change from the early 1960s onwards. In 1966, 10,000 Lebanese Christians arrived in the country. Because of the rise in living standards in the European countries that had provided the great source of post-war immigrants, the government now turned to Asian peoples that were most like Europeans. Nevertheless, the government still attempted to secure more traditional sources of migrants and in 1965 signed further agreements with West Germany and The Netherlands, as well as a new treaty with the I.C.E.M.[610] to bring out Maltese migrants in the same year. High Italian and Greek migration also continued largely through family reunion.[611] Nonetheless, white British migration continued to be of utmost importance. In an Immigration pamphlet in 1963 the Australian government emphasised that:

> One of the basic objectives of our immigration policy is to preserve the British characteristics and ideals of the nation by maintaining a predominantly British intake...Australia, as a British country, has striven over the years to maintain as high a rate of British migration as possible, consistent with balanced national development.[612]

Therefore, Australia desired British migration above all others because it still considered itself a British country. Towards the end of 1964 the Cabinet approved an increase of 15,000 British migrants on top of the existing numbers for that year at an additional cost of A£2.5 million. Furthermore, it suggested that the Minister for

---

[609] Curran, *The Power of Speech*, 56.
[610] This was the successor organisation to the UN I.R.O. agency.
[611] Jordens, 'Post-War non-British Migration', 67-8.
[612] NAA, M2576/20, 'Australia's Immigration Programme', 1963, 1.

Immigration make a public announcement of the increase.[613] This suggests that the move would get a good reception from the Australian public. Moreover, in a brief written by his department before he left for a visit to Europe in 1965, the Minister for Immigration, Opperman was reminded that British migration 'has been, is, and will remain a corner-stone of Australia's policy of rapid population building aided by immigration – the maintenance of the British connection has the first interest of the Government'.[614] This again clearly highlights that Britishness still resonated in Australian immigration policy. Hence, the decline of Australia's British self-identification was very much a slow and gradual process.

Nevertheless, as a result of the demise of Britishness and whiteness from the early 1960s onwards, the policy of assimilation was also replaced by one of integration. One of the first indications of the changing view towards migrants at this time was provided by Menzies in a speech to the Annual Citizenship Convention at the start of 1962. He stated that for various reasons, 'native' Australians[615] had got used to discussing 'New Australians'. However, so-called 'old Australians' were also descendents of migrants. Therefore, he did not approve of these synthetic differences.[616] Menzies' description of 'old Australians' as the descendents of migrants is extremely important and should be emphasised as it was the first time that an Australian Prime Minister had described the founding peoples of the nation in such terms. However, he concluded by returning to a more traditional message of the importance of Australians as one people:

> The great thing about building up Australia through a programme of this kind is that we should become one people...These splendid bodies such as the Commonwealth Immigration

[613] NAA, A4940 (A4940/1)/C1954, Cabinet Minute - Decision No. 617 on Submission No. 489 - British Assisted Migration 1964-65, 11th November, 1964.
[614] Cited in R. T. Appleyard, 'Post-War British Immigration' in Jupp (ed.), *The Australian People*, 64.
[615] I am not referring to Aborigines here, but instead 'white' Australians born in the country, and of whom the vast majority were descended from the British Isles.
[616] NLA, MS 4936/Series 6/Box 274/162, 23rd January, 1962 – Citizenship Convention, Australian – Speech by Prime Minister, 6, 7.

> Planning Council, the Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council and the Good Neighbour Movement – that is an organisation which has so much to do with this matter – know that so well.[617]

The overall tone of Menzies' speech however represented a shift in rhetoric, from expecting migrants to abandon their original cultures immediately and completely, to welcoming the cultures they brought with them as benefitting Australia "We will, in 50 years' time, be a different people – not detached from our old anchors, not detached from our old traditions, but enriched by new ones."[618] On the other hand, he did stress that the hope was that those people who came to Australia from various European countries would not segregate themselves and form colonies, separate from the rest of the community.[619] The emphasis was now on national cohesion, not so much on remaining 'one "British" people'.

The distinction between assimilation and integration was clearly illustrated by Menzies in a metaphor relating to metal smelting at the close of his speech 'It would be, indeed, one of the great triumphs of the migration policy that we so weld all new elements with the old as to produce an alloy which would be of power, significance and achievement in our own country.'[620] The reference to the production of 'an alloy' illustrates the problem of employing a new language to describe ideas of national community.

The changing attitude towards migrants was also illustrated in the organisation of the Good Neighbour Movement. In mid-1962 its executive announced that it was opening up its organisation to naturalised Europeans, who would be encouraged to take a greater part in its initiatives. The Co-ordinator of the Movement, G. G. Sutcliffe, acknowledged that the decision to allow former migrants

---

[617] *Ibid.*, 9.
[618] NLA, MS 4936/Series 6/Box 274/162, 23rd January, 1962 – Citizenship Convention, Australian – Speech by Prime Minister, 8.
[619] *Ibid.*
[620] *Ibid.*, 9-10.

to work with newcomers was an important development in the Movement's approach. It demonstrated that the country was starting to recognise that it was turning into a society made up of people from many lands. In contrast, when the Good Neighbour Movement was founded, the policy was to have an all-Australian membership only, as Australia was the assimilating nation.[621]

An example of integration in practice at the grassroots level was given in *The Good Neighbour* in July 1972 in an article on soccer matches. It commented on the rise in attendance at soccer matches in the Wollongong district at weekends, and how the atmosphere there, with banter in so many languages, was adding to the popularity of the sport.[622] But of course this journal had a vested interest in such stories. Nonetheless, this positive view of multilingualism was in stark contrast to the period in which assimilation was predominant, and a migrant speaking in their native tongue was frowned upon. On the other hand, this new open-minded view towards migrant languages was confined to the social sphere. At work and in school migrants were still expected to speak only English.

Professor Morven Brown, the President of the Good Neighbour Council of New South Wales[623] stressed that changes in Australia's migration pattern necessitated a change in approach in the activities of the Good Neighbour Movement. The integration of migrants into Australian society was becoming less difficult and this pattern would continue.[624] This was in the sense that they were becoming a part of mainstream Australian society without so many problems as in the past. So, even as integration became easier, which was the policy objective, challenges remained. Brown added further that 'The 15 years of immigration had

---

[621] 'Increasing part in Good Neighbour', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 101, June 1962, 8.
[622] 'A changing tempo in Wollongong', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 102, July 1962, 7.
[623] The organisation had previously been known as the New Settlers' League of N.S.W., but it had changed its name to fit in with the majority of its sister state organisations.
[624] 'Work of Movement – "A change required"', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 104, September 1962, 7.

seen the people of Australia accept the principle of a plural society in which foreign languages, new cultures and ideas had their place.'[625] The references to cultural pluralism are of particular note, especially at this time, as it was much later that it started being referred to in official government circles. On the other hand, migrants were also now more willing to accept that their integration into the Australian community was not only unavoidable but desirable.[626]

The government's official policy shift was announced by the Minister for Immigration, Downer in a speech at the end of 1962. A strong Anglophile, Downer encouraged Australians to actually become 'more European' in their ways and consequently facilitate the integration of migrants into society 'Australian-born citizens would be wise to leaven their British traditions by learning of the cultures brought to Australia by migrants from Europe.'[627] But he did not mention what he was doing to advance this. However, Downer's later statements as High Commissioner to the UK on it being a terrible outcome if the UK was to become merely a European power, suggest that these views on incorporating European cultures did not imply a willing acceptance of integration, but instead a grudging, slow, painful move away from assimilation and a reluctant disengagement from the idea of British Australia.

Downer also recommended that all Australians should pick up a European language in an attempt to meet the migrant half-way in the integration process. If all Australians learned a European language it would represent a major step forward, and would represent a welcoming hand to those who came to Australia from other lands. Downer even went as far as saying 'that it would be wrong to make newcomers abandon all their European ways and become identical with people born

---

[625] *Ibid.*
[626] 'Work of Movement', 7.
[627] 'Minister suggests: "Be more European"', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 107, December 1962, 3.

to the Australian way of life.'[628] There is no clearer display of the abandonment of assimilation than this, although it was an incremental process, not a radical change.

While acknowledging that Australians had many faults as well as a lot to be proud of, Downer went on to suggest that migrant cultures should be incorporated to create a new and distinctive Australian culture 'Let us respect the cultures of people from Europe and encourage these people to express themselves freely...The ultimate result will be the creation of a highly individualist, unique Australian nation.'[629] And so integration meant no longer assimilating to a white British Australia but to a distinctively 'Australian' Australia. This new 'distinct' Australian identity was, as stated above, supposedly made up of a combination of the Anglo-Celtic culture and migrant cultures. Downer ended his speech with a rather grandiose statement about the conglomeration of the best of British and European values raising Australia so much that she would become one of the truly great powers of the next century.[630]

This concept of the Anglo-Celtic culture combining with migrant traditions to form a new, unique Australian identity continued under Opperman. At the opening of the Annual Citizenship Convention at the beginning of 1965 he stated that 'We are not merely trying to make newcomers conform to our national pattern – nor to submit passively to our traditions...We expect them actively to inject themselves, their ideas, their traditions into the fusion with ours that will give Australia distinction and significance among the nations.'[631] This was again a reference to the idea that a new distinctive Australian identity would be created through the amalgamation of migrant cultures with the Anglo-Celtic culture. Even Menzies at the opening of an Italian-Australian sports club in April 1965 commented that 'We native-born Australians are

---

[628] *Ibid.*
[629] 'Minister suggests: "Be more European"', 3.
[630] *Ibid.*
[631] '"English a basis for integration – Minister"', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 133, February 1965, 3.

occasionally a little narrow-minded about our own ideas and our own way of living.'[632] This is a notable remark on Menzies' part, and illustrates the extent to which official migrant policy was changing.

However, Holt, Treasurer at the time, as a former Minister for Immigration returned to more traditional messages in his speech to the Annual Citizenship Convention in 1965:

> Our immigration programme has revealed Australia and Australians at their best. The national characteristic of mateship, our cheerful willingness to help the battler, have revealed themselves repeatedly in the absorption – with remarkable little dislocation of our national life – of the hundreds of thousands of new settlers who have built a new home and a new life with us.[633]

The government was highlighting that the large waves of non-British migration Australia had received had not fundamentally changed its core Anglo-Celtic culture, while it did acknowledge that migrant cultures were opening up minds somewhat, or, as Holt put it, they were lifting their heads towards 'broadened horizons'.[634]

On a more practical note, Opperman submitted a proposal to the Cabinet in early 1965 to change the regulations under which an Alien had to inform the government of a change of address, employment or marital status. Previously, non-British migrants had to inform the Department of Immigration every time a change took place. However, Opperman suggested reducing this to an annual notification instead.[635] This practical measure illustrated the relaxation of controls placed on non-

---

[632] NLA, MS 4936/Series 40/Box 576/36, Opening of the A.P.I.A. (Italian/Australian Sports Association) Club, Leichhardt, N.S.W., 14th April, 1965, 2.
[633] NAA, M2607/107, Speech by Harold Holt, Treasurer at the opening of the 1965 Citizenship Convention at the Albert Hall on Tuesday, 19th January, 2.
[634] *Ibid.*, 3.
[635] NAA, A5827 (A5827/1)/Vol. 19/Agendum 630, Cabinet Submission No. 630 - Aliens Act 1947-1959 - An amendment to provide for the annual notification of address, occupation and marital status, by aliens required to register under the Aliens Act by Hubert Opperman, Minister for Immigration, 23rd February, 1965, 2, 4, 5.

British migrants under integration policy compared to its predecessor of assimilation. The cabinet approved the proposal the following month.[636]

The government's position towards migrant integration was illustrated in a factsheet produced by the Department of Immigration that same year 'Integration is the final phase in the process of immigration, the merging of a migrant with the community...Upon successful integration depends the maintenance of a homogenous society, free of inter-nationality tensions.'[637] This integration language is very vague. This was because the country was grappling with defining a national identity without the central British race ideal. Numerous references to homogeneity in this period highlight the emphasis placed on national cohesion. With the gradual demise of Britishness there was a constant fear that Australia could face the same problems that other societies with ethnic minorities had encountered, prominently the UK with its migration from the Caribbean.[638]

The document also reaffirmed the prominent role of the Good Neighbour Movement in co-ordinating the activities of organisations, societies and individuals who were willing to give their time and energy to the integration of migrants. To this end, the Good Neighbour Movement had active links with nearly three hundred groups, quite a few of them nation-wide. Specifically, the branches and Councils handled the greeting of migrants, hospitality (particularly in relation to citizenship ceremonies), youth activities, arranging cultural displays, advising and assisting individual migrants who experienced problems, and promotion to existing Australian organisations to inform Australian public opinion on the immediacy and need for

---

[636] NAA, A5827 (A5827/1)/Vol. 19/Agendum 630, Cabinet Minute - Decision No. 773(GA) on Cabinet Submission No. 630 by Legislation Committee, 17th March, 1965.
[637] NAA, A9609/VOLUME 41, Department of Immigration - Facts and figures about migration, 1965, Section 21 - Migrant Integration, 1.
[638] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 173.

migrant integration.[639] This support of the Good Neighbour Movement went back to the time of assimilation when the government had regarded it as a key partner in the incorporation of migrants into Anglo-Celtic society.

Opperman summed up the government's overall immigration approach in an address to the Youth and Student Seminar in Canberra in May 1966 'Our primary aim in immigration is a generally integrated, substantially homogeneous, and usefully industrious population.'[640] This continued emphasis on homogeneity again illustrates that change was incremental. It would not be until the early 1970s that this changed. In terms of specific policies Opperman emphasised the changes in Citizenship regulations which meant non-British migrants were being placed on a more equal footing to their British counterparts.[641] Thus the practical distinctions between British and non-British migrants continued to be broken down.

Heydon, the Permanent Head of the Department of Immigration referred to these themes in a speech to the Fourteenth State Conference of the Good Neighbour Council of Victoria in late 1966. He believed that the basic issue was 'how in this diversity Australia can achieve economic, social and cultural co-operation and homogeneity, balance between nationalities, but especially a community of fully integrated and happy Australian citizens.'[642] The most important part of this was the complete acceptance of the migrant on his own terms. Heydon did not specifically refer to any obligations on the part of migrants, but it was expected that they would carry out the duties and responsibilities of Australian citizenship. Therefore, the

---

[639] NAA, A9609/VOLUME 41, Department of Immigration - Facts and figures about migration, 1965, Section 21 - Migrant Integration, 5, 6.
[640] NLA, MS 3155/Box 12/101, "Australia's Immigration Policy" by Hon. Hubert Opperman, M.P., Minister for Immigration - A Paper Delivered to the Youth and Student Seminar, Canberra, 28th May, 1966, 23.
[641] *Ibid.*
[642] NLA, MS 3155/Box 11/85-86, The Good Neighbour Council of Victoria - Fourteenth State Conference - Melbourne, Friday and Saturday, 18th and 19th November, 1966, 8.

Good Neighbour Councils and New Settlers' Leagues required maximum government support to facilitate this central feature of migrant integration. Heydon did though concede that at the end of the day, it fell to all Australian citizens to overcome the distance between themselves and migrants, so that migrants could really consider themselves as full members of the Australian community.[643] He did not elaborate on what this actually entailed. Australians making migrants feel welcome though was something the government had encouraged since the adoption of assimilation.

The Good Neighbour Movement also recognised the central role it would need to play in this new integration process. John R. Huelin, President of the State Good Neighbour Council of Western Australia emphasised that it was important to advertise the activities of the Good Neighbour Movement generally, as well as encourage the concept of requiring new migrants to integrate, for the reason of forming over a number of years a cohesive Australian community.[644] This is yet another reference to the importance of national cohesion. The implied failure of assimilation through an evaluation of the role of the Good Neighbour Movement is explored by Tavan, who commenting on the theme of the 1961 Citizenship Convention of 'The Way Ahead' asserts that 'It suggested a desire for reflection on past achievements and failures and on future objectives...This reappraisal of the work of "Good Neighbour" offered an implicit acknowledgement that assimilationist strategies were failing.'[645] The *Australian* in response to the setting up of an inquiry by the Immigration Advisory Committee into the reasons for the return of migrants to

---

[643] *Ibid.*
[644] NLA, MS 3155/Box 20/170, Report of John R. Huelin, President of the Good Neighbour Council of Western Australia - Visit to the North West – 16th to the 25th September, 1966, 1.
[645] Quote taken from Gwenda Tavan, '"Good Neighbours": Community Organisations, Migrant Assimilation and Australian Society and Culture, 1950-1961', *AHS*, vol. 28, no. 109, October 1997, 87, 88.

their home countries, outlined in late 1966 the limitations of the Good Neighbour Council in its current form, in particular its lack of adequate counselling services for migrants on how to integrate. The newspaper recommended that there should be much more government funding and facilities for the employment of paid professional staff.[646] It did not enunciate what the tests for integration actually were however.

David Dutton argues that 'the term "assimilation" [was replaced] with "integration" in Commonwealth policy from 1964..."Integration" reflected a more benign and inclusive set of expectations, in which the demands for the effacement of foreign characteristics were slightly diminished, but within the parameters of preserving homogeneity as the indispensable condition of social cohesion.'[647] As mentioned above, during this period there was a consistent adherence to an idea of being one people; homogeneity. But there was also an important shift at this time in actually regarding migrant cultures as something positive that should be integrated into the Anglo-Celtic culture. However, the most important point is that this would not have happened if the belief in being white and a part of a wider British world was not losing relevance and credibility.

In 1967 a migration treaty was concluded with Turkey which resulted in a large number of Muslim settlers arriving in Australia for the first time. By 1971, 10,000 Turks had migrated to the country. In 1970 assisted passage agreements were concluded with Malta and Yugoslavia and consequently between 1969 and 1970 more than 50,000 Yugoslav settlers arrived in Australia. The treaty with

---

[646] NLA, MS 4738/Series 15/Box 59/1964-1969, Extract from the *Australian*, Thursday, 6th October, 1966 – 'Convincing migrants to settle'.
[647] Quote taken from David Dutton, *One of Us?: A Century of Australian Citizenship* (Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press, 2002) 151.

Yugoslavia was the last of Australia's migration agreements.[648] Again, migration from the long-standing source countries of Greece and Italy continued during this period. Nevertheless, as in the earlier period migration from the UK continued to be emphasised first and foremost. Appleyard highlights that 'In 1969 the immigration minister, Phillip Lynch, explained the government's interest in non-British sources mainly in terms of not wanting to become excessively dependent on any one source because it would make the immigration program "unduly subject to influences and factors totally beyond our control"...The following year Lynch reaffirmed that the United Kingdom was the corner-stone of Australia's immigration program and announced that he was "positively pursuing a vigorous recruitment policy" in the United Kingdom, designed to arrest a decline in British interest in emigrating to Australia.'[649] So, the Australian government was broadening its immigration intake while at the same time making public pronouncements about its commitment to securing British migration.

From the mid-1960s onwards, with the rise of the 'new nationalism' and the abandonment of the White Australia policy to all intents and purposes, integration policy was also developed further. There was a continued emphasis on cohesion. However, again, there were references to the Anglo-Celtic and European migrant cultures coming together to form a new, distinctive Australian identity. It was never however, as pointed out above, explained what this actually meant, as no one had a clear idea of what Australian national identity might now consist of. The demise of Britishness had left a void in the national psyche.

Official government integration policy during this period was established by Heydon in early 1967. He argued that migrants who were part of the community,

---

[648] Jordens, 'Post-War non-British Migration', 67, 68.
[649] Quote taken from Appleyard, 'Post-War British Immigration', 64.

actively adding to it, alone could be good citizens and most importantly they could do so without necessarily having to abandon their language and culture suddenly.[650] Huelin, President of the State Good Neighbour Council of Western Australia went even further than Heydon and asserted that Australia could be an example to the world of how people of different nationalities, with different divergent backgrounds and cultures, could all live together in one community 'The pattern of Australian life was like a mosaic, made up of people from many other lands, who had brought their ideas, cultures and workmanship to Australia [to build] up one community.'[651] In addition, he believed that Australians were very much interested in the background and heritage of people who came to settle in the country. Huelin's hope was that migrants would never abandon their own national cultures, arts and other activities, while, at the same time becoming good Australians.[652] Slowly the language and ideals of multiculturalism were rising to the surface.

Snedden expanded upon this new direction in policy in August 1967.[653] He asserted that non-British migrants had mixed with the native born to produce a uniform society. No country had integrated so many people as Australia, in such a short time. Snedden commented on the large number and broad range of national clubs that had subsequently emerged. These included Italian clubs, Greek clubs, Maltese clubs and even a Polish society of Australia. They were reading newspapers produced locally and printed in numerous languages, watching soccer, playing baseball, and studying European instead of British history in their schools.[654] There

---

[650] NLA, MS 3155/Box 11/88, Speech for Automotive Industries Dinner, 22nd February, 1967, 14-15.
[651] 'Australia could be example to world', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 161, June 1967, 6.
The reference to a mosaic is in the mould of language used in Canada about the same time. This could indicate that developments in Canada were being closely watched in Australia.
[652] 'Australia could be example to world', 6.
[653] 'Whose way of life? By the Minister for Immigration, B. M. Snedden', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 163, August 1967.
[654] *Ibid.*, 2.

could not be a clearer contrast with the previous assimilation policy. Snedden also explicitly drew attention to the differences between assimilation and integration 'Migrants have brought with them centuries of traditions and woven it into the fibre of Australian life...The changes noted have been those of true integration, not those of assimilation and of change forced from outside influences...The first settlers, after all were the first migrants.'[655] This description of the first settlers as migrants built on Menzies' reference to 'old Australians' as the descendents of migrants earlier in the decade. Taken together they represent the beginning of the view that Australia was a 'nation of immigrants'. It was the start of a new teleology, a search for a usable past that might help to explain the new circumstances.

Snedden acknowledged that integration took time 'We ask particularly of migrants that they be substantially Australians in the first generation and completely Australians in the second generation.'[656] However, what was meant by being 'completely Australian' was not defined. This again reflected the void that the demise of British race patriotism had left in ideas about what it meant to be 'Australian'. The expectation of only the second generation of migrants integrating completely was a fundamental difference to the previous policy of assimilation, where migrants were expected to abandon their home cultures immediately and become Anglo-Celtic Australians.

An example of integration in practice at the local level was the experience of a Primary School in New South Wales at the close of 1967.[657] According to Mr. Barnes, the principal of Cringila Primary School near Port Kembla, its fundamental goal was to speak English all the time at school for the purposes of rapid integration,

---

[655] 'Whose way of life?', 2.
[656] NLA, MS 3155/Box 12/101, 'Looking at some aspects of Australia's Immigration Policy' An address to Monash University Liberals by the Hon. B. M. Snedden, Q.C., M.P., 1967, 11.
[657] 'Integration begins in the school yard', *The Good Neighbour*, no. 167, December 1967.

but he believed it would be wrong to attempt to 'Australianise' the children. In other words he meant expecting them to assimilate. Instead their aim was to overlay the migrant children's cultures on the Australian. This captures the essence of integration policy at this time. The playground was evidence of success. Seventeen different nationalities mixed easily together.[658]

On the other hand, the distinction between integration and what would later emerge as multiculturalism was made clear by Heydon in a speech in May 1968:

> Our policies are still based on the need for a substantially homogeneous society into which new-comers, from whatever source, will merge themselves and to which they will contribute from within rather than by creating what is called 'pluralism', but in twenty years our policies have moved away from totality of exclusion of particular elements. Our primary aim in immigration is a constantly developing, unified, industrial community.[659]

Thus, there was still the emphasis on homogeneity. Although Heydon did highlight the prominent changes that had taken place with the White Australia policy.

Heydon also again expressed the core tenet of integration in 1968 'We must be one people, enriched by all who come to share our adventure.'[660] Again, the reference to 'one people' as opposed to 'one British people' marked a new departure in the rhetorical effort to define a new idea of Australian community.

Snedden elaborated upon what he believed to be the major points of difference between assimilation and integration in July the following year:

> Whereas in former years we spoke of 'assimilation', today our objective is 'integration'. This implies and requires a willingness on the part of the community to move towards the migrant, just as it requires the migrant to move towards the community. But in practical terms, what is actually achieved is, perhaps, too often assimilation and too infrequently integration. If so, we deny ourselves, as a community, some of the non-material advantages of immigration.[661]

---

[658] 'Integration begins in the school yard', 2.
[659] NLA, MS 3155/Box 10/76, Remarks by P.R. Heydon introducing a discussion of immigration by members of Commissions IV (Government) and VI (The Living Environment) of the Duke of Edinburgh's Third Commonwealth Study Conference, Canberra, 17th May, 1968, 8, 9.
[660] NLA, MS 3155/Box 11/87, Notes by Peter Heydon, 1968, 13.
[661] NLA, MS 3155/Box 12/100, 'Immigration and Australia's Future' An address by the Hon. B. Snedden, Q.C., M.P., to the Committee for Economic Development of Australia, Sydney, Friday, 25th July, 1969, 24.

The non-material benefits of immigration were the cultures that migrants brought with them. As the demise of Britishness had left a void in the heart of Australian national identity, migrant cultures were now regarded as perhaps offering something in the creation of a new, distinct Australian identity. Snedden also emphasised how through the integration process a new national identity would gradually emerge.[662] So, the emphasis was above all on cohesion, with an identity to 'emerge' later, in other words, in the future. This is a classic hallmark of the 'new nationalism'.

Heydon highlighted the initiatives that his minister, Snedden, had also undertaken in citizenship matters. He had been responsible for the adoption of legislation which would make it easier for new migrants to apply for Australian citizenship, and thus be able to associate themselves more with their new country, and be more passionate about its national identity.[663] This emphasis on the importance of securing citizenship in the integration process was something that had its origins in the assimilation process at the start of the post-Second World War period.

Lynch, the new Minister for Immigration outlined plans in 1970 to carry out surveys of settler experiences in the first years of arrival in Australia to assist the government in its integration activities. These surveys would adopt methods first applied in Canada, whose research in this field was quite extensive. There would be a close relationship and mutual exchanges with the Canadian migration authorities. Both would benefit from closer co-operation as Australia and Canada were each

---

[662] NLA, MS 3155/Box 12/100, 'Immigration and Australia's Future' An address by the Hon. B. Snedden, Q.C., M.P., to the Committee for Economic Development of Australia, Sydney, Friday, 25th July, 1969, 33.

[663] NLA, MS 3155/Box 10/75, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration - Thirty-First Session of the Council, 1st December, 1969, Geneva, 'Statement by Mr. P. R. Heydon, C.B.E., Secretary, Australian Department of Immigration, at the 264th Meeting of the Council, 1st December, 1969', 6.

countries of mass immigration.[664] This demonstrated the fact that Canada had received large mass non-British migration earlier than Australia and was also a good example of collaboration between the Canadian and Australian governments in formulating official migrant policy. Lynch also commented on the broader impact of immigration on Australian society 'Immigration...in the past 25 years...has made a major impact on Australia in terms of economic growth and in the social and cultural diversification of the Australian community.'[665] This is a noteworthy statement as previously ministers had been very careful to play down the effects of immigration on Australian society, instead emphasising homogeneity.

Ministers and their departmental officials continued to emphasise the important role of voluntary organisations and also of the public in the integration process. Bob Armstrong, Assistant Departmental Secretary to Heydon (and future successor as Permanent Head of the Department of Immigration) argued that in attempting to reduce the initial difficulties encountered by migrants when they arrived in Australia, the government's policy acknowledged that the task of integration could not effectively be undertaken by itself alone. Instead it relied predominantly on the positive and willing co-operation of individual Australians and the community at large.[666] This continued a long-standing theme from the days of assimilation when the government had acknowledged that it needed the help of the broader Australian community to assist migrants to settle into their new home.

A definition of integration at this time was given by Heydon in April 1971 'All Australia's immigration policies are suffused by the belief generally...held by public

---

[664] NLA, MS 3155/12/95, "Immigration in the 'Seventies" The Hon. Phillip Lynch, M.P., Minister for Immigration, 1970, 17.
[665] NLA, MS 3155/12/95, News release by the Minister for Immigration, the Hon. Phillip Lynch, M.P., Sunday, 26th July, 1970, 1.
[666] NLA, MS 3155/Box 10/75, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, Lecture No. 5 – 'The Administration of a Department of Immigration' by Mr. R. E. Armstrong, 1970, 9.

opinion and by all political parties that we should remain an integrated society, without self-perpetuating enclaves and undigested minorities but rather with all sharing similar basic standards of life and conduct.'[667] What these precisely were was not specified. Furthermore, Heydon outlined that for the longest time the view was held by governments that integration was inhibited by national associations and collectives. Though governments were still against established enclaves and ghettoes, there were only a small number and they were not important. However, governments had come to recognise the benefit to countless settlers of inclusion in migrant organisations as efficient and compassionate means with which to become integrated into the wider Australian society.[668] This also built on earlier changes of view towards migrant organisations actually contributing to the integration of migrants.

When Armstrong became the new Permanent Head of the Department of Immigration (after the sudden death of Heydon) he reiterated the importance of the community in the integration process 'From the inception of post-war immigration it was acknowledged that while governments could bring people to our shores their successful integration would depend upon community effort – it could not be achieved by officialdom alone.'[669] Moreover, he asserted that 'For more than 150 years after the first settlement in 1788, ours was almost exclusively an Anglo-Saxon community, British by heritage, institutions and kinship.'[670] But this had now changed considerably. The nation was depriving itself of a great resource from migration due

---

[667] NLA, MS 3155/Box 9/71, 'Immigration into Australia - Progress and Prospects' by Sir Peter Heydon, Reprinted from the *Round Table*, April 1971, 305-6.
[668] NLA, MS 3155/Box 9/71, 'Immigration into Australia - Progress and Prospects' by Sir Peter Heydon, Reprinted from the *Round Table*, April 1971, 309.
[669] NLA, MS 8953/Box 2/7, Address by Mr. R. E. Armstrong, O.B.E., Secretary to the Department of Immigration at the 17th Annual State Conference of the Good Neighbour Council of South Australia incorporated on Saturday, 30th October, 1971, 1.
[670] *Ibid.*, 2.

to its inability to completely appreciate the benefit to Australia of the migrant cultures the new settlers had brought with them.[671] This illustrated yet again the positive way in which migrant cultures were now considered in terms of Australian national identity.

The issue of migrant organisations was further discussed at a conference of Immigration Ministers in early 1972. A notable societal progression in the post-Second World War period had been the rise and steady expansion of various migrant associations all across the country. A National Groups unit was established in the Department of Immigration's Integration Branch in 1969 to carry out studies on the situation across the nation, and especially to ascertain through one on one consultation with leaders, the chance of a closer working relationship with the Department.[672] So, the government was keen to build closer links with migrant associations to assist in the integration of new settlers. The government's position towards migrant organisations had certainly moved a long-way from them being considered a hindrance to the incorporation of migrants into Anglo-Celtic society during the assimilation period.

The two-way process of integration was stressed by Anthony Forbes, the yet new Minister for Immigration[673] in a submission to the Cabinet in mid-1972. He announced specific proposals to assist in the integration of migrants, with a particular emphasis on greater education and welfare services. He called for the addition of an 'on call' telephone interpreter service at the state branch level to the current interpreter services provided by the Department. It would provide 24-hour assistance

---

[671] *Ibid.*

[672] NAA, A446 (A446/167)/1970/75453, Conference of Ministers for Immigration – 25th February, 1972 - Canberra - Information Item - National Groups in Australia, 15th February, 1972, 1.

[673] There was certainly a high turnover in the position of Minister for Immigration. From 1962-72 there were no less than five different ministers at the helm of the department. Though there was high turnover, it did not interrupt the momentum for change.

to migrants in the languages that were causing the most difficulties. Most importantly Forbes outlined that 'a programme to educate the Australian community on the importance of immigration and in an understanding of migrants and the countries and cultures from which they come will be undertaken to ensure that the national interest is served through an integration programme based on mutual understanding and acceptance.'[674] Thirdly, teacher training courses would be revised to incorporate instruction in the difficulties of migrant children due to their 'disparate social background and cultural differences.'[675] All of these reforms signalled a new government understanding that migrants had specific problems that needed to be dealt with. Moreover, there was also an emphasis on integration truly being more of a two-way process, whereas in the past there had been a heavy emphasis on the migrant side. The Cabinet approved all of Forbes' recommendations the subsequent month.[676]

In a speech to the North Sydney Federal Electorate Conference in July 1972 Forbes emphasised the foundation of the government's immigration policy 'a cardinal purpose of our policies [is] that we should preserve our national identity.' However, he did not elaborate on what this identity entailed – hardly surprising when there was no ready answer to the question. Forbes emphasised that Australians did not want 'self-perpetuating enclaves and undigested minorities'. Furthermore, they would not condone 'policies aimed at permitting – or actively encouraging – the migration of substantial groups of different ethnic origins; groups properly proud of their differences – and determined to perpetuate it by every possible means.' He returned to a continuous theme in political speeches on the subject of maintaining an

[674] NAA, A5882 (A5882/1)/CO1433, Cabinet Submission No. 720 - Migrant Integration - Increased Welfare and Education Services by A. J. Forbes, Minister of State for Immigration, June 1972, 1, 5.
[675] *Ibid.*, 5.
[676] NAA, A5882 (A5882/1)/CO1433, Cabinet Minute - Budget Revenue and Expenditure Committee of Cabinet, 25th July 1972 - Decision No. 1200(BRE).

'essentially homogeneous society'. The term 'homogeneous society' in terms of immigration policy meant to him, 'a cohesive integrated society, one that is essentially undivided, without permanent minorities and free of avoidable tensions.'[677] This emphasis on cohesion was a result of the demise of Britishness as a means of uniting Australians in a national community, and the inability to find anything suitable to replace it with. Forbes reiterated Prime Minister McMahon's words '"we want one Australian people, one Australian nation"'.[678] However, he did acknowledge that Australia had gained benefits from social diversity. A socially cohesive society did not demand 'drab uniformity'. Forbes summed up the government's position 'Our attitude is, therefore, one of prudent realism; we maintain a continuing watch over the ability and willingness of individuals – and migrant groups – to become integrated into the Australian community.'[679] Therefore, on the one hand there was an acceptance of cultural difference and even the benefits of it, whilst on the other a continuing concern that migrants became a part of Australian society.

The concrete proposals the government intended to introduce in the field of migrant integration were set out by Forbes, in a Parliamentary speech in 1972. This included a greater focus on the condition of migrants, and thus the expansion of settler welfare services. Secondly, the broadening of existing integration facilities to meet the particular needs of migrant children was also announced. In addition, in line with long-standing support for the Good Neighbour Movement, financial support for

---

[677] NAA, A5882 (A5882/1)/CO1173, News Release from the Minister for Immigration – 'An Australian Immigration Policy' - An address by the Hon. A.J. Forbes at the North Sydney Federal Electorate Conference, Monday, 31st July, 1972, 2, 3, 4.
[678] *Ibid.*, 5.
[679] *Ibid.*, 6.

the Good Neighbour Councils would be increased in the Budget.[680] This increased financial support for the Good Neighbour Movement was notable as it had been so heavily discredited a few years earlier. However, the greater financial backing was a reflection of the long-standing support that the Liberal-Country coalition had given the Good Neighbour Movement, and the fact that it was responsible for its establishment in 1950.

On the eve of the 1972 election Armstrong countered those sceptics who argued that the move from assimilation to integration was simply a change of terminology and involved no real substance 'The shift in our social objective...from assimilation to integration was not simply a matter of semantics; it reflected a fuller understanding on our part of what might reasonably be expected of migrants – and how Australia might gain more from what they had to offer.'[681] However, he did not say what the impact for national identity was, showing once more that while a new language was being crafted, it did not necessarily amount to a new identity. In contrast to the previous period of assimilation there was no conformity. Instead this period was characterised by struggle and questioning.

In the early 1960s, then, the idea of Australia as a 'white' and 'British' country began to lose relevance and credibility. As a consequence of this assimilation policy was replaced by integration, which did not expect migrants to abandon their home cultures immediately. Later in the decade the 'new nationalism', which stressed a domestic Australian identity, emerged as a potential replacement for British race patriotism. However, this whole period was one of uncertainty and questioning.

---

[680] NAA, A446 (A446/216)/1972/95152, Extract from CPD, *H of R*, 'Migrant Education and Welfare Services - Ministerial Statement' by Dr. Forbes, 1972, 1005, 1006.

[681] NLA, MS 8953/Box 2/7, 'Faith in our future' An address to the general convention of the Lutheran Church of Australia by R. E. Armstrong, Secretary, Department of Immigration at Horsham (Vic.) on Sunday, 22nd October, 1972, 13.

Therefore, beyond an emphasis on national cohesion and distinctively Australian creative endeavour there was not much substance to the 'new nationalism'. Similarly, at times integration appeared to be a slower version of assimilation, whilst at others it emphasised the importance of migrant cultures contributing to a new and 'distinct' Australian identity. The government appeared to be trying different things at different times. The next chapter will compare and contrast the integration experiences of Canada and Australia.

Chapter Six – 'Retaining migrant cultures' and 'Leavening British traditions': A comparison of integration policies in Canada and Australia, 1950s-1970s

The demise of Britishness and the unravelling of Whiteness

Well into the 1950s, then, in both English-speaking Canada and Australia in the 1950s there was initially a continued emphasis on British race patriotism as the core of national identity. Prime Ministers Diefenbaker and Menzies were the most ardent advocates of Britishness in their respective nations. Menzies placed considerable importance on the 'British' part of the 'British Commonwealth', and highlighted the strength of familial ties between Australia and the 'mother-country'. In an address at a luncheon given by the Constitutional Association of New South Wales on 9th October, 1953 he emphasised the importance of the Crown to the Commonwealth, especially in the light of India's being allowed to remain in the Commonwealth after it became a republic in January 1950 'It is one of my own regrets that there has been a little disposition in modern times, or more recent times, to obscure the significance of this magnificent element [the Crown]...It is not only an element of law, but an element of the spirit, that we have a common allegiance.'[682] However, compared to Menzies, Diefenbaker's position towards British race patriotism was somewhat qualified. Diefenbaker would often phrase his comments about the British world with an emphasis on the Commonwealth and Canada's evolution within it. Speaking to the Canada Club at the Savoy Hotel in London in 1957 he stressed that Canada's commitment to the Commonwealth was not 'of sentiment alone, but sentiment had its place' but rather Canada was 'the first to make the peaceful transition to

[682] NLA, MS 4936/Series 6/Box 259/55, 'The British Crown' – Speech by the Prime Minister at the Luncheon given by the Constitutional Association of New South Wales, at the Trocadero, Sydney, on 9th October, 1953, 2.

nationhood, consciously and slowly..."by evolution and not revolution"'.[683] Diefenbaker's stance reflects the wider Canadian position towards Britishness, which saw a much greater focus on Canada's progression to independent status.

The demise of this belief of being a part of a wider British world was a slow and painful process in both English-speaking Canada and Australia. It was predominantly the result of two external shocks; the Suez Crisis of 1956 and the British decision to seek membership in the EEC in 1961. However, the signs of the collapse of British race patriotism were visible in Canada first. This reflected Britishness' problematic nature in a bicultural society. British race patriotism was not applicable to the entire Canadian population. The French-Canadians, who consistently comprised about a third of the population, were at the very least apathetic, and at the most hostile towards the belief that Canada was a part of a wider 'British world'. This position was maintained during the 1950s and 1960s and was even strengthened in the context of developments in Quebec from the early 1960s onwards, collectively termed the 'Quiet Revolution'. So, Britishness had always been a problematic concept in a bicultural society such as Canada. But this tension came to the fore in the 1950s as French-Canadians became increasingly critical of English-speaking Canadians' 'dual-identity'. Their criticisms were particularly effective as the UK's world position was declining, as epitomised by the Suez Crisis. Furthermore, the Liberal Party which was in power for the majority of this period had always encapsulated this conflict between the two founding peoples of the country, as it represented both French and English-speaking Canadians. Thus, it had to be sensitive to the views of a large proportion of its constituency. Australia contrarily did not have to face issues such as these as it was a

[683] LAC, MG26-M VII/Vol. 62/Reel M-9156/File A/507, 'Canada and the Commonwealth' – Text of a Speech delivered by Honourable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada to the Canada Club Dominion Day Dinner at the Savoy Hotel, London, England, 1st July, 1957, 35641, 35642.

monocultural society. Therefore, Britishness was able to continue as the basis of its national identity for longer in that country than in English-speaking Canada.

The 'White Canada' and 'White Australia' policies also continued to be slowly dismantled during the 1950s and 1960s. Again, this took place earlier in Canada. Nonetheless, Canada in the early 1950s, and Australia in the mid-1950s to early 1960s initiated an incremental breakdown of their long-standing restrictive immigration legislation. The main reason for this shift in immigration policy was a changing international environment, in which more and more former Western colonies were becoming independent and were subsequently vocalising their opposition to racially based immigration policies at the UN. On the edge of Asia, Australia felt these new pressures keenly, and began to gradually modify its policy. However, in response to this new pressure both countries, to a greater or lesser extent, remained on the defensive, precisely because their identities had been based on a powerful sense of racial unity for so long. The era of classical nationalism had ended.

As with the demise of Britishness, at the start of the 1950s there was initially continued emphasis on maintaining the essential 'white' nature of the respective populations in both Canada and Australia. The St. Laurent Liberal government and the Menzies Liberal-Country coalition government maintained their commitment to keeping their respective countries 'white' and 'British'.[684] Both governments did not make any major changes to the regulations regarding the admittance of non-European migrants. But the St. Laurent government did allow limited numbers of Indians, Pakistanis and Ceylonese to migrate to Canada from 1951 onwards.[685] The

[684] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 137.
Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 238-40.
[685] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 129.

racial idea, the belief that different races simply could not mix, did not have the same hold as it did in Australia. Canadian agreements with India, Pakistan and Ceylon built on its earlier agreement with Japan in the 1920s.

The different responses of the Canadian and Australian governments towards the Suez crisis of 1956 demonstrate the different political dynamic in Canada on the question of loyalty. The Canadian government's response to the crisis exemplified the tensions inherent in that country towards being an integral part of a wider British world. The issue divided public opinion and there was a passionate national discussion over what position Canada should adopt. The two major political parties, the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives took contrary positions. The Liberals supported the UN position, whilst the Progressive Conservatives instead criticised the Liberal government for not offering its whole-hearted support to the 'mother-country'.[686]

This can largely be explained by the fact that the Liberal Party encapsulated the tension between French-Canadians and English-speaking Canadians towards the whole issue of Britishness, as it represented both groups. In contrast, the Progressive Conservatives by and large only represented English-speaking Canadians, and thus were a bastion of British race patriotism. Nevertheless, the Liberal government's response to the Suez Crisis was the beginning of the end for the belief that English-speaking Canada was an integral part of a wider British world.

The Australian government's reaction to the Suez Crisis in line with their conservative brethren in Canada was one of unequivocal support for the British. This highlighted that Australia was a monocultural, not bicultural society, and hence had

[686] Igartua, '"Ready, Aye, Ready" No More?', 47-62.

no problem with identifying completely with being 'British'.[687] However, the opposition ALP, like the Liberals in Canada, endorsed the UN position which was to demand that the UK and France pull out of Egypt.[688] This represented opposition to the British government's policy though it was certainly not a reaction against being 'British'.

The different positions the Canadian and Australian governments adopted towards the Suez crisis vis-a-vis the US should also be noted. The US was strongly against the Anglo-French action. In the context of the Cold War and the threat of communism, Canada was certainly influenced by this position in framing its own response.[689] This was actually a charge laid against the Liberal government by the Progressive Conservative opposition at the time. In contrast, Australia adopted an opposing position to the US on the issue. It did not follow the line of its new, 'great and powerful friend'. Australia had actively sought American guarantees for its security in the context of the Cold War and fear over the spread of communism in Asia. To this end, it had concluded with the US, along with New Zealand, the ANZUS Treaty of 1951.[690] The Suez episode however is indicative of the Empire's tight grip on the Australian strategic imagination. It was so powerful in fact that it prevented it from following the position of its new most important ally.[691]

As with the demise of British race patriotism, the dismantling of whiteness was a gradual process in both Canada and Australia. There was no sweeping introduction of one piece of legislation to remove the restrictive immigration policies.

---

[687] Hudson, *Blind Loyalty*, 5-9, 11-14, 141.
[688] Meaney, *Australia and the World*, 623-4.
[689] Bothwell, *The Penguin History of Canada*, 381-3.
[690] This broadly speaking committed the signatories to coming to each other's aid if any of them was attacked.
David McLean, 'From British Colony to American Satellite? Australia and the USA during the Cold War', *AJPH*, vol. 52, no. 1, March 2006, 72.
[691] Hudson, *Blind Loyalty*, 6.

Instead, it was a piecemeal process which slowly removed certain barriers against the migration of non-Europeans to both countries. As pointed out above Canada took the lead in breaking down its White Canada policy. It largely removed its discriminatory immigration regulations during the Diefenbaker ministry of 1957-63.[692] Australia contrarily did not do this until much later during the Holt, Gorton and McMahon governments of 1966-72.[693] This difference is explained by the fact that White Canada was not as entrenched as White Australia in the national psyche. The White Canada policy was largely only concerned with British Columbia, which was primarily anxious about the Japanese. But as the Japanese threat diminished after the Second World War the primary motivation behind the policy was gone. The Japanese threat similarly declined in Australia, but the difference is that the White Australia policy always had more of a racial undertone. Therefore, it was much more difficult for Australia to overcome the long-standing psychological fear it had held towards the 'teeming masses' of Asia invading the small white population of the country. The different geo-political circumstances of Australia compared to Canada cannot be emphasised enough here.

Canada also admitted non-European migrants first, even if in limited numbers. This is an extremely important difference between the two countries. Canada allowed Arabs, Turks and South Americans into the country in the 1950s and 1960s. In direct contrast, Australia did not allow these groups to migrate to its shores until the 1960s. The particular example of the admission of West Indian domestic workers

---

[692] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 143, 144.
Hawkins, *Canada and Immigration,* 125, 130, 131.
[693] Jordan, 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia', 240-3.
Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 172-86.

to Canada in 1955[694] raises the question as to why Canada was willing to allow non-Europeans to migrate to the country much earlier than Australia. As argued above this is largely a reflection of the varying hold that White Canada had compared to White Australia. The latter unlike the former was one of the foundation blocks of the nation. Hence, it took Australia much longer than Canada to consider opening up the country to non-European groups.

Canada and Australia's responses to the UK's application for entry into the EEC in 1961 provide another key illustration of the demise of Britishness in both countries. Whilst in Australia this event in many ways initiated this process, in the case of English-speaking Canada Britain's European ambitions provided the culmination. On the surface the responses of the two nations to the British decision were quite similar. As two of the oldest, most senior Dominions they were at the forefront of highlighting to the UK how its decision could affect the economic interests of both countries and the wider Commonwealth.[695] But of more importance was their warning of the broader political consequences to the Commonwealth, and the British world in particular if the UK acceded to the EEC. Nevertheless, there was no collective action on the part of Canada and Australia to put pressure on the UK government in its decision to seek EEC membership. This was due to both countries having a keen sense of their own national interests, and personal differences between Diefenbaker and Menzies in handling this particular episode.[696]

Australia had greater economic interests at stake in the issue, although the impact of the UK entering the EEC on the Canadian economy was far from

---

[694] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 2658, Immigration; admission of British West Indians for domestic service, 8th June, 1955, 14.
[695] John O'Brien, 'The British Commonwealth and the European Economic Community, 1960-63: The Australian and Canadian Experiences', *The Round Table*, no. 340, October 1996, 484.
[696] Stuart Ward, 'Worlds Apart: Three "British" Prime Ministers at Empire's End' in Francis and Buckner (Eds), *Rediscovering the British World*, 409, 410, 411.

negligible. Canada though in some ways was more vociferous in its opposition to the UK. This reflected the fear of its economy becoming even more dominated by the US and of greater worry was potential American political dominance.[697] However, both Canada and Australia ultimately recognised that the UK's entry into the EEC was in that country's national interest, and therefore despite the failure of Britain's attempt it was only a matter of time before it would be successful. Hence, both countries made efforts to divert their trading interests away from the UK. In the case of Australia, this was largely directed towards Japan, and in the Canadian situation rather reluctantly to the US. On the other hand, the political and even psychological consequences for the two countries were of far greater importance. It was the end of an era. They both recognised, or in the Canadian situation, reaffirmed that Britishness could no longer be a viable form of national identity for their respective polities.

This whole period was one of questioning and uncertainty for both English-speaking Canada and Australia. The two nations struggled over how to incorporate their British heritage into a new idea of the nation following the demise of Britishness. Moreover, they were compelled to create a new sense of community without the unifying race idea. This was the beginning of the 'new nationalism'.

Immigration and Integration Policy

Both Canada and Australia continued to concentrate on securing British migration during the 1950s and 1960s. This demonstrates the continued presence of Britishness at the core of their respective national identities earlier in the period. However, attracting British migrants became increasingly difficult as the standard of living rose in the UK. Thus, the level of British migration was overtaken in both

[697] Ward, 'Worlds Apart', 409.

countries towards the end of the period by mainland Europeans. Both Canada and Australia continued to conclude migration agreements predominantly with European countries, although with rising living standards in traditional source countries, both countries broadened the net to include non-European nations such as Turkey and Lebanon.

The unravelling of Britishness and the all but complete dismantling of the White Canada and White Australia policies also led to the abandoning of the assimilation policy towards migrants. This was because with the demise of the unifying British race myth there was nothing for migrants to incorporate themselves into. Assimilation was instead replaced with a policy of integration. This encouraged migrants to integrate themselves into a 'Canadian' or 'Australian' culture, whilst at the same time retaining elements of their own cultures. However, both countries struggled to incorporate their British institutional heritage into these new local identities.

In the wake of the intense, monolithic idea of Britishness, its rapid dissolution provoked a crisis of identity in both countries, but the debate over what might replace it did not seem to lead in any clear direction. At the time that both countries started to sketch out a more unambiguously Canadian or Australian version of identity, both realised that the intense nationalism of old was no longer needed. But they still faced the problem of how to hold the nation together, particularly when their ethnic make-up was changing so rapidly. In other words, for governments in this period in these two countries, the challenge of finding the balance between unity and diversity became paramount.

In terms of defining integration, both Canada and Australia came to regard migrant cultures as positive, and governments in both countries argued that migrant

cultures combined with the Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic culture would, over time, create a new unique national identity. This new belief on the part of the governments that migrant languages and cultures were something worth retaining and would actually benefit the country was a fundamental difference in both countries from their previous policy of assimilation. With the demise of Britishness, both Canada and Australia realised that they were forced to find a new basis for national cohesion. There were numerous references to being 'Canadian' or 'Australian' during the 1960s, without what was meant by these ever actually being defined. The reason for this was because both countries were struggling to incorporate their British heritage in their new national identities after the demise of British race patriotism. Now, the problem was what role the British heritage would play in a new idea of community that stressed the tolerance of a number of different cultures.

On the other hand, in the actual practical implementation of integration policy both countries were still strongly opposed to the establishment of ethnic enclaves. This was a particular concern in the post-Second World War period with the vast majority of migrants going to urban areas. Canada's first major non-British migration at the end of the nineteenth century took the form of mainly bloc settlements in the Prairies. Despite its having been frowned upon at the time, it was accepted as an unfortunate by-product of the admittance of closely knit communities from agricultural regions in Europe. But with the more diverse post-Second World migration the Canadian government was keen to avoid having ethnic enclaves in its cities. Similarly, the Australian government, which had no real comparable experience of bloc settlements, was also very concerned for migrants not to reside in close proximity to each other, but instead to live amongst other Australians and incorporate themselves into mainstream society.

There was also a realisation in both countries that integration did not happen overnight, but would occur over time. This was an important distinction with the previous policy of assimilation, in which migrants were expected to abandon their home cultures immediately and become a part of the Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic cultures. There was now recognition that migrants should actually retain their native cultures, but most importantly at the same time become 'good Canadians' or 'good Australians'.

However, there was still a clear distinction between integration and what would later emerge as multicultural policy in Canada and Australia. Both countries continued to stress that first and foremost they desired to maintain the British nature of their populations. Britishness therefore did not disappear overnight. It still lingered on in both nations, especially in Australia. This was an expression of the greater emphasis placed on national cohesion rather than creating new distinct national identities. Drawing on the experiences in the UK and the US, both Canada and Australia were fearful of the consequences of having a mixture of different cultural and ethnic groups living in one society. Migrants were still expected to merge themselves into the society that they had migrated to. But in contrast to assimilation, they were allowed and even encouraged to maintain their native cultures in the process. Nevertheless, the focus or emphasis in the two-way process of integration was still more on the migrants to become a part of Canadian or Australian society.

This being said, both Canada and Australia made efforts to increase awareness of migrant cultures in their respective countries. Both countries believed that a greater understanding of the cultures of 'New Canadians' or 'New Australians' by the rest of their societies would facilitate the integration process. This was also a fundamental shift in both countries towards migrants. Previously, under assimilation,

migrants were expected to abandon their native cultures. There was therefore little point in other Canadians or Australians learning about these cultures. In contrast, under integration the understanding of migrant cultures was actually encouraged, especially the languages that migrants brought with them. This is an example of the two-way process of integration. The idea was to try to meet the migrant halfway.

Naturalisation also continued to be a centrepiece of integration as it had previously been under assimilation policy. The securing of Canadian or Australian citizenship by a migrant was seen as the greatest expression of their becoming a part of the two societies and demonstrated their commitment to their new countries. Gaining citizenship was regarded as the epitome of integration, in that it displayed the migrant's commitment to their new country and their full, unqualified membership of the nation. Hence, migrants in both countries were strongly encouraged to become naturalised and over the period distinctions between British and non-British migrants in terms of naturalisation were also steadily removed. This was again a reflection of the unravelling of British race patriotism in both nations.

On a more practical level, migrants actually began to take a more active role in the integration process themselves in both Canada and Australia. A prime illustration of this was growing migrant representation on the various voluntary organisations that were responsible for assisting settlers to become a part of Canadian or Australian society. This was the case even in the Canadian Citizenship Councils and Good Neighbour Councils in Australia. This was a marked contrast to the preceding period of assimilation, in which there was no migrant representation on these bodies.

Ethnic organisations themselves also now played a useful role in the integration process in both Canada and Australia. It was recognised that they could

have greater success in assisting migrants especially in their initial period in the country. This again was another major point of difference in both countries between integration and assimilation. Under the latter, ethnic associations of any sort were generally frowned upon as an inhibiter to migrants joining mainstream organisations, and they were certainly not seen as having any role to play in their assimilation.

However, the Canadian government in contrast to its Australian counterpart relied much more on voluntary organisations to carry out its integration plans. This continued a trend from the previous policy of assimilation and was largely a reflection of the Australian government being much more active itself in the integration process in that it administered the majority of integration activities rather than relying on voluntary groups.

Integration signified an important shift from its predecessor of assimilation in terms of how migrants were treated and the way in which Canadians and Australians saw themselves. Migrants were not expected to abandon their home cultures as they were previously, but there was now instead a much greater emphasis on national cohesion. Integration in both countries differed from assimilation in quite major ways. The slow unravelling of Britishness and the gradual demise of whiteness in Canada and Australia were the contexts in which assimilation was replaced with integration. Gradually, and not without some hesitation and ambivalence, the foundations were being laid for the adoption of multiculturalism. And it is to that subject which the thesis will turn next.

Chapter Seven – The introduction of a multicultural policy in Canada, 1963-1971

In the early 1970s Canada introduced a multicultural policy which replaced integration as the government's main approach towards the settling of migrants. A multicultural policy emerged out of a philosophy of multiculturalism; there was a distinction between the two. A philosophy of multiculturalism replaced the 'new nationalism' as the basis of Canadian national identity. Furthermore, a post-White Canada policy was adopted in the early 1970s after a non-discriminatory immigration policy had been introduced in the late 1960s.

The 'new nationalism', the French-Canadians and a non-discriminatory immigration policy

> The flag was part of a deliberate design to strengthen national unity, to improve federal-provincial relations, to devise a more appropriate constitution, and to guard against the wrong kind of American penetration...It was our purpose to develop national symbols which would give us pride and confidence and belief in Canada.[698]

The above quote from Pearson on the adoption of the new Maple Leaf flag in 1965 encapsulates the essence of the 'new nationalism' during this period. It emerged as something to potentially fill the void left by the demise of Britishness in English-speaking Canada. The 'new nationalism' involved the construction of local symbols of identity to replace those of British race patriotism. According to Stuart Ward, 'Into the 1960s...as it became abundantly clear that neither Empire nor Britishness could provide credible myths of identity and belonging, attention turned towards the shortcomings in the trappings of settler-colonial nationhood...This climate of national self-examination emerged initially in Canada, where the simultaneous rumblings of

---

[698] Lester B. Pearson, *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson: Volume 3, 1957-1968*, Edited by John A. Munro and Alex I. Inglis (London, UK: Victor Gollancz, 1975) 270.

Quebec separatism gave the issue added urgency.'[699] Pearson elaborated upon what the 'new nationalism' meant in a speech on the occasion of Dominion Day in 1963:

> Our national identity was not easy to create and it will not be easy to preserve and develop...That is why we more than most people must always make a special effort to recognise that a nation is more than its parts, that there is a Canada above its regions, that there is an unhyphenated Canadianism above what is English-Canadian or French-Canadian or any other of the cultures that have contributed to our nation. We need understanding among ourselves and the tolerance that comes from such understanding...I believe that we have those qualities.[700]

It was a remarkable statement. The emphasis on an 'unhyphenated Canadianism' reflected his desire for 'one nation' and national cohesion, while the references to tolerance and understanding also signify a move away from a monolithic Britishness.

Biculturalism was also a prime feature of the 'new nationalism' in Canada. In an address he gave to the Canadian French Language Weekly Newspapers' Association a few months later Pearson maintained that Canada was wealthy and lucky in more ways than one; especially as it was the benefactor and reserve of two magnificent cultures.[701] Pearson summed up his position by stating that 'I believe it is important to accentuate this fact; the recognition that Canada is a truly bilingual country with two basic cultures, to which many others have been added to our great advantage.'[702] He emphasised the issue by pointing out that the two groups were inseparable, as hundreds of thousands of English-speaking Canadians lived in Quebec, and nearly a million French-Canadians resided outside of Quebec.[703]

---

[699] Quote taken from Stuart Ward, 'The "New Nationalism" in Australia, Canada and New Zealand: Civic Culture In the Wake of the British World' in Kate Darian-Smith, Patricia Grimshaw and Stuart Macintyre (Eds), *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2007) 237.

[700] LAC, MG26-N9/Vol. 50 - National Unity – 1963-1964, Observance of Canada's National Holiday, 28th June, 1963.

[701] LAC, RG33-80/Acc. 1974-75-039/Box 83/Speeches by PM/1963-1967, Text of the Speech delivered by Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, at the Annual General Meeting of the Canadian French Language Weekly Newspapers' Association, at La Malbaie, on 17th August, 1963, 2.

[702] *Ibid.*

[703] *Ibid.*, 3.

On the other hand, Canada's lingering attachment to the sentiments of Britishness was illustrated in a speech Pearson gave to the British Commonwealth Ex-Services League in September 1963:

> As we have moved towards separate national status, we have acquired, rightly and inevitably, symbols and emblems of that status. The process is not completed in all parts of the Commonwealth. But it has taken place or is taking place, without any weakening, indeed with a strengthening, of the ties of friendship that link us together and especially to that great land which is mother country to so many of our new nations and from which we have inherited so many of our best traditions and developed most of our free institutions.[704]

Pearson ended by stating that he would always be grateful that as a Canadian citizen, his nation possessed the British legacy as part of a Commonwealth of free states, of which the UK was still the centre and the heart.[705] This demonstrates how change was very gradual and did not happen overnight.

Nevertheless, things were certainly starting to change as was demonstrated by Pearson's remarks at the Third Freedom Festival in Toronto in May the following year in which he maintained that 'This is a rich and colorful dramatisation of what Canada is all about...How infinitely poorer Canada would have been – how very much harder it would be to meet our challenges today – without the enriching differences represented in the peoples and cultures here tonight!'[706] Pearson expanded upon the importance of Canadians of neither British nor French descent to the nation:

> It is appropriate on an occasion like this that we pay tribute to Canadians of non-English, non-French origins who have given us so much of their history, colour and vitality; who have shown their resolve to make a worthy place for themselves in the Canadian sun; who are resolved to maintain Canada's place, too, in the sun of progressive, respected and trusted nations of the world; and who share fully in Canadian speech and thought and national aspiration.[707]

---

[704] LAC, RG33-80/Acc. 1974-75-039/Box 83/Speeches by PM/1963-1967, Remarks by Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister, at the opening of the 16th Assembly of the British Commonwealth Ex-Services League, Chateau Laurier, Monday, 16th September, 1963, 2.
[705] *Ibid.*, 3.
[706] LAC, RG26/Vol. 76/File 1-5-11/The Foreign Press in Canada/Part 4/1962-1964, Office of the Prime Minister Press Release - Remarks by the Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson at the Third Freedom Festival, O'Keefe Centre, Toronto, Sunday, 10th May, 1964, 1.
[707] *Ibid.*, 2.

Nonetheless, this was qualified as he was aware more than ever of the need to give every group in the population an incentive to fit into Canada's Anglo-French partnership and environment.[708] Pearson finished with something that captures the implications of the 'new nationalism' for social cohesion, 'It is the total quality of our citizenship that matters, not its class, or racial or religious origin...I think the time is near when the idea of Canadian citizenship strengthened by the adoption of Canadian national symbols, will erase the image and the idea of any kind of hyphenated Canadianism.'[709] It was intended that this new definition of Canada would enable the country to overcome its national divisions and become a more cohesive society.

The adoption of a new national flag is an excellent example of the 'new nationalism' at this time. The replacement of the Red Ensign (which had the British Union Jack in the top left hand corner) with the Maple Leaf flag in 1964 caused heated debate in the country and brought parliament to a standstill. Pearson announced his intention to adopt a new flag in May 1964 in a speech to the Royal Canadian Legion in Winnipeg. His primary motivation for wanting to replace the Red Ensign was to maintain national unity in the context of the 'Quiet Revolution' in Quebec:

> What we need is a patriotism that will put Canada ahead of its parts; that will think more of our future destiny than our past mistakes; that rejects emphatically the idea that, politically, we are, or should become, a federation of two associated states – some kind of prewar Austria-Hungary. We should have none of such separatism or of petty, narrow nationalism of any kind.[710]

Pearson's references to not desiring a 'narrow nationalism of any kind' attempted to reassure people that they were not looking for a chauvinistic kind of nationalism, as

---

[708] LAC, RG26/Vol. 76/File 1-5-11/The Foreign Press in Canada/Part 4/1962-1964, Office of the Prime Minister Press Release - Remarks by the Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson at the Third Freedom Festival, O'Keefe Centre, Toronto, Sunday, 10th May, 1964, 5.
[709] *Ibid.*, 6.
[710] Lester B. Pearson, *Words and Occasions* (Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1970) 229.

this had been heavily discredited by the fascist powers in the Second World War. Instead he asserted that he was proud to be Canadian. Yet, that did not make him any less grateful for his British heritage or his Irish ancestry. Pearson believed that Canada's national flag should illustrate its progression from a colony to self-governing dominion, to an independent nation. He attempted to assuage the British sentimentalities of a large proportion of his audience by stating that Canada's ties to the 'mother-country' no longer contained any element of political subservience. Instead they were links of affection, respect and tradition.[711] Pearson also highlighted the importance of Canada possessing a flag which represented all the diverse parts of its population:

> I believe that today a flag designed around the maple leaf will symbolize – will be a true reflection of – the new Canada. Today there are five million or more Canadians whose tradition is not inherited from the British Isles, but who are descendents of the original French founders of our country. There are another five million, or more, who have come to Canada from other far-away lands, with a heritage neither British nor French.[712]

The new flag would try to appeal to all the diverse elements of Canadian society.

On the occasion of the inauguration of the new flag in early 1965, Pearson endeavoured to bring all of these arguments together in an attempt to provide a compelling rationale for change:

> As the symbol of a new chapter in our national story, our Maple Leaf Flag will become a symbol of that unity in our country without which one cannot grow in strength and purpose; the unity that encourages the equal partnership of two peoples on which this Confederation was founded; the unity also that recognises the contributions and the cultures of many other races.[713]

This speech emphasised the two major long-standing themes in Pearson's rhetoric surrounding national identity since his entry to public life: the view of Confederation as a compact between two nations; and recognition of the contributions of other ethnic groups to Canadian society.

---

[711] Pearson, *Words and Occasions*, 229.
[712] *Ibid.*, 230.
[713] LAC, MG26-N9/Vol. 50 – National Unity – 1964-1965, The Inauguration of the National Flag of Canada - Ottawa, 15th February, 1965, 107.

In his memoirs Pearson did not spend too much time discussing imperial decline, but it is obvious that he had given it some thought. He appeared to accept that the traditional links with the 'mother-country' were gone and with it British race patriotism.[714] However, developments in Quebec also weighed on his mind. According to Johnson, 'The Quiet Revolution, with its *maître chez nous* ("masters in our own house") philosophy, was well under way...Pearson was impressed with the reforms and the process of modernization, but he believed that the Quiet Revolution had weakened national unity.'[715]

However, what of Opposition Leader Diefenbaker? Why did he decide to take the position of vociferous opposition to the flag and bring parliament to a complete standstill? Johnson maintains that 'By 1964 Diefenbaker was increasingly seen by many in his own party as a liability...The 208 seats he won in the 1958 election – the largest majority ever won to that point in Canadian history – had been reduced to 116 seats in the 1962 election, and then to 95 in the 1963 election in which the Pearson government came to power.'[716] Diefenbaker was also a firm advocate of the British Empire. But it would be wrong to consider him as a traditional reactionary out of touch with his period. In retrospect, Diefenbaker may have appeared out of date, but he had his followers.[717] Diefenbaker symbolised the residual attachment that many held to Empire.

The Cabinet's discussion about the observance of Dominion Day in mid-1964 highlights the concerns over national cohesion and identity in political discourse at this time. Specifically the Cabinet debated whether 1st July would be a Parliamentary holiday or not. In the previous year the House had been adjourned. In 1962 it had

---

[714] Gregory A. Johnson, 'The Last Gasp of Empire: The 1964 Flag Debate Revisited' in Buckner (ed.), *Canada and the End of Empire*, 243.
[715] Quote taken from Johnson, 'The Last Gasp of Empire', 243.
[716] Johnson, 'The Last Gasp of Empire', 245.
[717] *Ibid.*, 245, 246.

not been sitting; and in 1961 it sat all day. In 1960 it sat in the morning to consider the Bill of Rights; and in 1959 it also sat all day. Certain ministers argued that 'at a time when questions of national identity and national unity were so much in the forefront of political thinking and action, it would be wise and proper to mark Dominion Day by making it a Parliamentary holiday and thus setting an example to the rest of the country.'[718] Thus, what appears at first glance to be rather a mundane issue had assumed a much greater symbolic importance within the broader rhetoric of the 'new nationalism'.

However, Pearson was quite sombre in his actual Dominion Day speech in 1964:

> As we enter our ninety-eighth year of Confederation there is...cause for a balanced concern at the noisy activities of those few who would divide us; who would turn the Canadian dream of nationhood into a nightmare of peoples and sections in conflict and disunity...Shutting our eyes to the existence of separatist designs and ambitions – even though they are held by but a few – would be irresponsible...So this year, on our national birthday, as we rejoice and celebrate, we are also properly concerned about internal divisions.[719]

It showed that beneath the upbeat rhetoric about a new more cohesive Canadian national essence lurked the ongoing separatist elements in Quebec.

Pearson subsequently elaborated upon what needed to be done to combat these divisions, maintaining that Canada's national problems at that time centred on the necessity of building up a strong and united nation.[720] But his most crucial statement was that 'In my view, it is essential to the solution of this basic problem for those of us in the English-speaking majority – and I am certainly one of them – to recognize that while Quebec is a province like the others inside the constitution,

---

[718] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6265, Observance of Canada Day, 25th June, 1964, 12-13.
[719] LAC, MG26-N6/Vol. 29/Canadian Nationalism – Speeches, Office of the Prime Minister - Press Release – 30th June, 1964 – "Text of the Prime Minister's message in observance of Canada's National Holiday", 1.
[720] LAC, MG26-N6/Vol. 29/Canadian Nationalism – Speeches, Transcript of the Prime Minister's Address to the Annual Ontario-Quebec-Maritimes Kiwanis District Convention, Chateau Laurier, 28th September, 1964, 7.

inside the B.N.A. (British North America) Act, Quebec is more than a province.'[721] This linked to Pearson's earlier remarks regarding Confederation being a compact between two nations. He believed that there was considerable pessimism and a certain level of defeatism about the relations between the two founding races. Yet, if Canadians were to resolve the disagreements, they had to stress that while unity was essential, it did not mean uniformity in the country.[722] This clearly demonstrates the most fundamental difference between Canada and Australia. From the beginning of its origins Canada could not insist on a nationally cohesive, homogenous nation as Australia could.

At the same time as the 'new nationalism' was developed under Pearson the 'Quiet Revolution' was progressing in Quebec, and its consequences were becoming more apparent. *Citizen* devoted an entire full-length article to it at the close of 1964. It quoted Léon Balcer, Deputy Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and its Quebec lieutenant who described the Quiet Revolution as an awakening of Quebec. A young generation of French Canadians were breaking into the areas of business, finance, industry and science. Norbert Préfontaine, Executive Director of the Canadian Centenary Council[723] went even further and described it as a 'coming-of-age'.[724] He further maintained that 'Much the same pattern is discernible in the awakening which is causing French-speaking Canadians as a group to reassess the traditional standards – primarily within their own institutions – and, of necessity, their relationship to overall Canadian trends and to the Federal Government.'[725] These

---

[721] LAC, MG26-N6/Vol. 29/Canadian Nationalism – Speeches, Transcript of the Prime Minister's Address to the Annual Ontario-Quebec-Maritimes Kiwanis District Convention, Chateau Laurier, 28th September, 1964, 9.
[722] *Ibid.*, 9, 10.
[723] This was established in May 1960 and was organised as a national non-governmental body. Its purpose was to provide expression and involvement at a national level by voluntary non-governmental organisations in planning for the anniversary of Confederation in 1967.
[724] 'The Quiet Revolution in Quebec', *Citizen*, vol. 10, no. 5, December 1964, 6, 7.
[725] *Ibid.*, 8.

last remarks need to be underlined as the consequences of the Quiet Revolution were not just confined to Quebec, but it also had a profound impact on the relations between that province and the federal government.

René Lévesque, the Liberal Minister of Natural Resources in Quebec when asked by a journalist at *Le Devoir* whether people exaggerated when they discussed the Quiet Revolution in Quebec replied: 'there is no exaggeration, and indeed we have not yet finished measuring the significance of the recent changes in Quebec...What is the result? A nation awake, in full swing, fed up with being seen as a museum, as "the quaint old province of Quebec"; a nation bent on advancing, rising; no longer just content to endure.'[726] The references to Quebec as a *nation* are particularly telling. French-Canadians during this period began to see Quebec as their nation and Canada as their state, although some separatists were now also beginning to envisage Quebec as their state.

McRoberts and Posgate focus on Quebec's political modernisation. It was here that the impact of national consciousness was most apparent. Québec City emerged as the political capital of French-Canadians rather than Ottawa even more so than in the past.[727] They argue that 'The presence of a national consciousness also meant that the symbolism of Quebec's political modernisation bore an enormous importance...The Quebec provincial government became *L'État du Québec* with its *Assemblée nationale*.'[728]

Pearson responded to this growing nationalism in Quebec by stressing a Canadian identity which incorporated French-Canadians: 'We must become increasingly proud of the composition and character of our people – the French part,

---

[726] 'The Quiet Revolution in Quebec', 10, 11.
[727] Kenneth McRoberts and Dale Posgate, *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*, 2nd edn. (Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, c1980) 267.
[728] Quote taken from McRoberts and Posgate, *Quebec*, 268.

the English part, and the third force[729]...I don't believe that the Anglo-Saxon element in our society need be subordinated or minimized, because Canada is now a multiracial society.'[730] This was a ground-breaking statement as it was the first time that any Canadian leader had described their country as a multiracial society. In this respect it is similar to Prime Minister Gorton's famous Singapore speech in 1971, but without the ambiguity and ambivalence that characterised Gorton's remarks.

The long-standing controversy surrounding the national anthem returned to the centre of political life again at the start of 1966. The Cabinet Committee on Legislation proposed that a measure on the anthem be introduced in the House of Commons. The basis of the resolution was that 'While "God Save the Queen" shall continue to be the Royal Anthem in Canada, the Government be authorised to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that "O Canada" shall be the National Anthem of Canada.'[731] During the Cabinet discussion about the draft resolution, Paul Hellyer, the Minister of National Defence, argued that it 'could lead to a misunderstanding in that "God Save the Queen" had previously been generally recognized in English speaking Canada as the National Anthem.'[732] Moreover, several ministers maintained that the resolution, as it currently stood, did not place enough emphasis on the designation of the National Anthem in contrast to the Royal Anthem. The Cabinet agreed that the resolution should be redrafted in light of the comments made by various ministers.[733] The disagreements and confusion showed

---

[729] The first major reference to a 'third force' was by Senator Paul Yuzyk, who was of Ukrainian descent in his maiden speech to the Senate in 1964. He subsequently emerged as one of the strongest proponents of multiculturalism.

[730] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 91/File 1, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, in the *Weekend Magazine*, No. 14, 3rd April, 1965, has seen fit to make the following significant statement to all Canadians.

[731] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6315/Cab. Doc. 46/1966, Memorandum to the Cabinet - Re: Legislative Measures for Cabinet Approval, 19th January, 1966.

[732] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6321, Resolution Respecting the National Anthem, 20th January, 1966, 7.

[733] *Ibid.*

there was still no consensus within the Cabinet towards the issue of the national anthem even at this time.

Bilingualism was also another major feature of the 'new nationalism'. The Cabinet discussed the 'bilingualisation' of the federal civil service in early 1966. One minister argued that the policy would lead to a considerable amount of hostility in Western Canada towards the Liberal Party and would be taken advantage of by demagogues.[734] However, Jean Marchand, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, responded that 'there were demagogues on both sides of the question and that the problem was one of determining which ones were the most dangerous for the future unity and cohesion of Canada.'[735] Pearson concluded the discussion by saying that 'the policy of bilingualism of the government was an essential element in the promotion of the Canadian identity and national unity...Canada would not survive without it.'[736] Therefore, he recognised the importance of bilingualism at the federal level in holding the country together.

Between the early and late 1960s the White Canada policy was also completely abandoned and a non-discriminatory immigration policy was adopted. As a result of the new rules introduced under the Diefenbaker government immigration from the West Indies increased considerably after 1962. The numbers jumped from 1,000 to 2,000 per annum before 1962 to between 2,200 and 3,700 from 1963 to 1966, and, with the establishment of the points system to almost 8,000 in 1967 and 1968.[737] Marchand's deputy in the newly renamed Department of Manpower and Immigration was Tom Kent, who had been a notable British and Canadian journalist and a Montreal business executive before becoming part of the federal public service

---

[734] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6321, Bilingualism in the public service, 29th March, 1966, 5.
[735] *Ibid.*
[736] *Ibid.*, 6.
[737] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 145.

in 1961 as a special consultant to Pearson. During his tenure as deputy minister some extensive changes occurred in Canadian immigration policy: most importantly, the adoption of the points system.[738]

When Kent came to the de facto Department of Manpower and Immigration at the beginning of 1966, he was faced with an inadequately specified migration policy and only general rules for carrying it out. Essentially the policy aimed to encourage a steady line of migration in relation to the 'absorptive capacity' of the country and to help with the reunion of families already residing there. Considering these circumstances and the all but total abandonment of the White Canada immigration policy, the deputy minister concluded that some impartial and just system had to be created to choose unsponsored migrants. Up to that point, investigating immigration officers relied on only one specific criterion when deciding about an applicant's eligibility: education. Yet, circumstances had now shifted. Nationality and ethnicity were no longer an issue and Kent wanted to see an incontrovertible method of choice that was devoid of whims and prejudice.[739]

These issues together with the perpetual problem of visitors applying for immigrant status convinced the government to initiate a widespread survey of all features of migration. One major consequence was the White Paper of 1966, produced by the Department of Manpower and Immigration.[740] It highlighted that the new immigration policy should 'involve no discrimination by reason of race, colour or religion.'[741] The White Paper also acknowledged that the current sponsorship framework was directed towards migrants from Europe and the Americas. In addition, it argued that the congregation of migrants in certain areas was not

[738] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 149.
[739] *Ibid.*
[740] *Ibid.*, 146.
[741] *White Paper on Immigration by the Hon. Jean Marchand, Minister of Manpower and Immigration, October 1966* (Ottawa, Ont.: Queen's Printer, 1966) 6.

necessarily a bad thing, as long as it was a consequence of personal choice or family relationships, instead of discrimination or neglect. This continued a new trend in thinking. Another example of the new non-discriminatory approach to immigration policy was the extension of financial assistance to migrants by the expansion of the Assisted Passage Loan scheme to unsponsored migrants from all countries.[742] This was a notable measure as previously Assisted Passage Loans had only been offered to British migrants.

When the Cabinet came to discuss the White Paper towards the end of 1966, Pickersgill, the Minister of Transport warned that 'despite the articulate and persuasive quality of the White Paper, the policy proposed therein in relation to the restriction of sponsorship privileges until Canadian citizenship had been obtained would cause the government to lose the support of large ethnic groups in Canada, particularly those of Italian origin.'[743] Marchand however responded that:

> The policy as proposed would indeed involve immediate restrictions on sponsorship, but pointed out that, when landed immigrants had become citizens, their sponsorship rights would be greater than now...[He] did not believe that the immediate reaction to the implementation of the proposed policy would be sufficiently strong to justify the government in departing from the essential logic of the policy.[744]

During the Cabinet discussion certain ministers backed the suggestion made by Pickersgill, highlighting the political importance of Italian groups in Canada, and emphasising the risks of introducing what would be considered retroactive legislation. It was also proposed that time be given to bringing in larger groups of young immigrants with demonstrated ability, with a view to giving them adequate training in Canada.[745] Pearson weighed in on the issue, maintaining that on the whole:

---

[742] *White Paper on Immigration by the Hon. Jean Marchand, Minister of Manpower and Immigration, October 1966*, 11, 15, 42.
[743] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6321, White Paper on Immigration, 4th October, 1966, 6.
[744] *Ibid.*
[745] *Ibid.*, 7.

> The White Paper was an excellent piece of work which set out a good and sensible immigration policy. He considered that the proposal made by the Minister of Transport was worthy of further examination, as it would unquestionably ease the initial reaction to a basic change in policy, and would represent a diminishing limitation on the application of the new policy.[746]

The Cabinet ultimately approved the White Paper on Immigration, subject to Marchand coming up with 'an acceptable means of modifying the proposed limitation of the privilege of sponsorship to persons who had acquired Canadian citizenship in order that the limitation would not apply to immigrants legally landed in Canada on the date on which the policy was made public.'[747] Marchand was therefore forced to compromise on his ambitious plans, although the essence of them was approved.

The resolution regarding the national anthem had still not been finalised by the end of 1966. Pearson was anxious for it to be resolved before the Centenary of Confederation the following year. In the Cabinet it was suggested that it might be a good idea to ask a Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons to write a report. The Cabinet agreed that the government's House leader, George McIlraith 'prepare a resolution which would lead to the establishment of a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons to report on the authorization of "O Canada" as the national anthem.'[748] However, it was not until 1980 that the anthem issue was finally settled, with *O Canada* becoming the official national anthem.

The White Paper on Immigration was put into effect in the form of a new Immigration Act in early 1967. Marchand submitted a memorandum to the Cabinet on the subject. In it he outlined that the main principle behind the act which was derived from the White Paper was the 'complete removal of any discrimination by reason of race, colour, or religion.'[749] It was argued that 'revision of the Act as

---

[746] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6321, White Paper on Immigration, 4th October, 1966, 7.
[747] *Ibid.*
[748] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6321, Committee on the National Anthem, 20th December, 1966, 7.
[749] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6324/Cab. Doc. 136/1967, Memorandum to the Cabinet - Revision of the Immigration Act, 8th March, 1967, 2.

suggested would bring it into line with current thinking in the immigration field, not only in Canada but in other advanced countries...It would make it possible for immigration officers to administer the law more effectively while at the same time ensuring more humane and just treatment of individuals.'[750] The Cabinet authorised the Department of Manpower and Immigration to prepare drafting an Immigration Act in line with the points laid out in the White Paper on Immigration and summarised in the Cabinet memorandum by Marchand.[751] By this action Canada adopted a completely non-discriminatory immigration policy.

The points system was established as a part of the new immigration rules of 1967.[752] Harold Troper argues that 'Aside from issues of family reunification, several of the white paper's recommendations were implemented...Acting on one of its key recommendations, in 1967 any and all vestiges of racial and ethnic discrimination were finally and officially expunged from Canadian immigration regulations and procedures, including all sponsored and nominated immigration.'[753]

The celebrations surrounding the centenary of Confederation in 1967 were another focal point of the 'new nationalism'. In the *Globe and Mail* on Dominion Day during that year Pearson was quoted as saying that:

> This day, the 100th anniversary of the beginning of Confederation: this day, our Centennial birthday, belongs to every Canadian...the history and the heritage we celebrate are the possession of all Canadians, whatever our origin, whatever our occupation, wherever we live and work. Every one of you, and every Canadian before you, has had some part, however humble and unsung, in building the magnificent national structure of Confederation that we honour and salute today.[754]

---

[750] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6324/Cab. Doc. 136/1967, Memorandum to the Cabinet - Revision of the Immigration Act, 8th March, 1967, 3.
[751] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6323, Revision of the Immigration Act, 9th March, 1967, 6.
[752] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 151.
[753] Quote taken from Harold Troper, 'Canada's immigration policy since 1945', *International Journal*, vol. 48, spring 1993, 270.
[754] 'PM says it for all of us – "This Day Is Canada's"', *Globe and Mail*, Sunday, 1st July, 1967, 1.

The words 'humble and unsung' are possibly a reference to the Eastern and Central European migrants that arrived in Canada at the turn of the nineteenth century and were largely responsible for the growth of the Prairie provinces.

Issues of national identity and unity were illustrated in a Statement of Policy by the government on 'The Constitution of Canada' at the start of 1968:

> There is no need to debate the existence of a Canadian identity: Canadians know what Canada is, better than some would have us believe...Canada is a community of two societies, enriched by many heritages, and characterized by its several regional identities...But Canada is more than a collection of societies, heritages and traditions...The existence of a Canadian community is manifest too in our common institutions: the Parliament of Canada, a single market and a unified economy, common commercial and financial institutions, our national railways and Air Canada, the C.B.C. and other national institutions.[755]

The emphasis on 'national institutions' was a classic hallmark of the 'new nationalism'. The preservation of Canada's linguistic and cultural duality was stressed again in the policy statement.[756] Furthermore, it was announced that the government intended to introduce 'an Official Languages Bill that will formally declare English and French to be "the official languages of the Parliament of Canada, of the federal courts, of the federal government, and of the federal administration"'.[757] In a throwback to more traditional messages the policy statement maintained that 'the central institutions of government must be designed to ensure that the essential character of the country is preserved.'[758] This illustrates that change was very much slow and gradual.

Multiculturalism, the French-Canadians and a post-White Canada immigration policy

During the late 1960s and early 1970s multiculturalism came to take the place of the 'new nationalism' as the national identity of English-speaking Canada. However, the

---

[755] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6331/Cab. Doc. 17/1968, The Constitution of Canada - A Statement of Policy by the Government of Canada, 11th January, 1968, 7, 8.
[756] *Ibid.*, 13.
[757] *Ibid.*, 16.
[758] *Ibid.*, 17.

transition from the 'new nationalism' to multiculturalism was extremely awkward and difficult. It was not a clean break. Instead elements of the 'new nationalism' continued into the era of multiculturalism.

The distinction between language and culture was highlighted by W. J. Lindall, Founder and Past President of the Canada Ethnic Press Federation in a letter to Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau (who replaced Pearson as Liberal Party Leader and consequently Prime Minister in April 1968) in early 1969 in which he argued that it was incorrect to assume that non-British and non-French groups, upon adopting English or French as their language in Canada became English or French-Canadians. In fact the other ethnic groups he asserted were absolutely opposed to the view that they had adopted either the British or French way of life. They instead insisted that they had brought their own long-established cultures with them to Canada.[759] In a reply to Lindall the following month Trudeau stated that:

> During the past year, I have travelled in and received letters from all parts of the country...It has left me greatly impressed with the richness of our Canadian character...I am sure all of you who subscribe to papers published by the Canada Ethnic Press Federation will agree that Canadians have a precious opportunity to demonstrate the advantages of dissimilarity and the richness of variety.[760]

The reference to 'advantages of dissimilarity and the richness of variety' built on Pearson's earlier statements.

The main features of Citizenship policy and legislation were outlined by Robert Stanbury, the Minister Without Portfolio with responsibilities for Citizenship and Information in a memorandum to Cabinet in April 1970:

> To re-inforce existing elements of national cohesion, it is essential that we foster a sense of personal identification with Canada, improve communications among the several regions and distinct cultural groups of which Canada is comprised, and between them and the federal Government and increase mutual knowledge and understanding among Canadians in general. If a meaningful Canadian consciousness is to evolve, a series of imaginative

---

[759] LAC, MG26-O7/Vol. 43/File *045.1, W. J. Lindall, Founder and Past President, Canada Ethnic Press Federation to Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, 7th March, 1969.

[760] LAC, MG26-O7/Vol. 43/File *045.1, Judith M. Holland, Research Assistant, Office of the Prime Minister to Mr. W.J. Lindall, Founder and Life Past President, Canadian Ethnic Press Federation, including message from Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, 3rd April, 1969.

> programmes which recognize the various publics of this country: children and families, young people, women, rich and poor, citizens and immigrants, ethnic minorities or charter groups, etc. will have to be developed and directed effectively by a range of methods from print to electronics, from political speeches to citizen participation.[761]

He also commented on the perpetuation of some discriminatory provisions in the Canadian Citizenship Act, which no longer seemed appropriate to the majority of Canadians. These discriminatory provisions referred to some advantages still offered to British subjects over other immigrants.[762] Moreover, Stanbury argued that 'a desirable objective in relation to Canadian unity and identity is the gradual introduction of national symbols that are uniquely Canadian but do not necessarily flout tradition and history.'[763] This encapsulates what the 'new nationalism' attempted to achieve. That is, the creation of new unique national symbols whilst at the same time trying to incorporate the British heritage. Therefore, the 'new nationalism' did not just fade away when the philosophy of multiculturalism began to become dominant, rather elements of it continued to survive. There was not a clean break or transition between the two. The Cabinet approved all of Stanbury's recommendations the following month.[764]

A post-White Canada immigration policy was also adopted between the late 1960s and early 1970s. There was a further broadening of the immigration intake from the Caribbean, Asia and Africa during this period. The number of West Indian migrants to Canada increased from 8,000 in 1968 to 14,250 in 1969.[765] Refugee policy was also a new prominent aspect of immigration policy. According to Troper, 'With a world increasingly awash in refugees and the end of one refugee crisis seemingly the beginning of the next, the government and officials in Ottawa

---

[761] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6365/Cab. Doc. 440/1970, Memorandum to the Cabinet - Citizenship Policy and Legislation, 7th April, 1970, 1.
[762] *Ibid.*, 2.
[763] *Ibid.*, 5.
[764] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6359, Citizenship Policy and Legislation, 7th May, 1970, 20-1.
[765] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 145.

struggled to create a refugee policy which would replace the ad hoc response which characterized the previous decades.'[766]

A prominent example of refugees arriving in Canada during this period was the Tibetans. As a consequence of representations from the Dalai Lama the Canadian government in April 1970 agreed to investigate the possibility of admitting a group of Tibetan refugees into Canada on an experimental family or individual basis.[767] Specifically, the Department of Manpower and Immigration had investigated the possibilities of settling 240 Tibetans, in groups consisting of ten to twelve families or roughly sixty people in each, in appropriate regions of the country. Quebec, Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia were four potentially suitable areas that were selected.[768] Importantly, it was further suggested that the issue of more Tibetan refugees being admitted into Canada be assessed on the basis of the effects of the experimental scheme currently announced.[769] The Cabinet gave its approval to the plan a few months later.[770] Although the numbers involved in the Tibetan refugee scheme were relatively small, their importance lies in the fact that it demonstrated the government adopting a broader global outlook in terms of refugee policy.

As with other situations, the initiation of change could have unpredictable results. And this was nowhere more clearly displayed than in the carrying out of new and untested migration laws and rules. But the quick turnover in ministers of manpower and immigration in the first four years of the Trudeau government did not bode well for a widespread review of Canadian immigration policy, nor did the

---

[766] Quote taken from Troper, 'Canada's immigration policy since 1945', 274.
[767] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6368/Cab. Doc. 611/1970, Memorandum to the Cabinet - The Settlement of a limited number of Tibetan refugee families in small family groups in Canada – Summary, 30th April, 1970.
[768] *Ibid.*
[769] *Ibid.*
[770] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6359, The settlement of a limited number of Tibetan refugee families in small groups in Canada, 18th June, 1970, 11.

considerably weak Canadian economy of the 1970s.[771] Knowles maintains that 'As the 1970s unfolded, the changes set in motion by the abolition of racial discrimination in Canadian immigration policy and the introduction of the points system began to assert themselves...While 87 per cent of Canada's immigrants in 1966 were of European origin, only four years later 50 per cent came from new regions: the West Indies, Guyana, Haiti, Hong Kong, India, the Philippines, and Indochina.'[772]

Trudeau illustrated how much things had changed in terms of Canada's self-identity in a message in May 1970, 'What constitutes a nation is not speaking the same tongue or belonging to the same ethnic group, but having accomplished great things in common in the past and the wish to accomplish them in the future...This definition of a nation describes the common ideal which unites us as Canadians.'[773] It was the very antithesis of an absolute, all encompassing nationalism. However, Trudeau emphasised a core of past achievements, which though newly defined, held Canadians together.

The problem of replacing old symbols with adequate new ones was highlighted by the *Globe and Mail* a few months later. It specifically emphasised Trudeau's omission, in his 1st July message, of any reference to it as Dominion Day or for that matter of any of the possible alternatives.[774] The newspaper, with a tinge of sarcasm, added that 'One suggestion put forth in Parliament is Confederation Day which falls on the ear with about as much impact as Lester Pearson's three-twigged Maple Leaf flag had on the eye [This was a design for the new flag suggested by

---

[771] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 151, 152.
[772] Quote taken from Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 161.
[773] LAC, MG26-O13/Vol. 37/Prime Minister's Messages – 1970-1971, Thomas Paul D'Aquino, Special Assistant, Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet to Mr. E. R. Soroczan, Administrator, Canada Committee, including a message from Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, 13th May, 1970.
[774] 'On our one hundred and third...er...Day', *The Globe and Mail*, Wednesday, 1st July, 1970, 6.

Pearson. It was also mockingly referred to as the "Pearson pennant" by those who opposed the replacement of the Red Ensign].'[775] The newspaper maintained though that whichever selection the government made in its preoccupation with styles and symbols, there was no certainty that the people would go along with the label.[776] So, the 'new nationalism' was not a grass-roots phenomenon. There was no clamour from the people. This highlighted the problem of devising new symbols that were going to resonate with the people. The newspaper believed that it was likely that Canadians would cease to care about the whole issue. Though, it was keen just to retain Dominion Day.[777] This is not surprising as the newspaper had long been a bastion of Britishness in English-speaking Canada.

Joseph Kage, Chairman of the Advisory Board on Immigrant Adjustment, Department of Manpower and Immigration in a paper to the 'Manitoba Mosaic Congress' conference in Winnipeg towards the end of 1970 discussed the broader issues of the position of the French-Canadians and cultural pluralism, 'Many like to think of Canada as an ethnically plural society which can be defined as a society in which two or more ethnic groups exist side by side...Canada is not unique in its ethnic plurality, but the integration of its ethnic groups contains certain unique features.'[778] He raised the question as to how then could you balance the goal for multiculturalism in such a social environment and political society? First Kage advocated the acknowledgement that the French fact was a crucial component of the country's potential and distinctiveness, a very important part in Canada's development. He argued that French-Canadian nationalism was a new occurrence,

---

[775] 'On our one hundred and third...er...Day', 6.
[776] *Ibid.*
[777] *Ibid.*
[778] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 90/File 8, 'The French Fact and Cultural Pluralism in Canada' by Joseph Kage - Paper presented to the Manitoba Mosaic Congress, Winnipeg, 13th-17th October, 1970, 1.

but had its very specific, historical origins.[779] Kage added that 'The history of European peoples shows quite clearly that language does not pose a basic problem in relation between groups as long as a society remains agrarian...In many ways the upsurge of French-Canadian nationalism has been due to the fact that the total social, industrial and economic structure of French Canada has changed.'[780] This was of course a reference to the 'Quiet Revolution' in Quebec.

Kage believed that the country's problems related to identity and cultural pluralism. He instead strongly advocated bilingualism and biculturalism.[781] Kage emphasised that 'The national aspirations of French Canada are important for all Canadians including the various immigrant groups who form almost a third of the Canadian society.'[782] What is more, he acknowledged and was grateful for the part that French Canada performed in the country's cultural development and in its mission for expressing its identity. Kage ended with the sombre note that constructing distinctive Canadian institutions would require a series of sacrifices.[783] These sacrifices would most likely have to be made by English-speaking Canadians to accommodate the growing nationalism of French-Canadians if the country was to remain united.

Saul Hayes, Executive Vice-President of the Canadian Jewish Congress in a letter to Gérard Pelletier, the Secretary of State for Canada explored the theory of cultural pluralism which underlined multiculturalism, 'Accommodation is a process through which men and groups seek such forms of interaction as do not tend to lose

---

[779] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 90/File 8, 'The French Fact and Cultural Pluralism in Canada' by Joseph Kage - Paper presented to the Manitoba Mosaic Congress, Winnipeg, 13th-17th October, 1970, 3.
[780] *Ibid.*, 3-4.
[781] *Ibid.*, 4.
[782] *Ibid.*, 5.
[783] *Ibid.*, 5, 10.

identification while promoting mutual diffusion of cultures.'[784] So, all ethnic groups could preserve their own cultures while at the same time learning about the cultures of other groups. Saul maintained that 'Cultural pluralism stresses National Unity by crossfertilization of heterogeneous cultures.'[785] The ideology of cultural pluralism worked from the assumption that difference in culture was a beneficial characteristic of a society that was truly democratic. Yet, despite all the positive features the ideology could be misunderstood in its actual practice. Saul ended with the view that the preservation of group cultures could not be a replacement but must complement the national culture of the country.[786] Therefore, there still had to be some sort of overarching culture to hold together all the diverse elements of Canadian society.

The issues of bilingualism and biculturalism were explored in an official capacity through the Royal Commission Pearson established (the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, but more commonly referred to as the Bi-Bi commission) very soon after coming into power in July 1963. The terms of reference of the proposed royal commission were:

> To inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution.[787]

In setting up the report Pearson showed from the outset that he essentially regarded the country as a bicultural society with other ethnic groups enriching that culture.

---

[784] LAC, RG6/Acc. 1987-88-038/Box 43/File 323-190-C47, Saul Hayes, Executive Vice-President, Canadian Jewish Congress to Gerard Pelletier, Secretary of State, including a paper on 'The Evolution of Canadian Policy Towards Cultural Pluralism' by Professor Arthur Lermer, 26th October, 1971, 2.
[785] *Ibid.*, 2-3.
[786] *Ibid.*, 3.
[787] LAC, MG26-N6/Vol. 18/Bilingualism - B. & B. Commission - correspondence with Premiers, Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister, Canada to Premiers of all Provinces, including terms of reference of the proposed Royal Commission, 15th May, 1963.

Two co-chairmen were appointed to head the commission: Andre Laurendeau, editor-in-chief of *Le Devoir* newspaper, Montreal, and Davidson Dunton, president of Carleton University, Ottawa.[788]

The reactions in parliament towards the setting up of the inquiry were mixed. Robert Thompson, leader of the Social Credit Party maintained that it was an auspicious day that would celebrate, he hoped, the start of a new period of co-operation amongst the two major ethnic peoples that made up the nation.[789] Gilles Grégoire, a party colleague of Thompson (and future co-founder of the Parti Québécois) agreed, 'We cannot but congratulate this government for establishing a royal commission on biculturalism...Since I have come to this house...I have ascertained that it is possible to have understanding between our two great nations provided we know each other, but we have to know exactly what each of these two great nations wants and desires.'[790] Particular note should be taken of Grégoire's reference to biculturalism alone, implying that bilingualism was already an established fact of Canadian society.

On the other hand, Diefenbaker in his capacity as Opposition Leader unequivocally stated that the Progressive Conservatives did not believe that the establishment of a royal commission was an appropriate means with which to deal with the difficulty that the country was presented with.[791] He argued that:

> The royal commission will sit, elicit facts and listen to arguments; but in no case, of course, can it determine the results of its recommendations. No action can be taken until there has been agreement between the dominion government and the provincial governments on the question of the amendment of the constitution in order to meet this problem.[792]

---

[788] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1963, Monday, 22nd July, 1963, Mr. Pearson, 2440.
[789] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1963, Monday, 22nd July, 1963, Mr. Thompson, 2440.
[790] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1963, Monday, 22nd July, 1963, Mr. Grégoire, 2442-3.
[791] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1963, Monday, 22nd July, 1963, Mr. Diefenbaker, 2441.
[792] *Ibid.*

So, Diefenbaker believed constitutional negotiations between the federal and provincial governments were a better solution to the problems the country was facing rather than introducing a royal commission.

In a speech he gave on biculturalism and the commission in Quebec in 1963 Pearson emphasised that the primary motivation behind the setting up of the commission was to find ways to put English and French-speaking Canadians on the move to equality, 'The determination of this government is that the partnership of English-speaking and French-speaking people shall become truly equal.'[793] The fundamental reason behind all of them working together was to maintain and expand a Canadian identity. But a Canadian identity was difficult to sustain. Pearson recognised that Quebec required the means to be itself. There was no quarrel there. However, he maintained that there should be no confusion about the fundamental issue; his government would work towards equal partnership and biculturalism.[794] It again demonstrated Pearson's commitment to a truly bicultural Canada.

Nonetheless, Diefenbaker continued his attack on the Bi-Bi commission in late 1963 at a Halifax City and County Progressive Conservative banquet, at which he argued that distinctions amongst the two major ethnic groups in the country would be strengthened the longer the commission continued its proceedings.[795] Diefenbaker asserted: 'Shall we maintain this nation as a nation or allow the provinces to exist as states within a state?...You cannot build a united Canada on concessions made to individual provinces to conciliate them.'[796] He did not even need to point the finger at Quebec.

---

[793] LAC, MG26-N6/Vol. 18/Bilingualism - B. & B. Commission - Prime Minister's statements, Speech by Lester B. Pearson on 'Biculturalism - the Commission' in Quebec, 1963, 1.
[794] *Ibid.*, 2, 3, 4.
[795] LAC, MG26-N6/Vol. 18/Bilingualism – Diefenbaker's Statements, Extract from the *Halifax Chronicle Herald*, "Inquiry Won't Ease Differences", 18th November, 1963.
[796] *Ibid.*

Ethnic groups' reactions to the Bi-Bi commission were extremely diverse. Many of them put forward submissions or briefs to the commission expressing their positions. The Canadian Council of National Groups, which represented twelve national organisations of cultural communities of other than French or British origin in a submission in mid-1964 maintained that 'It is time that Canadians outside Quebec realized that our compatriots in French Canada are in earnest...They are demanding recognition of their status as a nation...Quebec is not just another province...The French in Canada are a nation, not a spiritual abstraction.'[797] The idea of statehood did not enter into this definition however. But the Canadian Council of National Groups did acknowledge though that the French-Canadian community possessed all the required elements of a nation, and the various other national groups in the country were integral parts of the British and French nations.[798] It reiterated that 'We have already stated our position that Canada is not a country of "many nations"; and that ethnic groups are not nations...The theory of the "mosaic" is just as misleading...The theory of the "third force" is similarly fallacious.'[799] The fact that an organisation of non-British and non-French groups was advocating the national aspirations of French-Canadians should be highlighted.

This view was shared in the *Toronto Daily Star* in early 1965. The newspaper commented positively on the decision of the leadership of the city's Italian-Canadian community not to present a brief to the Bi-Bi commission. They quoted a representative of the group as saying that as they considered Canada an officially bilingual and bicultural country, there should be no attempt to increase the problems,

---

[797] LAC, RG33-80/Vol. 51/File 460, Submission to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism by the Canadian Council of National Groups, June 1964, 4, 5.
[798] *Ibid.*, 5.
[799] *Ibid.*, 13.

by any implication that other ethnic groups should be given special treatment.[800] However, this only reflected the view of one ethnic group in Canada.

On the other hand, the submission of the Canadian Polish Congress' brief to the Bi-Bi commission in 1964 expressed a very different view, 'The Canadian Polish Congress views with strong reservations the name and terms of reference of the Royal Commission which, by limiting its task to a study of the two main languages and cultures of Canada, unfortunately underestimates the value of the many other languages and cultures existing in this country.'[801] The reality in Canada did most definitely not reflect a monolithic biculturalism in their opinion. But they did accept that Canada was a bilingual nation and that this should be put into practice across the country.[802] Opposition to biculturalism, but an acceptance of bilingualism was a common position adopted by many different ethnic groups in Canada.

The Ukrainian Canadian Committee in Winnipeg criticised the very basis of the commission in May 1966, 'the reference to equal partnership between the two founding races in the Terms of Reference is distasteful to many of the ethnic groups, as it implies a sort of race superiority and seems to relegate the other ethnic groups to second-class citizenship.'[803] This position is not surprising though as Ukrainian-Canadians had out of all the non-British and non-French ethnic groups been the most vociferous in maintaining their culture and identity in Canada.

German-Canadians had a problem with bilingualism, 'Reflecting the issue of language controversies, the personal views and aspirations of the German group can be summarized thus, Canada should call one common language its own from

---

[800] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 87/File 1, 'Two Languages are enough', *Toronto Daily Star*, Wednesday, 31st March, 1965.
[801] LAC, RG33-80/Vol. 51/File 447, Brief presented to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism by the Canadian Polish Congress, 1964, 1.
[802] *Ibid.*, 8, 9.
[803] LAC, RG33-80/Vol. 111/Reel C-4886 – Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Headquarters, Winnipeg, Submission of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, 18th May, 1965, 2360.

coast to coast, that is English.'[804] However, they were heavily critical of any suggestion that non-British and non-French Canadians were somehow all part of a monolithic 'third force'. The German-Canadian Association was concerned with firstly preserving and maintaining the German culture and language and secondly with assisting new German settlers. German-Canadians also had a particular issue with what they perceived as the privileged position of French-Canadians in the country, in that they had effective autonomy in the province of Quebec and equal status in the federal parliament and bureaucracy. They highlighted the importance of allowing migrants to maintain the culture and language of their forebears.[805] This opposition to bilingualism by German-Canadians was a noteworthy one as they formed the largest ethnic group after Canadians of British and French descent.

There was a small controversy over the title of the preliminary report of the commission in early 1965. Prominent members of the Cabinet, including the Prime Minister believed 'that the title "The Canadian Crisis" which the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism proposed to give to its preliminary report conveyed an undesirable impression and did not, in fact, accord with the substance of the report which, on the whole, was factual and constructive.'[806] The issue came up again in the Cabinet a few days later. The point was reiterated that 'While present divisions in Canada did indeed constitute a kind of crisis, the situation was in fact what could normally be expected in view of past events...Nevertheless, it would be quite undesirable to over-emphasize the difficulties by fostering their consideration in

---

[804] LAC, RG33-80/Acc. 1974-75-039/Box 43/File 830-271/The Cultural Contributions of the German Ethnic Group to Canada - Herbert Wilhelm Debor, Chapter V - Aspirations of the German Ethnic Group, 28th September, 1965, 68.
[805] *Ibid.*, 69, 70, 73, 74.
[806] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6271, Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 9th February, 1965, 10.

terms of "crisis".'[807] Therefore, the Cabinet was conscious of being careful in the selection of words even to describe reports of the commission, so as to avoid exacerbating the problems the country was facing.

The actual preliminary report without the title 'The Canadian Crisis' acknowledged that

> It must be recognized at the outset that the Commission was appointed, at least to some extent, for the purposes of studying the grievances which French Canadians, and particularly those in the Province of Quebec, have been expressing more and more vigorously. It is French Canada which, through its spokesmen, has been expressing dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs and insisting that it is the victim of inequalities which it finds unacceptable. For that reason we were led to study first those areas where grievances are already numerous and where the status quo is under examination. Any other approach would be unrealistic.[808]

Moreover, Canadians who were neither of French nor British descent, and therefore were a part of what was commonly termed the 'other ethnic groups', in numerous instances agreed with these views. On the other hand, others, particularly on the Prairies, argued that if the two groups were given a special position then by logical extension all the other ethnic groups were 'second class citizens'. The commission was quite taken aback by the vehemence of what it determined was largely an unfounded fear. Yet, it continued to be voiced on numerous occasions.[809] It showed once more the problem of maintaining national cohesion in the new circumstances.

On the occasion of the release of Volume 1 of the report of the Bi-Bi commission on the Official Languages, Pearson maintained that 'the government fully endorses the principle of French speaking and English speaking linguistic and cultural equality that forms the core of and is so clearly defined in this report.'[810] The report itself asserted that:

---

[807] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6271, Preliminary report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 11th February, 1965, 12.
[808] Canada, *A Preliminary Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* (Ottawa, Ont.: Queen's Printer, 1965) 23.
[809] *Ibid.*, 28.
[810] Debates, *H of C*, vol. V, 1967, 5th December, 1967, Mr. Pearson, 5065.

> The world-wide prestige and influence of English and French, the isolation and the minority situation of the French-speaking community in North America, the deep roots of the French language in Quebec and in Canada – all these make Canada a bilingual state of a unique kind. The two languages and the two communities which speak them coexist in this country under conditions duplicated nowhere else.[811]

In addition, it argued that French and English be formally declared the official languages of the federal administration, of the federal courts, of the federal government and of the Parliament of Canada.[812] The report was calling for the official enshrinement of bilingualism at the federal level.

In a statement of policy on 'The Constitution of Canada' at the beginning of 1968 the government argued that a Bill of Rights it was proposing should contain a section 'designed to protect those linguistic rights identified by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.'[813] The policy statement was released in the context of a Constitutional Conference between the federal and provincial governments. To this end, the federal government urged all governments participating in the conference to agree to carry out the suggestions of the Bi-Bi commission.[814] This goes to show the consistent support the Pearson government gave to the creation of a truly bilingual Canada.

Immigration and Integration Policy during the 1960s

Integration policy also continued as official government policy towards migrants between the early and late 1960s. The Cabinet discussed the issue of equality of rights for naturalised Canadians in April 1963. It agreed that consideration should be given, at another meeting, to the inclusion in the Parliamentary programme of a measure to give naturalised Canadians exactly the same rights as native born

---

[811] Hugh R. Innis, *Bilingualism and Biculturalism: An Abridged Version of the Royal Commission Report* (Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1973) 8.
[812] *Ibid.*, 31.
[813] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6331/Cab. Doc. 17/1968, The Constitution of Canada - A Statement of Policy by the Government of Canada, 11th January, 1968, 15.
[814] *Ibid.*

Canadians. While this was of little practical importance, the Cabinet believed it would be valued highly by new Canadians.[815] It was a sign that the government recognised the symbolic value to New Canadians of an equalisation of rights with their native born counterparts. More importantly, it demonstrates how much things had changed in that the government was so concerned about the perspective of New Canadians.

The relationship between integration policy and bilingualism and biculturalism was discussed at the end of 1963:[816]

> In what sense can it be said that there are, or that there are not, two distinct 'nations' in Canada, to which other ethnic groups have joined themselves; or in what sense is there, or is there not, a single Canadian nation?...What are the common denominators which underlie our two cultures, and upon which we might hope to establish some degree of Canadian identity?...What is the contribution of the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada? What measures should be taken to safeguard the contribution of these other ethnic groups (e.g. teaching of their languages in schools)?[817]

Therefore, this underlined that questions of national identity were very much interlinked with official migrant policy.

Integration in practice in Québec City was illustrated early the following year.[818] Four years previously an international food fair was arranged by a group of women in Québec City as a Citizenship Week programme. It was also pointed out that 'The motto of the Society is "Friendship and Culture"; its objects are to extend a welcome to new Canadians regardless of their national origin, race or religion, and to establish friendly relations between them and Canadians of several generations.'[819] The international food fair had emerged as a prominent yearly function of *La Fraternité canadienne*. The organisation drew on the resources of the community for its activities. The scheme consisted of numerous social activities at which New and old Canadians mixed and got to know each other better; bowling, dances, folk

---

[815] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6253, Equality of rights for naturalized Canadians, 30th April, 1963, 5.
[816] 'For Discussion on Bilingualism and Biculturalism', *Citizen*, vol. 9, no. 5, December 1963.
[817] *Ibid.*, 26.
[818] 'Newcomers Welcomed by Women of Quebec', *Citizen*, vol. 10, no. 1, February 1964.
[819] *Ibid.*, 26.

singing, maple-sugar parties, skating and supper parties; and celebrations of many different types such as an international arts exhibition and the giving out of toys from Santa Claus to the children of the newcomers.[820] Thus, integration at the grassroots level in French-Canada was not very different at all from its English-speaking counterpart.

The problems of some migrants possessing an adequate knowledge of English or French and of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship for naturalisation purposes were discussed in a memorandum to the Cabinet in early 1964. It was pointed out that 'In Italian immigrant families, for example, the wives often fail to learn either of the Canadian languages, although their devotion to domestic and maternal duties makes them potentially good citizens.'[821] So, there was now a potential willingness to show some flexibility in expecting migrants to know the official languages if they demonstrated their integration in other ways. This was certainly a notable change from the earlier period of integration.

The meaning of integration was explored in April 1965.[822] Settlers were faced with two imperative and urgent requirements: employment and somewhere to live. But a settler could not truly see him or herself as Canadian until they had a sense of belonging in the country. This sense of belonging was formally recognised by the acquisition of citizenship. Therefore, it was argued that 'The immigrant in his way of thinking and feeling, in his way of life has been moulded by his culture so much so that it has become second nature to him...Unless the people of the community accept the newcomers in their midst, the newcomers cannot feel they belong.'[823] It

---

[820] 'Newcomers Welcomed by Women of Quebec', 26, 27.
[821] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6259/Cab. Doc. 131/1964, Memorandum to Cabinet: Amendment of Canadian Citizenship Act, 19th March, 1964, 1.
[822] 'The Community and the Newcomer', *Citizen*, vol. 11, no. 2, April 1965.
[823] *Ibid.*, 16, 18, 19, 20.

was at this time that ethnic associations could be especially useful.[824] This continued a trend from the previous period of integration (1953-63) in which ethnic organisations were now considered as having a useful role to play in the integration of migrants.

The responsibilities of the Citizenship Branch, which was the government section in charge of integration were outlined in a report by the Secretary of State for Canada in early 1967: 'The continuing role of the [citizenship] branch is the development of inter-group and inter-regional understanding throughout Canada and encouragement, at the local level, of fuller participation by all ethnic groups in community activities.'[825] Specifically, the branch's activities were based in nine programme areas: bicultural relations, citizenship development, human rights, immigrant integration, Indian integration, language instruction, multi-ethnic activities, travel and exchange and youth services.[826] Therefore, the Citizenship Branch played an important role in the integration of migrants.

The relationship of the branch with different ethnic groups in the country was reinforced and their activities were greatly encouraged by pre-centennial and centennial events. For instance, the Canadian Folk Arts Council took charge of the organisation of a range of local, regional and provincial Folk Arts Councils. Under their direction, lively festivals, involving some 35,000 people and incorporating the majority of ethnic groups in the nation, took place in major urban areas. Several performing arts groups, selected for their artistic ability, also offered a wide-ranging list of events on Parliament Hill in Ottawa in commemoration of Dominion Day. The branch worked together in the selection of the performing groups and assisted with

---

[824] 'The Community and the Newcomer', 20.
[825] Canada. Secretary of State, *Report of the Secretary of State of Canada for the Year Ended March 31st, 1967* (Ottawa, Ont.: Supply and Services Canada, 1967) 7.
[826] *Ibid.*

the cost of accommodation and transportation costs in Ottawa.[827] Thus, the Citizenship Branch had a close relationship with grassroots organisations that were involved in integration activities.

The report also drew attention to the fact that 'The branch keeps in close touch with the interests and activities of all ethnic groups through the more than 200 ethnic newspapers and periodicals in over 30 languages published in Canada...These afford a valuable resource when articles and papers are being prepared for official publications.'[828] By the close of the financial year, efforts were also in their final stage in the publishing of centennial versions of *The Canadian Family Tree* and *Les Rameaux de la Famille Canadienne.* A film was also in production which would illustrate the role of other ethnic groups in the enrichment of Canadian life and the advancement of the nation.[829] So, the close contacts with ethnic newspapers as well as the production of films on the contribution of ethnic groups to Canadian society illustrate how much the government's view of ethnic cultures was changing.

The challenge of integration was addressed in mid-1967.[830] The ability of the migrants to communicate adequately with those around themselves was identified as one difficulty. The extent to which the settlers accepted very different social and cultural traditions, thus, to some point, abandoning their own was another potential challenge.[831] However, it was emphasised that:

> This brings us to the final factor in the social integration process. Will the new social or cultural groups in which the migrant now finds himself accept him as an equal and not only allow him, but encourage him as well, to participate in society; to contribute his experience,

---

[827] Canada. Secretary of State, *Report of the Secretary of State of Canada for the Year Ended March 31st, 1967*, 7-8.
[828] *Ibid.*, 8.
[829] *Ibid.*
[830] 'The Challenge of Integration', *Citizen*, vol. 13, no. 3, June 1967.
[831] *Ibid.*, 10.

> talents and skills to community life – thus giving him a feeling of personal satisfaction and strengthening his sense of belonging?[832]

The wider community's inability to take an active role in the integration process would lead to migrants unsuccessfully trying to integrate themselves in a new social setting. Integration of any new settler into a community, whether they were from another country or another province was a two-way street.[833] The importance of the Canadian community in welcoming migrants was a long-running theme in government migrant policy; going back to assimilation.

Immigration and Multicultural Policy

During the period of the late 1960s and early 1970s a policy of multiculturalism replaced integration as government policy towards migrants. The Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights in Toronto at the close of 1968 was the first major step towards the introduction of a multicultural policy in Canada. It brought together for the first time national ethnic associations and British and French community groups to talk about multicultural issues in a new Canadian constitution. They focused on the relevance and the connection of the nation's unique ethnic cultures to Canadian society generally, and especially to Canada's multicultural heritage.[834] The specific goals of the conference were:

> To discuss with a wide variety of ethnic, religious, social and community organisations the cultural patterns that make up Canada, and the multi-cultural aspect of Canadian life...To discuss the responsibilities and rights of cultural groups in Canada with respect to the current constitutional dialogue between the federal and provincial governments...To make recommendations to the appropriate government levels regarding the preservation of Canada's multi-cultural tradition...To discuss the establishment of a forum representative of Canada's cultural minorities to promote the development of a broadly-based all-Canadian cultural council as an advisory body to government.[835]

---

[832] 'The Challenge of Integration', 12.
[833] *Ibid.*
[834] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 91/File 1, Press Release on "Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights", King Edward Sheraton Hotel, 13th-15th December, 1968, 6th December, 1968, 1.
[835] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 87/File 2, Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights - Purpose of the Conference.

The conference, while supporting the federal and provincial governments' attempts to produce a new Canadian constitution, was at the same time vociferously opposed to the idea of biculturalism and instead sought the official acknowledgement of the multicultural nature of Canada.[836] This conference was the first major instance of a diverse range of groups in the country calling for a multicultural agenda.

Senator Yuzyk gave a speech at the conference on his theme of the 'Third Force':

> What is common to the ethnic groups of the Third element is their intense loyalty to Canada, their belief in a strong and united Canadian nation based on a mutual partnership of all its component elements, their whole-hearted acceptance of the Canadian democratic institutions and way-of-life, and their desire to perpetuate their culture as an integral part of the evolving cultural pattern of Canada.[837]

So, Yuzyk was very much couching the preservation of ethnic cultures within the context of national cohesion.

Signs that the government was moving slowly in the direction of adopting a multicultural policy were given by John Yaremko, the Minister of Social and Family Services in an address he also gave to the conference:

> I must say, that when we read about the two solitudes, I have discovered that there are more than two solitudes, that there are many solitudes, not only between the English and the French as two specific categories, but amongst many of the variety...In the Throne Speech of the 1968 Spring Session, there were spoken the following words: 'My government also recognizes the existence of two linguistic communities and many cultures within Canada, and appreciates that this diversity is the source of much of our strength and the arrangement of our life'.[838]

The government's rhetoric was slowly moving away from that of a bicultural Canada to a multicultural one.

---

[836] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 87/File 2, Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights - Report of the Resolutions Committee, 15th December, 1968, Toronto.

[837] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 113/File 3, 'The Emerging New Force in the Emerging New Canada' by Senator Paul Yuzyk, Professor of History, University of Ottawa at the Thinkers Conference on Cultural Rights, Toronto, 13th, 14th and 15th December, 1968, 4-5.

[838] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 90/File 14, Address by the Honourable John Yaremko, the Minister of Social and Family Services, given at the Luncheon sponsored by John P. Roberts, Prime Minister and the Government of Ontario, for the Delegates and observers attending the "Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights" held in the Crystal Ballroom, King Edward Hotel, Toronto, on Sunday, 15th December, 1968 at 1.00pm, 4, 5.

The French-Canadian perspective on the inseparability of language and culture was offered by Claude Ryan, the new editor of *Le Devoir* in a speech he presented at the conference, 'You cannot give official recognition to a given language without at the same time accepting implicitly to give some special recognition to the culture of which it is the expression.'[839] On the other hand, Ryan did give some ground when he asserted that although Canada was principally and primarily a bilingual and bicultural nation; it was also a multicultural society.[840] Thus, even some prominent French-Canadians were beginning to give some ground to the idea of a multicultural Canada.

In the context of the Thinkers' Conference some members of Parliament began to press the government to take action to promote the multicultural nature of Canada. But the government while acknowledging that the issue was uppermost in their thoughts, believed it was best to wait until the Bi-Bi commission published its fourth volume on 'The Other Ethnic Groups' before proceeding with any firm action.[841] So, the government was trying to carefully avoid being swept up in the momentum of the conference. The future publication of the volume on 'The Other Ethnic Groups' provided it with a convenient opportunity to delay any public announcement.

However, before this, official bilingualism was finally legislatively enshrined in the *Official Languages Act* of 1969. It declared that 'The English and French languages are the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the Parliament and Government of Canada, and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal

---

[839] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 90/File 15, Speech by Claude Ryan, Editor, *Le Devoir*, Montreal at the Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights, 15th December, 1968, King Edward Sheraton Hotel, Toronto, 7.

[840] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 91/File 1, Press Release on "Thinkers' Conference on Cultural Rights", King Edward Sheraton Hotel, 13th-15th December, 1968, 15th December, 1968, 1.

[841] Debates, *H of C*, vol. IV, 1968-69, 17th December, 1968, Mr. Korchinski and Mr. Trudeau, 4030.

rights and privileges as to their use in all the institutions of the Parliament and Government of Canada.'[842] This was the long culmination of efforts begun by Pearson in the early 1960s.

Trudeau responded to notable backlash towards official bilingualism from some sections of the population, particularly in the West, in a rather aptly named article entitled, 'Why are they forcing French down our throats?' in July 1969. This question arose he believed largely because of a general misunderstanding of what the government's official bilingualism policy actually meant. English had never been used in certain sections of Quebec. In the same vein you could never hear one word of French in many other parts of the nation. Trudeau also pointed out that the *Official Languages Act* would in no way discriminate against those whose mother tongue was neither English nor French. However, it would be impractical for the government to operate in every language spoken by a Canadian. Trudeau also went to great lengths to debunk the claims that not being bilingual would debar Canadians from working for the government.[843] He ended by stressing the importance of official bilingualism to the country, 'To build and maintain a strong and united country, it is essential that both French and English speaking Canadians should be able to feel at home in all parts of the country, and that their rights as members of our major language groups should be respected by the federal government.'[844] The reference to the importance of official bilingualism at the federal level for national unity is reminiscent of speeches made by Pearson earlier in the decade.

Book IV of the Bi-Bi commission report was finally published towards the end of 1969. The report first debunked the idea of the 'Third Force'. It argued that it was

---

[842] Canada. 1969, *Official Languages Act*, Ottawa in John R. Mallea and Jonathan C. Young (Eds), *Cultural Diversity and Canadian Education* (Ottawa, Ont.: Carleton University Press, 1984) 502.
[843] LAC, MG26-O13/Vol. 2/Articles by Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Article by the Prime Minister, Written for The Canadian Press – 'Why are they forcing French down our throats?', 15th July, 1969, 1, 2, 3, 4.
[844] *Ibid.*, 8-9.

far too simplistic and grouped people together whose only common characteristic was that they were neither of British nor French ethnic origin.[845] The report also dealt specifically with the issue of biculturalism and multiculturalism:

> Among those of non-British, non-French origin, some accept official bilingualism without hesitation but categorically reject biculturalism. They consider Canada to be a country that is officially bilingual but fundamentally multi-cultural. It is clear that we should not overlook Canada's cultural diversity, always keeping in mind that there are dominant cultures, the French and British. It is in this perspective that we shall study the contribution of various other cultures to the life of the country.[846]

This was hardly a ringing endorsement of multiculturalism.

The response of non-British and non-French ethnic groups to Book IV of the report varied considerably. Croatian-Canadians were highly critical of extending language rights beyond English and French.[847] This was a view shared by Polish-Canadians as well.[848] Slovenian-Canadians went even further and asserted that 'most of the Slovenians who have settled in Canada know that...they would not be able to maintain their identity as a separate group within Canada.'[849] Therefore, the diverse range of views by ethnic groups to the fourth volume of the report was similar to the reaction to the first volume.

On the other hand, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee took a different position. This is hardly surprising as Ukrainian-Canadians were at the forefront of the drive for the government to adopt a multicultural policy:

> The record of the Government in acting on Volume I of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, pertaining to official languages, was prompt...To us Volume IV on cultural contributions of the other ethnic groups is no less important than Volume I...We urge prompt attention in implementing the recommendations of this report.[850]

---

[845] Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book 4, *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups* (Ottawa, Ont.: Supply and Services Canada, October 23rd, 1969) 10.
[846] Innis, *Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, 135.
[847] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 92/File 4, Steven Plesa Jr., Secretary, United Croats of Canada to British, French and Others Conference, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ont., 20th November, 1969, 2.
[848] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 92/File 4, British, French and Others' Conference, Lakehead University, 22nd November, 1969 - Some Views by A. R. Morpurgo, 6.
[849] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 92/File 4, A statement concerning cultural and linguistic rights of ethnic groups in Canada by Frank Obljubek, President, Cultural Society of Canadian Slovenians.
[850] LAC, RG6/Acc. 1987-88-038/Box 43/File 323-190-U6, Memorandum of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Ottawa, 7th June, 1971, 2.

The comments by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee imply that they felt the government did not regard the other ethnic groups in Canada to be as important as their French-Canadian counterpart.

The federal government was slow to respond however. Donald S. Macdonald, President of the Privy Council in a letter to Trudeau in early 1970 pointed out that the Liberal Party recognised that there were particular regional interests in Canadian politics. The policy of the party had never been to pander to specific ethnic groups through policy initiatives that were contradictory to their programmes nationally. However, by ignoring and cutting off any opportunity for encouragement to participate on the part of ethnic groups, the party would quite literally lose their confidence.[851] Macdonald emphasised that:

> During the Pearson years, the P.M. had personal representation with ethnic organizations, had given recognition through official messages to their gatherings, had acknowledged their briefs, had encouraged their participation in national and regional rallies, had shown through Liberal speakers and articles written in their papers that he had an understanding of their problems.[852]

The problem according to Macdonald was that at the present time the view that the government considered Canada to be bicultural rather than multicultural was extremely prevalent amongst ethnic organisations.[853] This was hardly surprising considering the views of the Bi-Bi commission as well as Pearson's numerous speeches over the decade.

However, the government did attempt to respond to these concerns. This was demonstrated in a memorandum to the Cabinet on Citizenship policy and legislation by Stanbury in April 1970. The memorandum set out the main policy goals that represented the working structure for a re-energised citizenship programme in the

---

[851] LAC, MG26-O7/Vol. 43/File 045.1 Pers. & Conf., Donald S. Macdonald, President of the Privy Council to Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, including memorandum on 'Suggested Party Program with New Citizens' by Senator Andrew Thompson, 3rd February, 1970, 1.
[852] *Ibid.*
[853] *Ibid.*, 2.

Department of the Secretary of State for Canada. One of the objectives was 'To encourage cultural diversification within a bilingual framework, particularly following the publication of the fourth volume of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.'[854] The reference to encouraging 'cultural diversification within a bilingual framework' is extremely important as it represents the first tentative formulation of what would emerge as the government's official multicultural policy the following year. Stanbury specifically recommended that 'Existing programmes to assist ethnic cultural groups and disadvantaged segments of the population be immediately expanded and a long-term support programme based on surveys and studies be developed.'[855] He suggested that an additional $325,000 be provided in the financial year 1970-71 for this purpose.[856] The Cabinet approved all of Stanbury's recommendations in May 1970.[857]

The new direction that the government was moving in was illustrated in a message Trudeau wrote in the *Ukrainian Voice* that same month:

> Since the times of the first explorers the development of Canada has depended upon the hard work and imagination of people who have come here from different parts of the world, bringing with them their values and traditions. In recent years our population has been strengthened and diversified by newcomers from many countries. Our common goal is a society which will not impose a single way of life on all but which will recognize and encourage the contributions which every group can make to the Canadian community.[858]

The ambition was clear: Trudeau was trying to give multiculturalism a new history.

On the other hand, in response to a question in parliament as to whether Canada was a bicultural or multicultural country, Trudeau replied in early 1971 that

---

[854] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6365/Cab. Doc. 440/1970, Memorandum to the Cabinet - Citizenship Policy and Legislation, 7th April, 1970, 1.
[855] *Ibid.*, 9.
[856] *Ibid.*
[857] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6359, Citizenship policy and legislation, 7th May, 1970, 20-21.
[858] LAC, MG26-O13/Vol. 37/Prime Minister's Messages – 1970-1971, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister to Ukrainian Voice, 23rd May, 1970.

Canada was a multicultural country but also a bilingual one.[859] This would form the essence of the government's multicultural policy later in the year.

Concrete signs that the federal government was going to adopt an official policy of multiculturalism came in July 1971. In a Cabinet memorandum Pelletier, the Secretary of State for Canada acknowledged that every ethnic group had the right to preserve and develop their own culture and values within the Canadian context.[860] The memorandum proposed a policy of multiculturalism in response to Book IV of the report of the Bi-Bi commission. It accepted all the recommendations that were directed at the federal government and hoped that the provincial governments would follow suit with the suggestions aimed at them.[861] However, the most important part of the memorandum was that the Cabinet approve 'a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework ensuring equality of cultural expression to all citizens in our diverse society.'[862] This subsequently emerged as the foundation of the government's multicultural policy.

The memorandum also went beyond the recommendations of Book IV of the Bi-Bi commission report, "There is a clear need to expand the extent of knowledge of non-official language (N.O.L.) groups' cultural and linguistic retention beyond that provided in Book IV of the Royal Commission's Report."[863] It also underlined that Book IV had drawn attention to the fact that there was a lack of information on the

---

[859] Debates, *H of C*, vol. III, 1971, 2nd February, 1971, Mr. Alexander and Mr. Trudeau, 2983.
[860] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6394/Cab. Doc. 864/1971, Memorandum to Cabinet - Canada: The Multicultural Society - A Response to Book IV of the B & B Commission, 13th July, 1971, 7.
[861] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6394/Cab. Doc. 864/1971, Memorandum to Cabinet - Canada: The Multicultural Society - A Response to Book IV of the B & B Commission – Summary, 13th July, 1971.
[862] *Ibid.*
[863] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6394/Cab. Doc. 864/1971, Memorandum to Cabinet - Canada: The Multicultural Society - A Response to Book IV of the B & B Commission - Appendix F: Culture Development Programme, 13th July, 1971, 36.

majority of ethnic groups in Canada.[864] The contrast between the new multicultural policy and its predecessors was also highlighted: 'Canada consciously strives to foster ethnic diversity rather than homogeneity...Besides the two major ethnic groups there are several that have reached sizeable proportions.'[865] This last reference to striving for ethnic diversity over homogeneity encapsulates how much things had changed in terms of both national identity and migrant policy.

It took the Cabinet a few months before they made a decision on the memorandum and its recommendations, which was due to robust Cabinet debate taking place on the issue. Yet, when they did, it was in the form of a firm expression of support for the introduction of a multicultural policy.[866] However, it was not without qualifications. Several ministers emphasised that any multicultural policy 'should be set firmly within a Canadian context.'[867] Martin O'Connell, the Minister of State explained that this was the goal of the proposed policy, and he mentioned as an example, that certain ethnic groups had suggested that a separate ethnic museum be established, but the memorandum proposed instead that ethnic exhibits be a part of the National Museum of Man. The Minister of Justice, John Turner believed 'that the proposed policy would make a definite contribution to national unity...He thought that it would help to counteract the impression, particularly prevalent in the West, that the government had shown an excessive concern for the problems of other cultural groups in Canada.'[868] This was a reference to French-Canadians. Trudeau pointed out that the memorandum said that a large number of ethnic communities

---

[864] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6394/Cab. Doc. 864/1971, Memorandum to Cabinet - Canada: The Multicultural Society - A Response to Book IV of the B & B Commission - Appendix G: Ethnic Histories, 13th July, 1971, 42.
[865] LAC, RG2/Series B-2/Vol. 6394/Cab. Doc. 864/1971, Memorandum to Cabinet - Canada: The Multicultural Society - A Response to Book IV of the B & B Commission - Appendix H: Canadian Ethnic Studies, 13th July, 1971, 45.
[866] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6381, Canada - The Multicultural Society, a response to Book IV of the B & B Commission, 23rd September, 1971, 6.
[867] *Ibid.*, 4
[868] *Ibid.*

were displeased with the suggestions in Book IV of the Bi-Bi commission Report. He wondered how those ethnic communities would respond to the proposed multicultural policy.[869] In the following Cabinet discussion on the issue the point was made that:

> Many ethnic groups felt that there was an implicit bias in favour of biculturalism in Book IV of the B & B Commission, that the B & B Commission was really recommending a policy of cultural absorption of ethnic groups into either the English or French culture. The multiculturalism policy now being proposed would be seen by the ethnic groups as a definite advance on that proposed in Book IV. Undoubtedly, there would be some particularly militant ethnic leaders who would argue that the multiculturalism policy did not go far enough, but the majority of ethnic group members would find the policy acceptable.[870]

Some ministers were worried that the suggested plan to help with the teaching of third languages, for example, by the offering of teaching aid could precipitate ethnic communities to ask for their respective languages to be given official status. Several ministers also counselled 'against raising the expectations of ethnic groups about the amount of assistance which the federal government would be offering.'[871] In Trudeau's opinion, and the opinion of various other ministers, more importance should be put on self-help by ethnic communities. Trudeau also emphasised that 'the policy of multiculturalism should not give the impression that the government was committed to achieving economic equality for all ethnic groups, but rather that the government's hope was to achieve some degree of cultural equality.'[872] Thus, while announcing general support for a multicultural policy the government was very careful to place limitations on what it was actually willing to do in practical terms.

Trudeau announced his government's decision to introduce a multicultural policy in a well-known parliamentary speech on 8th October, 1971. He declared that the government had embraced all the suggestions of the Bi-Bi commission in

---

[869] LAC, RG2/Series A-5-a/Vol. 6381, Canada - The Multicultural Society, a response to Book IV of the B & B Commission, 23rd September, 1971, 4.
[870] *Ibid.*
[871] *Ibid.*, 5.
[872] *Ibid.*

Volume IV of its report aimed at federal agencies and departments. It was the perspective of the commission, also of the government and, he believed of all Canadians, that there could not be one cultural policy for Canadians of French and British origin, another for the native peoples and yet a third for all others. Trudeau also emphasised that though there were two official languages, there was no official culture, nor did any ethnic group take priority over any other. He believed that no citizen or group of citizens was anything other than Canadian, and all should be treated equally.[873] The most important part of Trudeau's speech was the following passage:

> A policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework commends itself to the government as the most suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of Canadians. Such a policy should help to break down discriminatory attitudes and cultural jealousies. National unity, if it is to mean anything in the deeply personal sense, must be founded on confidence in one's own individual identity; out of this can grow respect for that of others and a willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions. A vigorous policy of multiculturalism will help create this initial confidence. It can form the base of a society which is based on fair play for all.[874]

Here the emphasis was no longer on the nation, but instead on 'cultural freedom' and "one's own individual identity". And the choice of the word 'vigorous' to describe the proposed multicultural policy illustrated the extent of the government's commitment.

Trudeau also outlined the specifics of his government's multicultural policy:

> In implementing a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework, the government will provide support in four ways. First, resources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, and a clear need for assistance, the small and weak groups no less than the strong and highly organized. Second, the government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society. Third, the government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interest of national unity. Fourth, the government will continue to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society.[875]

---

[873] 'Announcement of implementation of policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework' by Prime Minister Trudeau, Debates, *H of C*, vol. VIII, 1971, 8th October, 1971, 8545.
[874] *Ibid.*
[875] *Ibid.*, 8546.

The Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State for Canada was given the role of putting these recommendations into practice. The section was at the time in charge of matters relating to the social integration of migrants and the cultural activities of all ethnic groups.[876]

The French-Canadian position on the new multicultural policy was generally quite critical. They perceived the policy as an attempt by the federal government to place their culture on the same level as one of many others. This they were strongly opposed to as they considered their culture to be the foundation of the nation. They were the true *Canadiens*. Trudeau's announcement of the introduction of an official policy of multiculturalism prompted an almost immediate response from the new French-Canadian leader of the Social Credit Party, David Caouette. He was heavily critical of Trudeau's suggestion that there was no official culture in Canada, 'If there is no official culture in Canada, I do not see how we could succeed in really becoming a nation while we would be endowed with only a few cultures unable to get on among themselves or at war with one another.'[877] This emphasis on language and culture being inseparable was a major point of difference between French-Canadians and Trudeau.

Ryan articulated the French-Canadian position in *Le Devoir* in late 1971. He argued that if it were only a question of allowing a scheme for assisting in the development of the cultural values held by approximately five million Canadian citizens who were not of British or French descent, the list of policies announced by Trudeau would be welcomed throughout the country. Ryan drew attention to the fact that Canadians whose origins were neither French nor British made up over 25 per

---

[876] 'Announcement of implementation of policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework' by Prime Minister Trudeau, Debates, *H of C*, vol. VIII, 1971, 8th October, 1971, 8546.
[877] Debates, *H of C*, vol. VIII, 1971, 8th October, 1971, Mr. Caouette, 8548.

cent of the population of the country.[878] However, his most important point was that 'barely one per cent of these immigrants are not familiar with at least one of the official languages – indicate[s] that in time these "New Canadians" not only adopt one of Canada's official languages, but also assimilate a growing part of the social and cultural values conveyed through each.'[879] This was a common French-Canadian argument and relates to the point above about the inseparability of language and culture.

Ryan acknowledged that the Bi-Bi commission in the fourth volume of its report suggested that the federal and provincial governments, in their specific areas of responsibilities, recognise the cultural contribution of the 'third group' to Canadian society. But French-Canadians could not agree with Trudeau's views that there was no official culture in Canada and that Canadians must accept a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework. This threw light on one of Trudeau's favourite ideas, but one which was not accepted by the commission. Ryan instead emphasised the renowned blue pages (blue referring to the Québécois) of the first volume of the report, in which the commission outlined unambiguously the crucial link between language and culture, and explained how this connection had given rise in Canada to not only two cultural communities, but also to two societies.[880] Ryan ended:

> In the fourth volume of its report, concerning the 'cultural contribution of the other ethnic groups', the Commission again took up the theme of the two cultures: 'In particular the immigrant should know that Canada recognizes two official languages and that it possesses two predominant cultures that have produced two societies – Francophone and Anglophone – which form two distinct communities within an overall Canadian context.'[881]

---

[878] LAC, MG32-C67/Vol. 87/File 3, Multiculturalism, English translation of an article appearing in *Le Devoir*, 9th October, 1971 – 'Does Aid to Ethnic Groups Mean the End of Biculturalism?' by Claude Ryan, 9th October, 1971, 1.
[879] *Ibid.*
[880] *Ibid.*, 1, 2.
[881] *Ibid.*, 2.

This illustrates that the federal government actually went beyond the recommendations of the Bi-Bi commission in the introduction of its multicultural policy.

Howard Palmer, a prominent academic and commentator who was employed by the Department of the Secretary of State for Canada as the Research Director of the Multicultural Programme from September 1971, however countered the major criticisms made by French-Canadians towards the new multicultural policy. He firstly pointed out that 'French-Canadians have been suspicious of the mosaic concept because it has appeared to them as a disguised version of an anglophone melting pot.'[882] That multiculturalism was a betrayal of the work of the Bi-Bi commission was also a charge made by some. It had also been suggested that the new policy would make it more difficult to advance the French culture across the country. That the policy placed French-Canadians on the same level as all 'other ethnic groups' and ignored their unique historical position in Canada was also another claim made by some French-Canadian nationalists. But Palmer argued that official bilingualism did not imply that Canada was made up of only two cultures. Part of the problem he believed resided in the name of the commission and the blue pages of the first volume in which a strong correlation was made between language and culture. Palmer raised the question of what impact the new policy would have on the integration of migrants into French-Canadian life in Quebec. The fact that the Anglophones who were most hostile to the aspirations of French-Canada were the very same people who expressed opposition to the multicultural policy (for example in the editorials in the *Calgary Herald*), should be highlighted he believed to the

[882] LAC, RG6-I/Acc. 1987-88-038/Box 59/File 328-2, Notes prepared by Howard Palmer on Multiculturalism and the French Canadians, 1.

critics of the multicultural policy in French-Canada.[883] Yet, Palmer kept his greatest counter argument until the end, 'Despite what was said in the blue pages of volume one (which was written before the study on the "other ethnic groups" had been completed) English speaking Canada clearly does not have "one way of being, thinking, and feeling"'.[884] This highlighted the important difference between English-speaking Canada and French-Canada in that the former was extremely diverse in terms of culture. Although many Canadians shared the same language (English) this did not necessarily mean that they belonged to the same culture.

However, in the actual event the government of Quebec declined to introduce an official multicultural policy within its jurisdiction. It instead decided to adopt an intercultural policy. This was basically the same, although it gave more attention to settlers speaking French and integrating themselves into the society of French-Canada. This was an illustration of the defensive psychology of French-Canadians trying to maintain their culture and language in a North American continent predominantly made up of Anglo-Saxon culture and English-speakers.

Canada replaced its integration policy towards migrants with a multicultural policy in the early 1970s. A policy of multiculturalism appeared to offer a way to counter growing French-Canadian separatism as well as appeal to other ethnic groups. The multicultural policy came about due to the rise of a philosophy of multiculturalism which replaced the 'new nationalism' as the basis of Canadian national identity. The latter did not have much substance. A multicultural philosophy won over biculturalism due to opposition from Canadians of British descent as well ethnic groups of non-British and non-French origin who saw biculturalism as

[883] LAC, RG6-I/Acc. 1987-88-038/Box 59/File 328-2, Notes prepared by Howard Palmer on Multiculturalism and the French Canadians, 1, 2, 3, 4.
[884] *Ibid.*, 4.

downgrading them to second class citizens. At the same time Canada adopted a post-White Canada immigration policy in light of the complete abandonment of the policy in the late 1960s. A good example of the new direction in policy was the arrival of refugees from South America, Africa and Asia. The thesis will now turn to exploring the emergence of a multicultural policy in Australia.

Chapter Eight – The introduction of a multicultural policy in Australia, 1972-1978

Australia adopted a multicultural policy in the late 1970s to replace integration as the basis of its approach to migrants. Like Canada an official policy of multiculturalism arose out of a multicultural philosophy, there was a difference between the two. Also similarly to Canada a philosophy of multiculturalism took the place of the 'new nationalism' as the foundation of Australian national identity. Moreover, a post-White Australia immigration policy was introduced in the late 1970s after the White Australia policy was completely abandoned earlier in the decade.

The 'new nationalism' and a non-discriminatory immigration policy

> If you want to put a label on it, the New Nationalism does as well as any. Call it that, or a greater spirit of national identity, or an increased sense of Australian purpose, or whatever, but the chances are that unless you're a 67-year old mining magnate who's a member of the League of Empire Loyalists you're aware of a certain rare feeling of national self-respect these days.[885]

The above quote from *The Australian* in April 1973 attempted to capture the essence of what the 'new nationalism' meant during the early 1970s. However, it has to be acknowledged that it never had a clear meaning. It was an attempt by Australian governments to deal with the demise of Britishness as the core of their national identity by constructing a local nationalism. The 'new nationalism' was primarily a reaction to external events, namely the UK's decision to apply for membership in the EEC and its withdrawal from the East of Suez. It attempted to fill the void left by the collapse of British race patriotism. The 'new nationalism' began under Prime Ministers Holt and Gorton and continued under Gough Whitlam.

Whitlam defined the 'new nationalism' in a famous speech he gave on the anniversary of the Eureka rebellion in Ballarat at the end of 1973:

---

[885] 'The New Nationalism: How far are we going?', *The Australian*, Monday, 9th April, 1973, 9.

> It means the greatest possible measure of Australian control over our industries and resources. It means an independent foreign policy – not one without allies, but one without obsessions, without distortions, without subjection to the ideologies or follies of other powers. It means the creation of a robust and thriving economy by which the talents and skills of all Australians can be fulfilled. It means strengthening and developing Australian industries, including rural industries, to make them more resilient and competitive in a changing world.[886]

Whitlam emphasised the economic and foreign policy aspects of the 'new nationalism' in this speech. However, he also attempted to reassure people that he did not intend to abandon Australia's past traditions or long-standing allies, 'Rather than discard our authentic traditions, we want to restore and invigorate them...Rather than break off old friendships, we want to form new ones – friendships that will enhance our name and reputation in the world as a good friend, a concerned and helpful partner in our region and beyond.'[887] Moreover, Whitlam reassured everyone that there was nothing chauvinistic about the 'new nationalism'. It was not an old-style nationalism which had been so heavily discredited by fascism in the Second World War. He went even further and emphasised the need of every country for a certain type of nationalism, one which was 'benign and constructive'.[888] Whitlam recognised the need for Australia to have a new sense of national community in the wake of the demise of Britishness, but also realised that a traditional nationalism would not be possible.

The 'new nationalism', though frustratingly elusive, nevertheless had important consequences for the idea of Australian 'community'. Al Grassby, the Minister for Immigration added to this definition in his address to the Family of the Nation Rally in Sydney in mid-1974, 'The people of a nation, like the members of a family, should have a shared history, common ideals, a mutual knowledge of the history of our country and all its people, an active concern and interest in the present

---

[886] NAA, M163 (M163T1)/19A, Speech by the Prime Minister, Mr. E.G. Whitlam, at the unveiling of the Eureka Flag, Ballarat Fine Art Gallery, Ballarat, 3rd December, 1973, 4.
[887] *Ibid.*, 3.
[888] *Ibid.*, 4, 6.

and common objectives for the future.'[889] Therefore, Grassby also acknowledged that the Australian people needed something to bind them together as a national community.

A series of articles in *The Australian* in April 1973 explored the main features of the 'new nationalism'. These were economic nationalism, a more assertive foreign policy and cultural nationalism. Economic nationalism was summed up by a commonly used phrase at the time, 'Buying back the farm', which involved greater Australian control over key national industries and resources. The loosening of links with the UK and US was not regarded as necessarily damaging Australia's economic interests. Instead a new economic nationalism saw Australia establish new markets closer to its region in Asia.[890] Curran maintains that 'It was clear that the constant emphasis on "independence" in the Whitlam program could be diminished or impaired if Australian natural resources were controlled by foreign companies.'[891] In addition, the Whitlam government called for a greater part for Australians in the upper echelons of management in US-owned companies in Australia.

However, the most well-known feature of the 'new nationalism' was a more independent Australian voice in foreign affairs. *The Australian* summarised the main elements of this as follows:

> Gough Whitlam's overtures to China, North Vietnam and East Germany; his handling of racially selected sports teams; his anxiety to hand Papua New Guinea over to Michael Somare; his support of the idea of a neutralised zone in South East Asia; his backing of United Nations resolutions against white supremacist South Africa and Rhodesia; and his abolition of the White Australia policy.[892]

---

[889] A. J. Grassby, *Credo for a nation: An address by the Minister for Immigration the Hon. A. J. Grassby, M.H.R., to the Family of the Nation Rally, at the Sydney Opera House, Sunday, 9th June, 1974* (Canberra, ACT: AGPS, 1974) 14.
[890] 'The New Nationalism: Buying back the farm', *The Australian*, Tuesday, 10th April, 1973, 9.
[891] Quote taken from James Curran, *The Power of Speech: Australian Prime Ministers defining the national image* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2006) 116.
[892] 'The New Nationalism: Making a bolder place on the map', *The Australian*, Wednesday, 11th April, 1973, 8.

Thus, all of the above represented a new assertiveness in Australian foreign policy. The primary goal of Australian foreign policy was now to build better relations with its Asian neighbours. During a visit to South-East Asia in early 1974 Whitlam stated that the 'new nationalism' in Australia meant that it should become more independent and assertive. Traditionally and historically he believed Australia had been quite ignorant of and felt threatened by its Asian neighbours, but, this was changing. Whitlam argued that Australia now saw itself as a part of Asia.[893] This new emphasis on Australia as part of Asia would be the main theme of foreign policy rhetoric over the following few decades. But the government's new assertive foreign policy was heavily criticised by the opposition with Andrew Peacock, the Shadow Minister for Foreign Affairs asserting that:

> Australian foreign policy should serve this country's national interest, but the Government's new nationalism in foreign policy is not in Australia's interest. It is not new nationalism but old-style aggressive nationalism, a petulant self-assertiveness that has already harmed relations with the United States, the United Kingdom, Singapore, the South Pacific countries and Japan.[894]

Peacock, however, stressed no alternative, and certainly no reversion to reliance on 'great and powerful' friends. The cultural aspect of the 'new nationalism' was the emphasis on home-grown Australian arts and media. According to *The Australian* the 'larrikin nationalist [was]...in the ascendancy after a 20-year rule by the Anglophiles led by Sir Robert Menzies.'[895] Whitlam personally as the self-proclaimed 'man of the arts' was heralded as the benefactor of an Australian cultural revival.[896] Curran argues that, 'When Whitlam made room for the "new nationalism" to mean "the protection of Aboriginal culture and traditions as the original and most authentic expression of an Australian identity", it contributed to a growing tendency among some Australian historians and intellectuals, once the old British-centred idea of

---

[893] 'The Prime Minister's Visit to South-East Asia' in *AFAR*, vol. 45, no. 2, February 1974, 85, 87.
[894] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1973, vol. 87, 20th November 1973, Mr. Peacock, 3497.
[895] 'The New Nationalism: Larrikins in the ascendant', *The Australian*, Thursday, 12th April, 1973, 8.
[896] Curran, *The Power of Speech* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2006) 117.

White Australia no longer carried the same ideological force, to incorporate the Aboriginal people as emblematic of Australia's distinctiveness as a nation.'[897]

The adoption of *Advance Australia Fair* as the new national anthem during the Whitlam government is an excellent example of the 'new nationalism' in practice. In his first Australia Day broadcast as Prime Minister in 1973, Whitlam took as his major theme the introduction of a new national anthem. This had been an election commitment of the Labor Party. Whitlam firstly outlined the reasons why his government felt that a new anthem should be introduced, 'We feel it is essential that Australians have an anthem that fittingly embodies our national aspirations and reflects our status as an independent nation.'[898] Therefore, a new national anthem would be an important symbol of Australia's new identity. Whitlam then went on to propose a public competition to come up with music and words for a new national anthem.[899] Unfortunately the judging panel could not decide on any successful entries amongst the thousands that they received.[900]

In his second Australia Day speech in 1974 Whitlam announced that a wide-ranging public survey would be undertaken instead to establish the popular choice for a new national anthem. He again highlighted the importance of a new anthem, 'Such an anthem is needed, not so much to <u>create</u> a sense of national pride and purpose, but to give expression to it; not to <u>foster</u> a sense of identity and national consciousness, but reflect it.'[901] Again, Whitlam was careful to reassure the

---

[897] Quote taken from Curran, *The Power of Speech* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2006) 121.
[898] NAA, M163 (M163T1)/8, 'National Anthem' - Australia Day Broadcast by the Prime Minister, 26th January, 1973, 1.
[899] *Ibid.*, 2.
[900] Ward, 'The "New Nationalism" in Australia, Canada and New Zealand', 249.
[901] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/20, Speech notes for the Prime Minister for Australia Day celebrations, Regatta Point, Canberra, 26th January, 1974, 1.

Australian people that he did not envisage a great Australia in any chauvinistic or bombastic way.[902]

In April 1974 Whitlam announced that the Australian people had chosen *Advance Australia Fair* as the new national anthem. Therefore, it would be played during the official Anzac Day ceremony in Canberra that month. He had also instructed that from then onwards *Advance Australia Fair* be played on all appropriate occasions. However, he did emphasise that the recent survey only related to the music of *Advance Australia Fair*, not the words. In addition, Whitlam pointed out that 'on occasions when the Queen was present, or when it was especially important to acknowledge our links with the Queen as Queen of Australia and Head of the Commonwealth, "God Save The Queen" would be played as well as the national anthem.'[903] This was an attempt to incorporate the British heritage into a new sense of Australian national identity.

The passage of the Australian Citizenship Act of 1973 during the Whitlam government was another prime illustration of the 'new nationalism'. A Cabinet submission on the subject was put forward by Grassby in early 1973. His main suggestion was that 'all the conditions and procedures to be met by people seeking to become Australian citizens should be exactly the same – whether the applicants are British or not and whether European or non-European by descent.'[904] He specifically proposed the abolition of the existing provisions of the Act regarding 'registration', 'naturalisation' and 'notification'. Furthermore, he argued that the residency period for all applicants be set at three-years. Moreover, they should be

---

[902] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/20, Speech notes for the Prime Minister for Australia Day celebrations, Regatta Point, Canberra, 26th January, 1974, 2.
[903] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/23A, Press Statement No. 229, 18th April, 1974 – 'Australia's National Anthem'.
[904] NAA, A5915 (A5915/1)/102, Cabinet Submission No. 102 - Grant of Australian Citizenship by A. J. Grassby, Minister for Immigration includes Appendices, February 1973, 1.

able to understand and speak English and accept the privileges and responsibilities of Australian citizenship.[905] In addition, Grassby proposed a new oath of allegiance that removed all direct references to the Queen and which stressed loyalty to Australia and its constitution, 'I.... swear by Almighty God that I will faithfully uphold the Constitution of Australia and I will faithfully observe the laws of Australia and fulfil my duties as an Australian citizen.'[906] These were all important changes; the effect of which was to break down the distinctions between migrants in terms of naturalisation and place a new emphasis on Australia and the constitution for pledging allegiance. The Cabinet approved all of Grassby's recommendations.[907]

Grassby maintained in a parliamentary speech in April 1973 that a further aim of the Citizenship Bill was to end the misunderstanding amongst a large number of Australians that they were not only citizens of Australia, but also UK citizens.[908] This was a common misconception held by many Australians.

However, the passage of the Citizenship legislation did not occur without notable opposition being expressed by the Liberal and Country parties. Lynch, now the deputy leader of the opposition pointed out in a parliamentary speech in May 1973 that although the source countries of the immigration programme had been broadened, British migration continued to be its foundation. This was to be expected as it was clear that settlers from overseas would wish to migrate to a nation that possessed a shared language, history, institutions and traditions. They would hence tend to integrate better. But Lynch did nevertheless acknowledge that recent

---

[905] NAA, A5915 (A5915/1)/102, Cabinet Submission No. 102 - Grant of Australian Citizenship by A. J. Grassby, Minister for Immigration includes Appendices, February 1973, 2-3.
[906] *Ibid.*, 4.
NAA, A5915 (A5915/1)/102, Cabinet Submission No. 102 - Grant of Australian Citizenship by A. J. Grassby, Minister for Immigration includes Appendices, February 1973, Appendix "B".
[907] NAA, A5931 (A5931/1)/CL147 – Cabinet Minute - Decision No. 183 - Submission No. 102 - Grant of Australian Citizenship, 13th February, 1973, 1-2.
[908] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1973, vol. 83, 11th April, 1973, Mr. Grassby, 1313.

decades had witnessed the loosening of links between Australia and the UK. Yet, this did not largely change the British inheritance of Australia in his opinion. Consequently, he asserted that British migrants should receive preferential treatment above all others. Lynch did not consider this prejudice but an expression of the fact that British settlers integrated the best.[909] He articulated these views in specific suggestions:

> The present period of residence for citizenship [for British subjects] should remain at 12 months...We have the right to assume that because of their British nationality British subjects already are loyal subjects in the terms of the existing legislation and, therefore, swearing a separate oath on arrival in Australia is superfluous.[910]

This demonstrates that remnants of Britishness still lingered in Australia, even into the early 1970s.

The difficulty of incorporating the British heritage into the 'new nationalism' and the lingering of Britishness was illustrated by Whitlam himself in his Mansion House speech in London, UK at the close of 1974:

> Some people – more in Australia than in Britain – have regarded Australia's foreign policies in recent years as some sort of affront to Britain: an insult to the mother country. Let me be personal for a moment. I don't suppose there is anyone in Australia, certainly no one else who is still...in public life, who has a greater love for Britain than I do.[911]

In addition, Whitlam attempted to reassure his audience that the 'new nationalism' was in no way anti-British, 'What Australia is trying to do is establish an independent identity in the world and especially in our own region...We have grown up...Our actions are in no way anti-British...They are simply pro-Australian.'[912] According to Curran, 'The Whitlam era is of crucial significance in understanding Australia's changing attitude to nationalism...As Australians faced up to the British abandonment of its Empire, looked more towards Asia and gradually shed the idea

---

[909] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1973, vol. 83, 9th May, 1973, Mr. Lynch, 1900.
[910] *Ibid.*, 1901.
[911] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/31, Speech by the Prime Minister of Australia, E.G. Whitlam, at the Mansion House, London, Thursday, 19th December, 1974, 2.
[912] *Ibid.*, 6.

of being a homogeneous nation, they began to identify positively with the country's ethnic diversity.'[913]

The 'new nationalism' is a very difficult concept to pin down. Some of its fiercest supporters at the time even struggled to define what it actually was. However, there were some things that we can definitely be sure of. The 'new nationalism' recognised that Australian national identity could not incorporate anything that smacked of old style nationalism, such as the Bush Legend, as Australia now found itself in a post nationalist world. But what to focus on instead was a difficulty Australian governments from Holt down to Whitlam struggled with. All of the governments to varying degrees attempted to create a distinctive, local Australian identity. However, there was no substance to this compared to the previous monolithic period of Britishness. So, multiculturalism as a philosophy began to appeal as a possible new source of identity as it appeared to reconcile unity with diversity.

From the mid 1960s – even earlier – (as Matthew Jordan has shown), the White Australia policy was also officially abandoned. Though the vast substance of the policy had already been removed before the Whitlam government came to power, it did put the last nail in the coffin by introducing a completely non-discriminatory immigration policy. This was a major shift in the position of the Labor Party as due to Australia's economic and social history it had been the foremost defender of the White Australia policy and therefore was most reluctant to abandon support for it.[914] However, this changed when Whitlam became leader of the party in 1967. The momentum for change was strengthened by the election of South Australian Labor Premier Don Dunstan, who was also a firm advocate of the

[913] Quote taken from Curran, *The Power of Speech* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2006) 78.
[914] 'The Prime Minister's Visit to South-East Asia', 84.

abandonment of the policy that same year. According to Tavan, 'The measures taken to dismantle the final remnants of the White Australia policy had both practical and symbolic aspects, seeking to remove the stain of racial discrimination from Australia's immigration policies and provide equality of treatment to all migrants...For the first time, non-Europeans were promised access to assisted passage services.'[915]

The Whitlam government also made family reunion a major concern in the immigration programme, a measure that was anticipated to boost non-European figures by enabling people already established in Australia to sponsor family members. It broadened rules relating to overseas students who desired to continue living in Australia after completing their education and offered assisted passages for Vietnamese orphaned children.[916]

The government introduced a Bill in 1974 aimed at ending all racial discrimination and to ratify the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, to which Australia had been a signatory from 1966 but had not ratified. The Bill was finally passed in both houses of parliament on 4th June 1975 after several amendments and became the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*.[917]

The key role of Grassby as the Minister for Immigration in the last stage of the dismantling of White Australia must also be emphasised. He had a strong commitment to removing the final remnants of racial prejudice from Australian government policies.[918] When asked about the White Australia policy by Asian journalists in early 1974 he famously responded with, 'It is dead – give me a shovel

---

[915] Quote taken from Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 199.
[916] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 199.
[917] *Ibid.*, 199-200.
[918] *Ibid.*, 203.

and I will bury it.'[919] But in terms of practicalities, there is consensus amongst the majority of scholars that the reforms did not result in any sudden, large increase in non-European migration. The reforms did not also result in any real change in the kind of Asian migrants arriving in Australia after 1972. These continued to be skilled and professional people and those joining their families already settled in Australia.[920]

There was undoubtedly majority popular support for the end of White Australia. The Whitlam government's win at the 1974 election, regardless of the loss of Grassby's federal seat and a smaller plurality in parliament, demonstrated real public backing of its general political plan, including the changes introduced to immigration policy.[921] Tavan maintains that 'Ultimately, the legitimacy of the Whitlam reforms must be understood in terms of the broad historical context within which they occurred...While some people interpreted Whitlam's pledge to abandon the White Australia policy as radical, the reality is that it represented a pragmatic response to changing international and domestic circumstances that made it almost impossible to sustain a racially discriminatory immigration policy.'[922]

Towards the end of his term in power Whitlam had to face the issue of Indo-Chinese refugees. Despite a large proportion of informed opinion on the issue believing it was Australia's moral obligation to admit these refugees due to its involvement in the Vietnam War, Whitlam was very reluctant to do this. This was because the memory of the post-Second World War East European Baltic refugees was still fresh in his mind. They had fled communism and so they became disproportionately strong supporters of the Liberal-Country coalition. Whitlam was

---

[919] Cited in 'The Prime Minister's Visit to South-East Asia', 84.
[920] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 205-6.
[921] *Ibid*, 210.
[922] Quote taken from Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 210.

afraid the same would happen with the Vietnamese refugees fleeing the communist Vietcong.[923] Nevertheless, Whitlam did announce in mid-1975 that about two hundred Vietnamese refugees would be admitted to Australia from Hong Kong.[924] However, this was insignificant compared to the large numbers that were allowed into the country by the successive Fraser government. But Whitlam did still emphasise the importance of accepting any Vietnamese refugees the following month, 'This is the first time that Australia – without regard to racial origins – has offered resettlement opportunities to people displaced in Asia who had no identifiable connection with this country.'[925]

The opposition criticised the government for proscribing the right of domestic political activity of Vietnamese refugees in August 1975. This relates to the point above about Whitlam being concerned about the anti-communist leanings of the refugees. Nonetheless, Whitlam responded to the criticism by arguing that only 'nine of the nearly 1000 Vietnamese who have so far come to Australia had been asked to provide an undertaking that they would eschew political activity.'[926]

Multiculturalism and a post-White Australia immigration policy

The Whitlam government was replaced by a Liberal-Country coalition government headed by Malcolm Fraser in December 1975. Multiculturalism as an idea of national identity was accepted by the successive Fraser governments. As Ken Inglis notes:

---

[923] Nancy Viviani, *Australian government policy on the entry of Vietnamese refugees in 1975,* Research Paper No. 1. (Nathan, Qld.: Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations, Griffith University, 1980) 4.
Paul Kelly, 'John Malcolm Fraser' in Michelle Grattan (ed.), *Australian Prime Ministers*, Revised edn. (Sydney, NSW: New Holland, 2008) 369.
[924] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/37, Prime Minister Press Statement No. 517, 19th June, 1975 – 'Vietnamese Refugees'.
[925] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/38, Prime Minister Press Statement No. 534, 23rd July, 1975 – 'Vietnamese Refugees', 2.
[926] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/39, Prime Minister Press Statement No. 546, 21st August, 1975 – 'Political Activity by Vietnamese Refugees', 1.

> Imported from Canada, where in turn it had been invented as a tactic in a contest which had no parallel in Australia, proclaimed in Canberra before it had any general usage, the word not surprisingly accommodated a variety of meanings, which might or might not be brought into conflict according to the state of the economy, the level and texture of immigration, the strategy of political parties, and more accidental considerations.[927]

Prime Minister Fraser's address at the Australia Day Fair in Adelaide at the beginning of 1977 was the first major example of explicit official government support for a philosophy of multiculturalism:

> The Fair demonstrates that Australia is a multicultural community and has benefitted immensely from the mixture of cultures...Ethnic cultures have added a new dimension of diversity and richness to the traditions of those other migrants, the English, Scots and Irish. What is emerging from this is a distinctive Australian culture which is derived from the best all cultures can offer. Fortunately, the days of Anglo-Saxon conformity are over, and I believe that we are all better off as a nation and as individuals because of this. One can love Australia and participate effectively in Australian life, as is obvious today, while retaining an affection and preserving the heritage of one's culture and origin.[928]

Although on the surface Fraser's address appears to be very similar to Whitlam's at Eureka there are some important differences. Firstly, the description of English, Scots and Irish as 'those other migrants' should be emphasised. They are reminiscent of Menzies and Snedden's remarks of a similar nature in the previous decade. Secondly and more importantly, Fraser's words on the end of 'Anglo-Saxon conformity' give the impression that he was relieved at the development.

At the inaugural meeting of the AEAC[929] in Canberra in early 1977, Jerzy 'George' Zubrzycki[930], who was chairman maintained that the establishment of the Council was a major step in the adoption of a philosophy of multiculturalism in Australia, 'This is a most important and historic occasion and I am sure that all of you present here consider today to be a milestone in the development of Australia and

---

[927] 'Review of C.A. Price ed., *Australian National Identity* (1988), pp.13-31' in Ken S. Inglis, *Observing Australia: 1959 to 1999*, Edited and Introduced by Craig Wilcox (Carlton South, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1999) 203.

[928] Malcolm Fraser, Australia Day Fair Speech, Adelaide, 31st January, 1977, in *AFAR*, vol. 48, no. 2, February 1977, 105.

[929] This was an advisory body established to provide specialist guidance to the government regarding policy towards migrants. It was set up in January 1977, and had a membership of two-dozen individuals who had strong links with many different ethnic groups.

[930] The late Prof. Jerzy 'George' Zubrzycki was an academic at the ANU and one of the central figures behind the adoption of multiculturalism.

tangible proof of what the Queen in her speech to the Australian Parliament described as the multi-cultural society of Australia.'[931] It added weight to Fraser's earlier statement that Australia now saw itself as a multicultural society. Michael MacKellar, the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs also addressed the council on their first meeting and added that 'Our meeting today marks a further step in the Government's concerted effort, together with the ethnic communities, to implement its declared policy aimed at the preservation and development of a culturally diversified but socially cohesive Australian society free of racial tensions and offering security, well-being and equality of opportunity to all those living here.'[932] So, despite support for cultural diversity, the need for national cohesion was also mentioned. This highlights the slow and gradual nature of change when it came to national identity.

The report by the council in August 1977 entitled *Australia as a Multicultural Society* went on to elaborate on the meaning of multiculturalism in Australia:

> The crux of our argument is that Australia is already a society of multiple cultural identities, or a multicultural society, and that equality can best be promoted (perhaps can *only* be promoted) through policies that harness it to cultural identity. Both are means and both are ends: equality depends on and strengthens multiculturalism...What we believe Australia should be working towards is not a oneness, but a unity, not a similarity, but a composite, not a melting pot but a voluntary bond of dissimilar people sharing a common political and institutional structure.[933]

The references to 'unity over oneness' and 'a composite over a similarity' illustrate how multiculturalism was beginning to replace the 'new nationalism' as the identity of Australia, as the latter had stressed national cohesion and the creation of a distinctive local identity.

---

[931] NLA, MS 6690/Series 13/Box 43/Series 23, Attachment B (Agenda Item No. 1) - Speech to the inaugural meeting of the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council by Chairman, Professor Jerzy Zubrzycki, Canberra, 23rd March, 1977, 1.

[932] NLA, MS 6690/Series 13/Box 43/Series 13, Attachment A (Agenda Item No. 1) - Minister's speech to the inaugural meeting of the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council, in Canberra, 23rd March, 1977, 1.

[933] Australia. AEAC, *Australia as a Multicultural Society* (Chairman J. Zubrzycki), Submission to the Australian Population and Immigration Council on the Green Paper, Immigration Policies and Australia's Population (Canberra, ACT: AGPS, August 1977) 4, 17.

Zubrzycki articulated his thoughts on multiculturalism in an article entitled 'Towards a Multicultural Society in Australia' during 1977, 'On occasions such as this we must concern ourselves with the larger issue about what we are as a nation, in short, what is being an Australian about...I look forward to the day when history books will tell us that Australia became freely accepted by the nations of Asia as one of us; that Australia became a multi-racial society.'[934] Securing acknowledgement from the region was a key component of this new emphasis on diversity.

Between the mid and late-1970s Australia actually began to receive large levels of Asian migration for the very first time since it adopted a non-discriminatory immigration policy during the Whitlam government. This was primarily due to Fraser's decision to allow a large number of Vietnamese refugees into the country. The arrival of the first Vietnamese 'boat people' on the Australian mainland in April 1976 was barely remarked upon; however popular anxiety began to build as the level of such arrivals increased.[935]

The Fraser government's response to the crisis was markedly different from that of the Whitlam government.[936] Fraser agreed to resettle the Vietnamese refugees that had arrived to Australia in the country and offer them assistance to support themselves. Of more importance though was his decision to actively accept more refugees from the actual camps in the countries neighbouring Vietnam, so as to remove the reason for people to attempt to arrive in Australia illegally by boat. This was not something Whitlam was inclined to do due to the reasons specified earlier. However, at the same time the Fraser government also provided financial assistance

---

[934] NLA, MS 6690/Series 19/Box 80/36, 'Towards a Multicultural Society in Australia' by Jerzy Zubrzycki, 1977, 9, 15.
[935] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 214.
[936] Nancy Viviani and Joana Lawe-Davies, *Australian government policy on the entry of Vietnamese refugees: 1976 to 1978*, Research Paper No. 2. (Nathan, Qld.: Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations, Griffith University, 1980) 1.

to Vietnam's neighbours to accept larger numbers of refugees themselves and lobbied the international community to do more as well.[937] Fraser did all of the above because he strongly believed that Australia had a moral obligation to accept Vietnamese refugees in light of Australia's involvement in the war. Paul Kelly actually argues that Fraser's actions regarding the Vietnamese refugees signal the true end of White Australia:[938] a claim that is difficult to dispute.

In July 1978 MacKellar announced that he would be discussing with regional governments methods of continuing the systematic management of refugees and of securing increased assistance from the international community to respond to the rising difficulty of Vietnamese refugees, 'It is a problem for the world – not for one region and certainly not for one country...Australia is already accepting its share of the burden and expects that other countries will play their part.'[939] Australia's ability to accept refugees was not unrestricted. Instead the continued acceptance of large numbers of refugees was linked to the broad spectrum of Australian community concerns.[940] Thus, MacKellar was acknowledging here that the government was not completely indifferent to the Australian public's reaction to the admittance of Vietnamese refugees.

In late 1978 MacKellar announced his pleasure at the announcement of the Labor opposition officially supporting the government's policy towards Vietnamese refugees. However, he was still quick to point out the contrast in the position his government had taken compared to its predecessor 'This Government, in marked contrast to its Labor predecessor, has a record of humanitarian and responsible

---

[937] NAA, A12909/1916, Cabinet Submission No. 1916 – Indo-Chinese Refugees, February 1978, 3-12.
[938] Kelly, 'John Malcolm Fraser', 369.
[939] NAA, M1277 (M1277/1)/102, For the Ethnic Media, 7th July, 1978.
[940] *Ibid.*

action in resettling refugees which is well-known to the international community.'[941] So, there was now political consensus regarding the acceptance of Vietnamese refugees.

In a telephone interview on ABC Radio's 'A.M.' broadcast towards the end of 1978 MacKellar again drew a direct contrast between the actions of his government and that of the previous Labor one towards Vietnamese refugees. This was in response to a question about whether due to Australia's involvement in the Vietnam War it had a moral obligation to accept large numbers of refugees:

> The situation which confronted us when we came to power in 1975 was a pretty horrific one, Australia's reputation at that stage was very bad because the previous Labor administration had taken an extremely hard line towards Indo Chinese refugees, but when we came to power in 1975 one of the first things we did, one of the first things I did as minister, was to reorganise the Australian approach towards Indo Chinese refugees and in fact they started coming here in quite some numbers in February 1976. So since this government has been in power we have demonstrated a concern towards the refugees.[942]

Therefore, the government certainly took advantage of any opportunity to secure as much political capital as it could out of its support for the Vietnamese refugees.

Tavan asserts that 'Looking back, Malcolm Fraser agrees that the decision represented a significant development in Australia's immigration history, one which fundamentally changed Australia's ethnic composition...As such, it had the potential to incur a major electoral backlash, but Fraser believes the ethical dimensions of the situation made any other choice impossible.'[943]

Fraser gave little time to suggestions that the decision was made through any extensive debate in the Cabinet over the way in which the Australian people could respond, or what it might be necessary to do to deal with negative popular opinion, emphasising that these were all secondary concerns to the more pressing problem

---

[941] NAA, M1277 (M1277/1)/175, Press Release from the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, M.J.R. MacKellar, 12th October, 1978.
[942] NAA, M1277 (M1277/1)/175, Refugee Crisis in Asia - Transcript from A.M. Broadcast, 27th November, 1978, 2.
[943] Quote taken from Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 215.

of the way in which to cope with the refugee crisis. In this way, he articulated what had for some time been a characteristic of governmental practice, including the construction and administration of immigration policy, the ability to act separately from popular opinion if issues of national or international importance had been seen to require it.[944]

The growth in Asian migration during the Fraser years also expressed a more general shift in immigration policy. The new Prime Minister was a nation-builder who felt that mass migration was the prerequisite to economic growth. Immigration change is widely considered one of the most prominent legacies of the Fraser government.[945]

Immigration and Integration Policy during the 1970s

According to Jupp, 'The formal ending of White Australia by 1973 did not immediately change the pattern of migration to Australia...The final abolition of the White Australia Policy was masked in its effects by the drastic reduction of the total migrant intake in the last year of the Whitlam government.'[946] This had the future impact of all but completely closing migration from mainland Europe, a pattern strengthened by the abandoning of the US national quota system in 1965. With the exception of Portuguese and Yugoslavs the numbers of Southern European-born migrants peaked in 1971 and then started to decrease and age. It became less easy to migrate to Australia and it was more straightforward to move to the US and this development was not temporary.[947]

---

[944] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 215.
[945] *Ibid.*, 216, 217.
[946] Quote taken from James Jupp, 'Changes in Immigration Patterns since 1972' in Jupp (ed.), *The Australian People*, 75.
[947] Jupp, 'Changes in Immigration Patterns since 1972', 75.

Integration policy continued to be the mainstay of the government's approach to migrants during the early to mid-1970s. However, it developed in quite different ways to the previous period of integration under the coalition governments of Holt, Gorton and McMahon.

A common feature of the rhetoric surrounding integration policy during the Whitlam period was 'The family of the nation'. This was a phrase coined by Grassby, which has been taken by some scholars as evidence of a policy of multiculturalism during the Whitlam government. But a 'family' implies all being linked in one close group, which is much closer to integration than multicultural policy. In his remarks on the report into the departure of settlers from Australia by the Immigration Advisory Council, Grassby, in a parliamentary speech in early 1973 stated that the committee had recommended that there should be 'a positive and continuing campaign to inculcate in the present and future generations, a feeling of national pride in the achievements of Australians of many national origins in all fields of human endeavour.'[948] Grassby went on to say that the government supported this recommendation fully and believed that only by the acceptance of all migrants into the family of the nation, as equal citizens in every way, could this goal be achieved.[949] It was testament to the belief that the treatment of all migrants on an equal basis would lead to a greater sense of national community.

Grassby made another reference to his 'family of the nation' a few months later, 'We have agreed that every migrant coming to this country should be assured that there is a place for him and, for our part, that every new settler should be a worthy addition to Australia's "family of the nation"'.[950] This was reiterated again in

---

[948] Cited in CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1973, vol. 82, 14th March, 1973, Mr. Grassby, 547.
[949] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1973, vol. 82, 14th March, 1973, Mr. Grassby, 547.
[950] NAA, A446 (A446/167)/1970/75453, News release from the Minister for Immigration, A. J. Grassby, Canberra, A.C.T., 11th May, 1973, 1.

July 1973, 'The position at the present time is that there is an urgent need for a new national effort to build unity in our community to assist in the integration of newcomers and to build a united family of the nation through citizenship.'[951] It showed that the government was still very much concerned with national cohesion in this period.

A symbol of the changing integration policy towards migrants was Grassby's proposals to the Cabinet a few months earlier to abolish the annual notification by migrants of any change in their address, occupation or marital status. However, the main reason he gave for the change was the high level of non-compliance that existed towards the current regulations. Therefore, Grassby did not see any point in continuing it.[952] The Cabinet approved Grassby's recommendation later that same month.[953] The loosening of controls on migrants illustrates that the government was not as concerned as it had previously been about monitoring new settlers.

Some important reforms also took place in foreign language broadcasting during the Whitlam government. The Department of Immigration made various representations to the Australian Broadcasting Control Board to end the restrictions on the use of foreign languages in radio and television broadcasts. A memorandum to the Board in late 1973 suggested the ending of the restriction for the following reasons:

> Multi-lingual programmes assist the early settlement of newcomers by providing a cultural bridge between their birthplaces and Australia; they assist the integration into the community of settlers with limited English by providing opportunities to communicate important aspects of

---

[951] NAA, A463 (A463/43)/1973/1967, News release from the Minister for Immigration, A. J. Grassby, Department of Immigration, Canberra, July, 1973, 1.
[952] NAA, A5915 (A5915/1)/327, Cabinet Submission No. 327 - Aliens Act 1947-1966: An Amendment to Eliminate the Annual Notification of Address, Occupation and Marital Status by Aliens Required to Register under the Aliens Act by A. J. Grassby, Minister of State for Immigration, May 1973, 1, 3, 4.
[953] NAA, A5915 (A5915/1)/327, Cabinet Minute, 28th May, 1973 - Decision No. 718 - Submission No. 327 - Aliens Act 1947-1966: An Amendment To Eliminate The Annual Notification Of Address, Occupation And Marital Status By Aliens Required to Register Under The Aliens Act.

> life in Australia in their own languages; multi-lingual programmes help make the community aware of the cultural and social backgrounds of the various ethnic groups.[954]

This illustrates how much integration policy had changed. Previously there would have been no question of the possibility of multilingual broadcasts on public television to help migrants settle into their new home.

As a consequence of these representations the Australian Broadcasting Control Board acquiesced to remove restrictions on the level of foreign language programming allowed on television and radio. The Immigration department had pointed out to the Board that as a result of shifts in the make-up of the Australian population and the consequences of ongoing sociological research, it no longer considered the current regulations as relevant.[955] This was quite a major change, as it had been the long-established practice of the Australian government to restrict foreign language programming as it was believed it would hinder migrants' assimilation, then their integration.

Lopez dates the origins of a multicultural policy during the Whitlam government. He maintains that the first seven months of the Whitlam ministry did not lead to a shift from integration to a policy of multiculturalism. However, the multiculturalists, in spite of a series of setbacks, were able to secure positions where they could introduce change.[956] Therefore, Lopez argues that 'Multiculturalism initially emerged around the Whitlam Government rather than through it...The first significant change towards the emergence of multiculturalism was in the ideological content of the advice presented in government reports to the Minister for

---

[954] NLA, MS 6690/Series 12/Box 41/37, Immigration Advisory Council - Committee on Community Relations Meeting - Agenda, Melbourne, 26th October, 1973, Agenda Item No. 3: 'Broadcasting Control Act - Restrictions imposed by broadcasting and T.V. programme standards on foreign language programmes used by ethnic groups', Action by Department of Immigration, 3-4.

[955] NLA, MS 6690/Series 12/Box 41/47, Immigration Advisory Council – Agenda – Committee on Community Relations, Canberra, 6th December, 1973, Agenda Item No. 5: Foreign Language Broadcasting, including two circular letters by B. J. Connolly, Secretary, Australian Broadcasting Control Board, 1.

[956] Lopez, *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics*, 232.

Immigration.'[957] Before July 1973 only one government report included multicultural concepts, the Social Patterns Committee of the IAC's *Progress Report* of October 1972. In comparison the Migrant Education Committee of the IAC's *Interim Report* of the same month included integrationist concepts. But by the end of July 1973 two-thirds of the six most current advisory reports included multicultural concepts. However, the culmination of all the efforts of multiculturalists to push ideas of multiculturalism in official circles was Al Grassby's speech 'A Multi-Cultural Society for the Future' the subsequent month, written by Jim Houston. According to Lopez this was to all intents and purposes an official endorsement of a policy of multiculturalism.[958] However, the author of this thesis would argue instead that it laid the foundations for the adoption of an official multicultural policy.

In the speech Grassby argued that 'The image we manage to convey of ourselves still seems to range from the bushwacker to the sportsman to the slick city businessman...Where is the Maltese process worker, the Finnish carpenter, the Italian concrete layer, the Yugoslav miner or – dare I say it the Indian scientist?'[959] In addition he argued that:

> Today, irrespective therefore of what labels we use, the fact is that the increasing diversity of Australian society has gradually eroded and finally rendered untenable any prospects there might have been twenty years ago of fully assimilating newcomers to the "Australian way of life", to use a phrase common at that time.[960]

This clearly demonstrates the distance that migrant policy had come from the days of assimilation. Grassby also criticised Australia's lack of progress in developing strong relations with its Asian neighbours under the previous coalition governments. He believed that all groups in Australian society were in constant interaction and in a state of adjustment, slowly but steadily, to each other and to life in Australia, without

---

[957] Quote taken from Lopez, *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics*, 233.
[958] Lopez, *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics*, 233, 249.
[959] Quote taken from Grassby, *A Multi-cultural society for the future by the Hon. A. J. Grassby, Melbourne, 11th August, 1973* (Canberra, ACT: AGPS, 1973) 4.
[960] *Ibid.*, 5.

abandoning, at least in the first generation, their core ethnic identity.[961] These last remarks on migrants not abandoning their cultures until the second generation are reminiscent of the earlier period of integration (1966-1972).

Therefore, though the Whitlam government is credited by many scholars with introducing a policy of multiculturalism, this was simply not the case. Integration, not multiculturalism continued to be government policy towards migrants. However, a definition of integration provided in an immigration reference paper produced by the Department of Immigration at the start of 1974 highlights that integration was most definitely shifting and slowly moving in the direction of a multicultural policy:

> 'Integration' means that migrants should be accepted into the community without prejudice and that they should retain their cultural identity, if they wish. The Department of Immigration encourages migrants to freely express their social, religious and political aspirations, subject only to the normal legal and other restraints of Australian society. The Department seeks to remove any impediment which puts the newcomer at a disadvantage to the established citizen and which might restrict his own well-being or his ability to make a full contribution to the well-being of the community.[962]

The reference to the retention of cultural identity should be particularly underlined.

Whitlam outlined the main features of integration policy in an address at the 20th Anniversary Gala Dinner of the A.P.I.A (now Leichardt Tigers Football) Club in Sydney a few months later. He firstly identified the main force behind the policy, 'In all of our policies we have worked on the assumption that migrants have been one of the great disadvantaged groups in Australian society...Our policies on immigration and other government activities have been designed to ensure that migrants enjoy the same opportunities as all Australian citizens.'[963] In terms of specifics, task forces had been set up in all state capitals to determine the most pressing settlement

---

[961] Grassby, *A Multi-cultural society for the future by the Hon. A. J. Grassby, Melbourne, 11th August, 1973,* 9, 12.

[962] Australia. Department of Immigration, *Australia and Immigration: A Review of Migration to Australia Especially since World War II*, Immigration Reference Paper, revised January 1974 (Canberra, ACT: Department of Immigration, 1974) 22.

[963] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/22A, Notes for the Prime Minister for the 20th Anniversary Gala Dinner of the A.P.I.A. Club, Sydney, Wednesday, 27th March, 1974, 3.

issues facing settlers. Each task force was headed by an MP and its members consisted of individuals that were in regular contact with settlers and their issues. The country's first telephone interpreter service in twenty languages was also set up in the capital cities to respond to emergency calls for assistance from settlers. Thirdly, migrant education centres were established in Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Brisbane and Perth. Classroom accommodation, language laboratories, libraries and child-minding facilities were all offered.[964] Therefore, the government recognised that migrants had specific needs which were not necessarily met by the general services offered to all Australians.

In his opening speech at the 25th Anniversary Celebrations of the Good Neighbour Council of South Australia in July 1974 Whitlam acknowledged the growing diversity of the Australian population and its effect on the nation, 'Since the foundation of the Good Neighbour Movement, we have indeed become a different nation and a different people...The influx of more than 3 million people in the post-war period has meant that 20 per cent of our present population was born overseas.'[965] Furthermore, he also commented on their cultural, social and political impact on Australia, and committed the government to a programme to allow all Australians to benefit from the rich linguistic and cultural heritage the country now possessed.[966] Whitlam outlined the essence of integration policy at this time when he said that 'We do not want migrants to feel that they have to erase their own characteristics and imitate and adopt completely the behaviour of existing Australian society...We want to see that society enriched by the cross fertilisation that will result

---

[964] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/22A, Notes for the Prime Minister for the 20th Anniversary Gala Dinner of the A.P.I.A. Club, Sydney, Wednesday, 27th March, 1974, 5, 7.
[965] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/26, Speech by the Prime Minister, Mr. E.G. Whitlam, at the official opening of the 25th Anniversary Celebrations of the Good Neighbour Council of South Australia, Adelaide Town Hall, Saturday, 13th July, 1974, 2.
[966] *Ibid.*, 3, 13.

from migrants retaining their own heritage.'[967] Again this illustrates that integration was most definitely shifting in the direction of a policy of multiculturalism.

Another example of this was the cultural agreement announced at the beginning of 1975 between Italy and Australia. It was argued that 'One of the main purposes of the agreement is to enable Italians who have settled in Australia to be integrated into the Australian community, but at the same time to maintain their traditional cultural links with Italy.'[968] So, Italian migrants were encouraged to retain their cultural links with their ancestral homeland, while at the same time becoming a part of Australian society.

Whitlam emphasised the importance of citizenship in the integration process in an address to a Meeting of Ethnic Organisations in Sydney in July of the same year, 'There is one very good way of measuring the contentment of migrants and the success of all government efforts to care for them and speed up their integration into Australian society...That is in the figures for Australian citizenship – what we used to call naturalisation.'[969] This continued a long-running theme since the introduction of an assimilation policy in the late 1940s. Another recurring concept in policy towards migrants which was also reiterated was the importance of language.[970]

Immigration and Multicultural Policy

Jupp again maintains that 'Changes in migrant source countries became suddenly apparent at the end of 1975 and in 1976...These were mainly the result of refugee

---

[967] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/26, Speech by the Prime Minister, Mr. E.G. Whitlam, at the official opening of the 25th Anniversary Celebrations of the Good Neighbour Council of South Australia, Adelaide Town Hall, Saturday, 13th July, 1974, 14.
[968] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/32, Press Release – 'Cultural Agreement signed between Italy and Australia', 8th January, 1975.
[969] NAA, M163 (M163/0)/38, Speech Notes for the Prime Minister E.G. Whitlam for a meeting of Ethnic Organisations, Lower Town Hall, Sydney, 27th July, 1975, 5.
[970] *Ibid.*, 8.

intakes from East Timor, Vietnam and Lebanon under the Fraser coalition government.'[971]

During the mid to late-1970s, multiculturalism also replaced integration as government policy dealing with migrants. But the key slogan of this period was 'the development of migrant cultures within a cohesive Australian society.' So, although migrant cultures were to be nurtured, this was all within the context of national cohesion. At the start of the period though there were still references to integration. This again highlights the slow, gradual nature of change in the period. This was shown in a letter from MacKellar to Fraser at the close of 1975 regarding the setting up of an Ethnic Affairs branch in the Department of Immigration. The branch would introduce and put into place initiatives to encourage the effective integration of migrants into the Australian community.[972] MacKellar argued that in addition it would 'encourage interest and active participation in migrant integration by all sections of the community including national groups.'[973] Therefore, these were all quite traditional integration statements.

Yet, by July 1976 MacKellar's position had changed, 'The Government is committed to the preservation and development of a culturally diversified but socially cohesive Australian society, free of social tensions and offering security, well-being and equality of opportunity to all those living here.'[974] Again, though there was an acceptance of cultural diversity, there was at the same time a continued emphasis on a cohesive society. This was reiterated in a further letter from MacKellar to Fraser

---

[971] Jupp, 'Changes in Immigration Patterns since 1972', 75.
[972] NAA, A1209 (A1209/86)/1976/2577 - Ethnic Affairs Unit - Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs - Establishment and policy aspects, M.J.R. MacKellar, Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs to J.M. Fraser, Prime Minister, 23rd December, 1975 - Attachment B: Summary of main functions.
[973] *Ibid.*
[974] NAA, A446 (A446/167)/1964/45017, Bernard Freedman, Director - Immigration Information to Mr Volker, First Assistant Secretary, Department of Immigration & Ethnic Affairs, 2nd July, 1976, containing Ministerial article, 'Welcome to "Newcomer News" by the Hon. M.J.R. MacKellar, Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs'.

a few months later, again on the possible functions of a division of Ethnic Affairs, 'The development – in consultation with the ethnic communities – of approaches to preserve ethnic cultures and traditions within the context of a diverse but cohesive evolving Australian culture.'[975] Nevertheless, simultaneously attention was given to more traditional messages of the fostering of, and the arrangements for, the acquisition of Australian citizenship.[976] MacKellar also asserted that to expedite the integration of migrants into a cohesive Australian society was very much in Australia's interests.[977] Thus, there was no clear transition between integration and multicultural policy. Rhetoric about integration continued for some time.

On the other hand, the new shifts in policy towards migrants were also displayed:

> If Australia is to maximise the benefit it derives from multi-national immigration, it should assist migrants to enter fully into the life of Australia; this would include adequate recognition of overseas occupational qualifications, the involvement of migrants in community activities and organisations, the dissemination of migrant cultures and promoting and facilitating the use of English.[978]

MacKellar added that it was most desirable for the government to provide an effective medium for government-migrant community communication as the migrant community now comprised a large segment of the Australian population.[979] This was a possible reference to the government distributing information through the ethnic press.

Another major differentiation with integration was the positive role of concentrated ethnic communities. A survey of immigrants in areas of high migrant

---

[975] NAA, A1209 (A1209/86)/1976/2577 - Ethnic Affairs Unit - Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs - Establishment and policy aspects, M.J.R. MacKellar, Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs to J.M. Fraser, Prime Minister, 16th September, 1976 - Attachment C: Functions of a Division of Ethnic Affairs, 1.
[976] *Ibid.*, 2.
[977] NAA, A1209 (A1209/86)/1976/2577 - Ethnic Affairs Unit - Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs - Establishment and policy aspects, M.J.R. MacKellar, Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs to J.M. Fraser, Prime Minister, 16th September, 1976 - Attachment B: Rational of an Ethnic Affairs function, 1.
[978] *Ibid.*, 2.
[979] *Ibid.*

density in inner Melbourne in 1976 argued that 'The existence of ethnic concentrations is also likely to have modified the settlement and integration experiences of some new arrivals, by providing an environment in which there is emotional and social support and a familiar cultural background.'[980] Though the presence of the concentration of ethnic minorities in inner-city areas was acknowledged, it was now advanced that these communities provided a good settlement role.[981] Previously the concentration of migrants beyond a short period of time was strongly frowned upon and discouraged.

In an address at the opening of the Sephardi Synagogue and Communal Centre in Malvern, Victoria in early 1977 Fraser illustrated some of his multicultural views, 'I believe that we are now witnessing an unparalleled development in community groups...This is particularly true of ethnic communities which are committed to preserving their cultural, linguistic and religious heritage, while participating in Australian society.'[982] In the speech notes for the address Fraser emphasised that:

> Government policy is to develop a cohesive Australian society in which settlers from over 100 countries combine with the Australian-born population, sharing certain fundamental goals and aspirations and certain common ideals and standards. Within this cohesive society, however, I believe it is worthwhile that the cultural and linguistic heritage of its various component groups should be maintained and disseminated to others...It is my hope that Australian society can continue to develop in a way in which each of us will be proud of our being Australians and at the same time cherish traditions passed on to us by our forefathers.[983]

Fraser ended with 'The strengthening of the sense of common unity between all peoples in Australia will take us much further along that pathway of transforming potential into reality both for our own benefit and that of the wider world community

---

[980] NAA, A9609/VOLUME 40 – Survey of Immigrants in areas of high migrant density in Inner Melbourne, Part I - Introduction, Summary of findings and Conclusions - (i) Introduction and background, 2.
[981] *Ibid.*, 3.
[982] NAA, A463/1977/618 PART 1 – Prime Minister's Address at the Opening of the Sephardi Synagogue and Communal Centre, Malvern, Vic., 20th March, 1977, 1.
[983] NAA, A463/1977/618 PART 1 – Notes for Prime Minister's Speech at the Opening of the Sephardi Synagogue and Communal Centre, Malvern, Vic., 11th March, 1977, 2-3.

of which we are an integral part.'[984] So, the emphasis was first and foremost on national cohesion. But within this overall context migrants would be encouraged to preserve and share their cultures.

The key turning point in the introduction of a multicultural policy was the establishment of the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants,[985] or as it was more commonly known the 'Galbally Enquiry' in May 1977, named after its chairman Frank Galbally. One of the most pressing concerns in deciding upon a chairman for the review was that the person should be known to migrant communities and acceptable to them, as well as non-partisan.[986] This is an excellent example of how much things had changed. Previously under integration the government would not have been overly concerned about the reaction of migrant groups to the appointment of a chairman of a particular inquiry that concerned them.

The Galbally Enquiry actually originated from the Bailey Task force. In its initial report this had suggested that an appraisal of the responsibilities and future role of Good Neighbour Councils be undertaken by a group separate from the Departments of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, and Social Security.[987] This narrow suggestion was however broadened considerably by the government, 'In accepting that there should be a review, the Government has decided that it should be set in the broader context of reviewing the effectiveness of the Commonwealth's programs and services for those who have migrated to Australia and the assistance it gives to non-government organisations providing programs and services to migrants.'[988] The membership of the review group would also be a good balance in terms of ethnic

---

[984] NAA, A463/1977/618 PART 1 – Notes for Prime Minister's Speech at the Opening of the Sephardi Synagogue and Communal Centre, Malvern, Vic., 11th March, 1977, 8-9.
[985] NAA, A10756/LC1437/PART 1, Cabinet Minute, 31st May, 1977, Decision No. 3116, 1.
[986] NAA, A10756/LC1437/PART 1, Notes on Cabinet Submission No. 1259 - Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants, 19th May, 1977, 1.
[987] NAA, A10756/LC1437/PART 1, Cabinet Submission No. 1259, May 1977, 2.
[988] *Ibid.*, 5.

descent, gender, state origin, administrative and research skills, and experience with services to settlers.[989] Therefore, the Bailey Task Force's recommendation offered the government an opportunity to carry out the survey of migrant services that it had been contemplating for some time.

The goal of the enquiry was to 'ensure that the changing needs of migrants are being met as effectively as possible within the limits of available resources, and that regard should be had to the Government's Federalism policy and its objective of encouraging self-help and supporting the enterprise and dedication of community groups and individuals.'[990] Thus, despite the Government's desire to introduce a multicultural policy it was conscious of budgetary constraints as well as the long-standing practice of relying on voluntary community groups.

In an information paper produced by the Ethnic Affairs Branch of the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs in September 1977 it was also outlined that 'The Review shall examine and report on the effectiveness of the Commonwealth's programs and services for those who have migrated to Australia, including programs and services provided by non-government organisations which receive Commonwealth assistance, and shall identify any areas of need or duplication of programs or services.'[991] This again highlights the Government's concern about saving money. This was a reflection of the tough economic times Australia was facing during this period; with the effects of the OPEC oil crisis earlier in the decade still being felt.

---

[989] NAA, A10756/LC1437/PART 1, Cabinet Submission No. 1259, May 1977, 11.
[990] NAA, A12933/325 PART A, Paper No. 325 – For Cabinet – Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants, 3.
[991] NLA, MS 6690/Series 13/Box 45/80, Information Paper - Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants, Ethnic Affairs Branch, Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Canberra, 7th September, 1977, 1.

In a Cabinet submission that same month MacKellar called for the provision of additional funds for ethnic affairs. He specifically requested A$200,000 to assist ethnic organisations, to advertise in ethnic languages in the ethnic press and to translate government announcements into ethnic languages. MacKellar argued that the coalition government's pre-election policy platform on ethnic and immigration affairs pushed for a more assertive role for itself in the ethnic community.[992] However, his key point was that:

> The success of the Government's longer term policies on ethnic affairs generally depends on improving communication with ethnic communities, by explaining what is being done and is available and by using techniques to break down the isolation of the migrant in a community alien to and sometimes apparently indifferent to him.[993]

He acknowledged that the long-standing goal regarding migrants had been that they learn English. However, teaching resources struggled to cope and for many settlers it was a slow process to learn a new language. Mackellar also pointed out that no other organisation had adequate resources to advertise the government's initiatives in ethnic affairs in the ethnic press. He believed that the ethnic communities would generally react very positively to his recommendations.[994] Thus, the Cabinet approved MacKellar's submission towards the end of 1977.[995] This is quite important as it represented the government moving in the direction of a multicultural policy even before the Galbally Enquiry published its report.

In an interview with *Nea Patris*, a prominent Greek-Australian newspaper, Fraser outlined the ways in which the government was improving communication between ethnic groups and wider Australian society. Firstly, an ethnic affairs branch had been set up in the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. It had been

---

[992] NAA, A12909/1687, Cabinet Submission No. 1687 - Ethnic Communities financial assistance and Improved Communications by M.J.R. Mackellar, 30th September, 1977 includes Appendices, 2.
[993] *Ibid.*, 3.
[994] *Ibid.*, 3, 5, 6.
[995] NAA, A12909/1687, Cabinet Minute – Decision No. 3977: Submission No. 1687 – Ethnic Communities Financial Assistance and Improved Communications, 4th October, 1977, 1.

given a wide-ranging mandate to manage the government's programmes and to improve links with ethnic groups, and between these groups and the wider community.[996] Secondly, Fraser highlighted that the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and the head of his new branch had had detailed discussions with ethnic community leaders as a crucial step in the process of forming new ideas.[997] Thirdly, he stated that ethnic radio was being set up on a fixed basis by the federal government through the Special Broadcasting Service, and would be extended over time to all states. The importance of this was that it would 'not only benefit ethnic communities themselves, but will be a major factor in sharing their cultural heritage more effectively with the whole Australian community.'[998] The fact that Fraser was going to such lengths to explain to an ethnic newspaper the way in which his government was reaching out to ethnic communities clearly illustrates how much things were changing in terms of migrant policy.

The previous day MacKellar had announced a nationwide project to gather 'the best loved stories of Australia's children – A heritage of 100 countries'. He maintained that not enough had been done in the past to make sure that the cultural and linguistic heritage of the country's settlers was not only supported but also shared with all Australians. The project would help with this. MacKellar argued that 'If we are to have a culturally diversified but socially cohesive Australian society, it is essential that we begin to share our cultures more effectively.'[999] So, the emphasis of the government's multicultural policy was on the sharing of cultures, while at the same time maintaining social cohesion.

---

[996] NAA, A463/1977/618 PART 1 – Speech notes for the Prime Minister on ethnic affairs matters, For the Prime Minister - Meeting with *Nea Patris* - Question 2, 18th October, 1977, 1.
[997] *Ibid.*
[998] *Ibid.*
[999] NAA, A463/1977/618 PART 1 – Speech notes for the Prime Minister on ethnic affairs matters, News Release from the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, M. J. R. Mackellar – "Best loved stories of Australia's children - the heritage of one hundred countries", 17th October, 1977, 1, 2.

Petro Georgiou, who was a senior adviser to Fraser in the Prime Minister's Department (and later became a Liberal MP), played an important role in the adoption of a multicultural policy. He supplied Fraser with information that advocated the adoption of a multicultural policy towards migrants.[1000] In a note to Fraser at the beginning of 1978 he pointed out that the Galbally Enquiry was due to report in mid or late March. Georgiou also reminded him that he had agreed to a 'uranium-type strategy' for the publication of the report.[1001] This referred to the public relations approach the government had adopted towards the deeply contentious issue of uranium mining in Australia, specifically the Prime Minister and any ministers with a vested interest in the policy appearing in all forms of media vociferously arguing for its adoption.

The coalition was also in a poor electoral position amongst Ethnic Communities in public opinion polls. Georgiou argued that the Galbally report could however turn things around, 'Our election policy on ethnic affairs and the Galbally report provides the basis of a number of major statements on ethnic affairs...This would show our practical concern for ethnic communities, and start to turn things around in the ethnic affairs area, particularly since it could not be tied to immediate electoral pressures.'[1002] But concern for the 'Ethnic vote' in the adoption of a multicultural policy should not be overstated as it would have made more electoral

---

[1000] NAA, M1277 (M1277/1)/102 - [Personal Papers of Prime Minister Fraser] Immigration and ethnic affairs (5) - Migrants - General [includes notes for discussion relating to new policy initiatives, published material], 'The Plight of the Migrant: Assimilation and Alienation', The Medical Journal of Australia, vol. 2, no. 4, Saturday, July 24th, 1976.
'The Plight of the Migrant: Basic Considerations', The Medical Journal of Australia, vol. 1, no. 26, Saturday, June 26th, 1976.
M. L. Kovacs and A. J. Cropley ,'Alienation and the Assimilation of Immigrants' , *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1975.

[1001] NAA, M1277 (M1277/1)/100, Note by Petro Georgiou, Office of the Prime Minister to Malcolm Fraser, 11th January, 1978, 1.

[1002] *Ibid.*, 2.

sense for the government to introduce a policy which appealed to the majority of the electorate, which still remained predominantly of Anglo-Celtic origin.

The actual report of the Galbally Enquiry was published in May 1978. The most salient passage was:

> We believe Australia is at a critical stage in the development of a cohesive, united, multicultural nation. This has come about because of a number of significant changes in recent years – changes in the pattern of migration and in the structure of our population, changes in attitudes to migration and to our responsibilities for international refugees, changes in the needs of the large and growing numbers of ethnic groups in our community, and changes in the roles of governments and the community generally in responding to these needs.[1003]

It also argued that the Commonwealth government needed to change the course of its participation in the provision of services and programmes for settlers, and to take further steps to facilitate multiculturalism. In changing the course, the report emphasised from the beginning that the greater role of ethnic groups themselves and of other layers of government was essential.[1004] So, ethnic groups would play an active part themselves in the implementation of the government's new multicultural policy.

The report also stressed the importance of encouraging migrants to preserve their cultures:

> We are convinced that migrants have the right to maintain their cultural and racial identity and that it is clearly in the best interests of the nation that they should be encouraged and assisted to do so if they wish. Provided that ethnic identity is not stressed at the expense of society at large, but is interwoven into the fabric of our nationhood by the process of multicultural interaction, then the community as a whole will benefit substantially and its democratic nature will be reinforced. The knowledge that people are identified with their cultural background and ethnic group enables them to take their place in their new society with confidence and a sense of purpose if their ethnicity has been accepted by the community.[1005]

The report's comments on ethnic identities being an integral part of Australian nationhood should be highlighted. There is no clearer illustration of multicultural policy than this.

[1003] Australia. Report of the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants, *Migrant Services and Programs* (Chairman Frank Galbally) (Canberra, ACT: AGPS, May 1978) 3.
[1004] *Ibid.*, 3-4.
[1005] *Ibid.*, 104-5.

On a more practical note a recommendation was made for the Good Neighbour Councils to be replaced by Ethnic Communities Councils which in contrast to the former would be run and organised by the ethnic groups themselves.[1006] This was a fundamental shift from the previous policy of integration. The Good Neighbour Movement had been supported by governments since the time of assimilation.

The government promptly responded to the recommendations of the Galbally Report. Speaking in parliament, Fraser announced that the government recognised that services to migrants needed to change direction and that multicultural policy needed to be further encouraged. In addition, considerable support from the government was needed to develop a multicultural attitude in Australian society. The retention of the cultural heritage of diverse ethnic groups would be fostered and intercultural understanding would be promoted.[1007] The speech was noteworthy in a number of ways. Firstly, Fraser highlighted that the government already had a multicultural policy that needed to be expanded. Secondly, it was recognised that this policy needed wider public support. Thirdly, the essence of the government's multicultural policy was migrants being encouraged to preserve their cultures, but also that Australians needed to understand these cultures and vice versa.

In a submission to the Cabinet in mid-1978, J. L. Carrick, the Minister for Education outlined the Government's proposals for child migrant education, which formed an important part of the new multicultural policy, 'The Government accepts that it is essential to encourage the development of a multicultural attitude in Australian schools, to promote the maintenance of ethnic languages and to improve

---

[1006] Australia. Report of the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants, *Migrant Services and Programs*, 110.
[1007] CPD, *H of R*, sess. 1978, vol. 109, 30th May, 1978, Mr. Fraser, 2728, 2731.

methods of teaching English to migrant children.'[1008] He went on to outline the background of a teacher exchange scheme the government intended to introduce:

> Consideration was given in the early 1970s to a teacher exchange with Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia and Turkey. Advantages were seen for Australian teachers and migrant children; the teachers to obtain firsthand knowledge of the language, to experience the social and cultural backgrounds of migrant children, and for the children to benefit from the presence of teachers from their countries of origin.[1009]

It was proposed that an initial programme consisting of five Australian and five Italian primary teachers would be introduced in 1978/79 and 1979/80.[1010] This clearly illustrates the distinction between multicultural policy and its predecessor integration.

In an address to an influential group of Italian-Australians towards the end of 1978 Fraser reaffirmed his support for multiculturalism:

> Our customs, our traditions and way of life have benefitted enormously from your presence in this country. I know you are proud to be Australians but just as proud of the richness and quality of your culture. It is necessary here to repeat that the Australian society has not been weakened but strengthened by the presence of so many diverse cultures. It is possible to love Australia and to participate fully in all aspects of Australian life and yet, at the same time, retain one's own cultural heritage.[1011]

In this speech Fraser continued a theme from his Australia Day address in 1977 in which he expressed his relief at the end of the era of Anglo-conformity.

In the late 1970s Australia introduced an official multicultural policy. This replaced the integration policy which had been the mainstay of the government's approach towards migrants since the early 1960s. There was a continued emphasis on national cohesion though in the new policy of multiculturalism. Furthermore, there was no clear division between integration and multicultural policy. The change from integration to a multicultural policy was a consequence of the replacement of the

---

[1008] NAA, A10756/LC563 PART 1, Cabinet Submission 2365 on Child Migrant Education by J. L. Carrick, Minister for Education, 9th June, 1978, 1.
[1009] *Ibid.*, 3.
[1010] *Ibid.*
[1011] NAA, M1277 (M1277/1)/104, Extract from *Il Globo*, Monday, 13th November, 1978, Issue No. 46, Year 20, page 22 – 'The Soiree of the Presidents at the Sanremo Ballroom – Prime Minister Fraser among the Melbourne Italians', 2-3.

'new nationalism' with a philosophy of multiculturalism as the national identity of Australia. A philosophy of multiculturalism emerged because the 'new nationalism' did not have any substance in contrast to British race patriotism. Moreover, multiculturalism appeared to resolve the dilemmas of diversity and unity. In addition, Australia also pursued a post-White Australia immigration policy in the late 1970s after officially abandoning the policy in the early 1970s. The arrival of large numbers of Vietnamese refugees is the best example of this. The last chapter will now compare the introduction of policies of multiculturalism in both Canada and Australia.

Chapter Nine – 'Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework' and 'A cohesive, united, multicultural nation': A comparison of the introduction of multicultural policies in Canada and Australia, 1960s-1970s

Between the 1960s and 1970s integration was replaced with multicultural policies in both Canada and Australia as the main focus of both governments towards migrants. These emerged out of a philosophy of multiculturalism in both countries; there was a distinction between the two. A multicultural philosophy replaced the 'new nationalism' as the foundation of national identity in Canada and Australia. This was due to the latter having little substance compared to the previous monolithic period of Britishness. The White Canada and White Australia policies were also completely dismantled and a non-discriminatory immigration policy was adopted in both Canada and Australia.

The 'new nationalism' and non-discriminatory immigration policies; multiculturalism and post-White Canada and post-White Australia policies

The adoption of a new Canadian flag and a new Australian national anthem were two key examples of the 'new nationalism' in practice in both countries. The replacement of *God Save the Queen* with *Advance Australia Fair* was extremely contentious in Australia. The whole debate surrounding the issue highlighted the lingering British race patriotism in the country and the difficulties of developing a home-grown nationalism to replace it. Similarly, the introduction of a new Maple Leaf flag to take the place of the Red Ensign in Canada was no less controversial, perhaps even more so, as it brought parliament to a complete stop.[1012] It illustrated the prevalence of sentiments of Britishness in English-speaking Canada as well. But one might also conclude that notwithstanding this, Canada managed the transition to

[1012] Johnson, 'The Last Gasp of Empire', 245.

a post-imperial world more confidently. The vehemence of the debate in Canada was also a reflection of the bicultural nature of the country. One of the prime motivations behind the adoption of a distinctly 'Canadian' flag was to placate the growing French-Canadian nationalist feeling in Quebec. There was no comparison to this in Australia as it had no competing founding group. This is one of the most fundamental differences between the Canadian and Australian experiences. Time and time again it goes a long way towards explaining the distinctions between the two countries.

In Canada, on the face of it, there was a break in the unravelling of Britishness with the Diefenbaker government. In contrast in Australia governments from that of Prime Minister Holt down to Whitlam and Fraser wrestled with the problem of what to put into the post-imperial void.

The 'new nationalism' in the 1960s and early 1970s illustrates the changes that were necessary when Britishness was no longer at the heart of the national identity of both English-speaking Canada and Australia.[1013] According to Stuart Ward, 'As Britishness was slowly consumed by the receding wake of empire, it was widely assumed that Canada [and] Australia...were somehow incomplete as national entities – that they were in urgent need of a national-cultural makeover.'[1014] There was a crisis of national meaning and a search for a new definition of national community. This consequently meant that major shifts had to be made, in the sense of constructing a local identity, instead of the previous dependence on 'Greater Britain' as the main focus of cultural and ethnic uniqueness.[1015]

However, the 'new nationalism' was not explicitly mentioned by Canadian leaders in national identity speeches in contrast to their Australian counterparts. This is a fundamental difference between the two countries. This is due again to the

[1013] Ward, 'The "New Nationalism" in Australia, Canada and New Zealand', 235-6.
[1014] Quote taken from Ward, 'The "New Nationalism" in Australia, Canada and New Zealand', 236.
[1015] Ward, 'The "New Nationalism" in Australia, Canada and New Zealand', 258.

bicultural nature of Canada. Canadian leaders had to be more general and vague when it came to discussing issues of national identity because their society was not a monocultural one like Australia. Instead the French-Canadians were a very large minority in the country, one moreover that was actually defining itself as a distinct people from other Canadians. Therefore, Canadian leaders could hardly explicitly stress the existence of one, unique, all encompassing national identity at this time. Australian leaders on the other hand had no issues such as this and could refer to the 'new nationalism' with ease.

As stated above one of the main reasons why the debate over the adoption of a unique Canadian flag reached such extreme levels was because of the growing nationalist fervour in French-Canada. This was a result of the consequences of the Quiet Revolution in Quebec. The reforms initiated by Quebec Premier Lesage and his government in the early 1960s started to bear fruit. Quebec began to emerge as a modern and progressive state. With this modernisation and liberalisation came an increasing self-assertiveness, especially in terms of relations with the federal government.[1016]

Between the 1960s and 1970s both Canada and Australia also completely removed their respective White Canada and White Australia policies from their law books, and subsequently adopted non-discriminatory immigration policies.[1017] However, this was a gradual process. The restrictive immigration policies were fully abandoned and non-discriminatory ones were adopted during the Pearson and Whitlam governments in Canada and Australia respectively. But it was with the successor Trudeau and Fraser governments in the two countries that large numbers

[1016] McRoberts and Posgate, *Quebec*, 265-73.
[1017] Hawkins, *Canada and Immigration*, 158, 159.
Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 145-52.
Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 199-218.
Troper, 'Canada's immigration policy since 1945', 266-74.

of Asian migrants actually started arriving. This took place again earlier in Canada. This was a consequence of the previous immigration changes occurring first in Canada due to the weaker hold that White Canada had on the national psyche. In addition, the total disavowal of the White Canada and White Australia policies was due to changing international circumstances and domestic activism that meant that having a racially based immigration policy was no longer possible in both countries.

Canada took the lead in adopting a points system in 1967 to determine the eligibility of migrants to settle in the country. This basically awarded points to potential immigrants on the basis of their education, proficiency in the official languages and work experience. It has continued in its basic form to the current day. The new points system removed the previous large level of personal discretion that immigration officers had in deciding upon a potential immigrant's suitability. Australia contrarily first went for a half-way house during the Whitlam government which incorporated some elements of a points system, but also maintained the personal discretion of immigration officers to decide upon a migrant's eligibility. It was not until much later in 1989 that the Australian government established a points system along the lines of the Canadian one.[1018]

In terms of the actual practical consequences of a non-discriminatory immigration policy Canada had a much broader immigration intake than Australia. This was largely due to the different geographical positions of the two countries. Canada received a lot more migration from the Caribbean and South America, whilst Australia was a destination for mainly Asian migrants. Canada also received a large level of Asian migrants.

[1018] Hawkins, *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared* (Kingston, NSW: University of New South Wales Press, 1989) 105-6.

The rise of the philosophy of multiculturalism in both Canada and Australia was a slow process. It was precipitated by the growing realisation that the 'new nationalism' was insufficient as the core of the national identities of both countries. A large part of the problem was due to the difficulty in actually defining what the 'new nationalism' meant and giving it some real substance. However, there was not a clear transition between the 'new nationalism' and multiculturalism. Elements of the former continued to exist into the 1970s in both Canada and Australia.

Bilingualism and biculturalism were the main precursors to the rise of multiculturalism in Canada. Official bilingualism was adopted by Canada in 1969. The Pearson government also attempted to push biculturalism, but this faced heavy opposition from certain long-established ethnic groups, particularly the Ukrainian-Canadians, not to mention from Canadians of British descent. In numerous speeches Pearson appeared to accept and even embrace the long-standing French-Canadian view of Confederation as a compact between two nations, creating a new state; Canada. The problem with this, apart from strong opposition from certain quarters, was that it was a slippery slope. Certain sections of French-Canadian opinion began to build on this and no longer saw Quebec only as their *nation*, but desired it to also be their *state*.

This was the situation faced by Trudeau upon coming to power in 1968. In his opinion a philosophy of multiculturalism was a means with which to counter French-Canadian nationalist demands and appeal to Canadians who were not of French or British descent. However, as stated earlier multiculturalism above all offered the possibility of a new national identity after the decline of British race patriotism in English-speaking Canada.

Australia contrarily did not have any experience of bilingualism or biculturalism. This makes its acceptance of multiculturalism even more notable. The lack of bilingualism or biculturalism highlights that the demise of Britishness in Australia was of much more importance than in English-speaking Canada, as unlike the latter its identification as a British nation had never been complicated by the presence of a competing founding group.

Multiculturalism seemed to be the logical option for a society as divided as Canada; contrarily Australia was still a predominantly monocultural society. But the demographic face of Australia had been changing since the Second World War, and along with the collapse of Britishness, made old style exclusivist nationalism no longer relevant or credible. This underlines, again as emphasised above, the greater impact that the demise of British race patriotism had on Australia. The subsequent failure of the 'new nationalism' left few options for the country in terms of national identity.

There was also a new focus on refugee policy in both Canada and Australia. This replaced the ad hoc responses of the past, especially in Canada. This was again an illustration of changing international circumstances, in which the plight of refugees was given a new importance. Canada admitted a small number of Tibetan refugees in 1971-2. Though their actual numbers were not large they represented a new direction in Canadian refugee policy, in that the country was more willing to assist those in need from all over the world rather than just Europe. This ranged from the Ugandan Asians to Chileans and Vietnamese refugees.[1019] It was actually the

[1019] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-1997*, 2nd edn. (Toronto, Ont.: Dundurn Press, 1997) 171-5.

arrival of Vietnamese refugees to Australia during the Fraser years that initiated the high levels of Asian migration to that country.[1020]

Integration and multicultural policies

In terms of official government policy towards migrants, during the earlier period both Canada and Australia continued having integration policies towards migrants. Yet, these had developed in quite important ways from the previous period of integration (Chapter Six). There was a much greater emphasis on migrants preserving their cultures and languages, as well as the rest of the society meeting the migrant half-way. Though, there was still the focus on this taking place entirely within the context of the overall 'Canadian' or 'Australian' culture. As pointed out above Australia had no experience of biculturalism or bilingualism as in Canada; there was no Bi-Bi commission there. Hence, Australia was monocultural and monolingual. As a result there was still a much greater emphasis in Australia during the earlier period on migrants integrating into a distinct Australian culture. In Canada, because the population was a lot more diverse this was more difficult. There was also a larger focus on integration being a two-way street in both countries. This also continued a trend from the previous period of integration. However, this was becoming more balanced, compared to the emphasis being more on migrants previously.

Canada did not have a catch phrase like 'Family of the Nation' during its final period of integration, as was the case in Australia. The phrase fitted with what the ideal of integration was at the time, essentially different ethnic groups preserving their languages and customs but foremost being a part of one, united Australian group. A phrase such as this would have been extremely problematic in Canada,

[1020] Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, 214.

due to the French-Canadian factor it was very difficult to advocate a broader uniform Canadian society that other ethnic groups could be a part of. The fact that other ethnic groups were much longer established in Canada compared to Australia also complicated the situation.

There was encouragement in both Canada and Australia during the integration period for migrants to retain an interest in, and an attachment to their ethnic institutions and homelands. It had been recognised that migrants would still hold on to the languages and cultures of their homelands despite what the government attempted to do. So, rather than this being seen as a negative thing, the positive benefits of this were instead stressed. This certainly fit into the whole idea of the 'new nationalism', in that migrant cultures and languages were regarded as helping to create a unique, national identity in both Canada and Australia.

Book IV of the Bi-Bi commission report on 'The Other Ethnic Groups' in 1969 was the key precipitator to the introduction of an official multicultural policy in Canada. The Galbally Report of 1978 was the equivalent of this in Australia. But unlike the Australian situation, the Canadian government took quite some time before responding to the recommendations of Book IV, specifically over two years. The Fraser government instead responded to the suggestions of the Galbally Report almost immediately. Though, in defence of the Trudeau government the last volume of the Bi-Bi commission report was not tabled in Parliament until 1970.

Integration and multicultural policy in Australia were much more concerned with practical, 'bread and butter' issues and not a new definition of the nation. This was again a reflection of the presence of the French-Canadians in Canada. Contrarily in Australia there were no issues of this kind. The majority of Australians in the late 1970s were descended from people from the British Isles (this remains the

case to this day. In the 2006 Census nearly half of all Australians stated that they were English, Irish and Scottish in terms of ancestry. The nearly equal figure of those who said they were 'Australian' would imply that a large proportion of these were most likely descended from the British Isles as well). Therefore, the Australian government could afford to just focus on the more practical issues facing migrants and their position in wider Australian society.

Though both countries stressed the development of migrant cultures within the context of the overall Canadian or Australian culture, there was a greater emphasis on this in Australia. This relates to an earlier point made above. Australia did not have to deal with issues of national unity as its population was still largely descended from the British Isles. But the evidence still suggests that Australian policymakers saw 'unity' as fundamental. In contrast, in Canada due to the presence of the French-Canadians, and other long-established ethnic groups like the Ukrainian-Canadians, it was a lot more difficult to encourage migrants to be a part of a broader Canadian culture. This is an extremely important point of difference between the two countries, and as stated above makes the adoption of a policy of multiculturalism in Australia that much more noteworthy.

The change in both Canada and Australia from integration to a policy of multiculturalism was slow and gradual. Change did not happen overnight, but took place over a long period of time. But in contrast to the shift from assimilation to integration, the change from integration to multiculturalism was faster. This being said, even as late as a year or two before official multicultural policies were introduced in the two countries, integration was still used in official government circles. Even with the adoption of policies of multiculturalism in both Canada and Australia, there was still the underlying, unstated belief that migrants would integrate

into the wider Canadian or Australian culture. Despite all cultures in theory being equal, in actual practice the Anglo-centric and Anglo-Celtic cultures and institutional heritage were still dominant in both countries, and remain so to this day. In terms of politics, big business, the media and other state institutions, both Canada and Australia are still dominated by Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic elites.

There was a greater reliance in Australia on the establishment of advisory bodies such as the AEAC compared to Canada. This relates to a broader difference between the two countries in terms of the practice of their political systems at the time. In Australia, governments often relied on expert advice from established advisory bodies. Contrarily in Canada, although governments also received expert advice, it was not in the form of such a formal relationship. What is more, the advisory bodies that existed in Canada were not so closely linked to the government as they were in Australia. This meant that they did not have as much impact on Canadian government decision making, but at the same time they were not subject to the same government controls as their Australian counterparts.[1021]

The positive impact on the opinion of ethnic minorities towards the government through the adoption of an official policy of multiculturalism was acknowledged in Canada and Australia. However, this point should not be overstated. Unfortunately, it has been stressed far too much in the secondary literature on the subject as the primary cause for the introduction of multicultural policies in both countries. This was simply not the case. It would have made more electoral sense for the governments in both countries to introduce policies which would appeal to the majority of the electorate, which in Canada and Australia were not those of other than British (or French as well in the case of the former) origin.

[1021] Hawkins, 'Multiculturalism in Two Countries', 64-80.

Non-British and non-French ethnic groups in Canada, especially the Ukrainian-Canadians were much more assertive in calling for a policy of multiculturalism than their counterparts in Australia. This was a reflection of the fact that they were a lot more established in Canada. Canada had ethnic groups such as the Ukrainian-Canadians who had been in the country for a considerably longer period than their counterparts in Australia. This meant that they had more clout as they had more resources and greater political representation. This is a fundamental difference between the two countries. The Ukrainian-Canadians were at the forefront of calling for a policy of multiculturalism to be adopted in Canada. However, going back to an earlier point, this lobbying coincided with the interests of the government. Nevertheless, the activities of Greek and Italian-Australians cannot be compared to this.

Multicultural policies replaced those of integration in Canada and Australia between the 1960s and 1970s. An official policy of multiculturalism was introduced first in Canada, with Australia following soon after. But in the earlier period, integration actually continued to be the main approach of the governments in both countries. The contexts in which integration and multicultural policies emerged in Canada and Australia were the 'new nationalism' and the rise of a philosophy of multiculturalism, and the total abandonment of the White Canada and White Australia policies and the introduction of a non-discriminatory immigration policy. On the other hand, a fundamental difference between the two countries was the Quiet Revolution in Canada. This relates to the French-Canadian presence in that country which complicated its search for a new national identity even more so than Australia, and certainly gave it an added sense of urgency. The position of other ethnic groups

in Canada, which were established for considerably longer than their counterparts in Australia also goes a long way to explaining the differences between the experiences in the two countries.

Conclusion

During the nationalist era that is from the late nineteenth century down to the 1960s both English-speaking Canada and the Australian colonies identified themselves as an integral part of a wider British race. However, Britishness was always complicated in Canada by the presence of the French-Canadians. They could not identify with British race patriotism; they even felt excluded by it. Unlike their English-speaking compatriots in Australia, English-speaking Canadians had to share their country with a competing founding group, one that had arrived before the British; the French-Canadians. This meant that expressions of British race patriotism in English-speaking Canada were more nuanced and problematic. This issue would arise repeatedly and goes a long way towards explaining the major differences between the English-speaking Canadian and Australian experiences.

Along with Britishness, whiteness formed the second pillar of the national identities of both English-speaking Canada and Australia. They were both closely related as English-speaking Canada and Australia identified themselves as white, British nations. Both countries adopted White Canada and White Australia policies by which non-whites, mainly Asians, were excluded from entering the country. However, both Canada and Australia were concerned with Japanese migration the most. The Japanese victory over Russia in 1905 was a warning to the world, especially to those countries that bordered the Pacific Ocean.[1022]

But in contrast to the White Australia policy, the White Canada policy did not apply, or was not relevant, to the whole country. It was instead mainly concerned with the province of British Columbia, which bordered the Pacific Ocean. On the

---

[1022] Neville Meaney, *Towards a new vision: Australia and Japan across time* (Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press, 2007) 2.

other hand, the whole of Australia due to its different geo-political circumstances felt threatened by Asia and therefore a nationwide policy was adopted there. Consequently the White Australia policy was a more integral part of the national psyche compared to its Canadian counterpart. This was not the case in Canada.

Canada and Australia also adopted very different methods to exclude Asians from their shores. In Australia this was achieved through the use of a dictation test. In contrast in Canada the government actually legislated to prevent Asian migrants from arriving in the first place. In addition, Canada signed a "Gentleman's Agreement" with Japan whereby the latter agreed to limit to 150 the number of its own citizens who wanted to migrate to the country.[1023] In comparison there was no question of this even being a possibility in Australia, as due to its particular geo-political circumstances it felt much more threatened by its region. What is more, the race idea, which was the belief that different races could not mix, had much more of a hold in Australia than in Canada.

The divisions between English-speaking Canadians and French-Canadians over Britishness were illustrated most when Canada was called upon to contribute troops to imperial war efforts. From the Sudan conflict through to the Second World War both sides had very different opinions as to whether Canada should supply troops. On the whole English-speaking Canadians wholeheartedly supported giving aid to the 'mother-country'. In contrast most French-Canadians did not see why Canada should become involved in far-flung conflicts which served no direct Canadian interest. Australia conversely adopted a similar position to English-speaking Canadians in terms of offering unconditional support to the Empire. This again highlights the fact that Australia did not have any competing founding group.

[1023] Ward, *White Canada Forever*, 138.

However, in the 1960s English-speaking Canada and Australia's identification as British nations began to unravel. The turning point in both nations was the UK's decision to apply for membership to the EEC in 1961.[1024] This signified to the rest of the Commonwealth that the UK now saw its future to be in Europe. It was a great psychological shock to both English-speaking Canada and Australia as for nearly a century they had believed that they were part of a wider British world. They thought that no part of this world, especially its core, would take actions to the severe detriment of the rest. Thus, the British decision to seek membership in the EEC forced both English-speaking Canada and Australia to readdress some very deep issues concerning who they were as a 'people'.

But the signs were visible earlier in English-speaking Canada with the Suez Crisis of 1956. The Liberal Canadian government did not support the British and French military action in Suez. It also actively criticised their actions and was instrumental in resolving the issue through the UN which resulted in an embarrassing retreat for the UK and France. However, the issue was very divisive in the country, with the Progressive Conservative opposition heavily critical of the Liberal government's actions. This to some extent demonstrated the English-speaking/French-Canadian divide in the country as the Liberals were considered the party of French-Canadians federally until the Bloc-Québécois was formed in 1990. In contrast the Progressive Conservatives were a bastion of Britishness in Canada.[1025] Though the two major political parties in Australia, the Liberals and the ALP, also differed on the position the country should take towards the Suez issue, the latter's

[1024] O'Brien, 'The British Commonwealth and the European Economic Community', 484.
[1025] Igartua, '"Ready, Aye, Ready" No More?', 47-62.

opposition to the UK government's policy was exactly that, not a reaction against their Britishness.[1026]

In the 1960s in both Canada and Australia racially based immigration policies were also slowly broken down and as with the demise of Britishness it was an incremental process. This occurred first in Canada. As stated earlier White Canada was not an integral part of the national psyche compared to its Australian counterpart, but Australia soon followed. This was due to a combination of both changing international circumstances and the domestic situation which meant a discriminatory immigration policy was no longer acceptable. This mainly related to the growing numbers of former Western colonies becoming independent in Asia and Africa and expressing their opposition to racially discriminatory immigration policies at the UN.

So, the White Canada and White Australia policies were not removed with one sweeping piece of legislation, but instead they were gradually broken down over time. This took place earlier in Canada, during 1957-63 compared to Australia, 1966-72. The main reason Canada abandoned its discriminatory immigration legislation was because as stated above of growing international pressure, with countries in Asia and Africa gaining their independence and expressing their opposition to racially based immigration policies at the UN. Though the same can be said of Australia, its particular geo-political circumstances and siege mentality made the move considerably harder.

Canada also took the lead in admitting non-European migrants. In the 1950s and 1960s migrants from the Caribbean, South America, the Middle East and Turkey were allowed into Canada. In contrast this did not occur in Australia until the 1960s.

[1026] Hudson, *Blind Loyalty*, 5-9, 10-14, 118, 141.

The reason for this is because as pointed out above White Canada had a varying hold on the national identity compared to its Australian counterpart. Australia due to its geographic position was much more concerned about preserving itself as a white nation.

The demise of Britishness in both English-speaking Canada and Australia was a gradual process though and did not culminate in the latter until the 1970s. If the UK's membership bid into the EEC was the beginning of the unravelling of British race patriotism in Australia, the withdrawal of Britain from the East of Suez in 1967 was the last nail in the coffin.[1027] This was another great psychological blow to Australia.

During the 1960s and 1970s a 'new nationalism' emerged in both English-speaking Canada and Australia which attempted to fill the void left by the demise of British race patriotism as the core of their national identities. In essence the 'new nationalism' was an attempt to create a locally based identity, which was founded on home grown symbols and institutions. Prime examples of the 'new nationalism' in practice in both nations were the replacement of the Red Ensign with the new Maple Leaf Flag in Canada in 1965 and the adoption of *Advance Australia Fair* as the new national anthem in Australia in 1974.[1028] Both of these changes proved highly contentious in English-speaking Canada and Australia respectively, and the debate over the adoption of the new Maple Leaf Flag in Canada actually caused Parliament to come to a halt. In some ways the debate over the flag was the last hurrah for British race patriotism in English-speaking Canada.

The 'new nationalism' emerged in Canada in the context of the Quiet Revolution in Quebec. This involved the mass modernisation of Québécois society;

[1027] Kristensen, '"In Essence still a British Country"', 40, 43.
[1028] Ward, 'The "New Nationalism" in Australia, Canada and New Zealand', 235-6.

economically, politically and socially. It was encapsulated by the phrase 'Maîtres Chez Nous' (Masters of our own house). As a consequence Quebec became increasingly assertive, especially in terms of its relations with the federal government.[1029] Most French-Canadian nationalists argued that Quebec was their nation and Canada was their state. However, some went even further and asserted that Quebec should be their state as well. So, the 'new nationalism' in Canada was an attempt to hold the country together. With Pearson's emphasis not only on bilingualism but also biculturalism, the concept of Canada as a union of two nations was stressed.

The concern over US dominance was also another specific Canadian concern. From the beginning of its existence as a country through the act of Confederation in 1867 Canada had identified itself in opposition to its republican neighbour to the South.[1030] However, with the demise of Britishness, English-speaking Canada lost one of the major points of difference with the US in terms of its identity. What is more, this took place during a period in which US economic and military influence in Canada was growing. Thus, on the surface the 'new nationalism' offered a way in which to differentiate itself from its Southern neighbour.

In contrast to Britishness, the 'new nationalism' in Canada was advanced as something that the whole population, English-speaking Canadian and French-Canadian could relate to. The construction of local symbols, like the new national Maple Leaf Flag, was envisaged as a way in which to bring the two nations together into one identity.

But it proved unsuccessful in both Canada and Australia as a substitute for Britishness as it had little substance; there was no sense of being a distinct people,

---

[1029] Behiels, *Prelude to Quebec's Quiet Revolution*, 4, 5.
Thomson, *Jean Lesage & The Quiet Revolution*, 2, 3.
[1030] Thompson and Randall, *Canada and the United States*, 3, 253.

as under British race patriotism. In both countries the 'new nationalism' did not resonate with the people in the same way that Britishness once had. There was also considerable confusion as to what the 'new nationalism' actually meant. Sometimes it was referred to in radical nationalist terms; while other times it was described as the amalgamation of migrant cultures with the Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic to create a new, distinctive Canadian or Australian culture. Hence, the era of the 'new nationalism' was not a monolithic period as British race patriotism had once been.

Therefore, multiculturalism replaced the 'new nationalism' in both countries in the 1970s. Multiculturalism, however, was the antithesis of nationalism. In theory all cultures were considered equal, and the identities of both Canada and Australia were based on the multitude of cultures. However, all Canadians and Australians had to abide by the laws and values of their respective countries. Furthermore, although all cultures were in theory equal, in practice the Anglo-centric or Anglo-Celtic identity continued to dominate in both countries.

The precursors of multiculturalism in Canada were bilingualism and biculturalism. Pearson made repeated references to the dual nature of Canada; English and French. The Bi-Bi commission was established on this basis and the federal public service was also made bilingual at this time. The Pearson government attempted to push biculturalism as well. However, it faced heavy opposition from Canadians of non-British or non-French descent, in particular the Ukrainian-Canadians. However, the emphasis on two nations within one state actually strengthened the hand of French-Canadian separatists even more. Some were now beginning to call with greater assertiveness for Quebec to not only be their nation but also their state.

Both Canada and Australia also officially repealed their restrictive immigration legislation in the 1960s and 1970s. Again this was a slow process though. The Pearson and Whitlam governments removed the White Canada and White Australia policies from the statute books. However, it was with the subsequent Trudeau and Fraser governments that large numbers of non-European migrants actually started arriving in the two countries. Consequently, both Canada and Australia started to receive a diverse immigration intake. Migrants from Asia began to dominate the numbers of new settlers arriving into both countries.

A points system was adopted first in Canada in 1967. With this all migrants were treated on an equal basis and were assessed according to their education, language and work experience. The previous personal discretion of immigration officers to determine the suitability of migrants was removed. In contrast Australia introduced a half-way house in which parts of a points system were adopted but the personal discretion of immigration officers on the ground was also retained. It later adopted a fully fledged points system.[1031]

Canada received a much broader immigration intake than Australia after it adopted a non-discriminatory immigration policy. This was largely due to the different geographical positions of the two countries, with Australia receiving more Asian immigration, and Canada more from the Caribbean and South America. However, Canada also received considerable Asian migration as well. Moreover, the two countries introduced a more consistent refugee policy. This was in direct contrast to the previous ad-hoc positions. This change was largely due to a greater concern for refugees worldwide.[1032]

[1031] Hawkins, *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared* (Kingston, NSW: University of New South Wales Press, 1989) 105-6.
[1032] Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates*, 171-5.

As a consequence of their being white, British nations both English-speaking Canada and Australia adopted an official policy of assimilation towards non-British migrants. The policy began much earlier in Canada – in the 1890s – as this is when it received its first major wave of non-British migration. In contrast this happened in Australia in the post-Second World War period. The fact that Canada had a much earlier experience of mass non-British migration was another major difference in the experiences of the countries, and also goes a long way towards explaining the contrasts in their migrant policies. But in both countries migrants were expected to abandon their home cultures completely and incorporate themselves into the dominant Anglo-conformist or Anglo-Celtic culture. This was of course based on their nature as a British people, with British laws and institutions.

However, there was an emphasis on Protestant Christianity in the assimilation drives in Canada. This was not the case in Australia. This is of note as ironically Canada most likely contained more Catholics, with its French-Canadian and Irish-Canadian populations. There was also a major difference in the assimilation policies of Canada and Australia. In Australia migrants were expected to incorporate themselves into the Anglo-Celtic culture. But in Canada migrants could either assimilate into English-speaking Canada or French-Canada, depending on what part of the country they went to. Though in practice most migrants actually went to English-speaking Canada, and so they incorporated themselves into the Anglo-conformist culture.

Naturalisation was an important part of assimilation in both Canada and Australia. It was considered the ultimate goal of the assimilation process. This was because it incorporated all the main elements of assimilation: migrants were expected to learn English (or French in Canada) and take classes to learn the

responsibilities and duties of citizenship. Voluntary organisations also played an integral role in assimilation in both countries. The Good Neighbour Councils or New Settlers' Leagues were the main organisations co-ordinating voluntary activities in Australia. Their counterparts in Canada were the Citizenship Councils.

But with the rise of the 'new nationalism' in the 1960s in both Canada and Australia assimilation policy was replaced with integration. Migrants were now expected to incorporate themselves into the dominant Canadian or Australian culture. But at the same time it was accepted that they would want to retain elements of their home cultures, and moreover that the wider society could actually learn something from them as well. Nevertheless, incorporation into the dominant Canadian or Australian culture was of importance first and foremost. This highlighted the emphasis on national cohesion in this period.

Both Canada and Australia also recognised that integration actually took time. This was a major departure from the previous migrant policy of assimilation, by which migrants were expected to abandon their home cultures straight away and incorporate themselves into the Anglo-conformist or Anglo-Celtic cultures. However, migrants were constantly reminded that they needed to become 'Good Canadians' or 'Good Australians' first and foremost. So, this highlights the difference between integration and multicultural policy which would emerge later. Both English-speaking Canada and Australia desired to preserve the British nature of their populations. Therefore, the emphasis was on migrants to incorporate themselves into the dominant Canadian or Australian cultures. This focus on national cohesion was due to fears in both Canada and Australia over the problems other countries, prominently the UK and the US, were experiencing with integrating ethnic minorities.

But both Canada and Australia did stress that the dominant cultural groups in their societies should learn more about migrant cultures. Under assimilation migrants were expected to abandon their home cultures immediately, so there seemed no point in learning about the cultures migrants brought with them. However, under integration this changed. Integration was defined as a two-way street. Though, the emphasis still continued to be on the migrants to incorporate themselves into the dominant Canadian or Australian society.

By the 1970s integration was replaced with an official policy of multiculturalism in Canada and Australia. Migrants were now actively encouraged to preserve their home cultures. The fundamental cause of the introduction of a policy of multiculturalism in Canada was the publication of Book IV of the Bi-Bi commission on 'The Other Ethnic Groups' in 1969. The equivalent in Australia was the Galbally Report of 1978. In contrast to the Fraser government, the Trudeau government took quite some time before responding to the recommendations of Book IV. However, the actual multicultural policies adopted in the two countries were quite different. In Australia although in theory it was aimed at all groups, in reality it was directed towards migrants. Contrarily in Canada it was genuinely aimed at all sections of Canadian society. This was largely a result of the French-Canadian factor in Canada. However, the longer-established non-British and non-French groups in that country also played a part.

Though the change from integration to multiculturalism was very much a gradual one, it was a much faster change than that of assimilation to integration. Despite this, the term integration was still in use up until a year or two before official policies of multiculturalism were introduced in Canada and Australia. Moreover, there still continued to be an underlying tone of integration in the new policies. Migrants

were still ultimately expected to become a part of mainstream Canadian or Australian society. Even though all cultures were supposed to be equal under the multicultural policies the Anglo-centric and Anglo-Celtic cultures still dominated and do so to this day.

The overall French-Canadian reaction to the adoption of an official multicultural policy was one of general hostility. Many considered it as an attempt to denigrate their culture to one of many migrant cultures. Instead they regarded themselves as one of the founding nations of the country, the real *Canadiens*, one that was there before the British. Most French-Canadians regarded Canada as a bilingual and bicultural nation, not a multicultural one. They argued that migrants either became a part of French-Canada or English-speaking Canada. So, the Quebec government actually refused to adopt a policy of multiculturalism within its jurisdiction. Instead it opted for a policy of interculturalism. This was essentially the same, although it placed much greater emphasis on migrants learning the French language and incorporating themselves into French-Canadian society. This reflected the siege mentality of French-Canadians attempting to preserve their language and culture in a continent heavily dominated by English-speakers and Anglo-Saxon culture.

The multicultural policies in Canada and Australia developed over the course of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. In Canada after the publication of Book IV of the Bi-Bi commission Report the next major policy document on multiculturalism was the report *Equality Now!* of 1984 during the second Trudeau ministry. The report was produced by the Special Committee of the House of Commons on Participation of Visible Minorities in Canadian Society. Its main recommendation was that 'The government must now consciously choose to remove all roadblocks preventing the

full participation of all citizens in the cultural, social, economic, and political life of the country.'[1033] The report specifically argued that 'There is evidence of racially discriminatory mechanisms that provide different advantages and benefits to people of different races...Canadian society is in reality a "vertical mosaic" with some pieces raised above the others.'[1034] Therefore, this report signalled a new concern for social and economic equality compared to cultural equality previously. Furthermore, this was largely to do with more relatively recent 'visible' minorities from the West Indies, Asia and Africa rather than more long-established ethnic groups.

Canada went one step ahead of Australia and actually legislatively enshrined multiculturalism in 1988 during the Mulroney government. The main features of the proposed Canadian Multiculturalism Bill were outlined by David Crombie, the Secretary of State for Canada the previous year. Multiculturalism had previously been included in the constitution in 1982 in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The aim of the Multiculturalism Bill was to give legislative expression to those constitutional provisions. The Bill was based on the following principles of multiculturalism: '1. Multiculturalism is a central theme of Canadian citizenship...2. Every Canadian has the freedom to choose to enjoy, enhance and share his or her heritage...3. The federal government has the responsibility to promote multiculturalism throughout its departments and agencies.'[1035] By passing the Bill the following year Canada became the first country in the world to introduce a national Multiculturalism Act.

[1033] Canada. House of Commons, *Equality Now!, Report of the Special Committee of the House of Commons on Participation of Visible Minorities in Canadian Society* (Ottawa, Ont.: Supply and Services Canada, March 1984) 1.
[1034] *Ibid.*, 4, 5.
[1035] Canada. Department of the Secretary of State of Canada, *Multiculturalism – Being Canadian* (Ottawa, Ont.: Supply and Services, 1987) 3, 19.

The next major policy document after the Galbally Report in Australia was the *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* of 1989 during the Hawke government. It drew on the advice of the Advisory Council for Multicultural Affairs. It defined the fundamental principles of multiculturalism based on three rights and three limits. In summary these were: the right to cultural identity (expressing and sharing one's individual cultural heritage, including their language and religion); social justice (equality of treatment and opportunity, and the removal of barriers of race, ethnicity, culture, religion, language, gender or place of birth); and economic efficiency (the need to maintain, develop and utilise effectively the skills and talents of all Australians); the obligation to have an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia, to its interests and future first and foremost; to accept the basic structures and principles of Australia; and to accept that the right to express one's own culture and beliefs involves a reciprocal responsibility to accept the right of others to express their views and values. Therefore, the government whilst still maintaining its support for multiculturalism recognised the importance of placing limitations, and most importantly stressed the need for a national sense of community. The continued importance of the British heritage in Australia's self identity was illustrated even as late as the 1980s by Hawke in the foreword to the agenda in which he claimed that immigrants and refugees had 'been attracted by our British heritage and institutions.'[1036]

The *New Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* a decade later during the Howard government was the last notable policy statement on multiculturalism in Australia. This was in response to the NMAC report *Australian Multiculturalism for a new century: Towards inclusiveness.* The agenda generally supported the NMAC

[1036] Australia. OMA. *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia: Sharing Our Future* (Canberra, ACT: AGPS, July 1989).

recommendations. It defined an 'Australian' multiculturalism, created the Council for Multicultural Australia and announced a plan of action to give practical effect to four principles for multicultural Australia to continue to flourish for the good of all Australians: civic duty; concerned with support for the basic structures and principles of Australian society; cultural respect; social equity; concerned with equality of treatment and opportunity; and productive diversity, which seeks to maximise the major cultural, social and economic dividends arising from the diversity of the Australian population.[1037]

Moving to the present day, towards the end of 2006 the Conservative Harper government officially recognised that Quebec was a nation within a united Canada. This legitimised at a federal level what many Québécois had believed for many decades. Michael Ignatieff, who later became leader of the Liberal Party, supported the Conservative government's position at the time as he argued that Quebecers' culture, history, language and territory marked them out as a distinct people that should be recognised as a nation.[1038] In the Quebec election the following year the politics of the province and perhaps even the nation were transformed. However, incumbent Liberal Premier, Jean Charest remained in office. The separatist Parti-Québécois suffered what seemed a potentially terminal defeat. As a result, the federalist-separatist divide that had defined the French-speaking province's politics and infected the politics of the rest of English-speaking Canada for more than a generation appeared to have become a thing of the past.[1039] In its place emerged a new party, the ADQ and a new demand for 'autonomy'. The surge in support for the

---

[1037] Australia. DIMIA, *A New Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* (Canberra, ACT: AGPS, 1999).
[1038] 'Quebecers form a nation within Canada: PM', http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2006/11/22/harper-quebec.html (Accessed 11/07/2008) (Last Updated: Wednesday, 22nd November, 2006) 1.
[1039] The recent Canadian federal election in May 2011 saw the Parti Québécois' federal counterpart; the Bloc Québécois almost completely wiped out. This indicates that separatism is not a pressing issue in Quebec, at least for the moment.

ADQ turned a two-party system into a tripartite one.[1040] This demonstrated that Quebec politics was moving away from the traditional mould it had been set in for decades. However, in a snap provincial election in 2008 the Parti-Québécois and the ADQ's fortunes were reversed, with the former becoming the official opposition again and the latter losing official party status in the Quebec national assembly. However, after a succession of leaders the ADQ appeared to be rebuilding its electoral support in 2010 as demonstrated by strong showings in by-election victories. Therefore, Quebec politics has entered a very uncertain chapter and what this means for future relations with the federal government remains to be seen.

The release of the report of the 'Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences' in Quebec, or the Bouchard-Taylor Commission as it is more commonly known, in May 2008 highlighted the problems Quebec was experiencing in incorporating its religious minorities into Québécois society. The establishment of the commission was precipitated by incidents of religious intolerance in the province, particularly of Islamaphobia. The report argued that the Quebec government should preserve secularism, while encouraging understanding and interculturalism. However, the most controversial recommendation of the report was that the *French-Canadian* identity could no longer be the only part of *Quebec* identity.[1041] This was a fundamental statement as the two identities had been synonymous for centuries.

[1040] 'Au revoir separatism, bonjour "autonomy"', *The Economist*, vol. 382, iss. 8522, 31st March, 2007, 66.

[1041] 'Quebec's day of reckoning', *Globe and Mail*, 22nd May, 2008, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20080523.wereasonable23/B... (Accessed 28/05/2008).
Gerard Bouchard and Charles Taylor, *Building the Future: A Time for Reconciliation, Abridged Report, Commission on Reasonable Accommodation* (Québec City, QC: National Library and Archives of Quebec, 2008).

The 400th anniversary of the founding of Québec City in July 2008 provided an opportunity for those with different views towards the position of Quebec in Canada to express their viewpoint. Prime Minister Stephen Harper was accused of revising history when he asserted that Samuel Champlain[1042] not only established a city and the start of Quebec as a French-speaking nation in 1608, but he also established Canada, despite the actual formation of the country occurring under the British some 259 years later. Therefore, Harper was attempting to establish one historical narrative for the country, which firmly included French-Canadians. In contrast, Prime Minister Fillon of France referred to Quebec as a country on four occasions as he discussed the talks between France and Quebec over a manpower mobility agreement.[1043] Premier Charest instead emphasised the importance of bilingualism in Canada.[1044] However, because language is so important politically in the province, he counterpoised his remarks with references to the 'exceptional history' of the survival of French in North America, 'It is the history of a people, of a nation that had learned to preserve its language and its culture despite being surrounded by 300 million people who speak English [on the continent]...Our history is the history of our firm will, an unshakable will, to preserve our language and culture.'[1045] Thus, Charest illustrated a long-standing theme in French-Canadian history.

In spring 2008 the Harper government commissioned research into multiculturalism. The paper entitled 'The current state of multiculturalism in Canada and research themes on Canadian multiculturalism 2008-2010' written by the

---

[1042] The original French founder of Québec City.
[1043] 'Quebec's 400th bash used to secure points', *Globe and Mail*, 3rd July, 2008, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20080703.wquebec04/BNStor... (Accessed 08/07/2008) 1.
[1044] 'Charest applauds bilingualism on eve of Quebec City's birthday', *Globe and Mail*, 3rd July, 2008, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20080703.wquebec03/BNStor... (Accessed 08/07/2008) 1.
[1045] *Ibid.*

respected social scientist Will Kymlicka, emphasised the importance of the integration of migrants. The context of the research paper was the decline in support for multiculturalism in Western Europe and the argument that Canada would follow the same fate. However, the paper actually argued that multiculturalism had been a success in Canada compared to other Western nations (some of the measures used included naturalisation rates, earnings of second-generation migrants, views held by native born Canadians and migrants as well as Canadians' views towards Islam) and that it had been instrumental in the integration of migrants into Canadian society.[1046] Emphasis should be placed on the use of the phrase integration of migrants.

Jason Kenney, the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism elaborated on the government's new approach to multiculturalism in a speech to the National Metropolis Conference in Calgary in early 2009 in which he stressed the importance of integration in the multiculturalism programme. By this he meant ensuring migrants who arrived in Canada developed a competency in at least one of the two official languages of the country; faster recognition of the foreign qualifications of educated migrants; and a focus on migrant youths who were 'at risk either to criminality or extremism.'[1047] Therefore, there has definitely been a shift in multiculturalism policy in Canada to a greater emphasis on incorporating migrants into mainstream society. Nevertheless, nearly four-decades since its introduction a policy of multiculturalism still exists in Canada in some form and looks likely to remain for the foreseeable future.

[1046] 'The current state of multiculturalism in Canada and research themes on Canadian multiculturalism 2008-2010' by Will Kymlicka, http://www.cic.gc.ca/english//resources/publications/multi-state/index.asp (Accessed 22/03/2010) (Last Updated: 03/03/2010).

[1047] Speaking notes for Jason Kenney, Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism at the Eleventh National Metropolis Conference, Calgary, Alta., March 20th, 2009, http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/speeches/2009/2009-03-20.asp (Accessed 13/05/11) (Updated 14/04/09).

Under the Howard government at the end of 2006 multiculturalism was abandoned as the preferred government policy towards migrants in Australia, and was instead replaced with that of integration. So, this was a more overt move compared to the Canadian one above. The Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs was replaced with the Department of Immigration and Citizenship. National cohesion was stressed first and foremost. This was regarded as a pressing concern due to the large numbers of non-Europeans that had migrated to the country since the late 1970s. This emphasis on national cohesion has been a part of official migrant policy in Australia since the demise of Britishness in the 1960s. The change in policy actually had bipartisan support with Kevin Rudd, leader of the ALP (and subsequently Prime Minister) also supporting the new emphasis on integration rather than multiculturalism.[1048] However, the Rudd government did resurrect an Australian Multicultural Advisory Council at the close of 2008 to provide it with advice on the country's cultural diversity. Although, it still did not reverse the Howard government's decision to downgrade the responsibility for multiculturalism to a parliamentary secretary as opposed to a minister as previously.[1049]

However, Chris Bowen, the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship reaffirmed the now Gillard government's commitment to multiculturalism in an address to the Sydney Institute in early 2011. The overriding theme of his speech was mutual respect between Australians and new migrants. Bowen made his speech in the international context of an increasing number of countries questioning the benefits of multiculturalism, including Germany and the UK. However, he

---

[1048] 'Unity, not diversity, is PM's word' by Mark Metherell, *SMH*, 13th December, 2006, 2.

[1049] 'Multicultural experts to further Australia's strength in diversity' – Joint Media Release of Senator Chris Evans, the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship and Laurie Ferguson, Parliamentary Secretary for Multicultural Affairs and Settlement Services, Wednesday, 17th December, 2008, http://www.minister.immi.gov.au/media/media-releases/2008/ce08122.htm (Accessed 22/03/2010) (Last updated 17th December 2008).
Yuko Narushima, 'Mixing pot is back in multicultural Australia', *SMH*, 18th December, 2008.

emphasised that multiculturalism had 'strengthened Australian society.' But Bowen made the point though that Australian multiculturalism was unique. He identified three main features of Australia's policy: respect for traditional Australian values; the basis of it being citizenship; and political bipartisanship.[1050] Thus, the current political rhetoric appears to be more supportive of multiculturalism in Australia than Canada. Nevertheless, despite challenges from within and without, in both countries multiculturalism has survived as government policy for over thirty years and is likely to do so for the near future. Whatever the future shape of Canadian and Australian ideas of community, the story of their evolution from monolithic Britishness to multiculturalism will remain a lively source of debate and discussion in the years to come.

[1050] 'The genius of Australian multiculturalism' address to the Sydney Institute by Chris Brown, Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Thursday 17th February 2011, http://www.minister.immi.gov.au/media/cb/2011/cb159251.htm (Accessed 13/05/11) (Last updated Thursday, 17th February 2011).
'What makes multiculturalism great is mutual respect', *SMH*, 17th February 2011, http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/politics/what-makes-multiculturalism-great-is-mutual-respect-20110216-1awik.html (Accessed 13/05/11).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

LAC, Ottawa

Department of Agriculture

- **RG17**: Immigration Branch, 1842-1893

Department of Citizenship and Immigration

- **RG26/Series A-1-a**: Deputy Minister's registry files: departmental administration and general (block 1), 1942-1972
- **RG26/Series A-1-b**: Deputy Minister's registry files: citizenship (block 2), 1943-1966
- **RG26/Series A-1-c**: Deputy Minister's registry files: immigration (block 3), 1929-1972
- **RG26/Series A-2-a**: Legal Files, 1923-1964

Department of Employment and Immigration

- **RG76-B-1-B**: Subject files, 1911-1971
- **RG76-E-1**: Central Registry Files, 1947-1971

Department of the Interior

- **RG15**: Dominion Lands Bureau, 1821-1959

Department of the Secretary of State of Canada

- **RG6**: Registry files of Minister's Office, 1960-1974

Privy Council Office

- **RG2**: Central registry files, 1938-1976
- **RG2/Series A-5-a**: Cabinet Conclusions, 1944-1975
- **RG2/Series B-2**: Cabinet Documents, 1938-1976

Miscellaneous

- **RG33/80**: Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1963-1971

Fonds

- **MG26-J**: William Lyon Mackenzie King fonds, 1641, 1703, 1815-1969
- **MG26-L**: Louis S. St. Laurent fonds, 1879-1973
- **MG26-M**: John Diefenbaker fonds, 1888-1987
- **MG26-N**: Lester B. Pearson fonds, 1881-1973
- **MG26-O**: Pierre Elliott Trudeau fonds, 1900-2000
- **MG28-V12**: Canadian Jewish Congress fonds, 1931-1988
- **MG32-C67**: Paul Yuzyk fonds, 1911-1986

NAA, Canberra

Cabinet Office

- **A2700**: Curtin, Forde and Chifley Ministries – folders of Cabinet minutes and agenda, 30th Apr. 1941 – 30th Nov. 1949
- **A4639**: Fourth Menzies Ministry – folders of Cabinet submissions and associated decisions, 15th Dec. 1949 – 30th Mar. 1951
- **A4940**: Menzies and Holt Ministries – Cabinet files 'C' single number series, 1st Dec. 1949 – 31st Jan. 1985
- **A5819**: Seventh Menzies Ministry – copies of Cabinet submissions and associated decisions (second series) [1961-1963], 21st Oct. 1961 – 18th Dec. 1963
- **A5827**: Eighth Menzies Ministry – copies of Cabinet submissions and associated decisions [1963-1966], 19th Dec. 1963 – 26th Jan. 1966
- **A5839**: First Holt Ministry – folders of decisions of Cabinet and Cabinet Committees, 26th Jan. 1966 – 9th Dec. 1966
- **A5841**: First Holt Ministry – copies of Cabinet submissions and associated decisions [1966], 27th Jan. 1966 – 14th Dec. 1966
- **A5842**: Second Holt Ministry – copies of Cabinet submissions and associated decisions [1966-1967], 14th Dec. 1966 –
- **A5868**: Folders of Cabinet Submissions, Second Gorton Ministry, 21st Feb 1968 – 26th Sep. 1969
- **A5869**: Third Gorton Ministry - folders of Cabinet submissions, 14th Nov. 1969 – 9th Mar. 1971
- **A5873**: Third Gorton Ministry - folders of decisions of Cabinet and Cabinet committees, 12th Nov. 1969 – 29th Jan. 1971
- **A5882**: Gorton and McMahon Ministries - Cabinet files, 'CO' single number series, 1st Jan. 1960 – 31st Dec. 1985
- **A5908**: McMahon Ministry - Cabinet submissions, 12th Mar. 1971 – 30th Sep 1988
- **A5909**: McMahon Ministry - folders of decisions of Cabinet and Cabinet Committees, 12th Mar. 1971 – 26th Oct. 1972
- **A5915**: Whitlam Ministries - Cabinet Submissions, 19th Dec. 1972 – 31st Dec. 1975
- **A5925**: Whitlam Ministries - Folders of Decisions of Cabinet and Cabinet Committees, 20th Dec. 1972 – 5th Nov. 1975

- **A5931**: Whitlam Ministries - Cabinet files, single number series with 'CL' prefix, 20th Dec. 1972 – 11th Nov. 1975
- **A10756**: Fraser Ministries - Cabinet files, single number series with 'LC' prefix, 11th Nov. 1975 – 30th Nov. 1983
- **A12909**: Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Fraser Ministries - Cabinet Submissions (with Decisions), 23rd Dec. 1975 – 4th Feb. 1983
- **A12933**: Fraser Ministries - Cabinet Papers (some with Decisions), 23rd Sep. 1976 – 23rd Jan. 1979
- **A13075**: Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Ministries - Folders of Cabinet Decisions, 22nd Dec. 1975 – 11th Feb. 1983

Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council

- **A2169**: Council Meetings – Volumes of Agendas, Notes and Minutes, 13th Mar. 1947 – 6th Nov. 1958

Department of Immigration

- **A434**: Correspondence files, Class 3 (Non British European Migrants), 1st Jan. 1908 – 31st Dec. 1976
- **A445**: Correspondence files, multiple number series (policy matters), 1st Jan. 1922 – 31st Dec. 1968
- **A446**: Correspondence files, annual single number series with block allocations, 1st Jan. 1953 –
- **A6980**: Secret correspondence files, single number series with block allocations and 'S' [Secret] prefix, 1st Jan. 1932 –
- **A9609**: Reports on follow up surveys to monitor migrant welfare, 1st Jan. 1962 – 31st Dec. 1976

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

- **A461**: Correspondence files, multiple number series (third system), 1st Jan. 1901 – 31st Dec. 1950
- **A462**: Correspondence files, multiple number series, fourth system, 1st Jan. 1900 – 31st Dec. 1956
- **A463**: Correspondence files, annual single number series with occasional 'G' [General Representations] infix, 6th Mar. 1903 -
- **A1209**: Correspondence files, annual single number series (classified), 18th Apr. 1913 -
- **A4959**: Binder of transcripts of press conferences, interviews and broadcasts given by the Prime Minister (Rt Hon Robert Gordon Menzies), 9th Apr. 1960 – 27th Nov. 1963
- **A5619**: Cabinet files, single number series with 'C' [Cabinet] prefix, circa 1st Jan. 1949 - circa 31st Dec. 1972
- **M163**: Press Office - Prime Ministerial Press Releases, Speeches, Press Conference Transcripts, and Transcripts from Interviews on Radio and

Television (Canberra Office - Master Set) [of Gough Whitlam], 3rd Dec. 1972 – 12th Dec. 1975

- **M1277**: Senior Adviser's research material [to Malcolm Fraser], second series [Partially transferred to University of Melbourne Archives custody 2006], 1st Jan. 1966 – 7th Nov. 1983
- **M2576**: Folders of papers maintained by Robert Gordon Menzies as Prime Minister, 10th May 1932 – 2nd Mar. 1967
- **M2607**: Folders of speeches and articles maintained by Harold Edward Holt, 3rd Jul. 1946 – 26th Nov. 1965
- **M2684**: Correspondence files maintained by Harold Edward Holt as Prime Minister, 1st Jan. 1929 – 31st Dec. 1968
- **M3787**: Subject files of the Rt. Hon. John Grey Gorton as Prime Minister and Minister for Defence, 19th Oct. 1963 – 30th Apr. 1973
- **M4295**: Personal papers of Harold Edward Holt, 21st Jul. 1943 – 24th May 1968
- **M4299**: Personal papers of Harold Edward Holt, 1st Apr. 1941 – 10th Oct. 1967

Miscellaneous

- **A1838**: Correspondence files, multiple number series, 1st Jan. 1914 – 8th Dec. 1993
- **AA1978/508**: Files of correspondence, pamphlets, reports and speeches [of John Gorton], 1st Jul. 1959 – 31st Oct. 1970
- **M2454**: Personal records of Hon. Sir Reginald Swartz, 1st Jan. 1953 – 31st Dec. 1972

NAA, Sydney

Cabinet Office

- **A5915**: Whitlam Ministries - Cabinet Submissions, 19th Dec. 1972 – 31st Dec. 1975
- **A5925**: Whitlam Ministries - Folders of Decisions of Cabinet and Cabinet Committees, 20th Dec. 1972 – 5th Nov. 1975
- **A5931**: Whitlam Ministries - Cabinet files, single number series with 'CL' prefix, 20th Dec 1972 – 11th Nov. 1975

NLA, Canberra

- **MS3155**: Papers of Sir Peter Heydon, 1901-1977 [manuscript]
- **MS4738**: Papers of Arthur Calwell, 1905-1973 [manuscript]
- **MS4936**: Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, 1905-1978 [manuscript]
- **MS6690**: Papers of Jerzy Zubrzycki, 1919-1999 [manuscript]
- **MS7984**: Papers of Sir John Gorton, 1946-1995 [manuscript]
- **MS8953**: Papers of Robert Edward Armstrong, 1947-1974

Parliamentary Debates and Papers

Debates, *H of C*

- Sess. 1917, Vol. III
- Sess. 1945, Vol. I
- Sess. 1945, Vol. II
- Sess. 1946, Vol. I
- Sess. 1946, Vol. II
- Sess. 1946, Vol. III
- Sess. 1947, Vol. III
- Sess. 1947, Vol. IV
- Sess. 1947, Vol. V
- Sess. 1950, Vol. III
- Sess. 1952, Vol. III
- Sess. 1952, Vol. IV
- Sess. 1953, Vol. III
- Sess. 1955, Vol. IV
- Sess. 1955, Vol. V
- (Special) Sess. 1956-57
- Sess. 1957-58, Vol. I
- Sess. 1960, Vol. IV
- Sess. 1960, Vol. V
- Sess. 1962, Vol. I
- Sess. 1962, Vol. III
- Sess. 1963, Vol. I
- Sess. 1963, Vol. II
- Sess. 1963, Vol. III
- Sess. 1963, Vol. VI
- Sess. 1965, Vol. I
- Sess. 1965, Vol. II
- Sess. 1967, Vol. I
- Sess. 1967, Vol. V
- Sess. 1968-69, Vol. IV
- Sess. 1969, Vol. I
- Sess. 1970, Vol. I
- Sess. 1970, Vol. III
- Sess. 1970, Vol. IV
- Sess. 1970, Vol. VI
- Sess. 1970, Vol. VII
- Sess. 1971, Vol. III
- Sess. 1971, Vol. VII
- Sess. 1971, Vol. VIII
- Sess. 1971, Vol. IX
- Sess. 1971, Vol. X
- Sess. 1972, Vol. III
- Sess. 1975, Vol. VI
- Sess. 1975, Vol. VII
- Sess. 1984, Vol. IV

- Sess. 1987, Vol. IV
- Sess. 1987, Vol. IX
- Sess. 1987, Vol. X
- Sess. 1987, Vol. XI

CPD

- Sess. 1945, Vol. 184
- Sess. 1946-47, Vol. 190
- Sess. 1946-47, Vol. 191
- Sess. 1946-47, Vol. 193
- Sess. 1946-47, Vol. 195
- Sess. 1948, Vol. 198
- Sess. 1948, Vol. 200
- *H of R*, Sess. 1954-55, Vol. 6 (New Series)
- *H of R*, Sess. 1961, Vols. 32 and 33
- *H of R*, Sess. 1967, Vol. 56
- *H of R*, Sess. 1967, Vol. 57
- *Senate*, Sess. 1967, Vol. 35
- *Senate*, Sess. 1967, Vol. 36
- *H of R*, Sess. 1968, Vol. 58
- *H of R*, Sess. 1968, Vol. 60
- *H of R*, Sess. 1973, Vol. 82
- *H of R*, Sess. 1973, Vol. 83
- *H of R*, Sess. 1973, Vol. 86
- *H of R*, Sess. 1973, Vol. 87
- *H of R*, Sess. 1978, Vol. 109
- *H of R*, Sess. 1979, Vol. 115
- *H of R*, Sess. 1984, Vol. 139
- *H of R*, Sess. 1988, Vol. 159
- *H of R*, Sess. 1989, Vol. 168
- *H of R*, Sess. 1989, Vol. 169

Commonwealth Parliamentary Papers

- 1944-45, Vol. IV
- 1945-46, Vol. II
- 1946-47-48, Vol. II
- 1961, Vol. IV

Newspapers

Globe and Mail (Toronto)

- April, May, July, November 1945
- April, May, July, November 1950
- April, May, July, November 1955
- April, May, July, November 1960
- April, May, July, November 1965
- July 1967
- April, May, July, November 1970
- October 1971
- May 2008
- July 2008

Montreal Gazette (Montreal)

- April, May, July, November 1945
- April, May, July, November 1950
- April, May, July, November 1955
- April, May, July, November 1960
- April, May, July, November 1965
- July 1967
- April, May, July, November 1970
- October 1971

Toronto Star (Toronto)

- April, May, July, November 1945
- April, May, July, November 1950
- April, May, July, November 1955
- April, May, July, November 1960
- April, May, July, November 1965
- July 1967
- April, May, July, November 1970
- October 1971

Vancouver Sun (Vancouver)

- April, May, July, November 1945
- April, May, July, November 1950
- April, May, July, November 1955
- April, May, July, November 1960
- April, May, July, November 1965
- May, July, November 1970
- October 1971

SMH (Sydney)

- January, April, May, August, November 1945
- March, November 1947
- January, April, May, November 1950
- January, April, May, November 1955
- January, April, May, November 1960
- August 1961
- January, April, May, November 1965
- January, April, May, November 1970
- January, April, May, November 1975
- May 1978
- August 1986
- July 1989
- December 2006
- December 2008
- February 2011

Age (Melbourne)

- January, April, May, August, November 1945
- March, November 1947
- January, April, May, November 1950
- January, April, May, November 1955
- January, April, May, November 1960
- August 1961
- January, April, May, November 1965
- January, April, November 1970
- January, April, May, November 1975
- May 1978
- January 1983
- July 1989

The Australian

- April 1973
- September 1986
- July 1989

West Australian (Perth)

- January, April, May, November 1945
- January, April, May, November 1950
- January, April, May, November 1955
- January, April, May, November 1960
- January, April, May, November 1965
- January, April, May, November 1970

- January, April, May, November 1975

Canberra Times (Canberra)

- August 1945
- November 1947
- August 1961
- May 1978
- September 1980
- June, July 1982
- December 1986
- July 1988

Daily Telegraph (Sydney)

- August 1945
- March, November 1947
- August 1961
- May 1978

Mercury (Hobart)

- June 1982

National Times (Sydney)

- September 1986

Ethnic and Government Journals

Citizen

- Vols. 1-14, April 1955 - February 1968

The Ukrainian-Canadian

- Vols. 1-4, 1st September 1947 - 15th December, 1950
- Vol. 5, No. 13, 1st July, 1951
- Vol. 6, No. 13, 1st July, 1952
- Vol. 7, No. 13, 1st July, 1953
- Vol. 8, No. 13, 1st July, 1954
- Vol. 9, Nos. 1-24, 1st January - 15th December, 1955
- Vol. 10, No. 13, 1st July, 1956
- Vol. 11, No. 13, 1st July, 1957
- Vol. 12, No. 13, 1st July, 1958
- Vol. 13, No. 13, 1st July, 1959
- Vol. 14, Nos. 1-6, 1st January - 15th March, 1960
- Vol. 14, No. 13, 1st July, 1960
- Vol. 15, No. 13, 1st July, 1961
- Vol. 16, No. 13, 1st July, 1962
- Vol. 17, Nos. 1-24, 1st January, 1963 - 15th December, 1963
- Vol. 18, No. 13, 1st July, 1964
- Vol. 19, No. 13, 1st July, 1965
- Vol. 20, No. 13, 1st July, 1966
- Vol. 21, No. 13, 1st July, 1967
- Vol. 21, Nos. 19-20, 1st - 15th October, 1967
- Vol. 22, Nos. 1-19, 1st January, 1968 - 1st October, 1968
- Vols. 507-542, November 1968 - December 1971

The Jewish Standard, Canada

- May 1958
- June 1958
- July 1958
- July 1959
- July 1960
- July 1961
- July 1962
- March 1963
- July 1963
- July 1964
- July 1965
- July 1966
- July 1967
- January 1968
- May 1968

- July 1968
- June - July 1969
- July 1970
- June - July 1971
- October 1971

The Handbook for Newcomers

- 1954, 1956, 1958, 1959

Canadian Citizenship Series – Our Land

- 1953, 1967

Canadian Citizenship Series – Our Government

- 1949

Canadian Citizenship Series – Our System of Government

- 1966

Canadian Citizenship Series – Our Resources

- 1952, 1963

Canadian Citizenship Series – The Arts in Canada

- 1957, 1958, 1961, 1965, 1967

Canadian Citizenship Series – Our History

- 1966

The Canadian Scene

- 1951, 1962

The Good Neighbour

- Nos. 1-12, August 1950 - July 1951

- Nos. 18-29, January - December 1952
- Nos. 1-24, January 1954 - December 1955 (Amalgamated with *The New Australian* in January 1954)
- Nos. 36-47, January - December 1957
- Nos. 72-83, January - December 1960
- Nos. 96-107, January - December 1962
- Nos. 132-143, January - December 1965
- Nos. 156-167, January - December 1967

The New Australian

- Nos. 1-12, January-December 1949
- Nos. 25-36, January-December 1951
- Nos. 49-60, January-December 1953

Progresso, Australia

- Vol. 4, Nos. 1-7, February - November 1960
- Vol. 9, Nos. 1-12, January - December 1965
- Vol. 14, Nos. 1-12, January - December 1970
- Vol. 19, Nos. 1-12, January - December 1975
- Vol. 21, Nos. 3, 5-12, March, May - December 1977

Published Primary Sources

Australia. AIMA. *Evaluation of Post-arrival Programs and Services: A Summary.* Melbourne: Globe Press, 1982.

Australia. AIMA. *Future Directions for Multiculturalism: Final Report of the Council of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs.* Melbourne: AIMA, 1986.

Australia. AIMA. Council. *Looking forward: a report on consultations concerning the review of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs by the Council of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs.* Melbourne: AIMA, 1984.

Australia. Committee of Review of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs. *Report to the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs*, Vol. 2 (Chairman Moss Cass). Canberra: AGPS, November 1983.

Australia. Department of Immigration, *Australia and Immigration: A Review of Migration to Australia Especially since World War II.* Immigration Reference Paper, revised January 1974. Canberra: Department of Immigration, 1974.

Australia. Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. *Annual Report.* Canberra: AGPS, 1977.

Australia. Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. *Review of Activities to 30th June 1976.* Canberra: AGPS, 1977.

Australia. Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. *Review of Activities to 30th June 1977.* Canberra: AGPS, 1977.

Australia. DIMA. *Australian Immigration: The Facts, Update.* Canberra, ACT. Dept. of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, 1998.

Australia. DIMIA. *A New Agenda for a Multicultural Australia.* Canberra: AGPS, 1999.

Australia. Migrant Task Force Committee NSW. *First Report of a Task Force Established by the Minister for Immigration, into the Immediate Problems of Migrants and Recommendations for their Resolution.* Canberra: Department of Immigration, 1973.

Australia. Migrant Task Force Committee Victoria. *Recommendations to the Minister for Immigration.* Canberra: Department of Immigration, 1973.

Australia. OMA. *Multiculturalism and Immigration/Office of Multicultural Affairs, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.* Canberra: AGPS, 1988.

Australia. OMA. *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia: Sharing Our Future.* Canberra: AGPS, July 1989.

Australia. Report of the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants, *Migrant Services and Programs* (Chairman Frank Galbally). Canberra: AGPS, May 1978.

Bouchard, Gerard and Taylor, Charles. *Building the Future: A Time for Reconciliation, Abridged Report, Commission on Reasonable Accommodation.* Québec City: National Library and Archives of Quebec, 2008.

Canada. *A Preliminary Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965.

Canada. Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. *Annual Report, 1980.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1982.

Canada. Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. *Annual Report, 1981-82.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1983.

Canada. Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, Conference Report. *Multiculturalism as State Policy.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.

Canada. Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. *First Annual Report.* Ottawa: Information Canada, 1975.

Canada. Canadian Heritage. *Publications, Multiculturalism and Citizenship.* Ottawa: Canadian Heritage, 1993.

Canada. Department of the Secretary of State. *Multiculturalism – Being Canadian.* Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1987.

Canada. Department of the Secretary of State. *The Canadian Family Tree.* Ottawa: Information Canada, 1967.

Canada. House of Commons. *Equality Now!* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1984.

Canada. House of Commons. *Equality Now! Report of the Special Committee of the House of Commons on Participation of Visible Minorities in Canadian Society.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, March 1984.

Canada. Minister of State for Multiculturalism. *Multiculturalism – A Canadian Reality.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1980.

Canada. Minister of State. Multiculturalism. *Multiculturalism and the Government of Canada.* Ottawa: Printing and Publishing, Supply and Services Canada, 1978.

Canada. Minister of State for Multiculturalism. *Multiculturalism as State Policy.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1978.

Canada. Minister of State for Multiculturalism. *The Place of Multiculturalism in Canada's Long-Term Economic Development.* Ottawa: The Department, Multiculturalism Directorate, 1984.

Canada. Minister of State for Multiculturalism. *The Second Decade of Multiculturalism: Opportunities for the Future.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1983.

Canada. Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. Corporate Policy and Research. *Cultural Autonomy in the Constitution and in Practice: The Canadian Model.* Ottawa: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, 1992.

Canada. Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. *Multiculturalism: what is it really about?* Ottawa: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, 1991.

Canada. Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. *Recent publications supported by Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada.* Ottawa: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, 1992.

Canada. Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. *Working together towards equality: an overview of race relations initiatives.* Ottawa: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, 1990.

Canada. Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book 4. *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, October 23rd 1969.

Canada. Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Report. Vol. 1. *General Introduction: The Official Languages.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967.

Canada. Secretary of State. *Annual Report of the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1982-3.

Canada. Secretary of State. *Report of the Secretary of State of Canada for the Year Ended March 31st, 1967.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1967.

Canada. Secretary of State. *Report of the Secretary of State of Canada for the Year Ended March 31st, 1969.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1969.

Canada. *The Canadian Constitution 1981.* Ottawa: Canadian Unity Information Office, 1984.

Grassby, A. J. *A Multi-cultural society for the future by the Hon. A. J. Grassby, Melbourne, 11th August, 1973.* Canberra: AGPS, 1973.

Grassby, A. J. *Credo for a nation: An address by the Minister for Immigration the Hon. A. J. Grassby, M.H.R., to the Family of the Nation Rally, at the Sydney Opera House, Sunday, 9th June, 1974.* Canberra: AGPS, 1974.

Innis, Hugh R. *Bilingualism and Biculturalism: An Abridged Version of the Royal Commission Report*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973.

Jayasuriya, D. L. 'Whither Multiculturalism?', 10th Lalor Address, Human Rights Commission. Canberra, 29th November 1984.

Mirges, G. *Multiculturalism: Building the Canadian Mosaic, Report of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism*. Ottawa: House of Commons, 1987.

Pearson, Lester B. *Words and Occasions*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

White Paper on Immigration by the Hon. Jean Marchand, Minister of Manpower and Immigration, October 1966. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1966.

Secondary Sources

Books and Articles

Abella, Irving. 'Multiculturalism, Jews, and the Forging of a Canadian Identity' in A. Cardozo and L. Musto (Eds). *The Battle over Multiculturalism: Does it Help or Hinder Canadian Unity?* Ottawa, Ont.: PSI Publications, c1997.

Abu-Laban, Yasmeen. 'The Politics of Race, Ethnicity and Immigration: The Contested Arena of Multiculturalism' in James Bickerton and Alain-G. Gagnon (Eds). *Canadian Politics.* 3rd edn. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 1999.

Abu-Laban, Yasmeen. 'Welcome/STAY OUT: The Contradiction of Canadian Integration and Immigration Policies at the Millennium'. *CES*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1998.

Abu-Laban, Yasmeen and Gabriel, Christina. *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment Equity, and Globalisation.* Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2002.

Abu-Laban, Yasmeen and Stasiulis, Daiva. 'Ethnic pluralism under siege: popular and partisan opposition to multiculturalism'. *Canadian Public Policy*, vol. 18, December 1992.

Adelman, Howard. (ed.). *Immigration and Refugee Policy: Australia and Canada Compared.* Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1994.

Alexander, M. and Galligan, B. (Eds). *Comparative Political Studies: Australia and Canada.* Kuala Lumpur: Pitman Publishing, 1992.

Allan, Lyle. 'Ethnic transition in inner-Melbourne politics' in James Jupp (ed.). *Ethnic Politics in Australia.* Sydney, NSW: George Allen & Unwin, 1984.

Allan, Lyle. 'A selective annotated bibliography of multiculturalism'. *Social Alternatives*, vol. 3, no. 3, July 1983.

Allan, Lyle. 'Ethnic Politics: Migrant Organisation and the Victorian ALP'. *Ethnic Studies*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1978.

Allen, Richard (ed.). *The Social Gospel in Canada.* Ottawa, Ont.: National Museums of Canada, 1975.

Alomes, Stephen. *A Nation at Last? The Changing Character of Australian Nationalism, 1880-1988.* Sydney, NSW: Angus and Robertson, 1988.

Amit-Talai, Vered and Knowles, Caroline (Eds). *Resituating Identities.* Toronto, Ont.: Broadview Press, 1996.

Anderson, Alan B. 'Implications of the changing demographic profile, multiculturalism and immigration policies for Canadian ethnic research' in Satya P. Sharma,

Alexander M. Ervin and Deidre Meintel (Eds). *Immigrants and Refugees in Canada: A National Perspective on Ethnicity, Multiculturalism and Cross-Cultural Adjustment.* Saskatoon, Sask.: University of Saskatchewan, c1991.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* Rev. edn. London, UK: Verso, 1991.

Anderson, J. T. M. *The Education of the New-Canadian: A Treatise on Canada's Greatest Educational Problem.* London, UK; Toronto, Ont.: J. M. Dent, 1918.

Anderson, Mark and Ashton, Paul. *Australian History and Citizenship.* South Yarra, Vic.: Macmillan Education, 2000.

Angus, Ian. 'Cultural Plurality and Democracy'. *IJCS*, no. 25, spring 2002.

Appleyard, R. T. 'Post-War British Immigration' in James Jupp (ed.). *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins.* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Arnold, A. J. 'How far do we go with Multiculturalism?'. *CES*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1970.

Atchison, John. 'Immigration in Two Federations' in B. W. Hodgins, J. J. Eddy, S. D. Grant and J. Struthers (Eds). *Federalism in Canada and Australia: Historical Perspectives, 1920-1988.* Peterborough, Ont.: The Frost Centre for Canadian Heritage and Development Studies, Trent University, 1989.

Atchison, John. 'Patterns of Australian and Canadian Immigration: 1900-1983'. *International Migration*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1984.

Atchison, John and Westin, Charles. 'Comparative Aspects of Swedish and Australian Multiculturalism' in *Scandinavian and European Migration to Australia and New Zealand: Proceedings of the Conference held in Stockholm, Sweden, and Turku, Finland, June 9th-11th, 1998.* Turku, Finland: Institute of Migration, 1999.

Auger, Martin Francois. 'On the Brink of Civil War: The Canadian Government and the Suppression of the 1918 Quebec Easter Riots'. *CHR*, vol. 89, no. 4, December 2008.

'Au revoir separatism, bonjour "autonomy"', *The Economist*, vol. 382, iss. 8522, 31st March, 2007.

Ayers, Philip. *Malcolm Fraser: A Biography.* Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1987.

Bagley, Christopher and Friesen, John W. (Eds). *The Evolution of Multiculturalism.* Calgary, Alta.: The Calgary Institute for the Humanities, The University of Calgary, May 1988.

Bain, Colin M. *Relationships: Canada since 1960.* Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall Canada, 1996.

Bain, Colin M. *Multiculturalism: Canada's people*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall Canada, c1987.

Ball, Rochelle E. *Worlds Turned Upside Down: Stories of Migrant Children in Contemporary Australia: the Canberra Community Experience*. Charnwood, ACT: Ginninderra Press, 2005.

Bannerji Himani. 'Multiple multiculturalisms and Charles Taylor's politics of recognition' in Barbara Saunders and David Halijan (Eds). *Whither Multiculturalism? A Politics of Dissensus*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2003.

Bannerji Himani. *The dark side of the nation: essays on multiculturalism, nationalism and gender*. Toronto, Ont.: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2000.

Bannerji, Himani. 'On the Dark Side of the Nation: Politics of Multiculturalism and the State of "Canada"'. *JCS*, vol. 31, no. 3, 1996.

Barber, Marilyn. 'Nationalism, Nativism and the Social Gospel' in Richard Allen (ed.). *The Social Gospel in Canada*. Ottawa, Ont.: National Museums of Canada, 1975.

Batrouney, Trevor. 'From "White Australia" to Multiculturalism: citizenship and identity' in Ghassan Hage (ed.). *Arab-Australians Today: Citizenship and Belonging*. Carlton South, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2002.

Bauhn, Per, Lindberg, C. and Lundberg, S. *Multiculturalism and Nationhood in Canada: The Cases of First Nations and Quebec*. Lund, Sweden: Lund University Press, 1995.

Behiels, Michael D. and Stuart, Reginald C. (Eds). *Transnationalism: Canada-United States History into the Twenty-first Century*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.

Behiels, Michael D. (ed.). *Quebec Since 1800: Selected Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Irwin Publishing, 2002.

Behiels, Michael D. 'The Bloc Populaire Canadien and the Origins of French-Canadian Neo-Nationalism, 1942-1948' in Michael D. Behiels (ed.). *Quebec Since 1800: Selected Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Irwin Publishing, 2002.

Behiels, Michael D. 'Lester B. Pearson and the Conundrum of National Unity, 1963-1968' in Norman Hillmer (ed.). *Pearson: The Unlikely Gladiator*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

Behiels, Michael D. *Quebec and the Question of Immigration: From Ethnocentrism to Ethnic Pluralism, 1900-1985*. Ottawa, Ont.: Canadian Historical Association, 1991.

Behiels, Michael D. (ed.). *Quebec Since 1945: Selected Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Copp Clark Pitman, 1987.

Behiels, Michael D. 'Quebec: Social Transformation and Ideological Renewal, 1940-1976' in Michael D. Behiels (ed.). *Quebec Since 1945: Selected Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Copp Clark Pitman, 1987.

Behiels, Michael D. *Prelude to Quebec's Quiet Revolution: Liberalism versus Neo-nationalism, 1945-1960*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985.

Behiels, Michael D. and Martel, Marcel (Eds). *Nation, Ideas, Identities: Essays In Honour of Ramsay Cook*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Belich, James. *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783-1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Bell, David V. J. *The Roots of Disunity: A Study of Canadian Political Culture*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bell, Duncan. *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*. Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Benvenuti, Andrea. *Anglo-Australian Relations and the 'Turn to Europe', 1961-1972*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2008.

Benvenuti, Andrea and Ward, Stuart. 'Britain, Europe, and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada' in Phillip Buckner (ed.). *Canada and the End of Empire*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2005.

Berdichewsky, B. *Racism, Ethnicity and Multiculturalism*. Vancouver, BC: Future Publications, 1994.

Van Den Berge, Pierre L. 'Australia, Canada and the United States: ethnic melting pots or plural societies?' *ANZJS*, vol. 19, no. 2, July 1983.

Berger, Carl. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Berger, Carl (ed.) *Imperialism and Nationalism, 1884-1914: A Conflict in Canadian Thought*. Toronto, Ont.: Copp Clark, 1969.

Berger, Carl. 'The True North Strong and Free' in P. Russell (ed.). *Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Berry, J. W. and Laponce, J. A. (Eds). *Ethnicity and Culture in Canada: The Research Landscape*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Berry, J. W., Kalen, R. & Taylor, D. M. *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada*. With the assistance of L. Lamarche and J. Christian. Ottawa, Ont.: Ministry of Supply and Services, Canada, 1977.

Bessant, Judith and Watts, Rob. *Sociology Australia*. 2nd edn. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 2002.

Betts, Katherine. Book Review on Mark Lopez. 'The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics: 1945-1975'. *People and Place*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2000.

Betts, Katherine. *The Great Divide: Immigration Policies in Australia*. First published in 1988 by MUP under the title *Ideology and Immigration*. Sydney, NSW: Duffy and Snellgrove, 1999.

Betts, Katherine. *Ideology and Immigration: Australia, 1976 to 1987*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1988.

Bibby, Reginald. 'A Question of Identity: Canada's Ukrainians and Multiculturalism' in Stella Hryniuk and Lubomyr Luciuk (Eds). *Multiculturalism and Ukrainian Canadians*. Polyphony Series, vol. 13. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Bibby, Reginald. *Mosaic Madness: The Poverty and Potential of Life in Canada*, Toronto, Ont.: Stoddart, 1990.

Bickerton, James and Gagnon, Alain-G. (Eds). *Canadian Politics*. 3rd edn. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 1999.

Birch, Anthony H. *Nationalism and National Integration*. London, UK; Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Birrell, Robert and Birrell, Tanya. *An Issue of People: Population and Australian Society*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1981.

Bissoondath, Neil. *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Revised and Updated. Toronto, Ont.: Penguin, 2002.

Blainey, Geoffrey. *All for Australia*. Sydney, NSW: Methuen Hayes, 1984.

Blair, H. 'Bloc Populaire' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Bociurkiw, B. 'The Federal Policy of Multiculturalism and the Ukrainian-Canadian Community' in M. R. Lupul (ed.). *Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, Proceedings of the Conference Sponsored by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, September 9-11, 1977*. Edmonton, Alta.: The University of Alberta Press, 1978.

Bohaker, Heidi and Iacovetta, Franca. 'Making Aboriginal People "Immigrants Too": A Comparison of Citizenship Programs for Newcomers and Indigenous Peoples in Postwar Canada, 1940s-1960s'. *CHR*, vol. 90, no. 3, September 2009.

Bolton, Geoffrey. *The Oxford History of Australia: volume 5, The Middle Way 1942-1995*. 2nd edn. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Bongiorno, Frank. '"Real Solemn History" and its Discontents: Australian Political History and the Challenge of Social History'. *AJPH*, vol. 56, no. 1, March 2010.

Bongiorno, Frank. 'John Beasley and the postwar world' in Carl Bridge, Frank Bongiorno and David Lee (Eds). *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010*. Australia: DFAT, 2010.

Boreham, Paul, Stokes, Geoffrey and Hall, Richard (Eds). *The Politics of Australian Society: Political Issues for the New Century*. 2nd edn. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education, c2004.

Bostock, William W. 'The Effects of Ethno-Cultural Mix on Policy Outcomes in Australia and Canada', *Social Alternatives*, vol. 3, no. 3, July 1983.

Bothwell, Robert. *The Penguin History of Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: Penguin Canada, 2006.

Bothwell, Robert. *Pearson: His Life and World*. Toronto, Ont.: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978.

Bothwell, Robert, Drummond, Ian and English, John. *Canada since 1945: Power, Politics, and Provincialism*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Bottomley, Gill and de Lepervanche, Marie (Eds). *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*. Sydney, NSW: George Allen & Unwin, 1984.

Bouchard, Gerard (Translated by Paul Leduc Browne and Michelle Weinroth). *The Making of the Nations and Cultures of the New World: An Essay in Comparative History*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008.

Breton, Raymond. 'Intergroup Competition in the Symbolic Construction of Canadian Society' in Peter S. Li (ed.). *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*. 2nd edn. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Breton, Raymond. 'The Evolution of the Canadian Multicultural Society: the Significance of Government Intervention' in A. J. Fry and Ch. Forceville (Eds). *Canadian Mosaic: Essays on Multiculturalism*. Amsterdam: Free University Press, 1988.

Breton, Raymond. 'Multiculturalism and Canadian Nation-Building' in A. Cairns and C. Williams (Eds). *The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity and Language in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Breton, Raymond. 'The Structure of Relationships Between Ethnic Collectives' in L. Driedger (ed.). *The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic: A Quest for Identity*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.

Brett, Judith. *Robert Menzies' Forgotten People*. Sydney, NSW: Sun Australia, 1993.

Bridge, Carl. '"Undependable busybody?" S.M. Bruce and World War II' in Carl Bridge, Frank Bongiorno and David Lee (Eds). *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010.* Australia: DFAT, 2010.

Bridge, Carl (ed.). *Munich to Vietnam: Australia's Relations with Britain and the United States since the 1930s.* Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1991.

Bridge, Carl and Attard, Bernard (Eds). *Between Empire and Nation: Australia's External Relations from Federation to the Second World War.* Melbourne, Vic.: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2000.

Bridge, Carl, Bongiorno, Frank and Lee, David (Eds). *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010.* Australia: DFAT, 2010.

Bridge, Carl, Bongiorno, Frank and Lee, David. 'Introduction' in Carl Bridge, Frank Bongiorno and David Lee (Eds). *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010.* Australia: DFAT, 2010.

Bridge, Carl and Fedorowich, Kent (Eds). *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity.* London, UK: Frank Cass, 2003.

Brimelow, Peter. *The Patriot Game: Canada and the Canadian Question Revisited.* Stanford, CA: Hoover Press, 1986.

Brocklehurst, Helen and Phillips, Robert (Eds). *History, Nationhood and the Question of Britain.* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Brotz, Howard. 'Multiculturalism in Canada: A Muddle'. *Canadian Public Policy*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1980.

Brown, Judith M. and Louis, Wm. Roger (Eds). *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume IV, The Twentieth Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series.*

Brown, Nicholas and Cardinal, Linda (Eds). *Managing Diversity: Practices of Citizenship.* Ottawa, Ont.: University of Ottawa Press, 2007.

Brown, Nicholas and Cardinal, Linda. 'Introduction' in Nicholas Brown and Linda Cardinal (Eds). *Managing Diversity: Practices of Citizenship.* Ottawa, Ont.: University of Ottawa Press, 2007.

Brown, Robert Craig and Cook, Ramsay. *Canada 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed.* Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1981.

Buchigani, N. 'Canadian Ethnic Research and Multiculturalism'. *JCS*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1982.

Buchigani, N., and Engel, J. *Cultures in Canada: Strength in Diversity.* Edmonton, Alta.: Weigl Educational Publishers, 1983.

Buckner, Phillip (ed.). *Canada and the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.

Buckner, Phillip. 'Canada and the End of Empire, 1939-1982' in Phillip Buckner (ed.). *Canada and the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.

Buckner, Phillip. 'Introduction: Canada and the British Empire' in Phillip Buckner (ed.). *Canada and the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.

Buckner, Phillip (ed.). *Canada and the End of Empire*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2005.

Buckner, Phillip. 'Introduction' in Phillip Buckner (ed.). *Canada and the End of Empire*, Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2005.

Buckner, Phillip. 'The Long Goodbye: English Canadians and the British World' in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (Eds). *Rediscovering the British World*. Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary Press, 2005.

Buckner, Phillip. 'Canada' in David Omissi and Andrew S. Thompson (Eds). *The Impact of the South African War*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002.

Buckner, Phillip. 'Whatever happened to the British Empire?'. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, vol. 4, 1992.

Buckner, Phillip and Bridge, Carl. 'Reinventing the British World'. *The Round Table*, vol. 92, issue 368, 2003.

Buckner, Phillip and Francis, R. Douglas (Eds). *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2006.

Buckner, Phillip and Francis, R. Douglas. 'Introduction' in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (Eds). *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2006.

Buckner, Phillip and Francis, R. Douglas (Eds). *Rediscovering the British World*. Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary Press, 2005.

Buckner, Phillip and Francis, R. Douglas. 'Introduction' in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (Eds). *Rediscovering the British World*. Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary Press, 2005.

Bumsted, J. M. *A History of the Canadian Peoples*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Burnet, Jean R. *Multiculturalism in Canada*. Canadian Studies Resource Guide. Ottawa, Ont.: Canadian Studies Directorate, Department of the Secretary of State, Canada, 1988.

Burnet, Jean R. 'The Multicultural Mosaic: Multiculturalism 10 Years Later' in J. L. Elliott (ed.). *Two Nations, Many Cultures: Ethnic Groups in Canada*. 2nd edn. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall Canada, 1983.

Burnet, Jean R. 'The social and historical context of ethnic relations' in Robert C. Gardner and Rudolf Kalin (Eds). *A Canadian Social Psychology of Ethnic Relations*. Toronto, Ont.; New York, NY: Methuen, 1981.

Burnet, Jean R. 'Separate or Equal: A Dilemma of Multiculturalism' in A. W. Rasporich (ed.). *The Social Sciences and Public Policy in Canada*. Faculty of Social Sciences Inaugural Symposium Papers, vol. 1. Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary, 1979.

Burnet, Jean R. 'The Policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: An Interpretation' in A. Wolfgang (ed.). *Education of Immigrant Students: Issues and Answers*. Toronto, Ont.: OISE, 1975.

Burnet, Jean R. and Palmer, Howard. *"Coming Canadians": An Introduction to a History of Canada's Peoples*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1989.

Burnley, Ian H. *The Impact of Immigration on Australia: A Demographic Approach*. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Burridge, Kate, Foster, Lois and Turcotte, Gerry (Eds). *Canada-Australia: Towards a Second Century of Partnership*. Montreal, QC: International Council for Canadian Studies, Carleton University Press, 1997.

Burton, Antoinette (ed.). *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation*. Durham, NC and London, UK: Duke University Press, 2003.

Caccia, Ivana. *Managing the Canadian Mosaic in Wartime: Shaping Citizenship Policy, 1939-1945*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.

Cairns, Alan C. (ed.). *Citizenship, diversity and pluralism: Canadian and comparative perspectives*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

Cairns. Alan C. and Williams, C. (Eds). *The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity and Language in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Cairns, Alan C. and Williams, D. E. (Eds). *Reconfigurations: Canadian Citizenship and Constitutional Change, Selected Essays*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland & Stewart, c1995.

Calwell, Arthur A. *Be just and fear not.* Adelaide: Rigby in association with Lloyd O'Neil, 1978.

Canadian Studies. Chiba-Shi, Japan: Chiba University, Canadian Studies Forum, 1995.

Cannadine, David. 'Imperial Canada: Old History, New Pluralism' in Colin M. Coates (ed.). *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A selection of papers given at the University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference – May 1995.* Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.

Cardozo, Andrew and Musto, Louis. (Eds). *The Battle over Multiculturalism: Does it Help or Hinder Canadian Unity?* Ottawa, Ont.: PSI Publications, c1997.

Carey, Jane and McLisky, Claire (Eds). *Creating White Australia.* Sydney, NSW: Sydney University Press, 2009.

Carroll, John Alexander (ed.). *Reflections of Western Historians.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1969.

Castles, Stephen. Book Review on James Jupp. *From White Australia to Woomera: The History of Australian Immigration.* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2002. *Australian Journal of Public Administration,* vol. 63, no. 1, 2004.

Castles, Stephen. 'Multiculturalism in Australia' in James Jupp (ed.). *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins.* 2nd edn. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Castles, Stephen. 'Immigration and social cohesion' in James Jupp (ed.). *Immigration and multiculturalism: Global perspectives.* Melbourne: Committee for Economic Development of Australia, November 1999.

Castles, Stephen. 'Globalisation, Multicultural Citizenship and Transitional Democracy' in Ghassan Hage and Rowanne Couch (Eds). *The Future of Australian Multiculturalism: Reflections on the Twentieth Anniversary of Jean Martin's The Migrant Presence.* Sydney, NSW: Research Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Sydney, 1999.

Castles, Stephen. *Migrant Incorporation in Highly Developed Countries: An International Comparison.* Wollongong, NSW: Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong, January 1993.

Castles, Stephen. 'Australian multiculturalism: social policy and identity in a changing society' in Gary P. Freeman and James Jupp (Eds). *Nations of Immigrants: Australia, the United States, and International Migration.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Castles, Stephen. *The Challenge of Multiculturalism: Global Changes and Australian Experiences.* Working papers on multiculturalism, no. 19. Wollongong, NSW: Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong, 1992.

Castles, Stephen. *Demographic Change and the Development of a Multicultural Society in Australia*. Wollongong, NSW: Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong, 1988.

Castles, Stephen and Davidson, Alastair. *Citizenship and Migration: Globalisation and the Politics of Belonging*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 2000.

Castles, Stephen, Kalantzis, M., Cope, B. and Morrissey, M. *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*. 2nd edn. Sydney, NSW: Pluto Press, 1990.

Champion, C. P. *The Strange Demise of British Canada: The Liberals and Canadian Nationalism, 1964-1968*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.

Champion, Christian P. 'A Very British Coup: Canadianism, Quebec, and Ethnicity in the Flag Debate, 1964-1965'. *JCS*, vol. 40, no. 3, fall 2006.

Champion, Christian P. 'Our Ethnic Friends: Canadians, Britishness, and New Canadians, 1950-1970'. *CES*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2006.

Chan, Angela. 'Playing with Words' in Ghassan Hage and Rowanne Couch (Eds). *The Future of Australian Multiculturalism: Reflections on the Twentieth Anniversary of Jean Martin's The Migrant Presence*. Sydney, NSW: Research Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Sydney, 1999.

Chennels, David. *The Politics of Nationalism in Canada: Cultural Conflict since 1760*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Chesterman, John and Galligan, Brian (Eds). *Defining Australian Citizenship: Selected Documents*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1999.

Clark, S. D. 'The post Second World War Canadian society'. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 12, no. 1, February 1975.

Clifton, R., and Roberts, L. 'Exploring the Ideology of Canadian Multiculturalism'. *Canadian Public Policy*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1982.

Coates, Colin M. "French Canadians' Ambivalence to the British Empire" in Phillip Buckner (ed.). *Canada and the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.

Coates, Colin M. (ed.). *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917: A selection of papers given at the University of Edinburgh's Centre of Canadian Studies Conference – May 1995*. Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.

Cole, Douglas L. 'The Problem of "Nationalism" and "Imperialism" in British Settlement Colonies'. *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, May 1971.

Cole, Douglas L. '"The Crimson Thread of Kinship": Ethnic Ideas in Australia, 1870-1914'. *Historical Studies*, vol. 14, no. 56, April 1971.

Collins, Jock. *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land: Australia's Post-War Immigration*. 2nd edn. Sydney, NSW: Pluto Press, 1991.

Connors, Jane. 'The 1954 royal tour of Australia'. *AHS*, vol. 25, no. 100, April 1993.

Cook, Ramsay. *Canada and the French-Canadian Question*. Toronto, Ont.: Macmillan of Canada, 1966.

Cope, Bill (ed.). *Policy into Practice: Essays on Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity in Australian Society*. Wollongong, NSW: Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong, c1992.

Cope, Bill and Kalantzis, Mary. 'Speaking of Cultural Difference: The Rise and Uncertain Future of the Language of Multiculturalism'. *Migration Action*, vol. 9, no. 3, 1987.

'The cradle's costly revenge; Quebec's demography', *The Economist*, vol. 390, iss. 8613, 10th January, 2009.

Curran, James. *Curtin's Empire*. *Australian Encounters* series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Curran, James. 'The "new line in the Strand": John Armstrong and the "new nationalism"' in Carl Bridge, Frank Bongiorno and David Lee (Eds). *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010*. Australia: DFAT, 2010.

Curran, James. '"An Organic Part of the Whole Structure": John Curtin's Empire'. *JICH*, vol. 37, no. 1, March 2009.

Curran, James. '"Australia Should Be There": Expo '67 and the Search for a New National Image'. *AHS*, vol. 39, 2008.

Curran, James. 'Britain–Australia' in Brian Galligan and Winsome Roberts (Eds). *The Oxford Companion to Australian Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. *Oxford Reference Online*, http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t250.e45

Curran, James. *The Power of Speech: Australian Prime Ministers defining the national image*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2006.

Curran, James. *The Power of Speech: Australian Prime Ministers defining the national image*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2004.

Curran, James. 'The "Thin Dividing Line": Prime Ministers and the Problem of Australian Nationalism, 1972-1996'. *AJPH*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2002.

Curran, James and Ward, Stuart. *The Unknown Nation: Australia After Empire.* Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2010.

Curthoys, Ann. 'Does Australian History Have a Future?'. *AHS*, vol. 118, 2002.

Dahlie, J. and Fernando, T. (Eds). *Ethnicity, Power, and Politics in Canada.* Toronto, Ont.: Methuen, 1981.

Dare, Tim. *Australia, a nation of immigrants.* Revised edn. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Child & Associates, 1988.

Darian-Smith, Kate, Grimshaw, Patricia and Macintyre, Stuart (Eds). *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures.* Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2007.

Darwin, John. *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830-1970.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Darwin, John. 'A Third British Empire? The Dominion Idea in Imperial Politics' in Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis (Eds). *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume IV, The Twentieth Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series.*

Darwin, John. "Britain's Withdrawal from East of Suez" in Carl Bridge (ed.). *Munich to Vietnam: Australia's Relations with Britain and the United States since the 1930s.* Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1991.

Davidson, Alastair. 'National Identity and Global Migration: Listening to the "Pariahs"' in Nicholas Brown and Linda Cardinal (Eds). *Managing Diversity: Practices of Citizenship.* Ottawa, Ont.: University of Ottawa Press, 2007.

Davison, Graeme, Hirst, John and Macintyre, Stuart (Eds). *The Oxford Companion to Australian History.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Day, David. *Reluctant Nation: Australia and the Allied defeat of Japan, 1942-45.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Day, David. *The great betrayal: Britain, Australia & the onset of the Pacific War, 1939-42.* North Ryde, NSW: Angus & Robertson, 1988.

D'Cruz, Glenn. '"The Good Australians": Multiculturalism and the Anglo-Indian Diaspora'. *Studies in Western Australian History*, vol. 21, 2000.

Deb, Kushal (ed.). *Mapping Multiculturalism.* Jaipur, India: Rawat Publications, 2002.

Diefenbaker, John G. *One Canada: Memoirs of the Right Honourable John G. Diefenbaker, The Years of Achievement, 1957-1962.* Toronto, Ont.: Macmillan of Canada, 1976.

Dilke, Charles Wentworth. *Greater Britain: A record of travel in English-speaking countries during 1866 and 1867*. New York, NY, 2005. Originally 1868.

Dorais, Louis-Jacques, Foster, Lois and Stockley, David. 'Multiculturalism and Integration' in Howard Adelman, Allan Borowski, Meyer Burstein and Lois Foster (Eds). *Immigration and Refugee Policy: Australia and Canada Compared*, vol. II. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1994.

Driedger, Leo. *Race and Ethnicity: Finding Identities and Equalities*. 2nd edn. (1st edn. published 1996 under title *Multi-Ethnic Canada*). Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Driedger, Leo (ed.). *The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic: A Quest for Identity*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.

Driedger, Leo and Halli, Shiva S. (Eds). *Race and Racism: Canada's Challenge*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.

Driedger, Leo. and Halli, Shiva S. 'Racial Integration: Theoretical Options' in L. Driedger and Shiva S. Halli (Eds). *Race and Racism: Canada's Challenge*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.

Dutil, Patrice (ed.). *Searching for Leadership: Secretaries to Cabinet in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Dutton, David. *One of Us?: A Century of Australian Citizenship*. Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press, 2002.

Eddy, John and Schreuder, Deryck (Eds). *The Rise of Colonial Nationalism: Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa first assert their nationalities, 1880-1914*. Sydney, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1988.

Eddy, John. 'Australia' in John Eddy and Deryck Schreuder (Eds.). *The Rise of Colonial Nationalism: Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa first assert their nationalities, 1880-1914*. Sydney, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1988.

Eisenberg, Avigail. *Commentary: Citizenship and the Recognition of Cultural Diversity: The Canadian Experience, Response to Jenson and Pappillon Backgrounder*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, May 2000, http://www.cprn.org/doc.cfm?doc=693&l=en

Elliott, Jean L. (ed.). *Two Nations, Many Cultures: Ethnic Groups in Canada*. 2nd edn. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice Hall, 1983.

Elliott, Jean L. and Fleras, Augie. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction of Race and Ethnic Dynamics in Canada*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice Hall, 1992.

Emy, Hugh V. & Hughes, Owen E. *Australian Politics: Realities in Conflict*. 2nd edn., revised. Melbourne: Macmillan, 1991.

Encel, Sol (ed.). *The Ethnic Dimension: Papers on Ethnicity and Pluralism by Jean Martin*. Sydney, NSW: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.

English, John. *Just Watch Me: The Life of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Volume 2: 1968-2000*. Toronto, Ont.: Random House, 2009.

English, John. *Citizen of the World: The Life of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Volume One, 1919-1968*. Toronto, Ont.: Random House, 2006.

English, John. *The Worldly Years: The Life of Lester Pearson, Volume II: 1949-1972*. Toronto, Ont.: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 1992.

Epp, Frank H. *Mennonites in Canada, Vol. 1, 1786-1920*. Toronto, Ont.: Macmillan, 1974.

Ferguson, Barry. 'Before the Citizenship Act: Confronting Canadian Citizenship in the House of Commons, 1900-1947' in Gerald Friesen and Doug Owram (Eds). *Thinkers and Dreamers: Historical Essays in Honour of Carl Berger*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Ferguson, Barry. 'British-Canadian Intellectuals, Ukrainian Immigrants, and Canadian National Identity' in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (Eds). *Canada's Ukrainians: negotiating an identity*. Toronto, Ont.: Published in Association with the Ukrainian Canadian Centennial Committee by University of Toronto Press, c1991.

'Fighting old battles; Quebec', *The Economist*, vol. 390, iss. 8620, 28th February, 2009.

Fitzherbert, Margaret. *So Many Firsts: Liberal Women from Enid Lyons to the Turnbull Era*. Sydney, NSW: The Federation Press, 2009.

Fitzpatrick, Brian. *The British Empire in Australia: An Economic History, 1834-1939*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1941.

Fleras, Augie. 'Toward a multicultural reconstruction of Canadian society'. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1989.

Fleras, Augie, and Elliott, Jean L. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race and Ethnic Dynamics in Canada*. 4th edn. (Authors' names in reverse order on 1st edn.). Toronto, Ont.: Prentice Hall, c2003.

Fleras, Augie and Elliott, Jean L. *Engaging Diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada*. 2nd edn. (Previous edn. published under title: *Multiculturalism in Canada*). Toronto, Ont.: Nelson Thomson Learning, 2002.

Fleras, Augie and Elliott, Jean L. *Multiculturalism in Canada: The Challenge of Diversity*. Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Canada, 1992.

Flint, David. *The Twilight of the Elites*. North Melbourne: Freedom Publications, c2003.

Foster, Lois. 'Language Policy' in Malcolm Alexander and Brian Galligan (Eds). *Comparative Political Studies: Australia and Canada*. Kuala Lumpur: Pitman Publishing, 1992.

Foster, Lois. 'Themes in the analysis of multiculturalism: Canada and Australia'. *Australian-Canadian Studies: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Review*, vol. 1, January 1983.

Foster, Lois and Bartrop, Paul R. 'The Roots of Multiculturalism in Australia and Canada' in Kate Burridge, Lois Foster and Gerry Turcotte (Eds). *Canada-Australia: Towards a Second Century of Partnership*. Montreal, QC: International Council for Canadian Studies, Carleton University Press, 1997.

Foster, Lois and Stockley, David. *Australian Multiculturalism: A Documentary History and Critique*. Clevedon, Somerset: Multilingual Matters, 1988.

Foster, Lois and Stockley, David. *Multiculturalism: The Changing Australian Paradigm*. Clevedon, Somerset: Multilingual Matters, 1984.

Foster, Lorne. *Turnstile immigration: multiculturalism, social order and social justice in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: Thompson Educational Publishers, 1998.

Francis, Daniel. *National Dreams: Myth, Memory and Canadian History*. Vancouver, BC: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1997.

Francis, R. Douglas and Smith, Donald B. (Eds). *Viewpoints: Readings in Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Nelson, 2007.

Francis, R. Douglas and Smith, Donald B. (Eds). *Readings in Canadian History: Post-Confederation*. 6th edn. Toronto, Ont.: Nelson, 2002.

Fraser, Malcolm. 'Australia Day Fair Speech, Adelaide, 31st January 1977'. *AFAR*, vol. 48, no. 2, February 1977.

Freeman, Gary P. and Jupp, James (Eds). *Nations of Immigrants: Australia, the United States, and International Migration*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Friesen, Gerald and Owram, Doug (Eds). *Thinkers and Dreamers: Historical Essays in Honour of Carl Berger*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Friesen, Gerald. *Citizens and Nation: An Essay on History, Communication, and Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Friesen, John W. *When Cultures Clash: Case Studies in Multiculturalism*. 2nd edn. Calgary, Alta.: Detselig Enterprises, c1993.

Friesen, John W. 'Preserving a religious-turned cultural identity: Mennonites in Canada' in Christopher Bagley and John W. Friesen (Eds). *The Evolution of*

Multiculturalism. Calgary, Alta.: The Calgary Institute for the Humanities, The University of Calgary, May 1988.

Fry, A. J. and Forceville, Ch. (Eds). *Canadian Mosaic: Essays on Multiculturalism*. Amsterdam: Free University Press, 1988.

Fulford, Robert. 'A Post-Modern Dominion: The Changing Nature of Canadian Citizenship' in William Kaplan (ed.). *The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Gagnon, Alain-G. "Quebec-Canada's Constitutional Dossier" in R. Douglas Francis and Donald B. Smith (Eds). *Viewpoints: Readings in Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Nelson, 2007.

Gagnon, Alain-G and Iacovino, Raffaele. 'Federalism and the Politics of Diversity: The Canadian Experience' in Nicholas Brown and Linda Cardinal (Eds). *Managing Diversity: Practices of Citizenship*. Ottawa, Ont.: University of Ottawa Press, 2007.

Galligan, Brian and Roberts, Winsome (Eds). *The Oxford Companion to Australian Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Galligan, Brian and Roberts, Winsome. *Australian Citizenship*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2004.

Gardner, Robert C. and Kalin, Rudolf (Eds). *A Canadian Social Psychology of Ethnic Relations*. Toronto, Ont.; New York, NY: Methuen, 1981.

Gare, Deborah. 'Britishness in recent Australian historiography'. *The Historical Journal*, vol. 43, no. 4, December 2000.

Gauld, Greg. 'Multiculturalism: The Real Thing?' in Stella Hryniuk (ed.). *Twenty Years of Multiculturalism: Successes and Failures*. Winnipeg, Man.: St. John's College Press, 1992.

Gauvreau, Michael. *The Catholic Origins of Quebec's Quiet Revolution, 1931-1970*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Gerus, Oleh W. 'The Ukrainian Canadian Committee' in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.). *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

Gillespie, Paul. 'Conclusion: Managing Diversity in a Post-Nationalist World' in Nicholas Brown and Linda Cardinal (Eds). *Managing Diversity: Practices of Citizenship*. Ottawa, Ont.: University of Ottawa Press, 2007.

Gillis, John R. (ed.). *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Glazer, N. and Moynihan, D. P. (Eds). *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Gobbo, James. 'Criticisms of Multiculturalism'. Paper presented at the Global Cultural Diversity Conference, Sydney, 26th April 1995. Canberra, ACT: OMA, 1995.

Goldstein, Jay E. and Bienvenue, Rita M. (Eds). *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada: A Book of Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Butterworths, 1980.

Goldsworthy, David. *Losing the Blanket: Australia and the End of Britain's Empire*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2002.

Goodman, David, O'Hearn, D. J., Wallace-Crabbe, Chris (Eds). *Multicultural Australia: The Challenges of Change*. Newham, Vic.: Scribe, 1991.

Granatstein, Jack L. *Who killed Canadian history?* Toronto, Ont.: HarperCollins Publishers, c1998.

Granatstein, Jack L. *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1986.

Granatstein, J. L. (ed.). *Canadian Foreign Policy: Historical Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Copp Clark Pitmann, 1986.

Grant, George. *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1970.

Grassby, Al. 'Four Great Chapters in the Australian Story'. *Canberra Historical Journal*, September 2003.

Grassby, Al. 'Multiculturalism, the 25th Anniversary'. *Ethnic Spotlight*, no. 47, August 1999.

Grassby, Al. 'Has Australia's Cultural Revolution Stalled?' *Social Alternatives*, vol. 3, no. 3, July 1983.

Grattan, Michelle (ed.). *Australian Prime Ministers*. Rev. edn. Sydney, NSW: New Holland, 2008.

Graubard, S. R. (ed.). *In Search of Canada*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1989.

Groenewold, H. J. *Multiculturalism: Can Trudeau's Liberalism tolerate it?* St. Catherines, Ont.: Paideia Press, 1978.

Gutman, A. (ed.). *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Gwyn, Richard J. *Nationalism without walls: the unbearable lightness of being Canadian*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1995.

Haebich, Anna. *Spinning the Dream: Assimilation in Australia, 1950-1970.* North Fremantle, WA: Fremantle Press, c2007.

Hage, Ghassan. *Against Paranoid Nationalism: Searching for hope in a shrinking society.* Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press, 2003.

Hage, Ghassan. 'Multiculturalism and White Paranoia in Australia'. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, vol. 3, no. ¾, summer/fall 2002.

Hage, Ghassan (ed.). *Arab-Australians Today: Citizenship and Belonging.* Carlton South, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2002.

Hage, Ghassan. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society.* Sydney, NSW: Pluto Press, 1998.

Hage, Ghassan and Couch, Rowanne (Eds). *The Future of Australian Multiculturalism: Reflections on the Twentieth Anniversary of Jean Martin's The Migrant Presence.* Sydney, NSW: Research Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Sydney, 1999.

Hajdu, Joe. *Samurai in the Surf: The Arrival of the Japanese on the Gold Coast in the 1980s.* Canberra, ACT: Pandanus Books, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, ANU, 2005.

Hall, D. J. 'Clifford Sifton: Immigration and Settlement Policy, 1896-1905' in Howard Palmer (ed.). *The Settlement of the West.* Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary, Comprint Publishing Company, 1977.

Hallowell, Gerald (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History.* Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Hampel, Bill. 'Social analysis or ideology? Themes, tensions and contradictions in a selection of major government statements on multiculturalism'. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1989.

Hancock, William K. *Australia.* Melbourne: Jacaranda, 1966.

Harding, Sandra. 'Multiculturalism in Australia: Moving Race/Ethnic Relations From Extermination to Celebration?' *Race, Gender & Class*, vol. 3, no. 1, fall 1995.

Harles, John C. 'Multiculturalism, national identity and national integration: The Canadian case'. *IJCS*, vol. 17, spring 1998.

Harles, John C. 'Integration before Assimilation: Immigration, Multiculturalism and the Canadian Polity'. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 30, no. 4, December 1997.

Harney, Robert F. '"So Great a Heritage as Ours": Immigration and the Survival of the Canadian Polity' in S. R. Graubard (ed.). *In Search of Canada.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1989.

Harney, Robert F. and Troper, Harold. *Immigrants: A Portrait of the Urban Experience, 1890-1930*. Toronto, Ont.: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1975.

Hawkins, Freda. *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared*. 2nd edn. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queens University Press, 1991.

Hawkins, Freda. *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared*. Kingston, NSW: University of New South Wales Press, 1989.

Hawkins, Freda. 'Canadian Multiculturalism: The Policy Explained', in A. J. Fry and Ch. Forceville (Eds). *Canadian Mosaic: Essays on Multiculturalism*. Amsterdam: Free University Press, 1988.

Hawkins, Freda. *Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern*. 2nd edn. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Hawkins, Freda. 'Multiculturalism in Two Countries: The Canadian and Australian Experience'. *JCS*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1982.

Hawkins, Freda. 'Migration as a Factor in Anglo-Canadian Relations' in Peter Lyon (ed.). *Britain and Canada: Survey of a Changing Relationship*. London, UK: Frank Cass, 1976.

Hayday, Matthew. 'Fireworks, Folk-dancing, and Fostering a National Identity: The Politics of Canada Day'. *CHR*, vol. 91, no. 2, June 2010.

Hayday, Matthew. 'Variety Show as National Identity: CBC Television and Dominion Day Celebrations, 1958-1980' in Gene Allen and Daniel J. Robinson (Eds). *Communicating in Canada's Past: Essays in Media History*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, c2009.

Healey, Justin (ed.). *Multiculturalism in Australia*. Thirroul, NSW: Spinney Press, 2005.

Healey, Justin (ed.). *Australia's National Identity*. Balmain, NSW: Spinney Press, c2000.

Healey, Justin (ed.). *Multiculturalism*. Balmain, NSW: Spinney Press, 2000.

Healey, Kaye (ed.). *The Immigration Debate*. Balmain, NSW: Spinney Press, 1997.

Healey, Kaye (ed.). *An Australian Identity*. Balmain, NSW: Spinney Press, 1995.

Henry, Francis and Tator, Carol. 'State Policy and Practices as Racialized Discourse: Multiculturalism, The Charter, and Employment Equity' in Peter S. Li (ed.). *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*. 2nd edn. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Hiller, H. H. *Canadian Society: A Macro Analysis*. 4th edn. Toronto, Ont.: Prentice Hall Canada, c2000.

Hilliker, John. 'Diefenbaker and Canadian External Relations' in J. L. Granatstein (ed.). *Canadian Foreign Policy: Historical Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Copp Clark Pitmann, 1986.

Hillmer, Norman. 'Statute of Westminster' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Hillmer, Norman (ed.). *Pearson: The Unlikely Gladiator*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

Hillmer, Norman and Chapnick, Adam (Eds). *Canadas of the Mind: The Making and Unmaking of Canadian Nationalisms in the Twentieth Century*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007.

Hirst, John. *Sense & Nonsense in Australian History*. Melbourne: Black Inc. Agenda, 2009.

Hirst, John. 'The National Mix'. *Best Australian Essays*, 2001.

Hirst, John. 'Australia's Absurd History: A Critique of Multiculturalism'. *Quadrant*, March 1991.

Hodgins, B.W., Eddy, J. J., Grant, S. D., and Struthers J. (Eds). *Federalism in Canada and Australia: Historical Perspectives, 1920-1988*. Peterborough, Ont.: The Frost Centre for Canadian Heritage and Development Studies, Trent University, 1989.

Hopkins, A. G. 'Rethinking Decolonization'. *Past and Present*, no. 200, August 2008.

Horne, Donald. *Ideas for a Nation*. Chippendale, NSW: Pan Books, 1989.

Horne, Donald. 'The New Nationalism', *The Bulletin*, 5th October, 1968.

Horne, Donald. *The Lucky Country*. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin Books, c1964.

Hryniuk, Stella (ed.). *Twenty Years of Multiculturalism: Successes and Failures*. Winnipeg, Man.: St. John's College Press, 1992.

Hryniuk, Stella and Luciuk, Lubomyr. (Eds). *Multiculturalism and Ukrainian Canadians*. Polyphony Series, Vol. 13. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Hudson, Michael R. 'Multiculturalism, Government Policy and Constitutional Enshrinement – A Comparative Study' in *Multiculturalism and the Charter: A Legal Perspective*. Toronto, Ont.: Carswell, 1987.

Hudson, W. J. *Blind Loyalty: Australia and the Suez Crisis, 1956*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1989.

Husband, Charles. 'Multiculturalism as Official Policy in Australia' in Richard Nile (ed.). *Immigration and the Politics of Ethnicity and Race in Australia and Britain.* Carlton, Australia; London, UK: Bureau of Immigration Research; Sir Robert Menzies Centre for Australian Studies, University of London, 1991.

Huttenback, Robert A. *Racism and Empire: White Settlers and Coloured Immigrants in the British Self-Governing Colonies, 1830-1910.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Iacovetta, Franca, Draper, Paula and Ventresca, Robert (Eds). *A nation of immigrants: women, workers, and communities in Canadian history, 1840s-1960s.* Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Igartua, Jose E. 'The Genealogy of Stereotypes: French Canadians in Two English-language History Textbooks'. *JCS*, vol. 42, no. 3, 2008.

Igartua, Jose E. 'The Quieter Revolution: Evolving Representations of National Identity in English Canada, 1941-1960' in R. Douglas Francis and Donald B. Smith (Eds). *Viewpoints: Readings in Canadian History.* Toronto, Ont.: Nelson, 2007.

Igartua, Jose E. *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2006.

Igartua, Jose E. '"Ready, Aye, Ready" No More? Canada, Britain, and the Suez Crisis in the Canadian Press' in Phillip Bucker (ed.). *Canada and the End of the British Empire.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2005.

Ignatieff, Michael. *Blood & Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism.* London, UK: BBC Books/Chatto & Windus, 1993.

Inglis, Christine. *Multiculturalism: New Policy Responses to Diversity.* U.N.E.S.C.O., 1996, http://www.unesco.org/most/pp4.htm

Inglis, Ken S. *Observing Australia: 1959 to 1999.* Edited and Introduced by Craig Wilcox. Carlton South, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1999.

Irving, Helen. 'Citizenship, Statehood, and Allegiance' in Nicholas Brown and Linda Cardinal (Eds). *Managing Diversity: Practices of Citizenship.* Ottawa, Ont.: University of Ottawa Press, 2007.

Isajiw, W. W. *Understanding Diversity: Ethnicity and Race in the Canadian Context.* Toronto, Ont.: Thompson Educational Publishers, 1999.

Isajiw, W. W. (ed.). *Multiculturalism in North America and Europe: Comparative Perspectives on Interethnic Relations and Social Incorporation.* Toronto, Ont.: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1997.

Jaenen, Cornelius. 'A multicultural Canada: Origins and implications' in Peter G. Liddell (ed.). *German Canadian studies: critical approaches.* Vancouver, BC: CAUTG publications, 1983.

Jakubowicz, Andrew. 'Ethnicity, multiculturalism and neo-conservatism' in Gill Bottomley and Marie de Lepervanche (Eds). *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*. Sydney, NSW: George Allen & Unwin, 1984.

Jakubowicz, Andrew. 'State and ethnicity: multiculturalism as ideology'. *ANZJS*, vol. 17, no. 3, November 1981.

Jakubowicz, Andrew. 'The nature of multiculturalism: liberation or co-option?' Paper presented at the Second National Conference, Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia. Canberra, ACT: ANU, 26th July 1980; CHOMI Reprint No. R401, Melbourne, 1980.

James, Carl E. *Possibilities and Limitations: Multicultural Policies and Programs in Canada*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 2005.

James, Carl E. *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Ethnicity, Race and Culture*. Toronto, Ont.: Thompson Educational, 2003.

Jamrozik, A., Boland, C. and Urquhart, R. *Social Change and Cultural Transformation in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Jayasuriya, D. Laksiri. 'Charting a New Way for Australian Multiculturalism'. *Migration Action*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2004.

Jayasuriya, D. Laksiri. *Immigration and Multiculturalism in Australia*. Selected Essays by Laksiri Jayasuriya. Nedlands, WA: School of Social Work and Social Administration, University of Western Australia, 1997.

Jayasuriya, D. Laksiri. *Immigration Policies and Ethnic Relations in Australia and Australian Multicultural Education in a Comparative Perspective*. Perth, WA: University of Western Australia, 1987.

Jayasuriya, D. Laksiri. 'Immigration Policies and Ethnic Relations in Australia' in D. L. Jayasuriya, *Immigration Policies and Ethnic Relations in Australia and Australian Multicultural Education in a Comparative Perspective*. Perth, WA: University of Western Australia, 1987.

Jayasuriya, D. Laksiri. 'Multiculturalism in Australia'. *Ethnos*, no. 40, May 1985.

Jayasuriya, D. Laksiri and Pookong, Kee. *The Asianisation of Australia?: Some Facts About the Myths*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1999.

Jayasuriya, D. Laksiri, Walker, David and Gothard, Jan (Eds). *Legacies of White Australia: Race, Culture and Nation*. Crawley, WA: University of Western Australia Press, c2003.

Jenson, Jane. 'Naming Nations: Making Nationalist Claims in Canadian Public Discourse'. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1993.

Jenson, Jane and Pappillon, Martin. *Backgrounder: Citizenship and the Recognition of Cultural Diversity: The Canadian Experience*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, 12th May 2000, http://www.cprn.org/doc.cfm?doc=693&l=en

Johnson, Gregory A. 'The Last Gasp of Empire: The 1964 Flag Debate Revisited' in Phillip Buckner (ed.). *Canada and the End of Empire*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2005.

Jones, Gavin W. 'White Australia, National Identity and Population Change' in Laksiri Jayasuriya, David Walker and Jan Gothard (Eds). *Legacies of White Australia: Race, Culture and Nation*. Crawley, WA: University of Western Australia Press, c2003.

Jordan, Matthew. 'The Reappraisal of the White Australia Policy against the Background of a Changing Asia, 1945-67'. *AJPH*, vol. 52, no. 1, March 2006.

Jordan, Matthew. 'Rewriting Australia's racist past: How Historians (Mis)Interpret the "White Australia Policy"'. *History Compass*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2005.

Jordens, Ann-Mari. 'Post-War non-British Migration' in James Jupp (ed.). *The Australian People: An Encylopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Jordens, Ann-Mari. *Alien to Citizen: Settling migrants in Australia, 1945-75*. St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin in association with the Australian Archives, 1997.

Jordens, Ann-Mari. *Redefining Australians: Immigration, Citizenship and National Identity*. Sydney, NSW: Hale & Iremonger, 1995.

Jupp, James. 'Assimilation' in Brian Galligan and Winsome Roberts (Eds). *The Oxford Companion to Australian Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. *Oxford Reference Online*, http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t250.e31

Jupp, James. 'Immigration' in Brian Galligan and Winsome Roberts (Eds). *The Oxford Companion to Australian Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. *Oxford Reference Online*, http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t250.e170

Jupp, James. 'Integration' in Brian Galligan and Winsome Roberts (Eds). *The Oxford Companion to Australian Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. *Oxford Reference Online*, http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t250.e178

Jupp, James. 'Immigration policy and the attack on multiculturalism' in Paul Boreham, Geoffrey Stokes and Richard Hall (Eds). *The Politics of Australian Society: Political Issues for the New Century*. 2nd edn. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education, c2004.

Jupp, James. *From White Australia to Woomera: The Story of Australian Immigration*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Jupp, James (ed.). *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins*. 2nd edn. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Jupp, James. 'Changes in Immigration Patterns since 1972' in James Jupp (ed.). *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins*. 2nd edn. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Jupp, James. 'Multiculturalism: maturing or dying?' *Dissent*, summer 2000/2001.

Jupp, James. 'Immigration and the Australian welfare state' in Anthony McMahon, Jane Thomson and Christopher Williams (Eds). *Understanding the Australian Welfare State: Key documents and themes*. Croydon, Vic.: Tertiary Press, 2000.

Jupp, James (ed.). *Immigration and multiculturalism: Global perspectives*. Melbourne: Committee for Economic Development of Australia, November 1999.

Jupp, James. 'Creating multicultural societies: Australia, Britain, Sweden, and Canada'. *International Journal*, vol. 52, summer 1997.

Jupp, James. *Understanding Australian Multiculturalism*. Canberra, ACT: AGPS, 1996.

Jupp, James. 'Perspectives on the politics of immigration' in James Jupp and M. Kabala (Eds). *The Politics of Australian Immigration*. Canberra, ACT: Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, 1993.

Jupp, James. 'The ethnic lobby and immigration policy' in James Jupp and M. Kabala (Eds). *The Politics of Australian Immigration*. Canberra, ACT: Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, 1993.

Jupp, James. 'Immigrant settlement policy in Australia' in Gary P. Freeman and James Jupp (Eds). *Nations of Immigrants: Australia, the United States, and International Migration*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Jupp, James. 'One Among Many' in David Goodman, D. J. O'Hearn and Chris Wallace-Crabbe (Eds). *Multicultural Australia: The Challenges of Change*. Newham, Vic.: Scribe, 1991.

Jupp, James. 'Multicultural public policy' in Charles A. Price (ed.). *Australian National Identity*. Canberra, ACT: Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia, ANU, 1991.

Jupp, James. *Immigration: Australian Retrospectives*. Melbourne, Vic.: Sydney University Press and Oxford University Press Australia, 1991.

Jupp, James. *The Challenge of Diversity: Policy Options for a Multicultural Australia*. Canberra, ACT: AGPS, c1989.

Jupp, James. *Multicultural Policies in Selected Democracies: Australia, Canada, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America, West Germany*. Canberra, ACT: OMA, 1988.

Jupp, James (ed.). *Ethnic Politics in Australia*. Sydney, NSW: George Allen & Unwin, 1984.

Jupp, James. 'Power in ethnic Australia', in James Jupp (ed.). *Ethnic Politics in Australia*. Sydney, NSW: George Allen & Unwin, 1984.

Jupp, James. 'Multiculturalism: friends and enemies, patrons and clients'. *Australian Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 2, winter 1983.

Jupp, James and Kabala, M (Eds). *The Politics of Australian Immigration*. Canberra, ACT: Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, 1993.

Kalantzis, Mary. 'Immigration, multiculturalism and racism' in Susan Ryan & Troy Bramston (Eds). *The Hawke Government: A Critical Retrospective*. North Melbourne, Vic.: Pluto Press, 2003.

Kalantzis, Mary and Cope, Bill (Eds). *Reconciliation, Multiculturalism, Identities: Different Dialogues, Sensible Solutions*. Altona, Vic.: Common Ground Publishing, 2001.

Kallen, Evelyn. 'Multiculturalism: Ideology, Policy, and Reality'. *JCS*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1982.

Kaplan, William (ed.). *Belonging: The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Kelly, Paul. 'John Malcolm Fraser' in Michelle Grattan (ed.). *Australian Prime Ministers*. Rev. edn. Sydney, NSW: New Holland, 2008.

Kelly, Paul. *The Unmaking of Gough*. Revised edn. Sydney, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1994, first published 1976.

Kent, Tom. *A Public Purpose: An Experience of Liberal Opposition and Canadian Government*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Keohane, Kieran. *Symptoms of Canada: An Essay on the Canadian Identity*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Kernerman, Gerald. *Multicultural Nationalism: Civilising Difference, Constituting Community*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2005.

Keshen, Jeffrey A. *Saints, Sinners, and Soldiers: Canada's Second World War*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2004.

Kiernan, Colm (ed.). *Australia and Ireland: 1788-1988, Bicentenary Essays*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1986.

Klaus, Martens (ed.). *The Canadian alternative*. Wurzburg, Germany: Konigshausen and Neumann, c2003.

Knopfelmacher, Frank. 'The case against multi-culturalism' in Robert Manne (ed.). *The New Conservatism in Australia*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Knowles, Valerie. *Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-2006*. 3rd edn. Toronto, Ont.: Dundurn Press, 2007.

Knowles, Valerie. *Forging Our Legacy: Canadian Citizenship and Immigration, 1900-1977*. Ottawa, Ont.: Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2000.

Knowles, Valerie. *Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-1997*. 2nd edn. Toronto, Ont.: Dundurn Press, 1997.

Knowles, Valerie. *Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-1990*. Toronto, Ont.: Dundurn Press, 1990.

Kohn, Hans. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1944.

Koilpillai, Robinson. "Multiculturalism: It's as Canadian as Diversity" in Matthew Zachariah, Allan Sheppard, Leona Barratt (Eds). *Canadian Multiculturalism: Dreams, Realities, Expectations*. Edmonton, Alta.: Canadian Multicultural Education Foundation, 2004.

Kramer, Leonie (ed.). *The Multicultural Experiment: Immigrants, Refugees and National Identity*. Sydney, NSW: Macleay Press, 2003.

Kristensen, Jeppe. '"In Essence still a British Country": Britain's withdrawal from East of Suez'. *AJPH*, vol. 51, no. 1, March 2005.

Kymlicka, Will. 'The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism? New Debates on Inclusion and Accommodation in Diverse Societies'. *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 61, iss. 199, March 2010.

Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the new international politics of diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Kymlicka, Will. 'Canadian Multiculturalism in Historical and Comparative Perspective' in Matthew Zachariah, Allan Sheppard, Leona Barratt (Eds). *Canadian Multiculturalism: Dreams, Realities, Expectations*. Edmonton, Alta.: Canadian Multicultural Education Foundation, 2004.

Kymlicka, Will. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Kymlicka, Will. *Commentary: Citizenship and the Recognition of Cultural Diversity: The Canadian Experience, Response to Jenson and Pappillon Backgrounder*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, May 2000, http://www.cprn.org/doc.cfm?doc=693&l=en

Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Lack, John. 'Multiculturalism' in Graeme Davison, John Hirst and Stuart Macintyre (Eds). *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Lack, John and Templeton, Jacqueline. *Bold Experiment: A Documentary History of Australian Immigration Since 1945*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Lalande, Julia. 'The Roots of Multiculturalism: Ukrainian-Canadian involvement in the multiculturalism discussion as an example of the position of the third force'. *CES*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2006.

Laponce, Jean and Safron, William (Eds.). *Ethnicity and citizenship: the Canadian case*. London, UK: Frank Cass, 1996.

Légaré, Evelyn I. 'Canadian Multiculturalism and Aboriginal People: Negotiating a Place in the Nation'. *Identities*, vol. 1, no. 4, 1995.

Leman, Marc. *Canadian Multiculturalism*. Ottawa, Ont.: Library of Parliament, Research Branch, 1994.

de Lepervanche, Marie. 'From Race to Ethnicity'. *ANZJS*, vol. 16, no. 1, March 1980.

Lester, Normand. *The black book of English Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 2002.

Levey, Geoffrey Brahm. 'Jews and Australian Multiculturalism' in Geoffrey Brahm Levey and Philip Mendes (Eds). *Jews and Australian Politics*. Brighton; Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2004.

Levey, Geoffrey Brahm and Mendes, Philip (Eds). *Jews and Australian Politics*. Brighton; Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2004.

Levy, Jacob T. *The Multiculturalism of Fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Lewins, F. 'Assimilation and Integration' in James Jupp (ed.). *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins*. 2nd edn. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Lewycky, L. 'Multiculturalism in the 1990s and into the 21st Century: Beyond Ideology and Utopia' in V. Satzewich (ed.). *Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism, and Racism in 90s Canada*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 1992.

Li, Peter S. 'Chinese' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Li, Peter S. *The Making of Post-War Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Li, Peter S. (ed.). *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*. 2nd edn. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Li, Peter S. 'The Multiculturalism Debate' in Peter S. Li (ed.). *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*. 2nd edn. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Liddell, Peter G. (ed.). *German Canadian studies: critical approaches*. Vancouver, BC: CAUTG publications, 1983.

Liffman, M. 'The origins of multiculturalism' in Australia: Committee of Review of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs. *Report to the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs*, Vol. 2 (Chairman Moss Cass). Canberra, ACT: AGPS, November 1983.

Liffman, M. 'Multiculturalism: Where to, with whom – and why?' *Social Alternatives*, vol. 3, no. 3, July 1983.

Liodakis, N. and Satzewich V. 'From Solution to Problem: Multiculturalism and "Race Relations" as New Social Problems' in L. Samuelson and W. Antony (Eds). *Power and Resistance: Critical Thinking about Canadian Social Issues*. 3rd edn. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing, c2003.

Litt, Paul. 'Massey Commission' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Lopez, Mark. 'The Origins of Multiculturalism' in James Jupp (ed.). *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins*. 2nd edn. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Lopez, Mark. 'The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics: The Role of the Multicultural Left, 1945-1975' in Mary Kalantzis and Bill Cope (Eds). *Reconciliation, Multiculturalism, Identities: Different Dialogues, Sensible Solutions*. Altona, Vic.: Common Ground Publishing, 2001.

Lopez, Mark. 'The Politics of the Origins of Multiculturalism: Lobbying and the Power of Influence'. *People and Place*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2000.

Lopez, Mark. *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics: 1945-1975*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2000.

Louis, Wm. Roger. *Ends of British Imperialism: The Scramble for Empire, Suez and Decolonization*. London, UK; New York, NY: I. B. Tauris, 2006.

Lowry, Donal. 'The Crown, Empire Loyalism and the Assimilation of Non-British White Subjects in the British World: An Argument against "Ethnic Determinism" in Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich (Eds). *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity*. London, UK: Frank Cass, 2003.

Luciuk, Lubomyr and Hryniuk, Stella (Eds). *Canada's Ukrainians: negotiating an identity*. Toronto, Ont.: Published in Association with the Ukrainian Canadian Centennial Committee by University of Toronto Press, c1991.

Lupul, Manoly R. *The Politics of Multiculturalism: A Ukrainian-Canadian Memoir*. Edmonton, Alta.; Toronto, Ont.: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2005.

Lupul, Manoly R. 'A Question of Identity: Canada's Ukrainians and Multiculturalism'. *Polyphony*, vol. 13, 1993.

Lupul, Manoly R. (ed.). *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

Lupul, Manoly R. (ed.). *Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment, Proceedings of the Conference Sponsored by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, September 9-11, 1977*. Edmonton, Alta.: The University of Alberta Press, 1978.

Lyon, Peter (ed.). *Britain and Canada: Survey of a Changing Relationship*. London, UK: Frank Cass, 1976.

Macintyre, Stuart. 'The Rebirth of Political History'. *AJPH*, vol. 56, no. 1, March 2010.

Macintyre, Stuart. *A Concise History of Australia*. 2nd edn. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Macintyre, Stuart. *A Concise History of Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Macintyre, Stuart. *The Oxford History of Australia: Volume 4 1901-1942, The Succeeding Age*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Macintyre, Stuart. 'Australia and the Empire' in Robin W. Winks (ed.). *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume V, Historiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.

Mackey, Eva. *The House of Difference: Culture Politics and National Identity in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

MacLennan, Jennifer. 'Dancing with Our Neighbours: English Canadians and the Discourse of Anti-Americanism' in Michael D. Behiels and Reginald C. Stuart (Eds). *Transnationalism: Canada-United States History into the Twenty-first Century*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.

Magrath, C. A. *Canada's Growth and Some Problems Affecting it*. Ottawa, Ont.: The Mortimer Press, 1910.

Makkai, T. and McAllister, I. 'Immigrants in Australian Society: Backgrounds, Attainment and Politics' in Jake M. Najman and John S. Western (Eds). *A Sociology*

of Australian Society: Introductory Readings. 2nd edn., 1st edn. 1988. Melbourne: Macmillan Education, 1993.

Mallea, John R. & Young, Jonathan C. (Eds). *Cultural Diversity and Canadian Education*. Ottawa, Ont.: Carleton University Press, 1984.

Malouf, David. 'Made in England: Australia's British Inheritance'. *Quadrant*, Essay 12, 2003.

Manne, Robert (ed.). *The New Conservatism in Australia*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Manzo, Kathryn A. *Creating boundaries: the politics of race and nation*. Boulder, CO.: L. Rienner, 1996.

Martel, Marcel. '*"Hors du Quebec, point de salut!"* Francophone Minorities and Quebec Nationalism, 1945-1969' in Michael D. Behiels and Marcel Martel (Eds). *Nation, Ideas, Identities: Essays In Honour of Ramsay Cook*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Martens, Klaus (ed.) *The Canadian Alternative*. Wurzburg, Germany: Konigshausen & Neumann, 2004.

Martin, Jean I. 'Migrants: equality and ideology'. La Trobe University, Meredith Memorial Lecture 1972, reprinted in S. Encel (ed.). *The Ethnic Dimension: Papers on Ethnicity and Pluralism by Jean Martin*. Sydney, NSW: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.

Martin, Jean I. *The Migrant Presence: Australian Responses, 1947-1977*. London, UK: George Allen & Unwin, 1978.

Martin, Paul. 'Citizenship and the People's World' in William Kaplan (ed.). *The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

McAllister, I., Mackerras, M. Ascui, A. and Moss, S. *Australian Political Facts*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1990.

McCreery, Christopher and Milnes, Arthur (eds.). *The Authentic Voice of Canada: R.B. Bennett's Speeches in the House of Lords, 1941-1947*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009.

McGregor, Russell. 'The necessity of Britishness: ethno-cultural roots of Australian nationalism'. *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2006.

McKenna, Mark and Ward, Stuart. '"It Was Really Moving, Mate" The Gallipoli Pilgrimage and Sentimental Nationalism in Australia'. *AHS*, vol. 38, iss. 129, April 2007.

McKenzie, Francine. 'Balfour Report' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

McLean, David. 'From British Colony to American Satellite? Australia and the USA during the Cold War'. *AJPH*, vol. 52, no. 1, March 2006.

McLellan, Janet, and Richmond, Anthony. 'Multiculturalism in Crisis: A Postmodern Perspective on Canada'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1994.

McMahon, Anthony, Thomson, Jane and Williams, Christopher (Eds). *Understanding the Australian Welfare State: Key documents and themes*. Croydon, Vic.: Tertiary Press, 2000.

McNeill, William H. *Polyethnicity and national unity in world history*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, c1986.

McQueen, Humphrey. 'Melting Pot'. *The Bulletin*, 9th October, 2001.

McQueen, Humphrey. *A New Britannia: An argument concerning the social origins of Australian radicalism and nationalism*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1971.

McRobbie, Andrea (ed.). *Arrivals, Departures, Achievements: Essays in Honour of James Jupp*. Canberra, ACT: Centre for Immigration and Multicultural Studies, ANU, 1992.

McRoberts, Kenneth. *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*. 3rd edn. With a postscript, 1993. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1999.

McRoberts, Kenneth. *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1997.

McRoberts, Kenneth. *Competing Nationalisms: Quebec-Canada Relations*. Barcelona: Institut de Ciències Polítiques i Socials, 1995.

McRoberts, Kenneth. *English Canada and Quebec: Avoiding the Issue*. North York, Ont.: Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies, York University, c1991.

McRoberts, Kenneth. *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*. 3rd edn. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, c1988.

McRoberts, Kenneth. 'The Sources of Neo-nationalism in Quebec' in Michael D. Behiels (ed.). *Quebec Since 1945: Selected Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd., 1987.

McRoberts, Kenneth and Posgate, Dale. *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*. 2nd edn. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, c1980.

Meaney, Neville. 'The first high commissioners: George Reid and Andrew Fisher' in Carl Bridge, Frank Bongiorno and David Lee (Eds). *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010*. Australia: DFAT, 2010.

Meaney, Neville. *Australia and World Crisis, 1914-1923. A History of Australian Defence and Foreign Policy 1901-23: Volume 2.* Sydney, NSW: Sydney University Press, 2009.

Meaney, Neville. '"In History's Page": Identity and Myth' in Deryck M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (Eds). *Australia's* Empire. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series.*

Meaney, Neville. *Towards a new vision: Australia and Japan across time.* Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press, 2007.

Meaney, Neville. 'Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections'. *JICH*, vol. 31, no. 2, May 2003.

Meaney, Neville. 'Britishness and Australian Identity: The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography'. *AHS*, vol. 116, 2001.

Meaney, Neville. 'The End of White Australia and Australia's Changing Perceptions of Asia, 1945-1990'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 49, no. 2, November 1995.

Meaney, Neville (ed.). *Under New Heavens: Cultural Transmission and the Making of Australia.* Melbourne: Heinemann Educational Australia, 1989.

Meaney, Neville. *Australia and the World: A Documentary History from the 1870s to the 1970s.* Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1985.

Meaney, Neville. *The Search for Security in the Pacific, 1901-14. A History of Australian Defence and Foreign Policy 1901-23: Volume 1.* Sydney, NSW: Sydney University Press, 1976.

Menadue, John. 'Australian Multiculturalism: Successes, Problems, Risks' in Leonie Kramer (ed.). *The Multicultural Experiment: Immigrants, Refugees and National Identity.* Sydney, NSW: Macleay Press, 2003.

Meyers, Nechemia. 'New Faces: Australia Moves Towards Multiculturalism'. *World & I*, vol. 12, January 1997.

Miller, T. B. *Australia in Peace and War.* Canberra, ACT: ANU Press, 1978.

Modood, Tariq. *Commentary: Citizenship and the Recognition of Cultural Diversity: The Canadian Experience, Response to Jenson and Pappillon Backgrounder.* Canadian Policy Research Networks, May 2000, http://www.cprn.org/doc.cfm?doc=693&l=en

Monet, Jacques. 'Canada' in John Eddy and Deryck Schreuder (Eds). *The Rise of Colonial Nationalism: Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa first assert their nationalities, 1880-1914.* Sydney, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1988.

Moodley, Kogila. *State Responses to Immigration in Culturally Homogeneous and Multicultural Societies: Comparative Perspectives*. Toronto, Ont.: Robert F. Harney Professorship and Program in Ethnic Immigration and Pluralism Studies, University of Toronto, 1996.

Moodley, Kogila. 'Canadian Multiculturalism as Ideology'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 6, no. 3, July 1983.

Moore, Tony. *The Barry McKenzie Movies*. Australian Screen Classics Series. Strawberry Hills, Sydney, NSW: Currency Press/Australian Film Commission, 2005.

Morrison, Katherine L. "The Only Canadians: Canada's French and the British Connection", *IJCS*, vol. 37, 2008.

Morton, Desmond. 'Divided Loyalties? Divided Country' in William Kaplan (ed.). *The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Morton, W. L. *The Canadian Identity*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972.

Morton, W. L. *The Canadian Identity*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

'Mother knows best', *The Economist*, vol. 383, iss. 8529, 19th May, 2007

Mulroney, Brian. 'Excerpts from the "Speech by Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to the Multiculturalism Means Business Conference in Toronto on 12th April, 1986"'. *Ethno Canada*, vol. 6, no. 2, spring 1986.

Najman, Jake M. and Western, John S. (Eds). *A Sociology of Australian Society: Introductory Readings*. 2nd edn., 1st edn. 1988. Melbourne: Macmillan Education, 1993.

Nancoo, Stephen E. and Nancoo, Robert Sterling (Eds). *The Mass Media and Canadian Diversity*. Mississauga, Ont.: Canadian Educators' Press, 1996.

Neatby, H. Blair. 'Bloc populaire' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Nelles, H. V. *A little history of Canada*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Nelles, H. V. *The Art of Nation-Building: Pageantry and Spectacle at Quebec's Tercentenary*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Nelson, Camille A. and Nelson, Charmaine A. (Eds). *Racism, eh? A critical Inter-Disciplinary Anthology of Race and Racism in Canada*. Concord, Ont.: Captus Press, 2004.

Newman, Peter C. *Renegade in Power: The Diefenbaker Years*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1964.

Nicholls, Glenn. *Deported: A History of Forced Departures from Australia*. Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press, 2007.

Oakes, Leigh and Warren, Jane. *Language, Citizenship and Identity in Quebec*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers, 2007.

O'Brien, John B. 'The British Commonwealth and the European Economic Community, 1960-63: The Australian and Canadian Experiences'. *The Round Table*, no. 340, October 1996.

O'Farrell, Patrick. *The Irish in Australia*. Kensington, NSW: University of New South Wales Press, 1987.

Offner, Avner. '"Pacific rim" societies' in John Eddy and Deryck Schreuder (Eds). *The Rise of Colonial Nationalism: Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa first assert their nationalities, 1880-1914*. Sydney, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1988.

Omissi, David and Thompson, Andrew S. (Eds). *The Impact of the South African War*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002.

Onselen, Peter Van and Senior, Philip. *Howard's End: The Unravelling of a Government*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2008.

O'Reilly, David. *Britain's Global Australians: Sixteen Profiles*. London, UK: Menzies Centre for Australian Studies, King's College London, 2007.

O'Reilly, David. 'Selling immigration to the electorate'. *The Bulletin*, September 20th, 1988.

Owram, Doug. Book Review of Phillip Buckner (ed.). *Canada and the End of Empire*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2005. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, vol. 35, iss. 4, winter 2005.

Owram, Doug. *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Owram, D. R. 'Canada and the Empire' in Robin W. Winks (ed.). *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume V, Historiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.

Pal, Leslie A. *Interests of State: The Politics of Language, Multiculturalism, and Feminism*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Palanithurai, Ganapathy. *Polyethnicity in India and Canada: possibilities for exploration*. New Delhi: M. D. Publications, 1997.

Palmer, Bryan D. Canada's 1960s: The Ironies of Identity in a Rebellious Era. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division, 2009.

Palmer, Howard. *Ethnicity and Politics in Canada since Confederation*. Ottawa, Ont.: Canadian Historical Association, 1991.

Palmer, Howard. 'Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century in John R. Mallea & Jonathan C. Young (Eds). *Cultural Diversity and Canadian Education*. Ottawa, Ont.: Carleton University Press, 1984.

Palmer, Howard. *Patterns of prejudice: A history of Nativism in Alberta*. Toronto, Ont.: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

Palmer, Howard (ed.). *The Settlement of the West*. Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary, Comprint Publishing Company, 1977.

Palmer, Howard (ed.). *Immigration and the Rise of Multiculturalism*. Toronto, Ont.: Copp Clark, 1975.

Palmer, Howard. *Land of the Second Chance: A History of Ethnic Groups in Southern Alberta*. Lethbridge, Alta.: The Lethbridge Herald, 1972.

Palmer, Howard. 'Canada: Multicultural or Bicultural?' *CES*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1971.

Paquet, Gilles. 'Political Philosophy of Multiculturalism' in J. W. Berry and J. A. Laponce (Eds). *Ethnicity and Culture in Canada: The Research Landscape*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Parkin, A. and Hardcastle, L. 'Immigration politics in the USA and Canada' in James Jupp and M. Kabala (Eds). *The Politics of Australian Immigration*. Canberra, ACT: Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, 1993.

Parkin, A., Summers, J. and Woodward, D. *Government, Politics, Power and Policy in Australia*. 5th edn. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1994.

Patience, A. & Head, B. (Eds). *From Whitlam to Fraser: Reform and Reaction in Australian Politics*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Pearson, Lester B. *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson: Volume 3, 1957-1968*. Edited by John A. Munro and Alex I. Inglis. London, UK: Victor Gollancz, 1975.

Pearson, Lester B. *Memoirs 1948-1957: The International Years, Volume 2, 1948-1957*. Edited by John A. Munro and Alex I. Inglis. London, UK: Victor Gollancz, 1974.

Pearson, Lester B. *Memoirs 1897-1948: Through Diplomacy to Politics*. London, UK: Victor Gollancz, 1973.

Pearson, Lester B. *Words and Occasions*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Pender, Anne. 'The Mythical Australia: Barry Humphries, Gough Whitlam and "New Nationalism". *AJPH*, vol. 51, no. 1, March 2005.

Peter, Karl. 'The Myth of Multiculturalism and Other Political Fables' in J. Dahlie and T. Fernando (Eds). *Ethnicity, Power, and Politics in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: Methuen, 1981.

Pettman, Ralph. *Multicultural Australia/Human Rights Commission*. Canberra, ACT: AGPS, 1985.

Pickersgill Jack W. and Forster, D. F. (eds.). *The Mackenzie King Record: Volume 4, 1947-1948*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1960-1970.

Pickersgill Jack W. and Forster, D. F. (eds.). *The Mackenzie King Record: Volume 3, 1945-1946*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1960-1970.

Pickersgill, Jack W. and Forster, D. F. (eds.). *The Mackenzie King Record: Volume 2, 1944-1945*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1960-1970.

Pickersgill, Jack W. (ed.). *The Mackenzie King Record: Volume 1, 1939-1944*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1960.

Pocock, J. G. A. 'British History: a Plea for a New Subject'. *The New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 8, no. 1, April 1974.

Poole, Ross. *Nation and identity*. London, UK: Routledge, 1999.

Porter, John. 'Canada: Dilemmas and Contradictions of a Multi-Ethnic Society', in J. E. Goldstein and R. M. Bienvenue (Eds). *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada: A Book of Readings*. Toronto, Ont.: Butterworths, 1980.

Porter, John. 'Ethnic Pluralism in Canadian Perspective' in N. Glazer and D. P. Moynihan (Eds). *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Potter, David M. *Nationalism and Sectionalism in America, 1775-1877: Select Problems in Historical Interpretation*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Potter, Simon J. 'The Imperial Significance of the Canadian-American Reciprocity Proposals of 1911'. *The Historical Journal*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2004.

Price, Charles A. (ed.) *Australian National Identity*. Canberra, ACT: Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia, ANU, 1991.

Price, Charles A. (ed.), *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, Number 4, 1979*. Canberra, ACT: Department of Demography, ANU, 1979.

Price, Charles A. 'Immigration and population policy: the Fraser Government' in Charles A. Price (ed.). *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, Number 4, 1979*. Canberra, ACT: Department of Demography, ANU, 1979.

Price, Charles A. 'Immigration and ethnic affairs' in A. Patience & B. Head (Eds). *From Whitlam to Fraser: Reform and Reaction in Australian Politics*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Price, Charles A. 'Australian immigration: the Whitlam Government 1972-1975' in Charles A. Price and Jean I. Martin. *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, Number 3, 1975*. Canberra, ACT: Department of Demography, ANU, 1976.

Price, Charles A. *The Great White Walls are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australasia, 1836-1888*. Canberra, ACT: The Australian Institute of International Affairs in association with ANU Press, 1974.

Price, Charles A. and Martin, Jean I. *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, Number 3, 1975*. Canberra, ACT: Department of Demography, ANU, 1976.

'The Prime Minister's Visit to South-East Asia'. *AFAR*, vol. 45, no. 2, February 1974.

Provinelli, Elizabeth A. *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.

Pybus, Cassandra. *Black Founders: The unknown story of Australia's first black settlers*. Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press, 2006.

Rasporich, A. W. (ed.). *The Social Sciences and Public Policy in Canada*. Calgary, Alta.: Faculty of Social Science, University of Calgary, 1979.

Radwanski, George. *Trudeau*. Toronto, Ont.: Macmillan, 1978.

Recent Publications Supported by Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. Ottawa, Ont.: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, 1992.

Resource Guide of Publications Supported by Multiculturalism Programs, 1973-1992. Ottawa, Ont.: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, 1993.

Reitz, Jeffrey G. *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*. Toronto, Ont.: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1980.

Resnick, Philip. *The Land of Cain: Class and Nationalism in English Canada, 1945-1975*. Vancouver, BC: New Star Books, 1977.

Ricci, Nino. *Pierre Elliott Trudeau*. Part of the *Extraordinary Canadians* Series. Toronto, Ont.: Penguin Books Canada, 2009.

Richards, Eric. *Destination Australia: Migration to Australia since 1901*. Manchester, UK: MUP, 2008.

Richmond, Anthony H. *Global Apartheid: Refugees, Racism, and the New World Order*. Toronto, Ont.; New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Richmond, Anthony H. 'Immigration and Multiculturalism in Canada and Australia: The Contradictions and Crises of the 1980s'. *IJCS*, vol. 3, spring 1991.

Richmond, Anthony H. *Post-War Immigrants in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Robertson, Gordon. *Memoirs of a very Civil Servant: Mackenzie King to Pierre Trudeau*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Rocher, Guy. 'The Ambiguities of a Bilingual and Multicultural Canada' in John R. Mallea & Jonathan C. Young (Eds). *Cultural Diversity and Canadian Education*. Ottawa, Ont.: Carleton University Press, 1984.

Rocher, Guy. 'Multiculturalism: The Doubts of a Francophone' in Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. Conference Report. *Multiculturalism as State Policy*. Ottawa, Ont.: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.

Rockefeller, S. 'Comment' in A. Gutman (ed.), *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Roe, Michael. *Australia, Britain, and Migration, 1915-1940: A Study of Desperate Hopes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Rotstein, Abraham. 'Is There An English-Canadian Nationalism?'. *JCS*, vol. 13, no. 2, summer 1978.

Roy, Patricia E. 'The Fifth Force: Multiculturalism and the English Canadian Identity'. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 538, March 1995.

Roy, Patricia E. *A White Man's Province: British Columbia Politicians and Japanese and Chinese Immigrants, 1858-1914*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 1989.

Rubinoff, Lionel. 'Multiculturalism and the Metaphysics of Pluralism'. *JCS*, vol. 17, no. 1, spring 1982.

Russell, Peter (ed.). *Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Ryan, Claude. 'Lester B. Pearson and Canadian Unity' in Norman Hillmer (ed.). *Pearson: The Unlikely Gladiator*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

Ryan, Susan and Bramston, Troy (Eds). *The Hawke Government: A Critical Retrospective*. North Melbourne, Vic.: Pluto Press, 2003.

Samuels, Barbara Ann. *Multiculturalism in Canada: Images and Issues*. Calgary, Alta.: Weigl, c1997.

Samuels, Raymond. *National Identity in Canada and cosmopolitan community.* Ottawa, Ont.: Agora Cosmopolitan, c1997.

Samuelson, L. and Antony, W. (Eds). *Power and Resistance: Critical Thinking about Canadian Social Issues.* 3rd edn. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing, c2003.

Sharma, Satya P., Ervin, Alexander M., Meintel, Deirdre (Eds). *Immigrants and refugees in Canada: a national perspective on ethnicity, multiculturalism and cross-cultural adjustment.* Saskatoon, Sask.: University of Saskatchewan; Montreal, QC: Université de Montreal, 1991.

Satzewich, Vic (ed.). *Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism and Racism in 90s Canada.* Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 1992.

Saunders, B., Haljan, D. (Eds). *Whither Multiculturalism? A Politics of Dissensus.* Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2003.

Sawer, Marian. 'James Jupp: Immigrant scholar' in Andrea McRobbie, (ed.). *Arrivals, Departures, Achievements: Essays in Honour of James Jupp.* Canberra, ACT: Centre for Immigration and Multicultural Studies, ANU, 1992.

Scandinavian and European Migration to Australia and New Zealand: Proceedings of the Conference held in Stockholm, Sweden, and Turku, Finland, June 9th-11th, 1998. Turku, Finland: Institute of Migration, 1999.

Schreuder, Deryck M. and Ward, Stuart (Eds). *Australia's Empire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series.*

Schreuder, Deryck M. and Ward, Stuart. 'Epilogue: After Empire' in Deryck M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (Eds). *Australia's Empire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series.*

Schreuder, Deryck M. and Ward, Stuart. 'Introduction: What Became of Australia's Empire?' in Deryck M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (Eds). *Australia's Empire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series.*

Scott, Joan W. 'Multiculturalism and the Politics of Identity', *October*, vol. 61, summer 1992.

Seeley, J. R. *The Expansion of England.* London, UK: Macmillan, 1931. Orig. 1883.

Sestito, Raymond. *The Politics of Multiculturalism.* Policy Monographs 3, Melbourne: Centre for Independent Studies, 1982.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism.* London, UK: Methuen, 1977.

Sharma, S. P., Ervin, A. M., Meintel, D. (Eds). *Immigrants and Refugees in Canada: A National Perspective on Ethnicity, Multiculturalism and Cross-Cultural Adjustment.* Saskatoon, Sask.; Montreal, QC: University of Saskatchewan; University of Montreal, 1991.

Sheehan, Paul. *Among the Barbarians.* New edn. Milsons Point, NSW: Random House Australia, 1998.

Sheridan, William H. *Canadian Multiculturalism.* Ottawa, Ont.: Library of Parliament, Research Branch, 1990.

Sissons, C. B. *Bilingual Schools in Canada.* London, UK; Toronto, Ont.: J. M. Dent, 1917.

Sleight, Simon. "Australia's House" in Bridge, Carl, Bongiorno, Frank and Lee, David (Eds). *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010.* Australia: DFAT, 2010.

Smart, Patricia. *The Diary of Andrœ Laurendeau: Written during the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1964-1967.* Selected and with an introduction by Patricia Smart. Translated by Patricia Smart and Dorothy Howard. Toronto, Ont.: James Lorimer & Company, 1991.

Smith, Allan. *Canada – An American Nation?: Essays on Continentalism, Identity, and the Canadian Frame of Mind.* Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.

Smith, Allan. 'Metaphor and Nationality in North America'. *CHR*, vol. 51, September 1970.

Smith, William George. *A Study in Canadian Immigration.* Toronto, Ont.: Ryerson Press, 1920.

Smolicz, J. J. 'Constructive Diversity in Multicultural Australia'. *World Studies in Education*, vol. 3, no. 1-2, 2002.

Soutphommasane, Tim. *Reclaiming Patriotism: Nation-Building for Australian progressives. Australian Encounters* series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Stockley, David. 'The Politics of Multiculturalism: Some Australian and Canadian Comparisons'. *Australian-Canadian Studies*, vol. 2, January 1984.

Stockwell, Sarah (ed.). *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Stokes, Geoffrey. *Politics of identity in Australia.* Cambridge; Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

'The strange disarray of Quebec separatism', *The Economist*, vol. 382, iss. 8517, 24th February, 2007

Stratton, Jon. *Race Daze: Australia in Identity Crisis*. Sydney, NSW: Pluto Press, 1998.

Stratton, Jon and Ang, Ien. 'Multicultural Imagined Communities: Cultural Difference and National Identity in Australia and the USA'. *Continuum*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1994.

Stursberg, Peter. *Diefenbaker: Leadership lost, 1962-67*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Stursberg, Peter. *Diefenbaker: Leadership gained, 1956-62*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Sugunasiri, S. H. J. *Towards Multicultural Growth: A Look at Canada From Classical Racism to Neomulticulturalism*. Toronto, Ont.: Village Publishing House, 2001.

Tamis, Anastasios Myrodis. *The Greeks in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Tarasoff, Koozma J. 'Doukhobors' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian* History. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Tate, John William. 'John Howard's "Nation": Multiculturalism, Citizenship, and Identity'. *AJPH*, vol. 55, no. 1, March 2009.

Tavan, Gwenda. *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*. Carlton North, Vic.: Scribe, 2005.

Tavan, Gwenda. 'Immigration: Control or Colour Bar? The Immigration Reform Movement, 1959-1960'. *AHS*, vol. 32, no. 117, October 2001.

Tavan, Gwenda. '"Good Neighbours": Community Organisations, Migrant Assimilation and Australian Society and Culture, 1950-1961'. *AHS*, vol. 28, no. 109, October 1997.

Taylor, Charles. 'The Politics of Recognition' in A. Gutman (ed.). *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Tazreiter, Claudia. *The Politics of Protection in a Security-Conscious World*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.

Temelini, Michael. Book Review on Manoly Lupul. *The Politics of Multiculturalism: A Ukrainian-Canadian Memoir*. Toronto, Ont.: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2005. *CHR*, vol. 88, no. 3, September 2007.

Tepper, Elliott L. 'Immigration Policy and Multiculturalism' in J. W. Berry and J. A. Laponce (Eds). *Ethnicity and Culture in Canada: The Research Landscape*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Theophanous, Andrew. *Understanding Multiculturalism and Australian Identity.* Melbourne: Elikia Books, 1995.

Thomas, L. G., 'The Umbrella and the Mosaic: The French-English Presence and the Settlement of the Canadian Prairie West' in John Alexander Carroll (ed.). *Reflections of Western Historians.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1969.

Thompson, John Herd. 'Canada and the "Third British Empire", 1901-1939' in Phillip Bucker (ed.). *Canada and the British Empire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series.*

Thompson, John Herd and Randall, Stephen J. *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies.* 3rd edn. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2004.

Thompson, J. H. and Weinfeld, M. 'Entry and Exit: Canadian Immigration Policy in Context'. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 538, March 1995.

Thomson, Dale C. *Jean Lesage & The Quiet Revolution.* Toronto, Ont.: Macmillan of Canada, 1984.

Thomson, Dale C. *Louis St. Laurent: Canadian.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1968.

Thordarson, Bruce. *Lester Pearson: Diplomat and Politician.* Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Trainor, Luke. 'Building Nations: Australia and New Zealand' in David Omissi and Andrew S. Thompson (Eds). *The Impact of the South African War.* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002.

Troper, Harold. "Canada's immigration policy since 1945". *International Journal*, vol. 48, spring 1993.

Troper, Harold and Weinfeld, Morton (Eds). *Ethnicity, politics and public policy: case studies in Canadian diversity.* Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, c1999.

Trudeau, Pierre Elliott. *Approaches to Politics.* Translated by I. M. Owen. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Trudeau, Pierre Elliott. *Federalism and the French Canadians.* With an introduction by John T. Saywell. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1968.

Tsokhas, Kosmas. 'Tradition, fantasy and Britishness: Four Australian prime ministers'. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2001.

Vipond, Mary. 'One Network or Two? French-language Programming on the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, 1932-36'. *CHR*, vol. 89, no. 4, September 2008.

Vipond, Mary. 'Canadian Clubs' in Gerald Hallowell (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to Canadian History*. Toronto, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Viviani, Nancy. *Australian government policy on the entry of Vietnamese refugees in 1975*. Research Paper No. 1. Nathan, QLD: Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations, Griffith University, 1980.

Viviani, Nancy and Lawe-Davies, Joana. *Australian government policy on the entry of Vietnamese refugees: 1976 to 1978*. Research Paper No. 2. Nathan, QLD: Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations, Griffith University, 1980.

Walsh, Kate. *The Changing Face of Australia: A Century of Immigration, 1901-2000*. St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 2001.

Wangenheim, Elizabeth. 'The Ukrainians: A Case Study of the "Third Force"' in Peter Russell (ed.). *Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto, Ont.: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Ward, Paul. *Britishness since 1870*. London, UK: Routledge, 2004.

Ward, Russel. *Concise History of Australia*. Brisbane, QLD: University of Queensland Press, 1992.

Ward, Russel. 'The End of the Ice Age'. *Meanjin Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 1, March 1973.

Ward, Russel. *Australia*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, c1965.

Ward, Stuart. 'Sir Alexander Downer and the embers of British Australia' in Carl Bridge, Frank Bongiorno and David Lee (Eds). *The High Commissioners: Australia's Representatives in the United Kingdom, 1910-2010*. Australia: DFAT, 2010.

Ward, Stuart. 'Imperial Identities Abroad' in Sarah Stockwell (ed.). *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Ward, Stuart. 'Security: Defending Australia's Empire' in Deryck M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (Eds). *Australia's Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.

Ward, Stuart. 'The "New Nationalism" in Australia, Canada and New Zealand: Civic Culture In the Wake of the British World' in Kate Darian-Smith, Patricia Grimshaw and Stuart Macintyre (Eds). *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2007.

Ward, Stuart. 'Worlds Apart: Three "British" Prime Ministers at Empire's End' in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis (Eds). *Rediscovering the British World*. Calgary, Alta.: University of Calgary Press, 2005.

Ward, Stuart. '"Culture up to our Arseholes": Projecting Post-Imperial Australia'. *AJPH*, vol. 51, no. 1, March 2005.

Ward, Stuart. '"Post-Imperial" Australia: Introduction'. *AJPH*, vol. 51, no. 1, March 2005.

Ward, Stuart. 'Fellow Britons'. *Meanjin*, 63, no. 3, September 2004.

Ward, Stuart. 'The End of Empire and the Fate of Britishness' in Helen Brocklehurst and Robert Phillips (Eds). *History, Nationhood and the Question of Britain.* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Ward, Stuart. 'Transcending the Nation: A Global Imperial History?' in Antoinette Burton (ed.). *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation.* Durham, NC and London, UK: Duke University Press, 2003.

Ward, Stuart. 'The British World'. *Australian Historical Association Bulletin*, vol. 94, June 2002.

Ward, Stuart (ed.). *British culture and the end of empire.* Manchester, UK; New York, NY: MUP; Palgrave, 2001.

Ward, Stuart. *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal.* Carlton South, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2001.

Ward, Stuart. 'Sentiment and Self-interest: The Imperial Ideal in Anglo-Australian Commercial Culture', *AHS*, vol. 32, no. 116, 2001.

Ward, Stuart. 'Anglo-Commonwealth relations and EEC membership: the problem of the old Dominions' in George Wilkes (ed.). *Britain's Failure to enter the European Community, 1961-63: The enlargement negotiations and crises in European, Atlantic and Commonwealth relations.* London, UK: Frank Cass, 1997.

Ward, W. Peter. *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Towards Orientals in British Columbia.* 3rd edn. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.

Waterfall, Donald E. 'Multiculturalism Policy in Canada' in Kushal Deb (ed.). *Mapping Multiculturalism.* Jaipur, India: Rawat Publications, 2002.

Wear, Rae. 'The Howard Years: An Evaluation'. *AJPH*, vol. 55, no. 3, September 2009.

Weinfeld, M. 'Ethnic Assimilation and the Retention of Ethnic Cultures' in J. W. Berry and J. A. Laponce (Eds). *Ethnicity and Culture in Canada: The Research Landscape.* Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Whitaker, Reginald. *Canadian Immigration Policy since Confederation.* Ottawa, Ont.: Canadian Historical Association, 1991.

White, Richard. 'Cooes across the Strand: Australian Travellers in London and the Performance of National Identity', *AHS*, vol. 32, no. 116, 2001.

White, Richard. 'The Australian Way of Life'. *Historical Studies*, vol. 18, 1979.

Who's Who in Australia, 22nd edn., 1977. Compiled and edited by J. S. Legge. Melbourne: The Herald and Weekly Times, 1977.

Who's Who in Australia, 21st edn., 1974. Compiled and edited by J. S. Legge. Melbourne: The Herald and Weekly Times, 1974.

Who's Who in Australia, 19th edn., 1968. Compiled and edited by J. S. Legge. Melbourne, Vic.: The Herald and Weekly Times, 1968.

Who's Who in Australia, 15th edn., 1955. Compiled and edited by Joseph A. Alexander. Melbourne, Vic.: Colorgravure Publications, 1955.

Who's Who in Australia, 14th edn., 1950. Compiled and edited by Joseph A. Alexander. Melbourne, Vic.: Colorgravure Publications, 1950.

Who's Who in Canada, 1969-70. Edited by Herbert E. Barnett and Hugh Fraser. Toronto, Ont.: International Press, 1969.

Who's Who in Canada, 1966-68. Edited by Hugh Fraser, Herbert E. Barnett and Edward R. White. Toronto, Ont.: International Press, 1964.

Who's Who in Canada, 1964-5. Edited by Hugh Fraser and Herbert E. Barnett. Toronto, Ont.: International Press, 1964.

Who's Who in Canada, 1962-3. Edited by B. M. Greene. Toronto, Ont.: International Press, 1962.

Who's Who in Canada, 1949-50. Edited by B. M. Greene. Toronto, Ont.: International Press, 1950.

Who's Who in Canada, 1943-44. Edited by B. M. Greene. Toronto, Ont.: International Press, 1944.

Wigley, Philip G. *Canada and the Transition to Commonwealth: British-Canadian Relations, 1917-26.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Wilkes, George (ed.). *Britain's Failure to enter the European Community, 1961-63: The enlargement negotiations and crises in European, Atlantic and Commonwealth relations.* London, UK: Frank Cass, 1997.

Willard, Myra. *History of the White Australia Policy to 1920.* Carlton South, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1974.

Willmot, Eric. *Australia: The Last Experiment.* Sydney, NSW: Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 1987.

Wilton, J. and Bosworth, R. *Old Worlds and New Australia: The Post-War Migrant Experience.* Melbourne, Vic.: Penguin, 1984.

Winks, Robin W. (ed.). *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume V, Historiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 in Wm. Roger Louis (general editor). *The Oxford History of the British Empire series*.

Wolfgang, A. (ed.). *Education of Immigrant Students: Issues and Answers*. Toronto, Ont.: OISE, 1975.

Woodsworth, J. S. *Strangers Within Our Gates*. Toronto, Ont.: Stephenson, c1909.

Woolford, D. *Resource Guide of Publications Supported by Multiculturalism Programs, 1973-1992*. Ottawa, Ont.: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, c1993.

Yarwood, A. T. *Asian Migration to Australia: The Background to Exclusion, 1896-1923*. Parkville, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1964.

York, Barry. *Ethno-Historical Studies in a Multicultural Australia*. Canberra, ACT: Centre for Immigration & Multicultural Studies, 1996.

York, Barry. *From Assimilationism to Multiculturalism: Australian Experience, 1945-1989*. Canberra, ACT: Centre for Immigration & Multicultural Studies, 1996.

Yuzyk, Paul. 'Canada: A Multicultural Nation'. *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. 7, 1965.

Zachariah, Matthew, Sheppard, Allan, Barratt, Leona (Eds). *Canadian Multiculturalism: Dreams, Realities, Expectations*. Edmonton, Alta.: Canadian Multicultural Education Foundation, 2004.

Zizek, Slavoj. 'Multiculturalism; or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism'. *New Left Review*, vol. 225, 1997.

Zubrzycki, Jerzy. 'Multicultural Australia' in James Jupp (ed.). *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins*. 2nd edn. Melbourne, Vic.: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Zubrzycki, Jerzy. 'The evolution of the policy of multiculturalism in Australia', paper presented at the Global Cultural Diversity Conference, Sydney, 26th April 1995. Canberra, ACT: OMA, 1995.

Zubrzycki, Jerzy. 'The Search For Roots And Nationalism in a Multicultural Australia: A (partly autobiographical) Essay in Social Theory' in Andrea McRobbie (ed.). *Arrivals, Departures, Achievements: Essays in Honour of James Jupp*. Canberra, ACT: Centre for Immigration and Multicultural Studies, ANU, 1992.

Zubrzycki, Jerzy. 'The evolution of multiculturalism', in C. A. Price (ed.). *Australian National Identity*. Canberra, ACT: Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia, ANU, 1991.

Zubrzycki, Jerzy. 'Sociological methods for the study of immigrant adjustment' in C. A. Price (ed.). *The Study of Immigrants in Australia*. Canberra, ACT: ANU Press, 1960.

Theses

Caccia, Ivana. *Managing the Canadian mosaic: Dealing with Cultural Diversity during the WWII Years*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of History, University of Ottawa, 2006.

Champion, Christian P. *Nova Britannia Revisited: Canadianism, Anglo-Canadian Identities and the Crisis of Britishness, 1964-1968*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of History, McGill University, 2007.

Curran, James. *More than empty words?: Prime Ministerial rhetoric and Australian nationalism, 1972-1996*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 2001.

Gledhill, Amelia. *Professors at play: academics as fantasists*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 2008.

Isaacs, Bruce. *Film cool: towards a new film aesthetic*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 2006.

Jordan, Matthew. *The reappraisal of the 'White Australia' policy against the background of a changing Asia, 1945-66*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 2001.

Ledgard, Bronwyn C. *Early Celtic notions of time: reconsidering 'the Celtic year'*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 2007.

Lehane, Richard J. R. *Lieutenant-General Edward Hutton and 'Greater Britain': late-Victorian imperialism, imperial defence and the self-governing colonies*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 2005.

Mann, Parminder. *A Shelter in the Struggle for Civil Rights: A Comparative Study of the NAACP in Birmingham, Alabama and Detroit, Michigan 1945-1965*. Department of History, University of Surrey Roehampton, University of Surrey, 2001.

Purewal, Shinder. *The politics of multiculturalism in Canada, 1963-1971*. Thesis (B.A.) – Department of Political Science, Simon Fraser University, 1988.

Reason, Matthew. *It all depends on the land: identity, myth and landscape at Uluru and Mount Rushmore*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 2006.

Ward, Stuart. *Discordant communities: Australia, Britain and the EEC, 1956-1963*. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 1998.

Web Sites

http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5478/ (Accessed 18/03/09)

http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;adv=;db=HANDBOOK;group=;holdingType=;id=handbook/newhandbook/2008-12-19/0077;orderBy=;page=;query=Id:"handbook/newhandbook/2008-12-19/0071";querytype=;rec=;resCount=

http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;adv=;db=HANDBOOK;*group=;holdingType=;id=handbook/newhandbook/2008-12-*19/0090;orderBy=;page=;query=Id:"handbook/newhandbook/2008-12-19/0071";querytype=;rec=;resCount=

http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2006/11/22/harper-quebec.html (Accessed 11/07/2008) (Last Updated: Wednesday, 22nd November, 2006)

http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/speeches/2009/2009-03-20.asp (Accessed 13/05/11) (Last Updated 14/04/09)

http://www.cic.gc.ca/english//resources/publications/multi-state/index.asp (Accessed 22/03/2010) (Last Updated: 03/03/2010)

http://www.cprn.org/doc.cfm?doc=693&l=en

http://www.minister.immi.gov.au/media/cb/2011/cb159251.htm (Accessed 13/05/11) (Last updated Thursday, 17th February 2011)

http://www.minister.immi.gov.au/media/media-releases/2008/ce08122.htm (Accessed 22/03/2010) (Last updated 20th December, 2010)

http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t250.e45

http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t250.e31

http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t250.e170

http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t250.e178

http://www.unesco.org/most/pp4.htm

http://www.ushistory.org/documents/monroe.htm

http://www2.parl.gc.ca/Parlinfo/Compilations/FederalGovernment/MinisterProvincial.aspx?Province=&Ministry=132d9623-0144-4280-aa3e-9d9fd8f83d02&Region=

http://www2.parl.gc.ca/Parlinfo/Lists/Members.aspx?Parliament=8714654b-cdbf-48a2-b1ad-57a3c8ece839&Current=True

RARE BOOKS LIB.

- 5 JUL 2011

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY LIBRARY
0000000613883170