

How the Proportion of Artificial Canadians Varied Among Regions of Canada and Ethnic Origins Between 1991 and 1996*

Karol J Krótki
Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration
and Integration (PCERII)
www.pcerii.metropolis.globalx.net
Department of Sociology, University of Alberta
Edmonton, AL T5N 3H9

Real Canadians vs Artificial Canadians

This paper presents regional variations in the ethnic integration of Canada as disclosed by interethnic marriages. For a century, reluctance and outright prohibition ruled against census declarations by a respondent of more than one ethnicity. In recent censuses respondents were permitted, even encouraged, to report all ethnicities that may have occurred among their ancestors. There is a useful parallel with residential segregation, well-known among students of integration. Nobody asks: 'did you move to your current address in order to improve the integration of the society?' Similarly, nobody asks 'did your parents and/or other ancestors marry interethnically in order to increase the integration of the society?'

Careful research assistance has been provided by Kwame Boadu, a graduate student in demography at the University of Alberta. Professor K Vaninadha Rao of the Bowling Green State University discussed usefully and positively another paper by this author involving the concept of artificial Canadians at a session on recent methodological developments in demography at the annual meeting of the Canadian Population Society, Ottawa, 3-5 June 1998. Important comments have been received from an anonymous peer reviewer at the Canadian Journal of Regional Science.

The mere fact of physical movement or intermarriage is taken by analysts as an indicator of integration.

Canadian census takers of 1991 and 1996 coded interethnic marriages by giving a value of 'one' to each of the ancestral ethnicities. They created in this manner new and valuable data. A respondent with, say, three ethnicities appeared

TABLE 1 Artificial Canadians in 1991 and 1996, guesstimates for 2026

	1991	1996	2026
1. Census population of Canada (1)=(2)+(3)	27	29	33
2. Respondents reporting SINGLE ethnicities	19	18	5
3. Respondents reporting MULTIethnicities (also called 'real' Canadians)	8	10	28
4. Total multiethnicities**	21	24	84
5. Artificial Canadians (5)=(4)-(3)	13	14	56
6. Census and artificial Canadians added together (6)=(1)+(5)	40	43	89
7. Multiethnicities per respondent reporting multiethnicities' (7)=(4)/(3)	2.7	2.4	3.0
'Canadians'			
8. as one of multiethnicities	0.7***	3.5	--
9. as a single ethnicity	--	5.3	--
10. as one of multiethnicities + single ethnicities (10)=(8)+(9)	--	8.8	--

Note: Except * = all rows are in millions and subject to heavy rounding; ** = own calculations and/or extractions; *** = 3% according to Statistics Canada (19-98).

Sources: *Ethnic origin. The nation*. 1991. Catalogue 93-315. Ottawa: Statistics Canada; *The Daily*. 1998. Catalogue nr 11-001E. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. *1996 census: nation tables*. <http://WWW.StatCan.CA/nic.htm>. Ottawa: Statistics Canada; 2026 figures are illustrative examples of possible developments suggested by the author.

three times in the data bank, but only one was a real person, the other two were artificial figments of the coding process. In short, the more "artificial Canadians" are reported in a region, the greater the social integration of the society in that region. A highly integrated Canada would contain, say, 33 million real Canadians and 56 million artificial Canadians (table 1). Similarly, a region with a higher proportion of artificial Canadians would be taken as more integrated than other regions (see glossary at end of paper).

The proportion of people reporting multiethnicities in Canadian censuses has risen rapidly over the last four censuses: 11 per cent in 1981, 28 in 1986, 31 in 1991 and 36 in 1996.¹ However, this rapid rise is not necessarily an indicator of

1. Although, in 1981 '... respondents were not specifically informed that multiple responses were permitted', White et al 1993: 229. The first two percentages given in the text come from *ibid*; the third is missing there.

increasing interethnic marriages and, therefore, of increasing societal integration. It is generally agreed that the rapid increase is, partly, the outcome of increasing encouragements to report multiethnicities.

The 1991 census

A numerical summary of much of this paper is provided in table 1. The encouragement of multiple responses to the question on ethnic origin during the 1991 census took the form of an invitation inserted in the instructions on the completion of the census questionnaire and the provision of 15 tick-off spaces and two write-ins on the census questionnaire itself. Eight million respondents out of 27 million took the opportunity to report more than one ethnicity among their ancestors. To repeat, it is a given that such multiethnicities are the outcomes of ethnic intermarriages in the past.² One can say that by 1991 a small proportion (less than 30%) among the forebears of our populations took part in interethnic marriages. The same meaning can be formulated more dramatically: over 70% of our ancestors were shunning other ethnic groups.³

The national figure of over 70% of shunners is an average of regional and local variations. Literature knows several rules determining or at least influencing interethnic marriages. For example, large and isolated groups intermarry less than small and intermixed groups. Thus, the French of Quebec are the least intermarrying group in Canada -- 7% were in 1991 the outcome of ethnic intermarriages when compared with single ethnicity (pure French), rising to 11% in Montreal, to 50% in Ottawa-Hull, 169% in Ontario, 310% in Edmonton, 418% in Calgary (418% in comparison with Edmonton's 310% because of smaller size than in Edmonton; Krótki 1996).

The 1996 Census

Reporting multiethnicities was encouraged again in 1996 in the pamphlet with

-
2. Some students of ethnic intermarriage are impressed with the possibility that some of the ethnic intermarriages took place before the immigration to Canada of the people concerned. Tabulations of multiethnicities by the time of immigration might offer some handle on the phenomenon.
 3. The multiethnicity of childless couples made up by partners of different ethnic groups would not be reflected in the census data, unless special coding and tabulation steps are taken. The writer developed a suitable proposal to that effect.

census instructions. Three important changes took place on the questionnaire itself: the numerous (15 in 1991) tick-off entries were abolished, but the write-in spaces were increased from two to four. Most importantly, among the suggestions offered on the questionnaire as multiethnicities, Canadian appeared as the fifth among 24 suggestions.⁴

Under these new circumstances, 10 million respondents reported multiethnicities out of a 1996 population of 29 million. The proportion reporting single ethnicities declined within five years from 70% to 64%. The six additional percentage points in 1996 account for 1,712,000 new multiethnics. But 'Canadian' was listed by 3,479,000 multiethnics. Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that at least 1,767,000 (3,479,000 - 1,712,000) multiple 'Canadians' were among the 1991 multiethnics. As there must have been at least some new multiethnics arising out of more recent intermarriages, the number of multiple 'Canadians' among 1991 multiethnics must have been smaller than 1,767,000.

Short of additional research with new data it is not possible to say how much multiple 'Canadians' contributed to the decline among those reporting single ethnicities from 70% to 64%.

The 'Canadian' Canadians For The First Time In History

The Emergence of 'Canadians': Another Indicator of Integration?

In most Canadian censuses there were some 50,000 or 100,000 sturdy individuals who insisted on reporting themselves as Canadians (a like number reported themselves as Americans). Both the Canadians and Americans did so not in the citizenship question, which would cause no problems, but under ethnicity. In 1991 the tolerant eyes of census officials encouraged an emergence of three-quarters of a million of 'Canadian' ethnicity (or 3%, see table 1). They were all pure Canadians, or single 'Canadians' in the phraseology adopted for this paper. Another one percent reported 'Canadian' in combination with other ethnicities.

By 1996 over 5 million reported themselves in ethnicity as single 'Canadians', that is in addition and apart from the three and half million reporting 'Canadian' as one of their multiethnicities. Statistically, the five million single ethnicity 'Canadians' raise probably fewer questions than the multiethnic 'Canadians': the great majority come apparently out of the various British groups (English, Scotch, Welsh, Irish, Celtic) and out of the French. Numerically, it also

4. Actually, there were other changes. Emphasis was increased on racial origin and other related characteristics; some required by legislation on fairness in employment. The existence of these related questions, their mere replacement, must have affected the collection of data on ethnic origin in some still unknown ways.

appears that the Germans and Ukrainians might have experienced related and corresponding losses. This matter is not taken up in this paper.

The regional distribution of single 'Canadians' in 1996

In table 2 we show the distribution of single ethnicity 'Canadians' as a proportion of all single ethnicities. The largest proportion of 'Canadians' is in Quebec, almost half of the Quebecers (47.2%). The Atlantic region reported 35.2%, almost on the level, though not quite, of Quebecers. Ontario (27.4%) and the Western region (21.3%) are far behind in claiming 'Canadian' ethnicity. Differences among provinces, as distinct from regions, are too small to call for attention, but the case of Alberta deserves mentioning with almost 27% of its respondents reporting themselves as single 'Canadians', ahead of other Westerners, **TABLE 2 'Canadian' single responses on ethnic origin as a percentage of all single responses, provinces and regions of Canada, 1996**

Provinces (1)	'Canadian' Singles (2)	All Singles % (3)	(2) as % of (3) (4)	as (4) for re- gions (5)
Canada	5,326,995	16,946,785	31.4	31.4
NF	114,660	399,065	28.7	
PE	17,305	63,570	27.2	
NS	173,135	461,985	37.5	Atlantic
NB	174,570	438,595	39.8	35.2
QC	2,655,830	5,621,785	47.2	47.2
ON	1,289,135	5,748,740	22.4	22.4
MA	94,955	572,750	16.6	
SK	99,560	470,150	21.2	
AL	341,505	1,288,800	26.5	Western
BC	357,280	1,869,330	18.8	21.3
YK	4,595	14,575	31.5	
NW	4,455	44,955	9.9	

Source: Columns (2) and (3) have the same source as 1996 in table 1.

though still below the lowest proportion among the Atlantic provinces.

In short, if we take the single 'Canadians' seriously, we have an influence in the East with strong leadership given by Quebec (Who would have expected it!). The proportions are weaker in the West, beginning with the Ontario percentage which is less than half that of Quebec.⁵ Is the westward waning a sign of west-

5. The writer came to Canada as an immigrant in 1964. (He was here earlier as a tourist.) At that time 'Canadian' meant French-Canadian. Other ethnic groups, including

ward weakening of patriotism and whole-country nationalism? In the next section we enquire into the role and influence of multiethnics, the other mode of integration through ethnic intermarriage. A study of immigration with new tabulations of periods of immigration is called for.

Multiethnics Create “Artificial Canadians”

The regional distribution of multiethnics in 1996

Statistics Canada analysts never add up multiethnicities, but they show them together -- next to each other, so to speak -- inviting an addition optically. Occasionally, a number will appear in the usual place of a total under a column titled 'Multi responses' (such as the instances in Statistics Canada 1998a). Occasionally, the space for totals is unused (see the 13 pages of Statistics Canada 1998b). No complaint here, as the meanings of the columns are clearly stated. Row 4 in table 1 is the result of the data from census publications having been added up by the author.⁶

Although it is not appropriate to add up different multiethnicities (except under suitable safeguards by the present writer and his like), the fact remains that the new data are being used by less informed people in added-up form. When the Polish-Albertans were celebrating the 100th anniversary of their settlement in Alberta, they were using these data in the added-up form.⁷ When Premier Klein

the English had to hyphenate their ethnic origin with -Canadian added.

6. The legal creation of multiethnics in 1991, and their near-explosion in 1996, opened the problem of their coding, tabulation and analysis. Two writers at the University of Alberta suggested that each multiethnic be given a value equal to the reciprocal of the number of multiethnicities reported (half with two multiethnicities, one-third with three multiethnicities, and so on; Krótki and Odynak 1990). The Krótki-Odynak suggestion will come into its own, when attempts are made to avoid double-counting among multiethnicities. Then say, 100,000 multiethnicities will turn out to have been produced by 35,714 multiethnics with an average of 2.8 multiethnicities per multiethnic (row 7 in table 1) and 43,478 multiethnics with an average of 2.3.
7. The writer is responsible for providing the 1991 data that follow in the text. Since the 1996 data became available and provided for a similar occasion would be: single ethnics 29,460 [for Canada as a whole: 265,930], multiethnics 97,215 [520,805]. Should anyone engage in the 'no-no' of adding singles and multiples, the number would be 126,670 [786,735]. Taking the 2.4 in row 7 of table 1

and Minister Paszkowski took part in that occasion at the Legislative Assembly, they were using the figure of 125,000 Polish-Albertans, but of these only 33,000 were single ethnics. Of the other 92,000 (quoting from memory) more than half belonged to other multiethnics.⁸

Tables 3 and 4 show the distribution of artificial Canadians respectively by province and region. To repeat the bias of this article: the presence of artificial Canadians is an indicator of interethnic marriages in the past, and consequently of the degree of integration prevailing in the society. We are therefore concluding that the Western region is the leader in this type of integration (based on inter

TABLE 3 Artificial Canadians by province, Canada 1996

Provinces (2) (1)	1996 Census Population (2)	Multi- ethnicity (3)	Multiple Responses (4)	Artificial Canadians (3) - (4) (5)	(5) as % of (1) (6)
Canada	28,526,125	24,380,745	10,224,495	14,156,250	49.6
NF	547,160	343,810	146,815	196,995	36.0
PE	132,855	174,235	68,510	105,725	79.6
NS	899,970	1,094,390	427,765	666,625	74.1
NB	729,830	729,175	288,430	440,745	60.4
QC	7,045,080	2,564,485	1,194,060	1,370,425	19.5

seriously for both the province of Alberta and the whole country, only 40,506 [217,002] multiethnics belong to Canadians of Polish origin, the balance of 56,709 [303,848] belong to other multiethnicities.

8. There is, so far, at least one instance where the duplicated and triplicated multiethnics are used as if they were single ethnics, though in this case the subject concerns multilinguals (spoken at home and mother tongue, but the principle, that these data must not be added up should prevail in this instance as well, Kogler n.d.). However, there are already instances of Statistics Canada analysts engaging in some forms of double counting. For example, a million of Ukrainians are cited alongside three-quarters of a million of Poles (Statistics Canada 1998a). All those of mixed Polish-Ukrainian ancestry are counted twice, once as Poles and once as Ukrainians. It is not immediately obvious that less than half of those cited in Statistics Canada publications are real Canadians and more than half are artificial Canadians. That type of double counting is institutionalised in tabular presentation: in table showing 'Top 15 ethnic origins' the column 'Multiple responses' gives the correct country total, but it is heading a long list adding up to well over 10 million (Statistics Canada 1998b). The total of multiple responses for the 'Top 25 ethnic origins' is avoided and the component parts (single and multiple) for each ethnicity stand on their own.

ON	10,642,790	10,076,695	4,185,675	5,891,020	55.4
MA	1,100,295	1,221,905	494,540	727,365	66.1
SK	976,615	1,242,650	485,110	757,540	77.6
AL	2,669,195	3,151,910	1,274,420	1,877,490	70.3
BC	3,689,755	3,961,545	1,625,555	2,335,990	63.3
YK	30,650	39,565	15,250	24,315	79.3
NW	64,125	43,625	18,360	25,265	39.3

Source: Columns (2) and (4) are from *The Daily*, Statistics Canada, February 1998. Column (3) is calculated by the author.

TABLE 4 Artificial Canadians bu region, Canada 1996

Regions (1)	1996 Census Population (2)	Multi- ethnicity (3)	Multiple Responses (4)	Artificial Canadians (3) - (4) (5)	(5) as % of (2) (6)
Canada	28,526,125	24,380,745	10,224,495	14,156,250	49.6
Atlantic	2,309,815	2,341,610	911,520	1,430,090	61.9
Quebec	7,045,080	2,564,485	1,194,060	1,370,425	19.5
Ontario	10,642,790	10,076,695	4,185,675	5,891,020	55.4
Western	8,435,860	9,578,010	3,879,625	5,698,385	67.5
Yukon	30,650	39,565	15,250	24,315	79.3
NWT	64,125	43,625	18,360	25,265	39.3

Source: Calculated or copied from columns (2) and (4) from *The Daily*, Statistics Canada, February 1998. Column (3) is calculated by the author.

ethnic marriages), followed by the Atlantic region, then Ontario. Quebec appears a long way back.⁹ Within the Atlantic region the behaviour of the population is less clear cut. Newfoundland is a poor producer of artificial Canadians, that is, displays a poor indicator of integration. Ignoring Newfoundland the Atlantic provinces are as good in their absence of ethnic biases (the 'shunning') as the Western region (Krótki 1995). The contradiction between the message of table 2 against tables 3 and 4 calls for further research.

9. To any one thinking in terms of national (nationalistic?) patriotism, it is clear that the Western region is superior to Ontario. That type of reasoning leads to dangerous developments, of which the concealment of data is only one aspect. Independent and free Poland of the 1990s will follow the practice of Soviet Poland of the forty years after World War II in not recording ethnicities in their census of 2000 (Eberhardt 1998). On the other hand all Anglophones and Allophones in Canada must hope that Quebec will not follow the Canadian production of artificial Canadians. However, this latter reasoning is not the concern of this article.

The Integration of 'Canadians' vs Multiethnics

It might be suggested that those who reported themselves as 'Canadian' are *par excellence* integrated Canadians. As such, the argument runs, they are no different from those intergrated through interethnic marriages. The two sets should thus be added together to give a true picture of societal integration. In fact, however, the three and half million multiple 'Canadians' have already been accounted for by being included among the total multiethnics and the total multiethnicities.

However, removing the five million single 'Canadians' out of the 18 million of all single ethnicities (see table 1) and putting them together with 10 million multiethnics would be like adding oranges and apples. A review of the 1991 and 1996 totals by ethnicity (not presented in this article) suggests that the new 1996 category of ethnic 'Canadians' came at the expense of the 1991 single British and single French, with a sprinkling of single Germans and single Ukrainians. Who knows what kind of integrated Canadians they are? Is their kind (pure English, pure French, etc) of integration into the Canadian society at all comparable with the integration by interethnic marriage, which is the main concern of this paper? Is this reporting anything more than merely a definitional formality, not at all comparable with the profound change embedded in an interethnic marriage, especially when the ethnicities participating are very 'far apart'?

We have by now three sets of percentages that illustrate the provincial and regional values arising in Canadian provinces from east to the west: single 'Canadians' as a percentage of all singles (table 2); 'Canadian multiples' as a percentage of all Canadian singles (table not included in this version of paper); and artificial Canadians as a percentage of census population (tables 3 and 4). The messages from these data are as follows:

- Single 'Canadians' play a greater role in the east than in the west, but they are most important in Quebec;
- 'Canadian' multiples are more important in the west, including Ontario, than in the east; that is to say, westerners do not go much in for 'Canadianism', but when they do go for it, they are comfortable intermixing it with other ethnicities. One could risk saying that they are more "citizens of the world" than easterners;
- Westerners produce more artificial Canadians than easterners, but their superiority in this respect dwindles in table 4 to 6 percentage points (67.5 - 61.9)
- The joint influence of 'Canadian' ethnicity and of artificial Canadians appear to neutralize each other and regional differentials disappear. Summing 'Canadian' singles and multiethnics yields: Newfoundland, 48%; PEI, 65%; Nova Scotia, 67%; New Brunswick, 63%; Quebec, 55%; Ontario, 51%; Manitoba, 54%; Saskatchewan, 60%; Alberta, 61%; and B.C., 54%; for a national average of 55%. Thus to study regional differentials it is more illuminating to keep each of the integrating processes separately.

Artificial Canadians as an Outcome of Ethnic Intermarriages and as a Measure of Integration

State Policy: Create 100 million Artificial Canadians

The closure of the previous section points to a paradox. Provinces in the Eastern region have recourse to reported (single) 'Canadianhood' ahead of the provinces in the Western region (table 2). On the other hand Western provinces have recourse to 'Canadianhood' mixed with other ethnicities to an extent greater (116.4%) than the Eastern region (73.4%). In other words, Easterners use 'Canadianhood' as such, in isolation, apart from other ethnicities. The Westerners use 'Canadianhood' combined with other ethnicities.

Good-natured as they are, Canadians have a clear chance of developing a society with tolerance of multicultural characteristics and yet rich in its own Canadian features.¹⁰ As other writers have reported, Canadians tend to live with higher residential integration than, say, the society south of the border. They move now towards increasing interethnic marriages.

Formulators of state policy should be aware of these fortunate developments in the Canadian society. While the state has no business in the bedrooms of its citizens, it should consider policy measures that would increase interethnic marriages. Creating special and new categories of citizens in attempts to solve social problems affecting some segments of the society is probably not among such measures.

The need for Statistics Canada to follow the 1996 census procedures in 2001 and subsequent censuses

The 1991 changes in census procedures threw new light onto the Canadian society, as argued in the opening paragraphs of this article, through the creation

10. The policy of multiculturalism has been nurtured and launched on the society, when the need arose to bring French power to Ottawa. Multiculturalism was a convenient, almost noble, way to draw away attention of the 'Anglos' from the developing French power towards the 'multi' groups. Some might remember Charlotte Whitton, the Mayor of Ottawa. She claimed that the capital city of a bilingual country could not afford bilingual street signs. Those who remember will agree that the introduction of multiculturalism was a 'neat' (as my sons would have said when they were younger) and successful action.

of artificial Canadians. Some damage was done to our understanding of the society by changes in the 1996 census procedure, but it was a slight damage. In fact, one of the changes has probably disclosed a degree of individual and societal maturity in the creation of 'Canadians', although too much must not be made of this argument. The term 'Canadians' was due to come eventually as describing the nation inhabiting the country of Canada. Using it in the meantime as an ethnicity is not a bad stop-gap bridge.

Students of Canadian society will keep their fingers crossed in the hope that the comparability with subsequent censuses will not be lost. The continuing development of Canadian society is of prime interest politically and societally. The increasing use of the phenomenon of artificial Canadians is a condition of successful assessment of what is happening to the society in general and especially in observing the differential developments that take place in regions and provinces of the country.

Future Research

However serendipitous, the new data collected and presented by Statistics Canada and their value to our understanding of the Canadian society, as well as to other societies with problems in ethnicity, will be further enhanced when studies are launched to address questions that arose in the course of the present investigation:

- Who contributes to the increasing proportions and numbers of artificial Canadians: multiple 'Canadians' and/or multiethnics other than 'Canadians'?
- What ethnic origins contribute to the emergence of single and multiple 'Canadians', that is, at the cost of what ethnicities did the new groups emerge?
- In what periods did the immigrations and intermarriages producing artificial Canadians occur?
- What accounts for the contradictions between messages in table 2 (integration indicated by the emergence of ethnicity 'Canadians') and tables 3 and 4 (integration indicated by interethnic marriages)
- How do interethnic marriages break down into ordinal categories from the least significant from the perspective of integration (say, Anglo-Scottish) to most significant (say, German-Pakistani)

References

- Eberhardt, Piotr. 1998. "Przed narodowym spisem powszechnym. Jak poznać strukturę etniczną społeczeństwa polskiego? Narodowość w spisie powszechnym" «The forthcoming national population census. How to discover the ethnic structure of the Polish society? Nationality in the census» *Rzeczpos-*

- polita* «prestigious Warsaw daily». Reprinted in *Wiadomości Statystyczne* «a monthly of the Central Statistical Office in Warsaw», 43:82-83.
- Kogler, Rudolf K. n.d. “The Polish Community in Canada. Growth, Spatial Distribution, Use of Heritage Language”, in Edward Soltys and Rudolf K Kogler (eds.). *Half a century of Canadian Polish Congress*. ISBN 0-920517-04-8.
- Krótki, Karol J. 1995. “Polish Canadians In Numbers: A Demographic Study”, in Andrzej M Kobos and Jolanta T Pekacz (eds.). *Polonia in Alberta 1895-1995. The Polish centennial in Alberta*. Edmontona: Polish Centennial Society, Canadian Polish Congress, Alberta Branch.
- _____. 1996b. “The Eight Million Artificial Canadians, Their Future and Related Policies”, in *Towards the XXst Century: Emerging Socio-Demographic Trends and Policy Issues in Canada*. Ottawa: Federation of Canadian Demographers.
- Krótki, Karol J and Dave Odynak. 1990. “The Emergence of Multiethnicities in the Eighties”, in S.S. Halli, F. Trovato and L. Driedger (eds.). *Ethnic Demography*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Statistics Canada. 1993. *Ethnic Origin. The nation*. Catalogue 93-315. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- _____. 1998a. “1996 Census: Ethnic Origin, Visible Minorities. Highlights”. *The Daily*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- _____. 1998b. “1996 Census: Nation Tables”. <http://www.StatCan.nic-.htm>.
- White, P.M., J. Badets and V. Renaud. 1993. “Measuring Ethnicity in Canadian Census”. *Challenges of Measuring an Ethnic World. Science, Politics and Reality*. Proceedings of the Joint Canada-United States Conference on the Measurement of Ethnicity.

Glossary

Multiethnic is a census respondent reporting under ethnic origin more than one ethnicity among ancestors. *Single ethnic* is a census respondent reporting one ethnicity among ancestors. *Multiethnicity* is one of several ethnicities reported by a multiethnic. *Single ethnicity* is the only ethnicity reported by a single ethnic.

For each multiethnic, one multiethnicity, and only one, is counted as a *real Canadian*. The other multiethnicities are counted as *artificial Canadians*. Real Canadians plus artificial Canadians are counted as *multiple Canadians*. The count of real Canadians is made without prejudice to the actual multiethnicity. Any one of the multiethnicities can be counted as real Canadians, then the others become artificial Canadians. *Census Canadians* consist of *single ethnics* plus *real Canadians*. Single ethnics are, of course, and obviously 'real' Canadians, but we do not extend the use of real Canadians to single ethnics. To us real Canadians when added to artificial Canadians make up the multiple Canadians. Interethnic marriages and ethnic intermarriages are used interchangeably.

'Canadians' in quotation marks are one of the ethnicities reported either as a multiethnicity along with some other multiethnicities, or as single ethnicity. In either case the answer is in response to the question on ethnic origin. The concept of Canadians without quotation marks is not considered in this paper, except when accompanied by one of the adjectives suggested above (real, artificial, single, multiple). Canadian census practice and the developments in the society have not reached the stage of recording Canadian as nationality.