

Vol. LXXXVI.—No. 53



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
KING'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1947

Price per copy, 5 cents; per session, \$3. Address King's Printer, Ottawa, Canada.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee. Second report, Mr. Breithaupt...	2391
Canadian National Railways. Reference of budget to Railways and Shipping Committee. Motion, Mr. Chevrier, agreed to.....	2391
Answers to Questions asked by: Mr. Webb, Mr. Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie), Mr. Tucker, Mr. Thatcher, Mr. Herridge, Mr. Church.....	2391
Questions passed as Orders for Returns. Mr. Brooks, Mr. Knight, Mr. Black (Cumberland), Mr. Knowles.....	2392
Motions for Papers. Mr. Pouliot, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Church, Mr. Coldwell.....	2393
United Nations. Security Council—Deliberations of military staff committee, Mr. Graydon, Mr. St. Laurent.....	2394
Labour Conditions. Inquiry respecting authorization for admission of Europeans to Canada, Mr. Coldwell, Mr. Mitchell.....	2395
Privilege. Attendance in House—Japanese Question, Mr. Diefenbaker.....	2395
Butter. Hoarding in anticipation of increased prices, Mrs. Strum, Mr. Gardiner.....	2395
Veterans Affairs. Inquiry as to amendments to War Veterans' Allowance Act, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Mackenzie.....	2395
Foreign Exchange. Discount on Canadian bonds and stocks in United States market, Mr. Cockeram, Mr. Abbott.....	2395
Cheese. Negotiations with the United Kingdom as to price, Mr. Tustin, Mr. Gardiner....	2396
Emergency Powers. Continuation of certain orders and regulations. Bill No. 104, Mr. Ilsley, further considered in committee, progress reported.....	2396

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker: The Honourable GASPARD FAUTEUX

WEDNESDAY, April 23, 1947.

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Second report of the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.—Mr. Breithaupt.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFERENCE OF BUDGET TO RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table the budget of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited for the calendar year 1947. By leave of the house I move:

That the budget of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited for the calendar year 1947, tabled this day, be referred to the sessional committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

INCOME TAX—EXPENSES INCURRED IN OPERATION OF MOTOR CAR

Mr. WEBB:

1. Has a general ruling been issued by the taxation division of the Department of National Revenue regarding the deductibility by a salaried taxpayer in ascertaining his net assessable income of expenses incurred in the operation of a motor car in connection with his business?
2. If so, what is such ruling?

Mr. McCANN: No general ruling has been issued.

WAR ASSETS—PRIORITIES

Mr. RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie):

1. Does the war assets corporation grant priorities for the purchase of assets dealt with by such corporation?
2. If so (a) to whom; (b) in what order; (c) are there any formalities to be complied

with in order to obtain such priorities; (d) are such priorities granted by right under the rules made by the war assets corporation?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes.

2. (a) and (b) Priority is given to requests received from Dominion Government Departments or Agencies; Provincial Governments; Municipalities; and Public Bodies; in the order stated, providing the requests cover only war surplus which

(i) is required by the claimant for its own use and is not intended for resale, and

(ii) is not required by the claimant for the manufacture of goods which are for sale in commercial markets.

There is one exception to the foregoing proviso:—

Government sponsored low-cost emergency housing projects are given first priority on certain buildings, lands and materials salvaged from demolished buildings.

(c) Yes, the priority claimant must provide satisfactory proof that it falls within one of the four priority groups listed above.

(d) No. Priorities in the order stated above were established on the recommendation of the Crown Assets Allocation Committee and subsequently confirmed by the Right Honourable the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP—APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES

Mr. TUCKER:

How many applications have there been for Canadian citizenship certificates under the new citizenship act?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): 9,250.

DISTRICT DIRECTOR OF POSTAL SERVICES, MOOSE JAW

Mr. THATCHER:

1. Has the position of "District Director of Postal Services" at Moose Jaw been abolished?
2. If so, for what reason?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): On Thursday last the hon. member for Queens asked about

certain changes in postal service organization with particular reference to their effect on Prince Edward Island. I have also received an inquiry from the hon. member for Rosthern respecting the Moose Jaw postal district.

Briefly stated, we have set up positions of regional directors of postal service in an endeavour to promote increased efficiency. There are only five such positions of senior rank, obviously not enough to go around on a provincial basis. Actually it would be impossible to organize an efficient postal service on provincial boundary lines.

Thirteen positions of district inspector of postal service have been established to look after purely inspectional duties of former district directors. Inspectors will be maintained at Charlottetown and Moose Jaw.

At the same time we have restored the position of postmaster at the more important offices, including Charlottetown and Moose Jaw. This has meant changes in titles and a certain shifting of responsibilities, but I can assure my honourable friends that no harm will come to any province because of anything we are doing in our internal organization. Indeed, the changes are made, as I have already indicated, with a view to a better postal service.

DIRECTOR OF MERCHANT SEAMEN

Mr. HERRIDGE:

1. When did G. L. C. Johnson, director of merchant seamen, first enter Canada for permanent residence?
2. What is his citizenship status at the present time?
3. Was he granted citizenship? If so, on what date?
4. On whose recommendation was he appointed director of merchant seamen?
5. Were any seamen's organizations consulted previous to his appointment?
6. What marine certificates does he hold?
7. What seagoing experience has he had?
8. What administrative experience has he had?
9. What are his general educational qualifications?

Mr. CHEVRIER:

1. April 29, 1941.
 2. Canadian.
 3. As a British subject, acquired citizenship through domicile in Canada.
 4. On the recommendation of Mr. Arthur Randles, at that time director of merchant seamen, and approved by the Minister of Transport.
 5. No.
 6. Foreign-going master.
 7. Through regular stages of cadet and officer to permanent master at age of 28.
- Served in naval transports during war of 1914-18.

[Mr. Bertrand (Laurier).]

After several years in command became a maritime pilot in Chinese waters.

Acted as nautical assessor in admiralty division.

8. Manager and secretary of Tientsin and Takubar Pilot Association, North China, for 12 years.

Regional director, Montreal and Vancouver Manning pools, 5 years.

Director of Merchant Seamen—14 months.

9. Private and public schools in Staffordshire, England until commencement of sea career at age of 16.

PAN-AMERICAN UNION

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has there been any change since last session regarding Canada joining the so-called pan-American union?
2. If so, what changes have been made in this policy since then?
3. Can Canada, as one of the overseas dominions, join this union without the consent of the governments of Great Britain and the other dominions?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

INCOME TAX—CAMPBELLTON, N.B., OFFICE

Mr. BROOKS:

1. Has a date been set for the opening of the proposed office of the Income Tax Department at Campbellton, New Brunswick?
2. Have offices been rented?
3. If so, from whom and what rental per month?
4. Are repairs and alterations necessary and what is the estimated cost for same?

EXAMINER OF PUBLICATIONS

Mr. KNIGHT:

1. Is an author or a publisher of a book printed or published in Canada compelled to submit it to any government department for censorship?
2. If so, under what circumstances, is he so compelled?
3. What is the name of the examiner of publications now on superannuation leave?
4. What are his background and training with reference to his work as a censor?
5. What is the name of the general executive assistant now carrying on the duties of censorship?
6. What are his background, standard of education, and training with reference to such duties?
7. Is the official mentioned in question number five responsible for the censorship of books entering Canada?
8. Does he personally read and pass judgment upon such books?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

PASSPORTS

Mr. POULIOT:

For a copy of all regulations of the Department of External Affairs concerning the issue of passports?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: These are departmental regulations which are not intended for general circulation, but I shall be glad to table them and to table at the same time an order in council passed on March 6, 1947, which will require some modification of these departmental regulations with respect to diplomatic passports.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank the right hon. gentleman, but what I wanted mostly to know was why the applications for passports are considered confidential when the passport is a public document.

SURVEY OF FLUID MILK DISTRIBUTION

Mr. KNOWLES:

For a copy of the survey of fluid milk distribution in Canada, prepared by the accounting division of the wartime prices and trade board, for the year 1941, and any similar reports prepared for any subsequent period.

Mr. MAYHEW: The documents asked for in this motion are interdepartmental documents which are privileged. I must ask that this motion be dropped.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the parliamentary assistant one question? Is he aware of the fact that some twenty copies of this report were made available to the counsel of the milk distributors of Ontario?

Mr. MAYHEW: I made inquiry as to that report and I find that, so far as the department is concerned and so far as the government is concerned, there has been no official report circulated. If any has been released, it has been without the authority of the government.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask the parliamentary assistant if copies of the report were provided unofficially to the milk distributors, or got into their hands unofficially? If so, I think the house is entitled to what the milk distributors had.

Mr. MAYHEW: Not so far as we know. We have not recognized anything.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is it true that they got them?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Motion dropped.

BEAUHARNOIS LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents exchanged between the government of Canada or any de-

9. Is there a committee or group of assistants to aid this official in his work of censorship?

10. If so, what are the names of the members of such group or committee?

11. Are any individuals or groups of individuals ever (or customarily) consulted before prohibitive censorship is exercised in any given case?

12. If so (a) who are those individuals; (b) what are those organizations?

13. Is there any appeal from the decision of the Examiner of Publications?

14. If so (a) to what body is such appeal addressed; (b) what is the procedure followed in making such an appeal?

MILLTOWN, N.B., POSTMASTER

Mr. BROOKS:

1. Who is the present postmaster at Milltown, New Brunswick?
2. Does the present incumbent hold the office as a permanent or temporary employee?
3. Was a competitive examination held within the last year to fill this position?
4. If so (a) when; (b) what are the names of applicants; (c) who was the applicant obtaining the highest marks?
5. If present incumbent is a temporary employee, when will a permanent appointment be made?

CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Who is the superintendent or resident person in charge of the Cape Breton Highlands national park, stating his experience and qualifications?
2. What amounts were paid him during the years 1945 and 1946 in (a) salary; (b) travelling expenses; (c) car and other allowances or expenses?
3. Who were the park wardens for the years 1945 and 1946 stating where located, their duties, salaries, travelling and other expenses?
4. What was expended during the years 1945 and 1946 on the golf course for (a) improvements; (b) maintenance, stating the number of men employed in playing season?
5. What was the total amount expended on the park during the years 1945 and 1946 for (a) improvements; (b) maintenance, and on the highways?
6. Were any construction tenders called or contracts let in 1945, 1946 and 1947, and if so for what work, to whom let and for what amounts?
7. Who were the foremen in charge of the maintenance of highways, where located and remuneration and expenses paid?
8. Was J. P. MacMillan employed in 1945 and 1946 in connection with the park, and, if so, in what capacity and what remuneration and expenses were paid him?

COMMONWEALTH CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. Have any government contracts been awarded to the Commonwealth Construction Company, Limited, of Winnipeg?
2. If so, what are the dates thereof, what is the nature of such contracts, and what amount of money is involved in each?

partment or officer thereof and any officer of the Beauharnois Light, Heat and Power Company regarding the company's application for the right to use additional water from the St. Lawrence river for light and power purposes of the said company, also a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the government of Canada and any of the provinces or the state of New York or the federal government of the United States of America, or any officer thereof with reference to the matters herein.

EMPIRE DEFENCE POLICY

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all telegrams, cables and other correspondence exchanged since the last great war, between the government of Canada and the governments of Great Britain and the other dominions or crown colonies of the empire, regarding a common defence policy for the defence of the empire in the future.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, there has been no correspondence since the great war between the government of Canada and the government of Great Britain and the other dominions or crown colonies of the empire regarding a common defence policy for the defence of the empire in the future. There are constantly exchanges between governments with respect to their respective defence forces, but none of this correspondence could be published without the consent of the other governments. It is the view of the Canadian government that it would not be in the public interest to publish these exchanges at this time and that we should not request the consent of the other governments to do so. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would not withdraw his motion.

Mr. CHURCH: May I say to the right hon. gentleman that I think we should have some papers connected with it. There are no meetings and no defence policies of any kind.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped

INCOME TAX—FARMERS

Mr. COLDWELL:

For a statement showing the number of farmers filing income tax returns and the number assessed for the fiscal year 1945-1946, together with the number of farmers, by provinces, assessable, non-assessable, and assessed for the same year; and also the number of farms in Canada according to the 1941 census, together with the percentages, by provinces, of farmers filing returns and farmers assessable.

QUEBEC NORTH SHORE AND LABRADOR RAILWAY

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports and other documents exchanged during the years 1946 and 1947 between the government of

[Mr. Church.]

Canada or any officer thereof and the provisional government of Newfoundland and Labrador or their trustee and the government of Great Britain, with respect to the Quebec North Shore and Labrador railway company.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There has been no correspondence between the government of Canada or any officer thereof and the government of the United Kingdom during the years mentioned, 1946 and 1947, with respect to the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway Company, or between the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland or any officer thereof. The only thing that is on the file is a request from Canada's high commissioner in Newfoundland communicating to us a request made to him for a copy of Bill 106, which was passed as Bill "H" of the senate. I shall be glad to table a copy of the portion of the communication from our high commissioner dealing with that request.

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried with the reservation made by the minister.

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL—DELIBERATIONS OF MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I wish to direct an inquiry to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. A report from Lake Success, dated April 20, indicates that the military staff committee of the security council has decided to limit in size the proposed international police force to one that would have power to punish only small international wrongdoers and let wrongs committed by the larger powers perhaps go unpunished. Has Canada been invited, in accordance with article 47 of the united nations charter, to sit in on this military staff committee's deliberations? If not, how closely has Canada been kept informed as to the deliberations of that committee?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am afraid that the report referred to by the hon. member as a basis for his question is rather speculative. As a matter of fact we are informed that no report has been made by the military staff committee of the security council, and that its sessions so far have been held in camera. Answering the other portion of the question, Canada has not been invited by the military staff committee to participate in its present deliberations.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

INQUIRY RESPECTING AUTHORIZATION FOR ADMISSION OF EUROPEANS TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Was an order in council passed authorizing Mr. Dionne's visit to Europe and for the admission of labour to Canada for employment in the textile industry?

Mr. GRAYDON: Which Mr. Dionne?

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Dionne, the hon. member for Beauce. If so, will the minister please table that order in council?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I do not know why, but I expected that someone would ask that question. I shall table the order, but I think I should read a few words from it so that they will be on record:

... the Dionne Spinning Mill Company of St. George, Beauce, Quebec, have applied for the admission to Canada from Europe of one hundred women for training and employment as textile workers in the company's mills at wages as required by the law of the province of Quebec regulating the salaries and conditions of work of textile industries in that province.

Mr. COLDWELL: The minister is tabling the order in council?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DIEFENBAKER—ATTENDANCE IN HOUSE—JAPANESE QUESTION

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I was absent from the house last evening. I am seldom absent, but while I was away the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) made the following statement, as reported at page 2378 of *Hansard*:

It is strange to me that the hon. member for Lake Centre, who talks so much about freedom, happens to be absent from the house every time this issue comes up.

My first point is that this statement is untrue; I have not been absent on previous occasions. Last evening I had an appointment that took me out of the house. Then there was a remark by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles): "He was here at nine o'clock". For the first time this identifies that hon. gentleman as the head of the secret attendance police of the house; he mentions the hour I was still here. I am going to be absent this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, by reason of a prior appointment.

I want to say that my attitude has never changed, and aspersions such as those do not detract from that fact. I am opposed to any discrimination against Canadians, regardless of their race or creed.

BUTTER

HOARDING IN ANTICIPATION OF INCREASED PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. GLADYS STRUM (Qu'Appelle): Will the Minister of Agriculture assure the house that steps will be taken to prevent firms who are hoarding butter from profiteering at the expense of the Canadian people, in view of the rumoured increase in the price of butter?

Right Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Action was taken some time ago to make that impossible.

Mrs. STRUM: Will the minister please tell us just what that means, and how it is to be applied?

Mr. GARDINER: I should not like to attempt to go into all the details at the moment. I think it can be applied very effectively by means of operations that will be carried out by the Department of Agriculture and the prices board.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO AMENDMENTS TO WAR VETERANS' ALLOWANCES ACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Will the Minister of Veterans Affairs say whether consideration is being given by the government to amending the War Veteran's Allowance Act to provide an increase in the amount of the allowance both for veterans and for the widows of non-pensioned veterans?

Right Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Veterans Affairs): It is not the intention of the government to introduce at the present session of parliament any amendments to the War Veterans' Allowance Act.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

DISCOUNT ON CANADIAN BONDS AND STOCKS IN UNITED STATES MARKET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALAN COCKERAM (York South): In view of the fact that Dominion of Canada bonds are selling in New York at a discount of approximately 11½ per cent, and unlisted

stocks at a discount of 15 per cent will the Minister of Finance inform the house what steps the government propose to take to cope with the increasingly adverse and critical exchange position as between Canada and the United States of America?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): I do not think that is a question to be asked on the orders of the day, but appropriate action is being taken. I suggest that my hon. friend's friends sell their bonds in Canada.

CHEESE

NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED KINGDOM AS TO PRICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. J. TUSTIN (Prince Edward-Lennox): Several days before the Easter recess the Minister of Agriculture stated in the house that negotiations were going on between his department and the food ministry of the United Kingdom in regard to the price of cheese for this year. I wonder if he is in a position to make a statement as yet.

Right Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I think at or about the same time I said consideration was being given to the possibility of adjusting the prices of all dairy products around May 1, in order to carry out the announced policy of doing something in regard to subsidies. I also made the statement about the same time that the whole matter was being considered by the advisory committee, which represents the provincial governments and farm organizations across Canada. We received the recommendations of that committee just this morning. Consideration is being given the whole matter, and an announcement will be made in accordance with the previous statement.

EMERGENCY POWERS

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN ORDERS AND REGULATIONS

The house resumed from Tuesday, April 22, consideration in committee of Bill No. 104, to provide for the continuation of certain orders and regulations of the governor in council for a limited period during the national emergency arising out of the war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Golding in the chair.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Last evening we were dealing with the labour department, and discussing order in council P.C. 946, and also P.C. 251, P.C. 1665, P.C. 469 and P.C. 7355.

[Mr. Cockeram.]

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a point of order. On April 1 the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs said, speaking of the consolidation which has been debated and discussed for the last three weeks, as reported at page 1976 of *Hansard*:

... an office consolidation, which has no probative value whatsoever but is a compilation of the orders as they exist now, with the amendments made thereto. That consolidation is not a part of the bill. It is merely a document and one that could not be received in court, that would be no evidence of the orders in council.

I submit that according to the description given by a jurist of the experience and fame of the right hon. gentleman, it is evident that this committee has been engaged in a futile and frivolous discussion for the last three weeks. I entirely agree with the right hon. gentleman that this compendium has nothing to do with the bill, but it is precisely what has been discussed in vain by all hon. members who have taken part in the discussion. I do not see the use of members of parliament wasting their valuable time discussing something that will be of no value before the courts. Therefore, under standing order 59 I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think the hon. member is omitting to take into consideration some pertinent and important facts in connection with this matter. The first of those is that the orders in council mentioned in the schedule annexed to the bill are in force at the present time, are the law of the country and are to remain in force until May 15. They are orders in council which have been promulgated and published in the manner in which the law requires that that be done. The list of them is mentioned in the schedule to the bill and, for the convenience of hon. members, the orders in council were tabled before the second reading of the bill. The compendium or office consolidation was a convenient document prepared so that hon. members would not have to have recourse to the various issues of the official gazette, or to the wartime orders publications, to have before them the text now in force.

The hon. member is right when he says that in the bill we are not dealing with the office consolidation. In it we are dealing with certain orders in council which are in force, which have been published and promulgated as required by law and with respect to which parliament is considering whether the expiry date should be May 15 or some subsequent date.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Temiscouata has moved under standing order 59 that the committee rise and report progress. The motion is not debatable. All in favour will please say yea.

An hon. MEMBER: There is no seconder.

Mr. POULIOT: Yea.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion (Mr. Pouliot) negatived.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I might add that we have before the committee an amendment by the hon. member for Moose Jaw. At the adjournment last night the hon. member for New Westminster was about to speak.

Mr. REID: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to enter into the debate at this moment because I was waiting until the order in council having to do with Japanese fishing licences was before the committee. However, since an amendment has been moved I feel it incumbent upon me, particularly in view of some speeches made last night, to make some remarks now which would be pertinent to the five or six orders in council and the amendment before the committee.

Let me say first of all, with the hon. member for Vancouver South, that what we have to say in the matter is not influenced by nor does it emanate from racial hatred, a cry which is thrown at us so often when we speak about the Japanese question. The situation in this respect reminds me of the condition in some quarters of the country where certain individuals will not allow one even to mention the name of Russia. They raise their hands in holy horror if the name of that country is even mentioned. I do not know whether that pertains throughout all the provinces, but I do know that in British Columbia I have been challenged at times for even mentioning the name of that country, and because I have asked questions about it the accusation has been made against me that I am out to engender bad feeling between the two countries. I deprecate any such accusation. I want those in the house and outside of it who do not see eye to eye with me at least to recognize that my views are just as fair and as sincere as are their own. And if they are out to uphold this great democracy, then surely they will grant us at least that concession.

With respect to racial hatred I shall say something now which I do not think I have mentioned in the House of Commons before. I wonder, however, if one were out to arouse hatred—and I am not—which of the two would be worse, class hatred, of man against man, or racial hatred. I remember that in British Columbia in 1935, long before some hon. members came to the house, there was a reign of fear and intimidation. That took place previous to and in the 1935 election campaign throughout the Fraser valley and was engendered by supporters and adherents of the C.C.F.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. REID: And I say that without fear of successful contradiction. Two or three people around my own home town said, "We are afraid of what may happen to us." I had even to take my children out of school on one or two occasions. Oh, the hon. member for Vancouver East can laugh, but I hope he will allow me to say the things I have to say in all sincerity. I did not interrupt him when he was speaking.

Mr. MacINNIS: I did not interrupt my hon. friend. He went out of his way to make reference to me.

Mr. REID: But there was just the fear that he would. It was, as I say, a reign of fear and intimidation, and engendering of class hatreds; for they were pitting class against class.

Mr. MacINNIS: The hon. member did not like my sinister silence.

Mr. REID: The hon. member was talking last evening about racial hatred in this country. Well, I come from a land where a man can stand on a platform or a soapbox and say what he likes. They believe in the good sense of the people there, and I am one of them who believe the same.

An hon. MEMBER: A good Labour government.

Mr. REID: I will have something to say about that at the proper time, when probably I will discuss the hon. member's remarks. But the people of that country leave it to the good sense of the citizens. I am one who would like to leave it to the good sense of the people here. As a matter of fact, I should like to leave this entire question to the people of British Columbia.

The suggestion has been made by hon. members opposite that at least fifty per cent of the people of British Columbia, and perhaps a majority of them, are against what

we stand for. I am going to ask those who take the opposite view to answer some questions when their turn comes to speak. For the past fourteen or fifteen years I have been asking certain questions in the House of Commons about the Japanese. I have also asked the civil liberties league, and I have even gone so far as to ask the Japanese themselves these same questions.

When the debates were on in the house last year and in the previous year the periodical known as the *New Canadian*, which I believe is sent to most members of parliament—free of charge, of course—printed excerpts from all the speeches on the Japanese question made by hon. members in the house. The excerpt they printed about my speech was this: "Tom Reid, the member for New Westminster, says that we are an unassimilable race, and that we owe allegiance to Japan." There were no further remarks. I then wrote them saying, "You have made that quotation; do you deny it? Do you deny that you owe allegiance to Japan in the first instance, that your first loyalty is to that country, and that each one of you is registered with it?" There was no answer. One would have thought surely that those of Japanese stock, those who were born in this country, those who were educated in our schools, would have something in their make-up similar to that which we ourselves have. Having quoted from my speech in the House of Commons it was passing strange that they would not reply to my inquiry.

Then we have the civil liberties league, another of the leagues which have sprung up lately. I am sorry to see so many prominent persons in this country getting mixed up in that group. They held a large meeting last year, and another one this year. I suppose most members of parliament have received a communication from an organization at the university of British Columbia called the Christian brotherhood. They were commenting upon the fact that the provincial government had granted the right to vote to Indians and Chinamen but not to those of the Japanese race. I wrote to them also and I said, "Would you place before your organization this question: Can a person be truly a Canadian when he has a dual citizenship and whose allegiance in the first instance is to Japan, which government claims him?" The second question I asked was, "Why is it that no one of the Japanese race has yet come forward and openly stated, either in the press or on the public platform or privately, that he had no allegiance to Japan?"

Surely I cannot be accused of racial hatred when I ask those questions. They are practical questions. The oriental has a different psychology and make-up from ours. I do not understand them, and perhaps they do not understand us. If we were in the same position I do not think we would have any compunction about getting up and saying, "I was born in this land and I owe allegiance to no other government or to no other country than Canada. We owe no allegiance to Japan." I believe that many people might be prepared to accept such a statement from the Japanese. I ask this of the members of this house: Why, then, the silence? It is significant and it has a bearing upon the matter before us.

I am not going to take up much time trying to visualize what might happen in the future, but I believe that the Japanese nation, with its 95 million people, a nation which rose to great military heights prior to the war, is not yet finished. It is my belief that they are waiting until General MacArthur goes. When statements are made that the Japanese in this country have not said anything, it is my belief that they are acting just the same as the Japanese in Japan. There is some high authority saying to them, "Keep quiet, say nothing, do nothing, the time for us will come later." I think I am on fairly sound ground when I quote from an authoritative dispatch which was sent from Admiral Halsey's flagship some time ago. It reads:

Asked to comment on the "new democracy" now being hailed by the Japanese press, Carney said:

"The people who are going through this new process are exactly the same people who were guilty of atrocities during the last four years. There is no reason to think that under the same circumstances they wouldn't do it again."

He warns the democracies, especially the United States, to beware of what might happen in Japan once General MacArthur has left that country. I am going to propound one or two more questions and those who oppose our views can probably answer them after I sit down. Will anyone deny that Japan did not embark on a long range scheme or plan to conquer the countries fronting on the Pacific ocean? Will anyone get up and say that that is not correct? I do not think any man would be foolish enough to do that. Will anyone deny that the Japanese government saw to it that her nationals were placed in every country fronting on the Pacific ocean?

Mr. MACKENZIE: And in key positions.

Mr. REID: And in key positions. Will anyone deny that the Japanese government financed them, and that in turn the Japanese who came here were obligated to return those loans? I looked up the Japanese year book

for 1934 and I found that the Japanese in British Columbia had returned something like 23,000,000 yen during 1932. That figure is not quoted from our records; it is from a Japanese year book issued in Japan, and it can be found in our library. Will any one deny that large numbers of military and naval men were sent by Japan to this country? Let me ask this question: Why did she send military officers to train young Japanese? In 1936 I visited a large hall owned and operated by Japanese. I had been told what was going on there and I went down one evening and found fifty or more young Japanese being taught by a military strategist and expert from Japan. It is true they did not have guns, but they were using fencing sticks. They were being taught to march up and down, and to carry out all the tactics incidental to military life. Will anyone say that that was being done just for fun, or to make them better Canadian citizens? In those years these military men were coming from Japan at the expense of the Japanese government, and they were being sent here for a special purpose.

There has been criticism of the government because in one fell swoop 1,100 Japanese fishing vessels were picked up. I have some idea of what would have happened if 25,000 Canadians had been living in a group in Japan. I have some idea that they would not have been allowed to go round as these people were. After all, there is some good in democracy. To those who sometimes point the finger of scorn at this country, to those who point to another country as an example, may I say that instead of democracy being on trial, communism is on trial. We are waiting to see if they can produce in communistic countries what we have produced here, if they can give their people the kind of life that our people here enjoy.

Be that as it may, will anyone now say that it was unwise to move the Japanese from the danger zone on the Pacific coast? No one will deny that. As the hon. member for Vancouver South pointed out when he read the wire which had been sent by men in prominent positions, men of all parties, including high ranking members of the C.C.F., urged the removal of the Japanese. Bear in mind we now know the plans of the Japanese. It was well that our government took the action they did at the time. We now know that in Japan there was a fight between the naval and military groups. The military group wanted to land in Alaska where there was no protection and nothing to stop them from coming right down our coast. But the naval

and air force groups in Japan were too strong, the plans were changed, and so they struck at Pearl Harbor. We know what happened from then on.

What would have happened had the Japanese landed in Alaska when there was no protection there, or on our Pacific coast? Will anyone say that in these 23,000 or 24,000 Japanese there were not scores who would have been ready to help them? I suppose if we were in Japan and the same thing happened we too might be prepared to help the Canadian authorities. I am not altogether finding fault with them, but I do know that some of them were blatant about it when they were in the camp at Hastings Park. Complaints were made that they were not being properly treated, and those complaints were investigated by a representative of Switzerland. During the tour through Hastings Park prominent Japanese came boldly forward and said, "We want to be taken back to Japan." Some of them openly admitted that they were military men and that they had come to this country for that avowed purpose. Hon. members will remember that I mentioned in the house that during the war I was prevented from seeing guns that were located in Steveston, and yet inside the military area a Japanese family was living. Oh, yes; they said, this Jap was a school teacher and could be trusted. But strange to say, two months later the authorities had to pick him up and put him in an internment camp. Many stories of that kind could be recited. Why British Columbia is perturbed over this matter can be summed up thus.

For at least forty years prior to the war the people of British Columbia had been crying to Ottawa to do something about the Japanese but without avail. The people of Ontario and other provinces may think at the moment that the Japanese are all right. The people of British Columbia thought exactly the same at first, just as I did when I first came to British Columbia. As a rule they were good workers; they worked hard; they were obedient; they caused no trouble. It took quite a number of years before we realized that the Japanese were not the Chinese, who are a different race entirely. Once there were enough of them in British Columbia they began to assert themselves. With some as long as they worked for John Jones it was fine, but the minute they started up in business against John Jones, these same people wanted them taken back to Japan.

Since I came here in 1909 I have never changed my views on the oriental question in British Columbia. What we in British Columbia fear is that when Japan rises again, not

today or tomorrow or a few years hence but at some time in the future, these Japanese will be useful to Japan because they will all be back in British Columbia once the restrictions are removed. Some people are advocating the lifting of all restrictions. They do not want the Japs in their province and this is a fine move to get them out without being accused of being pro-Jap. The Japanese, it is true, have been tried out in the beet fields in certain provinces and some of the people there are beginning to find out that they are not just the fine little fellows they were thought to be at the beginning when they came into the province to help out. As I say, the views I hold I have held right from almost the first days I came to this country, and that was away back in 1909.

I am going to speak for a few moments on the fishing industry in British Columbia. The question was raised last night by the hon. member for Vancouver South, and I want to compliment him on the speech he made. There are not many members who were in this house when I spoke here in 1933—not many. I hold in my hand the *Hansard* of 1933—and bear in mind that in those days there was never any question raised as to the Japanese being Canadian citizens; there was no question then of racial animosities. It is strange that this has all started since the inception of the C.C.F. party. Before that, no such accusations were made. When I spoke in the house in 1933 I was advocating that the number of fishing licences issued to the Japanese be curtailed, if not eliminated. I will tell you why. When it came to my knowledge that at Steveston no white Canadian could throw a net into the Fraser river and fish except at the peril of his life I made up my mind that so far as I was concerned I would bend my efforts to taking back that heritage and restoring it to our own Canadian people rather than having it in the hands of a people who were here for a special purpose and whose first allegiance and loyalty—this is on record—was to Japan. No cry went up then that I was raising a racial question. There was then no cry of Japanese being citizens of Canada and of their being deprived of their livelihood.

I want to quote what I said in this house on April 24, 1933. That is going quite a long way back. I think I am now one of the fifteen members who have been in this house before and since 1930. Parliament has changed a lot since then. I said at that time:

As I have stated, the Japanese are becoming very arrogant on the Fraser river, and last fall I had drawn to my attention a case whereby they threatened bodily harm because a white

[Mr. Reid.]

man dared to go around one of the little islands in the mouth of the Fraser river endeavouring to catch some fish with a line.

Mind you, on a Canadian river! The Japanese were protesting against Canadians fishing in Canada's own waters! I went on:

Another case occurred in the same year up north where a Japanese boat ran through a white man's boat and the two white men would have been drowned had they not been picked up by another fishing boat which happened to be near by. The Japanese use people of their own race all the time.

I went on to show that the Japanese were in complete control of the cod fishery of the Pacific coast. That was away back in 1932. Let us look for a moment at the fishing industry today. Here briefly is the record so far as fishing licences are concerned. In 1938 a total of 13,805 fishing licences were issued in British Columbia, and of that number 2,033 were Japanese and 3,144 were Indians. In 1941, the last year in which the Japs were fishing a total of 13,422 licences was issued, and of that number 8,023 were whites, 3,305 were Indians and 2,095 Japanese.

It was stated at one time that if the Japs were driven out of the fishing industry and out of the canneries in British Columbia the whole fishing industry of the province would collapse. Let us see just what happened. In 1946, last year, the number of fishing licences had increased from 13,423 in 1941 to 20,022, and no licences were issued to Japanese.

Mr. MacNICOL: How is production?

Mr. REID: The production is not always a guide, because there might be a good run of salmon in some years and a poor run in other years, but production in 1946 was very good. The runs sometimes fall off in certain seasons and so production is always a sound guide.

A good number of our returned men have gone into fishing in British Columbia. I have the honour to represent a place called Steveston, where there were more Japanese resident at one time than in any other part in British Columbia. It was known as Jap town. Before the war in a fourteen-room school thirteen rooms were occupied entirely by Japanese and one room by mixed pupils. That town, since the Japanese went, has gradually been coming back as a white man's town. I attended a meeting of the fishermen there. I did not make any remarks but just asked for their opinion about the Japanese. To a man they said that if the Japanese came back there would be serious trouble. "Never again", they said, "will we allow the Japanese to come back".

At the moment there are far too many in the fishing industry. Only a certain quantity of fish come up the Fraser river and only certain quantities can be caught off shore. As I have said, 20,022 fishing licences were issued in 1946. Where is there room for the Japanese to come back to fish? It is true that the Japs work long hours. A white man lives like a white man. He works eight or nine hours a day and then takes a rest. But the Jap takes his boy or his wife along with him and by taking turns they work day and night. It is contended that they are better fishermen than the whites, but that is not true. They fish longer hours because they bring their families into the work of fishing.

If this amendment passes and the Japs are brought back into British Columbia I prophesy that all who can come back will come back. In that event you cannot deny them a livelihood. But are we going to allow them to come back with their methods of work, with their long hours and with their families working, and with their low standards of living? Are we going to encourage them to come back into the fishing industry of British Columbia to the disadvantage of our own men, particularly numbers of veterans who have recently started up in the fishing industry? So far as I am concerned I am taking my stand right now, and I say no. I know that the member for Vancouver East says that we are taking the popular stand and that he is taking the unpopular stand. But opinions are changing. The civil liberties league is getting a lot of converts and getting a lot of help against those who like myself endeavour to point out to the country that the Japanese are an unassimilable race in this country and should not be allowed to congregate in any one province. Who, may I ask, has given authority to members to get up in this house and speak for the Japanese and say the things they do? I have before me a copy of the *New Canadian* of January 26, 1946, in which the editor says:

The Japanese problem in Canada can and should be solved through a dispersal policy.

Now there is the voice of the Canadian-born Japanese themselves, and yet there are those in this house who will support this amendment which would nullify that proposal of the Japanese and once again allow all the Japanese to go back into British Columbia. I am putting this to the members from other provinces, both in the Progressive Conservative party and in the Liberal party as well. I ask them to realize that this matter is a serious one to the people of our province. I believe that if a vote of the people were taken there would be no question about it.

Too little attention has been given to the plea that we from British Columbia have made. British Columbia should not have been called upon as a province to carry, and to have within that province, ninety-nine per cent of the Japanese who entered Canada.

Lest it may be said that it is the whites who are complaining against the Japanese, let me assure you that as a member of the committee on Indian affairs I know that there are Indians who have been complaining that the Japanese have deprived them of their livelihood, and these Indians have been endeavouring to get back into industry since the Japanese went out. During my travels last year I saw these people. In one part of the country that I visited I found that a group of Japanese had taken over four or five large farms, and what was the complaint of the Indians? The complaint was, "We had lots of work here as long as the white men owned these farms but the moment the Japanese took them over we were denied even a day's work"—and that was in the centre of British Columbia.

I am not particularly surprised that the member for Kootenay West champions the Japanese. It is not generally known to members from other provinces that the Japanese were located in the interior in many of what we call the ghost towns where buildings had been idle. No one was living there and those who owned property and had stores took the Japanese into their arms. They are making money out of them and they would hate to see anything happen to these good customers. Hence the member representing Kootenay West says, "We want them there". Of course they want them there, for the almighty dollar.

I have tried to keep this speech of mine free from rancour. I have put the argument before the committee and I trust that when the vote is taken we shall have full support for the government's order in council.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I believe this is the proper time to take the opportunity of expressing the views of my constituents in Comox-Alberni in regard to this Japanese problem. First of all, I think it would be only fair for me to congratulate the Minister of Labour on the excellent job he has done in handling this difficult problem. I believe he has done it with justice and, may I say, humanity. I should like also to congratulate the C.C.F. members on the extreme versatility they show at times in this house. They are authorities on every subject. I noticed the member for Regina City (Mr. Probe) the other night cast the usual C.C.F. innuendoes at the lumber industry in British Columbia. I assure you, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PROBE: To keep the record straight, may I say that all the figures I gave with respect to the hon. gentleman's lumber friends were taken from Moody's Manual of Investment, 1946, and every word can be substantiated. I put that on the record before and I can put it on again.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): The innuendo was still there. There is one thing I can assure you of, Mr. Chairman. Never in the history of the House of Commons was so little known by an hon. member about so large an industry. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Thatcher) led off the debate for the C.C.F. party. At times I have been enthralled listening to his addresses on immigration—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And water.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): And probably water. As the house listened with rapt attention one could have heard a tap drip. But when the hon. gentleman ventures into a field such as the Japanese problem in Canada, particularly in British Columbia, I think he is a little out of his province. He would be the first to admit, I believe, that he could not tell a Japanese from a Hottentot. I sincerely hope that the C.C.F. members are far better informed on other subjects than they are on the Japanese.

Mrs. STRUM: Now we hear the drip.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): There is one drip in your party who should probably be heard in this house.

Mrs. STRUM: One is enough in any house.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): He is strangely silent at times, though he represents a fishing riding. He had a lot of time during the war to look around and see what conditions were. I refer to the member for Skeena (Mr. Archibald). I should like to hear him today.

Mr. MacINNIS: Only one can talk at a time.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): The next time he speaks I hope he will not weasel around the question whether he wants the Japanese back in British Columbia. I want to be fair to him, and I am quite sure his constituents would very much like to hear his definite views on this subject, instead of saying that the real enemies of the fishermen are not the Japanese but the fish packers. Let us have his views on this subject, because that is not a real statement. You can weasel around on that question, but I say to him: Tell us whether you want the Japanese to return to the fishing industry on the west coast. If you do, I admire

[Mr. Gibson (Comox-Alberni).]

you for your stand. But in fairness to the house and to your constituents you should tell us.

I have been much impressed by the C.C.F. members over there. They make a loud plea for justice, tolerance and pity. There are many men of good will in this house and I am sure they are greatly impressed by those sentiments, but I wonder if my hon. friends are really expressing the views of their party generally in Canada. I have here a newspaper quotation of a statement made by Mr. Colin Cameron, who is president of the C.C.F. party in British Columbia. It is a masterpiece, but it does not quite tie in with the pity and tolerance they speak of all the time. Let me quote what Mr. Cameron said on Monday, April 14, as reported in the *Vancouver Province*. He is the leader of the party in British Columbia. He is a headache to you, I know, but let us be fair. He said:

The bold and ruthless removal from private hands of the means of production will have to be the role of the C.C.F. party in this province.

Mr. IRVINE: What has that to do with the Japanese?

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I was quoting it by way of illustration, because I was surprised at the word "ruthless" there. It startled me, and I went to Webster's International Dictionary and looked it up. I find that "ruthless" is there defined as "cruel, pitiless, merciless." I wonder how my hon. friends can reconcile those two points of view. I know the member for Skeena is itching to get on his feet and he can tell us. It makes it very hard to reconcile what the hon. member for Moose Jaw said in that classic speech of his in Moose Jaw last month. How is he to reconcile this bold, ruthless removal from private hands of the means of production? I imagine that means from the farmers. They produce the odd thing. He said at that time that they were just going to take over about five per cent and were going to leave 95 per cent to these farmers here. In this case I am afraid he should have a chance to tell us how he reconciles the two viewpoints. Of course this man, Mr. Cameron, comes from my riding. I am not particularly proud of that fact.

Mrs. STRUM: Neither is he.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I think he is. He tried to do a lot about it, but he could not. I should like to extend my personal sympathy to the leader of the C.C.F. party, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. It must be hard, as a matter of fact, to talk to a person in Saskatchewan and to have to

reconcile Mr. Cameron's views with those of his good friends on the prairies. I feel that when he goes home at nights he must say to himself, "Forgive my enemies, but deliver me from my friends."

The hon. member for Vancouver East is also a man for whom I have a high regard, and I say that sincerely.

Mr. MacINNIS: I am now beginning to doubt myself.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I think he is one of our able M.P.'s. He comes from Vancouver East. He was connected with the B.C. electric railway company there. He was a member of the union, and he and his friends were successful in making sure that this was an entirely white industry. What I particularly object to his doing is keeping his own union free from all oriental competition, but he says, "Fine; go over with Gibson in Comox-Alberni and work in the woods or work in the fisheries over there." I would hardly think that is fair. But when he was a respected alderman in the city of Vancouver I never heard him or any of his political friends there advocating that we should take Japanese or orientals of any kind into the police or the fire department. That sounds to me like rank discrimination.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Hear, hear. It is tough to take, but you have to take it.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Last night he implied that possibly the evacuation of the Japanese from the west coast was prompted by war hysteria, but he would not commit himself definitely on that.

Mr. MacINNIS: There is no doubt about it.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I do not think the hon. member is in any position to know anything about the matter. The people of Vancouver felt reasonably safe, I should think. I myself was living with my family on the west coast of Vancouver island in a Japanese settlement. We were particularly glad when the Canadian navy moved in there, impounded all those vessels and moved all those people away from the coast, because at that time we were patrolling the beaches there in anticipation of a Japanese landing. I know something of what actually happened out there, and I do not think it was prompted by war hysteria. I think it was an excellent job when we moved the Japanese away from the coast when we did. The secretary of the Tofino Japanese troller association, whose wife was a schoolteacher in the Japanese language school there, conveniently disappeared and went back to Japan just two

months before war broke out. I can hardly bring myself to believe that this was entirely a matter of coincidence. Hon. members from Saskatchewan do a tremendous amount of talking about the Japanese. They certainly take up a lot of *Hansard* in talking about this matter, even more, I believe, than the British Columbia members. But I think Saskatchewan has done the least of any of the major provinces in the whole dominion with regard to assisting Canada and this government in relocating these people. It should be possible for the Saskatchewan government to offer some jobs to these Japanese people. They could pack filet mignons of horsemeat for them, or maybe they could be talked into working in these brickyards. There are also some fisheries up there.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And box factories.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): They could probably use the Japanese.

Mr. BENTLEY: They could, if they wanted to. It is a free country.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): These Japanese are clever people. I think they would take one look at Saskatchewan and decide, "Oh, no."

Mr. BENTLEY: That is their choice.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I think I should take this opportunity of congratulating the Minister of Veterans Affairs on the stand which he took in this house yesterday and the stand which he has consistently taken with regard to this problem. I think he has led the whole British Columbia membership here, representing the members of all parties, with certain definite exceptions which he mentioned yesterday. I have sometimes heard rumours around this house that probably certain other cabinet ministers were just a little lukewarm about this Japanese problem in British Columbia. They have probably been listening to too much of this prattle from across the way. I should like to remind them that when the minister won his campaign in Vancouver and brought back four Liberals along with him, he won it on the basis that the Japanese were not returning to the British Columbia coast. I never heard any of the cabinet ministers or even the Prime Minister repudiate that stand during the election. We play for keeps in this game; if you win and want to keep, there are some liabilities involved and you must accept them. I might also say that the five Liberals from British Columbia are some of those who keep these hon. members in their position of drawing this motor car allowance. I should think the cabinet has had very good support from British Columbia.

I have heard some criticism of the disposal of the assets of the Japanese. I believe that in some cases they have suffered injustices and hardships in this regard. My own observations along the west coast were that their boats were, as a matter of fact, sold at inflated war prices. Their country created the war, and created the situation which raised the prices on those boats; and I think they have got out of the situation very well financially. I would, however, really urge the government that if any cases of hardship are shown, we should treat them with justice and with equity.

These restrictions on the Japanese are not bad. There are many eastern people among hon. members here, and they do not want to go to British Columbia. They are satisfied with the place where they live. If the Japanese want to re-enter the fishing business, I think they could go and fish for some of the whitefish in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I should like to see them go there. Strangely enough—and I say this in all sincerity—they would teach the people there many things about the fishing business. I have often thought that is really true. The Japanese are able fishermen and able boat builders. I have often thought, since I was in the maritimes—and I notice there is a province there where they have one Jap—the fishing industry there could very well use some of these skilled Japanese fishermen. If they go there I think they might contribute some modern methods to the fishing industry.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They do not like that.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): This distribution of the Japanese is a major national problem; and of course the C.C.F. attitude toward it is typically that of the C.C.F. Those gentlemen over there are theorists, but this is a practical problem. I appeal to all hon. members to realize that the government has a big job to do here. We want to distribute these people fairly across the dominion, and I think every member in the house ought to provide this government with time to do that. In my life I have found that time cures very many things. Today we are bickering about a problem which I believe time will solve. If we would leave them alone; if the Japanese themselves did not think they were getting such substantial support from one party in this house, they might well say, "If we disperse ourselves across Canada this whole matter will be dropped and by and by we may be able to go back to British Columbia if we still want to go there." Actually I believe if we would tell these people they would not be allowed to

[Mr. Gibson (Comox-Alberni).]

go back to British Columbia for five or ten years, the difficulty would be ended. Perhaps later we may be able to modify that, to temper justice with mercy; but if they were made to understand this, I believe they would scatter across Canada, settle down and become useful members of any communities to which they went. So I believe it would be in the best interests of Canada to tell them definitely they would not be allowed to go back to British Columbia for five or ten years.

Mr. IRVINE: I believe what is most lacking so far in this discussion is some sound reasons for the continuation of the order in council now before the committee. I propose to say a few words on this question, not that I think I can say anything someone else has not thought of already, but because I am deeply interested in the problem involved and I consider it my duty to express my views on one side or the other. In doing so I want to make it clear that I make no innuendos and offer no aspersions against any hon. member who holds an opinion which may differ from my own. I have no hesitation in joining in the congratulations to the Minister of Labour on the way he has handled this matter. I understand that it was a very serious and difficult problem indeed. I would never think of myself charging the minister with any inhumanity. I know he is not inhuman. Neither do I think he would for a moment deliberately do anything unjust to anyone. I do not think that is part of this discussion. Therefore I am not going to follow the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. In the first place, he made a clever and humorous speech, which I enjoyed very much, and in the second place, the body of his remarks was directed at the C.C.F., not at the issue at all. The C.C.F. does not need any defence by me, so I shall not bother to say anything about that.

I was somewhat interested in the remarks of the hon. member for New Westminster. His reasoning was strange. Indeed that is somewhat typical of those who have so far risen on the side of maintaining the present order in council, because I believe they are just as freedom loving as I am, and I believe they feel in their hearts that this cannot be justified under those principles of liberty with which this nation has been associated and which all its leaders have professed for many generations. I do not believe they can conscientiously square the continuation of this order in council with their own deep belief, and that is why their arguments are not very good.

Before I deal with these points, let me say that it is not a question of whether this or

that should have been done during the war period. That has been cleared up by a number of speakers from this side of the house. We know very well that the situation was critical during the war. We know very well that no government charged with the responsibility for the protection of this nation could take any chances or afford to make a mistake. Under war conditions that may often mean that in the interests of the nation the individual has to be forgotten. I think that is true in all the countries of the world; and I have no doubt that, as a result of the action taken, many innocent people among the Japanese suffered, just as many innocent people in other parts of the world suffered through the actions of our enemies with respect to our people, the people of the United States and the peoples of other nations engaged in the war. That is all past; we all understand that. But now this is peace time; and we are asking that, since the war is over, with our enemies outside Canada, we should not continue war practices with our own citizens within Canada.

The hon. member for New Westminster took the view that he would rather see expressions of racial hatred than see man set against man, which he said would happen were we to cancel this order in council and extend to our citizens of Japanese origin the same rights we have taken unto ourselves. But strange to say, he went on to state that he had had serious struggles and fights with some C.C.F. members; and even his children at school had experienced some difficulty. That would be a man to man fight, I suppose. Then would the hon. member go so far as to advocate dispersal of the C.C.F. on political grounds in order to prevent a struggle which he thinks is worse than expressions of racial hatred; that is, a man to man fight? If he follows his own logic that is what he would advocate, and I know of no reason why he should not continue to do that if this principle is good. If this principle is adopted in this country no man can say where it may end. If this is a solution for a racial problem it may be accepted as a solution for a political problem, for an economic problem, for a religious problem, or for any other problem, and it is not a solution for any problem at all.

Then the hon. member went on to ask a question. I may be rushing in where angels fear to tread when I attempt to answer the hon. member when he asked: Why this profound silence on the part of a Japanese when I ask him if his greatest loyalty is not to Japan rather than Canada? Let me suppose that the hon. member for New Westminster had been an immigrant to Japan. Suppose

they had taken all his goods out of his home and sent him, with his bagpipes, under guard to the top of a high mountain. Suppose they told him to stay there, told him how much he was to get for his daily work, how many hours he had to work, and all the rest of it. Then suppose a year or two later they came along and said, "Now, Mr. Reid, will you tell us to whom you owe your greatest loyalty? Is it to Canada or is it to Japan?" I am not sure the hon. gentleman would have remained silent. I think he would have replied unhesitatingly, "My greatest loyalty is to Canada, because I don't like the kind of treatment you are giving me". How does he expect a Japanese, as a human being, to give an answer different from what he himself would give under similar circumstances? So I think that very well disposes of the silence problem seems to have been bothering the hon. gentleman.

Then he went on to ask in his next question whether it was not so that Japan had a long-range plan to conquer Canada, the United States and the Pacific coast countries. I imagine she had. But I think it is also true that Germany, too, had long-range plans to conquer. Yet, so far that has not affected our attitude toward Canadian citizens of German origin. Neither do I suggest that we alter our present policy toward them. But I do say that, because the Japanese had a similar idea concerning world conquest, we should not treat them differently.

I say to my hon. friend there is only one logical conclusion to which we can come from his argument, and that is that in the one instance we deal with them on racial grounds, and that in the other we do not; that the German people are white people and that, therefore, we should accept them, while the others are yellow and that, therefore, in respect of them we must have a different rule.

Then he concludes by saying that if we pass this amendment we are virtually saying that all the Japanese must go back to British Columbia.

Mr. REID: That is where they will go.

Mr. IRVINE: That is a prophecy which may not be true. As a matter of fact, if the attitude of the majority of people in British Columbia be that of the hon. member for New Westminster, I do not believe they would want to go back. I do not know what the majority of people in that province think in the matter. However I am only expressing what I think when I vote for the amendment, and when I vote for it I do not vote to send all the Japanese back to British Columbia. Rather I am voting to give the Canadian

citizen of Japanese origin the same right to stay in British Columbia that I have, the same right to stay in any other province of Canada that I have. If he has not that right, then he has not the rights of a Canadian citizen. And I want to know by what authority even this parliament dares to tamper with its own principles in respect of citizenship.

I come now to the argument advanced by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I say that so far no acceptable reason has been advanced from the government side of the house why in years of peace legislation of this kind should be continued. The Minister of Labour referred to the treatment given Canadians by Japanese. I have no doubt that that treatment was very bad, and certainly I will not try even to excuse it. But he implied in his argument that because of that practice we were justified in treating citizens of Japanese origin in a manner that would be in violation of our own accepted principles.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He never said that, though.

Mr. IRVINE: I am giving a true interpretation of his remarks.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He did not say that.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. member is there, and the record is on *Hansard*.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will say to my hon. friend that I never implied that; and I say it sincerely.

Mr. IRVINE: If my hon. friend did not mean to imply it, then I suggest that he ought to read his own speech. If he can find any other meaning in it, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have no objection to the inference the hon. member takes from it.

Mr. IRVINE: I am not trying to impute any wrong motive to my hon. friend; but I am saying that, at least to my mind, that is the only inference I can take from his remarks.

I say in that connection that our citizenship rights and principles must not be determined by what Japanese may do to Canadian citizens anytime, and particularly under war conditions. What we do to our citizens, no matter what their country of origin may be, must be an expression of those principles of which we boast so highly. That is the thing I want to emphasize.

[Mr. Irvine.]

The Minister of Veterans Affairs went on to say that the present treatment of citizens of Japanese origin in Canada was based on the security of the Pacific coast. That takes us back to the war situation. But the Pacific coast is a part of Canada. British Columbia is not responsible for the protection of the British Columbia coast. The government of Canada has the responsibility for the protection of that coastline, as well as the Atlantic coast. Knowing what he does about military matters—undoubtedly a great deal more than I ever knew or am likely to know—I am sure the Minister of Veterans Affairs must know very well that in the next war, if ever there be such a calamity, it may be more dangerous for Canada to have enemy aliens in Montreal, Toronto or Regina than it would be to have them in Vancouver. For if the atom bomb continues its threat to world peace, perhaps an aggressor would not even attempt to land on the Pacific coast. If we disperse these people and deprive them of their rights of citizenship, nursing in their hearts a canker of resentment against the people of Canada, then surely, if ever another war came, they would be more likely to be disloyal. And their disloyalty in a war in an atomic age might be even more serious for us if they were in the interior than if they were on the coast.

I suggest, too, that since they are human beings the Japanese will respond to human treatment, the same as we will. If we treat them as human beings we will develop in them that loyalty which some have asserted many of them have not got. I suggest, therefore, that the carrying out fully of our own principles will be the best way of solving this Japanese question. The whole question it seems to me is this: Shall we have one law for citizens of Japanese origin and another law for the rest of us? That is the real issue before parliament. And all the circumlocutions of my hon. friends opposite have been in an endeavour to side-step facing that definite issue. They cannot defend it. They do not want to defend it, because they are too honest. Yet they are retaining that thing which is an insult to their own souls and intelligence.

There can be no ifs, ands and buts when applied to the principles of freedom extended under Canadian citizenship. Every citizen must be treated equally. And as for dispersal by order in council—well, that is neither Canadian nor is it freedom, nor is it democracy, nor is it a solution of the problem we have brought upon ourselves. I notice that some of the provinces are beginning to shout to the government here, "You put these people in

here for a while; you said you were going to take them out; take them out because we want to get rid of them."

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Saskatchewan.

Mr. BENTLEY: No, not Saskatchewan.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, yes.

Mr. BENTLEY: Oh, no.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Chairman, I think you will have to stop this argument until I finish. It does not matter which province it is. I am not criticizing Alberta, because I think Alberta was justified in asking the government to do what it said it would do.

Mr. BLACKMORE: To fulfil their contract.

Mr. IRVINE: That does not settle anything. There are a lot of people in Alberta who would like to disperse the Social Crediters from Alberta.

Mr. LOW: They have already done that with the C.C.F.

Mr. IRVINE: There are a lot of Social Crediters who would like to disperse the C.C.F.

Mr. LOW: We have done that.

Mr. IRVINE: That will not solve the problem at all. There is no use in going back and saying that this is what should have been done ten, fifteen or twenty-five years ago. We are faced now with a difficult situation, a situation disruptive in character, a situation which is challenging our own principles. I say to the committee: Let us stay by our principles in this case. It may be that some slight difficulty may follow, but we shall be right in following them and the solution will ultimately come. But if we continue to violate our principles the problem will grow in magnitude rather than diminish.

I am arguing now not so much in the interests of our citizens of Japanese origin, although I have every respect for them, although I have every interest in them as I have in all human beings I am urging the repeal of this order in our own interests. We just cannot afford to do a thing like this. If it were merely the Japs who were involved we might be able not to say anything about it, but we are involved. It is more important to me that we do this thing in accordance with our own convictions, our own philosophy and our own democratic principles, than it is for anything else that may be considered in connection with the question.

In the next place, I am arguing for this because of the international implications which

have been emphasized by several speakers, particularly by the hon. member for Kootenay West. As he pointed out, we are already pledged to respect all basic human rights, regardless of creed, colour or religion. That is the very soul of the Atlantic charter. I would not like to embarrass our representatives in the international court by making it necessary for them to defend anything of this kind, because it would be no more easy to defend it in that court than it is to defend it here. I think it is a credit to hon. members that so far they have not tried to defend it. They have not tried to give a reason why we should violate these principles of human rights, to which we have subscribed.

I suggest that the course we are now following cannot be defended logically. I am opposing it now, first, in our own interests; second, because of its international implications; and, third, because I am interested in keeping Canada's record clear and Canada's name clean. We cannot defend this course. I do not know whether we are supposed to bring up an ethical argument in parliament. I do not claim to be particularly ethical, but I think most of us like to have some claim to having certain principles from which we will not move. I believe we all have such principles and I believe we hold to them in a matter of this kind.

In conclusion, I should like to refer to a little bit of satire by one of our Canadian writers. Perhaps we can see a thing when it is put before us satirically, when the best kind of logic will not make an impression. This is an article by Bruce Hutchison which appeared in the *Fress Press* and I intend to quote only one small passage. In order to give point to the passage I want to tell what leads up to it. The Japanese who were sent from Canada have arrived in Japan and they have been telling the Japanese that they have come as missionaries of Canadian Christianity. By the way, this article is entitled, "Onward Christian Soldiers." They are saying, "We have come to preach to you Canadian Christianity." They go on to tell why they became missionaries. They said: "We have come because we were thrown out and kicked out—"

An hon. MEMBER: Left out.

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, left out. The Japanese at home say, "Well, there is nothing new about that; that is what we have been doing all the time." But these Canadian Japanese say, "You do not understand Canadian Christianity," and I quote:

"Ah, but you do not understand the Christians," the missionaries will explain. "You

pagans persecute minorities and hate other races because you believe in it. The Christians do the same thing because they don't believe in it and constantly denounce it. It is no sacrifice for you to behave in this barbarous fashion. But for a true Canadian Christian it is a deep and bitter sacrifice. It means sacrificing all his principles and all the teachings of his religion. Therefore, it is very noble of them. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his principles for his friend."

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): I have been following this debate closely, and I believe the time has come for me to participate in it and to express my viewpoint and take a definite stand on the issues involved. Yesterday, when speaking in this debate and addressing the hon. member for Moose Jaw, the Minister of Labour said it was easy for the hon. member to talk as he was talking. With that statement I disagree entirely. I do not think it ever is easy for a man to take a definite stand in a cause that is not popular, and certainly the cause of the Japanese is anything but popular at the present time. I take my stand with them, not because it is hard but because I believe in justice. I believe in the fullest expression of humanity, especially as far as minority groups are concerned.

I should like hon. members to allow their minds to range back over the years and think of how many wars have been fought in this world because of the oppression of minority groups. When you allow yourself to think along that line you will be amazed at the result of your thinking. I happen to represent a British Columbia constituency situated in the interior of the province. That does not mean to say that all my life in British Columbia has been lived in the interior. I have come into contact with the people of the Japanese race both on the coast and in the interior as much, I venture to say, as any other member of the house. I have a great deal of sympathy for the way British Columbia feels in this matter. The settlement of the Japanese has been allowed to become a provincial problem, when it never should have been. It should have been regarded as a federal problem.

In a recent debate in this house the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, on February 11, said, as reported at page 335 of *Hansard*:

We have a solemn responsibility towards the generations that come after us to see that we keep this Canada white.

I contend that the time for doing that is long since past if it ever existed. There was a time when such a policy might have been achieved, but it was definitely lost when the first oriental infiltration was permitted by the bringing in of cheap oriental labour because

[Mr. Irvine.]

let us not forget that is why they were brought in. Today we have Chinese, Japanese, Hindus and negroes residing in Canada. We cannot get rid of them even if we would, unless we become definitely anti-social and do things of which Canadians might well be ashamed. The sooner we make the people of all these different races Canadian citizens and give them the full rights and responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizens, the better. I would make not only everyone of these peoples a Canadian citizen but make him swear allegiance to our king and make him honour and recognize our Canadian flag—when we have one. The hon. member for New Westminster said this afternoon that he had addressed a question to people of Japanese origin again and again: To what country did they owe their allegiance. I did not want rudely to interrupt the hon. member but, if he were in his seat now, I would ask him this question: Has the privilege ever been given to these people to swear allegiance to Canada?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Of course.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): If we look at this matter in a reasonable light and be realistic, if we will use these people as we would like to be used ourselves, I believe that many of our difficulties will vanish.

In the debate yesterday the hon. member for Calgary West asked a question about the Japanese working sixteen hours a day. Surely he knows that thousands and thousands of Canadian farmers are working fourteen, fifteen and sixteen hours a day because they are working for themselves. But today we have laws in Canada which prohibit men of any race from being made to work fourteen, fifteen or sixteen hours a day. I have listened carefully to the arguments put forth by hon. members from British Columbia against the Japanese and, while I do not accuse those hon. gentlemen of race prejudice, I wish they would come out into the open and admit that the question is not merely a racial one, but that it has its economic side. British Columbia objects to the presence of the Japanese because in the fishing industry, in logging and in agriculture, they hold down jobs which white men need.

I believe that a federal labour code setting forth hours of labour and standard wages for labour would go far toward solving this problem. In the past, employers of labour have been permitted to pay a lower rate of wages to an oriental than to a white man, with this result, that when work becomes scarce and men must be let out it is only natural that the

employer of labour lets out the higher paid wage-earner first, and often the oriental has been permitted to keep his job because he works more cheaply. This should not be possible at all. Put them all on the same basis and a good deal of this discrimination will fade away.

During the war years I supported the action of the dominion government in handling the Japanese situation as they did and I too would like to pay my tribute to the Minister of Labour for what I consider the humanitarian and equitable way in which he tried to discharge that difficult task. I believe that the removal of the Japanese from the coastal area was a wise one. I go farther and say that their dispersal into all the provinces was a wise move, and I hope that the Canadian-Japanese for their own good will not insist on flooding back to the Pacific coast, for I for one am opposed to that. I fully agree with the policy which the Prime Minister announced on August 4, 1944, and I say, let us adhere to that policy. The war, thank God, is over now and I think hon. members will have noticed that, after the collapse of Japan, a lot of this war hysteria died down, because, after all, it was war hysteria, chiefly against the Japanese. Let us not revive or stir it up.

It is acknowledged on all sides that in this matter there is a strong division in public opinion. If we do not lose our heads, and lose our tempers, time will enable us to look at the situation in a dispassionate way and will keep us from making regrettable mistakes.

I cannot forget that in world war I the Japanese people were our allies, and monuments to Japanese who fought by our side in that great struggle and gave their lives are to be found in some of our Canadian cities.

In this more recent struggle the Japanese government supported the wrong horse and they have been made to pay for that error in judgment. I believe that they no longer constitute a menace to the peace of the world. I do not think we in this parliament should go out of our way to visit the sins of the fathers upon the children. I am sure that Canada is big enough and wise enough to take this problem in her stride, and deal with it justly and equitably; but if the continuation of this order in council is part of a move to fasten a permanent discrimination upon these people, as I think it is, then I will have none of it and will oppose it with all the power that God has given to me. As a minister of the Christian church I can do no other.

Mr. FULTON: The discussion of this order in council and the amendment moved by the C.C.F. has taken an interesting turn,

and we see on the part of most speakers in that party the assumption to themselves of the quality of being the only ones who have been consistent throughout this debate in the stand they have taken. Last night the hon. member for Winnipeg North threw down a challenge to this party. He challenged us to make a declaration of policy, since, he said, we profess to be so sincere in our devotion to liberty. This afternoon we heard the hon. member for Cariboo talk about principle, and the implication of his remarks was that all others, certainly those who favour the continuation of this order in council, are "laying down their principles for their friends", while the C.C.F. is the only party that remains true to principle.

But if we look at the position with regard to this particular group of orders in council we can see what the true situation is as regards consistency. This is an emergency measure. It is one of those orders in council which are being continued as an emergency measure, and the C.C.F., which prides itself on its consistency, has asked throughout for the continuance of emergency controls. Yet when it comes to this group of controls, which does not happen to coincide with their policy, they say that we should remove them, and they introduce an amendment to bring it to an end at once. And in the face of this they say that they are the only consistent party in the house.

If these hon. gentlemen want controls ended why do they not take a consistent stand? Which way did they vote on the bill? They voted for the bill and we voted against it. By voting for the bill they automatically continue these measures. We have always pressed in this party for the discontinuance of war-time controls. Since I have been here, from 1945 on, that has been the one stand which this party has taken above all others. Every time we have taken that stand the C.C.F. have opposed us bitterly and, at times, somewhat violently.

We have contended that, the war being over, the rights and liberties of the Canadian people should be restored, and every time we have done so we have been attacked and vilified by the C.C.F., who accuse us of having certain questionable motives in our stand. What support have they given the hon. member for Lake Centre in any of his moves to have war-time restrictions removed and to have the rights of the Canadian people—for example, the right of recourse to the courts—restored to them?

The C.C.F. have never supported this move to restore freedom to the Canadian people, to take off war-time restrictions and to hurry

the government along the path of restoring these liberties. We have had no support from the C.C.F. in that direction, and yet I would read the words of the hon. member for Vancouver East, spoken last night with regard to the Japanese, to be found at page 2379 of *Hansard*:

The war being over, we contend that it is time that the restrictions on these people were removed, that they were allowed to take up their rights and privileges as Canadian citizens.

Unfortunately the hon. member is not in his seat at the moment. If he were I should like to ask him why it is that he confines his efforts in that direction exclusively to Canadians of Japanese origin. I think, if we look closely into the question of consistency, we shall find that the C.C.F. is the most inconsistent party in this particular regard. I wrote down some of the words of the hon. member for Cariboo this afternoon. He said: "This is peace time and we are asking that, now that the war is over, we should not continue war-time practices with our own citizens". We contended that the whole principle of Bill No. 104 was the continuation of war-time controls and we accordingly voted against the bill. The C.C.F. voted for it, but on this particular measure that party, which claims to be the only consistent party in the house, adopts the opposite attitude because it finds it not in accordance with its policies.

When we come to the consideration of this particular question under the orders in council which are now before us I think we should examine the facts of the situation, and it appears to me that here is a problem which requires to be settled on the basis of reason, namely, the problem of relocating the Japanese. It is a continuing problem. We cannot just let them all go back to British Columbia. We cannot dispossess all those people who are now doing fishing which the Japanese did before the war. We certainly cannot dispossess one lot of people, largely veterans, to put another lot of people back; nor on the other hand can we take off the orders in council and abandon the Japanese to their fate.

It seems to me that the government has to deal with this problem and to carry through this matter of relocating and resettling the Japanese in Canada. It therefore requires certain powers for the purpose, and I certainly could not find it consistent either with reason or with principle to vote that this particular order should be revoked.

In his speech this afternoon it seemed to me that the hon. member for Kootenay East was the only one of his party who recognized

[Mr. Fulton.]

that problem and faced it in a manner which was consistent with the practical issues involved, and I was glad to hear him say that he recognized that not all members of other parties were motivated by race prejudice in approaching the question. Certainly the telegram read by the hon. member for Vancouver South last night did establish conclusively that the problem as it arose in the first place was not a result of one-sided action, nor was it a result of mass hysteria. It was the considered opinion of all parties in British Columbia at that time that the removal of the Japanese was in the best interests of Canada. That decision was taken deliberately as a matter of policy, and I suggest that we cannot now just revoke the order in council and leave the Japanese to shift as best they can. We have to carry that policy through to its logical conclusion and resettle the Japanese. In carrying that plan through, in carrying out the resettlement, we should not be motivated either by hysteria, nor should we allow any prejudice to enter into our decision as to how the settlement should be effected.

With deference, I should like to put forward a suggestion which I think might have some value in working out that settlement. The suggestion is very much in accordance with the idea advanced in his concluding remarks this afternoon by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, and I am glad to find that he and I have been thinking along the same lines on this question.

The first fact which I think we should bear in mind in dealing with the question of resettling the Japanese is that they have not yet been assimilated; they have not yet become Canadians in the sense that you and I, Mr. Chairman, think of ourselves as Canadians. I am not trying at the moment, to apportion any blame for that fact, but I think it can be taken as a fact that they are not, as yet, like the majority of Canadians in outlook and standards.

That being so, I suggest that our policy should be directed toward bringing about conditions under which the Japanese at present in Canada can most readily be assimilated, and that is where the dispersal policy should be followed through to its logical conclusion. That is where again the hon. member for Kootenay East and myself appear to feel the same on that matter at any rate. I suggest that for a limited period—a period to be decided after investigation of the whole question and perhaps in consultation with the leaders of the Japanese groups in Canada—the limitation on their return to British Columbia should be continued, and that the

Japanese should be dispersed throughout the provinces of Canada in proportion to the employment available in those provinces, and to the population of those provinces, in accordance with the total number of Japanese in Canada.

This would have two advantages. First, it would mean that British Columbia would not be called upon to reabsorb all the Japanese in Canada and, second, it would mean that there would be no resettlement in a single large community of this group of non-Canadians or of people who are not as yet assimilated in Canada. Surely experience with regard to immigration in the past has shown that it is not desirable for foreign groups to come in and settle in large community groups in Canada. They do not become assimilated. They continue their own language and their own customs, and they do not become Canadians. We passed a citizenship bill last session, and in the course of the debate on that bill it appeared to be unanimously felt by the house that the most desirable thing to bring about was that all people should regard themselves as Canadians pure and simple, and not in any way as hyphenated Canadians. This practice of settling in community groups is one which is calculated to prevent people from regarding themselves as Canadians. They will inevitably tend to regard themselves more as Japanese, or, at the best, as Japanese Canadians, if they are permitted to continue in a single community. There would thus be a twofold advantage to the policy of dispersement. It would be fair to the people of British Columbia and it would have the result that the people of Japanese origin would be more rapidly assimilated, would more rapidly become Canadians.

However, it seems to me we have to read this in the light of the admitted difficulty which is felt by all those who are considering this question, and that is that we all—and not only the C.C.F.—consider it desirable that there should be no racial discrimination, that there should be freedom and equality as between all those who live in Canada. Therefore, to continue a limitation upon the residence of the Japanese would be a denial of that principle or a postponement of the realization of that principle. That is certainly the difficulty which is present in the minds of all those of this party who are considering the question, just as much as it is present in the minds of members of the C.C.F. party. But we are prepared here to face the problem. We say that the Japanese are not as yet assimilated, that they should not be permitted again to settle in a community group. It would not be fair to them to send them all back to British Columbia and

allow them to shift for themselves and it would not be fair to British Columbia to put her in a position where she may again have to absorb all those of Japanese origin.

Facing those two conflicting problems, I suggest that this is one way of reconciling the difficulties. Disperse them for a period to be fixed and let them know that if, during that period, they conduct themselves in such a manner as to indicate that they wish to become true Canadian citizens, then at the end of that period this restriction will be lifted and they will be regarded as Canadian citizens. If the period is adequate and the treatment of the Japanese is proper, it is surely reasonable to assume that they would settle down in other parts of Canada and, if they are going to become Canadian citizens, would enter into the life of the communities where they are settled and become Canadian citizens in those other provinces. When the restrictions were lifted there would therefore be no tendency for the Japanese to congregate again exclusively in British Columbia. I put that suggestion forward to the Minister of Labour as a method which he might consider in working out the final details of the policy which is now being carried on under this order in council. I suggest, however, that it would be desirable not to implement that policy by order in council but rather by a statute of the Canadian House of Commons so that the Japanese can know—

Mr. MITCHELL: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. FULTON: Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL: Is he suggesting that we should have a quota basis for the other provinces by act of parliament? Is he suggesting that they should be moved on a quota basis to other provinces by act of parliament?

Mr. FULTON: No, I am not suggesting that. What I am trying to do is to put forward a principle, the details of which might be subsequently worked out and on the basis of which this problem might be settled. I am certainly not saying that we should pass an act of parliament that Ontario, Quebec or Manitoba, let us say, will absorb so many Japanese. That is not the way we do things in Canada. I am surprised at the minister making that suggestion. It is obvious that the matter would require rather to be solved by consultation between the dominion and the provinces, and between the provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL: If the hon. member reads *Hansard*, he will find he has been talking about a quota basis.

Mr. FULTON: It is the principle I am suggesting. Application of the principle must, of course, be left to negotiation. But it is a principle which I think reconciles the two difficulties, the difficulty of imposing a limitation or restriction on persons of Canadian nationality and, on the other hand, the unfairness of allowing all those of Japanese origin to congregate again in British Columbia.

I hope that, in the rest of this debate my hon. friends of the C.C.F. party will not continue to assume for themselves either the sole rights to consistency or the sole rights to interest in the preservation of freedom and equality as between Canadian citizens.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I should like to contribute a few words to this debate. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni suggested that I give an answer, yes or no, to a given question. It reminds me of that old question, "Do you still beat your wife, yes or no?" I will explain the question in my own way.

The oriental problem in British Columbia is not a new one. It is not new in Canada or, for that matter, on the North American continent. When the hon. member for Cape Breton South was speaking the other day he was telling us about the difficulties in the steel mills in the early days which were caused by the immigration at that time and the importing of large numbers of one given group, from a backward country, and throwing them into the steel mills. Then they would have to fight them in order once again to make the union work and build up conditions which were worth while living under. Years ago, along the boundary country among the miners the western federation of miners had to arm themselves with 30-30 Winchesters in order to keep out Chinese scabs. At that time the mine owners wanted to bring them in. It looks as though we are going into the same form of immigration at the present time when we allow industrialists to go over and pick up their own form of cheap labour, so that we can look for the same policy as we have had in the past.

During the depression the whole thing boiled up on the coast until it became absolutely impossible. To a large extent we have a monopoly in the fishing out there. H. R. MacMillan runs the major part of the packing companies, as he does the lumber industry out on the coast. Those packing companies played up to the Japanese. They gave them special conditions under which to live; they gave them equipment with which to work. No wonder they had good boats. I noticed the hon. member for Vancouver South spoke as though they had exceptionally good equipment, including boats in which they could

[Mr. Mitchell.]

sail over to Japan. Any 60 or 70-foot boat will sail over to Japan if you put enough oil in the hold.

Mr. GREEN: If I may ask the hon. member a question, is he in favour of allowing Japanese to come back and fish on the Pacific coast?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I will answer my own questions in my own good time, and when I see fit. I do not need any instructions from the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Mr. GREEN: I was not giving instructions; I was asking a question.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I will answer it in time.

Mr. GREEN: If you are afraid to answer it, O.K.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He is afraid to answer it.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Don't use the word "afraid". I am not afraid to answer the question. I answered it very well during the time of the election. I have heard various members from the other side of the house speak as though the Japanese question was just a matter of defence. Oh, no; they could not be accused of race hatred. When I think about it I sometimes wonder if the last election was just a bad dream. That is all we had to fight on the coast, the Japanese question. The Liberal party even brought an American woman who had been in a Japanese concentration camp up to Prince Rupert to speak of the horrors she had encountered in that camp.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: There are worse horrors in Prince Rupert now.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: One thing about it, that little attempt boomeranged, because she was such a hard-looking case it did not go over.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They have a harder looking case now.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: As I say, during the depression, with the companies playing up to the Japanese, giving them special concessions and at all times a better break than the white fishermen got, the white fishermen were driven down to poverty stricken levels. At that time even the halibut fleet, which is normally quite a stable industry, was driven down to the point where the men would make only \$200 in the season. That condition was prevalent all through the fishing industry at that time. It became a political football. All the hatred and suffering of the fishermen were turned on

the Japanese, quite consciously, because of political necessity. Now the fishermen are becoming well organized. They have their cooperatives; and what is happening now? At the last session of the provincial legislature an amendment to the cooperative act was put through, providing that fishermen on company-owned boats could not allocate their share of the catch to the cooperatives. They are paid in shares, a definite portion of the fish from the boats, and now they cannot allocate their share of the fish to the cooperatives. The large fish packing companies have declared war on them, and they are going to be driven right back into the same position they were in during the depression. They are beginning to find out where the real Japs are.

This Japanese question will not save the Liberal and Conservative parties at the next election, because they are both on the spot. We have a coalition government putting through that anti-fishing legislation. I grant that it may be Tory domination; I do not know whether the Liberals out there are weakened, but that is what is happening. Furthermore, they are starting to get together in the federal field. In Skeena they are crawling into the same bed; they cannot stand on their own feet. The hon. member for Fraser Valley had better look out. The hon. member for New Westminster pointed to the terrific increase in the number of fishing licences issued since 1941. That industry has been changing; the gill net method of fishing is becoming antiquated. The struggle between the seiners and the gill netters is boiling up once again.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What does the hon. member mean by that?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Just this; that the gill net method of fishing is becoming antiquated, as I had it explained to me during the recess by the fishermen out in Prince Rupert. The point is they are going to be driven right back where they were. At the present time, thank goodness, the Japanese are not on the coast. Otherwise the fishermen would be taking out their hatred once again on those Japanese.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Would you permit a question?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Certainly.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Are you in favour of giving the Japanese fishing licences?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Do I still beat my wife?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I asked you a question.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I will answer the question to my fishermen, not to you. I can understand and sympathize with the position of the Minister of Fisheries, of whom I think a great deal personally. He faces a difficult problem.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What about the question?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: When did you become my conscience?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I don't think you even have one.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: In the halibut fleet at the present time, for instance, the large companies are ramming in boats so fast that the independent fishermen are being squeezed to the wall. I have a letter here from the deep sea fishermen's union and, as I understand it, they are asking for that allocation per boat. They want that put through at this session of the house, because they are running into difficulties. There will be no independently owned fishing fleet on the coast, either in the salmon or in the halibut, unless the question is cleared up.

I want to just make my position clear at the present time. I believe this Japanese issue was used consciously by the large economic interests on the coast to sidetrack the main issue. It was picked up by those who had no basic idea of how to solve the problem, and they used it for their own political ends.

Mr. FULTON: Are you suggesting a solution now?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Certainly. The solution is quite clear; the fishermen take over the whole fishing industry ruthlessly, and that does not call for any apology.

Mr. FULTON: Does that settle the Japanese problem?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Yes, it settles the Japanese problem in this way, that the fishermen will control their own destiny and their own meal tickets, and will not be pushed around.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Would you give the Japanese licences?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I will consult and work with the fishermen; they will control the licences and the fishing, and you will not have anything to do with the matter. That is the way to solve it. I heard the hon. member for Comox-Alberni criticize Colin Cameron for talking about taking over industry ruthlessly. We have only three basic industries in British Columbia: fishing, lumbering and

mining. The fishing and lumbering are controlled by MacMillan; mining is controlled by Consolidated Mining and Smelting, and we will take it over.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: And now you want the Japanese in there too.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: We will solve the problem of the fishing industry by working in consultation with the fishermen, and by turning the fishing industry over to the fishermen themselves. That will solve the Jap issue, and it will take the only talking point you are capable of expressing right out of your mouth.

Mr. MERRITT: Perhaps I should say a few words on this matter, particularly in view of the speech we have just heard. The hon. member for Skeena has left no doubt in the mind of anyone in the house that he does not base his stand on this question on any of the high and moral grounds advanced by his party in support of their opinion.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I am basing it on my stomach.

Mr. MERRITT: And I respect the hon. member for being much more practical and facing facts much more clearly than his colleagues. But I want to call the attention of the committee to some of the things the hon. member has just said, and these from a member of the party of sweetness and light, who would have us think they are furthering great human ends by advancing this policy on behalf of the Japanese. Apparently the hon. member would permit the Japanese to go back to the Pacific coast and into the fishing business. At the same time he would ruthlessly dispossess white Canadians of their property.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is interpreting my words, and taking them out of their context. I said I would turn the fishing industry over to the fishermen, and take it out of the hands of H. R. MacMillan.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is not what you said.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Yes, it is.

Mr. MERRITT: We can leave it to *Hansard*. I wrote it down at the time, and the words I wrote were that he would ruthlessly take over the industry. He made an interesting remark to the hon. member for Fraser Valley, telling the hon. member in no uncertain terms, "You will not have anything to do with fishing licences."

So that apparently the idea of the C.C.F. is that there is room for discrimination and

[Mr. Archibald.]

room for class hatred in this country, but there is no room for racial differences. I think the hon. member pretty well summed up the attitude of his party on this question.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Tell that to the fishermen.

Mr. MERRITT: I do not think it is an attitude which will have much appeal for practical men in this country.

Then, I should like to say one or two things about what other members of that party have said. Last night the hon. member for Kootenay West said that the present members in the Liberal and Progressive Conservative parties were not truly representative of the people of British Columbia. If we believed that we did not truly represent the feelings of British Columbians I do not think we would have witnessed so consistent a stand over so many years by the members of the two old-line parties, parties which, whatever one says against them, have their feet on the ground and do not always have their heads in some rosy clouds.

I do not want to take any stronger position than was taken by the hon. member for Vancouver East who, I am sorry, is not in his seat at the moment. Last night he was asked a question by the hon. member for Fraser Valley, and the discussion is reported as follows at page 2379 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Cruickshank: Did you object to their being withdrawn from the coast?

Mr. MacInnis: No. I took the stand—

Mr. Cruickshank: Thank you.

Mr. MacInnis: —that it was desirable and perhaps necessary because of public feeling.

If in 1942 it was desirable and necessary, because of public feeling, that the Japanese should be removed from the Pacific coast, I would not like the committee to be under any misapprehension as to the present feeling. After all, those of us who are members from British Columbia are in the best position to know it is desirable and necessary, because of public opinion, that the Japanese should not be allowed to return.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Is the hon. member trying to give the committee the impression this afternoon that all the people of British Columbia are opposed to the return of any Japanese to that province?

Mr. MERRITT: Oh, no; and I am glad the hon. member asked that question. I will say emphatically that I believe a large majority of the people in British Columbia do not want the Japanese to return to that province. I should not like to state any definite percentage, because, for instance, no Gallup poll has been taken. The hon. member and I may

differ in our opinions. However I am giving my opinion, and it is that a very large percentage do not want the Japanese back.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Why do they not want them back?

Mr. MERRITT: That is a good question, too. I think this afternoon the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has stated sensible and practical reasons why they do not want them back. I would commend to the hon. member who has asked the question the commonsense speech of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, which will do more to formulate a wise judgment in the mind of the hon. member than talking to his colleagues.

I might add a word to what the hon. member said. He has spoken from the intimate day-to-day point of view and has given incidents within his knowledge. I should like to call the attention of the committee to a major reason why the people of British Columbia feel the way they do. The attitude of the people of British Columbia is not confined to that province. One sees the same attitude in Australia and on the Pacific coast of the United States. It is all very well for hon. members to rise in their places and say, in such an airy fashion, that we should hate those who manage industry, but that we should love the Japanese.

The practical fact is that those who live in the van, if one may so describe it, and who immediately face the orient, have always felt a measure of insecurity and uncertainty in their position. I believe they feel it principally because the continent of Asia is heavily populated, and the standard of living of peoples on that continent is much lower than the one we follow. We know the theoretical position, carried to its ultimate, simply means a mass influx, a lowering of our standard of living and a changing of Canada from what we all want it to be to something quite different. It is not based upon any racial hatred or any such theory. It is a perfectly practical view, based upon long experience and after many examples of exactly what would happen if those airy theories were applied in the way hon. members of the C.C.F. want them applied. This would not be Canada; it would be a totally different country.

The time may come when the ideal which the hon. member has expressed, without tying it to anything practical, will be accepted throughout the world. But I say to hon. members, in all sincerity, that it is not accepted now. There is no use in trying to

force that point of view upon people who do not want it. That is not the way to bring people around to one's point of view.

There is no use in bludgeoning them or criticizing them, following the tactics which some newspaper editors in the east seem to be developing. If you want to bring people over to your view you must educate them. Continue pressing your ideas upon them, in the proper democratic way; but refrain from this attempt to influence the house to do something which would be considered coercion by another minority, about whom the hon. member does not seem to think very much. I refer to the people of British Columbia who, from the practical point of view, would have to bear the brunt of what he has suggested. They are a minority in this country. This is not the way in which one deals with minorities in a democratic country. You do not just put through parliament a law which is entirely against their wishes and to which they cannot give support. If you are so advanced in your thinking as you seem to consider you are, then you should go and win over the people of British Columbia to your side. Do not come here to this chamber, which consists, in the main, of people who do not know this problem because they do not live with it, and try to get strangers to the problem to follow you, on a straight ideological basis, to a conclusion which could not be accepted by your fellow Canadians in British Columbia.

Mr. KNOWLES: Are you charging for the lecture?

Mr. MERRITT: No, I make no charge for the lecture; I make it gladly and freely and I hope it will have some effect upon the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GARDINER: The C.C.F. always charges fifty cents.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Especially on Sundays.

An hon. MEMBER: They usually get more than that.

Mr. MERRITT: I have tried to explain how I feel about this problem in the way of a lecture to my hon. friend which I hope he will take to heart. I want to try to offer, along with the other members of the old parties who have spoken in this debate, some practical answer to the problem. The suggestion I am going to make simply amplifies what has been said by the hon. member for Kamloops and the hon. member for Vancouver South.

During the forty years that we in British Columbia have been dealing with this problem

we have not had a great deal of support from Canadians living east of the Rockies and who did not know the problem as we knew it. Naturally that has solidified public opinion in British Columbia against the oriental much more than would have been the case had the people there felt certain that they had the people of Canada behind them. We have always had to take a strong stand. We have always been left up in the air; we have always been uncertain as to when we would be able to check large-scale immigration. When we did succeed in checking that we were uncertain as to how long we would be able to hold it under control. So long as you live in that state of uncertainty, so long will public opinion in the west remain in the state it is in today, the state which members of the Liberal and Progressive Conservative parties have outlined.

In addition to there being a continuation of the policy of the dispersal of Japanese in Canada; in addition to their being prevented from returning to British Columbia for a period of years, we should have from the government a definite statement on oriental immigration. We should know what their policy will be and whether it is one which could be accepted in British Columbia. If we could feel sure that that policy would not be changed against the will of the people of British Columbia, then there would be a lessening of the pressure which exists and the problem of those Japanese who remain in Canada would become much easier of solution.

I think there is another way of handling the oriental problem in Canada, one which is not restrictive, one which is the reverse. If the number of white people in British Columbia were so much greater than the number of orientals there would be removed from our minds the fear that our standards might be challenged by that oriental group which unfortunately does not assimilate. You would then find us more ready to fall in with theory. With that addition I stand by what has been said by the hon. member for Kamloops in connection with a solution of this problem.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the hon. member permit a question for the purpose of obtaining information? He has said that he is endeavouring honestly to give this committee the feelings of the people of British Columbia in connection with this whole problem, as he sees it. In referring to the problem, he constantly used the word "oriental". Do I understand him to mean that there is still a feeling in British Columbia against all orientals, or is it just with respect to the Japanese? I am

[Mr. Merritt.]

not expressing any views at the moment; mine are well known. I simply want to know what the situation is in British Columbia as the hon. member is seeking to report it.

Mr. MERRITT: That is a good question. The problem of trying to mix the yellow race and the white race or the white race and the black race, to be found in the United States, is not an easy one to solve. When I used the word "oriental" I was applying it to all those of the yellow race.

Mr. COLDWELL: Including Chinese?

Mr. KNOWLES: And East Indians?

Mr. MERRITT: Including Chinese; all people of a different colour from ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not wish to restrict the discussion, but the orders in council refer only to Japanese and I do not think we should get into a wide discussion on all orientals.

Mr. MERRITT: Since the hon. member has asked the question, I should like to make it perfectly plain. There is a difference in colour which makes assimilation almost impossible, but that does not suggest that the white people consider themselves superior to those of the yellow race. I am perfectly certain that the Chinese and Japanese prefer their own colour to ours. Simply because that difference does exist in fact need not result in charges of "discrimination" or anything like that against any of them or against any person.

There is one last thing I should like to say if it will go anywhere toward satisfying the people who follow an ideological view. We must apply any ideology to our time. Right at this moment there is not an hon. member who will not admit that rent control is an unwarranted invasion of the rights of the Canadian people. I do not think the Minister of Finance who administers it would try to justify rent control on any ground other than that of avoiding the social upset which would follow the removal of restrictions on evictions.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am enjoying my hon. friend's remarks, but I think it would be better if we stayed with the orders in council instead of getting off into rent control.

Mr. MERRITT: If the minister had not interrupted me I think I would have joined up the two to his satisfaction and would have been sitting down by this time. If the deprivation of the rights of all landlords can be justified for a period of one or two years I think we can, without hurting our con-

sciences very much, allow these orders in council to run along so long as rent control remains. It might be that as the housing situation clears up and permits of rent control being released, so will this situation clear up and these problems of principle may not then seem so important in the minds of members who are not faced with the practical consequences of the situation.

Mr. MAYHEW: Mr. Chairman, I notice it is ten minutes to six o'clock but I think I can say what I want to say in that time. In fact I would not be speaking at all, except that I have refrained for a number of years from taking part in the debates in this house on the Japanese question and because of that some of my hon. friends have probably misunderstood my position.

In 1942, after Pearl Harbor, I was one of those who wired Ottawa in connection with the picking up of the Jap fishing boats on the coast. However, that was not necessary because the navy was ahead of everybody and did an excellent job in picking up some twelve hundred fishing boats and bringing them into harbour.

I later tried to persuade the government that the Pacific coast area should be cleared of Japanese for defence purposes and I spoke on that in both 1942 and 1943. I asked that the Japanese be removed from the Pacific coast area in units of families, because I believed that was the most humane way of treating them and the best plan also so far as the government was concerned. By the removal of them in units of families into the interior of the province and to the prairies and to the central provinces they could help to feed our armies and our allies, but if we put them in concentration camps we had to feed them. One way they would have been helping us and the other way they would have been helping Japan.

Later on, when the Japanese were moved to camps along the Canadian National right of way I objected to their staying in that position because it was not a safe position. Since that time I have refrained, as I said, from taking part in the debates on this question. I refrained for two reasons. One was that Canada has treated the Japanese better than any other of the oriental races. We have permitted practical slavery among the Chinese people due to our laws, which I think should be cancelled just as soon as possible. We have not allowed them to come in with their wives, nor have we allowed the Hindus to come in with their wives. But the Japanese were allowed to bring their wives in and to set up

homes and live like the rest of us, although they have failed to do that in a number of places.

When our security commission wanted to move the Japanese people to other provinces in Canada, what did we find? The other provinces immediately started bargaining with the security commission for these Japanese. They said, yes, you can move in men who are capable of working and earning a living, provided that, when the war is over, you move them out again. Furthermore, that was practically the attitude of all the provincial authorities and we have seen the same attitude in other places. The hon. member for St. Paul's said in this house that no Japanese would come to the city of Toronto if he could avoid it. The mayor of this city is reported to have said that no Japanese are going to come to Ottawa, and other people in responsible places have said the same thing. What has that meant? It has meant that the rest of Canada is trying to put British Columbia in the position where she should shoulder the whole blame, and I refuse to do that. They are trying to make out, because we in British Columbia say we do not want the Japanese back, that the people of British Columbia are un-Christian and a heathen people, implying that people in this part of Canada are all saints. I say, let the people in the other parts of Canada come forward and say: We will not force anything on you, but we will welcome these Japanese people and treat them as Christians, thereby proving our Christianity. I am quite sure that British Columbia will then say the same and will go as far as they will in our Christian treatment of the Japanese. One Christian act never made a Christian, and one act of felony never made a felon, but if people in other parts of Canada will adopt that principle of Christianity and invite the Japanese and treat them as they say they want British Columbia to treat them we shall not have any difficulty in handling the Japanese.

I had a good deal I wanted to say, but I will be content with what I have said.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Tomorrow we shall continue with this bill and I hope that we shall appear to have made more progress, though I am quite convinced that this debate was necessary and that it means more progress than will appear in the records of what has been done today.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask if the treaty series containing the four treaties we are to discuss later on have yet been tabled and printed?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: They have been tabled and are now in the hands of the printer. That is the treaties with the satellite powers.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am concerned about their distribution to the members.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: They were in the hands of the printers and I will inquire as to what progress has been made in getting them ready for distribution.

Mr. GRAYDON: I wonder if their distribution could be expedited because I think we should have them.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.