

Vol. 87
No. 47

4th Session
20th Parliament



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Monday, March 15, 1948

Speaker: The Honourable GASPARD FAUTEUX

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.
KING'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1948

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

CONTENTS

Monday, March 15, 1948

Privilege. Provincially-owned insurance companies—Mr. Ferguson.....	2201
Private Bills. Senate bills—First readings.....	2201
House of Commons:	
Suggested arrangement as to length of Easter recess, Mr. Mackenzie King, Mr. Bentley, Mr. Cruickshank.....	2201
Special committee to consider Mr. Speaker's report on procedure, Mr. Graydon, Mr. Speaker.....	2202
Hong Kong. Reference to press report of statement by Minister of Justice, Mr. Bracken, Mr. Mackenzie King, Mr. Graydon, Mr. Ilsley.....	2202
Radio Broadcasting. Inquiry as to establishment of committee, Mr. Reid, Mr. McCann.....	2203
Grasshoppers. Request for government assistance to combat menace, Mr. McKay, Mr. Gardiner.....	2203
Labour Conditions:	
Alleged communist activity among Canadian seamen, Mr. Dickey, Mr. Mitchell.....	2203
Negotiation by shipowners with communist union members, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Mitchell.....	2203
Butter. Question as to steps to relieve shortage, Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Gardiner.....	2203
Refrigerator Cars. On track at Borden because of shortage of locomotives, Mr. Grant, Mr. Chevrier.....	2204
Income Tax:	
Farmers—Net worth portion of return, Mr. Miller, Mr. McCann.....	2204
Application of wheat participation payments and refundable portion to arrears of tax, Mr. Argue, Mr. McCann, Mr. Coldwell, Mr. MacInnis.....	2204
Veterans Affairs. Reception by committee of delegation from all veterans associations, Mr. Gregg, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Bentley.....	2204
Harbour Commissions. New Westminster—Refunding of debentures, guarantee of loans and redemption of securities. Motion, Mr. Ilsley, for consideration of resolution in committee; Mr. Mayhew. Motion agreed to, resolution considered in committee and reported. Bill No. 148, first reading.....	2205
Transitional Measures Act, 1947. Continuation of certain orders and regulations. Bill No. 136. Motion, Mr. Ilsley, for second reading.....	2205
Debate continued by:	
Mr. Bracken.....	2206
Motion (Mr. Ilsley) agreed to and bill read the second time.....	2207
Motion (Mr. Knowles) of instruction to the committee.....	2207
Debate continued by:	
Mr. Case.....	2209
Mr. Ilsley.....	2210
Mr. Smith (Calgary West).....	2211
Motion (Mr. Knowles) negatived on division: yeas, 31; nays, 116.....	2213
Motion (Mr. Ilsley) for consideration of resolution in committee, agreed to.....	2243
Bill considered in committee, progress reported.....	

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I desire to table a copy of order in council P.C. 958, covering an agreement with the province of British Columbia with respect to the maintenance and welfare of indigent persons of the Japanese race.

I table also copies in English and French of the regulations made under the Unemploy-

ment Insurance Act, 1940, providing for the extension of coverage as of April 1, 1948, to those employed in stevedoring.

I table also a copy of order in council P.C. 1009 dated March 9, 1948, under which the dominion government undertakes to pay the transportation and cost of movement of 4,500 domestic servants from displaced persons camps, from the point of entry to Canada to the place of employment.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 15, 1948

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

MR. FERGUSON—PROVINCIALY OWNED
INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. J. H. FERGUSON (Simcoe North): I rise to a question of privilege. On Saturday the *Montreal Gazette* published an article stating that J. H. Ferguson, Progressive Conservative member for North Simcoe, agreed with Mr. Coldwell, leader of the C.C.F. party, when a bill was introduced to authorize an insurance company to be established in the province of Manitoba. Many friends of mine in Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa have brought this to my attention. So that there may not be the slightest misunderstanding I want to make the statement that I did not agree in any way with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) with respect to the successful operation of the insurance company owned by the province of Saskatchewan. I do not believe it can possibly operate as economically and successfully as the stock companies of England, the United States and Canada. I wish the Canadian Press and the C.B.C. would make this correction, and say that Julian Ferguson of North Simcoe does not agree with the operation of an insurance company by any provincial government.

PRIVATE BILLS

SENATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 137, to incorporate Rinker Finance Corporation.—Mr. Dechene.

Bill No. 138, to amend The Export and Import Permits Act.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 139, for the relief of Mildred Frances Batten Gzowski.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 140, for the relief of Irene Nellie Kon Ballantyne.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 141, for the relief of Theophile Gobeille.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 142, for the relief of Violet Mary Cowper Preston.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 143, for the relief of Virginia Grace Borland Langton.—Mr. Boucher.

Bill No. 144, for the relief of Ethelwyn Lillian Flynn Budd.—Mr. Croll.

47—1948—14

Bill No. 145, for the relief of Alfred Winston Savage.—Mr. Maybank.

Bill No. 147, for the relief of Diana Eve Whittall Beurling.—Mr. Maybank.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTED ARRANGEMENT AS TO LENGTH OF
EASTER RECESS

On the order, "Government notices of motion":

That when this house adjourns on Wednesday, March 24th instant, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 30th instant.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the house, and without moving it at the present time, I should like to say a word on this resolution which has reference to the Easter adjournment.

This morning I had the privilege of meeting with the leaders of the three parties opposite. We discussed together what seemed to be most advisable with regard to the Easter recess. For reasons I need not enumerate at the present time, we were in agreement that what has been the customary length of adjournment in recent years might with advantage be followed again this year. This means a longer rather than a shorter adjournment.

As it now stands the notice of motion is that when this house adjourns on Wednesday, March 24 instant, it stand adjourned until Tuesday the 30th instant. It was thought—and later in the week I may make a formal motion to that effect—that it would be best to change "Tuesday the 30th" to "Monday April 5".

As to whether we would adjourn on the Wednesday night, the 24th, will depend upon the progress which may be made between now and the end of the present week. If it appears we have not made the progress which I believe will be necessary to make an adjournment on Wednesday advisable, I shall suggest that we sit on the Wednesday night and also on the following Thursday, to adjourn on the night of Thursday the 25th. However if the house can get through what seems to be imperative by the close of Wednesday afternoon, I shall then make a motion to adjourn on the afternoon of Wednesday, the 24th, until Monday April 5th.

Mr. BENTLEY: Has the government given consideration to sitting on Wednesday night of this week and on Saturday—and if necessary, some mornings—in order to make the progress desired?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government has not given consideration to any of the points my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister in this connection, in order to avoid moving an amendment to the proposed motion. Shall we be provided with air service to the west?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall have to wait until later to answer that question.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER MR. SPEAKER'S REPORT ON PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): May I ask Your Honour a question with respect to the house rules committee which was set up some three weeks ago? I know there were very good reasons which Your Honour advanced previously why this committee could not be called earlier, but I wonder if Your Honour could give the house some idea when the first meeting of this committee will be held.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was my intention to call the committee right after the Easter recess. I could do it before, but I thought that would be better.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I make a suggestion? Perhaps we could have an organization meeting. I realize it is not a large committee but there may be some things to which we would wish to give some thought and consideration over the recess. Perhaps it would facilitate matters if a meeting were called prior to that time.

HONG KONG

REFERENCE TO PRESS REPORT OF STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. I have not given notice of it, but I do not ask him to answer immediately. I would appreciate it however if he would give consideration to it and answer it later.

My question arises from a report which I find in the *Montreal Gazette* and which, I understand, has been published in a good many newspapers, respecting a statement yesterday by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley).

In view of the statement made by the Minister of Justice and in view of the controversy as [Mr. Mackenzie King.]

to the interpretation of the evidence in the Hong Kong report, will the government give consideration to either printing or mimeographing further copies of that evidence? It appears there is only one copy, and not one person in ten thousand will see that document unless we can find a way of making it available to more people. Will the government give consideration to that suggestion, with a view to making more copies of the evidence available if practicable?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I can answer that question at once. The government had thought that the tabling of the evidence was sufficient, and it is not the intention to have further copies printed. If the matter were to be considered further it would have to go before the joint committee of both houses on printing, and the question considered there as to whether it is advisable that the evidence should be among documents to be ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would the Prime Minister object to the committee considering it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I have no objection.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): In view of the statement given by the Minister of Justice yesterday to the press in which he criticized an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* of the day before, which editorial had criticized the former Chief Justice of Canada and his findings, will the minister and the government consider the matter of abandoning in future the practice of appointing to political inquiries men from high positions in the judiciary?

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, my views have been expressed on that subject in the house before. There are occasions when I think it is appropriate to appoint judges of high character and calibre to conduct inquiries. This was one of those occasions. My statement yesterday merely pointed out the ridiculousness of the editor of a newspaper, after having had the opportunity of seeing about 2,300 pages of evidence for only twenty-four hours, charging the Chief Justice of Canada with giving a false report.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Justice?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: I will be back.

[Later:]

Mr. GRAYDON: I desire to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Justice.

MARCH 15, 1948

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ALLEGED COMMUNIST ACTIVITY AMONG CANADIAN SEAMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. DICKEY (Halifax): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour in connection with one I asked him last Thursday. Has the minister any further information with respect to labour troubles among the Canadian merchant marine?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Halifax may I say that this morning I did receive a wire from Mr. T. Gerald McManus, chairman of the marine council of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, in which he suggested arbitration to settle the dispute. I replied to him as follows:

Re your telegram of fourteenth, understand it to contain proposal which your council has decided to place before three unions of officer personnel now on strike. If unions concerned accept this proposal of your council and I am advised officially to that effect by the responsible officers of each union I shall be glad to take the matter up with representatives of ship owners. If then the ship owners accept the proposal but fail to agree with unions on the personnel of the arbitration committee I shall be glad to assist the parties in making the selection.

This is signed by myself.

NEGOTIATION BY SHIP OWNERS WITH COMMUNIST UNION MEMBERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. FERGUSON (Simcoe North): I should like to ask the Minister of Labour if it is necessary for ship owners to negotiate with union representatives that have been nominated by avowed communists.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I do not care whether they are ship owners or trade unions, they should abide by the law.

Mr. FERGUSON: Or communists.

BUTTER

QUESTION AS TO STEPS TO RELIEVE SHORTAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JAMES SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. What steps, if any, is the government taking to relieve the shortage of butter in Canada today?

Right Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): It has been found in Canada that in the four months of winter farmers are

In reference to the case in respect to which he gave his statement to the press concerning the former chief justice, is the minister not aware that on that occasion the former chief justice was sitting, not as an ordinary judge on the bench, but as a commissioner? No appeal from his decision is possible, except to the public.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: For that reason—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GRAYDON: —we should not be denied the right—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Peel should resume his seat when the Speaker rises.

Mr. GRAYDON: I did not see you, Mr. Speaker. I could not hear you for the noise in the chamber.

RADIO BROADCASTING

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of National Revenue if it is the intention this year to set up the committee on radio broadcasting?

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue): The matter has not yet been given consideration, but I take it that if there is any request to set up the committee on radio broadcasting it will be set up.

GRASSHOPPERS

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO COMBAT MENACE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. B. McKAY (Weyburn): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. What assistance is the dominion government prepared to give farmers in Saskatchewan in 1948 to combat a threatened widespread attack by grasshoppers as reported by the Dominion Department of Agriculture?

Right Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The practice in the past in connection with combatting grasshoppers has been for the dominion government to supply all the technical services it possibly can in connection with that matter. But the financing has always been done by the provinces.

producing only about one-quarter of the butter consumed in those four months. In the four months of midsummer the same farmers are producing twice as much butter as can be consumed in this country during those months. During two months in the spring and two months in the fall of the year the farmers produce about the same amount of butter as is consumed. If there is not enough butter now to spread around all over Canada, there certainly will be very shortly when we get into the month of April and the cows are out on the grass.

REFRIGERATOR CARS

ON TRACK AT BORDEN BECAUSE OF SHORTAGE OF LOCOMOTIVES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. V. GRANT (Kings): Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Transport to a telegram which I received today from Prince Edward Island to the effect that 130 empty reefer cars are on track at Borden but cannot be moved because of a shortage of locomotives. I should like to know if the minister has received similar advice.

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): I have not received a similar telegram but I shall be glad to take note of the hon. gentleman's question and see what can be done to assist in the matter.

INCOME TAX

FARMERS—NET WORTH PORTION OF RETURN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. C. MILLER (Portage la Prairie): Before the orders of the day are called I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the protests of farm organizations and also of members of this house will the minister give consideration to issuing a directive cancelling the necessity of farmers completing the net worth portion of the income tax return?

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue): In reply to the hon. gentleman's question may I say that the matter is receiving consideration and a statement will be made within a few days.

APPLICATION OF WHEAT PARTICIPATION PAYMENTS AND REFUNDABLE PORTION TO ARREARS OF TAX

Mr. H. R. ARGUE (Wood Mountain): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue, notice of which I have [Mr. Gardiner.]

sent him. Is it the intention of the government to withhold wheat participation payments from the farmers because of income tax liability?

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue): I acknowledge receipt of the hon. gentleman's question and in answer I may say that officers of the taxation division have written to farmers who are indebted to the crown for income tax purposes to get in touch with the wheat board and request that the wheat board withhold deductions from their participation certificates for their income tax indebtedness. No blanket authority has ever been sought to withhold payment of the participation certificates. It is entirely optional with the farmer who is indebted to the crown to give an order to the wheat board for that payment.

Mr. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Will that be done for other people in connection with the refundable portion of the income tax which was paid by taxpayers several years ago?

Mr. McCANN: It has already been decided that the refundable portion of the income tax is to be used to offset income tax now due to the crown.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue arising out of his answer given a moment ago. In view of the fact that the refundable portion of the income tax is to be used to offset arrears of income tax, will the Department of National Revenue make the necessary adjustments in interest, either reduce the interest on arrears from eight to two per cent or increase the interest on the refundable portion from two to eight per cent?

Mr. McCANN: That is not a matter within the jurisdiction of the officers of the crown; it is fixed by statute. When it is changed by statute in this house our administrative officers will be glad to carry it out.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

RECEPTION BY COMMITTEE OF DELEGATION FROM ALL VETERANS ASSOCIATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. MILTON F. GREGG (Minister of Veterans Affairs): On behalf of the chairman of the select committee on veterans affairs I should like to report to the house that today, I think for the first time in the history of the house, that committee has had the pleasure

of receiving a delegation representing all veterans associations in Canada, including the Canadian Legion of the British empire service league and the National Council of Veterans Associations, which includes the Canadian Corps Association, the Sir Arthur Pearson Association of War Blinded, the Canadian Paraplegic Association, the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada, the War Amputations of Canada, and the Canadian Pensioners' Association of the Great Wars. I should like to express our pleasure at having these representatives present here, some of whom are in wheel chairs in the gallery and others on the floor of the house beyond the bar of the house.

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): If I am in order, I should like to second what has been said by the minister and express the appreciation, I am sure, of all members of the opposition as well as those on the government side, at having these men present here today.

Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): Hon. members in this corner of the chamber are in entire agreement with what has been said by the minister and the hon. member for Royal.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONS

NEW WESTMINSTER—REFUNDING OF DEBENTURES, GUARANTEE OF LOANS AND REDEMPTION OF SECURITIES

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to present a bill to provide for the refunding of certain debentures of the New Westminster harbour commission; the government guarantee of substituted securities therefor, and the making of loans out of the consolidated revenue fund to redeem securities that may be refunded.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I should like to ask if the minister will be prepared to make a statement in the committee stage.

Mr. R. W. MAYHEW (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I could make a short statement.

The bill to be based on this resolution provides for the refunding of a debenture issue of the New Westminster harbour commission which matures on April 1, 1948, the total amount being \$700,000. The coupon interest rate is 4½ per cent, and the securities are payable at the option of the holder in United States or in Canadian dollars. I should like to get this resolution through and have the

bill read the first time. I hope that any discussion will be held over until the bill is before the house.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Mayhew thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 148, respecting the New Westminster harbour commissioners and to provide for the refunding of maturing obligations.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

TRANSITIONAL MEASURES ACT, 1947

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN ORDERS AND REGULATIONS

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 136, to amend the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act, 1947.

Mr. BRACKEN: Are we not to have a statement from the minister?

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, the bill before the house, the second reading of which I am moving, consists of one section only, as hon. members will have noted. The present act, the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act, 1947, is being amended in such a way that it will expire not on the 31st day of March, 1948, but on the sixtieth day after parliament first meets during the year 1949 or on the 31st day of March, 1949, whichever date is the earlier. The proviso contained in the act is to be continued, namely:

Provided that, if at any time while this act is in force, addresses are presented to the Governor General by the Senate and House of Commons respectively, praying that this act should be continued in force for a further period, not in any case exceeding one year, from the time at which it would otherwise expire and the governor in council so orders, this act shall continue in force for that further period.

It is not my intention to make anything but a brief explanation of the bill, because it is self-explanatory, nor is it my intention to make any extended argument for its necessity, because it is generally recognized I think by members of the house that the government's decontrol policy has not reached the stage at which all controls can be abandoned now or at the end of the fiscal year.

The terms of the extension are not the same as the terms of the act which provided for expiration. The present act provided for its expiration at the end of December provided that parliament sat in either November or December and failed to make any provision for its continuation. The result of that was that we spent six or seven days, if I remember

correctly, in dealing with the act when we met in December last, and not to very much purpose because the act is up again now and two debates have been rendered necessary on the act within the space of two or three months. It is our hope that the present arrangement will appeal to members of the house and that instead of the act expiring on December 31 next if parliament meets in November or December next, it will be regarded as satisfactory if it expires at the end of sixty days after parliament meets in 1949, but in any event not later than March 31, 1949.

On Friday afternoon I placed on *Hansard* a list of the orders in council still extant. A large measure of progress was attained in the year 1947 in the revocation of orders in council and certain sections of orders in council which were appended to the act of last year, and I expect that in the months to come it will be possible to get rid of other orders in council and perhaps some sections of certain orders in council. Some orders in council now in force will manifestly remain in force for only a short time until legislation now before the house is approved by parliament.

I would hope that there would not be too much disposition on the part of the house to oppose this measure. When we get into committee of the whole the ministers who are acquainted with the existing orders in council which they are administering will be prepared to answer questions about them, which I submit is the proper stage at which to have those orders explained rather than at this stage. We are making progress, but it is manifestly impossible to contemplate the situation which would arise if the act itself were allowed to expire on March 31, 1948. Certain controls by common consent have to be extended beyond that time.

The other day the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) asked me some questions about reductions in the staffs administering these control orders. I have gathered together some figures, but I should not like to mar these brief remarks while you are in the chair, sir, by putting the figures on *Hansard*. I can give them to the committee when we are in committee.

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): The minister has suggested that the details of our discussion be postponed until the committee stage is reached. I rise not to make any extended remarks but to state briefly our position with respect to this measure.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

This is a bill to amend the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act, 1947. As the minister has explained, the existing measure expires on March 31. The amendment before us would extend it for approximately a year in an abbreviated form. The existing act includes some fifty orders in council. The amendment before us consists of but one section it provides for continuing in existence some twenty-seven orders in council, partly wholly.

The principle of this measure, Mr. Speaker, has been before us on five different occasions. We have debated it more or less fully, sometimes very fully, sometimes not so fully, on five different times since it was first introduced in December, 1945. The first National Emergency Transitional Powers Act was passed in December, 1945, to come into effect on January 1, 1946. The second act was passed to amend the first. It was passed in August, 1946, to continue to March 31, 1947. The third time it came before us was in the form of an address to His Excellency on March 11, 1947, to continue the measure in effect until the middle of May, 1947; and the fourth time was an act passed on the 14th of May, 1947, to further the extension of the measure until December 31, 1947. In December last year another address was made to His Excellency asking that the measure be continued until March 31 of this year. Now we have a bill to extend for another year the operation of the powers granted under the original act.

The measure has been debated so much that I think everybody knows where everybody else stands on the general principle of placing economic controls in the hands of the government at a time when essential parts of the control mechanism have been abandoned and at a time when even the government itself has no intention of restoring these parts of the original controls scheme. Nevertheless the government now seeks the continuance of powers contained in some twenty-seven of these orders in council. These powers, and others like them, it has had for over two years, and in our judgment there is very little to see by way of results from its use of these powers. Wage controls have gone; price controls have largely gone; the cost of living has had an unprecedented increase and inflation still continues on a widely increasing scale.

I had handed to me just a few moments ago the controls that still exist. They are relatively few in number, and are as follows: residential rents—with which continuation I think nearly everybody in this house agrees, though possibly in a modified form—sugar,

oils and fats, soap, primary iron and steel and non-ferrous metals. Since October 17 of last year a few controls have been reimposed, namely, those on butter, certain citrus fruits, carrots, cabbages, grapes and certain canned fruit juices and certain canned vegetables, and the government is reported to have in mind the imposition of certain controls on the price of meat. Until recent months there have been hundreds of these controls in effect. In substance these few are the ones remaining.

As I have said, the government now asks for the continuation not of the powers under fifty orders in council but of the powers under twenty-seven. With certain of these powers, namely, residential rental controls. To some others many are still opposed. Under these circumstances, in view of the fact that we have debated the principle of this measure and the details of it five times prior to this date, personally I do not see any purpose in re-debating it now for the sixth time. I suggest that we get this measure to the committee as soon as possible and there examine each of these twenty-seven orders that the government seeks to continue, and call upon each minister to justify, in so far as he can, the continuation of each of them.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Before Your Honour accepts the motion that Mr. Speaker leave the chair and the house go into committee of the whole on Bill No. 136, I should like to propose a motion of instruction to the committee. The procedure I wish to follow is identically the same as that which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) told us the other day it was his intention to follow with respect to Bill No. 135. He indicated at that time that after second reading of the bill had been passed he would move an instruction to the committee that they have power to do so and so with that bill. It is my intention at this identical stage to move as an instruction that the committee of the whole have power to carry out a certain procedure with respect to Bill No. 136 which is now before us. I do this, Mr. Speaker, under the authority of citation 407 of Beauchesne, third edition, which reads as follows:

An instruction is a motion empowering a committee to do something which it could not otherwise do, or to direct it to do something which it might otherwise not do. It directs the order and course of the committee's proceedings and extends or restricts the order of reference according to the discretion of the house.

Citation 410 indicates when and where such a motion as I am about to make is in order. It reads:

An instruction to a committee of the whole is a motion which ought to have the right of way on the question that the Speaker do leave the Chair.

I take it that it was on the authority of that citation that the Minister of Trade and Commerce outlined his proposed procedure the other day. It is on the same basis that I now rise, Mr. Speaker. I think it is only fair I should not go any farther without indicating the nature of the instruction which I wish to move. I shall move it at this time, seconded by my colleague, the hon. member for MacKenzie (Mr. Nicholson):

That it be an instruction to the committee of the whole that they have power to amend Bill 136 by inserting therein the following section:

2. Section four of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"4. The governor in council may revoke in whole or in part any order or regulation continued in force by or made under this act, provided that notwithstanding anything in this section no provision of any order or regulation of the governor in council specified in the part of the schedule to this act entitled 'Wartime Prices and Trade Board' shall be revoked by the governor in council unless addresses have been presented to the governor general by the Senate and House of Commons praying that such provision be revoked."

The Minister of Justice will recognize immediately that this is a point we raised last year when we were in committee on the original bill which was then before us. At that time, since we had the bill before us, it was competent in committee of the whole to move an amendment to section 4. Section 4 was, as I say, at that time before the committee of the whole. This year however we have before us, as the Minister of Justice has just indicated, a very simple bill with only one section, and it could be argued that that bill will bring before the committee of the whole only section 7 of the original act. Therefore if in the committee of the whole I were to rise and attempt to move an amendment to section 4 of the original act, it is altogether likely I would be told that section 4 is not before us, and therefore I would not be able to move an amendment to it.

That is my reason for moving that the house now pass this instruction to the committee, giving the committee the authority to take up section 4 and amend it by inserting another section in the bill now before the house.

I draw to the attention of the minister the fact that last year when I proposed this matter I did so on April 17, suggesting a wording which I felt met my point. The minister, although he did not agree with my motion, treated it with respect and asked that the matter stand, and the next day he suggested an alternative wording which is to be found at page 2242 of *Hansard* of April 18, 1947. The amendment which the minister then said would meet my purpose was:

Provided that notwithstanding anything in this section, no provision of any order or regulation of the governor in council specified in the part of the schedule to this act entitled "Wartime Prices and Trade Board" shall be revoked by the governor in council unless addresses have been presented to the governor general by the Senate and the House of Commons praying that such provision be revoked.

I accordingly withdrew the amendment in the form in which I had worded it in the first place and moved an amendment in the form in which the Minister of Justice suggested it to me. Later the committee voted it down; but, for reasons which I shall take a moment to indicate, I feel that the amendment should now be put into the original act.

I wish to point out as I go along that the fact that that amendment was accepted by the chairman of the committee of the whole last year and voted on indicates that it is an amendment which it is competent for a private member to move. But let me now give my reason for reintroducing the amendment at this time. The principal reason is that in our view the government has been going too fast along the road of decontrol. To use the words of the present Minister of Finance in some of his letters, he is strewing too many casualties along the path of decontrol, and we in this group would like to make sure of the one thing which we have the power to try to make sure of, namely, that the wartime prices and trade board set-up will not be scuttled in a matter of a few weeks. We want to be sure it will be kept in existence at least for the full year during which this bill is to be on the statute book.

Last year, as I have indicated, the Minister of Justice treated my proposal with respect so far as the idea was concerned, but opposed it, stating in fact on April 17 that he felt that the government should have the right to get rid of these wartime prices and trade board sections of the schedule in less than the twelve months for which the bill was then being passed. I submit that the minister will have to admit now that he was wrong. Not only were those sections kept in effect for the full twelve months, but he is now before the house with a bill which will continue them for a

[Mr. Knowles.]

further period. Despite the fact that the minister asks to have them continued for a further period, which can be the full year, the original act still has in it that section 4 which gives the governor in council power at any time to revoke orders in council such as those that keep the wartime prices and trade board in existence; and my fear is that the Minister of Finance, who is now the principal authority with regard to those orders in council, may go to his colleagues in the cabinet one of these days before long and suggest that the wartime prices and trade board be done away with. If he does that and a few weeks later everyone, including the government, realizes that there are certain controls that should be re-established, he will be in a position to say that he cannot do it because the authority for price control has been abolished.

I was not surprised on previous occasions when the Minister of Justice took amendments of this kind, and speeches of this kind, as expressions of confidence in the way in which the government has handled price control. It is only natural that he should take it that way, and I say to him without reservation that I am glad to express confidence in the way the government administered price control during the war when he was Minister of Finance. But we are not satisfied with the decontrol policy which the government has been following since the end of the war.

If my amendment carries, it does not do everything that I should like to do. It still leaves the government and the wartime prices and trade board with the power to scuttle some of the regulations. I would go farther if I could, but I cannot move an amendment that would call upon the government to carry out the price control powers given to it by parliament because that involves the expenditure of money. I am going as far as a private member can go in seeking to write into the statute a section which will ensure that the orders in council establishing the wartime prices and trade board will stay there at least until March 31, 1949, and that at least we shall have the wartime prices and trade board in existence to carry out any policy of price control which the government might yet be persuaded is necessary for the well-being of the people of the country.

I point out that if the motion I have now presented to the house carries, that is not the end of the story. For, as citations in Beauchesne, Bourinot and May indicate, this kind of instruction cannot be mandatory. It may be only permissive. This does not instruct the committee of necessity to write this extra clause into the bill. It merely gives the

committee the undoubted authority to do it, and since there is some doubt as to whether or not the committee would otherwise have this power under the bill, with section 4 of the original act not being before the committee, I suggest that the way to make sure that we can consider the matter when we are in committee is to accept and pass this motion.

I was really grateful to the Minister of Justice the other day for what I thought was the very fair way in which he dealt with the matter. He expressed his desire that hon. members have a complete and fair opportunity to move the kind of amendments they might wish to move. I know he may not agree with some of those we propose. He might perchance accept this one this year, but undoubtedly he was most fair, and I hope the house will see fit now to pass this motion I have moved.

If the house does pass it, that merely gives the committee power to consider this amendment. That means that when we get into committee of the whole at some proper stage, on the basis of the authority given the committee, I shall rise and move that a section 2 be inserted in the present bill in the words that appear in the motion I have just made.

That, I may say, explains the set-up of my motion. The bill before us will have only one section which amends section 7 of the original act. My amendment would call for the insertion of a section 2 which would amend section 4 of the original act. I point out again that this amends section 4 in the time-honoured way, by deleting the existing section and substituting another section made up of the wording already there, with no change, plus the addition of the proviso I sought to move last year.

In case the Minister of Justice has not had time as yet to compare the wording of these various proposals I assure him that the amendment I have now moved is composed of the original section 4, exactly as it stood, plus the proviso I sought to add last year, in exactly the words suggested to me by the minister on April 18, 1947. I repeat that this is not very far to go. It is not nearly the distance I and the members of this group would like to go. If it were at all possible we would call upon this house to instruct the government to use the powers provided by parliament to put price control back into effect and bring down the cost of living. That is denied us. Already we have moved an amendment to the address expressing this view, which this house has turned down, I think wrongly. But at least the government could go this far; and I should hope that at this stage the Minister of Justice

would agree to my motion, and let it pass as an instruction to the committee. Then when we get into committee I shall move it at the proper stage, in the hope that it will pass, so that the country may have the assurance that the machinery of the wartime prices and trade board will remain in operation for a full year, or until parliament may decide to do away with it. That proviso, of course, is maintained at all times: no one would want to supersede that right. But if perchance this is written into the statute and the government and the board itself and its chairman all know that the life of the board is ensured for a period of time, I should hope they might be a little more aggressive in their job in trying to hold down the cost of living in this country. At the moment, however, all I have placed before the house is a procedural motion which I hope the government and the house will be prepared to accept.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): If I may ask a question, when the hon. gentleman quoted from the Minister of Justice in April of last year, was that at the same stage of some proceeding?

Mr. KNOWLES: The answer to that question is no. Last year we had before us Bill No. 104, which has since become chapter 16 of the 1947 statutes. When we were in committee on that bill last year in due course we reached section 4; and it was in order, without any doubt or question, since we were dealing with section 4, for any private member in committee of the whole to move an amendment. This year, however, section 4 of the original bill will not be before us, because all we have is Bill No. 136, which opens up only section 7 of the original bill. Since there might be some doubt as to whether the committee of the whole could deal with a section not brought before the committee, I am moving this instruction, that the committee of the whole have power to deal with section 4 of the original bill in the manner I have proposed.

Mr. W. GARFIELD CASE (Grey North): From what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Isley) said the other day in explanation of the resolution I understood that the committee of the whole would have an opportunity to discuss any section of the act. With respect to the amendment, if we are to give any direction to the committee of the whole I think enough leeway should be given to permit us to consider the act in part or in whole. I am interested in one particular section. We have been told by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) that the law officers of the crown discovered a provision in the act which even

the administration did not know existed, which they said would permit the government to carry out what we have been inclined to call the austerity program. I do not think the government itself expected that the measure presented and passed last session would delegate such wide powers to the administration. For that reason I think when the committee of the whole is considering this bill clause by clause, or any part of it, we should have the right to seek out and deprive the governor in council of the right to deal arbitrarily with any situation with which parliament itself should deal.

We have heard a good deal about the legality of the taxes which have been imposed, and so on. By the admission of the Minister of Finance himself the administration must find itself in an embarrassing situation today, when it is asking parliament to condone something which was done on November 17 and which it had or had not legal authority to do. So I think when the committee is considering this bill, if any direction is to be given we should be privileged to review the act and suggest amendments thereto, so we may feel more secure and may know that we are returning to at least some semblance of democratic government.

Right Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Justice): I presume I may now speak to the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The hon. gentleman gave no notice; therefore I have been able to give it consideration only during the last few minutes. I am inclined to think no harm would be done by giving this power to the committee. What we should do in committee is another matter. Last year I took the view first, I think, that I was indifferent to a similar motion, because I regarded it as an empty gesture; and I think it is not much more than an empty gesture at the present time. The preservation of the regulations of the wartime prices and trade board, exactly as they are contained in the schedule, gives the government full power to revoke individual controls under those regulations at any time they wish. For instance, they could remove any particular commodity from the operation of the regulations. It was for that reason last year that I thought it did not make any difference whether or not a similar provision passed. Finally, however, I stated that as a member of the committee I would vote against it. While expressing indifference as to whether it passed or not, I said I would vote against it, and it was voted down because it seemed to do something that actually it did not do.

[Mr. Case.]

The hon. member thinks that if this provision is added to the bill perhaps it will exert some moral pressure upon the government to keep price controls on a little longer than otherwise would. But that is the most that can be said for this resolution. In practice it may accomplish absolutely nothing. At the same time I do not think I can oppose the motion. I think the committee ought to have the power to make this amendment to the bill if it wishes. But what position I will take on what position the government will take on the amendment when the hon. member proposes it in committee is another matter.

Those who are more directly connected with the administration of this measure are giving it some attention at the present time. Perhaps there is some reason why it is important that we do not surround the revocation of the order and the individual provisions of the order with these restrictions. Perhaps there is some reason why we should not now do this. It does seem somewhat illogical that the committee a year ago would vote against a provision like this.

Mr. KNOWLES: Perhaps the committee was then illogical.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not know that they were. I think that the logical thing is to oppose this because it is not of any practical value. If I am correctly informed it is not of practical value because within the framework of these orders, no matter how long they continue, the government has power to make orders under those orders in council for complete decontrol. That is the advice I got last year, and that is the reason I said last year it did not make any difference to me whether the order went through or not. I thought however that it would give a false impression, that it was an empty gesture—and I am afraid the same considerations would apply this year.

At the same time I do not know why on this short notice I should oppose his motion, because all it does is to give the committee an opportunity a little later, after we have given the proposal further consideration, to decide what we ought to do with it. And I may add that the notice I received was unfortunately short; my hon. friend might have given me notice of it this morning.

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion, for a different reason—and what I shall say perhaps will suit the mover of the motion. My objection to it is that while it gives section 4 to the committee—and I would have no objection to that at all—if the committee is

to take section 4 into consideration it should consider the matter without any limitation as to procedure, as is here indicated.

If we pass this as a directive to the committee, it means that the House of Commons directs the committee that it has the right to amend as specified, and that only. If we are in committee of the whole, wide open, on section 4, then of course my hon. friend will agree that he does not need this motion. His motion will apply only in the event of the committee not being open to deal with it. If we are to deal with section 4 it is my view that the committee should be free to deal with it in any way it sees fit.

My suggestion to the hon. member is this. I am quite content to have section 4 dealt with. Why would he not simply issue a directive to the committee empowering it to deal with section 4, so that we would not have to bring in this proviso two or three times? Perhaps someone in the committee would find a better way of putting an end to some of the operations of the board. I make the suggestion that perhaps this is a better way of handling the matter.

Mr. ILSLEY: With the consent of the house, may I ask the hon. member a question? What are his reasons for thinking that the committee would not have the power to propose this amendment in the absence of such a direction from the House of Commons?

Mr. KNOWLES: I suppose the short answer is that I have had six years of experience in this House of Commons. The other answer is the reference that the Minister of Justice unfortunately made the other day to a passage in May, which he said was not very helpful. I thought I had answered him by finding a helpful passage in May, but it so happens that the unhelpful passage is there too.

I believe this is a debatable point. There is however a helpful passage in Beauchesne which speaks about doubtful cases; and in doubtful cases the suggestion is that the thing to do is to get authority from the house. It is because there is doubt that the committee would have power to deal with the section brought before it that I felt the motion should be passed.

An hon. member to my right only a moment ago quoted the minister as saying on Friday that, in his view, when we got into committee all sections of the bill should be open. I doubt if that is what the minister said. As I recall it, the minister said we should have the right to discuss all the orders in council in the schedule. He answered the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) by saying that

we would be able to call the ministers, one by one, and ask each to defend the continuance of these orders in council. But having all the orders before us is one thing; having all the sections of the original act is another. And it is because section 4 of the original act is not before us that I was prompted to follow this procedure. I believe the minister's attitude in the matter has been fair.

Mr. ILSLEY: I can speak again only with the consent of the house. What I intended to say the other day was that I thought amendments to the various provisions of the orders in council would be in order. When I said that I meant of course that if they add to the expenditure, or are out of order for some other reason, those points of order may be taken by hon. members on this side of the house. There is however a passage in May to the effect that when an act is continued the original act cannot be amended in the continuing act. That is the unhelpful position I was referring to. In this instance, the bill we are introducing is an amending one. It is not an act which continues the original act.

Mr. KNOWLES: But that is all it does.

Mr. ILSLEY: Well, it amends the original act. And I think it does more than that. For instance there is a proviso in the amending section, and I was not able to see why another proviso in the amending section, or a separate section making some change in the orders validated last year or continued last year, would not be perfectly in order, and I am willing to take that position in the house.

It has been suggested by the officials that perhaps this increases the expenditure. I would not like to take that position in the present instance. In fairness to the committee I believe they will have to be free to propose amendments if they wish.

There is something in what was said by the hon. member for Calgary West, that if we specify this amendment and say that the committee has power to propose it, then that would appear to be based on the theory that that is the only amendment they have power to propose.

Mr. LOW: That is exactly what it does. I had the same feeling as the hon. member for Calgary West. My objection to the amendment as it is set out now is that it limits the part of section 4 that could be amended by the committee. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will rearrange his

amendment and make it possible for us to propose in committee any amendment we want to section 4, we will support it.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I think it should be made clear that the purpose of the amendment is to have the government come back to parliament for authority before repealing any order in council dealing with the wartime prices and trade board. As it now stands the government may do away with all the orders in council that come under this legislation without coming back to parliament for further authority. We are interested in that part which deals with price control, as was made quite clear by the hon. member who moved the amendment. I do not know why anyone should object to giving this parliament the right to discuss a matter of such importance particularly in view of what has happened in the last few months.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am agreeing with you.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: The contention is made that the passage of this amendment would limit the committee to the amendment of section 4 in only one particular. I cannot see the logic of that. If the committee already has power to amend all the sections of the act, as is contended by some, then the giving of instructions or extra power to the committee would not limit the power which the committee already possesses.

It may be argued that if the committee has the power already we do not need to give them any power. But by giving this extra power, by giving these instructions, we are not taking away any power which the committee already has under the rules; therefore I think the amendment should carry so that this house may have the opportunity of discussing the setting up or abolition of a board which has to do with price control. I am not going to go into the question of price control at this time, because it would be out of order, but I do submit that by adopting this motion we will be giving parliament an opportunity which it otherwise may not have to discuss an important question.

Mr. MITCHELL: Could we not do that when we are discussing the orders in council?

Mr. KNOWLES: When we are dealing with the orders in council we are dealing only with their substance and their content. The power of revoking orders in council is not set out in the schedule or in the orders, it is set out in section 4 of the original act which is not before us. I feel strongly that the passing of this

[Mr. Low.]

motion would not deny to the committee other powers which it might have. Hon. members may contend that it has this or other powers, but I want to be dead sure that the committee has the power to make this specific amendment.

Mr. REID: It seems to me that it would be out of order before the bill goes to second reading to give a restrictive direction to the committee. This amendment would restrict it to section 4 and I claim that that is entirely out of order. Surely to tell members of the committee of the whole after the bill passes second reading that we are to be restricted to section 4 is out of order.

Mr. MacINNIS: Section 4 deals with the power of the governor in council to move in revoking in whole or in part orders and regulations. I think it was on Friday that I made the statement that when an amending bill was before the house all sections of the act were open to amendment. This is an amending bill. It is not necessarily a bill for continuance; it amends section 7 in certain respects. That being so, in my opinion the whole act is open for debate and for amendment.

If my contention is correct the motion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre does not restrict the committee. As a matter of fact it brings section 4 into the debate. Consequently I do not think there is anything restrictive about it. I should like to thank the minister for his fair attitude in this matter. He is reserving the right to pass it in committee if he thinks it is desirable and nothing is lost.

Mr. KNOWLES: Speaking to the point of order raised by the hon. member for New Westminster, this sort of procedure is not followed very often and it is not surprising that it seems to be perplexing. The hon. member objected to a motion that would give a direction to the committee, indicating that was a form of dictation. I would refer to citation 409 of Beauchesne's third edition, which reads:

An instruction which is generally made when a bill is committed, is not mandatory, and it is therefore customary to state explicitly in the motion that the committee "have power" to make the provision required. The intention is to give a committee power to do a certain thing if they think proper, not to command them to do it.

If this motion is passed it does not command the committee to do this at all.

Mr. McILRAITH: Read the rest of it.

Mr. KNOWLES: It does not prevent the committee from doing everything which it has the power to do. The amendment merely

makes sure that this one particular right is protected. As I read the rules, it would be in order if my motion is passed for other hon. members to move other instructions protecting other rights. I submit to the hon. member for New Westminster that he might reconsider his point. He said that this was something that was being done before second reading, but second reading has already been had and I submit that my motion is perfectly in order.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I finish reading 409, which continues:

The right theory is not that the instruction should be given whilst the bill is still in the possession of the house, but rather after it has come in the possession of the committee.

Mr. KNOWLES: Go on and read the rest of it and also 410 and 411.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Knowles) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Archibald	McCullough (Assiniboia)
Argue	MacInnis
Benidickson	McKay
Bentley	Matthews (Kootenay East)
Bowerman	Maybank
Bryce	Michaud
Burton	Moore
Campbell	Nicholson
Castleden	Probe
Coldwell	Strum, Mrs.
Croll	Thatcher
Gillis	Townley-Smith
Irvine	Wright
Jaenicke	Zaplitny—31.
Knight	
Knowles	
McCuag	

NAYS

Messrs:

Adamson	Cruikshank
Baker	Daniel
Barrett	Dechene
Belzile	Dickey
Bertrand (Prescott)	Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)	Dionne (Beauce)
Blackmore	Douglas
Blair	Fair
Bonnier	Ferguson
Boucher	Fournier (Hull)
Bracken	Fulton
Bradette	Gagnon
Bradshaw	Gardiner
Brooks	Gauthier (Nipissing)
Brunelle	Gauthier (Portneuf)
Case	Gibson (Comox-Alberni)
Casselman	Gingues
Charlton	Gladstone
Chevrier	Golding
Church	Gour (Russell)
Claxton	Gourd (Chapleau)
Cloutier	
Cournoyer	

Grant
Graydon
Gregg
Hansell
Harkness
Hazen
Hlynka
Hodgson
Isnor
Jaques
Jean
Johnston
Jutras
Lafontaine
Langlois
Lapointe
Leger
Lennard
Lesage
Little
Low
McCann
McCubbin
McCulloch (Pictou)
McIlraith
McIvor
MacKinnon
MacLean
McLure
MacNicol
Maloney
Manross
Marier
Martin
Matthews (Brandon)
Mayhew
Menary

Merritt
Miller
Mitchell
Mutch
Nixon
Parent
Pearkes
Quelch
Raymond (Wright)
Reid
Richard (Gloucester)
Rinfret
Robinson (Bruce)
Ross (Souris)
Shaw
Sinclair
Sinnott
Skey
Smith (Calgary West)
Stanfield
Stuart (Charlotte)
Stokes
Timmins
Tremblay
Tucker
Tustin
Viau
Warren
Webb
Weir
White (Hastings-Peterborough)
White (Middlesex East)
Whitman
Winkler
Winters—116.

Mr. MARQUIS: I was paired with the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. HERRIDGE: I was paired with the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Pinard). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I wish to move an amendment to the motion, which will read as follows:

That it be an instruction to the committee of the whole to consider amendments to section 4 of the act, irrespective of whether or not this power falls within the general powers of the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member cannot move an amendment to the motion, because there is no motion before the chair.

Mr. Ilsley moves that I do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider the said bill. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Duration of act.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a moment to say a word on behalf of the majority of the members of the veterans affairs committee. We express our resentment at being called from a meeting of the blind and totally disabled to vote on such a trivial matter.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what you think.

Mr. MacINNIS: Wait until you meet the people of the Fraser Valley.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister of Justice, who is piloting this measure through the house, what arrangement he would suggest to facilitate discussion. He knows that there are twenty-seven orders in council before us. It seems to me that if it is just left to individual members to pop up to speak on the particular order in which they are interested we shall travel all over the place. I suggest that it might be a good idea for him to indicate the order and suggest that the various ministers responsible make a brief statement, which would save time in the long run.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I want it understood that, so far as I am concerned, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is not speaking for me on this matter. I do not consider it my business, or the business of this group, to facilitate the particular matter that is now before the committee. It contains resolutions which are being carried forward which are indicated by just a number. Very few hon. members understand what is behind these resolutions and what the implications are. If the government was in a hurry on this particular matter it should have brought it in sooner. So far as I am concerned, this is one of the most important matters that we have to discuss, and during the discussion in committee I am going to get a thorough explanation of every resolution that is being carried forward under the Continuation of Transitional Measures Act, 1947.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is what I am proposing.

Mr. GILLIS: No; the hon. member proposed that the minister suggest some way to overcome our popping up and delaying the matter and so on. I do not delay the house very often except on something that I feel pretty keenly about. I am not particularly anxious as to whether these powers are carried forward or not, because in the final analysis I do not think it means anything to the Canadian people. Whether we vote for it or not, it will be carried forward and adminis-

[Mr. Speaker.]

tered. All the controls which protect the ordinary people of this country in any way, shape or form are gone now.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. In order to have the situation clarified so far as the chair is concerned, we ought to have some understanding now as to what is to be discussed, because the only thing that is before the committee is section 1. If by agreement the committee wishes to discuss something else, the orders in council, or the bill itself on which the amendment is made, we should get consent to do so; otherwise all that is before the chair is section 1 of the bill.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, all that is before the committee is section 1; but it has been suggested that someone give the committee some guidance as to the order in which they will carry on the discussion on section 1. I am quite willing to do that if the committee will be guided by my suggestions. I suggest that the orders administered by ministers who are here today be discussed first, with the exception of some orders that are not very difficult. I might say a few words about those.

I hope that once we finish the discussion on any particular order we shall not revert to it. I express that merely as a hope. There is nothing in the rules to prevent our going back to it but I hope we do not do so. Might I mention the first two items at the beginning, the Department of Finance? Let us complete the discussion on these two items first. The Minister of Finance is not here today but the parliamentary assistant is. However I do not think the orders present any difficulty at all. One is an order exempting from customs duties coke made from coal for certain purposes, and the other is the exemption of oil-drilling machinery from customs duties. Those are two orders in council which have been carried along for some years and which will be dropped when they are dealt with in the budget. Budgets in recent years have not been making many tariff changes, but these items will have to be dealt with one of these days in the budget. They are a sort of remnant of some tariff orders in council of which there was a considerable number at one time. They have all been revoked except these two. I suggest that they would not require very much discussion, and such discussion as there might be could take place now.

Mr. GILLIS: That is exactly the point to which I object. I am not so much concerned about the orders which are being carried forward as I am about those which have been revoked. If the procedure now suggested by

the minister is gone on with, it means that we shall take the few orders which still remain; and, reading those orders over, as far as I am concerned, I suggest that they do not mean very much. I am afraid that some of the orders which have been revoked do mean something, and I want an explanation of them before we proceed to deal with those which remain. For my part, you could wipe the whole thing out tomorrow and I do not think it would change anything, because all the orders which were beneficial to the people are gone, and that is clearly reflected in the spiral of inflation.

For example, I would ask the minister for an explanation of P.C. 206173, 1945, civil service war service preference, certain persons excluded, and so on. That order in council established a preference for certain service personnel with respect to employment in the civil service. While the order remained, that preference remained, and unless I am sure that the preference has been guaranteed by legislation I am not prepared to say that the government were justified in revoking it. The same thing applies to the next order and several others following that. They are revoked. If we accept this as it is now we may be taking away from service personnel the preference which they had under that order in council and it may not have been guaranteed them by legislation. I should like to have an explanation of those particular orders.

Mr. ILSLEY: Is the hon. gentleman talking about those under the heading "civil service commission" in the table of contents?

Mr. GILLIS: That is right.

Mr. ILSLEY: Those orders in council were embodied in legislation, or legislation took the place of them. Legislation passed last year substituted a statutory preference for the preference established by order in council. Last year there was an amendment to the Civil Service Act dealing with the whole matter and providing for the preference. That took the place of these orders in council.

Mr. GILLIS: The reason I am concerned about it is that right now there is a great deal of difficulty in the matter of employment for veterans in the civil service commission, and the question where their preferences begin and end. If the minister assures me that the revocation of these orders in council has not taken away any of the preference they had, I am quite satisfied. I want to be sure that the preference remains, though there is still much that is left to be desired.

Mr. ILSLEY: It was all dealt with last session. It is section 29 of the Civil Service

47—1948—2

Act. The matter was debated fully at that time. I know there is and always has been difficulty about the preference to veterans. That is not a new thing. When I first came into the house back in the twenties there was a continual debate as to whether the proper persons were being given preference, and so on, and it is a difficult matter to arrange satisfactorily, but the whole matter was discussed last year and embodied in legislation.

Mr. GILLIS: I agree with the minister that there have been difficulties in the past but I do not think there should be. The veterans were guaranteed certain preferences because of certain services and they should receive them. What I have in mind is this. A boy went overseas when he was twenty-two. He came back and wrote his civil service examination for a certain job and qualified from the academic point of view, but he is told by the civil service commission that, while he has qualified in that respect, he has not the experience. When will he acquire the experience, and how? I am not going to argue that with the minister, but I want to be sure that, by revoking these orders, we have not disturbed any of the anemic preferences which the veterans now have in the matter of employment.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am confident that they are not being disturbed. The matter was dealt with last year. Might we now deal with the two finance orders to which I have referred? Is it necessary to have a discussion on those?

Mr. TIMMINS: Could the minister go back to *Hansard* where he dealt with the matter and give us some assurance that everything the veteran had before in the way of preference has been preserved?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is not an issue here. These orders in council have already been revoked and legislation has taken their place. It is of no use whatever for us to discuss something that is not before the committee. The matter was before the house last session; the time for discussion was then, and I have no doubt it took place. Certainly my understanding was that none of the rights conferred by these orders in council was omitted when the legislation came before the house. But that is in the past; that is not now before the committee.

Mr. TIMMINS: In other words, the act which brought it into being took place almost simultaneously with the dropping of the orders last year.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. TIMMINS: I think that is right.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, it is right. Perhaps we could go on, if there is to be no discussion on the two small items to which I have referred, and deal with the Department of Labour items.

Mr. GILLIS: Would the minister give an explanation with regard to item 8042, the one dealing with coke made from coal. What are the implications of that?

Mr. ILSLEY: The order in council is set out in the office consolidation of last year. Certain coke is let in free of duty. It is found on page 15 of the office consolidation. There are a number of recitals, but it all comes to this:

His Excellency in Council . . . is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that, effective on and after September 15, 1942, imports of coke, made from coal, when imported to be used as a fuel for cooking or baking foods or for heating buildings or water be exempt from war exchange tax and accorded the tariff treatment hereunder indicated.

And it is made free, free, free. The effect of the order is that coke made from coal, when imported to be used as a fuel for cooking or baking foods, or heating buildings or water, is to be free of duty.

Mr. GILLIS: I know we cannot do very much about the matter, but certainly we do not agree with that. You are importing United States coal, processing it into coke, and admitting it into this country free, while we believe our own domestic coal should be used for that purpose. The money you are losing under the tariff could be very well invested in coking plants in certain parts of the country where we have a pretty bad employment problem.

Mr. MacNICOL: I want to ask a question in regard to P.C. 394 of January 20, 1942, relating to anthracite coal. Does this mean that anthracite coal is now coming in free, or will continue to come in free?

Mr. ILSLEY: That order in council has been revoked. It permitted the importation of anthracite free of duty in certain parts of Canada only. I am handicapped, because the Minister of Finance is not present; but I understand that as of some recent date, I think as a result of the Geneva trade agreements, anthracite coal is permitted free entry.

Mr. MacNICOL: Previously there was a duty of fifty cents a ton, was there not?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is that on or off?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is off.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): P.C. 8042, as I understand it, did not deal with the importa-
[Mr. Timmins.]

tion of coking coal, from which coke was made, but with the importation of coke itself which had been manufactured in the United States. I believe it was the import of the coke for these specific duties that was dealt with.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, it makes coke free when imported for these specific purposes.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): But not the coal from which coke is made.

Mr. ILSLEY: No; that is provided for otherwise.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): That was the question asked by the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. ILSLEY: I understood that he was talking about anthracite coal, from which you do not make coke.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have drawn up a review of the situation with regard to the Japanese, which I thought might save a good deal of time in answering questions; it will take only about five minutes.

I wish, at this time, to outline the reasons which led the government to ask for the continuation for another year of the orders providing for control over movement of persons of the Japanese race in Canada.

The evacuation of Japanese residents from the coastal defence area in British Columbia was carried out in the early part of 1942 as a defence measure following the declaration of war with Japan. There was general agreement at the time as to the advisability and necessity of this measure.

When, in August, 1944, the Prime Minister made a statement of this government's policy to encourage the relocation across Canada of the Japanese who had been moved out of the coastal area of British Columbia, all parties in this house were in support of this policy as being in the national interest and in the interests of the Japanese themselves. In a statement on the Japanese problem in January, 1947, the Prime Minister said that the government would deal fairly with the claims of Japanese who had claimed that their property in the coastal area had been disposed of by the custodian of enemy property at less than a fair price. I believe hon. members will agree that the policy of relocation has been carried out in a reasonable, fair and humane manner with very gratifying results to date. Moreover, a commission has been established to deal with property claims of Japanese.

In January, 1942, out of a total of 22,837 persons of the Japanese race in Canada, 21,975, or 96.2 per cent, were resident in

British Columbia. These were chiefly concentrated in the coastal area in or adjacent to Vancouver. Only 664 persons, or 2.6 per cent, were resident in the prairie provinces and 159 persons, or .7 per cent, resident in eastern Canada. Thirty-nine persons were resident in the Yukon and Northwest Territories. As a result of the relocation program carried out by the Department of Labour, the distribution of persons of the Japanese race in Canada, as of February 1, 1948, was as follows:

In British Columbia, there are 6,291 persons, or 30.3 per cent, of the total 20,788 persons of the Japanese race in Canada. This number are resident in widely scattered areas in the interior of British Columbia. In the prairie provinces there are 5,684 persons, or 27.3 per cent, of the total Japanese population. In eastern Canada there are 8,779 persons, or 42.2 per cent. There are thirty-four persons of the Japanese race in the Yukon and Northwest Territories. In addition, a total of 4,067 Japanese have been repatriated to Japan on a voluntary basis.

As will be noted from the above figures, the relocation program has provided a practical solution of the Japanese problem in British Columbia both from a national point of view as for the Japanese themselves. The Japanese who have relocated are in self-supporting employment in a wide range of occupations. They have been well received and are well regarded in the communities in which they have re-established themselves. The progress made reflects great credit on the Japanese themselves.

Of all the persons of the Japanese race who were moved in 1942 into the interior housing centres operated by the Department of Labour in the interior of British Columbia, there remains today only a group of between 500 and 600 persons residing at New Denver, British Columbia, who, because of age or infirmity, are incapable of employment. An agreement has been completed with the government of British Columbia for the province to take over the responsibilities of administration of welfare of this group at the end of the current fiscal year and a sharing of welfare and administrative costs. At the end of that time the financial responsibility of the dominion government will terminate. This agreement has been approved by order in council P.C. 958 of March 6, 1948.

Hon. members will recall that, at the time of the evacuation of the Japanese from the coastal area, a group of some three thousand moved into the sugar beet areas of southern Alberta under an agreement with the province of Alberta, which included a provision that

these Japanese were to be regarded as temporary residents of the province during the war period and would be removed at the termination of the war if the province so requested. The dominion also assumed certain financial responsibilities with respect to costs of maintenance and education of these Japanese. I am glad to be able to report that agreement has been reached with the province of Alberta in settlement of the obligations of the dominion under this agreement. By the new agreement the Japanese in the province are accorded full residence rights in the province from the first of April of this year. The dominion and the province will share equally for the next two years costs of maintenance and educational costs which have heretofore been the responsibility of the dominion, and at the end of the two-year period the dominion responsibilities will be at an end. This agreement has been approved by order in council P.C. 589 of February 17, 1948.

At the present time the only restrictions covering the movement of Japanese in Canada are those contained in an order made by the Minister of Labour under the provisions of order in council P.C. 946 of February 5, 1943, which prohibit persons of the Japanese race from entering British Columbia or entering or residing in the coastal area of British Columbia; that is to say, the area in British Columbia lying west of the Cascades mountains, except under permit obtained from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police acting on behalf of the minister. While this order, P.C. 946, originally gave the Minister of Labour wide authority over the movement and placement of persons of the Japanese race in Canada, by amending order in council P.C. 804 of March 2, 1948, this authority is now limited to the authority to make orders and regulations making entry into British Columbia or entry or residence in the coastal area of British Columbia subject to permit by or on behalf of the minister.

Moreover the amending order also provides that P.C. 946 is revoked effective April 1, 1949. Therefore, while the bill now before the house provides for the extension of the life of P.C. 946, as amended, for another year, there can be no further extension of this order beyond April 1, 1949, in any event.

The government is of the opinion that the control over movement of Japanese into British Columbia from other parts of Canada and into the coastal area from elsewhere in British Columbia should be retained for another year to afford additional time to ensure stability of resettlement elsewhere in Canada. While my

information is that the very great majority of persons of the Japanese race have no desire to return to the coastal area of British Columbia, nevertheless the precipitate return of even a limited number at this time would possibly resurrect racial issues and animosities which have existed over many years but which will, I firmly believe, fully disappear within a very few years. The immediate abandonment of all control measures is bound, in my opinion, to have an unsettling effect on a number of Japanese, particularly perhaps the older age groups who are still in the process of re-orienting and re-establishing themselves in other parts of Canada. While personally therefore, I should be very happy to drop all controls at the present time, I believe that it is in the national interest and in the interest of all persons of the Japanese race in Canada that present controls over entry into British Columbia and the coastal area thereof be continued for the current year.

The necessity or advisability of retaining these limited restrictions over movement is a matter of judgment and opinion. I submit, however, that in this the house should be guided by the judgment of those who have had the responsibility for administering the relocation program. The majority of members of this house have, in the main, supported the objective of the relocation program. I do not know how the relocation and placement program could have been carried out with any measure of success without the retention of controls over movement. Had these not been continued in effect, I am satisfied that today well over fifty per cent of the Japanese population in Canada would be back in the coastal area of British Columbia.

I say that time and the success of the relocation program carried out by this government have proven that our judgment in this matter has been right.

If I may say so, even the majority of Japanese themselves are, I believe, now of the opinion that the relocation program has been in their own interests, and I quote for the information of the house, in support of this view, and editorial appearing under date of December 20, 1947, in the Japanese-Canadian newspaper *The New Canadian* which has a very wide circulation among Japanese in Canada:

If a poll were taken among the Japanese Canadians across the country asking the question "Are you glad that the evacuation took place?" there is a strong possibility that the majority of them would answer in the affirmative.

The reason for this answer is obvious wherever Japanese Canadians have scattered. De-

[Mr. Mitchell.]

spite the losses sustained at the time of evacuation, many have been able to recuperate, and in the case of Niseis whose evacuation losses were relatively light, the balance sheet shows a decided gain.

The widespread bitterness at being forced out of their original homes has given place to more positive outlooks, and the struggles for readjustment in new places east of the Rockies are beginning to bear fruit.

But apart from material consideration, there has been definite improvement in other directions.

The geographic and economic horizons of the Japanese Canadians have been extended. Niseis are now bringing up their children in an environment different from the Pacific coast, in an atmosphere relatively free of racial animosity . . .

The evacuation experience has also given a deeper understanding to Japanese Canadians, and perhaps ironically, a deeper appreciation for democracy.

While *The New Canadian* has attacked repeatedly during the year the restrictions and injustices suffered by Japanese Canadians, the balance sheet at the end of 1947 shows many gains which should not be overlooked.

I submit, therefore, that, inasmuch as our judgment has proven sound in this matter up to the present, our judgment as to the advisability of retaining a limited measure of control for another year should receive the support of this house.

Mr. MacNICOL: Did the orders in council apply to Japanese born in Canada as well as to those born in Japan?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: From my observations in Ontario I can say that the Japanese who were moved here have been well received and, so far as I can ascertain, they are highly respected.

Mr. GILLIS: I notice in the office consolidation of the orders in council to which the minister referred that he omitted everything between pages 70 and 110. The minister dealt only with the Japanese question. Why has he not mentioned orders in council with regard to labour—and I have in mind P.C. 1003, as amended up to January 30, 1947—and other agreements with the provinces whereby labour relations boards operated under some regulations from the federal government. I notice that these orders are inoperative, so far as I can understand. The whole matter is back in the hands of the provinces, and we are still carrying on this federal legislation. What is the purpose of it?

Mr. MITCHELL: As my hon. friend knows, with the exception of P.C. 1003, they were all struck out, at the request of the provinces. That was done with the abolition of wage

controls and the assumption by the provinces of their jurisdiction in the matter. They have control over property and civil rights, which includes labour. If I remember correctly, that jurisdiction was returned to them about the middle of April or the beginning of May of last year.

Mr. THATCHER: Before discussion closes on the orders in council respecting the Japanese Canadians, I should like to make some comment. I was disappointed with the explanation the minister gave the committee as to why these regulations had to be continued. I do not think that, considered on most grounds, his reasons can be accepted as satisfactory. I believe the majority of Canadians who value freedom and our democratic institutions will be sorry to hear that the government has decided for another year to renew order in council P.C. 946.

Hon. members will recall that the original purpose of the order in council, as pointed out by the minister, was to allow the government to control people of Japanese origin during the war. I think no one would argue that during the war these controls were not necessary. But as we sit here this afternoon debating the subject we must remember that the war has been over for almost three years, and the original reason for the orders in council has, in my opinion, disappeared.

We are not threatened with a stab in the back from Japanese Canadians. We are not threatened by any fifth column today. Therefore I cannot see any logical reason why we should continue these orders in council. The minister has said that they will be discontinued a year from now. If it is good to discontinue them a year from now, why is it not good to discontinue them today?

I suggest that the committee should remember that the vast majority of those who are affected by these discriminatory orders in council are Canadians who were either born in Canada or naturalized here. In effect, today the government is asking us to deny them the privilege of Canadian citizenship for another year. I cannot understand the reason for doing that. It could not be because they were disloyal during the war, because not one was charged with disloyalty. No charges of disloyalty were even made against any Japanese Canadians. It cannot be because they were guilty of aggression. They were no more guilty of the aggression of the Japanese empire, than were other Canadians; if, indeed, they were as much.

As I said a minute ago, the reason for putting these orders in council on in 1943 does not hold water today. To boil it down,

there is only one reason why these orders in council are brought up again today, and that is solely a reason having to do with intolerance and racial discrimination. These people have committed no crime. They have not been charged with any crime. They are denied the privileges of Canadian citizenship solely because their skins are yellow. Whether the minister admits it or not, I suggest that that is the fact.

I am particularly interested in these Canadians of Japanese origin because several hundreds of them were sent out to my own constituency two years ago. They were lodged in some old airport buildings. They did not want to go there, but they were put there by the government. After they had lived in these premises for about a year, the minister's department decided they should go somewhere else. The labour authorities told them to go into the bush to find some work, to go out to some farm, or elsewhere. They tried to force them to leave Moose Jaw, but they would not let them go back to their homes in British Columbia.

Several of the men who were living in that camp served with the Canadian army in the first great war, one of them having been wounded at Vimy Ridge. When this war broke out he was interned, his property was confiscated or sold on him, and then, after the war, he was put in the camp at Moose Jaw.

The authorities have been able to force these people one by one to leave the camp against their will, until today there are only a couple of dozen left. It may be that they are not co-operative; I do not know, but I think the government officials have been using methods to get these people to leave against their will, methods which are almost akin to those that would be used in a police state.

I have a letter from one of the inmates in that camp which was written to me about three weeks ago and from which I should like to read two or three paragraphs to show the minister just what has been done by the R.C.M.P., and some of his departmental officials. It reads:

On February 10, at nine o'clock in the morning the electricity was discontinued. Around eleven o'clock the water was also discontinued.

The officials were trying to force these people to move out of the barracks into which they had been put. The letter continues:

Near twelve o'clock the official in charge with the help of the R.C.M.P. came and carried away all government blankets and mattresses. Under the circumstances there was nothing we could do except to buy an oil burner to keep us going for an indefinite time.

I might say that we have pretty cold winters in Moose Jaw. The letter continues:

In the evening a group of mounties with the camp officials came in and saw us using the oil burner and they took it outside and destroyed it.

I am going to skip certain parts of this letter because they are so bad that I do not think they could be true.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think the last statement of my hon. friend is true either.

Mr. THATCHER: That may be so; I am prepared to admit that. The letter goes on:

We spent the whole of Saturday night with only a candle for warmth with 17° below temperature.

I do not know whether that letter is absolutely according to the facts because I have not had time to check it, but it is a letter which one of the inmates wrote to me and which has been verified by several others of the inmates of that camp. I think I would agree with the official in charge that the few who remained probably have not been co-operative, but they have had possibly many reasons for not being co-operative.

Mr. MITCHELL: On a point of order, unless my hon. friend is prepared to table the letter I do not think it has any value at all.

Mr. THATCHER: I am quite prepared to table it, but I do not want the R.C.M.P. going in there—

Mr. MITCHELL: Just one minute; just go a little easy on that. I will deal with it when it comes my turn to speak. Unless my hon. friend is prepared to table the letter it has no value whatever, and when I say, table it, I mean to give the name of the writer.

Mr. THATCHER: Would the minister be satisfied if I showed him the letter and did not put it on *Hansard*?

Mr. MITCHELL: If my hon. friend stands up in this assembly where he has absolute freedom, where he can say anything he wants to—

Mr. PROBE: The Japs have not.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just a minute. I asked the hon. member for Regina City just to keep quiet for a few minutes. I do not think the letter is worth the paper it is written on unless it is placed on the record with the name of the person who supplied the information.

Mr. THATCHER: Will the minister undertake that there will be no reprisal against the writer? If so, I shall be happy to table the

[Mr. Thatcher.]

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the Minister of Labour indicate the standing order upon which he relies? This matter has come up in the house a number of times. I recall quite vividly one occasion during the last parliament when the former member for York South was called upon by a minister to table a letter of this nature, and later the Clerk of the House returned the letter to the member saying that it was not a public letter, that it was merely a letter to a private member of the house and it was not in order to ask that it be tabled.

Mr. MITCHELL: Let us put it on the basis of honesty and decency, and when I say that I am casting no reflection on any hon. member.

Mr. PROBE: Be careful.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not need to be careful.

Mr. THATCHER: Is the minister doubting my word?

Mr. MITCHELL: I said that I was not casting any reflection upon any hon. member. The hon. member was casting reflections upon the police, perhaps inadvertently. It is easy to attack a person in this house or to cast reflections upon someone who cannot defend himself. I think we should consider this on a practical basis. I am not going to get into an argument on the rules of this house in order to satisfy the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I am simply working on the basis of common sense. Perhaps I had better read citation 316, which is as follows:

It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the house, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda.

Mr. KNOWLES: There you are; the words are coming right out of your own mouth.

Mr. MacNICOL: You have to take it back.

Mr. MITCHELL: No, I will not. I will go back another chapter although I think it is a complete waste of time.

Mr. THATCHER: May I proceed?

Mr. MITCHELL: Just a minute; you asked for this and you are going to get it. I will read what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is speaking of. It reads:

On the 18th of May, 1865, the attorney general, on being asked by Mr. Ferrard if he would lay upon the table a written statement and a letter to which he had referred on a previous day, in assuming a question relative to the Leeds bankruptcy court, replied that he had made a

statement to the house upon his own responsibility, and that the documents he had referred to being private, he could not lay them upon the table. Lord Robert Cecil contended that the papers, having been cited, should be produced—

Mr. KNOWLES: Go on.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am not like my hon. friend; I will read everything.

Mr. KNOWLES: But you stopped.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend is looking at himself in a mirror.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: That is an insult.

Mr. MITCHELL: It might be as far as my good friend who has just spoken is concerned.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: The sermon from the mount.

Mr. MITCHELL: It concludes:

—but the Speaker declared that this rule applied to public documents only.

Mr. THATCHER: I should like to finish my few remarks.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. THATCHER: When are you going to get to it?

Mr. MITCHELL: Citation 306 reads:

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the house and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the house.

There you are; you can take it whichever way you like. You have to take the responsibility.

Mr. MacNICOL: He does not have to table the letter.

Mr. JAMES: I do not pretend to have any expert knowledge of the rules of procedure, but I definitely remember that some years ago a member of this group read a letter and when he was required to give the writer's name it was decided that the contents of the letter should be stricken from the record. I forget the year, but it was before the war.

Mr. THATCHER: The minister said that I made allegations against the R.C.M.P., but he misunderstood me. All I am saying is that I received this letter from a person in my constituency. I hope the letter is not true, but I am afraid it is. I think the minister should at least investigate, because if the charges which this Canadian of Japanese origin makes are authentic, it is a reflection on Canadian justice. I do not say that I corroborate these

charges. I simply say that we might expect things of that kind in a police state but not in Canada.

This afternoon we are being asked to extend for another year this measure, one under which a Canadian minority is being denied its freedom, whether we like to admit that or not. A few weeks ago parliament set up a committee to bring in legislation to guard the rights and freedom of Canadians, and it seems to me that we are being a little hypocritical, if we bring down legislation just two weeks later denying these rights to certain Canadians. It just does not make sense. I remind the committee of the words of the Prime Minister who, on August 4, 1944, said at page 5917 of *Hansard*:

We must not permit in Canada the hateful doctrine of racialism which is the basis of the nazi system everywhere.

As I said a year ago, this order is based on racial animosity and discrimination. I therefore move in amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Wood Mountain:

That the following words be added after the word "period" in line sixteen: provided, however, that order in council P.C. 946 of May 2, 1943, shall not continue or be in force on or after April 1, 1948.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think the amendment is in order. While discussion has been permitted on certain features of orders and regulations, we are dealing with the one clause now before the committee.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, just consider the situation here. The government is asking the House of Commons to amend a section of the act which causes the act to expire on March 31, 1948. In effect, the government is asking the House of Commons to continue certain orders in council which have been passed under the act until such time as they are revoked, but in any event until about a year from now. There must in fairness be some machinery by which the House of Commons can give partial assent to that proposition which has been put forward by the government. I think that is essential. I do not think I could come before the house and ask it to swallow it whole, all or nothing, so to speak. I did not ask the house to do that last year and I am not asking it to do it today. Whether it could be done by proviso, as the hon. member has proposed, or by a separate clause, I do not care; but I feel that the house should be given an opportunity of moving an amendment one way or the other, and if you, Mr. Chairman, would indicate the way you think would be more

appropriate I am quite agreeable to either way. But I would be very unhappy if we got ourselves into such a position that no amendments at all could be proposed.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think the chairman should decide which method should be adopted; it should be by agreement of the committee as a whole.

Mr. CROLL: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this bill one can say for it that at long last the end of official discrimination against the Japanese in Canada is in sight. This bill, tardy and ungenerous though it is, at least draws the line of April 1, 1949, and no farther. I hope it marks the close of a chapter in Canadian history that we shall not be very proud to print in our school books.

I am not going to say very much today by way of valedictory. I spoke and used whatever influence I had against the government's action against Japanese of Canadian citizenship, but the government persisted in its view, although whatever justification there may have been for it came to an end at least two and a half years ago with the end of the war.

I can only say this. As one who was highly privileged to serve my country during the war I hang my head in shame before my comrades in arms of Japanese ancestry. As a member of this house I can neither forgive nor justify the wrong that has been done to a blameless people. As a firm believer in democracy I must say that I think we betrayed the fundamental principle of democracy which I consider to be equality. As a human being I say that we have committed an offence in passing judgment on our fellow men solely on the basis of blood and race. As a member of a minority race I say to the minority people, be ever on your guard.

In Canada there is no room for the doctrine of white supremacy, nor is there any room for second-class citizenship. I only hope that my country will never again put me in the position where I have to stammer forth some sort of explanation or apology for the action which the government has taken. Our treatment of Canadians of Japanese ancestry was in my opinion wrong in principle and demeaning in its application both to the Japanese and to ourselves.

It is my sincere hope that Canada will never again be guilty of official discrimination against any race or creed. Liberty is indivisible. It seems to me that if the humblest citizen of Canada is not free there is no freedom in this country for any of us.

I said that I was not going to say much about the bill. To all that is contained in [Mr. Ilsley.]

this bill I say good-bye and good riddance. I hope we shall never see the like of it again.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member for Moose Jaw spoke of the situation in his city. I have an intimate knowledge of it. It was used as a redistribution centre for the allocation of Japanese across the country. It is the only camp where we had any trouble.

Mr. MacNICOL: Which camp is that?

Mr. MITCHELL: It is the one outside Moose Jaw. Forty-five people still remain in it. What we wanted to do was to consolidate them all in one building, and they would not go in the one building. That is the information I have. All during the period when there was a great demand for manpower in this country there was never any effort on the part of the individuals concerned to move into the life of Canada in the areas where they were permitted to do so at the time. Whether you fought in the first great war or in the second great war, when you have a battle between two ways of life raging steadily in Europe and also in the orient there is an obligation on everyone. Let it stand on its own feet.

My hon. friend talked about a police state. We hear a lot about the police state, from people who do not know what a police state is. They are using the jargon of certain ideologies that some people follow in Europe. I am not suggesting that my hon. friend is doing that. I do not think it is in the best interest of this country to use that language. I would rather use Canadian expressions.

Let me say this to my hon. friend, the member for Spadina. I hope the committee will forgive me if I say in a personal way that I served my country as he did himself. I know something about the movement that takes place in affected countries under the stress of war. We did the same as they did in the United States. For reasons best known to themselves and for reasons obvious to us, they found it necessary to move these people in 1942 from the Pacific coast. That was undertaken, and I defy contradiction in what I am about to say. I do not hang my head in shame at the approach we made to the orderly movement of these people. I know of no other nation on earth that would have provided the facilities for the Japanese, not only those who wanted to stay in Canada, but also those who wanted to go back to Japan even before the war was over, that we did. I like to hear some of these purists talk, but one cannot always be a purist in the light of practical considerations, when the life of a nation is at stake.

The first obligation of a government, and the first obligation of this parliament, over and above every other obligation, is the safety of the state. If that was necessary in 1942—

Mr. THATCHER: Admitted.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend admits it.

Mr. THATCHER: But not today.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend says, "not today". If I might say this to the hon. member for Moose Jaw, I would rather take the word—

Mr. REID: He is not in a position to know.

Mr. MITCHELL: —of the Japanese themselves, or the Japanese organ which reflects the opinion of the Japanese in this country than that of the hon. member for Moose Jaw.

Mr. REID: He has not enough of them to know.

Mr. THATCHER: I have quite a few.

Mr. REID: You have not enough experience with them yet.

Mr. MITCHELL: I would rather take their opinion than my hon. friend's opinion. It is easy to make the statements that the hon. member for Spadina made when you are not charged with the responsibility that this government was charged with in 1942 and since.

It is true that at the conclusion of the war the United States authorities said to these people, "You are on your way; you can go where you like". We believed, rightly or wrongly, and history will show whether we are right or wrong—at least at the moment the Japanese think we were right—in the policy of relocation across this dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It was a man-size job. Hon. members will realize that when I tell them we spent a million and a half dollars in sending the Japanese back to Japan. I should like to know of any other nation that would have given these people who wanted to go back to Japan what we gave them. We gave them their transportation; we gave every adult \$250 when he landed and \$50 for every child in the family. I should like to know of any other country in the history of the migrations of people of that character who ever did a thing of that kind. Do not forget this, that under the stress of that time, in the midst of a war where freedom might have disappeared from the scene, desperate remedies were called for, especially after Pearl Harbor. You could not talk about it in public in this country or in any other country in which a free press existed at that time. It was necessary, and the responsibility of the government, to take adequate measures in their own interests. I remember flying

across this country and asking some of my friends if they would take these people away from the west coast and allow them to settle in their own provinces. Obviously, for reasons best known to themselves, they said no. We did make agreements with Alberta and, if my memory serves me rightly, with one or two of the other provinces, but particularly with Alberta. The chairman of the British Columbia security commission made an agreement that the Japanese would be removed from that province at the conclusion of the war. Let me say, to the credit of the government of Alberta, that the recent agreement consummated by myself and officers of my department permits the Japanese in Alberta to retain full civil rights on April 1 of this year. In the last few days we have made an agreement with British Columbia for the maintenance of the older people and the indigent people in New Denver, British Columbia. It will be required to make arrangements with other provinces where this problem exists. As my hon. friend knows, these things are not done overnight. I am happy to state that, in conformity with the order in council passed a few days ago, the Japanese will be permitted to move anywhere in the Dominion of Canada outside British Columbia.

I do not believe there is any other way in which we could have done it, Mr. Chairman. In my judgment it is all a question of timing, not a question of slogans. I was recently in the city of Montreal where I met a Japanese father of eight children. He said he liked living in Montreal better than Vancouver. He did not say anything about Moose Jaw.

Mr. THATCHER: He did not have the chance, I imagine.

Mr. CLAXTON: He had pretty fair judgment, of course.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes. There are more Japanese in Ontario today than there are in British Columbia.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend says, "hear, hear". I think there is some achievement. If we had listened to the pros and cons during the relocation of these people; if we did not maintain a steady course; if we had become hysterical, which it is quite easy to do when you have no responsibility—

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I thought that was what made you hysterical.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know; I have been tempted to get that way myself during the last five or six years. I think history will record—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL: There is one thing about it, you have to have a sense of humour. I will put this proposition forward. History will record that, in the light of the desperate situation that existed in this country in 1942, the policy of relocation of the people of the Japanese race was carried out in a humane way. It was in the best interest of the country. There was no breakdown of law and order and it was in the interests of the Japanese themselves. They will thank this parliament for the policies which were set in motion.

Mr. THATCHER: If I understood the minister correctly, he said that the official organ of the Japanese Canadians favoured the continuation of this legislation.

Mr. MITCHELL: I read that article. I will read it again if you wish.

Mr. THATCHER: Just tell me, do they favour it?

Mr. MITCHELL: They said in effect—

Mr. KNOWLES: Will you table the article?

Mr. MITCHELL: No. I read it into the record and gave the source. What they suggested was in effect that, while it was looked upon as not in their best interests originally, they would regard it now as being in the best interests of people of Japanese origin in this country; that is, the relocation.

Mr. THATCHER: But they do not favour the continuation of this legislation at this time. Is that not correct?

Mr. MITCHELL: I believe my hon. friend was upstairs getting his notes when I made the statement.

Mr. THATCHER: No; I have been here all the time. The question is a simple one.

Mr. MITCHELL: They never expressed an opinion.

Mr. MacINNIS: As the Minister of Labour has said, I do not believe that we can deal with this question by just reiterating slogans, of which, may I say, he seems to be a past master. We can only deal properly with it if we try to understand the circumstances under which these people were removed from their homes on the Pacific coast and scattered across Canada. Remember, no crimes were charged against these people, and none of them were convicted of crimes.

Mr. WARREN: What would you have done?

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Mr. MacINNIS: If my wise friend up in the corner will tell us what he is going to do, if he keeps quiet, I will tell him what I should like to see done.

Mr. WARREN: I think the government did a fine job.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is my hon. friend's opinion and I suppose if he did not think so he would not get the nomination at the next election or, if he did get it, he would not have his expenses paid.

Mr. WARREN: Never mind my expenses.

Mr. MacINNIS: The Minister of Labour said that we did the same as the Americans did. True, we did the same as the Americans did up to a point; and at that point we continued our restrictions and discriminations against people who, as I said before, were not charged with any crime and had not committed any. These people were moved from the Pacific coast for military precautionary reasons. Their property was confiscated, and I shall have something to say about that before I sit down. In some cases they have lost the labour of a lifetime in becoming settled in other parts of the country. That they have accepted in good part what has happened to them is to their credit. They have accepted it. The Minister of Labour said that we were fighting for our way of life. He said there were two ways of life and we were fighting on one side while other people were on the other. But as far as these people of Japanese origin were concerned, they felt here the kind of life we were fighting against in other parts of the world. That is what I object to in the government's policy in this matter.

I congratulated the Minister of Labour on a number of occasions on the job that his department did in the evacuation of these people. There is no reason why there should be any quibbling about that. I am not finding fault with that, but I am certainly justified in finding fault with the government where I believe the government is in the wrong, and that is the only point I wish to discuss.

The point has been made that these orders in council are to come to an end on a date certain, April 1, 1949, and, that being the case, we should be satisfied. But suppose the Minister of Labour were in a position where he was told that he could not go to the city of Montreal for a year without a police permit. How would he like it? To say that it is only for a year is beside the point. As far as Montreal is concerned, I would not be surprised if he said, "I don't mind". But if he wanted to go to Vancouver he would say, "I

want to go to Vancouver today without a police permit and I want to do so as a Canadian citizen; I do not see why I should wait until the first day of April, 1949". That is the situation.

There is an assumption—I do not know how it has been put over to the government—that there is tremendous race prejudice in British Columbia against the Japanese. That is not the case, as the government of British Columbia found out within the last few weeks. Mr. Chairman, I think it is six o'clock.

Mr. SKEY: Could the Minister of Justice tell us under what regulations we deal with rent controls, and approximately when we shall deal with them?

Mr. LISLEY: The hon. member will find it on page 2152.

Mr. SKEY: Can the minister tell me when it will come up?

Mr. LISLEY: When we get through with this we shall take it up. I expect so.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at six o'clock I was just beginning a few remarks I want to make in regard to certain of the orders in council attached to this bill, affecting persons of Japanese origin in Canada. I mentioned that some people were under the impression that there was intense feeling in British Columbia against persons of the Japanese race. As a matter of fact the government of the province thought that was the case and recently, with a couple of by-elections coming up, they thought they could raise the same old race issue. So they evoked a regulation in regard to persons of asiatic origin working on crown timber leases, which had been in abeyance I think since 1942. However, I am glad to say they found immediately they had made a mistake, because it brought protests from one end of British Columbia to the other. For the first time since the evacuation from the Pacific coast, all the daily newspapers in Vancouver were as one on this question; and I am going to take a few minutes of the time of the committee to read from the editorials that appeared. Before doing so, however, may I say that so strong was the protest against the action of the government that the government rescinded it and referred the matter to the

legislature for a decision. I should like to warn this government that unless they are careful they will find themselves further behind than the government of British Columbia in this matter.

Here is an editorial from the morning newspaper, the *Vancouver News-Herald*, entitled "B.C. takes another crack at the Japs." I shall read extracts from it:

This cruel and arbitrary act shows that the mentality which persists in persecuting these people is still very much alive in the government of this province—even in high places.

The regulation the government of British Columbia put into effect prevented certain people of the Japanese race from working on crown timber limits in that province. If it is cruelty and persecution to prevent these people from working in lumber camps in order to make their living, what can you call an order that prevents them moving from one place to another in British Columbia, or from other provinces to British Columbia? It is persecution, no matter which way you take it.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Call in the hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. MacINNIS: If the hon. member is interested in calling in the hon. member for Skeena he may do so. I am speaking now for myself. If any hon. members, even those behind me, or anywhere else do not agree with me, it does not make the slightest bit of difference as far as I am concerned. I would, of course, regret it as far as the cause in which I am interested goes, but it does not matter a bit who may or may not support me. I quote again:

Now the federal wartime order has ended, and the provincial government has lost no time in restoring the thirty-five year old discriminatory ruling. It has destroyed the living of these people, many of them Canadian-born or naturalized, who had found a useful, peaceful occupation in an industry where manpower is urgently needed. Many of them had been previously evicted from their homes by the wartime ruling barring them from the coastal area.

There seems to be no let-up to the persecution of these people who, as I have mentioned time and again, have committed no crime and have been charged with no crime, merely because of the accident of birth. I quote again from the same editorial:

Insistence on the part of politicians with their eye on an election, in persecuting—

Note that word again.

—fellow citizens of Japanese race has already given British Columbia a bad name wherever human rights are respected. The contrast between British Columbia and the state of Wash-

ington in the post-war treatment of citizens of Japanese race is a travesty on vaunted British justice and fair play.

I should like the Minister of Labour to take note of that. I have often heard him say in this house, with great gusto, that the Englishman's home is his castle. If that be true, these Canadian citizens of the Japanese race did not find much security in their castles in British Columbia. I have another editorial from one of the evening papers, the *Vancouver Sun*, which I believe is a Liberal paper—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Hear, hear.

Mr. MacINNIS: As far as I know, this is the first time the *Vancouver Sun* has criticized government policy, either provincial or federal, in regard to their treatment of persons of Japanese origin. The heading of the editorial is significant; it reads, "These Japanese are ours." Well, if they are ours we certainly do not show it. The extension of these orders in council for another year beyond what is necessary—and let me say that last year they went a year beyond what was necessary—does not show that we have much regard for our own. Let me read a few extracts from this editorial:

British Columbia has long since outgrown the kind of racism of which this order appears to be a reflection. C. D. Orchard, deputy minister of forests, cannot shrug it off by saying that "it has been done for fifty or sixty years." So what? This is 1948. Conditions which promoted racial antagonism have changed since Pearl Harbor.

Evidently they have not changed for many people in the Canadian cabinet. I shall have something more to say about that before I have finished.

Then it goes on:

Probably some of them will even return to Vancouver—

That is referring to the Japanese.

—when the coastal security zone is abolished. Their reception may be warmer than their welcome in certain quarters, but British Columbia must be fair. British Columbians have asked other provinces to absorb a proportionate share and British Columbia must retain its quota.

To deny them the right to work in the woods, which they obtained by federal wartime regulation, is a piece of needless aggravation. That merely cuts their new roots and induces them to drift back into their former haunts and habits.

Let me say again that to refuse them the right as Canadian citizens to travel anywhere in Canada is a needless aggravation.

Then I come to the third Vancouver paper, the *Vancouver Daily Province*. Let me say this for the *Vancouver Daily Province*, that while it supports the Progressive Conservative party—although I do not think it says it is a

[Mr. MacInnis.]

Progressive Conservative paper—I must say for it that, in my opinion, it has always taken a decent stand in this matter, from beginning.

The *Toronto Daily Star* in an editorial on February 5, 1948, quotes with approval, in an editorial on this subject, the following from the *Vancouver Daily Province*:

The policy the government now re inaugurates—

That is, the provincial government of British Columbia.

—is not a respectable policy, since it is based on racial and economic prejudice, and it is a dangerous policy since it violates one of the fundamental rights of a Canadian citizen—the right to earn a living in whatever occupation may seem desirable to the citizen himself.

The other day I heard some hon. members over here to my right make a great to-do about the effect of the placement orders in council passed by the British government, wherein a person would have to take essential service if so required. I hope they will express their fervour for freedom which they expressed at that time, when this amendment comes to a vote. I hope they will realize that in this country we have Canadian citizens who, according to the last statement I have had from the Minister of Labour cannot move for more than fifty miles in British Columbia without a permit from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Perhaps that is not the situation today; but if it is not, I should like to know.

I quote again from the *Daily Province*, as it has been quoted by the *Toronto Daily Star*:

This British Columbia policy violates the principle of equality which the citizenship act seeks to establish. How can that be tolerated by a people proud and jealous of their liberties? It is always dangerous to permit fundamental rights to be violated without challenge, or minorities to be pushed about.

I should be very much surprised if the Minister of Justice feels easy in his mind about the extension of this order for another year. I should be very much surprised if the Minister of National Health and Welfare felt easy in his mind when he had to give approval to this provision—because I imagine it came before council. I do not see the Minister of National Defence in his seat at the moment; but certainly I cannot understand his giving it approval; that is if the words of these ministers in the past are any indication of an inner sense of right and justice.

Mr. KNOWLES: Do not forget the Prime Minister.

Mr. MacINNIS: Well I can forgive the Prime Minister because he is a very busy man and perhaps has not the time to give to

these matters that they should have. I cannot understand the newcomer to the cabinet, the Minister of Veterans Affairs, agreeing to a proposal of this kind; nor can I understand the Secretary of State for External Affairs, doing so. I say I cannot understand them, that is, if one is to place any value on their statements of their high regard for liberty, equality and freedom. Their acceptance of this is not understandable.

Let me now quote from a *Vancouver Daily Province* editorial direct. The editorial is entitled: "A Rule to Make Canadians Blush." It reads:

The circumstance that this right and certain others were interfered with during the war is beside the point.

I would ask the committee to keep that in mind.

The war created an emergency, the nation's existence was deemed to be in danger and emergency measures were taken to protect it. There is no national emergency now, and no justification for the violation of fundamental rights.

That is the issue, the only issue, before this committee. Are we to violate fundamental human rights of Canadian citizens simply on the score that they happen to be of a certain racial origin? Every other consideration has been swept aside. No one can say there is any more danger of an exodus to the coast at the end of March, 1948, than there would be at the end of March, 1949. There is no reason behind those things. Let me say again that the only question at issue is whether this Canadian House of Commons will protect the fundamental human rights of Canadian citizens, regardless of their racial origin or the colour of their skin.

To continue from the *Daily Province*:

It creates a lower type of citizen—one lacking in certain privileges enjoyed by others. How can that be tolerated by a people proud and jealous of their liberties?

If we are proud and jealous of our liberties, this is the time to act; not when someone of the Anglo-Saxon race has his liberties curtailed. That may be too late. Probably by that time we shall become accustomed to abridging people's liberties. This is the time to act, when people who are in a minority—an insignificant minority at that—find their liberties in jeopardy.

Then the editorial continues:

We are proud in Canada of our free institutions and—

I want the Minister of Justice to listen to this.

We are proud in Canada of our free institutions and the even-handed justice which, we boast, prevails.

We cannot boast that that even-handed justice prevails if we allow this discrimination to be carried out. The editorial continues:

How much justice has there been in our treatment of the Japanese minorities since 1941?

And let me quote again—I believe I have already quoted it:

It is always dangerous to permit fundamental rights to be violated without challenge or minorities to be pushed about. Small liberties, experience has shown, are the important ones. Where they are stamped out, it is easy for the larger ones to be destroyed.

I am quoting this because it relates to the action of the provincial government. But in this instance it applies just as clearly and for the same purpose as it applied in connection with what the government of British Columbia attempted to put over.

I shall quote briefly from a *Toronto Daily Star* editorial of February 5, 1948, as follows:

Public opinion in British Columbia appears to be mounting against the government's racial policy. Among the protest meetings was one attended by 700 students, held at the university of British Columbia. A resolution was unanimously adopted demanding enfranchisement, freedom of movement and equal employment opportunities for Japanese in the province, as well as the repeal of the forty-year-old crown lands order against them.

The *Winnipeg Free Press*, another paper which has consistently taken a fair and decent attitude in this matter, says:

But voluntary dispersal is a very different thing from a government regulation which says that any Canadian cannot live in a certain part of the country. If this precedent is once established for one minority it can be applied to any minority in a nation of minorities. It can be used to destroy the most basic rights of all citizens.

On February 10, 1947, I asked the following question of the Minister of Labour:

Which of the restrictions on the movement and actions imposed on and after the evacuation from the Pacific coast defence zone still apply to Canadian citizens of Japanese racial origin?

The minister's answer was as follows: All restrictions have been revoked except the following which are still applicable to persons of Japanese race in Canada:

(a) The prohibition of issue of fishing licences to persons of Japanese origin contained in order in council P.C. 251 of January 13, 1942.

(b) The prohibition of movement by persons of Japanese origin in Canada without a permit from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police only in the following cases: (i) change of residence; (ii) entry into the coastal restricted area of British Columbia; (iii) travel for more than 50 miles in British Columbia.

I understand that in the Soviet Union a person cannot travel fifty miles without get-

ting a permit. I am sorry the Minister of Labour is progressing so far in the same direction.

Mr. MITCHELL: You cannot travel a mile there. The hon. member knows that you cannot go across the street.

Mr. MacINNIS: I could not get in there at all.

Mr. MITCHELL: You made a good try though.

Mr. MacINNIS: Then the next provision: (iv) Travel across a provincial boundary. Except for (ii), these remaining restrictions on movement are not applicable—

I want the veterans in this house to note this.

—to discharged members of the armed forces who are of Japanese origin.

That is, if you are of Japanese origin and served in the armed forces the restrictions that I mentioned do not apply, with the exception of entry into the coastal restricted area of British Columbia. I imagine that these men, to the extent that they had the opportunity, were fighting for that part of Canada as well as for other parts. We have a special committee of the house now looking into veterans affairs. Ever since the session began, we have heard from day to day condemnation of the government for its refusal to deal fairly with the veterans of the last war and of world war I. But here we have veterans who are refused the right to travel freely in the Dominion of Canada.

When I was home in December just before the house opened a man from the Fraser Valley district came to see me. He wanted to buy a piece of land which was owned by a Canadian of Japanese origin who had been removed during the period of evacuation. This young fellow eventually found his way into the army. The land had been taken over by the custodian of enemy alien property and had been sold to the administrators of the Veterans Land Act, but it had not been disposed of by them. I have the following report from the Secretary of State, to whom I wrote about it:

A report on our file indicates that this property comprised 6.67 acres all overgrown and bush except for eight fruit trees and on which there existed a one-storey house, sixteen by twenty—

I am not sure if the one-storey house existed on the fruit trees.

—containing three rooms unoccupied—

[Mr. MacInnis.]

No wonder they were not occupied when they took the owner away.

—and that this building and also a woodshed and garage were all in very poor condition. The value for assessment was \$500—and the annual taxes \$8.13.

They offered him \$180, and then when his land which had been compulsorily taken from him, they charged him with the legal expenses of making the transfer. The details were:

Taxes	\$ 9.34
Legal expenses	15.00
Certificate of encumbrance	1.00
Registration	3.00

Total \$28.34

and there remains a net credit in this account of \$251.66. This amount is available to Suzuki at any time.

The man who came to see me was anxious to get the property. He was willing to pay Suzuki as much as \$1,200 for it. He told me that was not all the property was worth and that if he was compelled to do so, he would go higher.

Mr. REID: Is that property in Surrey?

Mr. MacINNIS: I have the legal description of it. I think the gentleman who came to see me also saw the hon. member for New Westminster. I bring this matter to the attention of the House of Commons to show that we have two standards for veterans in this country, one standard for veterans of Japanese origin and another standard for other veterans. Citizenship on that basis cannot exist. Before hon. members let this thing go by, I ask them to realize that this is not an insignificant thing. A human being is a pretty peculiar mechanism. You cannot do anything which does not affect you either for good or for ill. If you do something today that you feel is not justified, that you find is in conflict with your conscience, you will be a worse person tomorrow for doing it. On the other hand, if you do a thing because you think you are right, then you will be a better person tomorrow because you did that today. I urge you not to let this thing go just because the freedom of only a few "Japanese" is at issue. It may be somebody else tomorrow, and tomorrow will be too late to rectify the mistakes of today.

The Minister of Labour said this afternoon that the Japanese Canadians themselves were not opposing this extension, if I understood him correctly.

Mr. MITCHELL: No, I did not say that.

Mr. MacINNIS: In any event, what he had in mind was, I think, and I agree with him,

MARCH 15, 1948

that they were satisfied that the evacuation had served a good end. I think that puts the matter straight. But the official organ of the Canadian Japanese, *The New Canadian*, makes it quite clear that the Japanese themselves are opposed to the extension of these orders. As a matter of fact I met their representative here last week. He interviewed some of the members. May I add that he was a returned man, but before he could go to British Columbia on business he had to get a permit from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that his time is up.

Mr. MacINNIS: If I may just conclude, Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the committee, I should like to quote from this editorial in *The New Canadian*:

Parliament will shortly be asked to review two anachronistic orders in council. One denies Japanese Canadians the right to live where they please in Canada; the other denies them the right to engage in fishing.

The orders were passed during the war and kept alive through the exercise of special emergency powers of the government. These emergency powers are due to expire on March 31, and the restrictive orders will lapse too unless they are continued by the parliament through special legislation.

It continues:

We wish to bring to the attention of the government sound arguments why the restrictions should go:

1. The restrictions are fundamentally wrong. They have long outlived the original emergency purposes for which they were intended. Mr. H. F. Angus, a well-known political scientist and former government adviser, has denounced the orders as "an abuse of constitutional powers."

2. The government has sacrificed principle to expediency in attempting to make the dispersal of the evacuees stick by maintaining the restrictions longer than warranted by the original emergency. Now, even this questionable sacrifice has no point. The dispersal has been achieved, and we cannot visualize a large-scale return to the coast six years after the evacuation.

Those are two reasons they give, and I think they are valid reasons. There are many more, but I shall not detain the committee further. In taking my seat I would urge the committee to right this wrong while we have the time.

Mr. MITCHELL: Let me say to the credit of my hon. friend the member for Vancouver East that right down through the years he has always been consistent on this question of Canadians of the Japanese race. May I say in reply to him that if I had to do this thing over again, in the light of all the circum-

stances, I would do exactly what I was charged with the responsibility of doing.

My hon. friend says there is no intense feeling on this question in British Columbia. At least there are mixed feelings; and if the bars had been let down when the war with Japan was over and there had been an influx of these people into British Columbia and Vancouver particularly, at a time when the men were returning from overseas and when housing was short not only in Canada but in every other country that had been engaged in the conflict, I shudder to think of what might have happened. The government had to take the responsibility, and you cannot laugh that off by slogans which appeal to the mob. I am not suggesting that this evening my hon. friend was making slogans which appeal to the mob, but I say that we had to take the responsibility.

My hon. friend also spoke of property rights. I always thought human rights took precedence over property rights.

Mr. MacINNIS: I did not say they did not.

Mr. MITCHELL: I did not interrupt my hon. friend and perhaps he will allow me to develop my argument. I have a vivid recollection of meeting representative people in British Columbia at that time, and having some inside knowledge of the conditions and of the possibility of the destruction of our way of life, I had to say this to them: "I do not know whether you know it or not but you are probably living in the eventide of civilization." In any great war it is unfortunate but true that a loss of property rights is inevitable. Consider the question for a moment on another level. Take the people engaged in the retail motor industry and in the service trades. Their savings and investments went in just the same way as those of the people for whom my hon. friend speaks. That is one of the unfortunate things about war. But first consideration must be given to those who gave human life itself so that this parliament could be sitting here at this moment.

My hon. friend speaks of the accident of birth and says that I have often spoke of an Englishman's home being his castle. I still believe that, but if it had not been for some people with courage and determination in this world during those dark days of the war the Englishman today would not have a home or a castle. If I speak vigorously, my hon. friend will forgive me because he and I were brought up in the same school.

My hon. friend says that these Japanese are denied the right to work. I know of no time since I have been charged with this administration when these people have been denied the

right to work. Our dispersal policy has scattered these Japanese across the dominion, to the advantage of themselves and of the dominion. My hon. friend will agree that an intense concentration of them in the city of Vancouver would have made conditions very difficult, taking a long view, in that community.

My hon. friend also spoke of the British government and said I had stated that the first duty of government was to look after the safety of the state. At the moment, as my hon. friend mentioned this evening, the British government finds it necessary to interfere with what many consider the fundamental right of the average person in the United Kingdom so that that nation might live. A personal friend of mine is a prominent member of the Labour party. He severely criticized the government of the day on that score. I have no objection; I do not have to live there although I was born there. At the moment the government of Great Britain in its wisdom knows it is necessary for that country, and is prepared to take the responsibility. That is what we must do in this instance. I am informed that the government of Australia prohibited the landing in Australia of Japanese women who married Australian nationals during the war. If I may say so, that is the attitude of one of the most democratic states or governments in the world today.

My hon. friend raised the question of some order of February 10, 1947. It has been changed since then. Under the administrative order the only power enjoyed by me is that of prohibiting persons of Japanese nationality from residing in or entering into the coastal area of British Columbia. That is the only regulation which exists at the moment.

My hon. friend referred to the figure of fifty miles and made an allusion to Russia. He said that they had to get a permit in Russia to travel fifty miles, and that the same thing exists in Canada. Of course it does not exist at the moment. Might I say this to my hon. friend? If this nation was being attacked and it was necessary for me, charged with some responsibility in the government of this country, to say to him that he could not travel ten feet, he would not travel ten feet if it was necessary for the safety of this nation. I say that very frankly.

I think that covers most of the points, but I want to say this before I sit down. If there is any criticism, of course we shall have to take it; but you cannot undertake the movement of a large body of people such as this without some criticism. It needs arrangement; it needs a tremendous amount of organization; it needs the building of schools, sanatoriums, hospitals and so forth; it needs the agreements

[Mr. Mitchell.]

of other provincial governments in connection with their social legislation so that they will be responsible at some day and give rights to those people equal to those enjoyed by the inhabitants of the respective provinces. That takes time. I would rather do it in an evolutionary way, as we have done, step by step, timing it as we go along, instead of in any other way, without all the inconvenience, might I say, to the Japanese themselves, that occurred in the United States, and the bitterness re-engendered in some of the cities on the west coast. It is like planting a tree; it is a slow growth. By the end of this year, as indicated in the amended order in council, I think these people will have found a niche for themselves in the other parts of Canada to their own distinct advantage and, in my judgment, to the vindication of the policies approved by this parliament.

In conclusion I wish to say I give my hon. friend credit for being consistent right through the peace, even in the darkest days of the war, in connection with this very difficult problem.

Mr. PEARKES: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the committee has been impressed with the sincerity and the idealism of the hon. member for Vancouver East. Without attempting to reach his eloquence, and knowing that I have not had the experience in the debate that he has had, I should like to put forward the point of view which I think represents that of those who live in my constituency. My constituency is on Vancouver island and in the islands surrounding it. It is a rural constituency, and I have lived in it for thirty or more years; therefore I feel that I can speak with some knowledge of conditions there.

Before the war there were many thousand Japanese living in that constituency. They were engaged in fishing, horticultural and small farming activities; they were engaged as gardeners around some of the big houses, and they were engaged in logging operations. In the main they were living in numerous small communities, but in those communities they frequently constituted a majority in that neighbourhood. They were difficult people to get on with, to co-operate with. They worked by themselves and for people of the same race. When war broke out, the order was given that they should be moved from the Pacific coast for defence purposes. Mind you, that was the opinion of all people who were living on the coast of British Columbia at that time, because there was fear in British Columbia. They did not know how far the navy, the army and the air force of Japan would move toward our coast. I am certain that it was regarded as a wise precaution to take. These

young Japanese, when they were ordered away from these villages, moved out with arrogance. They laughed at the lack of preparation that there was for defence of our British Columbia, and they boasted that they would be back again before long. They were stupid boasts, without foundation, I will admit, but they impressed the people who were living there and who were fearful at that time of what might happen. Those boasts and that attitude amongst these Japanese living in the rural parts have not yet been forgotten.

Then the war came, and we were brought close to the war in Asia, much closer than other parts of Canada were. We saw the troops moving through our ports. We had submarine scares; we had a Japanese submarine firing shells on a British Columbian village. These things have not yet been forgotten. Then we saw repatriated prisoners of war, both British and Canadian, moving back from Hong Kong. They were billeted for a while in camps just outside of Victoria. Victoria opened her heart to the British soldiers who were passing through. The Victorians heard the stories of the privations which these British and Canadian soldiers suffered at Japanese hands. There are Canadian soldiers still in Victorian hospitals in British Columbia. These things are not easily forgotten, and I am most anxious today not to take an unreasonable attitude, not to try to continue race hatred and that sort of thing. But I must be a realist, and I know it is not only Anglo-Saxon Canadians who are still bitter against the atrocities which were carried out by the Japanese, for there are many other nationals living in British Columbia. There are many thousands of Chinese still on our coast; the Chinaman realizes that China and Japan have been at war for many years, and he knows of the events which have taken place in Asia during that war. There are fishermen who remember the attitude of the Japanese fishermen on the coast before the war, where a white fisherman was driven off the ground because there were several boats owned by Japanese fishermen fishing in those particular waters.

I am happy to say that time is healing many of the sores and that there is not the same bitterness of feeling there was three years ago. The government has seen fit to adopt the policy of removing Japanese from our coastal area, and it has followed that policy up by distributing them across Canada in various other provinces, each province taking a share of the burden. While I was pleased to hear the Minister of Labour state that those Japanese who were living in other

parts of Canada were settling in those areas and were being absorbed by the people in the communities in which they are now living, I have also had communications from a Japanese who tells me that he thought it might not be wise to have a precipitate movement back to the coast and that he hoped that those Japanese who were living in other parts of Canada would be given an opportunity to settle down before the temptation to return to the coast was put before them.

I was pleased to hear the minister read the editorial from *The New Canadian*. I had not read it myself but it did bear out sentiments that have been expressed to me. Therefore I feel that the government is taking a wise course in saying that for another year it will not open wide the gates of British Columbia and allow all those Japanese to return to the coast before they have really had a chance to test out the living conditions in other parts of the country.

I accept the idealistic attitude, and I think it is right, that we cannot say that one class of Canadians must live in one part of Canada and cannot be free to move to other parts of the country. But I think we must use some reason in this matter and must accept the fact that there has been much bitterness of feeling in the past. That bitterness of feeling is gradually dying down and those Japanese who will one day become Canadian citizens and who are living in other parts of the country are gradually becoming acclimatized and gradually accepting the conditions of life in the other parts and being accepted by the other communities.

While therefore, the ideal, the objective, the goal must be that, as soon as it is practical, the boundaries of British Columbia must be opened and citizens of Canada, no matter what their racial origin, be allowed to move back to the coast, at the same time I question earnestly whether that time has yet arrived.

War is a difficult thing, a hard, ruthless operation. The innocent suffer with the guilty, and I think it better to go slowly in this matter and to give them another year. Would the government not blame itself, if some of those people went back prematurely and entered into the life of a community which had not forgotten all the hatred of a few years ago, and perhaps crimes were committed which all Canadians would regret?

In order to prevent the possibility of crimes being committed, crimes of revenge, I think

rooms were filled solidly with Japanese children; one room had white and Japanese children. It was a completely Japanese town, taken over by the Japanese, until the war broke out. I challenge any member of the C.C.F., either when an election comes or before, to go to that town and tell those fishermen, "We want the Japanese back, and that when they do go back they will go into the fishing business." They had better take a bodyguard with them. I say that sincerely because at least three of the men of that town wrote me, and I can produce the letters if necessary, saying their boys had been tortured by the Japanese. One said to me, "Reid, if ever those Japs come back here I will give my life to get even with them." It cannot be said that I am making these statements for political purposes, because that part of the country will not be in my riding when the next election comes along. As the hon. member for Nanaimo pointed out, there is still a strong feeling in the province of British Columbia; but we believe that if this could be delayed for another year the problem would solve itself.

Every hon. member will recall the Prime Minister saying in the house that it was the desire of the government to have the Japanese distributed throughout the various provinces. But it was found out that they could not be distributed, legally. They could not be kept in any province legally; we had no law which would do that.

In the government's motion we are taking as humane a method as possible to keep them out of the coastal area for a period, believing that, once they are thoroughly settled throughout Canada, many of them will not desire to return to British Columbia. Let me say this to hon. members from Ontario that if you live long enough to have two or three thousand of them in a group in your province, in the days to come, you will say, "Well, those boys from British Columbia were right; we did not realize it." Wait until they get down to the Niagara district! Wait until they get down to the county of Essex! Just wait until they get to those places and take over from you your land! Wait until they begin to work among themselves and to live an entire Japanese group and marry within their own group, speak their own language and live their own lives, and you will then say, "Those boys from British Columbia were not wrong, after all. But we did not heed them. They were right."

We have another group in British Columbia I might mention at this time; and British Columbia has always been the place in which one finds racial groups. Out there we also

[Mr. Reid.]

have the Doukhobors. There is no man or woman who can tell what to do with that group. It is one of the greatest problems we have in British Columbia, from a racial group point of view.

An hon. MEMBER: Your government brought them in here.

Mr. REID: I do not care what government brought them in; and I have no doubt if you had been living in that day you would have helped to bring them in. Then we have heard lately a good deal about sending guns and ammunition to China. We hear all kinds of protests about that; but I hear no one protesting about supplying anything to Russia. Oh, no! It is all wrong to send anything to China; but what we send to Russia is all right!

I say if we take a realistic view of this matter it will solve itself in the interests, both of the Japanese and of the people of British Columbia. Continue this order for at least another year. We hear a great deal about minority rights, but no one talks about minority provincial rights. British Columbia is a minority province; yet our cry has gone unheeded year after year.

And so to those of you from other provinces we say: Just ask yourselves why we from British Columbia, after the long years of experience we have had, get up and plead with you to listen to us. We ask you to be with us in this move to try, if we can, distribute the Japanese across the entire dominion. We are not now asking that they all be put out of the country; I think we should be commended for modifying our view. We have now taken a rational view; but apparently that will not satisfy the C.C.F.

I have risen tonight to express some of my views, to contradict some of the things which have been said, and to show that at least I am not convinced by any of the arguments used by the hon. member for Vancouver East.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you of this, that hon. members from British Columbia on this side of the house had no intention of taking part in this debate. However it has been more or less forced upon us by the hon. member for Vancouver East.

I did not hear the first part of his speech tonight, and I should like to place on record the reason why I did not hear it. I had the great pleasure and honour today of hearing what in my opinion has been the most distinguished contribution made before members of the House of Commons in the veterans committee since I have been a

member of it. It was made by those who are totally blind, those who have lost both limbs, or who were wounded in other ways—amputation cases, totally disabled cases. Because of that, I was not able to be here, and I did not hear all the hon. member had to say. Personally, however, I considered it a great pleasure and honour to listen to those disabled men, many of whom were from Hong Kong, rather than to listen to this great address on adoration of the Japanese. And I believe the Canadian people think as I do.

I want to give the hon. member for Vancouver East credit for his sincerity, because I believe he is sincere. He has been sincere in his arguments on behalf of the Japanese ever since he has been in public life; and for that I give him credit. But I suggest to him he should give us credit for being sincere in our arguments on the other side of the problem, without accusing us of racial hatred.

When I think of those men I saw over there today, some of whom lost both their eyes, others of whom lost both their legs defending us against Japanese, and when I remember that, while I was with those men, an argument was going on in this chamber, only some few feet away, in defence of the Japanese, who did their utmost to deprive us of the liberties we prize so much, I rather wonder.

We from British Columbia have never approached this matter from the racial angle. One reason I am so much interested in it is that the constituency of Fraser Valley is mentioned so often in this connection. I believe some of these farms are in my constituency, and some in that of the hon. member for New Westminster. About five hundred of them were in my riding. I am sorry to say it has not always been members of the C.C.F. who know so little about the Japanese. The only man I know in the House of Commons who knows less than the hon. member for Eglinton about the Japanese is the hon. member for Spadina. Both these hon. members are from Ontario.

It was the hon. member for Eglinton who brought up the hue and cry about selling the farms of the Japanese in the Fraser Valley constituency, and in that of New Westminster. As the hon. member for New Westminster has pointed out, if those prices were taken as of today, yesterday, or even a year ago they might not be considered equitable. But when we consider their run-down condition; when we consider that they were burnt-out, I think they were paid a reason-

47-1948-4

able rate. And, due to the excellent advocacy of the hon. member for Eglinton and the hon. member for Vancouver East, the people of Canada will pay many millions more.

Let me say this to my hon. friends opposite, through you, Mr. Chairman. I have a friend who worked in Hong Kong for the Canadian National Railways. He was seized and placed in a camp. No, he was not a soldier; he was an employee of the railways. That man was put into a camp, with the result that today his health is completely ruined. He is a physical wreck. Not only was he deprived of his property, his house and his furniture, but his bank account was seized and not one dollar of it has been returned to him. But not a murmur has been heard from the hon. member for Eglinton; not a murmur has been heard from the hon. member for Vancouver East to say that it should have been returned to him by the Japanese government. No, there has been not one murmur from either of them.

I admit that the hon. member for Vancouver East knows the Japanese problem, but the hon. member for Eglinton and the hon. member for Spadina know nothing about it. I defy any one of them to tell me that he is in favour of returning fishing licences to the Japanese of British Columbia. I defy any of them to tell me that—and particularly the hon. members from Saskatchewan who want these Japanese returned to British Columbia. I defy these great saviours of the human race, who believe that there should be no racial discrimination and who, in their own province, have less than 500 Japanese today!

I would speak a word to my hon. friends from Quebec. At the time of the war there were sixty-three Japanese in their province. My good friends from Prince Edward Island and the other maritime provinces did not know a Japanese from a Hindu; they had never seen one; yet they did wish to send them all back to British Columbia.

And let me right now pay a tribute to the Minister of Labour. I disagree with him on many things. It was only the other day that he did not refer to me in a flattering fashion. And I shall disagree with him on more occasions before I leave this house. I say, however, that no other minister has shown more human feelings in dealing with this difficult problem—and dealing so successfully with it—as has the Minister of Labour.

I give the hon. member for Vancouver East credit for sincerity in his belief. I sincerely believe that the most important reason why this legislation should be extended is that it is not for the benefit of the fishermen; it is not

it is wise to delay the removal of these restrictions for another year. If the government has decided it will remove them—perhaps that is all right—at any rate it will review them in a year's time. But this amendment is that the act will definitely be revoked a year hence, and I do not think either the common-sense people of British Columbia or the Japanese themselves will object to that restriction.

Mr. REID: I rise to take part in this debate for the reason that it might be said by those who are in favour of the Japanese returning to the Pacific coast that those who are against it were silent in the House of Commons because perhaps they could not meet the arguments which had been put up by those who advocated the return of these people to the Pacific coast.

I must commend the consistency of view held by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) and, while I am sympathetic to his views, I trust that he and others of that group are just as sympathetic to us who have long held the opposite view that the grouping of Japanese in one province was a terrible mistake allowed over the years. They are not an assimilable race. The fact has never been brought out that when we deal with this group we are dealing with a group that cannot be assimilated by marriage. I do not find many of our friends opposite willing that their daughters or sons should marry Japanese.

May I refer to two matters touched upon by the hon. member for Vancouver East? He rather beclouded the issue when he spoke of the law put into effect by the provincial government denying Japanese to work on crown lands. That is one of the things we fear on the coast, because I do not think there is any citizen in Canada, no matter what his views are, who would deny the right of any person to earn his livelihood. Realizing that, we take the stand that if they go back to the Pacific coast they will be back in the fishing industry, and therefore we want this delayed as long as possible. I shall speak of that later.

With regard to the particular case the hon. member mentioned, I interrupted to ask if it was the same case I had in mind because I knew this man had gone to my hon. friend. He found he could not buy the land belonging to the Japanese, and wrote me a letter saying, "I am through with the Liberal party forever; I am going to vote C.C.F. I am going to Angus MacInnis, and lay my case before him." Just what are the facts of the case? The gov-

[Mr. Pearkes.]

ernment set up a commission to investigate the sale of Japanese property, and they took the stand, I think rightly, that they would not have anything more to do with Japanese property until the commission made its final report. Naturally, when this case came up, though the Japanese was willing to sell the property, the government took the stand that no property belonging to Japanese in British Columbia should be sold until the final report of the commission had been received.

I might say a word or two in this connection, because I happen to know something about the buying of the Japanese property; and I can tell hon. members that in 1942 we paid more than that property was worth. I venture to say that if the government of the day had handed \$980,000 to reliable men and told them to go through the Fraser valley and buy the best land they could for our returned soldiers, they would have been able to buy more and better land than we bought from the Japanese. I make that statement without fear of successful contradiction. At that time, in 1942, you could hardly give away land. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Nanaimo, there was fear over the country. On the British Columbia coast there was a black-out. You could not move at night. No one knew where the Japs would strike next. That is all over now, though, and people say, "Oh, what a dastardly thing you did when you took away the property of the Japanese and moved them from the coast." But one has to go back to 1942 to appreciate the fear that existed at that time. When the Japs were moved from the coast I think that action met the views of every citizen of British Columbia. People in Toronto and cities like that were all right; they were quite safe, but on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts there was great fear of what might happen.

I believe those of us who have held to the view that the Japanese should not return to the coast have now gone a long way in our view. You will remember that we argued in this house that we should send back to Japan all those Japanese who had signified their willingness—and this at a time they thought the Japanese were winning, mark you—to go back to that country. We expected that after the war these men would appear before a royal commission of some kind and then be sent back to Japan. We expected that the Japanese would be combed out, and that those deemed undesirable would be sent back. That has not been done, and no one in British Columbia or in this House of Commons is now asking that it be done. Our views have

changed to some extent, but I differ greatly with the hon. member for Vancouver East when he says the entire feeling in British Columbia has entirely changed.

In a moment I am going to mention one place, and I will ask any member of the C.C.F. to go there and tell the people the Japs should be allowed back. When I mention this place I do not want to hear any accusation that I am doing so for political purposes, because I can assure hon. members that the district I am thinking of will not be in the riding of New Westminster when the next general election takes place, so that I cannot be accused of pulling for votes. Incidentally, when this charge is thrown at us that we are doing this for votes, I am always struck with this thought: why were any C.C.F. elected at all in British Columbia? Many members of the B.C. provincial legislature were elected on the C.C.F. ticket, and we have in this house at least two or three members of the C.C.F. who come from British Columbia and who hold views opposed to those I hold. If it is true that we have been taking this stand for political purposes, how is it that these men were elected? I am just trying to draw to the attention of this committee the fact that such charges are utter nonsense. I take strong exception to them, because away back in 1942—does my hon. friend wish to ask a question?

Mr. McCULLOUGH (Assiniboia): Would the hon. member give the committee the assurance that the property sold by the Japanese to the first purchaser was not resold, in some instances at a very much higher price?

Mr. REID: I cannot give any assurance, because that is a matter for the government and my assurance would not mean anything. I am pointing out that when the property was bought we paid more for it than it was worth at the time. In other words, we lost money. Now we have lawyers from the province of Ontario going among the Japanese and stirring them up, telling them they have been robbed; and I venture to say it will cost this country another six or seven million dollars before we are through. Someone says the C.C.F. are doing that. I do not know whether that is true, but I know these lawyers do not belong to British Columbia; and my great objection would be that these men going around the province are not conversant with property values there.

Mr. FERGUSON: I can assure the hon. member that the lawyer from Ontario is a member of the C.C.F.

Mr. REID: That makes it all the worse; he is doing this not only for money but for political purposes as well. The money end of it was bad enough, but the other makes it almost unpardonable.

I was saying that we on this side, together with many hon. members on the other side, were asking that many things be done in regard to the Japanese. Now, when we come along and ask the government to delay this order for another year, not only in the interests of the people of British Columbia but in the interests of the Japanese themselves, we are opposed tooth and nail by members of the C.C.F. I am not going to raise the old cry, but I would tell hon. members from other provinces that in British Columbia this was never a political question until 1932 or 1933, when the late founder of the C.C.F. party made the statement in the House of Commons that if he and his party were returned to power they would give the vote to the Japanese. I say, without fear of successful contradiction, and I am sure every member from British Columbia will support me, that prior to that time no one would have got up on the platform in British Columbia and talked about the orientals. We were in those days all agreed; but when the leader of the C.C.F. party said they would give the orientals the vote it became a political issue for the first time. I regretted it, because back in 1932 I raised in this house the question of Japanese fishing licences in the Fraser river, and there was no cry of racial discrimination then. I do not know that even the hon. member for Vancouver East opposed the curtailing of the Japanese fishing licences, because at that time, too, I pointed to cases where the Japanese had boarded the boats of white fishermen, first cutting their nets and breaking their engines, and then beating up the fishermen. So I said then that as long as I had breath in my body I would keep advocating in this House of Commons to see that the heritage which belongs to Canadians would be returned to the Canadian white people.

That was back in 1932, and like the hon. member for Vancouver East I have been consistent. Now we are told by those who hold opposite views that we are doing this for political purposes, and I say it is utter rot when any one throws that accusation at me. As I said before, if that is the case, how does it happen that any members of the C.C.F. party from British Columbia have been elected?

I challenge any member of the C.C.F. party to go to the town of Steveston, where there was a fourteen-room school. Thirteen of the

for the benefit of the white people of British Columbia; it is for the benefit of the Japanese themselves.

Those of you who do not live in British Columbia do not know the Japanese problem as we know it. I never heard any question raised across the way when I pointed out in this house that we had a large power development in British Columbia which was supplying most of the power for our war industries during the war. Above that power development were located Japanese. After Pearl Harbor they had powder available in their hands to run down and destroy our dams. Not one word came from over there questioning that.

Mr. MacINNIS: Did they use it? Was it not to their credit that they did not use it?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I tell you the reason why they did not use it. My hon. friend has asked a fair and legitimate question and I am going to tell him why they did not use it. It was because of the challenge by such members as the hon. member for New Westminster, the hon. member for Vancouver North and the hon. member for Fraser Valley. They saw to it that it was not used but we did not have one assistant over there. I do not think you will answer that. I am not giving the government credit for that.

What I do want to impress forcibly upon the committee is the fact that unfortunately the majority of these farms happened to be in the riding of Fraser Valley. An attempt has been made in certain sections of Canada to discredit that riding. This was made by the united or some other service league which was sponsored by a cartoonist paid by the *Globe and Mail*, and he was supported by the hon. member for Eglinton and the hon. member for Vancouver East. It was said that all these farms were in Fraser Valley.

I know what I am talking about when I say that, in so far as the Fraser Valley is concerned, no doubt the time will come when we as Canadians will assume our fair share of the responsibility for the Japs who are within Canada, but we believe that it would not be to the best interests of the people of the Fraser Valley and especially of the Japanese themselves to have them return at this time.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member for New Westminster and the hon. member for Fraser Valley speak on this subject tonight and on previous occasions, I am much happier to be standing with the hon. member for Vancouver East than with the hon. members across the

[Mr. Cruickshank.]

way. I am sure that members of parliament, regardless of where they sit, must admire the stand taken by the hon. member for Vancouver East on this subject as it has been discussed through the years. I should like to refer to the salute given by Alan Morley, columnist in the *News Herald* of Vancouver on April 28, 1944. Mr. Morley said:

But every honest man in British Columbia should stand up and salute Angus MacInnis today. He is the first politician in British Columbia within living memory to stand by an unpopular cause unflinchingly when he knew it would cost him votes and political support.

For my part, I'll argue against his socialistic fallacies till the air is blue, but I take off my hat to him as a man of honour, and one who is not afraid to stand on the side of decency and humanity when he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by doing so.

No—I take that back. He has a great deal to lose in the way of popular acclaim and votes at the poll, but he has his own self-respect and the respect of honourable men to gain by sticking to his guns.

I feel sure that when the history of our period is written many will blush with shame when they think that Canada continued to have legislation such as we are discussing tonight when there were a few in the Canadian parliament who felt as did the hon. member for Vancouver East. A year ago there were a number of speeches on this subject. I think the hon. member for Cariboo discussed the question in a rational way. He used some of the evidence that had been used by Bruce Hutchison in the *Winnipeg Free Press*, a paper that supports the government. Mr. Hutchison wrote a cynical story telling of some Canadian Japanese who had returned to Japan to Christianize the people there. They were reminded by the people in Japan that they had been kicked out of Canada, and the story goes on:

"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."

Then the hon. member for Spadina took part in the debate. He said:

Let me prick the conscience of the committee. A hundred and thirty-one Japs served in the Canadian army.

He was referring to Japanese Canadians.

A hundred and thirty of them were Canadian born; one was a naturalized Jap.

Mr. MITCHELL: What is the hon. member leading from.

Mr. NICHOLSON: From a speech delivered year ago, to be found on page 2428 of *ansard*:

Mr. McILRAITH: Why do not you write one of your own?

Mr. NICHOLSON: This is a much better speech than I could make. The hon. member went on:

Some of them were wounded, and I believe some of them were decorated. We deny them the right to go back to British Columbia, to go back to a particular zone, though they may have come from that zone. That is going a very long way, and I point out to the committee how serious a matter this is. Certainly we are ahead of the United States with respect to that particular confinement. The most obnoxious racial laws which were ever passed in any country in the world, which were passed in nazi Germany, exempted for a time soldiers who fought on the battle front. Yet in endorsing this order in council we go farther than they ever went. I do not compare my government with them; I do not intend to make that comparison with any other government in this country, but on this Japanese question in all the democratic countries in the world we are now the foremost in racial discrimination.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley spoke this afternoon about being in the company of veterans who had lost their sight or who had lost limbs fighting for democracy. I ask him to tell me if he is proud of a country that denies to Canadian-born Japanese who fought for this country the right to travel freely in Canada? If democracy is worth saving in France and India and Egypt, I think it is worth demonstrating in Canada three years after the war that we really believe in democracy and freedom of speech and freedom of travel.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I protested strenuously against the enlistment of Japanese in the Canadian army, but I will go with my hon. friend and say that any man who served his country should be allowed to travel anywhere in Canada.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I hope the hon. member for Fraser Valley will vote with us when we register our protest.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not say all Japs. Will my hon. friend permit me to put it this way? Will I be permitted to vote against the freedom of movement of those who did not come into the war until after Russia had come in?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I think if we are consistent we must not make any distinctions on the basis of nationality, race or colour. People

47-1948-43

who have been born in this country, people who have spent their lives here should have every liberty, regardless of their colour, race or religion.

There is one other speech to which I should like to refer and I am sorry the hon. member for Stanstead is not here at the moment. I was sorry that he could not get more support when he spoke before. It is significant that in this Canadian parliament there are one or two Progressive Conservatives who are not afraid to stand up and express their views. The hon. member for Stanstead said there were no Japanese in his constituency. He was not concerned about political implications. He said:

I have no one to reproach me but myself. I stand for the integrity of Canadian citizenship. Today it is the Japanese, tomorrow it may be the Jew; the next day it may be the Irish and the next day somebody else. Citizenship is a very sacred matter. Neither the few nor the many should be permitted to undermine it. For the first time we are being asked to depart from those things which have made us, I was going to say, a free people; for the first time we are asked to depart from the principles which the genius of two great races has evolved and which they have had the courage and the grace till now to apply.

I am not surprised that the hon. member for New Westminster and the hon. member for Fraser Valley should speak as they do. They are consistent. But I am surprised to find the Minister of Justice, who has established a reputation both nationally and internationally for a sense of justice and fair play, continuing for another year these objectionable orders in council. It is significant that the legislation we are now discussing will expire, in any event, by the end of March, 1949. It indicates a guilty conscience on the part of the government that they should select these orders in council and say: even though we might ask for a continuance of the emergency legislation for a longer period, these orders in council will be revoked. The Minister of Justice has represented Canada with distinction at the meeting of the united nations, and I ask him how, in the face of this discrimination, he is able to go there and support article 55 of the charter, which reads:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the united nations shall promote:

c. universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare has also represented Canada at the united

nations, and I find it difficult to understand how he, with his traditions for fair play, can support his government in continuing these objectionable and discriminatory orders in council one day longer than necessary.

Mr. REID: What about Australia?

Mr. NICHOLSON: The Minister of Labour took us to Australia, Russia and the United Kingdom, but he did not take us to Canada in 1948 and tell us why on March 15 of this year the government of this country requires these veterans who fought for Canada—130 of them—to go to the mounted police to get a permit to go to Vancouver.

Mr. MITCHELL: Certain areas are declared out of bounds for soldiers and sailors very often; there is nothing new about that. I do not know whether my hon. friend was in the army, but those of us who have been in the army or navy know that sailors are often told: You cannot go down that street, it is out of bounds.

Mr. BROOKS: Is Vancouver out of bounds for the same reason?

Mr. MITCHELL: It may be.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Is it out of bounds for all veterans, no matter what their racial origin? Is it out of bounds for veterans of German origin, or veterans of Italian origin?

I would say in reply to the hon. member for Fraser Valley that, although we have not a large number of Japanese Canadians in Saskatchewan, we have not closed our doors to them. We are proud to have them. Those who are there are making a valuable contribution to the life of the province.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Why only 300?

Mr. NICHOLSON: A while ago the hon. member said 500.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: It is 487 to be exact.

Mr. NICHOLSON: It is not my fault there are not more there. If more want to come to Saskatchewan to establish themselves there they will be warmly received by our people. This is a free country.

The hon. member for Nanaimo spoke a little more carefully this evening on this question than he did a year ago, but I was surprised that he should advocate continuing this injustice and letting the innocent suffer for another year, rather than righting the wrong now, when we should do so.

The hon. member for New Westminster said that C.C.F. members were elected in [Mr. Nicholson.]

British Columbia in spite of the attitude taken by the hon. member for Vancouver East. That reflects credit on the people of British Columbia. I am delighted to know that a majority of the citizens there are not so irresponsible in discussing questions of this sort as the hon. member for New Westminster has been every time he has discussed this question in parliament.

Before this debate closes, I hope the Minister of Justice will indicate his support of the motion moved by the hon. member for Moose Jaw.

Mr. ARGUE: Before the motion is put, I should like to say one or two things about the order in council that is now before us. It seems to me that we have been confining our remarks to what has gone on in the past, instead of correcting mistakes and seeing that they will not happen again. I am glad that the government has seen fit to limit the operation of this order in council to April 1, 1949. Whether 500 Japanese for Saskatchewan is a fair quota to the mind of the hon. member for Fraser Valley I do not know, but I can tell him that there are more Japanese Canadians there now than there have been in the past. Some of them are working in the government service and are very well trained and doing a good and efficient job.

The province of Saskatchewan does not discriminate against members of the Japanese race or any other race. It passed a bill of rights in 1947, chapter 35 of the statutes of that year, guaranteeing human rights and fundamental freedoms to all peoples, irrespective of their racial origin. I think it is time the government got around to granting basic human freedoms to Canadian citizens, instead of simply setting up a committee of inquiry. I would ask the Minister of Justice this question, and I ask it because he was one of Canada's chief delegates to the united nations. Does he not think this order in council violates clause 3 of article 1 of the united nations charter?

Mr. ILSLEY: Not as a transition measure, no.

Mr. ARGUE: Then the minister would say that if it were a permanent policy it would violate that particular clause, and I might presume that is one of the reasons why a time limit has been set.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is not the question which is up here; but I certainly would say that, as a transition measure, it is just a matter of fixing the time when these restrictions should

come to an end. Is my hon. friend not arguing very much on the question of principle? The principle is decided here.

Mr. ARGUE: I am glad to hear the remarks of the Minister of Justice. I think the best thing for the government to do would be to adopt this amendment, which would remove discrimination.

Mr. ILSLEY: Just a minute. I was talking to somebody else when my hon. friend started this question. Was he talking about his amendment or the measure itself?

Mr. ARGUE: I asked the minister a question in terms of the order in council.

Mr. ILSLEY: That is what I understood him to say. It seemed to me that very good arguments have been advanced for the position that the Japanese who are in various parts of Canada after the transference, which is admitted to have been a good thing for them and a good thing for Canada, should be allowed a little further time to enable them to take root in the various communities before this is brought to an end.

Mr. ARGUE: Then the minister will admit that until Canada complies with clause 3 of article 1 of the united nations charter—

Mr. ILSLEY: No; my hon. friend is talking childishly, I was going to say.

Mr. ARGUE: I understood the minister to admit that.

Mr. ILSLEY: Not at all.

Mr. FERGUSON: May I ask hon. members not to forget the crocodile tears we shed after the first war with Germany, and not to be too lenient with these people who were our enemies in the last war. I ask them not to forget the atrocities perpetrated on our soldiers and the burdens which were placed on their shoulders, and a burden which they had to carry during the war because of the Japanese. I ask them not to forget the fear that went across this country on account of the Japanese. Let us hear a little more in this country about the great country we own and about the great men who are here, the great Canadians who built this country. Let us hear a little less talk or soap-box oratory with regard to a few Japanese. Let us formulate plans for Canadians in Canada and keep our powder dry, because we may soon have to use it again. Stop trying to breed discontent from coast to coast; stop weeping crocodile tears and stop disparaging people in their own country, people who built up the country. Instead of doing that, put your shoulder to the wheel,

assume your burden and show that you are being a good Canadian. We hear too much talk in this house from a certain party advocating freedom of speech, freedom of this and freedom of that for people who recently have come out of a position where they would have cut our throats if it had not been for some members of parliament who represent various constituencies in Vancouver and throughout Canada. It is too bad we have to sit and listen in our time to that kind of stuff.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Mr. Chairman, I stand to support the motion, not the amendment. May I say that I do that in spite of the reasons given by the Minister of Labour. In short, I put it this way: in spite of his speech, I am still in favour of his idea.

When he spoke this afternoon every reason he gave us indicated that the emergency was over. We now have an agreement with Alberta and, as he said, with some other provinces. The way we look at it is this. We have always heard, and I think it is true, that half a loaf is better than no bread. I agree with my hon. friends over here that the sooner we can end this thing, the better. But now for the first time we have a date fixed, with a definite ending. May I say, in compliment to the minister and to his staff, that I prefer to take their word, with all the knowledge they have of what the situation is at the moment, rather than that given by theorists immediately to my left, with no facts at all to support their position. Of course we can understand that. That is the role usually occupied by them. They are just running true to type. Therefore I intend to support the extension of the order, knowing as I do that it is cut down in its dimensions and it has only one particular application.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this world and particularly this country will always have idealists. The world will not get anywhere when we lose men with ideals, particularly men who are prepared to make sacrifices for those ideals. I compliment those on my immediate left, the socialist party, on having an ideal of complete freedom for everyone who has the right to call himself a Canadian citizen. But let us be just a little bit realistic. In 1943, or whenever it was that the order in council was passed, we had this situation. I commend and compliment the government upon their action. There was only one over-riding thought in the minds of everyone of us, and that was the safety of our country and of our government, more particularly the safety of ourselves and of our families. If the government had failed to take that step and events had run the other way I can quite imagine the ruckus that would have been raised by the people to my left on the failure

of the government to take common-sense steps at that time. Hindsight is a great thing. Frankly—

Mr. IRVINE: You ought to know; you have lots of it.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): My hon. friend has deteriorated greatly. He beat me in an election in 1921. I telephoned him and congratulated him on doing so, and I did not think such a childish remark would come from him at the present moment. However, if they insist on being children I suppose there is nothing that any of us can do about the matter.

But to continue, and to finish in one sentence, what I was saying is this. When we took that step parliament took it for the safety of the country. Perhaps they are prolonging the agony a little bit, but I say—and it may soon arise in this parliament in connection with another group of people—that when the safety of the state and the nation is at stake we take unusual methods, and I am proud of the unusual method taken by this government and by this parliament in this particular instance. It is true that the Japanese have turned out fine. Who would stand in this house during 1943 when we were in trouble and oppose this motion seriously? At that time our freedom and safety were at stake. This is a poor time now to exercise that hindsight of which the hon. member tells me I have lots. At least I remember 1921. It is a poor time to exercise hindsight and abuse the government. Take the speech this afternoon of the hon. member for Moose Jaw with respect to a few Japanese who are in that constituency. I know nothing about it except what I have seen in the papers. All I have read is that they will not get out, as 99 per cent of the other Japanese have done, and earn their living in a proper way. I know nothing more about it than that.

I do not like these letters from disgruntled people used by a member of this house when he will not put his reputation, and his position as a member, behind what he reads from a letter. I wish to tell you, Mr. Chairman, something further about the Japanese in Alberta. As you know, and no doubt as many other hon. members know, we have quite a few of them in our irrigated area around Brooks, Scandia and Rainier, where I do some shooting. I have been going there to do a little shooting—at least I have been aiming if I have not shot much—and I know that there are several families there who have adapted themselves to the conditions of farming in that area and are making money. I agree with what the Minister of Labour has said, and that is reflected in the balance sheet, showing the

[Mr. Smith (Calgary West).]

amount of wealth they have acquired as compared with the amount they had before. They have made for themselves a position in the community.

I do not want us to forget idealism. Let us stay with it and swear by it. But do let us get rid of a lot of nonsense which is preached here under the veil of idealism.

Mr. MacINNIS: I hope the Minister of Labour and other ministers are duly impressed with the touching faith which the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) has in the correctness of their policies. I imagine we would get finished much more quickly if he could maintain that faith all through the session.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): How many times have I spoken this session?

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not object at all to your speaking. I was merely mentioning your faith in the correctness of government policy. It was so new a phenomenon that it touched me keenly, and I hope it also touched the ministers opposite.

What I rose to do, however, was to make a short reply to the member for Simcoe North (Mr. Ferguson). While I am on my feet, I would point out that not a solitary member who has risen in opposition to this amendment has touched the crux of the situation at all.

Mr. FERGUSON: Speak up. We cannot hear you.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is a new one to me.

Mr. FERGUSON: Lots of things are new to you.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is something new to me that people cannot hear me, because one of my chief worries is to keep from talking too loud. The question before the committee is not what happened at Hong Kong, when the people whom we are discussing now had nothing to do with Hong Kong. The question is not what we did in 1942 or what we had to do in 1942. The question is simply this; is there any logical reason for restricting the right, not of Japanese but of Canadian citizens, in this way? My hon. friend the member for Simcoe North says, "Just a few Japanese". It is not a matter of just a few Japanese. It is a question affecting Canadian citizens, and the question before the committee is, can a logical reason be given, a reason that you would accept if it applied to you for restricting your liberty for one year longer than is necessary?

It has already been extended for a year longer than I think necessary; that is, from March, 1947, to March, 1948, and I am satisfied that there is no good purpose to be served by extending it for another year.

Most of the people I see around me are Christians, and consequently they believe in the precept of doing unto others as one would be done by. That being so, how many hon. members can stand up and say that they would not object to having their freedom restricted for a year or even for a day? I would not want to have my freedom restricted for another day, and I do not want to restrict the freedom of anyone else. There is here no practical issue involved that demands it. Therefore, until that practical issue is put before me, all this hocus-pocus of what has happened in the last five or six years does not amount to a hill of beans. It is irrelevant, all of it. What is important is the fundamental rights of Canadian citizens. If you cannot answer that question, just keep your seats.

Mr. McIVOR: This is the first time I have spoken on the Japanese question. I have heard a good many debates on the question, and perhaps one of the finest speeches I have heard was delivered by the former member for Comox-Alberni. I do not think anyone's mind has been changed by the debates in this house since that time, and I would say that the Japanese who have gone out from Vancouver and have been put to work in other places should be considered, and the question asked, whether they want to go back to Vancouver or not.

I said in another place that if you want to make the Japanese who are working on the great lakes sawmills ripping mad, tell them they have to go back to Vancouver. I think we have been long enough on this debate. Let us get on with the business.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the Minister of Justice one question? I am not going to prolong the debate, because the hon. member for Vancouver East has expressed my sentiments. But my question arises from a remark made by the hon. member for Nanaimo as he sat down. He said that he accepted the government's decision to keep this order in council in effect for another year, subject to whatever decision they might make when another year rolled around.

An hon. MEMBER: He did not say that.

Mr. KNOWLES: It does not matter, but I understood him to say something that left a doubt in my mind as to what the decision of the government might be with respect to the question a year from now. My question is: Can we take it as ironclad that order in council P.C. 804 of March 2, 1948, which revokes P.C. 946 as of April 1, 1949, is irrevocable?

Mr. ILSLEY: The order speaks for itself. It is revoked as of April 1, 1949, and the government would be without power to revive it hereafter. The only way in which it can be extended beyond April 1, 1949, is by new legislation.

Mr. KNOWLES: Thank you.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I cannot let the debate end without thanking the hon. member for Fort William for the kindly reference he made to my predecessor Mr. A. W. Neill, who, I am sure, was one of the very competent authorities on this subject.

Tonight there have been excellent speeches by a number of hon. members. I do not subscribe to the views of the C.C.F. party, but the speeches delivered by the hon. member for Fraser Valley, the hon. member for New Westminster, the hon. member for Calgary West, and the hon. member for Nanaimo expressed my view. The hon. member for Nanaimo comes from a constituency on Vancouver island adjoining mine, and he made a fair statement of the case as to the conditions and the sentiments felt by the people living on the coast of British Columbia. The ridings of Nanaimo and Comox-Alberni contained the greatest number of Japanese while they were concentrated on the coast, and I think the committee realizes that the hon. member for Nanaimo has a fair working knowledge of the difficulties that had to be faced in handling these people before the war and also during the war period.

When the hon. member for Vancouver East discusses a subject I am always impressed with his patent sincerity; but I must say his approach in this case was typical of the approach of his party to any concrete proposal. That approach is always academic.

Mr. MacINNIS: There was nothing academic about what I said tonight.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): It was definitely academic. We have a concrete problem before us, and your party always faces concrete problems in an academic way because you have had very little experience in meeting problems on your own responsibility.

I can only say that one of the most frequent expressions I hear in my riding is, "Thank God we had Humphrey Mitchell handling this problem during the war." I was surprised, to tell the truth, to see the hon. member for Moose Jaw once more undertaking to lead the C.C.F. party in a debate on the Japanese question. I have no reason to believe his knowledge is any greater tonight than it was last year, and at that time I said I did not think he would know a Hottentot from a

Japanese. Since then I have seen something in the headlines about some sort of fiasco stirred up in Moose Jaw over a few Japanese who would not leave the excellent accommodation provided by the government. From reading the newspapers it would seem to me that these Japanese were a bunch of martyrs. I quite agree with the hon. member for Calgary West, however, that if these people think they are going to live forever at government expense it is time someone smartened them up. I really do not think the hon. member for Vancouver East or the hon. member for Moose Jaw are doing the Japanese a service by practically encouraging them in the attitude they take.

Mr. THATCHER: I am sure the hon. member wants to be fair. All these Canadians want to do is go home.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): I noticed that the hon. member for Vancouver East complained about these Japanese being kept from the coast. I can understand their position; no one likes to be kept away from any place where he wants to go.

Mr. MacINNIS: I did not say a word about the Japanese being kept away from the coast. I complained about Canadian citizens being refused permission to travel anywhere in this country.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Well, all right; let us call them Canadians of Japanese origin. It seems to me that hundreds of thousands of Canadian boys were forcibly removed from their homes and sent to Europe for six or seven years, during which time they were definitely in a much more precarious position than the Japanese ever were in this country.

Mr. MacINNIS: But the war is over now.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): The hon. member for Fraser Valley touched upon a vital point. We have heard a great deal of discussion here about the way in which advantage was taken of the Japanese as far as property was concerned; how they were dispossessed of their property, and were not paid a fair price. I believe the hon. member for Fraser Valley had the answer. In 1942 you could not have given anyone in Saskatchewan a farm in the Fraser valley. They did not have enough nerve to go and live there; and it would not have been wise to go there. As far as the Japanese fishing boats on the Pacific coast are concerned, let me tell you they got an inflated war price for those boats. It is true that it was not the price they would get today, but values have almost doubled in all lines since that

[Mr. Gibson (Comox-Alberni).]

time. There have been isolated instances where these people have had a bad deal, I know, and that is why I supported the setting up of a committee to deal with these matters. When anyone values this property on the basis of today's values and compares that with the valuation when the Japanese left, in 1942, he is not being fair either to the government or to the taxpayer, to whom, after all, the government must be responsible.

In the interests of these people, these Canadian citizens of Japanese origin if that suits the hon. member for Vancouver East better, it seems to me that it will be better if they are kept away from the coast for another year. I can only tell you what I know of my own people, but I can say they are still bitterly opposed to the Japanese. Time cures many things, and I sincerely hope it will cure this situation also, because I have no desire to see race prejudice of any kind perpetuated in Canada. In closing, however, I wish to express the thanks of my constituents to the Minister of Labour for the excellent job he did during the war and the excellent job he is doing today.

Mr. HLYNKA: I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question, and his answer will determine the way I vote. Is it desired to extend this order in council for another year for the purpose of defence, or is it simply a transitional measure? If it is a precautionary step which may be necessary for our future defence I will support the extension of the order in council, but if it is only a transitional measure I am afraid I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is a transitional measure.

Amendment negated on division: yeas, 23; nays, 73.

Mr. ILSLEY: Perhaps we had better take the Department of Fisheries now. We need not necessarily have any discussion on these orders in council, but I want to mention them so that, if there is any desire to do so, they may be discussed. If not, we can pass them over and take up something in which we are interested. There are just two orders in council under this department. One is an order in council enacting the pelagic sealing regulations. These are the subject of a bill already introduced in this parliament, and this order in council will be revoked when the bill becomes law, so that it is of temporary duration. The other is an order in council relating to fishing licences, which terminates on the same date as the order in council I have just mentioned.

Mr. PEARKES: If no objection is taken to the extension of this order in council regarding sealing, it would not commit us to supporting the bill which will be discussed later?

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, no; no hon. gentleman is committed in regard to the bill by his attitude in respect of this order in council.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is not my intention to say very much in regard to order in council P.C. 251, because the same arguments apply here that applied to P.C. 946.

Since the committee seems to be in favour of equal rights for all Canadians at some time in the future, I imagine they would vote any amendment to this order down as well as the other one. But I should like to draw the attention of the committee to how orders in council, when they are carried on like this, can be misused. The situation today has no relation whatsoever to the wording in the operative section of this order in council, the last paragraph of which reads:

Now therefore His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Fisheries under the authority of the War Measures Act, chapter 206, revised statutes of Canada 1927—

And note here:

—for reasons of national defence and security during the period of the war is pleased to order and doth hereby order that no fishing licence authorizing fishing in or off British Columbia as contemplated by the Fisheries Act, chapter 42, 22/23 George V and regulations adopted pursuant thereto shall be issued to persons of Japanese racial origin and also that no such person shall be permitted to serve on fishing vessels.

Here we have an order in council passed for reasons of national defence and for reasons of security during the period of the war, which is now being carried on for more than three years after the war. And for what reason? I have been asking that question all evening: For what reason? What is the reason for restricting the rights of Canadian citizens, three years after the war is ended, by an order in council passed for reasons of national security and national defence during the period of the war?

There are so many lawyers in the house who can make wonderful speeches on practically nothing, I would say to them that here is a fundamental issue.

Mr. WARREN: Do you include yourself?

Mr. MacINNIS: No; I am a modest person and would not think of putting myself on a level with the lawyer spell-binders in the house. But I am posing a fundamental issue

in this order which, no doubt, we are going to pass as if it did not affect anyone, and which would not seem to be worth anyone's time to get up and talk about. Let me point out again that this order in council was passed for "reasons of national defence and security during the period of the war." The war is now over. By the time this order comes to an end on April 1, 1949, the war will have been over for almost four years. I would ask somebody to give me some reasoned explanation for conduct of that kind.

Mr. MITCHELL: The reason is simple. What is the use of giving a person a fishing licence if he cannot go into the protected area where the fishing is done.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is a reason?

Mr. MITCHELL: It is just as simple as that; you do not need a constitutional lawyer to give that reason.

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes; there we have the reason. First of all we have an order in council passed for purposes of defence that restricts the freedom of people, to move about as they wish, to restrict the movement of Canadian citizens of Japanese origin to the Pacific coast of British Columbia. Then the Minister of Labour, with that logic of which only the Minister of Labour is capable, says that, because you have refused Canadian citizens the right to go to British Columbia, there would be no use in giving them a licence to go fishing off the coast of that province. I agree that the explanation is a wonderfully simple one. In fact I am sorry it is so simple.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is so simple—but my hon. friend likes things complicated.

Mr. MacINNIS: Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL: Some people make things so complicated they cannot understand them themselves; but they think the other fellow should. This is simple enough. If they cannot get into the protected areas, then they cannot fish in them.

Mr. MacINNIS: I would like the Minister of Labour to see the point.

Mr. MITCHELL: Make it complicated, and I will understand it.

Mr. MacINNIS: I suppose I might as well give up. The minister cannot understand why a person should object to the continuation of an order in council such as P.C. 251 because, forsooth, the government have already passed an order in council which takes away the freedom which might be enjoyed under it if P.C. 251 was rescinded.

Mr. MITCHELL: You are getting as bad as the lawyers.

Mr. MacINNIS: Well, one thing I am glad of is that I am not as bad as the Minister of Labour. I never heard anything quite as daft as that argument.

I notice that the Minister of Justice, with his usual good sense, has kept his seat and has not tried to explain an order of this kind. I admire him for that. Indeed, I have admired him for years for his integrity in the house and for his insistence upon not doing or saying anything unless he was sure he was right. I am glad tonight he is not departing from that practice.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I agree very largely with what the hon. member has said. The Minister of Labour took time out to prove that the emergency was over, when we were discussing the last item. We supported the order in council. I did so, because I could see it ended there. All these things are passed as emergencies. I quite agree with the hon. member for Vancouver East that some of these days we should know what kind of emergency we are facing, now that the war is over. The technical answer may be that the treaty of peace has not yet been signed. Even so, I intend to support this order in council, because I think we are now beginning to see the end of this picture.

Once again may I say I support it for reasons not yet given by the government; because their reasoning has proved that there is no emergency. Yet in a matter of emergency I hear them say, "We see the end of that emergency." I take their word for it, and I therefore support this order in council.

Mr. MITCHELL: Carried.

Mr. KNOWLES: On division.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the next order?

Mr. ILSLEY: Orders in council of the wartime prices and trade board.

Mr. KNOWLES: I have just a brief word to say in connection with the order in council setting up the wartime prices and trade board, which is P.C. 8528 of November 1, 1941.

What I shall have to say is in reply to what was said this afternoon by the Minister of Justice. He will recall that at that time I placed before the house a motion which would have given the committee power to put another section into this bill making it necessary to keep in existence the wartime prices and trade board machinery for the full year

[Mr. MacInnis.]

this bill is to be in force. The minister objected to the substance of my proposal, and did so on several counts.

One of the remarks he made was that it was an empty gesture. I did not take the time of the house to reply at that time; indeed I should imagine I did not then have the right to do so. I want to say a word in reply to it now.

In attempting to make clear what he meant by calling my motion an empty gesture, the minister said that even if my proposed amendment to section 4 of the act were accepted, which would thereby prevent the government from revoking the wartime prices and trade board orders in council, it would still be possible for the wartime prices and trade board, under the authority of the order, to revoke all price controls and do away with all price ceilings. What the minister said is quite correct, but I want to point out now that there is another side to the coin.

So long as the order in council itself is in force, in other words so long as the wartime prices and trade board is in existence, not only can it do away with price ceilings that are in existence, but it can reimpose price ceilings when it appears to the government that such reimpositions are necessary. I remind the minister and I remind the committee that that was done last fall in connection with a number of items when the situation seemed to be getting out of hand; it was done also on the price of butter, although at a pretty high level. At any rate the wartime prices and trade board brought back, by orders of the board, price ceilings and mark-up controls which had been done away with.

If the basic order in council setting up the wartime prices and trade board had been revoked by the government the board would not then have been in a position to reimpose those price ceilings. The minister is quite within his rights in objecting to my proposal on other grounds. I know he takes a constitutional position with which I do not agree, because I do not think this can be considered in terms of national emergency. I see it in terms of something that is of concern to the people of Canada as a whole, something over which in my view the federal parliament has control. My colleague, the hon. member for Kindersley, has effectively developed that argument on a number of occasions. I submit that it was not quite like the minister of Justice, and I believe if he would think it through a little further we would not press the point that my proposal this afternoon was without meaning.

The effect of my proposal was that the basic order in council should not be revoked because the Minister of Finance might some day want to go a little farther along the pathway of decontrol which would then get this country into a position where even the government, if it wanted to, could not reimpose price ceilings that might be desirable to the government as well as to the people of Canada.

The house settled the issue with the vote this afternoon, so that I do not propose to take up the time of the committee in trying to move the amendment at this stage. Obviously, if the house would not give permission for the committee to move the amendment, the committee would turn it down now. Perhaps this is the last debate that we shall have on the wartime prices and trade board, and I want to say that in our view the government has failed the people of Canada in its policy of decontrol. In our view the government has wiped out the wonderful record in terms of price control that it established under the direction of the Minister of Justice when he was Minister of Finance during the war, and the government will hear about it yet in the one way that governments hear about things in due course.

In the meantime I want to register once again my protest at the speed with which the government has taken the people of Canada down the pathway of decontrol. I am sorry the house did not see fit this afternoon to pass the motion that I made, so that we might have been in a position to make sure that the wartime prices and trade board would be kept in effect, at least for the lifetime of this bill.

Mr. ILSLEY: My hon. friend has made an ingenious argument in favour of the principle of the amendment he moved this afternoon. As he says, this probably is the last chance. He has tried to argue that there was some merit in the position that he took this afternoon. It is certainly threshing old straw for us to go over and over this again. How would it secure the purpose that my hon. friend apparently is interested in, the compelling of the government to desist from price control? He says that at least it compels the government not to get rid of the board.

The government certainly would not be getting rid of the board unless they were determined not to impose any more controls. Of what avail would it be to keep an empty shell there for a year if the government decided not to use that shell? That is all the amendment of this afternoon would have done. The government would certainly never decide to do away with the board unless they decided to

do away with controls. For my hon. friend to have some glimmer of hope that, by forcing them to keep the shell there, some way or another he would influence their conduct, is an illusory thing altogether. That is what I meant by saying that it was an empty gesture.

Mr. KNOWLES: Even a glimmer of hope with respect to the government is illusory.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am talking about the hope that this sort of formal technical move such as the amendment of this afternoon would have any effect upon government action. I explained that all a year ago and I have explained it again now. Any government, this government or any other, would act on a different principle altogether. They would act on the substance of the thing. If they felt the occasion required slower decontrol, they would move more slowly in decontrolling. But they would take abundant caution against getting rid of the machinery that would be necessary for decontrol. I am merely meeting my hon. friend's laboriously built up argument which he has just put forward to justify the technical move he made this afternoon.

I do not feel like letting all these compliments to myself go by at the expense of somebody else. I do not feel like accepting them. I think my hon. friend is completely underestimating the importance of the impact of forces which finally got beyond control. It is open to my hon. friend to argue that we should pour out great sums by way of subsidies as they still do in the United Kingdom and in some other countries. That would and could have kept down the prices of some goods at the expense of the treasury. But, as I said before, I do not think it is a good policy. I am sure it is not a permanent policy and I know it is a very dangerous policy.

As I said in another debate, I think people in positions of authority in other countries are disposed to congratulate the government of Canada on having the courage to disentangle themselves from the jungle of subsidies before it choked them, before it choked the taxpayers and the people of the country. That is the only practical thing to do. To try to control prices along the lines they were being controlled a few years ago under conditions such as existed then is to attain the impossible. By the pouring out of subsidies there could be some transference of purchasing power from certain Canadians to other Canadians but, for the reasons I have given repeatedly, I do not think that is desirable.

Mr. KNOWLES: I agree with the minister that what counts in this matter is the substance rather than any formal proposal put before the house, and it is not my intention to say one word further about the proposal that has been voted down by the house. But I want to say this to the minister. He uses the phrase "threshing old straw" and may feel that he can apply that to the proposals and the arguments that we have put before the house in our right in this matter over the past two and a half years, but I can tell him that it is not old straw so far as the people of Canada generally are concerned.

Mr. KUHL: How can you speak for all the people of Canada?

Mr. KNOWLES: It is not long since 76 per cent of the people of Canada recorded themselves in a Gallup poll as favouring the continuation of price controls and subsidies. I simply say to the former minister of finance, without embarrassing him by any further compliments, that it was this government's own practice during the war which educated the people of Canada in the possibilities of this means of keeping down the cost of living and of distributing, as the minister has just said, the wealth of the people of this country to a certain extent. We have had so many motions and amendments turned down in this house that members are beginning to treat it as though it were a case of threshing old straw, but it is still a pretty important measure to the people of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: We will take up the next order.

Mr. MacNICOL: I have a question to ask with reference to P.C. 9029, 21/11/41. A house owner in Toronto who owns two buildings rents one for \$45 a month and supplies the heat. The man and wife to whom he rented it have sublet every room in the house but one. The tenant and his wife live in that one room and have sublet all the other rooms to tenants from whom they receive \$196 a month. The owner has asked me what means of redress he has. He cannot get any more rent, and the coal he buys to heat the building has advanced in price at least 50 per cent. What can that owner do?

Mr. ILSLEY: There is a board order, 294, section 7(1)(d) which allows an application for an increase of the maximum rent if the \$45 is lower than the rental for comparable property in the neighbourhood. Paragraph (f) of the same section allows a ten per cent increase because of subletting.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

Mr. SKEY: Would the minister give the date of that order?

Mr. ILSLEY: October 1, 1943, but there have been many amendments since then.

Mr. MacNICOL: How would this owner get redress? He cannot put the tenants out and he cannot get possession of the property. The tenant is collecting almost four times as much rent from his sub-tenants as the owner of the property receives.

Mr. ILSLEY: Would my hon. friend mind giving the chairman of the board a ring in the morning and putting the case to him and getting a reference to the relative sections?

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, I will do that. Thank you.

Mr. SKEY: The case that has just been put by the hon. member for Davenport I can assure the minister is one of frequent occurrence in a great many cities in Canada. There are many similar cases which I have had referred to me, in which it is very difficult for the property owner to get anything approaching justice.

But I want to speak tonight particularly of the rooming-house operators. They submitted a brief and representations to the Minister of Finance, and I should like to put some of their representations on record because they will be of interest to the minister and the members. On January 28 they wrote the Minister of Finance and the members of the house, and among other things they said:

The rentals act fails to benefit either the roomer or the landlord when it is applied to renting furnished rooms.

They acknowledged Canada's housing prices and their own assistance in alleviating that crisis by renting rooms. They refer to the time during the war when the government appealed to people with space in their homes to rent accommodation, and they cite the fact that immediately afterwards tenants were frozen, and the rooming house operator was unable to remove even the small percentage of objectionable tenants. They ask that the rental controls be drastically amended as far as rooming house operators are concerned.

Their main point is this, that while the owner of a property which is used as a rooming-house is permitted an increase of ten per cent in his rent, the rooming-house operators are allowed no comparable compensation in respect of their roomers. At the same time the rooming-house operator is faced with all the current increases in costs, fuel, repairs, service, light and all these other things that

go into the running of a home. These expenses have increased substantially in the last two years. They ask respectfully that the regulations be amended to permit them at least a comparable rental increase with that of their own landlords; they ask for some alleviation of the six months' freezing order, which it takes to remove what are, in many cases, obnoxious tenants. They do not ask point-blank that the controls be taken off. They are too conscious of the situation in Canada today to want to produce a bit of bad citizenship such as that; but they do ask that at least they be allowed the same increase in rental that their landlord has been allowed, and some alleviation in the eviction controls which will permit them at least a little control over the type of tenant that they have in their homes. They point out the increase in the cost of all furnishings, supplies and necessities, which are all borne by the rooming-house operators.

I should like to put on the record for the minister the fact that this organization has submitted the names of operators in twelve major cities in Canada. The cities are, Montreal, Winnipeg, Windsor, Quebec, Vancouver, Halifax, Kingston, London, Hamilton, Ottawa, Toronto and Barrie. This organization spreads all through these cities, and if they had had time I know they would have had even more. Let me give some examples of what they are suffering today. In one letter we find that a single woman rented a room. She was married and brought her husband to live in the same accommodation and not even a minor increase in the rental was allowed. In another case a woman has a roomer, and since the advent of this roomer into her house she has found that articles have disappeared, her own articles from her own home and articles of other roomers; yet it takes her six months to get rid of this tenant whom she believes to be obnoxious. The rentals board advise her that she must either give the six months' notice or prefer a charge, and unfortunately she has no proof.

In another case we find a man who served five years in the air force. He took over a rooming house. The rent was \$70, with the lighting costing \$4.50 a month. He now finds that he has to pay \$84 a month rent and \$24.90 for his light for two months. The price of his coal has risen from \$10.90 a ton to \$15.90, and at the same time he can get no increase in rentals from his roomers. Those cases are all authenticated on the files of this organization.

Here is the case of a woman who was mentally deranged. She was placed in a home by the welfare agency of that city. It took the owner of the home six months to remove her from the premises. There are other examples, but I will not quote them all, except to say that this freezing order has had an unfortunate result in so far as accommodation is concerned. It has meant that when rooms have become vacant the owner of the accommodation will not rent them again in a great many cases. Apartments become vacant, and the owners of the apartment are not willing to rent them again, because they have had such trouble with tenants under this freezing order. I made recommendations to the Minister of Reconstruction and Supply when he was in charge of this. I am not going to do so now. I am putting these facts on the record to call it to the attention of the minister. In all seriousness, I say to the minister and to his officials who sit in front of him, that if, in this time of acute housing shortage, you want to do something to help out you should consider these facts that I put before you tonight and do what you can to alleviate the situation in which not only rooming-house operators but owners of a great deal of vacant accommodation in Canada find themselves.

Mr. MANROSS: Are not rooming-houses permitted to increase their rates the same as hotels? The Chateau Laurier has increased its rates 33½ per cent. Would not rooming houses have the same privilege?

Mr. ILSLEY: The answer is no, they have not.

Mr. TIMMINS: Since these celebrated orders were passed last year, there was a certain amendment made with respect to the rental order. One of these orders was to the effect that, in respect of residential properties where there was extreme hardship, the owner might apply for relief to a commissioner. In respect of these applications a good number were granted and relief was given to people, having regard to sickness, infirmity and a number of other reasons. However I do not believe that the amendment which was made to the order went far enough, because it left out almost entirely the case of the returned man who had a home of his own and who was not able to get in, who had bought a place since he came back from overseas and wished to get in. Probably he could not show extreme hardship because, under the order, financial matters are not a factor. Could not some consideration be given at this late day now that the war has been over for such a considerable period whereby a returned man who

has bought a place and who has not by reason of extreme hardship been able to prove to the commissioner that he should have possession but who, on the other hand, for financial reasons, probably cannot continue the house unless he gets possession of it? Some consideration should be given to that problem now, particularly in the case where the veteran asks for permission to get in his home and shows that just as many people would go into the home which belonged to him as would be vacated by reason of the order to be made in his favour. I see in front of the minister one of his assistants who has had a good deal to do with this matter in the Toronto district for a considerable number of years past. I am sure that he must have some answer to that pressing problem.

Mr. MICHAUD: I should like to ask the minister—

Mr. TIMMINS: Can we deal with this one matter first?

Mr. MAYHEW: There have been set up in Canada about forty different commissions to deal with hardship cases. Where an individual represents that he has a large family and that somebody else is occupying his house with a small family, both parties appear before the commissioner who, in many cases, visits the home and decides to whom the house should go. In other words, the house goes to the one whose hardship is the greater. That would be the same with the returned soldier. If he were actually in greater need of the house than the person occupying it he would get it.

Mr. TIMMINS: That is not a sufficient answer because, if I may say so, it is not quite the fact. So far as extreme hardship is concerned, the commissioners have held—and there is nothing to bind them in the amendment made—that extreme hardship does not take into consideration financial matters, and therefore the veteran who is bothered more by financial considerations than anything else cannot get into his own house. Some consideration should be given that. I have known hundreds of applications granted on the ground of extreme hardship owing to a large number of children, or to the fact that people were living in a garage, or that they were infirm and almost on their death bed when they made their application. In such cases relief was granted. But the veteran who does not receive too much money gets no relief on the ground of extreme hardship.

Mr. KIDD: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister another case that I submitted to the minister of reconstruction in the veterans affairs committee in 1945. It is a

[Mr. Timmins.]

disgrace that veterans of the last war are subjected to treatment of the kind meted out to one man in particular whose case I have in mind. He went overseas and served for five years. At the time of his enlistment he was an attendant in a hospital in Ontario—in Kingston as a matter of fact—and was in receipt of \$100 a month. He left his wife and four children, the eldest a girl then about fourteen or fifteen. I may say, by the way, that I have also brought this case to the attention of the officials. This man remained overseas for nearly five years. Living in a four-roomed apartment, this family pay the small sum of \$15. I mention that for the reason that the quarters were not luxurious. After five years overseas he comes back, his family having played their part. He had assigned pay and separation allowance; they accumulated what they could; his children helped by selling newspapers, and he purchased a piece of property about three years ago. Then he went back to his old position at about \$100 a month. This man is not only a tenant but now a landlord. I spoke to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, then minister of reconstruction, and an appeal made to the board was turned down. These veterans deserve some consideration. This man came and saw me personally and his girl is now twenty or twenty-one years of age. They are living in four rooms under conditions to which they should not be subjected, through no fault of their own but through the fault of government controls. I simply wish to put this on the record. If anyone looks up the files he will find that I wrote to the minister with reference to the matter.

Mr. MICHAUD: I should like to ask the minister a few questions. In the first place, I wish to know whether it is contemplated to decontrol further in the case of persons who have purchased houses with the intention of taking possession. I am aware of this order in council which was passed some time in August, where the hardship argument applies; but from the experience I have had in court it does not work out in the way I have heard suggested tonight. It is not a question of either the tenant or the landlord suffering the greater hardship. The landlord has to prove hardship on his own part and to disprove hardship on the part of the tenant. I have had quite a bit of experience in court in this connection and I do not recall a single case where the landlord got anywhere. I could take up the time of the committee in discussing these cases but I will dispense with that. I think that in the near future we should reach the stage where a person who bought a house in 1947 with the intention of occupying it should have the right to

possession of that house as if the purchase were prior to July, 1945. I do not believe the hardship argument is of any great value to the landlord. It may apply in one case out of twenty. I have other questions I should like to ask but since it is eleven o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BRACKEN: What is the program for tomorrow?

Mr. ILSLEY: The business for tomorrow will be: second reading of the New Westminster harbour commission act; then the

measure we have been dealing with today; then continuing the debate on the second reading of Bill No. 135, the Canadian Wheat Board Act; then the resolution to amend the Agricultural Products Act; and, if there is time, committee of ways and means on the excise measures of the Minister of Finance. With regard to the last three items I have given, there may be some variation in the order in which I have given them.

Mr. KNOWLES: This one comes first?

Mr. ILSLEY: After the New Westminster measure.

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