Vol. LXXXVI.—No. 54

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Thursday, April 24, 1947

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

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

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee, third report, Mr. Breithaupt..... 2419

Emergency Powers Act. Tabling of orders in council passed under, Mr. St. Laurent..... 2419

St. Lawrence Waterway. Concurrence in proposal for toll charges, Mr. St. Laurent, Mr. Bracken, Mr. Adamson..... 2419

East Indians. Franchise in British Columbia, Exchange of telegrams between Ottawa and New Delhi, Mr. St. Laurent, Mr. Church..... 2420

Canadian National Railways. Report of auditors referred to Railways and Shipping Committee. Motion, Mr. Chevrier, agreed to..... 2420

The Budget. Announcement of date of presentation as April 29 at 8 p.m., Mr. Abbott.... 2420

Supreme Court Act. Amendment to abolish appeals to the Privy Council. Bill No. 154, Mr. Jaenicke, first reading..... 2420

Answers to Questions asked by: Mr. Black (Yukon), Mr. Fraser, Mr. Winters, Mr. Church, Mr. Probe, Mr. Black (Cumberland), Mr. Coldwell..... 2421

Question passed as Order for Return. Mr. White (Middlesex East)..... 2422

Foreign Exchange. Discount on Canadian bonds and stocks in United States markets, Mr. Cockeram, Mr. Abbott..... 2422

Labour Conditions. Inquiry respecting authorization for admission of Europeans to Canada, Mr. Castleden, Mr. Mitchell..... 2423

Butter. Suggested shipment to Britain of supply in storage, Mr. Church, Mr. Gardiner.... 2423

National Defence. Civilian employees in armed services, Mr. Winters, Mr. Claxton..... 2423

St. George's Day. Celebration in Toronto—Tribute to Great Britain, Mr. Church..... 2423

Radio Broadcasting. Regina chamber of commerce broadcasts, Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. McCann, Mr. Coldwell..... 2424

External Affairs. High Commissioner to India—Appointment of High Commissioner to Canada, Mr. Graydon, Mr. St. Laurent..... 2424

Railways and Shipping. Reference to control of special committee, Mr. Lennard..... 2425

Emergency Powers. Continuation of certain orders and regulations. Bill No. 104, Mr. Ilsley, further considered in committee, progress reported..... 2425

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker: The Honourable GASPARD FAUTEUX

THURSDAY, April 24, 1947.

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

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

REPORTS AND PAPERS

TABLING OF ORDERS IN COUNCIL UNDER EMERGENCY POWERS ACT

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I wish to table copies in English and French of orders in council, including minutes of council and of the treasury board, passed under the authority of the National Emergency Transitional Powers Act, 1945, for the month of March, 1947, and copies in French for the month of February, 1947.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

CONCURRENCE IN PROPOSAL FOR TOLL CHARGES

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In view of the fact that the St. Lawrence seaway agreement has been resubmitted to the United States congress for approval, it is felt that it would be useful to provide a brief statement of the present position for the information of members of the house.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin agreement was signed on March 19, 1941. Since that time the agreement has been regularly submitted to congress, but has never been approved. In 1946 the senate foreign relations committee, after extensive hearings, made a favourable report on the bill but the matter never came to a vote in the senate.

The Canadian government was recently approached by the United States authorities regarding the possibility of reaching agreement in principle that the seaway be made self-liquidating through an agreed system of tolls the details of which could be worked out at a later date. The Canadian government has now concurred in principle with the proposal to make the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating by means of toll charges subject to the conclusion of arrangements satisfactory to both governments for the implementation of this principle.

[*Later*]:

Mr. JOHN BRACKEN (Leader of the Opposition): The minister referred to an agreement which had been made with respect to the seaway agreement. Can the correspondence be made available?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The consent of the United States government would be required. I am not sure how much of this was covered by correspondence. I know that there were negotiations which were conducted orally between the United States ambassador and the Department of External Affairs here, and there were other negotiations conducted orally between our ambassador in Washington and the state department there. There possibly has been an exchange of notes; if there has been, they will of course be tabled.

Mr. BRACKEN: The minister referred to an agreement in principle on a system of tolls. If there is an agreement could we have its exact terms?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There was a statement made that Canada would not object to the principle of tolls provided they could be arranged in such a way that there would be genuine benefit to transportation in a reduction of charges by the construction of the seaway. I am not sure that there was a formal exchange of notes, but if there was I shall be glad to see that the notes are tabled.

Mr. ADAMSON: Was the legislation introduced in congress in the form of a bill, or in the form of a treaty? Will it require a two-thirds majority or a simple majority?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I should not like to express an opinion as to what is required constitutionally, but my opinion is that a bill has been introduced.

EAST INDIANS

FRANCHISE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—EXCHANGE OF TELEGRAMS BETWEEN OTTAWA AND NEW DELHI

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): There is a statement I should like to make to the house in explanation of the fact that a release to the press was made this morning at eleven o'clock of an exchange of telegrams between Ottawa and New Delhi with respect to the amendment of the Franchise Act of British Columbia and its effect upon the franchise of East Indians. The reason the release was made this morning instead of being communicated first here in the house was that it was desired to have it released simultaneously here and in New Delhi. Because of the difference in time even eleven o'clock this morning meant something like 9.30 p.m. in New Delhi. The telegrams are as follows:

Right Hon. Louis S. St. Laurent,
Secretary of State for External Affairs,
Ottawa.

I would like to convey to Prime Minister of Canada, to Premier of British Columbia, and to yourself, my appreciation and thanks for action taken by legislative assembly of British Columbia in passing bill enfranchising Indians. I hope this is forerunner of increasingly friendly relations between Canada and India.

Jawaharlal Nehru,
Minister for External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations, India.

To which the following reply was sent:

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,
Minister for External Affairs
and Commonwealth Relations,
New Delhi.

Greatly appreciate your kind telegram regarding enfranchisement of Indians in British Columbia which has resulted from action by legislative assembly of that province. I join with you in hope that friendship between India and Canada will be strengthened by this action.

Louis S. St. Laurent,
Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. CHURCH: I take it from the Hindu statement with respect to votes for these Hindus in British Columbia that the government is automatically recognizing the new Nehru provisional Indian government.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REPORT OF AUDITORS REFERRED TO RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Hon. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of George A. Touche and Company, auditors of the Canadian National Railway system for the year ended December 31, 1946. Copies in English are being distributed to the members this afternoon and I expect to be able to table the French edition in a day or two. By leave of the house I move:

That the report to parliament of George A. Touche and Company, auditors of the Canadian National Railway System, for the year ended December 31, 1946, tabled this day, be referred to the sessional committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government.

Motion agreed to.

THE BUDGET

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DATE OF PRESENTATION

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members are anxious to get the budget as soon as possible. The Acting Prime Minister tells me he has spoken to the leaders of the parties and there seems a fair prospect that the emergency legislation will be passed this week or early next week, and on the assumption that it is, I intend to present the budget at eight o'clock on Tuesday.

SUPREME COURT ACT

AMENDMENT TO ABOLISH APPEALS TO PRIVY COUNCIL

Mr. F. E. JAENICKE (Kindersley) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 154, to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. JAENICKE: Mr. Speaker, on the 13th January, 1947, the judicial committee of the privy council decided that the dominion parliament may, in the exercise of the wide amplitude of power conferred by section 101 of the British North America Act, vest the Supreme Court of Canada with final and exclusive civil and appellate jurisdiction within and for Canada and may accordingly deny any appeal to his majesty in council either from the supreme court or from any provincial court and regardless of whether the matter in question is within the exclusive legislative authority of the dominion or of the provincial legislatures.

The purpose of the present bill is to give effect to this decision of the privy council, and also to a previous decision respecting appeals in criminal matters, namely, British Coal Corporation *v.* the King in 1935.

Section 54 of the Supreme Court Act, which it is proposed to repeal by this bill, reads as follows:

54. The judgment of the court shall, in all cases, be final and conclusive, and no appeal shall be brought from any judgment or order of the court to any court of appeal established by the parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, by which appeals or petitions to His Majesty in council may be ordered to be heard, saving any right which His Majesty may be graciously pleased to exercise by virtue of his royal prerogative.

The right of appeal to His Majesty in council has been regulated in certain statutes of the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, of which two are important: the Judicial Committee Act, 1833, and the Judicial Committee Act, 1844. Both these acts are proposed to be repealed by this bill. The act of 1833 recites that:

. . . from the decisions of various courts of judicature in the East Indies and in the plantations, colonies and other dominions of His Majesty abroad, an appeal lies to His Majesty in council.

And proceeds to regulate the manner of such appeal. The act of 1844 recites that:

. . . the judicial committee, acting under the authority of said acts (the act of 1933 and an amending act) hath been found to answer well the purposes for which it was so established by parliament, but it is found necessary to improve its proceedings in some respects for the better dispatch of business and expedient also to extend its jurisdiction and powers.

The first section of the act of 1844 enacts that it shall be competent to Her Majesty by general or special order in council to:

. . . provide for the admission of any appeal or appeals to her majesty in council from any judgments, sentences, decrees or orders of any court of justice within any British colony or possession abroad.

This bill is in accordance with the decisions of the privy council here referred to, which themselves were based on the provisions of the Statute of Westminster, 1931.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS FROM JAPAN

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

What public moneys have been expended or advanced to repatriate Canadian civilians from Japanese prison and concentration camps?

Mr. GLEN: The actual amount expended to date by the immigration branch in payment of accounts received is $73,780.04.

"HOUSING PROGRESS ABROAD", BI-MONTHLY REVIEW

Mr. FRASER:

1. How many copies of each issue of Housing Progress Abroad, Bi-monthly Review, are printed and issued by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation?

2. How many people are employed to compile and edit this review?

3. What is the total monthly salaries, or wages, of the above employees?

4. What is the total cost of printing and mimeographing this review?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. During 1946 five issues of "Housing Progress Abroad" were mimeographed (March 1, May 1, July 15, September 10 and November 7) averaging three hundred copies per issue.

2. One person was employed to compile and edit this review with part time assistance from other employees.

3. As nearly as can be estimated the total monthly salaries paid to compile and edit the review would not exceed $200.

4. $312.50 for 1946. This amount is made up of the cost of paper, stencilling and mimeographing.

WAR ASSETS—WOMEN'S SHOES AND SOCKS

Mr. FRASER:

1. Did war assets corporation, eastern division, receive within the last two months, about 5,000 pairs of women's white socks and about 15,000 pairs of women's oxford shoes?

2. If so, from what branch of the armed services were these received?

3. Will these socks and oxfords be sold by auction or through the firms that manufactured same?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. No. The eastern division (maritime region) of War Assets Corporation, during the last two months, received, on national distribution, no women's white socks and only 2,553 pairs of women's oxford shoes.

2. Department of National Defence (Army).

3. No. They will be sold to jobbers, wholesalers, and direct buying retailers.

PEACE TREATIES

Mr. PROBE:

1. With what enemy countries during world war two has Canada signed peace treaties to date?

2. Will these treaties be presented to parliament for ratification? If so, when?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Italy, Roumania, Hungary and Finland.

2. It is anticipated that the treaties will be presented to parliament for approval at an early date, dependent on progress made with urgent legislation which must be given priority.

WEST NOVA SCOTIA REGIMENT

Mr. WINTERS:

1. Where are the headquarters of the West Nova Scotia Regiment?

2. For military purposes, is Halifax considered to be in the west Nova Scotia area?

3. Who is the commanding officer of the West Nova Scotia Regiment, when was he appointed, and where does he live?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Kentville, N.S.
2. Yes.
3. Lieutenant-Colonel T. M. Powers; appointed: 1st April, 1947. Resides at Halifax, N.S.

INDIANS AND ESKIMOS—CITIZENSHIP

Mr. CHURCH:

Has any action been taken to give by grant of letters patent to the Indians and Eskimos of Canada under the prerogative powers of the sovereign full citizenship in Canada, and to include their right to all social services now extended to all citizens of this country?

Mr. GLEN: Indians and Eskimos are natural born Canadian citizens and enjoy, subject to the disabilities and liabilities provided for in the Indian Act, all the rights and privileges of such citizenship; as well they enjoy certain special rights and privileges under the said act not enjoyed by other citizens. It is understood this matter will be the subject of consideration by the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons.

WEYMOUTH-GROSSES COQUES-BELLIVEAU'S COVE-ST. BERNARD, N.S. MAIL SERVICE

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Has the contract for conveying mail from Weymouth, Grosses Coques, Belliveau's Cove and St. Bernard, Nova Scotia, been up for renewal and have or will tenders be called for, stating date?
2. Who are the tenderers, stating the amounts?
3. Has the contract been let, and if so, to whom and at what price?
4. Have or will returned men be given preference?

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier):

1. As the services of the contractor are satisfactory and the contract rate reasonable, arrangements have been completed for the renewal of the contract for a period of four years under the existing terms, dating from the 1st July next.

2, 3 and 4. See answer to No. 1.

NORTHERN WEATHER STATIONS—PERSONNEL

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Have steps been taken to recruit Canadian personnel for the projected far northern weather stations?
2. If so, what salaries are being offered to (a) officials; (b) senior technicians; (c) junior technicians?
3. What salary schedules are being offered by the United States for similar positions at the same weather posts?
4. What other inducements, if any, are offered (a) by Canada; (b) by United States?

Mr. McILRAITH:

1. Yes.
2. (a) $4,500, officer in charge; $3,300, forecaster; (b) $2,580; (c) $1,980.
3. Information not available.
4. (a) $1,200 isolation allowance; free board and lodging; all essential winter clothing and equipment; (b) information not available.

GRATUITIES TO RED CROSS PERSONNEL WITH OVERSEAS SERVICE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has anything been done since last session to grant gratuities and other benefits to the Red Cross personnel who served overseas in the last war since it was before the 1946 committee on veterans affairs?
2. Will any action be taken in the matter?

Mr. TUCKER:

1. No.
2. This question relates to matters of policy and it is not the practice of the government to disclose policy in giving answers to questions.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

MILITARY SERVICE—ALIENS—RIGHT TO NATURALIZATION

Mr. WHITE (Middlesex East):

1. How many aliens during the period of the war (a) received notice of call up; (b) thereafter agreed to serve in the Canadian army; (c) thereafter refused to serve on the ground that they were aliens?
2. Was an alien who refused to serve required to sign an undertaking that in doing so he was forever deprived of the right to be naturalized as a British subject?
3. If so, how many signed such an undertaking?
4. Have any of said aliens who declined to serve been naturalized since May, 1945 as (a) British subjects; (b) Canadian citizens?
5. If so, how many in each category?
6. Has consideration been given to allowing such aliens who signed such declarations to become naturalized?

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

DISCOUNT ON CANADIAN BONDS AND STOCKS IN UNITED STATES MARKETS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALAN COCKERAM (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question. Yesterday I directed a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) inquiring as to what steps the government proposes to take to cope with the increasingly adverse and critical exchange position as between Canada and the United States of America. The minister's reply was indefinite, and I now ask him to make a full statement to the house, informing us of the action which the government proposes to take to remedy this situation.

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of Finance): The minister's answer is exactly what it was yesterday. That is a matter of government policy which will be announced in due course.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): He is an isolationist.

Mr. COCKERAM: Mr. Speaker, this is twice the minister has refused to answer the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. COCKERAM: No "order" at all. I have a right to speak in this house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. COCKERAM: The minister has declined to answer the question and has reverted to his usual facetiousness. I wanted an answer by Abbott the minister, not Abbott of Abbott and Costello.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. ABBOTT: He did not like the answer yesterday and could not think of a come-back quick enough.

Mr. SPEAKER: The minister has answered the question.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

INQUIRY RESPECTING AUTHORIZATION FOR ADMISSION OF EUROPEANS TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Labour this question: is special permission being granted to any other manufacturer in Canada to bring in workers from Europe, under the present immigration regulations?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): My understanding is that there is, although I have not the figures in front of me. I shall be glad to give them to my hon. friend.

Mr. COLDWELL: May we have the facts?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, surely. I meant to have brought the memorandum in with me, but I forgot to do so. I met a delegation and did not leave them until the first house bell rang.

BUTTER

SUGGESTED SHIPMENT TO BRITAIN OF SUPPLY IN STORAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. Will he be prepared to do something to provide the people who are suffering in Great Britain with some of the butter we have in storage? I should like an answer.

Right Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there is not as much butter in storage in Canada as there has been on previous occasions. It will eventually all be required here. But I will take into consideration the suggestion made, and I may have something to say later.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN ARMED SERVICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT H. WINTERS (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence if the figures given by Arthur Blakely in a dispatch in the Montreal *Gazette* of today showing that there are 18,000 civilian employees in the army, 5,997 in the Royal Canadian Air Force and 8,131 in the navy, are correct?

Hon. BROOKE CLAXTON (Minister of National Defence): No; they are not correct. What the *Gazette* has given are the figures for December 31, 1946. At March 31, 1947, the number of civilians employed in the army was 11,535 instead of 18,000; for the R.C.A.F. it was 3,015 instead of 5,997 and for the navy it was 5,581 instead of 8,131. So instead of a total of 32,128, the total is 20,131, or a reduction of 11,997 or 37 per cent in the last four months.

ST. GEORGE'S DAY

CELEBRATION IN TORONTO—TRIBUTE TO GREAT BRITAIN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention and that of the four leaders in the house to the fact that St. George's day was celebrated yesterday. I waited for the leaders to speak, but nothing was said. There is a St. George's day celebration in my city today, and at this time I should like to pay tribute, as a private member of the house, to what Great Britain did in the war, and what they have suffered.

They starved themselves at that time, and they are starving themselves today to help feed their enemies.

RADIO BROADCASTING

REGINA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BROADCAST

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Revenue what decision the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has come to in reference to the request of the government of Saskatchewan for a ban against certain programmes put on by the Regina Chamber of Commerce, on the ground that they were of a political nature, dealing as they do with private enterprise.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows perfectly well that the purpose of a question is to get information from the government, not to give it to the house.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what the question did.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that the hon. member do that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is my question, Mr. Speaker. I asked what the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is going to do with regard to the objection raised by the government of Saskatchewan, the objection being that the broadcasting of—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member has put his question.

Hon. J. J. McCANN (Minister of National Revenue): I have had no notification of the question, but the matter will be given consideration and an answer made in due course.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask this further question of the Minister of National Revenue? In view of the fact that the broadcasts to which the hon. member for Lake Centre referred are practically political broadcasts put on by a non-political organization, and the further fact that the next one goes on on Sunday, will he look into the matter and inform the house so that action may be taken before Sunday—if these are illegal broadcasts?

Mr. McCANN: If the hon. member is anxious to listen to the broadcasts, we shall try to let him know in sufficient time, so that he may do so.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not want to listen to it.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. McCANN: It is the policy of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that political broadcasts are not to be dramatized on Sunday?

Mr. McIVOR: Or any other day.

Mr. McCANN: If it is considered that this is a dramatization of a political subject, then I am quite sure it will be banned.

Mr. COLDWELL: Even by a chamber of commerce.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

HIGH COMMISSIONER TO INDIA—APPOINTMENT OF HIGH COMMISSIONER TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. BRADETTE: Once a day.

Mr. GRAYDON: I could ask a lot more.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Put it on the order paper.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is about the only contribution the Secretary of State (Mr. Gibson) can make. From time to time he introduces the same theme. However, I am not easily discouraged. I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the Canadian High Commissioner to India has left Canada as yet. I asked this question some time ago, and the minister indicated he had not yet left. Has the minister any further information in the matter?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the High Commissioner to India was in early this week, either Monday or Tuesday, to take leave of me just before proceeding to his post. He told me the date he was embarking, but I would not venture to repeat it from memory. He was in, however, to take official leave before proceeding to occupy his post.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask whether the Indian appointment has been made of a high commissioner to Canada?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: When the government is notified officially of the appointment the announcement will be made in the house, without any delay.

Mr. GRAYDON: There has been none yet.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No, no official announcement has been communicated to the government as yet.

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING

REFERENCE TO CONTROL OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. E. LENNARD (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Transport with respect to a motion moved by him yesterday and passed. Since when has the sessional committee on railways and shipping been owned, operated and controlled by the government?

EMERGENCY POWERS

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN ORDERS AND REGULATIONS

The house resumed from Wednesday, April 23, consideration in committee of Bill No. 104, to provide for the continuation of certain orders and regulations of the governor in council for a limited period during the national emergency arising out of the war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Macdonald (Brantford City) in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose last night it was considering the schedule to the bill and orders in council 946, 251, 1665, 469 and 7355, along with an amendment moved by the hon. member for Moose Jaw.

Mr. STIRLING: The question before the committee is whether the five orders in council which have to do with Japanese in Canada should be continued for the life of Bill 104, roughly another year. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Moose Jaw suggests that P.C. 946 be deleted. P.C. 946 is the order in council which empowers the minister to exercise certain control over the movement of Japanese in Canada. It is obvious that if that order in council were deleted from Bill 104, no such power would continue, any settlement still being operated by the government would cease, any money being paid for the subsistence of Japanese in Canada would cease to be paid, and there would be nothing to prevent Japanese from moving about Canada at will.

The Minister of Labour referred in passing to the fact that an administrative order had been passed recently which modified order in council 946. That administrative order No. 5, new series, begins by describing the coastal area. I take it that the description which follows is the description of what was hitherto known as the restricted area.

Mr. MITCHELL: As the protected area.

Mr. STIRLING: The boundaries are the same?

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. STIRLING: It sets out for the purposes of this order the boundaries of the restricted area. The order then goes on to say:

> No person of the Japanese race shall
> (a) enter or reside in the coastal area; or
> (b) enter the province of British Columbia; or
> (c) travel a distance of more than fifty miles within the province of British Columbia; or
> (d) if resident in any place in the province of British Columbia, take up residence elsewhere in the province of British Columbia;
> unless such person has obtained a permit in writing to do so from a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

So that any restriction on the movement of Japanese which had hitherto been applied under order in council 946 ceases east of the rockies. It seems to me that it would have been a simple matter to deal with these five orders in council on their merits, realizing that they are merely for the purpose of carrying on certain powers for a limited period. However, hon. members have seen fit to open up the whole Japanese question and to debate the whole issue, and that being so I feel it is necessary to restate once more in as few words as possible the position which I take on behalf of those whom I represent.

Those whom I represent inhabit that portion of British Columbia lying immediately east of the restricted area. Long before the war a certain number of Japanese, perhaps between five and seven hundred, had resided there for a considerable time. It is not easy to say exactly what the number is today.

Mr. MITCHELL: 6618.

Mr. STIRLING: I am speaking of the area which I represent.

Mr. MITCHELL: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. STIRLING: The best check I have been able to make is to watch the issuance of ration cards in the last few years. The last figure I have for the district of which Kelowna is the centre is 665. At the beginning of the session I put on the order paper certain questions in connection with the number of Japanese residents, and in reply I received certain figures which have since been modified somewhat. As of January 31 there were 84 Japanese in the restricted area of British Columbia. I am given to understand that these were made up of infirm and sick persons in institutions and Japanese who had married white people and who were permitted to continue to reside in the coastal area. In the New Denver departmental project, one of the Japanese settlements in the southern interior, there were 949 persons. Those are the figures given to me and which appeared

in *Hansard* at the beginning of February. Elsewhere in the interior of British Columbia there were 5,727 Japanese.

I suggest that that is an altogether too high a number of Japanese to expect British Columbia willingly to accept if the solution of the Japanese question is to depend upon their distribution throughout the nine provinces. As I pointed out, in the one portion of the Okanagan valley from which I come a total of 665 ration cards were issued to Japanese. In the mining city of Greenwood, whose population has sunk to about one-tenth of what it was forty years ago, a settlement was arranged and paid for by this government, but I have not been able to get the exact number of Japanese located here. Besides that, there is a total of between 5,000 and 6,000 in what might virtually be described as one quarter of the province of British Columbia. It is obvious therefore that that province is being asked to assume a larger part of the total than is reasonable. The province with the largest number of Japanese at the present time is Ontario, and that figure is in the neighbourhood of 7,000, between 7,000 and 8,000.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just under 7,000.

Mr. STIRLING: Then one-quarter of British Columbia, in the southeastern portion, is asked to accommodate, to retain, pretty nearly as many as the whole province of Ontario, and that surely is not reasonable. I consider that those whom I represent, suffering as they have from this Japanese intrusion, have taken an extremely reasonable and restrained view of the matter. It should be remembered that even before the restricted area was set up by the British Columbia security commission, Japanese were beginning to trek out of what would be described as the restricted area, and in the Okanagan valley as well as in the valleys neighbouring thereto the Japanese population began to increase in considerable numbers.

It is true that the British Columbia security commission accepted the view of the inhabitants of those towns that as these people had moved out of the restricted area it was reasonable that they should be dealt with by the commission and put into the restricted areas which they set up, the camps or settlements or whatever they were, and to a large extent they were so removed.

To place the matter in more or less official wording, as from those whom I represent, I wish to quote a resolution which was adopted by the Okanagan and main line associated boards of trade meeting in Revelstoke in January. The text of that resolution was:

That this association point out to the dominion authorities the danger of an influx of Japanese into the interior of British Columbia, following the expiry of the Emergency Powers Act on March 31, and urge legislation to prevent such a situation developing.

At that time the executive of the Kelowna board of trade wrote a letter similar to that which was addressed by the other boards of trade to the Prime Minister. I want to read a couple of sentences from that letter:

We have been advised that after March 31, 1947, all restrictions on the movement of Japanese in Canada will be removed and we are writing at this time to ask what action is being taken to implement the promises and assurances given by various government department heads that the Japanese would never again be allowed to congregate in one area. We strongly recommend that some government action should be taken to ensure that these people are evenly distributed, on a per capita basis, across Canada or some plan that will prevent them from again congregating in small areas in British Columbia. The people of this part of the Okanagan consider that there are already too many Japanese in this area and are most emphatic that no more be permitted under any circumstances. It is felt by this board that the government has had sufficient time to have formulated some plan, and I would respectfully request that we be informed of this at once. If nothing has been done, I would request that we also be informed of this.

To that, the replies from Ottawa appear to have been non-committal. The British Columbia cabinet ministers, including Premier Hart, replied sympathetically. Attorney General Gordon Wismer had written a strong supporting letter. That places the situation, so far as those whom I represent are concerned, in as succinct a light as I can put it.

The basis of their objection to the further intrusion of Japanese into that area is that they do not consider that the Japanese are assimilable. There are two courses which may follow the return of the Japanese to those areas. One is that they may nest themselves in cells, and that, I believe, the majority of Canadians who think realize is not a desirable way to deal with the future unity of this country. The other one is that there will be assimilation, that there will be intermarriage, that there will be children born of a type different from either of the two races who go to make up the marriage. Surely, looking at the world all over for two centuries past, there have been a sufficient number of dreadful examples of what has resulted from the creation of an Eurasian cast.

Mr. CROLL: I am enough of a realist on this particular question to recognize that this

is a vexatious problem in British Columbia, but the implications concern all of us in Canada, and for that reason we have a responsibility to help British Columbia to solve the problem. It is not enough for us merely to discuss it; we have to do something about it. It is our duty to see that each of the provinces carries out its responsibility.

I appreciate that the great concentration of Japanese in British Columbia was unfortunate. The Japanese were not entirely responsible for that. They were brought there to a great extent. In any event, the concentration led to discrimination, to persecution in some instances—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Where?

Mr. CROLL:—both on racial grounds and sometimes on security or on economic grounds.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): In fairness to British Columbia the hon. member should cite those instances of persecution; for certainly there has never been any charge of persecution in our dealings with the Japanese.

Mr. CROLL: I have no instances of persecution at hand with me.

Mr. GREEN: Why say it, then?

Mr. CROLL: Instances have been brought to my attention from time to time, but I have not got them here at the moment. Looking at the picture generally, I do not think there can be any denial of it, but if the hon. member says it did not happen, perhaps he is in a better position to know.

Mr. GREEN: You just don't know the picture; that is the trouble.

Mr. CROLL: With respect to the government's position on dispersal, it has been charged, and I admit that it was harsh and in many instances the Japanese have said that it was cruel. But it is argued that it was necessary in the public interest. As a matter of fact I think dispersal has had a beneficial effect, because it has introduced the Japanese to the rest of Canada. For a long time they thought that British Columbia alone was Canada, and it has introduced Canada to the Japanese. They have been accepted; in many instances they have been welcomed. They have set up new homes; they have started their lives anew. Yesterday the hon. member for New Westminster quoted the *New Canadian* as saying that the Japs are advising their people that dispersal is in their own interest, and if my voice is of any use at all, I too think it is in their own interest. I agree with those who advise that course of action, but I am not at all convinced, as are other hon. members of this committee, that if this restriction is lifted the Japs will immediately flock back to British Columbia. There are just as many fish in the Atlantic, I am told, as there are in the Pacific.

Let me refer to an article which appeared yesterday in the Toronto *Star*, written by Edward Yoshioka, a young man who studied at Emmanuel college in Toronto and had to return to Vancouver to be ordained. In part he says:

It does not seem right that Canadians have to go through all that.

He has to have a permit in order to go to Vancouver. He says:

My parents even had to get permits just to travel from Kelowna to Vancouver to attend my ordination.

The paper goes on to say that he is the winner of three prizes this year for theological studies. He was born twenty-four years ago in Vancouver, of Japanese parents. His father, Reverend Yoshinosuke Yoshioka, is a United Church minister at Kelowna. He came to Canada in 1919 on a scholarship won in Japan. He also studied in Emmanuel college. These are the significant words. Speaking of Ontario and the university of Toronto particularly, where he completed his studies, he said:

It has been wonderful here, and even during the war not one unkind incident occurred. Of course, conditions are more ideal here, but if only people would realize that though we may look different, we are just as good Canadians as they are, then life would be happier for everyone. These regulations and restrictions really don't work severe hardship, but it's the principle of the thing.

That is my theme too. I could go along with the government during the war by backing the action that they took because they felt it was in the national interest and a matter of national security. They made a good case on that point; but in time of peace I see no justification for this order in council. On the grounds of principle I protest, because this puts an abnormal restraint on a Canadian citizen. It is tinged with racial discrimination and must outrage the conscience of all Canadians. What is more, this is a precedent, a precedent which will plague us for many years to come. So far as government policy is concerned today it is the Japs; tomorrow, well, who knows. Therefore we must be on guard and be awake to the dangers inherent in this order in council.

It is well to call the attention of the committee that racial discrimination is a phobia. It is just as essential to control as is atomic energy, because it too can destroy but from

within. I am impressed by the speeches that were made here by the various members from British Columbia. No one sitting here and knowing the men who spoke could be less than impressed.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): How much impressed were you by the member for Skeena?

Mr. CROLL: I am afraid I took in too much territory. In any event let us forget the racial part of it. I am prepared to forget the economic part of it. One distinguished member of the committee put it on the basis of security. He said: "We shall make sure this does not happen in British Columbia once again." The committee was impressed by that argument. Let me prick the conscience of the committee. A hundred and thirty-one Japs served in the Canadian Army. A hundred and thirty of them were Canadian born; one was a naturalized Jap. 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. There is no rhyme or reason in refusing to these men, who served and fought for this country, the right to go where they like in Canada, though there may be administrative reasons for doing otherwise with respect to other people. I am wholeheartedly and everlastingly opposed to discrimination on the basis of race or creed, or to any other discrimination, I feel that there is enough unofficial discrimination without my giving approval to what appears to me to be official discrimination.

Mr. MITCHELL: I shall not detain the committee long, but I cannot let the previous speaker's words pass without an answer. Originally it was my intention to get the views of a cross-section of the committee but when words such as "persecution, harsh and cruel" are used, and when this country is described as the foremost in the world when it comes to racial discrimination, I cannot let these words go unchallenged. It is all very well for an hon. member to rise in his place and make statements of that kind, but they should be backed up. In cold print I wonder what it would look like in Germany or in Russia. I know something about racial discrimination, because I visited these countries. I wonder how it would look in Great Britain or in South Africa. That is not the language to use in describing a movement of this kind, for the carrying out of which I have been charged with the responsibility. Let me say to my hon. friend that I do not take second place to him or to anybody in the country when it comes to treating my fellowmen in a humane way.

Mr. NICHOLSON: So long as they are not Japanese.

Mr. MITCHELL: Will my hon. friend wait just a minute? I come from a country which is pre-eminent in that regard, which has given shelter to people of all races and creeds.

Mr. MacNICOL: As no other country ever did.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, as no other country ever did. Let me say this to the hon. member for Spadina. Like myself, he was not born in Canada. The only nations in the history of the world that ever fought for a principle were the nations comprising the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. MacNICOL: And they sacrificed everything for it.

Mr. MITCHELL: Of course they did. And when they accuse this government, or this nation at the head of which this government stands, of persecution, of being cruel, of being foremost in the policy of racial discrimination, the charge is not true, Mr. Chairman; and nobody knows that better than the hon. member for Spadina. This whole policy has been conducted in a manner which stands out preeminently, when one considers the movement which is necessary under war conditions of certain people of certain racial origins. I saw part of the liquidation of the Kulaks in Russia not far from where my hon. friend was born. I was in Germany when Hitler put over his revolution. I was in that part of the world when the Turks sent the Greeks from Asia Minor into Greece. I have been in most of those countries, and I think I know something about what persecution is and what cruelty is. Our policy was investigated by a representative of the Japanese government. I think it was done by the Swiss or the Spanish, but it does not make much difference which it was. The point is that the policy was investigated and no complaint was found. I should like to know of any other government in the world which, when these people went back to Japan on a voluntary basis, would have paid their fares and given each grown-up $200 and each child $50. I should like to know of any other country which would have moved these people and taken care of them as they were taken care of under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour. Let me say this to my hon. friend, with all the sincerity of which I am capable. I believe that our policy is in the best interests of the Japanese people themselves. My hon. friends over here who have been critical—

An hon. MEMBER: What about over there?

Mr. MITCHELL: All right; my hon. friend over here too, but he was at the war and is in somewhat different position from that of some of my hon. friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is all right.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): I think every veteran in this house should stand up and repudiate that statement. There is no question of our loyalty. We had members in the forces. We served.

Mr. MITCHELL: Just wait a minute. I want to say to my hon. friends that they have not got a first mortgage on the defence of liberty and freedom.

Mr. FULTON: They think they have, and are trying to foreclose it.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is the trouble with them. They think they have a first mortgage. We have sat here for a day and a half and listened to some harsh criticism, and we have taken it.

Mr. MacNICOL: You have not replied to the hon. member for Spadina.

Mr. MITCHELL: The trouble with my hon. friends is they are so self-religious that they think they are the only people who are right; and when it comes to the expression of an opinion different from their own, they just cannot take it.

Mr. MacNICOL: You should reply to the hon. member for Spadina.

Mr. MITCHELL: Let me say this. Before the interruptions took place—

An hon. MEMBER: Make way.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend does not need to try to be funny, because he is funny enough anyway. Let me say that I would have felt in much better humour, if I can put it on that level, if the hon. member for Cariboo, who is an old friend of mine, and some of the other hon. gentlemen—with all the trials and tribulations which have been the lot of the Department of Labour in the past five or six years—could have stood up in their places and said they had formed committees in their communities east of British Columbia to receive these people of Japanese race and get them settled there. I should have felt in a much better frame of mind if they could have done that.

The hon. member for Victoria probably made the best speech, and the shortest one, on this problem. It reflected the basic principle of Christianity in everyday life. I think this—and I think it sincerely, Mr. Chairman—that our policy has been in the best interests of the Japanese. The hon. member for Spadina vindicated that today when he said he had read—I think it was in the Toronto *Star*—about a minister of the gospel of the Japanese race who spoke in glowing terms of conditions in Ontario. I do not have to live in British Columbia—I sometimes think, thank goodness.

Mr. MacNICOL: You cannot beat Ontario.

Mr. MITCHELL: But I do know something of the history of the intermingling of the orientals with the white people in that province. I say that not in a critical sense; but it has been a problem for a good many years. I believe in the early days the present Prime Minister went out under the direction of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and investigated it for the government of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE: With Sir William Mulock.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yes, with Sir William Mulock. I am speaking now from memory. But there is no question about it, the information I get from my officials is that the people of Japanese race who have come east are much happier than they were in British Columbia. Is it not the sensible thing to do, to continue that policy? Because in time, when we have them spread across this dominion, they will play their part in all its institutions and activities. I think it is much better than what I myself saw in British Columbia prior to the outbreak of the war, where there was a highly concentrated section of the community in the city of Vancouver which if I remember rightly they used to call Little Tokyo. What I should like to be able to do is to continue this policy

of dispersal—not by direction but by persuasion—which has been so successful up to the present time.

Notwithstanding the opinion of any man in this house or anyone outside of it without responsibility, if I had it to do over again in the light of the conditions which existed in 1942 I would do exactly the same thing, use exactly the same policies and treat our Japanese friends in the same humane way as that in which they have been treated under the jurisdiction of my department.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that there have been moments of heat, I think that those who have sat back and listened to this debate will recognize that it has been one of the best we have had on this subject for a good many years. Even though we have taken opposing stands and have got into some warm arguments, it seems to me that there has been a tendency to recognize sincerity and earnestness on both sides, which indeed befits a debate of this kind. Complimentary remarks have been made of some of those in this group who have stood firm on this matter through the years. I recognize likewise the sincerity and the earnestness of some of those who have taken a position with which I thoroughly disagree. I go even further and say that I take at their word those who support this order against Japanese citizens and who tell us that they are not doing so on the basis of any race hatred. I confess that in some cases as I listen to their speeches and read in *Hansard* the remarks that have been made it is a little difficult to believe that, but I take these members at their word. In particular when a member like the hon. member for Vancouver South stands up and speaks in the gentlemanly manner in which he did it is pretty hard to imagine that in his heart there is any hatred towards anyone.

I think too it is to be noted that there have been many efforts by those who have participated in this debate to make constructive suggestions. There has also been noted on the part of those on the other side a tendency to refer, as the minister did just now, to the Japanese as our friends. The hon. member for Vancouver South the other night made a plea for arrangements to provide restitution where the property of Japanese Canadians had been despoiled. All that is to the good. It suggests that in this parliament we have a reflection of the heart of the Canadian people, which is disturbed about this matter and which recognizes, as the hon. member for Spadina suggested, that the problem is a vexatious one but also, as he suggested, that there is a principle at stake and that we are determined to move toward the achievement of that principle with all that it means.

I think it is significant that those who have spoken in favour of the continuance of this order, P.C. 946, have all felt that they had to make a case for the position they were taking. A few years ago that was not necessary. All one had to do then was to throw out a few inflammatory slogans and the case was taken as established, because in those days there was much more bitterness about the subject than there is now. Today members make their case on various grounds. Sometimes it is on defence, sometimes on race but allegedly without race hatred, as the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard suggested last night. He was quite forthright in saying that from his viewpoint the problem goes beyond the Japanese and includes the Chinese and East Indians. I respect him for the honesty with which he made that statement, but as I say, when I look at it in print and realize its implications I must state my disagreement with him.

Mr. MERRITT: Surely the hon. member realizes that the question he asked me was what the problem was, not my views on it. Is not that his recollection?

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes. If that correction needs to be made to make everything perfectly clear, I am glad to make it. He said last night that he was endeavouring to give us what he believed to be the problem as British Columbia saw it, and he stated it in those terms. But you will notice, Mr. Chairman, that when he did so he was not throwing out slogans or telling us hair-raising stories, as was characteristic of previous debates on this subject, but was trying to make a reasoned basis for the position that he takes.

I want it to be perfectly clear that I disagree wholly with the members who are supporting this order, but I also want it to be clear that it seems to me that hon. members have made progress in their attitude toward this matter, and it provides a good basis from which to move on in the hope that even yet we shall achieve the full measure of the principle of which the hon. member for Spadina spoke a moment ago.

I do not blame the Minister of Labour for reminding us, as he did immediately following the remarks of the previous speaker, of the way in which the light of freedom burns in the United Kingdom, and that compared with other countries Canada has done a pretty fair job. I would be fully satisfied if we had in Canada the freedom so firmly established in the United Kingdom, but what we are concerned about, and this is what makes the difference in a democracy, is not how well we have done in comparison with other places, especially lands where conditions may be a lot worse, but how well our achievements match our ideals and our principles and the things that we espouse. As the hon. member for Spadina said, we have been in a bit of a dilemma here in this house in discussing this matter. I have felt in listening to the radio reports about this debate that the vexatiousness of the problem has been made clear and also the compulsion of the ideals that are in the minds and hearts of most of us who are here.

Having said all that, I wish we could realize that what we are voting for in this order in council is not the sincerity or earnestness that may be in the hearts of hon. members; it is not the hatred or lack of race hatred that may motivate our speeches or our votes. This is a specific order which does specific things, and the fact is that this order in council does deny to certain Canadian citizens rights which other Canadian citizens are permitted to enjoy. I feel that all of us have to look at this thing very closely and in that light. The members from British Columbia have the right to ask those who do not live in that province to try to look at this thing from their viewpoint, and I think we all were impressed by the appeal which the hon. member for Victoria made last night. I may say to the Minister of Labour that I had the privilege of being on a committee of the Winnipeg city council in 1942 which arranged to bring some Japanese Canadians from British Columbia to that city, and I imagine that others of us in this house have done that sort of thing. I have also had the privilege in a personal way of extending my welcome to some Japanese Canadians now living in my riding, and I can say with the member for Spadina that I know that some of them are quite happy to be there. But after we have done all that, after those of us east of the rockies have met the request that the people of British Columbia make to us and tried to look at things from their point of view, I think that they also should realize that what is at stake here is a principle affecting the whole of Canada and our interest in that principle is a matter of supreme importance. You cannot divide Canada into different sections and have one principle obtain in one part and another somewhere else. We in this group applauded with eagerness the exchange of telegrams which the Secretary of State for External Affairs read today expressing the appreciation of the government of India for the action of the British Columbia legislature in doing away with one bit of discrimination which has obtained out there all too long.

Speaking on this whole question of the principle of citizenship and of its being extended without any qualification to all people, I should like to make a brief reference to a recent book which has already been quoted in this house, the author of which has received a well deserved award. I refer to Arthur Lower's "Colony to Nation". In that book Professor Lower makes the statement that Canada is a supreme act of faith, and he goes on to underline that statement by pointing to the fact that normally one would not expect a nation such as ours to gain the position of strength it occupies, because of the difficulties we have had in welding various races together. But we have done so, he says, as a supreme act of faith.

He goes on to say that without tolerance, magnanimity, generosity and devotion to high principles, Canada just does not exist. I am deeply concerned that when we come face to face with a basic principle like this, always admitting that there are difficulties—and certainly there are in carrying out any high principle—we realize how fundamental it is to the very existence of this nation.

There are many principles without which Canada just does not exist. One of them, which is basic, is that there shall be no discrimination as between our citizens on the basis of race. There came to my desk today, as I imagine there did to the desks of all hon. members, a letter from the civil liberties association in Manitoba. The hon. member for Lake Centre, Mr. B. K. Sandwell of Toronto and I had the privilege not long ago of addressing a large meeting in the city of Winnipeg, held under the auspices of this association, when we discussed the whole question of civil liberties. I believe all will agree that this association has done a good job in the presentation of its six-point programme, each point of which is extremely important at this stage of our national life.

The first point, which is the only one I shall read at this time, because I am afraid the others would be out of order in this debate—although they are equally important—reads, under the heading "Declaration of Rights":

> No Canadian citizen shall be exiled, nor deprived of his citizenship in any part, nor be discriminated against in the exercise of his citizenship because of race, religion, colour, sex, language or political beliefs.

I know the Minister of Labour is likely to say it is easy to make speeches about these

high-sounding principles, but that actually one has to face up to the difficulties. That is right. And so are we right; and so is the hon. member for Spadina right, and so is my friend Arthur Lower right in suggesting that, without loyalty to principles like this, Canada just does not go on.

It seems to me it is extremely important, when a principle of this kind is being discussed, that we have a discussion of this kind in which hon. members express, in an honest and straightforward manner, the views they hold, as has been done in this instance. However I think it is also important, if at all possible, that the major political groups in the country give some definite and responsible expression as to where they stand on an issue of this kind.

Last night the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard said he was reporting to the house what he felt to be the views of his constituents. I am not quarreling with the statement he made as being a report on the situation as he sees it, but I should like hon. members to read for themselves a paragraph from page 3 of a letter from the Vancouver consultative council, under date of March 25, 1947, which was addressed to all of us. I will read only a sentence or two to indicate the tone of the letter:

> We are indignant that an impression has been spread that the citizen body of British Columbia is with substantial unanimity favourable to the perpetuation of such discriminatory measures. His Grace Archbishop Duke of this city selected a Catholic clergyman to act on the executive committee of this council and to serve as a member of a delegation which waited upon the Premier of British Columbia to protest against racial discrimination.

And then he goes on to refer to similar support given by private members and the responsible courts of other leading church bodies and leading persons in various political parties. The paragraph closes by saying:

> The mere fact that hundreds of citizens of British Columbia, without regard to their various religious and political affiliations, have together made financially possible the work of this consultative council is itself evidence that the section of British Columbians sharing the views reflected in this letter is far from negligible.

I accept the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard to the effect that he believes that the views he expresses are those of the majority of his constituents. But they are not the views of all the people of British Columbia. As this letter, over the signature, by the way, of Doctor Norman F. Black, would suggest, there is a considerable body of people in British Columbia who feel as we do.

Mr. GREEN: I suppose the hon. member knows that Doctor Black is a leading C.C.F.-er. I just wish to have it on the record.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes. I could go through and give the names of the members on that council and in the Vancouver branch, Canadian civil liberties union, but I shall not take the time. I am proud of the fact that members of the C.C.F. are found in groups of that kind. But there are people from other groups as well, particularly a large number of church and university leaders in British Columbia.

What I want to say to members like the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, who tell us about the views of their constituents, is that members of parliament and political parties have a duty in a country like Canada, not only to report what they believe to be the views of their people, but to give a lead when matters of high principle are at stake. That is so in the present instance.

I suggest that it should not be left to the hon. member for Vancouver East and other C.C.F. members from British Columbia to go against the tide, if that is the case, so far as British Columbian opinion is concerned. This is a principle which is of concern to the whole of Canada; and I would say that members of parliament in the different political parties, even though they may think the views of their people back home are in one direction, should try to give a lead in support of a principle which means so much to this country.

I was genuinely pleased yesterday when the hon. member for Lake Centre stated his position in the matter. I say to him right now that if the night before in my reference to his being here at a certain hour I gave offence to him, then I apologize. The fact of the matter is that what counts, to some of us, is the advancement of a principle.

Mr. HACKETT: You always know where he stands, if you do not know where he is.

An hon. MEMBER: We do not know where his party is.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Why not?

Mr. KNOWLES: I am serious about this. It was a real thrill to us yesterday when he said clearly that he stands for there being no discrimination against any Canadian citizen on grounds of race. I hope I am not going too far if I take from that the understanding that he would be opposed to continuing this order in council.

It seems to me that there ought to be other statements from the Progressive Conservative party. I may be accused of something when I say this, but frankly—

Mr. HACKETT: Sit down and give us a chance.

Mr. KNOWLES: I say honestly that I am not now trying to divide the Progressive Conservative party into two camps.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Not you; the last thing in your mind!

Mr. KNOWLES: My hon. friends can arrange their own divisions; I do not need to help them on that. But I do feel that, in view of the commendable statement of the hon. member for Lake Centre, it would help the advancement of this principle if the leader of the Progressive Conservative party would make a similar statement in that connection. Surely that is not asking too much.

Then, too, I feel we should have still something more from the government side, and particularly from the ministry.

I should like to hear from the Minister of Justice. I should like to hear from the Secretary of State for External Affairs who leads Canada's delegations to meetings of the united nations. I should like to hear from the Minister of National Health and Welfare, or from any other minister for that matter.

An hon. MEMBER: How long do you want to stay here?

Mr. KNOWLES: When a principle is at stake, time does not matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): We should like to hear from the hon. member for Skeena as to where he stands.

Mr. MITCHELL: He was a pretty fair roller skater yesterday.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I try to state what seems to be the position so far as the government is concerned in connection with this matter. The only definite thing we have before us is a group of orders in council and our amendment to have P.C. 946 deleted. That amendment has been opposed, either the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Justice having stated that the government cannot accept it. In other words, the government's position is that this order in council must stay on the statute books of Canada for at least another year. We have had no indication from the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Justice or the Secretary of State for External Affairs as to what is to be the policy after the expiry of this bill which we are now passing. The only views from the ministerial benches that we have had with regard to the future are those that were expressed by the Minister of Veterans Affairs. If I do him any injustice he is quite capable of correcting it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The Minister of Veterans Affairs will not mind what you do.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that the hon. member deal with the item before the committee.

Mr. KNOWLES: Speaking the other night, and also during the debate at a previous stage, the Minister of Veterans Affairs made it clear that, so far as he personally is concerned, he wants at least some of these restrictions continued for a long time, if not for all time.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is essentially Liberalism to have a variety of opinion within a party, not the regimentation that you have over there.

Mr. KNOWLES: Did my right hon. friend say that it is the essence of Liberalism to continue these restrictions?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did not say that and I do not wish any duplicity from my hon. friend.

Mr. KNOWLES: I would be glad to have my right hon. friend restate his position if I am not stating it correctly. It seems to me that it is pretty clear what he wants is a continuation of at least some of the restrictions now in existence for a considerable period, if not for all time.

Mr. MACKENZIE: At the proper time my opinion will be communicated to my colleagues and my colleagues will take action according to the responsibility of government.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I appeal again to the hon. member to deal with the item before the committee and not attempt to forecast what will happen in the future.

Mr. KNOWLES: I agree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and I shall refer only to such remarks as have been made on the future of this matter by the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Speaking on it some time ago, he told the house that if his views on this subject should ever differ from those of the government, he would no longer be a member of the government. The Winnipeg *Free Press* of April 7, 1947, had this to say about that situation:

> This would not be so formidable a disaster that the people of Canada, the government and the Liberal party could not endure it. If Mr. Mackenzie's retirement could be borne with fortitude, the principle which he seeks to perpetuate is much more serious. It could be justified in war time only on grounds of national

security. It cannot be justified in peace time. It cannot be maintained without establishing a precedent dangerous to all civil liberties in Canada and contrary to Canada's obligations under the charter of the united nations.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the Winnipeg *Free Press* is a strong supporter of the Liberal party. In other words, some Liberals do not accept the minister's views on this subject. I have said this because I feel that there should be some statement as to future policy made in connection with this matter. The Minister of Labour has said that all we are passing now is an order to continue for another year what he has been doing, but we have learned from experience that if you want to win something a year or two from now you have to start working for it now. If there had not been this debate I doubt very much if there would be much change in policy a year from now. Strange as it may seem, I take my stand in this instance with the Winnipeg *Free Press,* that the time to abolish these restrictions is right now. The time to save freedom is before we lose it. In the face of the government's stand against our amendment, we have taken the time to fiight for this principle, in the hope that by so doing we shall make possible its achievement at as early a date as possible.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is that your policy with regard to all restrictions?

Mr. KNOWLES: We are discussing a particular order in council, P.C. 946, which places definite restrictions on Canadian citizens. That is quite different from orders in council which impose restrictions upon economic forces, prices and so on in the interests of the Canadian people. The two things are in different categories, and the minister knows it very well.

Mr. HACKETT: Mr. Chairman, the government made it quite clear through the Minister of Justice that this legislation rests squarely on a national emergency—that if the government is seeking to enact legislation which for the time being sets aside the constitution and gives it power to invade a jurisdiction which normally is exclusively that of the provinces; if it seeks to legislate by order in council where normally only parliament can; if it seeks to suspend the rights and privileges of the individual and the rights of citizenship, it is because a national emergency exists.

I voted against the second reading of the bill because in my opinion no national emergency exists. I brought forward all the normal criteria by which the existence of an emergency is detected in peace, order and good government as well as in the realm of finance, commerce, employment and trade. I canvassed the whole field, and no one attempted to contradict me when I showed that times are good, that employment is plentiful, that production is greater than it has ever been before; that foreign trade, both in imports and exports, is greater than it has ever been. Finding no vestige of evidence of the existence of a national emergency, I was forced to vote against this bill.

The people of British Columbia are aroused over this question. They did not wish that orientals should land on their shores. As I recall, it was in 1907 that the late Mr. Lemieux, who was a much respected speaker of this house, went at the instance of Sir Wilfred Laurier to Japan and there entered into some kind of understanding with the government of that country. It was called a gentleman's agreement, whereby the number of Japanese who would come to Canada would be greatly restricted. Later, as some of us remember, there arrived off Vancouver a ship in which there was a large number of Indians, and although some of them bore on their breasts military decorations which showed that they had fought courageously and frequently in the defence of the British realm, they were not permitted to land. There were other instances in which the people of British Columbia expressed their wish that orientals should not come to their shores, but orientals did come. We are told that at the present time there remain in Canada about 23,000 Japanese, of whom about 17,000 are Canadian citizens.

The war was the occasion for the removal of the Japanese from the British Columbia shores of the Pacific. Some were moved to the interior of British Columbia, some to the eastern provinces. Now, two years after the cessation of hostilities—and I am dealing only with the Japanese who are British subjects—parliament is asked to continue the restriction and curtailment of the rights of these British subjects because of a national emergency.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, there is no national emergency. There is a keen desire, as manifested by many members from British Columbia—in fact, I think, by all members who represent constituencies which have returned followers either of the government or of the opposition—that these Japanese be not permitted to return to their former homes on the shores of the Pacific. Judging from the unanimity of Liberal and Conservative members, there must be a pronounced if not unanimous feeling among the white population of the coast. I submit that that hostile sentiment is largely economic in its origin. It may be tinged by racial feeling but judging from what I have heard in the house, it is almost entirely economic; it is because the

Japanese work harder and longer hours, live more cheaply and have made inroads upon the normal vocation and profits of the white population that they are not wanted in British Columbia.

That hostile sentiment may create a crisis but not an emergency. It probably does create a political crisis; but I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the constitution of a country may not be suspended because of a political crisis. When there is a national emergency, when the life, the very existence of the country as a whole is in peril, then the constitution must yield to the doctrine of survival. But a political crisis is a mere incident in the every-day life of a country. A constitutional, representative government like ours comes in and is bound to go out, and it almost invariably goes out in a crisis, a political crisis. A political crisis is just as much of the nature of our form of government as are three meals a day to the normal Canadian.

I submit that to contend that a national emergency has arisen because of this political crisis in one province is to make a travesty of our constitution and to endanger harmony among our people. Why does not the government deal with this crisis? Why does it not take this problem, which comes to it as a possible by-product of the war, if you will—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Long before the war.

Mr. HACKETT: My hon. friend will remember that I have said I know the people of British Columbia never wanted the orientals. They came, and the war provided the people of British Columbia with an opportunity to get rid of them. They were moved away, and now the people of British Columbia are doing all in their power to prevent their return. The point I am trying to make is that that is not a national emergency. It is a political crisis, and I say to the government, why not deal with it as such?

If it is desired that there should be no more orientals in Canada; to be specific, if it is desired that there be no more Japanese in Canada, we are masters here in this Canadian land. Let us enact legislation to prevent other Japanese from coming here. I see no difficulty in that course. This is our home land; we alone may determine who shall enter here. I have heard it said, not by one but by half a dozen hon. members, that the Japanese have some loyalty other than a loyalty to Canada. If that can be established—and it must not be established in the mass—if a Canadian citizen of Japanese origin has been a traitor to Canada, then the law provides a means for dealing with him.

Last year the hon. member who was formerly secretary of state put on the statute book the Canadian citizenship act, of which he was very proud. He conducted his bill through the house with great aptitude and persistence. By section 21 of this act Canadian citizenship can be revoked from anybody except a natural-born Canadian. How many of these 17,000 Japs are natural-born Canadians I do not know, but let us divide the group in two. If any of these who have been naturalized have misconducted themselves, have been traitors to Canada, their Canadian citizenship can be withdrawn. The act provides the means, and they can be sent back to Japan. Their naturalization can be taken from them; they will cease to be Canadian citizens and will be sent back to the land of their origin. If there be Canadian-born citizens who are traitors, the law provides a summary way for dealing with them. But I submit that it is not wise, it is not well, to make wholesale charges of disloyalty against a national group. I am convinced that there are many Japanese, men and women, who are loyal Canadians, industrious and hard working, who are good citizens. If there be among the Japanese—and it is always well to remember that one of the twelve fell—one who has been unworthy of his citizenship, let him be detected, tried and dealt with in consequence.

I am reasonably certain that if the government were to say that no more Japanese were to be brought to Canada, much of the disturbance among the deputation from British Columbia would cease, and much of the unrest and worry which is being felt on the coast today would disappear. The difficulty is that the government is still waiting for something to happen. It is relying upon a fiction. It is creating an artificial emergency that it may shield itself behind this shadow and like Micawber wait another year in the hope that something will turn up. If the government would accept its responsibility and meet the problems which confront it rather than try to put them off for another year under the assertion that a national emergency exists when none in fact does exist, we would be farther along our way to stability and order.

It is right and natural—and I am certain that if some hon. members from British Columbia speak after me they will do so—for hon. members to ask, what do you know about the Japanese? My answer is, nothing. They may then say to me: It is very easy for you to be magnanimous and altruistic; it is very easy for you to be censorious of us; it is very easy for you to attempt the role of the statesman. We are under the harrow at home; our

people are disturbed. They do not like this competition; they do not want the Japanese back. Under their breath they may say—they may tell me in intimacy, whether they are on this or the other side of the house: Our folk will vote against us unless we do as we are doing. I have been in parliament occasionally; I have been out of parliament a great deal. I do not know a great deal about the Japanese. I know a good deal about the irate electorate, and I have a great deal of sympathy for hon. gentlemen who are under its lash. But I want to make it clear that my experience with problems of this kind is not altogether negligible. I live, as do many hon. members of this committee, in the great metropolitan city of Montreal. Do not let British Columbia think it is the only province in the dominion which has had perplexities arising out of the meeting of races. Do not let British Columbia think that it is the only area in Canada which has to meet the problems, the trials and the worries which come from the meeting of peoples of different points of view.

It has been said that we cannot assimilate the Japanese, that they congregate in groups and should be dispersed. I must say that I do not like these words. People come to this land not to be assimilated, not to be dispersed. They come because they believe it is a haven in which they can live their lives, worship their God and bring up their children in the best, that is in their own, tradition, and in the respect and love of the land which gives them the right to lead that free life.

I open a book. It is not a law book; it is not a treatise on government. It is a record called "The Census of Canada." I open it at a page which gives the population and the racial origin of the great metropolitan area of Canada. I turn to the city of Montreal, the home of thirty-odd national groups. I find that in 1941 it had a population of 1,139,921 people. Of that number 281,875 were of British extraction. There are 850,000 others. The French people represent the largest group, a little over sixty per cent of the total population of Montreal. The remainder come from the four points of the compass, from the seven seas and the five continents. They have come there and learned how to accommodate themselves to a common life. It has not always been easy. The French came first and they made it a little uncomfortable for the Indians. Then the English came, and the Scotch came with them to see that the English did not get too rich. The Scotch were very mighty until the redistribution committee got after Muskoka-Ontario and levelled that fortress. Then there came from the mists of that green isle of the Atlantic, from that land of saints, scholars and fairies, the meek, the mild Irish. They did not inherit the earth this time, but they came to Canada about one hundred years ago, and some people did not like them. But they were woven into the Canadian web. Later, within my time almost, there came another element, an industrious element, thirsting for knowledge, a stiff-necked element, an element with an unquenchable spirit, one that has suffered in the last ten years as no race of men has ever suffered before, which indeed has been almost entirely exterminated on one or two continents. They came to the metropolitan centres and competed. They made it hard for the older races already there. They arrogated to themselves whole strata of business and drove out the English and the French. It was not easy. Then after them came other central Europeans. This problem is not a new one. British Columbia has not made a great find. British Columbia is having just the kind of worry and embarrassment that the older centres have known and have endeavoured honestly to accommodate themselves to during the centuries.

Let me just say this in passing. It is the peoples who have learned to accommodate themselves to the presence of him who may not be his brother in colour and creed who have made of this land what it is. Oh, we have done great things. We have fought battles; we have developed a continent; we have manufactured; we have traded; we have won ourselves a status in many realms. But there is one thing of which we can be justly proud, and that is that we have found the way of making everyone who has come here feel that he had a dignity which everybody respected, and that once having acquired our citizenship he was inviolate in his rights. There have been no Jim Crow cars in Canada.

Mr. REID: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. HACKETT: Yes.

Mr. REID: Do you think we in British Columbia did wrong by not marrying with the Japanese?—because the hon. gentleman spoke about what took place when there was intermarriage. That is the crux of the question.

Mr. HACKETT: I would say to the hon. member for New Westminster that I do not believe in a mixture of race and race of different colours.

Mr. REID: In Montreal that happened, though.

Mr. HACKETT: It may have happened.

Mr. REID: The Scotch married the French and improved the race.

Mr. HACKETT: I will not go into that.

An hon. MEMBER: Improved which one?

Mr. HACKETT: I am not going to say what happened. The point that I am trying to make, and I deal with the hon. member's question as a serious question—

Mr. REID: It is.

Mr. HACKETT: —is that the Japanese came here. I do not know that we invited them, but they came.

An hon. MEMBER: The Canadian Pacific brought them.

Mr. HACKETT: They served their apprenticeship. We issued to them a certificate which made them Canadian citizens. That may have been a great mistake. I am not debating whether it was a mistake or not; but if it was a mistake, it was our mistake. We did it. Having issued that document, having made all those people Canadian citizens we should respect their rights. In Canada there is no dominant element. Canada, after all, is a country of minorities. The French are in a minority; the English are in a minority; the Irish are in a minority and the Scotch are in a minority. We are a people of minorities. The test of the government of a country is the way it treats its minorities. It is only if we can respect the dignity which is inherent in the human soul, if we can respect that divine thing which makes us brothers in God, that our country can be great and we can be worthy of the reputation which it has achieved. After that most terrible conflict in South Africa when the Britain and the Boer had fought each other and hated each other for years, when some measure was sought whereby harmony might be brought to these tortured peoples, where did they go? They came to the Dominion of Canada to find out how we had solved that problem. More than that, when, after 500 years of conflict, it was determined at last that there should be an understanding between Ireland and Britain, it was written into the parliamentary document which preceded the treaty that the Irish should have what?—the kind of freedom which Canadians have.

We have achieved a great reputation in many fields, but the reputation which we have achieved in accommodating ourselves to the necessity of a common citizenship is the highest and most glorious of any. I do not wish to be understood as saying that I favour admitting this race or that race. I am for excluding any race that cannot fit into our national life. But there are some things that cannot be undone. If there are Japanese in this country today, it is not their fault. If they are Canadian citizens, it is because we placed the badge of Canadian citizenry upon them; and bearing that badge, it behooves us in honour to respect it. Possibly if I had had more courage I would not have made this speech; there are no Japanese in my constituency. No pressure is on me. I have no one to reproach me but myself. I stand for the integrity of Canadian citizenship.

An hon. MEMBER: You are lucky.

Mr. HACKETT: 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 of 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 do not now say how I shall vote; I am waiting for somebody to deliver me from the necessity of separating myself from many whom I cherish and whose wisdom I admire and frequently rely upon. Unless I can be rescued from the position as I see it, I shall find myself forced to support the amendment, and I shall do so proudly.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Mr. Chairman, I believe I am the last British Columbia member to speak on this series of orders in council affecting the Japanese. I do not intend to try to begin to match the eloquence of the hon. member for Stanstead who has just finished a very fine speech. I wish to speak briefly about what the order in council in its present form will do. I need not recapitulate the speeches which have been made about the attitude of British Columbia to the Japanese. I think it is a fair statement, however, to say that most of us did want the entire Japanese population of British Columbia sent back to Japan because we have found that, though they are a decent, hard-working people, they do not become part of our life. But we cannot do that now because the supreme court of this country and the privy council have ruled that those Japanese remaining have the right to remain here, and so, faced with that, our task is to see that they are made into Canadians. In that task we failed before, and they failed even more than we did. They have hived together and sent their children to Japanese language schools or sent them back to Japan. It is true

that there is not one British Columbia member who went to school in the province who did not sit in every classroom with Japanese students. But once they became adults, the gap started.

The only problem that I as a member of parliament am faced with today in regard to the Japanese is what is the best way to see that these Japanese do become real Canadians, Canadians not just by act of parliament but Canadians in thought and action and in loyalty to our way of living. All parts of this house are agreed that the old policy of the Japanese hiving together in Steveston and on the west coast of Vancouver island was bad, bad for us and bad for the Japanese too. Again and again in this house it has been said that the dispersal of the Japanese, spreading them all across Canada, is the only practical way of getting rid of the hostility towards them and of making them Canadians. The suggestion is that they should be allocated to the various provinces. That has been suggested very loosely by various speakers, but how are we to do it? Are we to take a roster of the Japanese and say that so many are going to Prince Edward Island, so many are going to New Brunswick and so many are going to Nova Scotia. Obviously that is impossible. It would take an order more restrictive than the present order in council to accomplish that.

The hon. member for Spadina rather loosely used the word "cruel" in speaking of the movement of the Japanese. I think it would be a real cruelty to force the Japanese to live in certain parts of Canada, and I say that as a British Columbian.

The second suggestion was that it be done by persuasion. But any of us who know the Japanese well know they are just as fond of the coast of British Columbia as every one of the nine members from that coast province is. Only last fall I spoke to a meeting of the Japanese in the coast town of Greenwood, where a large number of them had been relocated. A few of them came from my riding. They all want to go back to the coast of British Columbia and they were looking forward to March 31 when these orders in council expire, so that they could return. Therefore, if we remove this order in council and leave it to the persuasion of people who are in public life and to the good sense of the Japanese we shall find in a year that the Japanese will all be back on the coast and back in those two industries in which they work so well, fishing and farming. If, however, the Japanese are given to understand, as they are by this order, that they are free to go anywhere in Canada and can pass freely back and forth except in this one narrow coastal strip for a period of years they will disperse. The Japanese in Winnipeg, it has been said, are very happy; the Japanese in Ontario are very happy. I know they miss the mountains and the sea just as we who are here miss the mountains and the sea. But they are surrounded by people who, I think, are treating them a little more kindly than they have been treated in recent years in British Columbia because of the old feeling there. I say that this order in council is the simplest and most effective way of seeing that the Japanese will disperse and will become the good Canadians that the Chinese have become in exactly the same way. We have never had the feeling against the Chinese in British Columbia that we have had against the Japanese, and for this reason, that the Chinese are spread right across the country. There are more Chinese in the city of Toronto, I am informed, than there are in the city of Vancouver, and when that situation applies to the Japanese they will be gladly accepted right across this country. So I have no tangle at all with my conscience in voting for the continuance of this order in council restricting the Japanese from that little coastal zone in British Columbia, because I believe that this is the only practical way in which these Japanese can be dispersed and can have the chance to become good Canadians.

In closing, I wish to say just one word in defence of the Minister of Labour. I listened with the greatest of interest to the speech of the hon. member for Spadina. He spoke well, but he used two words I think just a little loosely. He used the word "persecution." I defy him to bring forward in this house one instance of Japanese being persecuted in British Columbia. There has been hostility against the Japanese; there has been perhaps indifference, perhaps an unwillingness to accept the Japanese into our homes as we accept other people. But persecution, no.

Then the hon. member for Spadina reflected on the way in which the Japanese had been handled. He said that their movement was a cruel movement. Any movement of people away from the homes where they have lived must involve heart-burning. When your people left the old land and my people left the highlands of Scotland there was heart-burning at giving up the old associations and leaving the old home. There is bound to be that. But there is a great difference between that and cruelty.

Lastly, on this matter of high principle of which the C.C.F. have spoken so often, there is one member of that party who knows the Japanese really well, because he represents the north coast of British Columbia. He represents a great number of fishermen in the Queen Charlotte islands and elsewhere. But we have not found much principle in the way he has weaseled—to use the word of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni—against taking a stand as his colleagues have done. My point in voting against the amendment is that if it carried automatically we go back to the days before 1939 and we should find ourselves in British Columbia saddled with a problem which should be a national problem. Once again we would have the Japanese hiving in colonies in my riding, in Comox-Alberni and in New Westminster, and once again we would have hostility developing between that group and all other Canadian groups. And so, as the only practical way to ensure the dispersal of these Japanese across Canada, I am going to support this order in council.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): If I may ask the hon. member a question, it seemed to me that he confiined himself to the one order in council which deals with the coastal situation. Does he regard that as a complete solution of the problem from the British Columbia point of view?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Certainly from my point of view, and I was only giving my own outlook. So far as fishing licences in British Columbia are concerned, if the Japanese are excluded from the coastal area the question of granting them fishing licences does not arise. I should like to join with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni in saying that I think the Japanese have a great future in fishing in the maritime. I see no reason why they should not be given a licence there. But so far as fishing licences in British Columbia are concerned, if the Japanese are restricted from the coastal zone the matter of licences does not arise.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Does the hon. member put that restriction partly on the ground of security?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Not I, no. The hon. member for Vancouver South mentioned it, but I do not. My point is that we are now faced with the job of making Canadians of these Japanese. We cannot deport them, as many of us would have liked to do. We have them here; and the best way to make them Canadians is to spread them across Canada. And it is the only proper way for years ahead to assure security.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I should like to ask another question, with no desire whatever to embarrass the hon. member. How can he suggest excluding them wholly from the coastal areas of British Columbia, if to some extent they are to be allowed in the coastal areas of Nova Scotia?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): That was my point. I am sorry if I failed to make it, because I should be able to speak the same language. My point is that, because Nova Scotia is open to them now—I think there is one Japanese there—the moment the coast of British Columbia is opened we shall have 23,000 of them, less those who have been deported. It is the difference between the two coasts.

Mr. MICHAUD: The order in council under discussion involves a principle which, to my mind, is far-reaching, and for that reason cannot be treated lightly. I listened to most of the speeches in the debate, with the exception of a few made yesterday afternoon when I was unavoidably out of the house. I have taken the trouble to read some of them, particularly those of the hon. member for Cariboo and the hon. member for Kootenay East. I must say that, after listening to the debate in what I consider an impartial manner, I have not as yet been convinced to change the views I held originally in the matter.

The hon. member for Stanstead has expressed eloquently and ably the views I should like myself to express on this question. Today it is the Japanese; tomorrow it may be the Jews, and another year it may be another minority. I consider it is a dangerous precedent to carry on this order in council.

I must say I have a good deal of sympathy with hon. members from British Columbia who have expressed their views with great sincerity and their usual ability. As one hon. member from that province said, no one should cast any reflections upon them by imputing to them improper motives or accusing them of racial discrimination. I honestly believe they acted according to their conscience. They have expressed the views of their constituents, and that is what they were sent here for.

In this matter of racial discrimination I think it is fair to assume that nobody considers himself guilty of such an attitude of mind. Hon. members who spoke in favour of retaining P.C. 934 have done so through a sense of duty. For us from the other provinces outside British Columbia I feel it should not be difficult to make up our minds as to what is the right thing to do in the matter.

The majority of those men who have been restricted in their freedom are Canadian citizens. The others are residents of this country, legally admitted to Canada; and as

such they should enjoy the protection and freedom of other residents, as long as they abide by our laws. The reasons advanced by those who would have the Japanese kept away from the British Columbia coast have not impressed me. In the first place, there is the economic reason. Frankly I am somewhat dumbfounded that such an argument should have been invoked. It boils down to this, that in order to solve a simple economic problem we must deprive Canadians of elementary human freedom and fundamental rights. This, in my humble opinion, is unfortunate and an admission of incompetence. For that reason I do not think I should endeavour to answer the economic argument.

Then there is the security problem. Here again I fail to see what we should have to fear. There will always be traitors within our ranks, and they may not always be Japanese. There were none of them involved in the espionage inquiry, and I feel that the most subversive elements of our people are not Canadians of Japanese origin. So why single them out among possible disloyal citizens?

So far as the alleged disloyalty of these people is concerned, I would rather take the word of the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) than that of other hon. members who have thrown aspersions against them. Doubtless there is some truth in what has been said. But, after all, what does it amount to? What proportion of Japanese have been disloyal? Some of them fought on our side, and that should help to vindicate them.

As the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merritt) has said—and in this he was supported only a short time ago by the hon. member for Stanstead—the problem of the Japanese would be more easily solved if we knew exactly what our immigration policy is to be, and particularly as regards orientals.

Bear in mind that I do not find fault with the manner in which our immigration policy has been carried out to this date. I think we are going about it in the right way. To my mind, the doors of this country are as wide open as we can afford to open them at this time. One thing is certain, and it is this, that we do not have to open the doors to oriental immigration just now. If at some future time we should have to do so, we could impose a number of restrictions which would not aggravate the situation in British Columbia. But let deal with each problem as it comes before us. We are now facing

the problem of Canadians who are restricted in their freedom. Those restrictions were very likely justifiable in time of war, for the same reason that it was then justifiable to send prominent citizens of this country into concentration camps, because of their political views. I think we are all agreed on this point. I understand that those who have been sent to concentration camps have now been released.

What about restrictions against Japanese? Is the present legislation to be continued, to be made permanent? If not, when is it to be abandoned. We have a duty toward those Canadians, but as yet we have no duty toward possible future immigrants of oriental races. So let us restore to our fellow Canadians their full rights as citizens; and when we deal with immigration of orientals in due course, we shall do it in the light of the solution we give to the present problem.

Speaking as a member of a minority group in the house, I make a special appeal to other hon. members who may represent minority groups, or who may belong to them. I want to appeal particularly to hon. members who come from Quebec and urge them to search their consciences carefully and to think twice before voting on this important matter.

I submit that it would be a dangerous precedent to maintain P.C. 946 one day longer than it is necessary to do so. Some hon. members have referred to the charter of the united nations. I am not particularly interested in that charter, but inasmuch as it embodies some of the principles of the great charter of Christianity which does not need to be defended in any deliberative assembly, I wish the charter of the united nations all the success it can possibly achieve.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Stanstead and also the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska. I think, if views such as they have expressed had been advocated in this parliament during the past fifty years we would not have many of the problems that are now on our doorstep. On reading the debates on matters of this sort which have occurred in previous sessions, I feel that we are making some progress. Hon. members from British Columbia who have spoken in support of retaining this order in council have moderated their opinion considerably since the question was dealt with previously. I have a great deal of sympathy with them in the problem they must face when they return to their constituencies and have to meet public opinion, but I think they are asking the rest of us to take a very serious step.

I spent the first twenty years of my life in a home where Liberal principles were taken seriously, and I can hardly believe that we now have to argue with a government which is resisting so stubbornly the proposal to remove P.C. 946. Take this clause, for instance, which gives the minister the power to:

(viii) make orders, rules or regulations respecting persons of the Japanese race as defined in these regulations, or of other persons resident anywhere in Canada who are wholly of the Japanese race, or who have a father or a mother who is or was wholly of the Japanese race, to prohibit such persons of the Japanese race or such other persons from moving or travelling anywhere in Canada, or from residing in any place or area in Canada, except subject to a permit issued by or on behalf of the minister and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by him or by any person authorized to act on his behalf under these regulations.

As the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska pointed out, when we pass a statute of this kind which selects one minority group on racial grounds, a group which has not been charged with having committed any crime, and states that their liberties are to be interfered with, we are taking a backward step. At this stage I should like to ask the ministry this question: In view of the opposition that has come from all sections of the house, will they be prepared to ask for a free vote on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Moose Jaw?

Mr. MITCHELL: I can answer that right away. Perhaps the hon. member's judgment is better than mine and perhaps the judgment of the hon. members who have spoken is better than mine, but I ask them to consider the confusion that would result if 23,000 Japanese moved back into Vancouver. Let us be practical about the matter. I think we have been reasonably successful in the reallocation of these Japanese and have done it to the distinct advantage of them as individuals and of the nation.

I ask my hon. friend to take his mind back to 1942 when this matter was first placed under my direction. I think it was the hon. member for Vancouver South who read a wire addressed to the Prime Minister of this country by a number of people in all walks of life in British Columbia. If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Winch was one of those who signed the wire, as was Mr. Birt Shewler, president of the trades and labour council. I do not know the people in British Columbia perhaps as well as do my hon. friends.

Mr. GREEN: And Grant MacNeil.

Mr. MITCHELL: I know Grant MacNeil; I know Mr. Shewler and I know Mr. Winch, but I do not know the other people. I remember quite vividly the discussion that took place within the government and outside the government. They were fearful of the possibility of bloodshed unless this movement was undertaken. Frankly I believe it was the sound thing to do. I should like to think, when it is completed, there will be a reasonable reallocation of these people right across the dominion, but I shudder to think of what may happen if this amendment is carried. Assuming it is carried tonight; tomorrow morning these people could start back to the coast and no doubt many of them would.

In Ontario there are, at the moment, close to 7,000 Japanese. I have never noticed them around because they consititute only a pebble on the beach in a population of 3,500,000. They have more or less moved into the life of this province. In Quebec there are well over 1,200 and they have moved into the life of that province. The same applies to Manitoba and the other provinces. We have to be careful and not get away from the principle involved. I have the figures in front of me but I do not want to clutter up the minds of hon. members with them. You do not need figures when you are dealing with a principle.

I have known the hon. member for Vancouver East for a good many years and I know he has never changed his opinion. When he expresses an opinion, it is a matter of conviction. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Stanstead. Let us not lose sight of the practical feature of this matter. There is a possibility of something almost like a trek back to Vancouver and one or two other centres in British Columbia. Many of us in eastern Canada have never seen a Japanese and it is all very well for us to get up and talk about them when we are not confronted with this problem.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The minister interrupted to answer my question and he has gone on for ten minutes. I did not expect the minister would make a second speech.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was going to make another speech anyway and I might just as well make it now.

Mr. COLDWELL: All right, go ahead.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am charged with the responsibility for this matter, which is an entirely different matter from just making speeches. As I say, there will probably be a trek back to Vancouver and other centres in British Columbia where the Japanese were highly concentrated. I agree in the main with the hon. member for Stanstead, but you have to look at the other side of the medal. I

think it is far better to attempt to establish the Japanese across this country than to be faced with the condition that might arise in some of the centres of British Columbia if this amendment were allowed to pass. That is the practical thing to consider.

I wish to say this to my hon. friend who has just spoken and to the hon. member for Stanstead. I take second place to no one when it comes to defending the freedom of the individual, and so far as we are concerned we are prepared to take the vote at any time. I cannot speak for the government but I cannot have any objection to any member arguing the question from the point of view of principle. I must point out, however, that, as the minister administering the department, I am faced with a practical situation and I would rather face up to it courageously. There is an emergency, whether you like it or not. You may argue, if you will, that there is no emergency, but I would ask my hon. friends this question. Suppose you had a tremendous influx into the city of Vancouver, in short order, if this amendment carried, would they consider that an emergency? Would you not call upon the government of the country, or upon the province or the municipality to face up to the problem?

In a broad and general way we have used every measure of common sense in approaching this problem in the interests not only of the people of British Columbia but of the Japanese themselves. I have studied the discussions that have taken place in this house ever since it was decided that their movement from the Pacific coast was necessary, and I hope we shall use the same good sense on this occasion as we have shown in the past, so that in the passage of time a point may be reached where everyone will be more or less satisfied.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I do not wish to delay the putting of the question. I simply want to say that my position has been clearly outlined by the members of this group who have spoken. We are against this sort of legislation and must protest.

Mr. BLACKMORE: There are several questions I should like to ask the minister, and then there is a statement which I think it is fitting should come from this group. I will not ask the minister to answer the questions as I put them. He can do so afterwards.

It would be well for the committee to have these questions answered, however, before this general debate is concluded. Can the minister tell us the number of Japanese from whom property was taken as a result of the exigencies of war? What measures did the government employ to ensure that each unit of the property was appraised at its full financial value? What precautions has the government taken to see that the Japanese owners shall not be permitted to suffer financial loss? Has the minister prepared a detailed report on all financial relations between the Japanese and the government?

My reason for asking these questions is that, in my opinion, the members of the house should have a report as a result of the perusal of which they can determine for themselves whether or not we have been in any way unfair to the Japanese in a financial way.

In my judgment, no Japanese must be allowed to sustain any financial loss as a result of any exigency of the war for which that Japanese was in no respect personally responsible. I believe that is a sound principle upon which the members of the house ought to act and to act sternly and justly. It would indeed be a reflection on this country if it were to be proved that Japanese had suffered financial loss.

May I turn now to the matter of discrimination. Much has been said about racial discrimination, Social crediters are unalterably opposed to all forms of racial discrimination. But Social crediters are aware—and let some hon. members bear this in mind, for it is a thing which they are overlooking—that certain forces are designing to discriminate against the white race.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes. The light-minded and the superficial will laugh, but those who realize the truth of what I say will not. They realize that there is much behind the statement. Are the white Canadians in British Columbia and elsewhere to be the only people in Canada to be discriminated against? Have white Canadians no right to protection against racial discrimination? Will anyone seriously argue that the Indians of British Columbia, whose fishing rights were infringed upon by the Japanese, were not being discriminated against, right under the eyes of this government? How is it that we have heard no voice raised in this house in defence of the Indians against such discrimination?

Mr. LOW: They have no vote.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Now is the time to show whether certain hon. members mean all this talk about their support of the Indians. Here is their chance to be practical, as the minister says. The trouble is that a good many superficial theorists are unable to think through far enough to see the practical application of some of the principles they preach.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: Take a look at the canneries and see what conditions they have to live under.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I do not think the hon. member's question has any bearing on my general contention.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: It never has.

Mr. BLACKMORE: My position is clearly established. Will anyone seriously argue that the white people of British Columbia, who have seen the Japanese invading the British Columbia small-fruit industry, are not being discriminated against? Can it be successfully maintained that when Canadian governments in the past short-sightedly admitted Japanese to British Columbia soil, against the protests and pleading of the people of British Columbia, they did not discriminate against the white people of British Columbia?

We must be realistic in these matters. It is easy enough for the white race to stand up so straight that it falls over backwards, and that is what a good many members would seem to wish to do today, so that their children and their grandchildren will wake up some day and find their rights as Canadians destroyed, given away in a moment of foolish sentimentality. Can it be denied that the present government, if it permitted Japanese to return to British Columbia and multiply there, and extend their economic, social and political strength in that province, would not be guilty of rank discrimination against the white people of British Columbia?

Social crediters are opposed to discrimination against the white race in Canada as well as discrimination against every other race. Social crediters are opposed to discrimination against the people of British Columbia, and social crediters are opposed to discrimination against white Canadians yet unborn, generations and generations of them.

Now may I stop here to make a comment in support of the minister's remarks regarding those people who never saw a Japanese. Why, the men and women in this country who have never seen a Japanese, who have never lived near Japanese, have no right to pronounce upon the subject at all. Let them listen to the people who know about the Japanese, the people who have lived near them and have seen what happens, the people who understand. How is it that men fail to appreciate this truth? What sore of intelligence or logic would there be in my rising to pronounce upon problems peculiar to Prince Edward Island when I have never been there? I listen to Prince Edward Island people on those problems. Let Canadians listen to British Columbians on British Columbia's problems.

Mrs. STRUM: Aren't they Canadian?

Mr. BLACKMORE: There are certain great fundamental principles which go down beneath the question of being Canadians. Bear in mind that the white people in Canada who sought out this land, who developed it and who fought and bled for it, are Canadians too; they have some rights—a thing which a number of hon. members are completely overlooking. Social crediters therefore propose to stand by British Columbia members and the minister in their courageous effort to safeguard and guard the rights of the white race in British Columbia. Social crediters will therefore vote against this amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Nobody is fond of speaking when he is not wanted to speak, but I wish to make a few brief comments. I find myself so much in agreement with the hon. member for Stanstead—we always like to vote together—that I find it difficult to vote against this amendment. But I intend to vote against it and I wish to say a word or two to explain why. I like to believe that I am a supporter of civil liberties, and I should like to challenge what the hon. member for New Westminster said yesterday. I do not think he intended to talk as if he felt that civil liberties were a thing that should be disregarded. I am sure he did not, but he spoke in a way that intimated he thought that people who had taken part in civil liberties associations were a lot of cranks. I should like to suggest to him that that is not so, although there was a tendency that I am very well aware of for all kinds of people to crowd into civil liberties associations and, in some cases, turn them from their original and valid purposes.

I wish to say two things about this resolution. It seems to me that, while it is not correct to say we have a war emergency at this time, at any rate we have a hang-over from a war emergency. It seems to me that we have not yet found a way to deal permanently with this situation. I am not going to take up the time to discuss whether it is the fault of the government or not. We should have been farther on the way, but we do not seem to be at the point where we can make a wise decision. To me there is great force in what is said by the people from British Columbia, that if this thing is decided in this way, if it is brought to an end now it means that the other provinces push back on them this whole problem. I do not think

that is fair. I remember once the late Lord Tweedsmuir said the difficulty was not when you were faced with right as against wrong but when you were faced with one right against another right.

I find myself in genuine difficulty; nevertheless, for the reasons which I have given, while having full respect for the principles laid down by the hon. member for Stanstead which have to guide us in our eventual dealing with this matter, at the moment I do not think we are right in pushing it back on British Columbia. Therefore I shall vote against the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Thatcher) negatived: yeas, 31; nays, 105.

Mr. MacINNIS: There is a specific case which I wish to bring to the attention of the committee to show the committee exactly where it has put itself by its vote on this amendment. This case may not be an isolated one. If the committee can find some way of justifying this case, then there may be some reason for having voted against the amendment. Yesterday I received a letter from Vancouver, written on behalf of a Japanese Canadian veteran of the last war who was evacuated from the west coast defence zone. The name of this man is Inouye. His regimental number is 228458-S. He was wounded and received an honourable discharge. Before evacuation he had a small farm near New Westminster, the legal description of which is given in the letter. For some reason or another, perhaps because he was a veteran, the farm was not sold. It is rented. The war being over for two years, this man is now seeking permission to return to his farm, but permission is refused. Permission cannot be refused on the score that he is disloyal. He has proved his loyalty by fighting for this country, as a matter of fact by offering his life in defence of the country. He had worked on this farm. It is the work of a lifetime. He was deprived of his farm, not because he was disloyal but because it was deemed necessary in the interest of Canada that for a certain time persons of the race to which he belonged should be moved from the Pacific coast. As a matter of fact this man comes in the category of persons who were referred to in 1920 by Captain Mackenzie, who is now the Minister of Veterans Affairs, when he said in the legislature at Victoria that these British subjects have vindicated the fundamental essentials of citizenship and an acceptance of that principle lay in the extension of the franchise. If that was right—and I submit it was right—by what process of logic or reason or of justice can this man now be denied the right to return to his farm?

Mr. MACKENZIE: What is his name?

Mr. MacINNIS: Inouye. It is not material; the name can be found. This may be an isolated case, but it may not. It demonstrates so clearly what this parliament, representing the principles of liberalism and the principles of freedom which the British people represent, denies to a man who fought for this country. Now I want to ask the committee this: what are you going to do with this man? Where stand all your professions of freedom, liberty and justice now?

Mr. IRVINE: On the practical problem.

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes, in a practical problem. Can anyone suggest that the return of this man to his farm in the Fraser valley, in British Columbia, is a danger to the security of Canada? Let us not forget that German submarines came up the St. Lawrence river; and yet we debar no person of German descent, regardless of what his loyalty or otherwise to this country may have been, from the normal freedoms of citizenship. As I mentioned before, here you have a man who was willing to make the supreme sacrifice for the country of his adoption, and you tell him, "You must remain in a concentration camp while somebody else lives on your farm."

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): He is not living in a concentration camp, surely?

Mr. MacINNIS: Well, what do you call those relocation centres?

Mr. Chairman, it is after six o'clock. Since that point has been raised, I should like to say a few more words about the matter.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MacINNIS: Just before the dinner recess I was saying a few words in regard to the case of a veteran of world war I which came to my attention. I thought I had just about finished, but the Secretary of State made an interjection which caused me to decide to say a little more. During the past two or three days I have listened to so much rationalization in this chamber that I really have had to keep fairly good control over myself in order not to get excited about it. I have listened to people who know their position is wrong trying to rationalize themselves out of it. You cannot rationalize yourself out of a wrong position. I have lived long enough to realize that the only way one can do right today is to have done right yesterday, and the only way you can do right tomorrow is to do right today.

I shall try to give expression to the few words I have to say tonight without rancour, without racial prejudice or anything of that kind. As a matter of fact I feel quite sure I do not harbour any racial prejudice myself. I believe the Scottish race is the finest race on earth.

Mr. MITCHELL: I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacINNIS: I have come to that conclusion because so often I have heard them say so, at Caledonian societies banquets and Burns suppers. The Secretary of State took exception to my saying that the veteran of world war I, to whom I referred before the recess, who cannot now get back to his farm at New Westminster, was in a concentration camp. Perhaps that was an extreme statement of the case, but the fact of the matter is that he cannot travel beyond a certain radius without a police permit, and a person who cannot do that is pretty close to being in a concentration camp. Certainly he is not a free Canadian; certainly he does not enjoy the freedoms for which he fought between 1914 and 1918. I am informed that Mr. Inouye, the man I referred to, has written many times to the authorities in Ottawa, and cannot get anywhere. The party in Vancouver who wrote to me in regard to this case said he saw Mr. Mackinnon, the commissioner or placement officer, who told him there was nothing he could do about the matter; that at the present time there were some four or five war veterans in Vancouver but they were there under special permits, and they either had to leave when those permits expired or had to have the permits renewed.

I should like to know what would be the attitude of the war veterans in this house if a white war veteran could not go to Nova Scotia, for example, without a permit. I am quite satisfied that every war veteran here would rise in his place and object to that sort of thing. If that is the case, as I am sure it is, the only reason there is not the same concern in this instance is that this man's skin is brown, and that he is of the oriental race. That is not good enough for the members of this house, nor, in my opinion, is it good enough for this government.

I am going to refer for a moment to the dispersal policy, and I hope the Minister of Labour will not take what I am about to say as anything personal to him. On more than one occasion I have made the statement in the house, and in letters to the minister I have said on several occasions, that I thought, under the circumstances within which he had to work, he did a good job. But I am going to say that in dealing with this matter the Minister of Labour was not a free agent. I am going to say that the cabinet itself did not give him the support he should have had to deal with this matter, that the cabinet allowed itself to be blackmailed into dealing with these people as it has done. That is why we are in our present position. Certain political promises were made that these people would never return to British Columbia. Then, once we got them out of the province, every attempt was made to make conditions so tough for them that not only would they not go back to British Columbia, but they would leave the country altogether. I am not blaming the Minister of Labour for that, but I am surprised that in the cabinet there were not men who loved freedom enough to insist that these people should have a fair deal.

As to the dispersal policy, is it any wonder it was found difficult to disperse these people, since we tried to disperse them and at the same time attached to them the stigma of disloyalty? They were sent out of British Columbia as enemy aliens. Is it any wonder that other provinces did not want to take enemy aliens? The first thing the government should have done in its dispersal programme was to make clear to the provinces and the Japanese themselves that they were not to be considered as enemy aliens. As a matter of fact, as the Minister of Labour has indicated, they were removed, not only for the protection and security of the west coast, but also for their own protection. And they should have been removed, not as enemy aliens but as wards of the state. Their property and persons should have been scrupulously protected.

But that is not what has happened. Their property has been despoiled. The minister suggested today that they would rush back to the coast. Very few of them can go back to the coast, because there is nothing for them to go back to. And I am not at all in agreement with him that they would suffer any violence if they went back. The same thing was said with regard to the Japanese evacuated from the Pacific coast in the United States if they returned. But they went back, and there was no violence; there were no disorders. A few people did try to make trouble. But the

good sense of the people in the Pacific coast states of the United States recognized that these people were American citizens, and should receive the protection of the government of the United States. I am satisfied that Canadians are even more law-abiding than our American neighbours, and I am quite sure that nothing serious would happen if the Japanese should go back to British Columbia.

But I do not want them to go back. In so far as I have been able I have urged them to settle in other parts of Canada. I have numerous letters on file from those who did go to other parts of Canada, and who have told me that they are getting along well.

If the government wanted them to settle in the other provinces, would not the logical thing be that, as soon as they went into those provinces, all restrictions with the exception of returning to British Columbia should be removed. But what happened? They went into these provinces, but they could not buy property. They could not move from place to place. They could not make long distance telephone calls. People who are placed in that sort of position cannot acquire the social and economic roots which are necessary for settlement anywhere. And it is only quite recently that those restrictions have been removed.

All this talk about dispersal is, in my opinion, too late. It is far more difficult today than it was during the last three or four years. In regard to irksome restrictions, I have in mind a particular case, which I mentioned in the house before. The government of Saskatchewan took into its employ a young Canadian-Japanese lawyer who had graduated from Dalhousie university in 1942. Because of conditions prevailing at that time, although he was ready to be called to the bar, the bar association in Nova Scotia, decided it was not desirable that he should be admitted to the bar at that time. He returned to Ottawa and did his best to try to get into the armed services. He could not do that. Then he got work somewhere in Saskatchewan, and a year or so ago was taken into a position of responsibility in the civil service of that province. Then he learned that, the war being over, he could now be admitted to the bar of Nova Scotia. But could he go to Nova Scotia as an ordinary Canadian citizen would? No; he had to have a permit from the mounted police to move from Saskatchewan to Nova Scotia to be admitted to the bar of that province.

Is it possible to get people to settle under conditions of that kind? It is folly and nonsense to think that can be done. So I say the first mistake that was made by the government when these people were removed and

they were designated as enemy aliens, and treated as such when there was no question whatever as to their loyalty.

I listened with pleasure and admiration to the great speech made this afternoon by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). There was one part of it particularly which appealed to me, and that was where he said that if a person were disloyal or subversive the thing to do was to bring him before the courts of the country and determine his guilt or innocence through those courts; but that the innocent should not be punished indiscriminately with the guilty.

We have been promised a loyalty commission. On August 4, 1944, speaking in this house on the same question, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said this, as reported on page 5916 of *Hansard*:

> What is clearly needed is the establishment of a quasi-judicial commission to examine the background, loyalties and attitudes of all persons of Japanese race in Canada to ascertain those who are not fit persons to be allowed to remain here. The commission I have referred to should, I think, be established in the fairly near future, in order that it may begin what will be a large and important task. The result of the work of the commission would be to establish a list of disloyal Japanese persons some of whom will be Japanese nationals, some British subjects by naturalization, and some British subjects by birth. The government's intention would be to have these disloyal persons deported to Japan as soon as that is physically possible.

That was on August 4, 1944. But no commission has yet been appointed to do that. Then in December, 1945, when the three famous, or infamous, orders in council were passed, one of them provided that a loyalty commission should be appointed. But the commission was not set up under that order in council. Again in December, 1946, I believe it was, it was again mentioned that a loyalty commission, or some sort of commission, should be appointed to look into the loyalty of these people. But no commission has yet been appointed for this purpose, although it is nearly four years since the Prime Minister said that what was clearly indicated was the appointment of such a commission.

In my opinion there is only one reason why no such commission was appointed, mainly, that there was no disloyalty to investigate. And because no such commission was appointed, after several promises were made, the government should now say to people of Japanese origin in Canada, Canadian citizens as most of them are, and to those who are not Canadian citizens that, no fault having been found with them, they should now be allowed to take up their place in this country as citizens and as residents. That is what is indicated by the actions and words of the government itself.

I was glad that the hon. member for Vancouver North, when speaking this afternoon, made it quite plain that he was not basing his claim for the exclusion of the Japanese from British Columbia on the score of the security of the province. If I understood him aright he based his reasons for wanting to keep them out of the province squarely on economic grounds, on the ground that if they were permitted to return to the province they would interfere with the employment of white residents. All I can say to that is that if economic conditions in this country are such that a mere handful—there are only about three or four thousand men, women and children—of people coming into British Columbia will upset the equilibrium of the economic situation in that province, then this government must be making a bad job of rehabilitation. However I am convinced that his economic fears are as baseless and as groundless as are the security fears of the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

When an effort was made to disperse these people across the country, not only were they considered as enemy aliens but everything that could be said in their favour was suppressed and their opponents were allowed to carry on their vilification without restraint. I have in my hand a report which appeared in the *News-Herald* of Vancouver under date of February 8, 1946. Under the heading, "Suppressed report says Japs save beet sugar crop", the report states:

> There can be little doubt that unless Japanese labour had been recruited, the great bulk of the crop would not have been seeded, with the consequent loss to Canada of many thousands of tons of beet sugar. The Japanese performed an important and essential function in maintaining sugar beet production in Manitoba and Alberta. In 1943 it was estimated the Japanese in Alberta alone provided at least $750,000 worth of necessary labour.
>
> The Japanese on the prairies have developed religious, cultural and recreational facilities in the areas where they settled. They have participated in community enterprises, church and youth organizations, sports teams, victory loan and Red Cross drives. While concentrating mainly on sugar beet work, the Japanese on the prairies also helped in general farm operations.

Why should a report like that be suppressed? Why not let the people of Canada know?

An hon. MEMBER: Who suppressed it?

Mr. MacINNIS: Evidently the government. I am accepting the report as it appeared in the paper.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have no knowledge of any report being suppressed. What report was it?

Mr. MacINNIS: It is special to the *News-Herald*, Ottawa, and it appeared in the *News-Herald* of Vancouver on February 8, 1946. The first part of the report reads:

> One of the two federal government reports dealing with the evacuation and resettlement of Japanese in B.C. and which were withheld from the public during the war, says—

Mr. MITCHELL: I know nothing about it. I am looking after a large department and it may be that I do not know everything that is going on, but I think I know most of what is going on and I have no knowledge of the suppression of any report. It is just a newspaper story, probably speculation.

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not think a newspaper would report a story of this kind if there were not some basis for it.

Mr. MITCHELL: I want to say frankly to my hon. friend that there is no basis whatsoever for that story.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is amazing to me that the government or the Department of Labour did not say so at the time.

Mr. MITCHELL: If I got up and denied all the stories in the nut columns of the papers of this country I would be on my feet twenty-four hours a day.

Mr. MacINNIS: It is not necessary that that should be done; all that would be necessary would be for the Minister of Labour to send out a contradiction—he sends out reports every day—stating to the newspaper that the report of their correspondent in Ottawa was not true and should be withdrawn.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why did you not raise it in 1946 rather than now?

Mr. MacINNIS: I am in somewhat the same position as the minister. If I said everything that I should like to say on this question there would be no one talking but myself. Since I have not that opportunity and since it would not be fair for me to exercise it if I had, I have to say these things when I get the chance. However I am going to leave the matter there. I am convinced as strongly as I have ever been convinced of anything that we are adopting the wrong attitude in this matter and that we cannot build, not only a united world but a united Canada, on a basis of that kind.

Mr. MITCHELL: I think in an evolutionary way my hon. friend's mind travels very much like my own. I think I mentioned

it this afternoon, but I want to say to my hon. friend that he has certainly shown a degree of sincerity which the hon. member for Skeena did not show yesterday.

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I have shown as much sincerity as the minister ever did.

Mr. MITCHELL: There is one thing about my hon. friend, he has been consistent down through the years, even from before the outbreak of the war when he raised a question about a returned soldier. My mind goes back to 1941 or 1942 before the Japanese were in the war, when the British government, for reasons best known to themselves, insisted that the wives of all British subjects in Hong Kong should go to Australia. There were a great many resolutions passed by wives of British residents that they wanted to stay with their husbands, which is a natural thing for any woman to do. I remember the criticism of the British government at that time because of the action they had taken in regard to that matter, but time has vindicated their action.

My hon. friend speaks of enemy aliens. I had something to do with prisoners of war in this country, since those who worked in civilian pursuits came under my jurisdiction. At the outbreak of the war the British government, I would not like to say arrested, but took under their control many people of many races, and there were those in Great Britain, and possibly in Canada and in the United States as well, who contended that such persons should have been allowed their freedom. Well, that is the price you have to pay when war breaks out. The government is charged with the responsibility of the state, and you cannot conduct a war successfully from a soap-box or on the basis of sentiment. War is war, and you have to make decisions in the light of the conditions and circumstances as they exist at the time, irrespective of the complexion of the political party that happens to be in power.

I am still convinced that our policy was a correct one in connection with these people of Japanese origin. I recall flying to Vancouver when it was decided that this movement should be made. When I got off the train I met a certain group in that city and they spoke to me about a policy I was setting in motion. I said to them—I will not give the committee the whole story—"I don't know whether you know it or not, but you may be living in the twilight of a civilization, for I have had some experience with the Japanese. I served with them out in Singapore in the last war and they have merely the veneer of civilization. If they should come to the Aleutian islands or into British Columbia or further into western Canada they would, if necessary, wipe out every man, woman and child in that part of the dominion." There was a real threat at that time.

Hong Kong was lost in two weeks, Singapore in six weeks, and the Dutch East Indies in twenty-four hours. The Americans had lost every effective capital ship in the Pacific; the Australian army was in Syria, and the state of defence in Australia was of a character that would make even a courageous man quiver. That was the situation at that time.

My hon. friend speaks of enemy aliens. I do not think they were ever treated as enemy aliens.

Mr. COLDWELL: I thought my hon. friend was talking about a soldier.

Mr. MITCHELL: I will come to that. If you do not like the whole story you need not listen to it.

Mr. COLDWELL: Why do you not talk about that?

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend made a forty-minute speech and I should like to go on with my speech now.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not. I have kept quiet.

Mr. MITCHELL: For the first time in your life.

Mr. COLDWELL: If you want to hear me on this you can.

Mr. MITCHELL: This is a free country.

Mr. MacINNIS: For some people.

Mr. COLDWELL: Not people of Canadian-Japanese origin.

Mr. MITCHELL: There is no objection to my hon. friend making a speech if he cares to do so. He makes lots of them.

Mr. COLDWELL: I can make more.

Mr. KNOWLES: And to the point too.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am giving the background. Probably my hon. friends do not like to hear the background.

Mr. COLDWELL: We would like to hear it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Go ahead.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was stating the position we were in. My hon. friend said that we treated these people as enemy aliens. If the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar had been sitting in another place instead of over there he would probably have had to take the same position as the British government did in this regard.

The hon. member speaks of concentration camps. I do not like the words "concentration camps". The hon. member for Spadina used what I term European language in reference to a question of this kind. A concentration camp, as understood in Europe, is something entirely different from the sort of camps in which these people were housed in Canada. There is no comparison whatever. Do not let us use the jargon of the communist party when we are talking about Canada.

Mr. MacINNIS: Is not a concentration camp any place where you are put and which you cannot leave without a permit? The conditions may be bad or good, but if you cannot get out of it, it is a concentration camp.

Mr. COLDWELL: A place where people are concentrated.

An hon. MEMBER: What about a gaol?

Mr. MITCHELL: If that is my hon. friend's definition of a concentration camp, these people were not in any concentration camp because they could get out of it. Having been assembled in these locations in British Columbia, there was a constant movement of the Japanese to Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and, to a lesser degree, to the maritime provinces. I do not like to hear these words and phrases, which are jargon in Europe, used in reference to the Dominion of Canada. We have had no concentration camps as far as the Japanese in Canada are concerned, during the time they were under my jurisdiction.

I know what a concentration camp is. I have been to Europe and I have seen the countries where they existed. My hon. friend spoke of a young Jap who wanted to go to Nova Scotia, I believe. There is no law against that.

Mr. MacINNIS: The hon. gentleman beats all round the bush. There was no law against it, provided that he could get a permit from the mounted police. There was no difficulty in getting the permit but he had to get a permit.

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend is putting up a straw man and knocking it down.

Mr. KNOWLES: Do you have to get a police permit to go to Nova Scotia?

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friend may have to get one if he wants to go there.

Mr. MacINNIS: Not unless he comes under you.

Mr. BENTLEY: Why would the hon. member need to get one?

An hon. MEMBER: It is a free country.

Mr. MITCHELL: Who said that?

An hon. MEMBER: You did.

Mr. MITCHELL: Let me say that this is the freest country on earth; make no mistake about it.

I say to my hon. friend that we have, in my judgment, the fairest system of judiciary of any country on earth, not excepting Great Britain; and when it comes to freedom of speech I do not make any exception either to that statement.

My hon. friend spoke of a loyalty commission. It is quite true that the statement he referred to was made by the Prime Minister, regarding the establishment of a loyalty commission. If the hon. gentleman's mind will go back, he will remember that, prior to the defeat of Japan by the allies, over 10,000 Japanese in this country wished to return to Japan voluntarily. After the defeat of Japan, that number was reduced considerably, but upwards of 4,000 went back voluntarily, which, in my judgment is, to speak the language of my hon. friend, a pretty fair vindication of the policy of the government, and an assessment of the loyalty of the Japanese individually.

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not agree with you.

Mr. MITCHELL: You are not asked to agree with that statement. I am putting forward that point of view. These people wanted to return to Japan and we paid their fares and gave them $200, on landing, for each adult and $50 for each child.

May I say this. I said it before and hon. members will forgive me for the repetition. I would like to think that our soldiers in Hong Kong, that the Canadian civilians in Japan or the Americans or the British were treated as well as we treated these people in the Dominion of Canada.

Let us be frank and honest about the matter. I said that my hon. friend himself is moving very much in the same direction as I am. During the dinner recess I looked up this quotation from a speech he made on August 31, 1946. It will be found at page 5722 of *Hansard* and reads as follows:

> These restrictions should be completely removed except as regards the return of persons to Pacific defence area.

These words were used less than a year ago. I say to my hon. friend that we are moving in an evolutionary way to meet this problem. Less than a year ago in this House of Commons my hon. friend said that the Japanese should not be permitted to return

to the Pacific area. I agree with him absolutely that it is not in their best interests as a group; that they should be relocated across this dominion. I agree with him from that point of view. But it takes time to do these things. Since the policy was enunciated in 1942, the problem of the Japanese has not been such a difficult one so far as I and my administration are concerned, but I must say that it was intensified by some of the speeches which have been made in this house. I am frank to admit that some have to talk to the boys back home. I have no objection to that at all. I forgive them for it. I think I have covered all the points raised by my hon. friend, but I know he is thinking of this returned soldier.

Mr. MacINNIS: Before we leave this matter, I wish to ask the minister three questions. I am glad he forgives me for "talking to the boys back home". In regard to Mr. Inouye, will the minister investigate the case, and if he has any discretion in the matter will he see what he can do with it?

My second question is, has any official request been made by the government of Alberta for the removal of persons of Japanese origin who were moved to that province shortly after the evacuation? Has the position of these people in Alberta been clarified? Will they be removed from there, or may they stay there if they wish? If they have to be removed from there, what provision is being made for settling them elsewhere? This is an important issue, because they should not be removed when the beet growers have finished producing their beet crop and there is no work for them elsewhere. They should be removed, not at the best time for the beet growers, but at the best time for Japanese.

The third question has to do with the loyalty commission. I mentioned that there were three definite statements made in regard to the loyalty commission, one in August, 1944, one in December, 1945, and if my memory serves me rightly, another one in 1946. Surely either that commission should be appointed or a statement of the government made and publicized that there is no disloyalty to be investigated.

Mr. MITCHELL: The first question has to do with the soldier. I shall be glad to look into that matter.

The second question is the Alberta matter. At the moment no request has been received from the Alberta government. As I indicated yesterday, the Japanese there can move out at their will so long as they do not go back to British Columbia. Of course there is a problem in Alberta. The sugar beet crop in Alberta and in Manitoba and, to a lesser degree, in Ontario was saved by the fact that we had Japanese labour in those three provinces in the last three or four years. That is a matter of fact, not a matter of argument.

The third question had to do with the loyalty commission. I would think that when the order in council was repealed—I am merely expressing a personal opinion now—and the power of deportation was ended, the loyalty commission became unnecessary because there has been no suggestion to my knowledge of deportation by compulsion. All the people who have gone to Japan have gone there voluntarily. I hope that answers my hon. friend.

Mr. MacINNIS: One other question about Alberta; has any request come from the beet growers of Alberta that these people should stay there for another year? I believe there was a conference on the matter.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have met the beet growers from Alberta. I am speaking from memory now. I cannot be too sure about it, but I am under the impression that they have also made representations to the government of Alberta. It is obvious that you have to get the crop off. The Japanese people assisted materially in getting the sugar beet crop off in Alberta.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I should like to ask the minister a question. I have two cases, one of which has already been referred to in the house, that of Sergeant Buck Suzuki. The leader of this party brought that case to the attention of the house last year. This man was born in Canada. I am told that his parents have been in Canada for thirty years. He served with great distinction in the Malaya campaign. While he was fighting with the British forces overseas, presumably for democracy, his wife and children were moved to Toronto and his house and land, which were valued at $7,000, were sold for the sum of $1,963. I do not know whether Sergeant Suzuki received that amount or not.

The second case is that of Yasuzo Shoji. He was wounded twice with the Princess Pats in the first world war. In British Columbia he had a two-story house, nineteen acres of land, four chicken houses, at least 2,500 hens and an electric incubator. I am informed that everything was sold for the sum of $1,429.59. The cheque which was handed to this man, after deduction of expenses and taxes, was $39.32. We have heard expressions from every side of the house today that justice

should be allotted to these people. We have done many things which I think afterwards we shall be ashamed of, if we are not now. The assets of loyal Canadians were seized and sold, and in many cases sold for a song. And now the demand is coming, as I say, from all quarters that justice should be allotted to these people. What plans does the government have to ensure that justice is meted out to them?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I do not know the details of the cases that my hon. friend has raised. I have heard of some of them. The suggestion is made by him that the assets of these Japanese, the evacuees from British Columbia, were sold for a song. That is by no means the case. The custodian of enemy property was placed in charge of the Japanese property and set up two commissions in British Columbia, one in Vancouver and the other for the rural area, each commission being headed by a judge and having on the commission a representative of the Japanese race. Each commission considered the sales and recommended sales at prices that were equal to the value that had been put on the properties by a responsible, reliable real estate dealer of Vancouver. The amount that the custodian received for properties was in excess of the valuations which had been placed on them by the real estate advisers. That is, the total sales or the amount received in total was greater. There are some instances in which the Japanese owners claimed that they did not receive as much as they should have received, and consideration is now being given as to what form of commission should be set up in order that those cases may be heard so that full justice can be done, as was promised by the Prime Minister, in any cases where a proper sale price was not received.

Where chattels were sold, they were sold by public auction. Large advertisements were published and the prices which were recevied for the articles were extremely good. Altogether the prices which were obtained by the sales were well up to the values of the property that came into the custodian's hands. There have been cases where chattels did not come into the custodian's hands. In some cases articles were stolen; in other cases they disappeared or they deteriorated, as in the case of fishing nets and other articles. Where the custodian was responsible, we are prepared to accept representations from the previous owners and have a commission or committee, whatever is appointed, investigate and find out to what extent, if any, the government may be responsible.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I did not know that we had passed on to the Secretary of State's Department in dealing with these orders in council.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may say to the hon. member for Vancouver East that the committee agreed to consider these orders in council together: 251 on page 4, 946 and 7355 on page 5; and 469 on page 6, and that we would try to pass them all together.

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not think we agreed to that, Mr. Chairman. We agreed to discuss them at the same time, but I do not think we agreed that we would pass them all in one vote. We have been dealing with these orders in council, as far as I remember, as sections of a bill, and I think there should be a separate vote on each order. I think it would be better to deal with P.C. 946 before we went on to the others.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the committee that we should deal now with these items separately?

Mr. COLDWELL: Put them one at a time, and we can see what happens.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: P.C. 946. Is that carried?

Mr. KNOWLES: On division.

P. C. 946 agreed to.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: P. C. 7355. Is that carried?

Mr. COLDWELL: On division.

P. C. 7355 agreed to.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: P.C. 251 on page 4 of the bill. Does that carry?

Mr. MacINNIS: I do not intend to make any lengthy speech on this order in council, but I should like to draw to the attention of the committee that on the west coast of the United States there is a situation which is similar to the one prevailing in Canada and they settled the matter some little time ago. The state of California passed a statute excluding Japanese residents from the commercial fishing business. That was in 1943. Objection to it was taken to the courts, and the superior court of the state dealt with the matter and decided that the statute passed by the state was ultra vires. I now make the claim that we have no right to deny to one citizen of this country any right that another citizen has.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall this item carry?

Mr. KNOWLES: On division.

P.C. 251 agreed to.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: P.C. 1665, on page 6. Does that carry?

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to ask the Secretary of State a question with regard to property which was owned by persons of Japanese origin who were removed from the coast. Is there still in the hands of the custodian any of that property which has not been sold?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): Yes. There are fifty parcels remaining which are vested in the custodian. Twenty-five of them belong to Japanese associations, either community halls or churches, and twenty-five parcels belong to individuals. Of those twenty-five parcels belonging to individuals, I think about twelve are up at a place called Port Essington, which is practically a deserted village, and there is no sale for them at the present time.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall this item carry?

Mr. MacINNIS: No, Mr. Chairman, I think we should have an assurance from the minister that no more of this property will be sold without the consent of the owner.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I am quite prepared to give that consent.

Mr. MacINNIS: That consent being given, I think it should be satisfactory. Did I understand the minister to say a moment ago that a commission was to be appointed to look into the values received by the owners of these properties?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): That is under consideration at the present time. I know that we shall give an opportunity to the owners to make representations. Just what form that will take has not yet been decided.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall P.C. 1665 carry?

Mr. COLDWELL: On division.

Mr. FLEMING: On this item, may I ask the Secretary of State when the public accounts committee will be called to meet? The bill, together with the accounts of the custodian, was referred to that committee ten days ago. Could arrangements be made to call that committee at an early day?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I understand that the chairman of that committee has been away. I am taking steps to find out if somebody else cannot call a meeting of that committee, because we desire to have that matter discussed as soon as possible since this is emergency legislation which we want to have passed before May 15, if possible.

P.C. 1665, P.C. 469, P.C. 7167 and P.C. 7168 agreed to.

[Mr. Knowles.]

On P.C. 6638.

Mr. BROOKS: This is just a matter of administration, I take it, in connection with post-discharge benefits for a man who joined the interim force. The only object of this is to see that, if he continues on in the interim force after leaving the other one, he will not lose his gratuities and other benefits except for misconduct before he joined the interim force.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right.

P.C. 6638 agreed to.

P.C. 3617 agreed to.

On P.C. 349.

Mr. HAZEN: I should like to know whether the claims commission set up under these orders in council dealt with claims made against the dominion government by the governments of other countries, arising out of the occupation or operations of the Canadian army in those countries during or after the war. If not, how were such claims dealt with? I have in mind France, Belgium and Holland. Did the governments of those countries make claims against the government of Canada, arising out of the occupation or operations of the Canadian armed forces in their countries during or after the war? If those claims were made, how were they dealt with? How much did they amount to in the case of Belgium, Holland and France, and how much has been paid to each of those countries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My understanding is that the claims referred to by the hon. member were not dealt with under these orders in council but by the government, through representatives who discussed the claims with the representatives of the foreign governments and arrived at a settlement. Those settlements were carried out by order in council, not under these orders in council which dealt only with claims resulting in injuries or damage caused through training, occupation, billeting, or manœuvring. The amount of each claim dealt with by this commission could not exceed $1,000, as my hon. friend will see.

Mr. HAZEN: I notice section 2(d) reads:

To function and cooperate with the British claims commission in the United Kingdom and any claims commission which may be set up under field service regulations, 1930 . . .

Of course I do not know what that refers to.

Mr. LAPOINTE: These commissions were set up for the purpose of dealing with claims similar to those with which this commission had to deal.

Mr. HAZEN: Is the hon. gentleman in a position to tell us the amount of the claims submitted by the countries I have mentioned, France, Holland and Belgium?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry I cannot say what they amounted to. I believe I can give the amount of the claims with which this commission has to deal. Those still outstanding under this order in council total £49,000. All told there are seventy-eight known claims outstanding in Britain at the present time, and it is expected that by June most of those will have been dealt with. Of course the number of claims is dwindling as the repatriation of our troops becomes complete.

Mr. HAZEN: There are seventy-eight claims totalling £49,000; is that right?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, that would be right.

Mr. HAZEN: How many claims have been settled, and what did it cost to settle them?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry but I have not that information before me. I am sure the amount must be quite considerable, because during the time Canadian troops were in England claims resulting from manœuvres, training and billeting were quite numerous, and claims officers were appointed in various divisional areas, as a rule, who were kept busy settling these claims which came into headquarters. I am sorry I have not the figures.

P.C. 349 agreed to.

P.C. 363 agreed to.

On P.C. 6367.

Mr. GREEN: This order in council refers to old age pensions, and I take it there would be no objection to having the discussion cover the other three orders in council having to do with old age pensions. Is that correct?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the committee would agree that we might discuss all these items together, concerning old age pensions.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. MARTIN: Might I point out to hon. gentlemen that it is the intention of the government to have the resolution preceding the bill dealing with old age pensions appear on the order paper on Monday next, so that perhaps some of the discussion contemplated tonight might be postponed until the bill has been brought in.

Mr. GREEN: Of course, while the bill to amend the act may be introduced on Monday, it may not be debated for some considerable time. In any event I have a few remarks I should like to make tonight, having to do with these orders in council and the general question of old age pensions. The four orders we are now considering deal, in the first place, with an increase of $5 granted on August 10, 1943, under the War Measures Act; a further order in council passed on May 29, 1944, which restored the privilege, existing before the passing of the first order, of having an annual income totalling $125 over and above the pension, the other two orders in council refer to pensions in the Northwest Territories. I have nothing directly to say about them this evening, though my general remarks will apply to them as well as to old age pensions in other parts of the country.

In my opinion, there has been an utter failure on the part of the government to realize the plight of the old age pensioners of Canada, our other older citizens, and our blind. This failure has been most noticeable with regard to the amount of the pension, which is too low for a recipient to live decently in many centres of Canada. In addition, the regulations are too severe, so that in some cases applicants are completely disqualified from receiving the pension, and in other cases where pensions are granted the amount is reduced by reason of the stringency of the regulations.

When old age pensions were first introduced in Canada the lead was taken by the dominion government. That was back in the twenties. At that time it was not a question of waiting for the provinces to move. The dominion government took the lead. The same was true in the early thirties, when the government of the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett increased the proportion of the pension payable by the dominion from fifty per cent to seventy-five per cent.

But in recent years the dominion government has not been taking the lead in old age pensions matters. It has been hiding behind the provinces. In support of that contention I would refer hon. members to the statement of policy made by the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley) on November 14, 1941; at that time he was Minister of Finance. He admitted in this statement that there had been requests from various parts of Canada for the dominion to pay a cost of living bonus to the old age pensioners. But he declined to grant that increase. All that he offered was that if any province saw fit to make a special supplementary payment, the dominion, very graciously, would not as a result reduce the dominion's contribution to the regular old age pensions payments.

At page 4428 of *Hansard* for November 14, 1941, the minister is reported as follows; and here, I think, we have the basic policy of the government on old age pensions:

The dominion must, I am convinced, take the position that old age pensions of the non-contributory type now in effect are primarily a provincial responsibility, the role of the dominion being that of a contributor financially assisting the provinces to discharge this responisibility.

In other words, the government then took the stand, in November, 1941, that the primary responsibility for old age pensions was with the provinces, and that the lead must come from them.

In the following year, 1942, the situation of old age pensioners in Canada had become so desperate that some of the provinces began to pay supplementary grants. The first one to do so was my own province of British Columbia. They made provision in January, 1942, for the payment of an additional amount of $5, bringing the maximum in our province up to a total of $25 a month for single pensioners.

The then minister of finance here in Ottawa was questioned about that situation in February, 1942, and in explanation of the British Columbia provision we find him stating this, as recorded at page 498 of *Hansard* for February 11:

The dominion government makes no contribution to the additional $5 a month. The position of this government was made clear in a statement which I made to this house in November.

Then a few days later, on February 17, the minister quoted from a speech by the Premier of British Columbia, made at the time the supplementary grant was passed in that province. The premier used these significant words; and, mind you, this was five years ago:

The government of the province has given careful consideration to this matter and is of the opinion that conditions in British Columbia warrant the increase of old age pensions to $30 per month, and, pending appropriate action by the dominion to that effect, it proposes to supplement the pension now paid by $5 per month. Of this amount $2.50 is the provincial share of the increase recommended—

That is one quarter of the recommended total increase of $10, which would have brought the pension to $30 a month.

—and the other $2.50 represents a war-time cost of living bonus, which will cease if the scale of pensions is increased by the dominion before the cessation of hostilities.

Subsequently other provinces demanded an increase in the general rate of pension. For example, in May, 1942, Manitoba demanded an increase, and I have here the statement of the then minister of finance with regard to that request from Manitoba.

I have here also a statement by the minister on April 1, 1943, when, again, he was being pressed with respect to an increase in old age pensions. He was being urged to have the dominion take some steps toward increasing the pension, and we find him taking this stand as reported at page 1769 of *Hansard*:

Essentially the question is one of jurisdiction; and the position which this government has taken, and which I announced in November, 1941, is that we regard the responsibility for old age pensions as primarily one of provincial jurisdiction, just to the same extent as mothers' allowances, for example.

I have never been able to bring myself to the belief that old age pensions and mothers' allowances are in the same category. I think that the dominion then, in 1943, was still hiding behind the provinces.

Then, two or three months later, in July of that year—

Mr. ILSLEY: What does the hon. member mean by "hiding behind the provinces"? Why does he use language like that, which is approbrious. My statement was clear, and I have nothing to take from it.

Mr. GREEN: I repeat it. The policy of the dominion government was and is that of hiding behind the provinces on this question of old age pensions.

Mr. ILSLEY: From the very beginning, under all governments, old age pensions were regarded as primarily a provincial responsibility.

Mr. GREEN: But in the beginning the lead was taken by the dominion. The question as to whether there would be old age pensions in Canada was decided here; and now that the time has come, and long since passed, for an increase in the pension, the lead should come from here. It should have come from here, rather than having a dominion government sitting in Ottawa and waiting, waiting, waiting for action to come from the nine different provinces.

On July 23, 1943, a report was tabled in the house by a special committee on social security, in which report we find this recommendation:

That the government review the existing regulations governing old age pensions, pensions for the blind, and war veterans' allowance, and consider the advisability of adjusting the eligibility age to a lower level and of increasing the amount of pension.

Someone on that committee must have known what was coming, because the next day the minister made a statement to be found at page 5355 of *Hansard* for 1943 to the effect that the dominion had finally agreed to let the ceiling for old age pensions be raised from $20 to $25, the difference of $5 being provided for by order in council under the War Measures Act. That is one of the orders in council we are considering tonight.

The provinces were still to be allowed to pay the supplementary grants. I think every province continued to pay those grants. I know my own province of British Columbia kept on paying the sum of $5, making the total amount in that province $30 a month.

On May 29, 1944, a further statement was made by the then minister of finance about old age pensions, and at that time the second order in council which we are considering tonight was passed, allowing a greater income over and above the pension; and there were also some improvements in the regulations.

On June 5, 1944, the Minister of Finance repeated the stand he had taken in November, 1941, that old age pensions were primarily a provincial responsibility. His words will be found on page 2632 of *Hansard* as follows:

In November, 1941, I announced the government's policy to the house. I stuck to the principle that has always been preserved in this pension scheme, namely, that it was primarily a matter of provincial responsibility; I said that if any province wished to pay a supplemental allowance we would alter the regulations in such a way that they could do so without that supplemental allowance being regarded as income, and certain provinces did that.

The plight of the older people in Canada continued to be desperate. This year the province of British Columbia added a further $5 to the supplemental payment, so that they are now paying $10 over and above the national figure. Pensioners in our province may now receive a maximum of $35 a month. The dominion maximum is still $25. The problem of old age and blind pensions is of great concern to the people of British Columbia and, I think, to the people of other parts of Canada as well. For example, a single pensioner living in the centre of Vancouver cannot get a proper room under $12 a month unless he is exceptionally lucky. It is practically impossible to get decent accommodation, that is without board, just the actual room, for less than $12 a month. Prices have been rising steadily and I do not see how these old age pensioners get along. In my opinion, it is practically impossible for an old age pensioner to exist in a city in Canada on the present pension, and I presume the situation is much the same in the smaller centres of the country.

I believe the people generally would be willing to pay the cost of adequate old age pensions. I have here the results of a Gallup poll which was taken on November 28, 1946, in connection with old age pensions. This question was asked:

If it were your job to decide how much money old age pensioners with no other means of support should receive from the government each month, what amount would you set?

The vote was as follows:

	Per cent
$20 or less	1
$21-$30	12
$31-$40	21
$41-$50	27
$51-$60	15
$61-$99	13
$100 or over	6
No answers; no opinion	3
Qualified answers	2

The significant feature of that poll is that forty-eight per cent of the people were in favour of pensions between $31 and $50 a month. Another thirty-four per cent were in favour of pensions from $51 to $100. Sixty-one per cent of the poll favoured pensions over $40. A month later a poll was taken in connection with the age for eligibility, with the following results:

	Per cent
50 years	2
55 years	4
60 years	39
65 years	41
70 years	6
Miscellaneous	5
No answer; no opinion	3

In other words, eighty-six per cent of the people thought the age should be from sixty-five years down. These polls are significant, because they show clearly what public opinion on this question of old age pensions is at the present time.

It is a tragedy that there has been no increase in the four years since 1943. These people have only a few years to live and many have died who would have qualified if changes had been made.

Mr. BLACKMORE: And would have probably lived if changes had been made.

Mr. GREEN: Yes, and probably would have lived if changes had been made. The delay of the dominion government in facing this old age pensions problem is a disgrace to this nation and to this parliament. I daresay that there is not one hon. member who did not

promise his constituents during the last election that he would have something done about old age pensions.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There are several who made no such promise and I am one of them.

Mr. BLACKMORE: They ought to have made that promise.

Mr. GREEN: I am quite certain that in my province there was not an hon. member who did not promise to do something about old age pensions and who did not intend to do something about them.

Mr. ILSLEY: I presume that every member who did that also promised lower taxes.

Mr. GREEN: I do not know about that. They may have done so. Perhaps if the dominion government had not been quite so extravagant it would have been possible to have both.

Then in 1945, nearly two years ago, we had the dominion calling a conference with the provinces. The dominion got out for that conference a nice green book, a copy of which I hold in my hand and which, by the way, I understand was given out to the press before being given to the premiers of the provinces. This book is entitled, "Proposals of the government of Canada." In those proposals hon. members will find the admission that old age pensions are much too low. That is to be found right here in the dominion's own proposals. Of course that was only confirming what was contained in the report by Doctor L. C. Marsh, published on March 16, 1943. Both those government documents suggested that the minimum should be at least $30 a month, and both suggested that the age should be dropped from seventy to sixty-five years.

The main objective of the dominion in making those proposals was to persuade or force the provinces to give up certain taxation powers which the dominion government had enjoyed during the war by virtue of agreements made with the different provinces. One subtle way of bringing pressure to bear on the provincial governments to give up those taxation powers was to hold out to the Canadian people the attractive social security programme to be found in this green book, including increased old age pensions. The dominion was hoping all the time that Canadians, when they saw those proposals, would demand that the provincial governments accept them and hand over the taxation powers. In fact the dominion was using the old age pensioners and the older people of Canada who would be reaching the age of qualification, as a pawn in the dominion's game with the provinces. Let me put it another way—

Mr. MARTIN: I am sure the hon. gentleman is too much of a gentleman to really be serious in making that observation.

Mr. GREEN: The minister of National Health and Welfare need not put it on the basis of gentlemanly conduct.

Mr. MARTIN: That is the way it should be.

Mr. GREEN: I do not make statements in this house which I do not believe, and I believe the statement I have just made. For the benefit of the minister I will repeat it. In my opinion the dominion, in effect, was using the old age pensioners and the elderly people of Canada who would be reaching the age of qualification, as a pawn in the dominion's game with the provinces. Or let me put it another way: using them as a club to force the provinces to accept and to give up taxation powers.

In any event, be that as it may, it is clear now that there is no possibility of agreement at an early date and it does not help the elderly people or the blind of Canada one bit for the dominion to try to place the blame on the provinces. The onus is right back on the dominion government to give a lead in settling the old age pensions problem. The onus is right where it was in 1926 and 1927 when the Old Age Pensions Act was first passed.

Finally, a word about the regulations. These regulations are much too severe. I do not need to rely only on my own opinion in making that statement. It is found right here in both government reports to which I refer, the report of August, 1945, and the Marsh report of 1943. These regulations should have been eased long ago. It does not require any big dominion-provincial conference to ease them. Demands have been made in this house at every session. I made them myself in 1945 and again in 1946, that the regulations be changed, and the Minister of National Defence, who was then Minister of Health and Welfare, promised on December 15, 1945, that he would call together a meeting of the representatives from the different provinces to deal with the regulations. He had not done so at the time the session of 1946 ended, but finally there was a meeting in December, 1946. As yet, however, there has been no announcement by the government of any change in the regulations. The minister from British Columbia, under whose

jurisdiction old age pensions come, returned from Ottawa on December 6 of last year and I have here an interview with him upon his return. He hinted that the pension rules might be eased. He said that the committee which had met was purely advisory as to the dominion's Old Age Pensions Act. All the provinces apparently are waiting for the dominion to announce what changes are to be made in these regulations.

I do not need to go over the details of the regulations to show their unfairness. That is shown by the very fact that only forty per cent of the people of Canada over seventy years of age have been able to qualify under the regulations. That figure is taken from the dominion's proposals of August 1945. at page 37. Doctor Marsh gave the percentage as from forty to forty-five. There are some glaringly hard regulations. One is the method of computing income. Take the regulation under which an applicant can be deemed to have a certain income because he has certain property, whereas in fact he may not be getting one cent out of it. That has always been a most unfair regulation.

Then there are the residence rules. I suggest that the regulations should be changed so that twenty years in Canada after the age of eighteen would be sufficient to qualify, with perhaps three years' residence immediately preceding application. Why should not changes be made such as we made last year in the War Veterans Allowance Act. After careful consideration by a special committee on war veterans affairs last year, a recommendation was brought in that the recipient of war veterans allowance could have his own home of a value up to $4,000 without having it taken into consideration in applying for war veterans allowance. There should be the same provision for old age pensioners. Under the War Veterans Allowance Act there is provision for casual earnings up to $125 a year. I do not see why there should not be the same regulation under the Old Age Pensions Act. The two acts were supposed to be similar. The War Veterans Allowance Act was improved last year, and there was no reason why the Old Age Pensions Act could not have been improved at the same time.

In closing, may I emphasize the importance of the time element. Time means so much when one gets up to that age. Every member of this house regards time as very important right now. Those of us who are only fifty or forty years of age begin to realize the importance of time. Put yourself in the position of the applicant for an old age pension, who is seventy or sixty-five years old. Time is of the utmost importance, and there should never have been this long delay in meeting the tragic position of elderly Canadians and of the blind people across the country. I repeat that that delay has been a disgrace to the nation and, in particular, a disgrace to this parliament.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all welcome the statement made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, that the resolution preceding the bill to amend the Old Age Pensions Act will be placed on the order paper, I believe he said, by Monday.

Mr. MARTIN: On Monday.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is fine.

Mr. BRIDGES: Why talk about it?

Mr. KNOWLES: The Minister of Fisheries says, "Why talk about it?" Mr. Chairman, we shall reserve most of what we have to say about this matter until this bill that has been foreshadowed is before us. But it is only because some people have been talking about this question for years and years, even long before I ever came to this house, that it has been possible to persuade governments to move even as far as they have. According to some reports that get into the press, I am supposed to be one of those who have too much to say about this question, and as I look over the record, I find that I have risen to my feet to speak about the Old Age Pensions Act a good many times.

Mr. BROOKS: Sometimes unnecessarily.

Mr. KNOWLES: My hon. friend says, "sometimes unnecessarily." I am sure he would not want his name attached to that remark. I do not think anything is more necessary than persistence in the endeavour to persuade the government to move in connection with this matter, and when, like other members, I was at home during the Easter recess and found the amount of interest there is in this question, the amount of concern that is felt not only by our old people but by citizens generally, I realize that I have not talked half enough about it. Neither have other hon. members, including my genial and now smiling friend the hon. member for Calgary West, risen often enough to demand action on this matter.

The orders before us have to do with continuing the basis as it now stands until the new legislation comes into effect. So far as I can see, no one will vote against these orders in council. One could not consider letting the present amount drop to the $20 provided in the act. But the point tha

some of us have been trying to make—and it seems to me it is important to make it now when the resolution is just about to appear on the order paper—is, in the main, the one that the hon. member for Vancouver South emphasized in his closing remarks, namely, that time is of the essence. It is not just a matter of the various ages which the hon. member for Vancouver South referred to; it is a matter of weeks and months in the lives of the old people who are now waiting for an improvement in their old age pensions. They certainly should not have to wait any longer; that is my plea to the government.

I rise particularly at this time to say to the Minister of National Health and Welfare that, unless the resolution which is to appear on the order paper on Monday really goes some decent distance in improving the needs of our old age pensioners, he had better use the time between now and Monday to redraft it.

There are some discouraging rumours abroad in the country at this time. One of them is that the new legislation is to provide for an increase in the amount of the pension to $30 a month. All the strong words that the hon. member for Vancouver South used will have to be applied to that figure. It simply is not enough for our old people to live on.

Earlier this session the Prime Minister made a specific promise that when the new bill was brought in it would cover everything that we now have in the order in council which is before us plus something more. I suggest that $30 a month now is not something more than $25 was when the Prime Minister made that promise on February 4. On account of the increases in the cost of living, $30 a month now for old age pensioners is actually something less than they were receiving at the time the promise was made. Therefore I urge the Minister of National Health and Welfare to consider seriously the effect upon the morale of our old people, the effect upon the spirit of our Canadian citizenry generally before he brings in that resolution for such a meagre amount. What is needed for our old people is a pension on which they can live in dignified retirement. We of this group say it should be not less than $50 a month. We say too that the time has come to lower the age; that the pension should be payable at an age not later than sixty-five. It is also extremely important, if this is to become a pension and not just a form of charity, that the means test with all its viciousness be removed. Further, if an old age pension is to mean what it should to our older Canadians there should go with it a cost of living supplement to fluctuate as the cost of living index moves up and down. There should also be with it a provision for hospitalization and medical care.

Almost every time there is a debate on the question of old age pensions, remarks, sometimes by way of an interjection, are passed around as to there being sympathy in all quarters of the house, sympathy on the part of all members for our old age pensioners. No one denies that for a moment. There is an abundance of it here. I am quite satisfied that at any time across the years had members had an opportunity to vote for improvements in our old age pensions legislation, had there been a free vote the majority would have been overwhelming, if not unanimous. But the point that really matters to our old people is not the sympathy that is expressed or any claims as to who has a monopoly on concern for the old people; what counts is definite action to improve their lot by providing a pension on which they can live.

I do not wish to go over the history of this matter again; it has been done quite thoroughly tonight by the hon. member for Vancouver South. I do not altogether concur in his contention that the dominion is hiding behind the provinces. Actually that is only one side of the picture. I think he has used the wrong figure of speech. Buck-passing is the proper phrase. The dominion has been saying that it is a provincial matter; but in the provinces, even those provinces that have made some increases, it is felt that the matter is one which is up to the dominion.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Does that apply to the Saskatchewan government?

Mr. KNOWLES: The Saskatchewan government, like the British Columbia government, both of which have made increases, as well as others, have done so out of practical sympathy for the old people in their provinces, but they feel that the final responsibility for a proper Old Age Pensions Act rests here in Ottawa.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What are the total pensions in these two provinces?

Mr. KNOWLES: The total pension in British Columbia is now $35 a month; the total pension in Saskatchewan is $30 a month, plus hospital, medical, optical and dental care free to all old age pensioners as well as to certain other groups.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In British Columbia it is the same.

Mr. GREEN: I believe they also get medical and dental care in British Columbia.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes, there is something of that kind, but it is not as all-inclusive as in Saskatchewan. I am not concerned about pitting these provinces against each other. I say, as I have already said in answer to the hon. member for Lake Centre, that even the province of Saskatchewan, which is doing the best it can—and I am pround of it—for the old age pensioners, feels that the final responsibility for a proper Old Age Pensions Act rests with the dominion.

Mr. MARTIN: Would the hon. member permit a question? Is it not a fact that Saskatchewan is now paying less than some other provinces?

Mr. COLDWELL: It has come up quite a bit since the present government came into office.

Mr. KNOWLES: Saskatchewan is paying in cash to the old age pensioner less than British Columbia, but one has to take into consideration the value of the over-all medical and hospital care which is accorded to old age pensioners in Saskatchewan, and the relative economic position of the two provinces. It is also to be noted, if one is going to discuss Saskatchewan, that the average amount paid to the pensioners of Saskatchewan has come up since the present government came into power. Under the former government the average amount paid in Saskatchewan was about third in the dominion. It has since come up to the top.

Mr. MARTIN: The fact is that the hon. gentleman who advocates $50 a month supports the only government in the dominion where his political ideology is in power and which has not paid as much as some other provinces.

Mr. KNOWLES: I deny that. When you add to the cash payment the value of the hospital and medical care on an over-all basis which is given to the old people of Saskatchewan, they are right up with all the rest of them.

Mr. TUCKER: I should like to ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. COLDWELL: We are not debating Saskatchewan, are we?

Mr. TUCKER: But I understood the hon. member's supporter was. He speaks about Saskatchewan as if he knew what was going on there. I wish to ask him this question. How much is taken off the old age pension when the old age pensioner in Saskatchewan has to go to the hospital. The hon. member speaks freely about Saskatchewan. I should like him to answer that question.

Mr. KNOWLES: So far as I know, nothing is taken off the old age pensioner.

Mr. TUCKER: That indicates you do not know anything about the matter.

Mr. COLDWELL: The hon. member had better go out to the Saskatchewan legislature and ask the question there. He had the chance to do it but he did not take it.

Mr. TUCKER: I know the hon. member would like to get me out of the house but, believe me, I shall stay here just as long as the Liberal party wants me. I am not taking dictation from the C.C.F. Why did you not get your own premier out there to go out and take a seat in the legislature when he was elected C.C.F. leader in Saskatchewan?

Mr. COLDWELL: He was not asked to take a seat in the legislature.

Mr. TUCKER: He never asked for a seat.

Mrs. STRUM: We took forty-seven seats out of fifty-two.

Mr. TUCKER: You will not do that next time.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the hon. member for Rosthern if, as a citizen of Saskatchewan, he is not proud of the improvements in social legislation which have been made in his province in the last few years?

Mr. TUCKER: I dislike seeing the old age pensioners having to pay more than $5 for hospitalization—having their old age pension taken away from them in part when they go into the hospital.

An hon. MEMBER: They do not. You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is not correct.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I ask if this is a private fight or a public fight? I really should like to listen to the hon. member. He is always interesting, even though he is usually wrong; but I want to know how far wrong he is.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the hon. member for Calgary West for reminding me to remind the committee that all remarks should be addressed to the chair and that hon. members should not interrupt another hon. member who is speaking, unless they have his consent.

Mr. KNOWLES: I want it to be clear that, in the province of Saskatchewan old age pensioners and others receive, through the medium of a card which entitles them to it, their hospital and medical care and benefits

free. These things were given them even before the general hospitalization plan was enacted.

Mr. COLDWELL: Old age pensioners and others.

Mr. WARREN: I do not often interrupt, Mr. Chairman, but may I ask if it is not true that the Saskatchewan citizens pay a per capita fee of $2 for that medical care?

Mr. COLDWELL: Not the old age pensioners.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am glad to know of this interest in the situation in Saskatchewan. I should be quite willing to go on answering questions, but I think I might leave it. After all, there are a number of Saskatchewan C.C.F. members in this house.

Mr. MARTIN: Let us get to the old age pensions bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. KNOWLES: Absolutely. What I was starting to say before I had these interesting questions was that the old age pensioners have been the victims of this game of tossing the responsibility back and forth from one place to the other, and we feel that the time has come to settle that responsibility where it belongs, namely, with the federal government. I was going to mention that in the province of Manitoba the issue has come up. The hon. member for Vancouver South spoke of the demands that province made a few years ago for an increase in the pension, and it is true that at one time they added $1.25 before the federal government made its $5 increase of 1943. No further increase has been made in that province, and only recently—in fact, this very month—a resolution introduced in the Manitoba legislature calling for that province to make a $10 increase, just for the period of time until the federal government increased its pension, was turned down. The resolution was introduced by Mr. M. A. Gray, a C.C.F. member for Winnipeg. It was the combined vote of Liberals and Progressive Conservatives that defeated the motion.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Why does the C.C.F. not raise it to $50 in Saskatchewan?

Mr. MARTIN: Is the hon. member aware that the leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan asked the Saskatchewan government the same thing that he says someone asked the Manitoba government today?

Mr. COLDWELL: Think of your own responsibility in these matters.

Mr. MARTIN: I will.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. KNOWLES: I can carry this on just as well as anybody else, but all this is doing, Mr. Chairman—even my part in a free-for-all of this kind—is demonstrating the fact that the old age pensioners are the victims of the back and forth political talk that we have in this house, that we have between dominion and provincial governments, and that we have right across the country.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): The most political statement I have ever heard made here is the one you have just made.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am prepared to accept my hon. friend's remarks, provided that we can get down to the fact that the time has come for a government somewhere—and we contend that the responsibility rests with the government of the Dominion of Canada—really to do something about this whole question of old age pensions.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I go right along with you there.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is fine. At last we have agreement. Now I want to say this, and I will sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KNOWLES: I really should not get applause for that, because I have said it several times before and it always gets applause.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Stay with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. KNOWLES: The thing I am most concerned about now, in addition to the provisions of the act that the minister says will be on the order paper by Monday, is its effective date.

Mr. MARTIN: I said the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes, the resolution. The hon. member for Vancouver South has referred to the importance of time. The promise to the old age pensioners of Canada that something specific would be done was made in the speech from the throne on January 30, 1947. That promise was confirmed by the Prime Minister on February 4 when he said that the amendments forecast in the speech from the throne would include all we have now, plus something more. It may be all right for us in this house to let time slip by, but it is not fair to the old age pensioners. My hon. friends over there are laughing. They have had the opportunity, the right and the authority, from the day this session started, to put old age pension legislation on the order paper, but they put it off, for one

excuse after another. When we first asked questions about it the Minister of Justice said that the matter was the subject of discussion with the provinces. Then a little later, when we began pressing for it, we were told that it was a matter of priority. Now we are being told that we must wait until we get this debate over; in other words, an attempt is being made to blame the house for the government's own delay in placing this matter on the order paper. The fact is that it could have been placed on the order paper any time after the day the speech from the throne was read. I say now that the proper thing for the government to do for the old people of Canada, when they do bring down this legislation, is to make retroactive to January 20 the payments that are to be provided under this act. Nothing less will be fair to the old people of Canada.

Mr. BLACKMORE: This is really the first opportunity members of the house have had to discuss the old age pensions question, and be thoroughly in order and thoroughly fair to the other members of the house. I believe that should be borne in mind when we are appraising the amount of effort that some members have made with respect to the old age pensions question. We have been in session since early this year but have not had a chance, except on the speech from the throne, to discuss old age pensions. That is unfortunate. I feel, however, that it is only fair to give credit to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre for the persistence he has shown in this matter.

I have no desire to occupy any great amount of the time of the committee, but I do wish once more to put our group on record with respect to old age pensions. Those who have been members of the house for some time will recall that, a good many years ago, I began to advocate $50 a month for people sixty-five years of age and over. There should be no means test. I do not intend to burden the committee with any amount of elaboration. I just wish to state the bare skeleton of the case, so that others may have the floor and speak also. There should, I repeat, be no means test. I consider that the means test today is a most irritating and unbecoming thing to be using in the Canadian system. To think that a man who is getting a meagre pension like $30 a month is denied the privilege of going out, even in his old age, and earning additional money without being in danger of losing his pension is a most discouraging, disheartening and altogether undesirable state of affairs. The means test should be abolished completely with respect to old age pensions. There should be no restriction whatever on the additional earnings of anyone who has gone beyond the age of sixty-five. Surely if a man or woman can go out and earn money in addition, after that age, he or she should be permitted to keep it.

Then I believe the pension must increase with the years. I know how unpalatable this will be to many hon. members who think in terms of orthodox finance, but we simply must face certain facts. The severe taxation structure in this country is rendering it harder and harder for anyone to save for his advanced years. It is at the same time rendering it harder and harder for young people to get enough money ahead to care for their parents. Consequently the pension simply must increase with the years.

Then the age at which people receive the pension must gradually decline. There is no use in making wise cracks about taxation and how it must be reduced. The simple, inescapable fact is, that the age at which people receive the old age pension must become lower and lower with the years, for the simple reason that it is becoming increasingly difficult for people over forty-five years of age to get jobs in this country as we begin to return to anything like normalcy. Let us face up to that situation and govern our thinking and planning in accordance with those facts.

In addition to the matters I have already referred to, hospitalization, medical and dental care must be given free to elderly people. I do not think I need say anything more about that; it is perfectly clear.

The question will be asked, where will the money come from? As the Minister of Justice indicated, it is obvious to every hon. member that it is going to be impossible to raise by taxation the money which will be necessary to give the elderly people what they ought to have, to provide the other social services the country ought to have, and to accomplish the many other things everyone in the house knows we should accomplish. It must be obvious beyond any shadow of doubt that there will have to be such a change in the financial system of this country as will render financially possible that which is physically possible.

Now may I say a word or two as to what is physically possible. May I once more remind hon. members that in 1944 this nation produced $11·8 billion worth of goods which, divided among twelve million people, amounts to about $983 for every man, woman and child in the nation. Let me recall what other hon. members have pointed out, that at the time we produced that $11·8 billion worth of goods we had some 700,000 of our finest producers overseas, and a very large percentage of our

productive capacity engaged in war work, purely for destruction. Now those 700,000 and more are back from overseas. There is no longer any need for that productive capacity to be used in war production.

Mr. MICHAUD: I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Gladly.

Mr. MICHAUD: The hon. member mentioned that in 1944 we produced $11·8 billion worth of goods. What kind of goods were those, and how many of those goods are in demand by the Canadian people today?

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is a very logical fair question, and I accept it. But surely the same energy that went into the production of tanks will produce trucks, butter—

Mr. LESAGE: Wheat.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Let us go through it point by point; there is no contention between us. I should like to spend a minute or two on this, since hon. members are very much interested. Into that $11·8 billion worth of production went the beef we were producing, the wheat we were producing, various kinds of grains, pork, eggs and all that sort of thing. Surely we can produce just as much of those commodities now that we have those 700,000 young men back again as we could when they were overseas; there will be no doubt about that. The same factories which were producing guns can now produce nails, wire and the other things we require. The factories which were producing battledress and clothing of other kinds for our soldiers can now produce civilian clothing. One could go right on down through the list and show that we could just as easily produce $11·8 billion, or probably $12 or $13 billion worth of goods and services in this country on a peace-time basis as we could on a war-time basis. Do I answer my hon. friend?

Mr. MICHAUD: Well, not quite.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Then let him ask more questions. I am completely prepared to give a reason for the hope within me.

Mr. MICHAUD: I am particularly interested in the things that are in short supply, the things we have to import. How would our capacity to produce affect those goods we have to import, those goods that are in short supply?

Mr. BLACKMORE: As far as I have been able to find out, there is no difficulty in getting the goods we need from outside, with very few exceptions. I will grant that bringing in goods from the United States is causing us a certain amount of embarrassment because we are finding it hard to get United States dollars. But if we look about in various parts of the world I think we shall find that we can obtain from elsewhere the goods we are now buying from the United States. I think we shall find it completely feasible to obtain the goods we need, but which we cannot produce in Canada, from countries that will be quite happy to accept our goods. I do not want to get out of order; I just want to use this as an illustration, and I draw the Chairman's attention to that fact. May I point out to the hon. member that, for example, under the sugar policy this country has been following for the last three or four years, the policy it is following today, there appears to be no anxiety whatever about getting goods from outside. We insist on bringing sugar from outside instead of producing it in Canada, where we could produce two or three times our total consumption if we began to use the resources at our disposal. I would say there is no doubt whatever that this nation can produce or trade for goods necessary to give every man, woman and child in the country a very high standard of living; and the fact that the $11·8 billion worth of goods we produced in 1944 would amout to $983 for each man, woman and child indicates quite clearly that what I have said is in moderation. The only problem we face is how to get the money and how to put the money into the hands of the people. We can produce the goods. The only difficulty with us is to distribute the goods.

I do not wish to go into this any farther at the moment, unless hon. members wish to ask other questions. However I will say to hon. gentlemen across the way who are interested in this matter that if they will bring up their questions when they will be completely in order, I will go to any degree of scientific exposition to show that what I am saying is correct, and I can call to my support the best economic knowledge obtainable in Canada. Perhaps no more need be said tonight.

I should like to go on and repeat once more that this old age pension question is a dominion problem. The Minister of Justice has said that it is a provincial problem. We will grant that under the British North America Act such matters as the old age pension come within the responsibility of the provinces, but it has been clearly proved that the majority of the provinces are unable to find the money, because they do not have

the taxation fields; and in many cases the taxation fields they were given under the British North America Act have been invaded by the dominion. The result is that there is only one authority that has the taxing power to get the revenue with which to do the things which ought to be done by way of social services.

One more matter must be borne in mind. What I have said indicates quite clearly that I believe that the money must ultimately be created by the federal government, as hon. members have heard me argue many times. Only one authority in Canada has that power to create money, and that is the dominion government. That is so because the British North America Act gave the dominion government control over banking, currency and coinage. From every angle and from every consideration it must be obvious that the dominion government must assume responsibility for old age pensions.

I say once more, in closing, that we should not even consider old age pensions of less than $50 a month at the age of sixty-five, without a means test, and with free medical, hospital and dental care.

Mrs. STRUM: Mr. Chairman, I hope we do not make this a political issue. It would be a great pity, because I believe if I had before me the election literature of all parties—and I have not—I could show that every party promised better old age pensions. I do not think it is a political issue at all; and I hope that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is not so sensitive about what he is to bring before the house next Monday that he found it necessary to go out of his way to pick a quarrel with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

I believe the country must recognize the fact that, as the span of life is extending, people are going to live longer, and as our civilization proceeds and our industrial organization develops, people are not going to be able in the future to work as many years in industry.

The other day I had a letter from an old person in Vancouver who made the statement that a number of firms in that city had already given notice that, after a certain date, all persons of sixty-five years of age would be out of employment. The gap between the ages of sixty-five and seventy has already appeared. Where will people of sixty-five go to look for work, with all the veterans back, and when women are being dismissed because the veterans are back?

Every day letters come to my desk from able-bodied women who do not know which way to turn because they are being let out of government services and other kinds of employment. If those able-bodied young people cannot find work, where is the person of sixty-five years of age to go for his livelihood in the time before the old age pension becomes effective? In the face of rising living costs, I do not know what these old people are going to do.

A pensioner said to me today—and this was not an old age pensioner, but one in a different category—"It will not make any difference to me if butter goes off the ration, because at sixty cents a pound I am not going to be able to buy butter." Dry bread for old age pensioners will not be a very happy thing in this country. Appetites of old age pensioners are not good at any time; they require special diets. I submit that, with butter at sixty cents a pound and a pension of $30 a month, old age pensioners will be eating dry bread, and they are not going to be able to have much milk, meat or those other things which enter into an adequate diet.

We ought not to let this become a partisan issue. It is a problem which has to do with a very large section of our population, and one in which you and I are involved personally—because we are the people who raised our own salaries last year, and made $2,000 of it income tax free. I, for one, did not support this, and I served notice on my caucus that I would not vote for it. I think that last year we should have made provision for the old age pensioners before we made provision for ourselves. Last year, time and again the government stalled off dealing with this problem, saying that the time was not yet.

If this matter is to be brought up next Monday, with respect to the increasing of pensions, I trust that the government will see fit to do more than add $5 to the pension which is now so inadequate, in the face of rising living costs. Rents are up; milk is up; butter is up; bread is going up; sugar is going up. How can these people live? How can their families afford to help them, when the sons and daughters of these people are going to have the greatest difficulty in meeting their food budget and their own family needs?

The government was to be commended last year when it decided to pay family allowances in cash to all parents in this country. That was a sensible and businesslike way of attacking the problem of family allowances. I say it should now do the same thing in respect of old age pensions. All persons over sixty-five years should be paid a superannuation allowance, and the income tax mechanism should be used to recover excess income, beginning on the same level with other persons who pay income tax. I do not know why we should segregate and treat as social

lepers the people who did the pioneering in this country, and laid the foundation of our prosperity of today.

I was sorry the hon. member for Rosthern tried to confuse the issue in my province. We realize we are one of the poorest provinces in Canada; but in spite of our lack of provincial income we have done much more than the previous government did, and more than our resources warranted.

Again I say this should not become a political issue. And in order that everyone in Canada at the age of seventy may receive the same treatment, it should be paid on a federal basis, and not be left to the discretion of the provinces to decide how they shall treat their pensioners. We did not do that in respect of family allowances. We said that all children in Canada have an equal claim to security. I think that likewise the pioneers in Canada have an equal claim to social security.

This should be universal superannuation, and they should begin to pay income tax on the same level as other people. In that way we would begin to put a floor under the family income of even old age pensioners.

Mr. BENTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss briefly another angle in connection with old age pensions which has always interested me. I agree with what has been said by the hon. mmebers for Winnipeg North Centre, Lethbridge and Qu'Appelle. There is another angle I would place before the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister of Finance and the government generally. It has to do with our whole system of living. I am assuming that we are earnest and sincere—and I believe we are—when we say we believe in the family unit. But the family unit presupposes that one member of the family will be the breadwinner; and, generally speaking, we look upon the man as being in that position. If he does not supply the necessities for his family, but is in a position to do so, we take the necessary court action to see that some of his earnings are diverted to that purpose.

There is another angle which enters into this matter. I do not know the percentage, but I should imagine it is a high percentage of the marriages which take place in Canada in which the man is several years older than the woman. If he is twenty-five and she is twenty-two we say to him, "Henceforth, and for the balance of your lives, you will be the breadwinner for the family, so long as you are able, and are earning. You must provide for your wife and family." Then, also, when a person reaches seventy years of age we say that we will pay an old age pension. So when the breadwinner becomes seventy years of age he—because in the majority of cases it is the husband—is entitled to the old age pension. He has a wife who is dependent upon him but he is told, "You must provide for this woman; while we recognize your needs and are going to pay you an old age pension, you will have to find some other means of carrying out your family responsibility and looking after your wife. Heretofore your earnings were supposed to do that but now your earnings have ceased. You are to receive from the nation for your pioneer work $30 a month—or whatever the amount will be; it varies in the different provinces—and either your wife will have to live on that with you, thereby reducing the standard of living for both of you, or she will have to go out and get a job." The wife is probably ill-equipped to do that. She will have spent all her life raising a family and will not be able to get a job except perhaps as a charwoman, and she would be too old to do that. The wife in many cases has not reached the age where she would be eligible for a pension.

It seems to me that that is manifestly unfair and uneconomical. It does not gibe with our belief in the family institutions of this country. When I have spoken of this I have heard it argued that if this is done there will be young women marrying these old age pensioners. I do not believe that is a sound argument, because most of the young women in this country are too sensible to do that. There may be the odd case and that may happen now and again, but it is not a major factor. I believe this government would be well advised to take this into consideration.

It is only fair that the wife and mother, who usually is younger than the husband, who has spent her lifetime in assisting her husband in his work and in the responsibilities of raising a family, should be recognized as being entitled to a pension.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I think we might approach this matter in a different way from what has been suggested so far. Several of the hon. members who have spoken have advocated a definite amount in connection with old age pensions. We in this party have advocated for a long time that the old age pensioner should get $50 a month at sixty years of age.

The question of finance was brought forward a while ago by the Minister of Justice when he asked where we were to get the money, that it would have to come from taxation. I am not going to argue that point, but when some hon. members were speaking a while ago I was reminded of what was said a few days ago

by the hon. member for Battle River. At that time he quoted a letter which had appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen*. I have that letter in my hand at the present time. The letter outlined the budget of a civil servant receiving $40 a week. I want to put this on record and then refer to it:

The following will give you some idea of what can be purchased for $40 a week:

63 meals per week at 30 cents	$18 90
(No extra meals for visitors)	
Rent	8 00
Heat	2 00
Light and power	1 00
Clothing and shoes	5 00
Insurance	1 00
Dentist	50
Doctor	50
Newspaper	18
Car fare	1 00
Church	50
Incidentals	1 42
	$40 00

No shows
No tobacco or drinks
No entertaining
No holidays
No savings
No happiness, only worry
How does it look to you gentlemen?

I think we should get at this old age pension question on a different basis from what has so far been suggested. It is possible that these figures are a little too high, but let us look at them again. He mentions sixty-three meals a week at thirty cents. Can one buy a meal in this city for thirty cents? He mentions rent at $8. I do not know anywhere in Canada, and certainly I do not know anywhere in Calgary where one could get a room for $8 decent enough to live in.

Mr. McCANN: That is $8 a week.

Mr. JOHNSTON: But this is for a family of three. Then heat, $2, for a family of three. Light and power, $1. I do not think one could minimize that in any way whether the family were three, two or only one. Clothing and shoes, $5, and insurance, $1. I do not think one could cut that down at all. Dentist, fifty cents; doctor, fifty cents; newspaper, eighteen cents, and carfare, $1. Surely older people should have that. Then church, fifty cents. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Swift Current, it is not a case of just one person living on the $30, it is often a case of two persons having to live on that amount. The budget I have just outlined was for a family of three persons.

I am going to suggest to the minister that before he brings down his old age pensions bill, before he sets an amount in that bill, he consider having the bill referred to a committee, probably after second reading. Then that committee should set up a budget for an old age pensioner, not to allow anything lavish, but just from a practical point of view. It has been suggested that perhaps some of the members of the committee might try to live on that budget for a month to see how it goes. I think in that way we could get some reasonable amount, and I am sure the Minister of Health and Welfare will see that no $30 a month can meet the requirements.

I join with the hon. member for Swift Current in what he said with regard to pensions paid to elderly people, especially when the man of the family is the only one receiving a pension. I have had instances of that kind brought to my attention, instances where two people had to live on the $25 or $30 a month which the husband was receiving. When we speak of $30 or $35 as being given in some of the provinces we must remember that that is not the amount of the old age pension being paid all across Canada. In fact, the pensions being paid in some of the other provinces are a great deal less than $30 or $35 a month.

We should look at this matter from a humane point of view, and not adopt the attitude taken by the Minister of Justice a while ago when he said, "Well, what about taxes?" A while ago we were talking about the Japanese and the freedom that Canada gives to her citizens. Let me tell the committee that there is no freedom or justice in forcing our own white people who are old to live on the paltry sum of $30 or less a month. I should like the Minister of Health and Welfare to look over the list I have put on *Hansard*, to pare it down as much as he likes, and then bring in an estimate for an old age pension that will allow so much for rent, so much for heat, so much for light and power, so much for insurance, medical care and so on, and give them a little bit for food and clothing; then I think it is only fair and decent that we should allow them a little bit for recreation.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Why should an old age pensioner have a family living with him at that age? I cannot understand that.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I did not suggest that he would have a family living with him at that age.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): You said three.

Mr. JOHNSTON: What I quoted was on the basis of a family of three, and that was $40.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): He is pretty good at sixty-five.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am not taking issue with the hon. member for Calgary West if he wishes to criticize my remarks. I think this is too serious a matter. I cannot see for the life of me how people can possibly exist on what they are receiving, and I am serious in this. I do not know how they can exist on the amount we give them.

Mr. MARTIN: I know the hon. member has given this matter a great deal of thought, but I would point out to him that a bill will be introduced on the subject and that his present remarks could more properly be made when the bill is brought down. I say that in order to expedite the debate.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I appreciate the minister's suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I should have pointed out to the committee before this that the present discussion is strictly not in order. What should be done on second reading has nothing to do with the present order in council. I have not asked hon. members to stay strictly within the rules, but I think I should point this out to them.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I appreciate your calling attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman. Possibly the whole discussion has been out of order and should have been directed more to the orders before us. However the discussion has gone on generally this evening, and I merely wanted to bring these suggestions to the minister's attention in the hope that he might take them into consideration, and that when he does bring down the bill he will bring down one that is really worth while.

Mr. NICHOLSON: There is one important aspect of this matter that I wish to develop before the order passes. In view of the fact that the cost of living is increasing rapidly and that the old age pensioners are in no position to protect themselves against such increase, I would suggest that the minister give serious consideration to including in these orders for their duration, if the bill is not to come into effect in the near future, the idea of a cost of living supplement in connection with old age pensions. I would remind the committee that Canada cannot afford to be niggardly with our elderly citizens. During the years of the war a very large number of young, able-bodied men and women from our farms, factories and mines served with distinction in the army, the air force and the navy, and those of us who remained at home were able to establish new records in the field of production on our farms, in the forests, in the mines and factories of the country. We were able to give away enormous quantities of our Canadian products. Now that the war is over, now that we have all our people available to produce goods and to perform services on the Canadian scene, I cannot think of any good reason why our people should find, in the year 1947, that they have to consume less food and wear shoddier clothing, and find it more difficult to visit the dentist—why in general they should have to put up with a lower standard of living.

I think the government deserves a great deal of credit for formulating, during the war, fiscal policies that distributed, on a more equitable basis than ever before, available supplies of butter, sugar and other commodities in short supply. We were able to supply the people with larger quantities of most commodities than they ever enjoyed before. I cannot see any reason why we cannot look forward to increasing our local consumption, and particularly by the people in the old age pension brackets.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare made some remarks regarding the treatment given old age pensioners in Saskatchewan as compared with other provinces. I would point out to him that he lives in a province where, throughout many years, the people have been able to organize the Canadian economy so that they can keep a lion's share of our national income here. Again I quote from one of the government publications. In Ontario you have only one per cent of the married men receiving incomes of less than $250 in 1942, whereas in the prairie provinces you have three per cent of the married people who reported that income in the same period. You cannot blame the C.C.F. government for the very low incomes that prevail, but the fact is that in the prairie provinces three per cent of the male wage-earners had an annual income of less than $250, when these statistics were compiled. For the group receiving less than $1,000 you have only fourteen per cent in Ontario as compared with twenty-one per cent in the prairie provinces.

Obviously, where the income is on a much higher level in the wealthy province of Ontario, it should be possible for the people out of their consolidated revenue to provide more generous pensions and better social services than we can in a poor province like Saskatchewan. But I will not admit that the old age pensioners of Ontario are better off than those of Saskatchewan. The minister carefully refrained from specifying that conditions were better for them in Ontario than in Saskatchewan. Taking into account cash payable to the pensioner, hospital, medical, dental and optical

services provided everyone receiving an old age pension, I think the pensioners in Saskatchewan are a good deal better off.

I hope the minister will take into consideration the rising cost of living and the need for seeing that, as the cost of living goes up, the old age pensioners shall not be required to do without butter. I find that on January 1, 1945, the cost of food, taking 1935-39 as basic 100, stood at 130·2. In January, 1946, it was 132·8 and in January, 1947, it was 145·5.

The old age pensioners are not like businessmen, who can anticipate what will happen to the market. They are at the mercy of the federal government, which controls the quality and quantity of what they eat.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I wish to agree with what the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has said. I am sure that this is completely non-political and that all parties in the house will agree that we have to do something more than we have been doing for old age pensioners. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to enter into any auction sale of so much a month so much higher and so much higher and have the bidding go on in that way, because the minute we mention sums of money without knowing the adequacy of the taxes—and I use the same word the Minister of Justice used—to take care of our various problems, then we are not true either to the old age pensioners or to ourselves. There is no use in saying: Here is a great big pot of gold, let us dip into it and dip into it, without having some method of keeping the pot filled. I am sorry to speak in favour of the government the way I am doing, but it is just a simple economic fact.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he not agree that we should be able to increase the consumption of foodstuffs by our old age pensioners now that the war is over?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I answer the hon. member directly? I would love to see the stomach of every old age pensioner enlarged by all the food he could consume. Do not let us have any doubt about that, but the hon. member asked me that question for a political reason. I am in favour—

Mr. KNOWLES: The point is it is food, not money, that counts.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The point I had in mind was that whatever is physically possible should be financially possible.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I know a lot of funny stories too, but they are a lot funnier than that.

Mr. BLACKMORE: What are we lacking in?

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I did not think the hon. member would take me on, but still he lives away up in the north country; he does not see many people and perhaps not any newspapers and does not know what is going on. I shall tell him. I am going to answer all of you at once. What are we lacking? We are lacking in money which represents earning capacity. Do not let anybody have any doubt about it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is as clear as mud.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): Real money, not funny money.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am talking about earned money which is real money. The hon. member for Lethbridge says it is as clear as mud. He is the one man in the House of Commons who knows what he means; I do not. We shall just leave it at that. But sir—and with respect may I just say I am not earning any votes in Calgary West by what I am going to say—I realize that this is a practical problem. We all believe; we are sincere in our belief that certainly the old age pensioners are not getting enough now. There is no question about that. In the generosity of our hearts we want them carried to the highest point we can, but I want to say something about legislation in the province called Alberta from which the hon. member for Lethbridge comes. These sentimental appeals are splendid for our aged people who built this country. There are a lot of them who still have enough to live on and they did a good deal to build up the province from which he and I come. We have a law there that the children of any family are liable for the upkeep of the parents. I hope other provinces have a similar law.

Some hon. MEMBERS: We have it in Quebec.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): I am so happy to hear that. Therefore I am trying, sir, with respect to all those who support me, to reduce this to a practical problem. In so far as I and we of this party are concerned, certainly everything that can be done should be done. I am not going to say that what is physically possible is financially possible. I have three mentors to my right who are helping me, but unfortunately they disagree with one another; they are not even agreed on it.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is what we did in the war. We made financially possible the things that were physically possible.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Let us talk about what we did. In the war we taxed ourselves for half of what we spent and we borrowed the rest of it. Do you think we can carry on doing that forever? If we do the country will be broke before we are through.

Mr. KNOWLES: With sufficient production it can be done.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I say that with sufficient production it can be done; but it will not be regimental production where I shall have a number instead of a name, even though Smith is the only name I have at the moment, and I would not use it if I had a better one. Coming squarely back—

Mr. KNOWLES: We like "Arthur" better.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Practically I like myself, no matter what you call me, so we shall let things rest at that. The only dollar we have which is any good is the earned dollar, the production dollar, if you care to put it in that way.

It is time that we in this House of Commons stop bidding for the votes of the old age pensioners, because they are organized in Canada. In the town from which I come they are well organized, but I still refuse to go into any election auction sale of $50, $60, $70, $80, or whatever it might be. I simply say, let us do everything that this country can do. I do not know the sum; therefore I look with much interest to the bill which the minister says he will introduce on Monday.

Mr. MARTIN: The resolution on Monday.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Yes. But may I also say, let us make it generous; let us do the best we can for these people. I agree with what someone said that they are in their present position through no fault of their own. They worked hard and in their later life they now find themselves in difficulty. Let us honour the people who helped to make this country. Let us go the limit that the finances will permit us to do.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Will the hon. member permit a question? Will he agree with the suggestion I made that possibly a committee of the house could make a budget and thereby ascertain correctly the amount that should be in the old age pension?

The CHAIRMAN: That question can be asked when the bill is before us.

[Mr. Smith (Calgary West).]

Mr. JOHNSTON: I think the hon. member would like to answer it now.

Mr. CASE: We should approach this problem in a practical and realistic way. We should examine the weaknesses of the present act. I have listened to the discussion this evening and, in the main, I have noticed that the tendency is to treat our old people as paupers. Of course that is a weakness of the present legislation. Old people have to be reduced to a state of pauperism before they are eligible for old age pensions. Therefore my first thought would be to remove that cause. In other words, the method that we are employing is putting a premium upon thrift, and a thrifty nation is a worthy nation financially and physically, if I may use that term. I would suggest that in any approach to dealing with this problem we should remove the means test, so that these old people will be privileged to set something by for themselves in the days that are to come.

As the hon. member for Calgary West said, while we are all prone and glad to pay tribute to the pioneers who laid the foundation of this great country, yet we must constantly remember that others made a contribution who are not recipients of old age pensions at the present time. I would seek to remove the present stigma which goes with pensions. I do not know whether that is done or not, but I would remove all reference to old age pension and I would call it a retirement allowance. I would seek to emphasize the word "retirement", indicating, as it were, that when one reached the age of seventy he had reached the retirement age and that this was a retirement allowance. It must be remembered that when one receives a retirement allowance or an old age pension, even under the present regulations, no one can avoid admitting that one who has lived a lifetime must have made some contribution to the welfare of this country. It could be considered a reward for services. On the other hand, if I were to compare the man who made himself a million with the other, it must be admitted that the former has taken more from the country in comparison with the other who has made his contribution throughout his life.

Those are the thoughts I have in mind. When the resolution is introduced I hope that the minister will take into consideration the one great weakness, as I see it, which does put a premium on thrift, and will still leave to the individual the hope that he can provide for himself, remove the means test and give the old age pension to everyone, and call it a retirement allowance.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. MARTIN: Having listened all night, I think that I should say just a word or two before the order is passed, but not with the intention of trying to cover everything that has been said. As I have already interjected, a bill will be brought in when there will be a full opportunity to discuss the measures which have thus far been discussed.

However there are one or two things I wish to say at this stage, in view of what has already been said. As the hon. member for Calgary West has just pointed out, no one in this committee has any monopoly on interest, not only in the aged but in all the people of this country. No matter in what part of the house we sit, let it be assumed that no one has a monopoly on interest in this important problem. I want to say this for one thing, and one does not like to say it, but sitting here as the minister responsible for this particular measure, I take second place to no one in this committee—not that I have any prior right over anyone—because of my own background, a background which is similar to that of so many members of this committee. None of us have had silver spoons in our mouths from the beginning. The vast majority of members of this committee came from poor beginnings. That is why I say that every man in this chamber is aware of the problem. When one is in government, one must consider the problem in all of its contexts. One has to consider the matter in terms of other measures of social security and not only in terms of a particular measure such as the one we are now considering. To the hon. gentleman who has just spoken I say that the government has given this matter a great deal of thought. I do not suspect for one moment that the measure to be brought in will meet the point of view of everyone, but in the light of all our responsibilities toward the aged, toward the young and toward other groups, it does represent what, under all the circumstances, seems most practicable for us to do at this time. The government that is proposing to bring in legislation is a government which has not been without great interest in social reform. It was this party which brought in old age pensions in the first instance. I am sure that will not be forgotten.

Mr. COLDWELL: Under a bit of spurring.

Mr. MARTIN: It was this party that brought in unemployment insurance, as a result of which we now have a fund of $400 million contributed to by employees, employers and by the state ,as a means of cushioning unemployment. It was this government that brought in family allowances, as a result of which some $260 million are being distributed among the families of the nation, reaching over 3,500,000 children every month and reaching over 1,600,000 families.

Mr. KNOWLES: That goes to everyone.

Mr. MARTIN: I am not saying we have done all of this by ourselves. Many hon. members of this house have collaborated in this great measure. I merely mention it so that the record will indicate that no hon. member or no group in this house has a particular monopoly in this important issue. I refrain from saying at this stage what I could say by way of reply to some hon. gentlemen, pointing out, not their particular record, but the record of their particular group in this house and in provincial fields; but I take it that there will be ample opportunity to do that sort of thing later if provocation is later given. What I say right now is what I said at the beginning, because the debate thus far has been put on this level. The government proposes to bring in a measure which is not final in form, but which is within the context of the fundamental proposals, not only with regard to old age pensions but with regard to the whole field of social security, which were made to the provinces in August, 1945. In the light of these facts, I assure every hon. member that the measure to be introduced represents, on the part of the administration, an honest attempt to deal with this problem as practicably as is possible in the light of all our obligations. When the measure is introduced I ask hon. gentlemen to realize these facts, and to realize that it is proposed by responsible men who have as deep an interest in human welfare, in the old and in the young, as anyone else. It is not easy to sit in one's seat—and certainly it is not easy for me to sit in my seat when I think of my own personal experience and that of my own family not very far from here, an experience which every member in this house can duplicate—and have it suggested that only one particular group is concerned about the aged. No, that is not so. We are all interested, everyone of us in this house. I suggest that when we come to deal with this measure we should approach it in the light of our common interest in the problem.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the minister a question about the orders which we are now passing? They all involve agreements between the dominion and the provinces. We have had it made clear to us that these orders in council will stay in effect until they are superseded by the legislation to be brought in. Will the new legislation be dependent upon agreements with the provinces?

Mr. MARTIN: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: Good.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. HAMEL: I wish to say a few words before this carries. Because of the importance of the matter now under discussion for the welfare of our old citizens, I consider it my duty to put our stand on the record right now. Of course I do not intend to speak at length on the problem, especially because a resolution is announced for Monday. Nevertheless I want to say tonight that we favour a substantial increase in the old age pension, one which will cover the increase in the cost of living and will also assure an improvement in the condition of the old age pensioners. So far as the means test is concerned, we think it should, in principle, be abolished.

The last point I wish to make clear tonight is that the age of the pensioners should be reduced. For the future, as soon as unemployment seems to face our country, this age should be considerably reduced. But in the present situation, because of the tremendous needs of manpower, especially in housing activities, I think it would be fair to fix the age at sixty-five for a year or two, particularly for those who at this age are still able and willing to enter the regular labour market.

P.C. 6367 agreed to.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Tomorrow we shall continue with this bill. If it is disposed of, at eight o'clock there will be the hour devoted to private bills, and there are on the order paper resolutions which might be called if there is time to consider them; the resolutions having to do with housing, the Penitentiary Act, and the superannuation measure for senior officials of external affairs.

It being three minutes after eleven o'clock, the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES

The Daily Edition is issued on the morning following each day's sitting, the speeches being reported in the language in which they were delivered. Speeches in French are translated into English and appear in that form as an appendix to the daily issue. Speeches in English are translated and appear in the French edition on the day following delivery.

Extra copies of the Daily Edition will be supplied at five cents each or $3.75 a hundred, if the order is given on the day of sitting. Order through the Debates Office.

Reprints of speeches are furnished if the order is given within ten days of first publication. Order through the Debates Office.

Hansard is available to the public by subscription. The rate for the session is three dollars. Remittance must accompany order, and should be sent to the King's Printer, Ottawa.

Following publication of the Daily Edition proofs are sent to members for revision. These should be returned within twenty-four hours.

Two indexes are issued, one to the Daily Edition, at the close of the session, and the other to the bound edition, published in book form later. The current index is compiled as the session proceeds and may be consulted in the Debates Office. For index inquiries and information as to mailing lists, telephone 2-8211, local 3246.

EARL C. YOUNG,
Editor of Debates, Room 324.

F. W. S. GALBRAITH,
Associate Editor, Room 325.

COMPTE RENDU OFFICIEL DES DÉBATS

L'édition quotidienne, publiée dans le texte original, paraît le lendemain matin de chaque séance. La version anglaise des discours prononcés en français est publiée en annexe à l'édition quotidienne du texte original.

L'édition française quotidienne, comprenant le texte original des discours prononcés en français et la version française des discours prononcés en anglais, paraît le lendemain de chaque séance.

On peut commander des exemplaires additionnels, à raison de 5 cents l'unité ou $3.75 le cent, en s'adressant, le jour même de la séance, au bureau des débats.

Pour les tirages à part de tout discours, la commande doit parvenir au même bureau des débats, dans les sept jours de son apparition.

L'édition quotidienne est adressée à toute personne qui en fait la demande à l'Imprimeur du Roi, à Ottawa. Cette demande doit être accompagnée de la somme de trois dollars, prix de l'abonnement.

Prière aux députés de renvoyer les épreuves dans les vingt-quatre heures.

Il est publié deux index séparés, l'un pour l'édition quotidienne, après la clôture de la session; l'autre, concernant l'édition définitive reliée, paraît un peu plus tard. L'index se fait en cours de session et peut être consulté au bureau des débats.

HENRI MACKAY, *LL.L.*,
rédacteur des débats français,
chambre 514.