

about what has taken place there. Instead of building all the ships they want, representatives of the three departments go round and if they see a fine fishing boat they send in a requisition and take it over from the owner. They also go to the various shipyards and if they see a fine commercial boat being built they say, "Oh, we would like that one," and away goes the boat. To-day many commercial owners will not build a boat, realizing that if they give an order to build it they have no guarantee that they will be able to acquire ownership, because the government may step in and take it away from them.

We have shipyards in British Columbia, at Vancouver, New Westminster, Victoria and other points, which are not working to full capacity. I have in mind one now, a shipyard in New Westminster called the Star shipyards, which has eight ways; six of them are idle, and the other two soon will be. That shipyard has been compelled to accept orders for rowboats to keep their men going. We should have a definite programme of building ships, and if we have not the engines to put in wooden ships we should put sails on them. From what I understand, a sailing vessel might pass more easily through the submarine menace than one propelled by engines, because I believe it is the noise and vibration of the engines which conveys the whereabouts of the ship to the submarine.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The *Egyptian Queen* did not have quite that history.

Mr. REID: There is no reason why these shipyards should not be working to full capacity, and every kind and type of ship should be built. Perhaps we shall have to come to it, but why has a programme not been inaugurated and proceeded with? I plead with the three ministers of defence to give attention to this matter and to hand over their orders to the Minister of Munitions and Supply; it may be that we shall then get some action along the lines I have just recommended.

My time is passing, but there is one particular matter I wish to discuss for a moment or two before I close, and that is a recent statement of Mr. G. E. Trueman, a member of the British Columbia placement commission, who, speaking at Toronto on January 6th, had this to say:

The reason for mass evacuation of Japanese from British Columbia coastal areas was not because of the Japanese but because of the white residents. The problem was one of mass hysteria and race prejudice.

Now, sir, I ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) to see to it that Mr. Trueman is called to account for that statement, because

I believe it is an insult to the people of British Columbia and should not be allowed to pass without some note being taken of it.

Mr. O'NEILL: Read the rest of what he said.

Mr. REID: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is bad enough. If I had time I would. The members for British Columbia and the people of that province who urged the removal of the Japanese from the coastal area did not do so on account of mass hysteria or race prejudice; they did it for the safety of the people of that province, including the Japanese themselves. No one in this country can tell which of the Japanese—or for that matter some other nationalities, but especially the Japanese—is loyal or disloyal, and it was felt to be in the best interests of the people of British Columbia to move them out. So far as I know, no Japanese citizen born in this country or in Japan, has come forward to the authorities and given any information or made any statement against one of his own race. That is significant. Although an inquiry has been held in the matter of the "Black Dragon", I would say that one of the reasons that none of them has come forward is the fear of reprisals.

In a booklet which has just been issued, entitled "Removal of Japanese from Protected Areas", issued by the British Columbia security commission, the statement is made, regarding the removal, at page 5:

The libraries of this continent held no reference to guide the organizers in their initial actions.

Well, if they had investigated a little further they would have discovered that this is not the first occasion on the north American continent when there has been a wholesale removal of people. How many hon. members realize that during the days of the war of independence the Americans moved the British people back fifty miles inland—and they did not receive the same consideration as we have given the Japanese, because their property and chattels were confiscated. I mention that to refute the statement that there is no precedent for the removal of Japanese from the coastal areas of British Columbia. Much good may come out of it; and one lesson I think this country should take to heart is that it is not in the best national interests to allow any large group to live away off by themselves and unto themselves. I may be wrong, but I am one of those who believe that difference of language does divide a nation. I point to the amicable relations between the United States and Canada as one outstanding example.