

over certain Canadian people of Japanese origin that this committee would be glad to go the extra step of striking out this disqualification entirely, but having in mind that decision of the House I think this probably would be the most acceptable decision the committee could make under the circumstances. I do not want to argue the case myself. Are there any other comments?

Mr. MUTCH: A year ago I think I made my own views on this matter very clear, and if I did not they are expressed more capably than I could do it in the excerpt from the *Winnipeg Free Press* which Mr. MacInnis read a short time ago. I am one of those who thinks he realizes some virtue in being practical. I feel myself there is an inconsistency. I am not very happy about the extension of the powers which the House agreed to until March, 1949. I think my views with respect to that are fairly well known. On the other hand, I do not want to be in a position of tolerating or affirming the situation on one side and changing it on the other, particularly when the change deals with the right of individuals to vote and, when we are dealing with a situation where an election is not an improbability in the foreseeable future. Therefore, believing there is some virtue in consistency, I have moved this amendment. After all, it is a clear and definite declaration that as of a fixed time, this discrimination with which I am in complete disagreement shall cease to exist. To me, that represents a victory.

I think, perhaps, in the light of the attitude adopted by the House previously it is as much as we can get. Therefore, since it is a step forward, my own attitude towards it is very much the attitude mentioned a moment ago by Mr. MacInnis. I am going to advocate what I can get because it does introduce finality to the matter, even though that finality is not of as today.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I was not here when the amendment was moved.

Mr. MUTCH: The motion is to strike out this restrictive clause concerning Japanese Canadians, as of 31st March, 1949. In other words, this restriction on Japanese Canadian voters will lapse, if my amendment carries, at the date when the order in council restricting the movement of Japanese lapses, the 31st of March, 1949.

Mr. MACINNIS: Paragraph (i) on page 3 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you the bill before you, Mr. Zaplitny?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Yes. You are speaking of the amendment or of the clause as it is in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is to add a clause (8) to section 14 on page 3 and that clause (8) will read this way: Paragraph (i), subsection (2), which you see before you is repealed as of 31st day of March, 1949.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I am just asking this for the purpose of obtaining information; would that be in order? You have set a sort of delayed action clause into the bill. I am a little doubtful whether or not that kind of clause could be put in a bill?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, in every bill we have clauses like this, that this shall come into effect on a certain date except section so and so which will come into force on a different date.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: You may reserve sections?

Mr. MUTCH: Yes.

Mr. MACINNIS: May I say a word further? I see no contradiction in deleting this clause without waiting for the expiration of the present disabilities. The Chairman mentioned that we might find ourselves in the position that, in a general election, these people would be allowed to vote and yet would not be—I am summarizing and perhaps not correctly—and yet would not be allowed to travel or reside on the Pacific coast of British Columbia without a permit.