

Immigration Act

agreement under which so far as Japanese are concerned, the Immigration Act does not apply. If my hon. friend will permit me, I should like to point out that according to his bill, if a Japanese over a certain age can read English, French or any other European language, he would be permitted into the country.

Mr. NEILL: If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, I shall apply to him the language he applied to me a few weeks ago and say that he is talking nonsense.

Mr. CRERAR: That is not the opinion of the immigration officials.

Mr. NEILL: Never mind. Do not make speeches. It does not matter whose opinion it is. My hon. friend says that they would be allowed to come in if they can speak English, but the gentleman's agreement restricts the number who may come in to 150. My bill does not do away with that restriction. If every Japanese in Japan was able to speak English, the gentleman's agreement would still exist and would permit only 150 to come in. I have the agreement before me; it states that hereafter immigrants from Japan will be subject to all the regulations of the Canadian Immigration Act—the minister evidently did not know that—and then there is the extra provision that the number coming in shall be limited to 150. I repeat that my bill does not repeal the gentleman's agreement that limits the number to 150, so how can thousands and thousands come in? The effect of my bill will be largely to cut down the 150. The classes that come in under the gentleman's agreement are mostly farm labourers and domestic servants, and it is seldom that they can speak anything but Japanese. The restriction imposed by this bill will probably restrict the number coming in to five or perhaps ten a year for some years to come. At most it will be a very small number.

Speaking of labourers reminds me of the interim report made by the committee which was sent out to investigate this matter. I think we should have had an opportunity of seeing that report. I have not seen it, but I believe if it had been presented to this house Bill No. 11 would be the law of the land to-day. I have not the interim report, but I have some of the information that was laid before that committee and I propose to give it to the house. The number of Japanese school children in British Columbia to-day is more than double, 110 per cent to be exact, what it was eleven years ago. The number of Japanese school children in Vancouver to-day is very close to the total number of Japanese school children in British Columbia

[Mr. Crerar.]

eleven years ago. Does this house know that in British Columbia to-day there are 1,000 Japanese on relief? They are not put to the trouble of seizing a public building to get it. They receive their relief as regularly as old age pensions. Yet we have all this quibbling between this government and the British Columbia government about the matter of domicile, and we have the spectacle of white men driven by despair to start what is practically a revolution. It is little better than a revolution even though it is a peaceful one. Yet these Japanese are receiving their relief as regularly as clock-work. These are the facts.

Does the house know that according to the records of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police the deportation of forty-three Japanese was recommended in a given period? Deportation is not recommended unless a crime is committed, and yet these forty-three deportation orders were cancelled at Ottawa. It would appear that the Japanese have some friends at Ottawa. It is generally quite difficult to get a deportation order cancelled. I once tried to get one cancelled in connection with a solitary, lone Scotchman, and I had considerable trouble. Yet these forty-three orders were cancelled even though they had been recommended and appeared on the records of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Here is the final thing. Notice was served on that committee by a Japanese official to the effect that if their investigation resulted in the deportation of not more than ten or fifteen Japanese there would be no serious trouble, but if thirty or forty Japanese were affected then there would be trouble. They were told that there would likely be repercussions in Japan. That was told the committee by a high Japanese official. The picture is this: When we find men committing crimes we must not find more than fifteen of them guilty or there will be trouble. It will be just too bad, or else. I believe if these facts had been laid before the house when we were considering Bill No. 11, the vote would have been different.

It is true that this bill does not provide for the total exclusion provided for by Bill No. 11, which should have been passed. The Minister of National Defence approved that bill, but he voted against it. His own national poet says:

He knows the right and doth approve it too,
Condemns the wrong but still the wrong
pursues.

The government rejected Bill No. 11 because the Japanese might not like it, but this bill makes no reference to the Japanese by name. They are only one of many of the