

Treaty of Peace (Japan) Act

it is most important that proper records be kept and be available to those responsible for the administration of the territory. If there is going to be a change in the assembly place from Whitehorse to Hay River or to these other places, what will be done with regard to the administrative records?

Mr. Winters: It is not proposed that the Northwest Territories council shall meet at any time at Whitehorse in the Yukon as mentioned by my hon. friend. When it meets at Yellowknife, Hay River, Norman Wells or any other place within the territories the records required for the meeting will go along with the people attending the meeting. The master records are kept here in Ottawa, although quite a large volume are retained at Fort Smith, with some at Yellowknife and other places for local administration.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. Winters thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 337, respecting the Northwest Territories.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

TREATY OF PEACE (JAPAN) ACT

PROVISIONS FOR CARRYING TREATY INTO EFFECT

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved that the house go into committee to consider Bill No. 210, to provide for carrying into effect the treaty of peace between Canada and Japan.

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

On section 1—*Short title.*

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to delay the progress of the committee with respect to this measure. I rise only to indicate that not only was this bill which is to implement the treaty of peace between Canada and Japan studied by the standing committee on external affairs, but that committee also had before it the treaty itself, which was fully discussed.

The deliberations in the committee were centred around inquiries of various governmental representatives from the Department of External Affairs, the department of immigration, the Department of Trade and Commerce and others. Perhaps the main interest of the committee was in the questions of trade and immigration, as one might expect having in mind the character of the relationship between Canada and Japan in previous times.

The main contention which arose in the committee had to do with section 4 and this resulted in a vote on the question of whether

[Mr. Black (Cumberland).]

or not the governor in council had been given too much power and parliament too little, if I may put it in those oversimplified terms. During the progress of this discussion I think the hon. member for Eglinton may have a word with respect to clause 4, because he was the member who took the initiative concerning this matter. With the exception of that feature I think the committee presented a somewhat unanimous front with respect to the treaty itself. While there were certain items in it which of course caused the committee some concern, as no doubt they cause the government a good deal of concern, nevertheless on balance the treaty was endorsed. In addition so was Bill No. 210, the issue having been decided against those who thought there should have been a change in clause 4. I do not think there is any point in my elaborating on the committee's work or in making any further observations.

Mr. Green: For quite a long time now there have been indications that once this treaty with Japan had been ratified an attempt would be made to bring about substantial immigration of Japanese to Canada. The lead in this direction has been taken by the national Japanese-Canadian citizens' association.

The Chairman: Order. Does the hon. member think we should go into this question?

Mr. Green: Pardon?

The Chairman: Does the hon. member think he is in order in wanting to go into the question of possible Japanese immigration?

Mr. Green: This very subject was one of the main questions considered by the committee on external affairs.

The Chairman: It may have been considered by the committee on external affairs, but as I understood the remarks of the hon. member for Peel the committee did not only discuss the bill. It discussed many other matters in connection with it. There was more latitude there. Perhaps the hon. member for Peel might clarify the situation.

Mr. Graydon: Yes. I can understand the position the chairman would normally take on a matter of this kind. I have no great objection to that; but as the minister and those who were members of the committee know, when the treaty was up for discussion in the house there was some question raised whether the treaty itself should go before the external affairs committee. It was generally agreed that was the course that should be followed. It was agreed that the treaty would go before the external affairs committee together with Bill No. 210, and that the bill would be the vehicle by