

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am sorry I have no personal knowledge of the matter. I am informed by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), who has looked into it, that he has thus far received nothing of a definite character to confirm what has been represented, but I shall speak to my colleagues in the defence departments and to the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) in an endeavour to get an exact answer.

#### JAPANESE NATIONALS

##### ENEMY PROPERTY—SALE OF JAPANESE FISHING BOATS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): Yesterday on the orders of the day the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) asked a question which I advised him at the time I would inquire into, and give an immediate reply. It arises out of an advertisement that appears in the newspaper *British Columbian* published at New Westminster, which advertisement was signed by the representative of the custodian of enemy property. The particular paragraph to which the hon. gentleman called attention reads:

Offers for fishing boats, if accepted, will be those from bona fide fishermen of fishing companies who are entitled to own vessels of Canadian registry.

On inquiry I find that the word "of" is a misprint. It should be "or", and instructions have been given to the paper to correct the impression created by the advertisement.

##### EVACUATION FROM PACIFIC COAST DEFENCE AREAS

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister or to the minister most directly concerned. It has to do with the evacuation of Japanese from Pacific coast defence areas. Have the British Columbia security commission and advisory committee, recently established to handle the evacuation of Japanese from Pacific coast defence areas, been authorized to handle the orderly disposal of Japanese businesses, and if not, is it the intention of the government to set up a special agency for that purpose? Further, what is the government's policy with regard to the handling of Japanese businesses which cannot be conveniently or immediately disposed of?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The hon. member asks two questions. One relates to government policy, and with respect to that I can only say that government policy will be made known in due course. With regard to the earlier portion of

the question, which relates to the present position and work of the British Columbia security commission, I would say that I intimated to the house a day or two ago that great care had to be taken with respect to the powers given the commission and details relating to its work. The formal order has not yet been passed; it will, I expect, be passed to-morrow. In the meantime government departments are carrying out part of the work, and the proposed members of the commission have been conferring on the matters that the commission has been appointed to administer.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is the Prime Minister in a position to give the names of the other two members of the commission, and of the advisory committee which I understand is to be set up, and the scope of their duties?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The other commissioners will be the assistant commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Commissioner Mead, and the assistant commissioner of provincial police of British Columbia, Mr. J. Shirras. The chairman is Mr. Austin Taylor. The names of the advisory committee I might give to the house to-morrow.

#### PLEBISCITE ACT

##### PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTE ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE

The house resumed from Monday, March 2, consideration in committee of Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes at such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada—Mr. McLarty—Mr. Vien in the chair.

On section 3—Limitation.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Last evening when the Prime Minister was speaking on this question he stated, as appears on page 969 of *Hansard*:

This question has been before the house since the house opened, and until to-night the language of it has not been questioned. . . .

I take exception to that statement, because the wording of the plebiscite was questioned when the resolution was before the house; in fact I questioned the wording of the plebiscite as well as the general ambiguity of the whole thing. I went so far as to offer an amendment which will be found at page 797 of *Hansard*, the last part of which read:

—provide that definite direction be sought from the people on all national issues submitted to them under the terms and provisions of this proposed Plebiscite Act.