

majority? That is how it is in control here. I say this, that the policy that is to be carried out as regards these Japanese Canadians is certainly not Liberal.

Mr. GIBSON (Comox-Alberni): It is generous.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): What I would call a Liberal policy would be to have all those who signed their names given an opportunity to revoke their signatures. Where there are those who want to go back to Japan, by all means send them back; where there are those who are proven enemies of Canada, by all means send them back. But every Canadian citizen, be he black, white, or yellow, Catholic or Protestant, believer or unbeliever, should have exactly the same opportunity in this country. To-day we are singling out one particular group as objects of our hatred.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is playing both ends against the middle.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): The democratic principles which the Liberal government are supposed to hold are being shamefully violated.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I tell my hon. friend that I fought an election on that issue and I am here on this side, to the right of the Speaker.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): The hon. member may be here, but that reflects no credit on his constituents.

All I want to say is that I regard this policy as a direct negation of Liberalism and of decent, elemental, fundamental democracy. I will go farther and say this, that in carrying through this policy, in deporting these Canadian citizens of Japanese origin, the Liberal government has merely proven itself to be what many of us have long suspected, an organized hypocrisy.

Mr. MACKENZIE: A government which is in office and in power.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I ask that that term be withdrawn. No hon. member has any right to say that any other hon. member or any government is an organized hypocrisy. Those are words which must be withdrawn.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I will withdraw the words if I am out of order. I should have said, the Liberal party.

Mr. MITCHELL: Statements of that kind are all right on a soapbox, but you cannot make them here.

Mr. HACKETT: I ask the Prime Minister if, in the negotiation of the extradition treaty

[Mr. Stewart.]

to which he made reference earlier in the evening, full recourse was had to the information and guidance of the department over which he presides.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it would be correct to say that it was, yes.

Mr. HACKETT: Would the Prime Minister be good enough to say for what reason the treaty was kept a secret or kept away from parliament for three years?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot give my hon. friend the exact reason, but I have had enough experience in watching some of these international negotiations not to be surprised that it took three years. It might have taken four or five. I think the subject itself has been such a complicated one that there has been some delay.

Mr. HACKETT: I am afraid I have not made myself clear. The agreement itself was signed by the high contracting parties on the 29th of April, 1942, and my query is, why was it kept away from parliament during the period which elapsed between the 29th April, 1942 and October, 1945?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot give my hon. friend an answer. I am informed that it was modified once by a protocol. That is all I can say about the—

Mr. HACKETT: It was modified on the 3rd of October of this year. But it would have interfered with so many national undertakings, and with some enterprises in my own constituency, that I have been prompted to be unduly curious about it. I draw to the attention of the Prime Minister that the treaty appears to have been dealt with most expeditiously in the United States. It was signed on April 29, 1942; on May 6, 1942, it was sent by the President to the senate of the United States, the committee on foreign relations dealt with it and made a report in the month of May, 1942. It appears to have been ratified by the senate within a few weeks after it was executed. I am prompted to inquire why Canada delayed in dealing with it. There was nothing in the treaty to be concealed because of the war in which we were engaged. After having seen it, I can understand why there may have been some hesitancy in introducing it into parliament, but I should like to know if there is some high reason for having held it in abeyance away from parliament for such a length of time.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I think I can satisfy my hon. friend's curiosity, although I cannot agree with all he has said. He said that the