

will have to go back to France, to Japan, to Germany or somewhere else." I am afraid we shall have to accept that responsibility. If these people commit crimes they will have to be punished as Canadian citizens. We cannot deprive them of their only nationality because there is no other country prepared to take these criminals. We must deal with them ourselves. I hope hon. members do not think I am talking about the Japanese because I am not. They are quite far from my thoughts at the present time.

Mr. FULTON: With due respect to all hon. members I think we should try to discuss this matter without heat. I have asked continually that the members from British Columbia be given a fair opportunity to state their case against the Japanese in order that this parliament of Canada may decide the matter on principles of justice. There is this distinction to be drawn between the Japanese referred to by the hon. member for New Westminster and by the hon. member for Vancouver East and the case referred to by the Secretary of State. I think 1,600 was the figure given by the hon. member for New Westminster. Those persons acquired Japanese nationality by virtue of the registration of their births in Canada. Therefore I think they are in a different category; from their point of view they were citizens of Japan.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Are they not citizens of Canada?

Mr. FULTON: These people are not desirable Canadian citizens because, according to their own light, they are Japanese citizens. Later, when section 17 is being considered, I shall have something more to say. However, I just wanted to draw a distinction between these cases, because in my submission these people in their own minds are not Canadians; they are Japanese and they should be so regarded and so treated.

Mr. McMASTER: I thought the debate on this particular phase of the matter had ended. If it has not, perhaps my remarks should be left until it has. However, since I am on my feet perhaps I might offer a suggestion about this clause which is general in its application. The Secretary of State has referred to stateless persons; but I have always thought that no one could be stateless, that is, that domicile or nationality is something that is cast upon a person by his birth. If you drive him out of one state and he is not a subject of another state, by international law,

[Mr. Knight.]

which says that a man comes back to his original domicile or original state, he immediately bounces back.

Mr. GREEN: It is quite amusing, but not very helpful, to hear the hon. member for Saskatoon City talk about welcoming back these Japanese. His province has been quite successful in keeping away from having many Japanese settle in its territory. They are really not in a very good position to talk about the Japanese question.

Mr. KNIGHT: Did the hon. gentleman say that I had welcomed back the Japanese?

Mr. GREEN: He is suggesting that this Japanese torturer should be brought back to Canada and tried.

Mr. KNIGHT: The hon. gentleman should withdraw what he has said because I said no such thing.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Your province did.

Mr. GREEN: That was the inference.

Mr. KNIGHT: Will the hon. gentleman withdraw that?

Mr. GREEN: No; I will not withdraw it.

Mr. KNIGHT: I appeal to the Chair. The hon. member has said that I said something which I did not say.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He said your province said it.

Mr. KNIGHT: I appeal to the chair.

Mr. BOUCHER: Let the record speak.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I must confess that I did not hear what the hon. member said.

Mr. GREEN: I forget what I said myself. However, as I understood the suggestion of the hon. member it was that cases such as this torturer should be brought back to Canada to be tried; that he should be brought back to Canada to be tried and any other Japanese who served in the Japanese forces should be brought back here and we should accept the blame for them being as they are. That is what I understood from his remarks and I think that is what he meant. I suggest to the minister that he allow this section to stand with section 10, because I think that in bringing in a section of this type the minister is not facing realities. This question must be faced. This question of dual nationality cannot be sidetracked. We must be protected against happenings such as have taken place during the last few years.