

extended also to Chinese and other orientals; they only wanted the privilege for themselves. As I say, they regard themselves as Japanese and are so described by their advocates. If they are British subjects, in that case they come under the ordinary law, or should do so at any rate.

The Japs who lived around Pearl Harbor had nothing but love for their white brothers until the war struck them. How are you going to prove that they are loyal? Ask them to get up and sing "God Save the King" and take an oath of loyalty? Of course they will do that. An oath means nothing to them. They would just as readily sing "God Save the King" as "Heil Hitler", and with just as much sincerity and intention of being loyal to one authority as the other.

I have mentioned this incident before, but I want to do it from a different angle. A man who held quite a good position as a doctor in Pearl Harbor had a summer home close to where I lived, and he employed a Japanese couple whom the family regarded as thoroughly reliable people. I am perfectly certain that if they had been asked six months before the war whether these Japs were loyal, these white people would have said, "Certainly. We have known them for twenty years. They could not be anything but loyal; they have been so faithful to us." But came the day of Pearl Harbor, and a United States detachment came along and took the Jap man out and shot him. There was ample proof that he had been a traitor all the time. He had obtained plans of Pearl Harbor, and also in his portmanteau they found charts of the ports and waterways in the district of British Columbia where they lived. The Jap woman expressed regret to the family; she said, "You have been just like a father and mother to us, but we had to do it because we serve the emperor." Yes; they had been loyal to United States institutions, but when they came within the orbit of a greater loyalty, that to their country of origin, why, then it was quite a different story.

It reminds me of a story, or rather of a tradition. In Scotland it was the habit of the kings to go around and listen to the grievances of their subjects. Any criminal had the right to claim a hearing from his king. The monarch visited what we would now call a penitentiary, and all the prisoners wanted to be interviewed. They all said that they had been treated horribly. They had been "railroaded" to prison; yet all of them were as innocent as a yoke of oxen, and if the king would only let them go it would be lovely. But one man remained silent. The king asked, "What is

the trouble with you? What injustice do you complain of?" The man answered, "My lord, I have not had any injustice; I stole a horse and I am punished for it." The king said, "What! you stole a horse! You are a regular villain;" and he turned to the gaoler and said, "I will deal with the cases of these innocent people the next time I come around, which will be about five years from now, but I direct you to throw out this wretched criminal, who stole a horse and who admits he stole a horse. I will not have these innocent men polluted by a blackguard like that. Throw out the man who says he stole a horse".

So it is with the Japanese. Put them in court and ask them if they will be loyal; why, they will be loyal to anything you could mention—for the time being.

The Prime Minister says that we must in some respects follow the policies of the United States. I would accept that counsel with a great deal of caution. Their problems, though in some sense analogous, are not identical. For one thing, the proportion of Japanese in Canada is far greater than in the United States, although in numbers there are many thousands more in the United States. At any rate we are running our own affairs and we are not obliged to follow anybody else's policy.

I believe the Prime Minister's second basic policy, to report only those convicted of disloyalty, is untenable, because ever since they have seen that the white man is holding his own they have been careful to avoid sabotage. It will not do to issue certificates to people as being loyal because they will sing "God Save the King." Oh, but, we are told, this is absurd; you will have to get some evidence; you cannot indict a whole nation. You cannot ask a man to prove his loyalty. A Jap can get some person who has dealt with him for twenty years, to say, "I know Homatka; he is all right; he has bought groceries from me," and unless you can get convincing evidence that he ought to be in the penitentiary, he is turned loose with a certificate that he is, so to speak, a white man.

A few weeks ago I saw in a Vancouver paper that one of the officials, an inspector who was connected with the job of taking care of the removal of the Japanese—I have not the cutting here, but I can speak from memory—gave testimony that the third generation of the Japs were the worst to handle, because they were better educated and knew what their so-called rights were, but they were just as firmly embedded in the traditions of their forbears as were the first generation. This man rather favoured the Japs; he said that