

*Supply—External Affairs*

Japs, let us say, in a village, but it would not be true of a larger place, nearly all Japanese.

The Prime Minister also says that if they were not able to produce a registration card they would not be able to continue in business. In the last war, white men and all others had to be registered, and to make sure all were registered you had to produce your registration card when you bought a railway ticket and other things of that kind. Nothing of that sort so far as I have heard has been recommended in the report of the committee. Those who can qualify will get their registration card, which they will be proud to show as evidence of their all-rightness, but those who are illegally in the country will not go near the place to be registered. Why should they? If, subsequently, they want to purchase a railway ticket or something of that kind and cannot get one without producing a registration card, they will borrow one from a friend. That is a common trick.

There was a regulation made that any Japanese who had served in the great war and could produce his military discharge could get a fishing licence without being subjected to the quota restriction which applied to the ordinary Japanese. What did they do? Every Japanese with a military discharge goes fishing. He does not really. He may be running a cigar store, but he will farm out his fishing licence to another Japanese, who produces the borrowed discharge. They are all alike; you cannot tell one from the other. So it was the practice to peddle out his licence. Every Japanese with a military discharge obtained a fishing licence for some other Japanese. Occasionally they are detected. If it is obvious that they have obtained the licence illegally, it is taken away from them. But that peddling goes on all the time.

I had not intended to bring this subject up at all for various reasons connected with diplomacy and because of the statement which the Prime Minister made earlier in the session, that anyone who made any suggestions dealing with the subject of Japanese in British Columbia was more or less disloyal or at any rate would be regarded as doing it solely for political effect—a thing which some of us in British Columbia do not appreciate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I wish my hon. friend would quote any statement I made to that effect. He surely has misunderstood the statement I made if he interpreted it as meaning that any member of parliament could not say what he pleased without being regarded as disloyal. I have made no statement of the kind.

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. NEILL: I was not prepared to speak on this subject to-night, and I rose only because the subject came up. The Prime Minister's statement will be found in *Hansard* No. 3, I think, reporting the proceedings on the third day of this session, which began on the 7th of November. The Prime Minister most distinctly stated that he would regard it as highly undesirable if any members made any remarks to excite in any way displeasure with the Japanese. He said he wanted the house to understand it was not just a casual or careless remark which some man might make, because that was not so harmful, as the rest of us knew that such statements were born only of a desire for political effect—it was that remark which I did not like—but that when it went to Japan it was represented as a statement, not of some careless, reckless, unworthy-of-confidence man here, but as the decided opinion of the Canadian parliament; and that was what he did not like.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that that is quite different from saying that any hon. member was disloyal. I made no reflection on the loyalty of anyone.

Mr. NEILL: Neither did I.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say further that I believe events which have occurred since I made the statement I did in this chamber show how wise was the statement to which my hon. friend alluded. He knows, as every hon. member knows, the critical nature of the situation which exists to-day between the British commonwealth of nations and Japan. I am sure that any word of counsel which I venture to express in the interest of the empire as a whole is quite different from an endeavour to restrict any hon. member from making statements which in his judgment are in the public interest.

Mr. NEILL: I am quite willing to leave it until I look up *Hansard* to see exactly what was said, but naturally, being more directly interested than the Prime Minister, I have an exact recollection of it. I was wrong, however, in saying that it was suggested I was disloyal. What was indicated was that the statement was highly undesirable because it gave the wrong impression; that we here understood it was merely the claptrap, for political purposes, of an individual, whereas in Japan it gave a different impression.

There is one other thing—I would not ask, it is useless; but I would protest. We are dealing with the composition of a committee of four, one of whom is known to be so violently pro-Japanese that it is a matter almost of