

coloured nations of the world which make up three-quarters of the population of the world. The educational test has been in use against the Japanese for many years now, I think thirty, or at least twenty, as regards Australia and New Zealand.

I object strongly to having it spread on the pages of Hansard and through the radio and the press that I have introduced in this house a bill which would make matters in British Columbia many times worse and allow thousands and thousands of Japanese to come in, when the facts are as I have stated, and they cannot be contradicted. I want to give hon. members a picture of this bill. It reached its second reading in the shape of Bill No. 38. I said what I could in favour of it. There was no objection made against it, no fault found with the matter of it, no comment upon it, no criticism of it. But a point of order was taken in connection with the printing of it, a point of order that has not been enforced for ten years, and had it been enforced impartially that day it would have thrown out nine other bills, six of them important government bills. However, it was thrown out; I brought it in again—the rules allowed it—and it came to the second reading the other night. The whole gamut of technicalities had been exhausted. Believe me, it was gone through with a tooth comb, and it could be attacked only on its merits. There are sixty-three lawyers sitting behind the leader of the government party. The massed intelligence of all that legal ability—for they are able men—would naturally be brought to bear on the subject, and what was the result? The mountain laboured and brought forth, not a mouse; it did not even bring forth the cheese to bait the mouse. All the concentrated ability of those sixty-three lawyers could produce only this piffle about the thousands and thousands of Japanese. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Taylor) would, I am sure, call it an “emotional argument” which was used in that connection.

That having been disposed of, what is left of the argument against the bill? Nothing, because there were no other arguments put up. There cannot be much wrong with the bill when the only argument used against it is of such a puerile character. But it is going to be condemned. We remember that in the nursery tale we were told that the wolf said he was going to eat Little Red Riding Hood because she had done something against him. When she proved she had not done it, the wolf said, “Well, I am going to eat you because your grandmother did something.” When she showed that her grandmother had not done it, the wolf said, “Well,

I am going to eat you, anyhow,” and this government is going to kill this bill anyhow, although no argument has been advanced against it. This is not a nursery or a nursery tale; we are a legislative body of lawmakers; we have some privileges and rights, and we ought not to be asked to defeat a bill without some reason being given for doing so. The premier told us, very properly, what in his opinion was wrong with Bill No. 11; but no one on the government side has told us what is wrong with this bill, and yet it is going to be defeated.

If the government will not take the house into its confidence as to the reasons for this course, I am going to take the house into my confidence. I am going to make a diagnosis, as the doctors call it, founded upon the facts as we know them and as they seem to warrant, and suggest the reason why the government is determined to defeat this bill upon a party vote without any justification. The reason is twofold. First, there is nothing wrong with the bill; but, second, there has been an arrangement made with Japan that there will be no further restrictions on immigration for a given period. Not a treaty, of course not; no written agreement; no negotiations even, but just these mysterious diplomatic things they call, I believe, in the highest diplomatic circles, “conversations”. If such an arrangement was made, I do not blame the government for living up to it; but I do blame them for making such an important arrangement without consulting this house, which alone has the power to make such an agreement; and still more, having made it, for not having told the house what it was. If that is the explanation, the bargain, not having been sanctioned by us, is not binding on us, and there is no reason why we should yield control over our domestic affairs.

Mr. CRERAR: Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. NEILL: No. For four months I have waited for this thing, and I am going to have my innings to-night.

Mr. CRERAR: There is just this—

Mr. NEILL: No!

Mr. CRERAR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to say this. My hon. friend has said either too much or too little.

Mr. NEILL: That is not a point of order.

Mr. CRERAR: He has hinted that there is some arrangement, and he ascribes the opposition to his bill as being the result of an arrangement which must have recently been made.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not say “recently.”