

United States. I may say that this Declaration of Principles was sent on as a state message from the state of California to be submitted to the federal government at Washington. They asked for rigid exclusion. It is curious how absolutely we are in agreement on a great many points. Our conditions are very similar. We also in British Columbia want rigid exclusion. We also want something else which hon. members who have spoken so far in the debate have not touched on, and that is that to make rigid exclusion worth anything we must have some system of registration because there are more orientals coming into British Columbia by the underground route than through the open door. It is no use shutting the lid on the top if you leave the underground passage open, and some system of registration such as we had in the war must be put into force, or we need not bother about putting restrictions on at the other end. I will show later the numbers that are coming in by the underground passage, and the only remedy for this is to have some system of registration.

Accompanying that Declaration of Principle the state of California submitted to Washington what they called a brief. It is a statement very carefully and very skilfully drawn up amplifying the Declaration of Principles and expressing the attitude of California. Yesterday I laid on the desk of hon. members copies, as many as I had, at any rate, of this small booklet. There is a certain amount of pathetic interest attaching to these little pamphlets. They were sent to me by a man in the Shaughnessy military hospital at Vancouver, which is practically a hospital for those who are going to die, for those who are so badly injured that the best thing for them is to allow them to die quietly and peaceably. The man who wrote me said that he had collected there the money to buy a hundred or a hundred and fifty of these pamphlets, and he sent them on to me in the hope that I would distribute them, so anxious were these men to try and get the true conditions in British Columbia before this House, and as the man who wrote the letter said, "Since I began this letter one more of our number has passed away—a man who only last week was fully and heartily engrossed in the presentation of this subject." It is pitiful to think of these young men taking such an interest in this question, and I hope hon. members will find the opportunity to

read this little pamphlet and the proofs contained in it. One might almost call it a message to hon. members from the grave.

As regards the preamble of this brief, I shall quote only a very few words. They say that "the facts presented offer conclusive evidence of a grave and imminent danger, not only to California and the Pacific states, but to the nation itself." That is the considered judgment of the state of California.

The second clause deals with the desire of the state of California to govern that rigid exclusion themselves, and not by the state of Japan. Under the Gentleman's Agreement, Japan decides who shall come in and who shall stay out. The state of California wishes the Gentleman's Agreement denounced and says: "In future let us decide who shall come in and who shall not." I might say that that also applies to British Columbia.

The third clause refers to a sort of protest against any possible action on behalf of the federal government interfering with the Alien Land Act of California, which prevents aliens from owning or leasing agricultural lands, the same as in Japan. This protest urges the federal government not to give way to any representations on the part of the Japanese government to alter or over-ride that act, or to change the act which says that aliens in the States cannot be naturalized.

The fourth clause which I need not quote asks—it makes it one of the principles of their platform—that justice and freedom shall be given to the Japanese already in California. They put that squarely and unmistakably, and the only exception they make is that aliens must not be allowed to lease or own land, and they quote for their reason the treaty between Japan and the United States, in which that provision is absolutely laid down. In neither of the contracting countries are the subjects of the other allowed to own or lease land for agricultural purposes, and the state of California asks that that be adhered to.

I might explain the difference between the law in the States and our own law in that regard. In the States they have a law which forbids the naturalization of any aliens of brown or yellow race. I need not go into the details—that is a fact to-day—and they put the law in three words: This act shall apply only to free white people. There is also a provision for letting in the Filipinos and negroes but it excludes