

ister representing Japan in this country, Mr. Nossé, whose correspondence is before the House and who, I understood, spoke for his government, gave written and verbal assurances that a large amount of immigration was not coming in. If this is not being fulfilled we may say that false pretenses were used to a small extent by those who entered into negotiations on the part of Japan. If that were the case, I think we should take a firm stand on the question and point out to the Japanese government exactly what we understood at the time; that we did not intend—and it was not so explained to us, or, if it was I for one certainly did not so understand it—that this country was to be made a dumping ground for a large number of Japanese to come in and engage in every walk of life. But if this may come upon us, it seems to me the question is to be viewed in an entirely new light. We have a mass of information leading up to the present situation, but showing no justification for the negotiations of the treaty as it was passed last year. The British government, perhaps, could safely enter into such a treaty, because there is no danger of Great Britain being flooded as we are likely to be. They especially drew our attention to this wide-open door, and asked our government if they were prepared to take the responsibility. Apparently, our government replied that they were prepared to take the responsibility, and to receive the immigration that would come in under the treaty. In the light of these facts, it has become a question for the country to deal with as a whole. It is a national problem, a problem that affects our citizenship to the very foundation. And anything we can do to relieve the situation, to mitigate the trouble that has come upon us and lessen the responsibility that we have taken upon our shoulders when we did not fully understand the situation, we should do to make clear to Japan the position we take, that we are not prepared to take unlimited immigration from that country, whether as labourers, commercial men, agriculturists or otherwise, and that when we extended the courtesies of that treaty to them we understood that it was to be exercised by them to a very limited extent.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Already, the members from British Columbia have placed their policy on this important question fully before the House. We are called upon again to say something upon the question as it arises out of the settlement made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) as a representative of this government in Japan in contradistinction to the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) on going into Supply. I desire to take only a few minutes to give my own personal reasons why, after all the anxiety that we have

expressed on this question, I am prepared to support the proposals of the government and vote against the amendment offered by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. We expected that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) says he expected that, I am dealing with my own reasons on this question, and I think I have good ones. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) through the whole of his speech, assumed that in the treaty with Japan, the trade advantages were secured at the expense of having tens of thousands of orientals coming into British Columbia; that it was not well to maintain such a treaty, especially as it would involve this very serious problem of Japanese immigration. From all that we know about the settlement made with the representative of this government in Japan, we have every reason to believe that the benefit of any trade in connection with Japan, important or unimportant, can be obtained and yet a restriction placed upon the immigration of Japanese labourers into British Columbia. We propose to do two things; In the speech I made to the House on this question on December 16, last, I said all I could in favour of trade relations with Japan. I repeat what I said on that occasion—that the commercial future of the Pacific coast depends very largely upon the extension of Canadian commercial markets in the orient.

No man who understands the geographical situation, or has thought at all of the actual conditions and the possibilities of the development of commerce between these two countries, will attempt to minimize the importance of that trade. Sir, we want to do two things. We want to maintain the trade and we want to keep out the labourer. Hon. gentlemen may not be able to see how those two things can be harmonized. For myself I would support any proposition to extend our trade with Japan, and at the same time I would use all my influence to prevent the importation of Japanese labour into Canada. The exportation of Canadian productions into Japan tends to make it more reasonable why Japanese labour should be retained in Japan in order to develop that country, and the importation of Japanese production into Canada, which do not come into competition with our own productions, raises the purchasing value of the wages of the labouring men of this country. We want the chief productions of Japan, articles that are desirable for our consumption, when those productions do not come into competition with our own productions. The ever increasing export trade of this country to Japan strengthens the reason why Japanese labour should remain at home. Therefore, I say the government had a double object in view, to maintain trade relations and to restrict Japanese immigration.