

should such a law at all be on our Statute Books. My opinion is the sooner it can be got rid of the better. As to the circumstances under which the Act was passed, they have been accurately stated. The argument has been urged here very properly that one province has no right to ask the other provinces to make such a concession as that. It is not a concession of some unimportant matter. It is a concession of the fundamental principle of the British Constitution. It is the enormity of the concession I object to. I would go a great way to meet the views of any of the provinces, but I am not prepared to go the length of abrogating the principle which makes Britain the glorious Empire it is. I think therefore if the hon. Minister would but consent simply to postpone this Bill until to-morrow, and let the House have an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon the Bill I have introduced, it will facilitate matters. Otherwise those who wish to have the law repealed must vote against everything in this Bill and make it as difficult as possible to enforce the Act, with a view to showing their determination to have it expunged. It is not a very pleasant position to be in. Speaking for myself, if I could not carry my own views, I should give my best efforts to make this bill as unobjectionable as possible. If the Minister would do this it would facilitate matters and save a great deal of time to-night. I know from the feeling manifested in this House that every clause will be a subject for discussion.

HON. MR. SCOTT—After the debate on this Bill which took place last week, I will merely point out the compromising character of the proposition to go into Committee on a bill of which we all disapprove. It is not merely the details of the law that we object to: it is a bad law in principle, and cannot be improved or made acceptable by alterations or changes. If the Senate is really sincere and earnest in the announcement that hon. gentleman made the other evening, then we ought to give effect to our individual opinions. Certainly the sentiment of the Senate seemed to be that the Act should be wiped off the Statute Book. I think, therefore, that the

proposition made by the hon. member from Sarnia is a very proper one—that before going into Committee on this Bill an opportunity should be given the House to say whether this Act should be allowed to continue any longer. I am pretty well advised that public opinion has changed materially in British Columbia since the Chinese law was first enacted. We have found, to my surprise, two Senators from British Columbia, not certainly advocating this law, but rather regretting its existence on the Statute Book. At the time the Act was passed the Chinese population in British Columbia was, I believe, treble what it is to-day. Chinamen find that the Canadians are not such a charming class of people that they care to remain among them. We know that serious riots have taken place on several occasions, when the poor Chinamen have been badly abused, and the consequence has been that their numbers have seriously diminished. Unless it would occasion great inconvenience, I do think it would be better that this law should be wiped off the Statute Book altogether. It certainly does not affect other provinces of the Dominion, and they ought not to have it apply to any province but British Columbia. Under this Act they cannot enter the country at one port and leave it at another without paying \$50. A Chinaman landing at Boston and wishing to pass through Canada to Detroit cannot do so without paying \$50, and he has to wait a week or so at Detroit before he can get it back.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Not at all.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The clause, as I understand it, renders the railway company liable and is any railway company going to be responsible for that \$50 unless the amount is deposited?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—There are many ways of securing the railway company without putting up the \$50.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The Chinese cannot pass through Canada except under certain regulations. Section 8 of the Chinese Immigration Act provides that if a railway company should fail to