

have simply been acting under the regulations.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What you propose to do now is to abolish the head tax altogether?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, we will not charge a merchant or a student the \$500 head tax.

Mr. BAXTER: You do not limit the time a merchant may stay in the country do you?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. BAXTER: Under the section that the minister referred to, authorizing him to grant a permit irrespective of the other provisions of the act, there was a limitation; but after all, what is a merchant? If a man chooses to come to Vancouver for instance, and open a little fruit store he is a "merchant," I suppose. He can get in and stay there as a merchant. Is a laundryman a merchant?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. BAXTER: I would not think so; he does not buy or sell anything. Just what is going to happen to us? Will we be fed on Chinese fruit and go unlaundered, or what is the object?

Mr. STEVENS: I was rather waiting for the reading of the clause to be proceeded with, for as far as I am concerned the main contention will be around sub-clause (c) of section I as to the word "merchant." That is really the crux of this whole bill, or very largely so. There are other points that will arise as we proceed. Unless the minister has some definition to supply in regard to merchants I am afraid the measure will be received with considerable alarm by a large section of the public. I wonder, would the committee be interested if I just gave a few figures—I think they have been given before by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) but it is just as well to refresh our memory—as to the number of Chinese merchants in Vancouver. In Vancouver alone there are the following businesses carried on by Chinese:

5 garages, 40 butchers, 65 barbers, 172 grocers, 144 candy, ice cream and fruit, 63 gents' clothing, 9 hardware, 30 jewellers, 89 restaurants, 38 express and dray, 201 tobacconists, 29 wholesale dealers, 154 hawkers and peddlers, 5 printers and publishers, 50 boot and shoe dealers, 54 stationers, etc. etc.

These are all in the city of Vancouver, and when you consider the number operating in a city like that, it must be clear that there is no necessity for special provision for merchants to be admitted to engage in merchandising in this country. I think what the minister has in mind, and what we all have in

mind, is the facilitating of international trade, trade between China and Canada, and I think we are quite prepared for the admission of such business men as are required to carry on that trade. But that is not at all what is in the mind of the Chinese when he suggests that merchants be allowed to enter free. What he means is to build up in Canada a merchandising group in all centres as far as he can. I was down at Kingston near here last year, where there are over 300 Chinese engaged in business in the city, including laundries, which were not included in the list I have just read. These men are running restaurants, fruit and grocery stores particularly, and tailoring shops. The same thing applies to many other eastern cities, and most of this, in fact all of it in the East, has grown up I think in the last ten years, and the impetus will increase as the years go by unless the movement is checked.

I fully appreciate the difficulty of facing this problem with the officials from China, and the same thing applies to Japan. It is difficult, but unfortunately we have got to speak plainly and as far as I am concerned I do so, I think, without passion. It is merely a question of economic necessity to further restrict this class. I think the whole answer to their contention that they have no intention of abusing the privilege is found in the records. I am quoting from memory, but I know I am not more than one or two out. Prior to October or November, 1920, the record shows that about two or three merchants a month were admitted to Canada. During that year we succeeded in stopping the movement whereby they had been bringing in a lot of Chinese students in direct violation of the correct interpretation of that privilege. When that was stopped they found a method of evading the regulation regarding merchants, and they switched to that. Up to that time, as I say, they were coming in at the rate of two or three a month. Suddenly the number rose to 25, 30, 40 and even as high as 400 a month for some months, until one year I think 1,400 came in, or approximately that number. The point I am getting at is this: If during that period only two or three a month came in, if that was the number covered by the normal movement without any undue restriction at all and then suddenly it increased to 300 and 400 a month it would seem that the entrance of such numbers is for some other purpose than merely trade. Now that is a feature we have got to face, and face very frankly in regard to this bill. I have not an amendment to move; I understand there is an amendment to be pro-