

ing likewise the citizenship of this Dominion. It is a question for every one to consider whether or not, in the interests of the people, we should have an influx of this class of immigration to the destruction of the history, the constitution and the traditions we have all been taught to venerate. The question is indeed a national one. When I thus speak regarding this Japanese treaty, do not think that I would for a moment say anything detrimental to our present relations with Japan. We have entered into a treaty either with our eyes shut or open. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that their eyes were open, but I must confess that mine were closed to the possibilities of the question when that treaty went through the House. I am not at all shirking my share of responsibility. But having seen the evils it has brought upon the country, we should take the earliest opportunity of retracing our steps. I am not advocating that we should do anything dishonourable. As a business man I have always endeavoured to carry out every obligation, whether to my advantage or disadvantage, once it was fairly and honourably entered into. If this government has fairly and honestly entered into a treaty with Japan, there is only one thing to do and that is to carry out that treaty until it can be honourably ended. But I understand it can be honourably ended. We have not bound ourselves and posterity by this treaty, but are at liberty to abrogate it on giving six months notice. I am not saying that we should give notice immediately, but ultimately, if we cannot improve the conditions, we would be justified in taking that step. As to the danger of jeopardizing our commercial relations with Japan, these relations are not so very important that these need trouble us very much. The Japanese in fact have more to lose by the abrogation of the treaty than we. And although I am always desirous of extending our trade relations with foreign countries, I do not think that, for the sake of a few more dollars of trade, we should sacrifice what is in the best interests of the people of Canada as a whole.

It cannot be said that the government acted without full knowledge. The secretary of the home government, in a despatch, drew the attention of the government to this very question of immigration, and asked whether they were ready to accept that treaty and thus throw wide open the door to Japanese immigration. But this government apparently made no reply, and some weeks later they sent a despatch saying that they wished to accept the treaty just as it stood without any restriction regarding immigration. When I heard the explanation which was given last session, I understood that by this treaty we were simply extending to Japan the same courtesy that we expected to receive from Japan. That, I think, was the explanation given

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

in this House. It was simply that a Canadian visiting Japan would receive in that country protection to his person and property and be free to come and go and to remain in Japan as long as he chose, and that he would be amenable to the laws of that country only in case he did something to contravene those laws.

That is as far as I thought it went. I thought we extended the same rights and privileges to the people from Japan to come and visit here their property and themselves, protected all the time they were in Canada. But I did not understand that we were taking in by the thousands, and it may be by the tens of thousands, immigrants from Japan to compete with us not only in labour, but in commercial enterprises, and, if the despatches we read in the press are correct, in agriculture as well. I have not heard this matter mentioned to-day, but there was a despatch in the newspapers a few days ago to the effect that a tract of land in the neighbourhood of Calgary was being obtained by Japanese, and that the owners had undertaken to place upon the property, in the near future, 250 families to follow agricultural pursuits. I think this land is in the irrigation belt. So, we shall find this not only a labour problem, but a problem affecting the settlement of our provinces in the Northwest. The Japanese are already in the foothills country, and they propose to come in in greater numbers. And we are told that we have taken this upon ourselves in exchange for the small trade that may be developed with Japan. I, for one, protest that, so far as I am concerned, I take no responsibility in that respect. The trade consideration did not weigh with me when the treaty was before the House. I think we should not be justified in exchange for the paltry trade with Japan, amounting to about \$2,000,000 in the aggregate and about \$500,000 of exports, in opening our gates and allowing them to send in any number of immigrants that they wish. If this is to be the situation, I think we are justified in viewing the question as one of great national importance. The government, having all these facts before them—and, I suppose, we must share the responsibility to a certain extent, we took part in it—and having discovered where we are, should arrange to limit the immigration that is coming in, whether it comes by way of Hawaii, or by passport direct from Japan, or otherwise. This matter was not explained to the House, and so cannot be fairly said to have been accepted by the House. I think we should take an early opportunity to relieve ourselves of a responsibility we have assumed when our eyes were not fully opened to the situation. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) has brought back a report. It is considered satisfactory by some, and may be considered the best that could be done under the circumstances. But that does not appear to be fully satisfactory. The min-