

immigrants, of course, we mean those coming here for permanent residence, to make this country there home. Is there anything we can do without going to the extent of the exclusion of that class? I really do not see that there is. I do not know what we can do but go to that length. The point then is to inquire what are the perils about going to that length. What is there that is offensive, that is wrong, about such a course? I do not think there is any disposition on the part of any nation to take umbrage at a law that excludes their people from the borders of another country. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) may have read reports of conferences at which I was not present but I cannot recall the question of exclusion coming up, or yet its being emphasized, in any way at conferences at which I was present, that there was aversion to that term on the part of other countries. I do recall a resolution which will appear in a document which has been laid on the Table of this House, which was passed at a conference which I attended last summer, and in which it was distinctly affirmed that full and unrestricted control of immigration rested in each dominion of the Empire, even as against the inhabitants of another dominion or of India, and I do not think a stronger resolution on that subject or a stronger expression of opinion could be possible. It has been said that exclusion is a term not used. The Prime Minister went rather far in that assertion. It is, of course, much too far to go to assert that laws have not been passed in countries excluding from their borders those of a certain race or those of different classes of races. That has been done more than once. It is the law of the United States to-day as respects China. None of us disputes that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is it the law as respects Japan?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. There is effective exclusion in the United States of Chinese. There is effective exclusion in Australia. We may have exclusion without using the word exclusion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is the same arrangement as we have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As regards Japan?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought my hon. friend referred to Australia. I will not state to the House what is allowed under the understanding with Canada as I have always been under the impression that those figures

were not to be made public, but in the United States they have some similar understanding. What their figures are I do not know. But there is effective exclusion in Australia, and as I understand the matter, effective exclusion in New Zealand. Exclusion can be effective even though, in the statute upon that subject, the word "exclusion" may not be used.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When my right hon. friend speaks about effective exclusion, do I understand that he means that no one is permitted to come in?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If he does not mean that, if he means "effective restriction," there is no disagreement between us.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean what I said, and I tried to be clear. I mean effective exclusion as regards immigrants as defined by our law, and that is as far as the resolution goes—exclusion of immigrants, not exclusion of students. Students are excepted under the terms of our definition; students are, in practice, excepted; tourists, clergymen are excepted. There are six or seven cases excepted within the definition of our law, if my memory serves me aright; and as long as the spirit of the term is used, that is as long as the restrictions as regards only those coming to reside are kept up, it would be quite consistent with the terms of that resolution that those exceptions might be modified.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my right hon. friend not recognize, in using such a word in a State document, if I may so describe it, or resolution, a danger that is very grave in these international transactions? May not the use of the word "exclusion", even in this resolution imply, when the cable reaches Japan to-morrow, that this Parliament has enacted a resolution in favour of the exclusion of Japanese? It is that danger that the Government is seeking to avoid.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There could not be justly a cable sent except one that was faithful to the resolution passed. I will proceed to argument that we ought to be able to say, without offence, that the time has come for effective exclusion of that class of people from our shores as residents here. That is all we intend to say by this. Let us proceed to argue—
12 m. ment. I stated first that there had been effective exclusion of the inhabitants of China in the United States.