

ing directly with the Japanese government or the accredited representatives of that government empowered to sign a treaty. I venture to submit that if the Postmaster General and Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) had gone to Japan in August, 1905, instead of waiting until 1908, and made directly the same representations to the Japanese government in 1905 which he did in 1908, and which he was then equally entitled to make in view of the assurances that had been given to the present government from time to time by the Japanese Consul General at Montreal, the present administration would have given some evidence that they were keenly alive to Canadian interests, would have made a proper treaty, or possibly would have had to report that, despite all their efforts, they found it impossible to make any treaty with Japan which would include a restriction of Japanese immigration to Canada. No such effort however was made, and after the steed was stolen the stable door was securely locked, and my hon. friend went on his mission to Japan. The people of this country, and particularly the people of British Columbia, have a just grievance against this government for having, without the slightest effort or the slightest personal communication with the Japanese government, and solely on the personal assurances of the Japanese Consul General, entered into this treaty and brought this trouble on the Dominion in the shape of an immigration to which the people of British Columbia in particular are bitterly hostile.

But, Mr. Speaker, if there was one thing that seemed to give the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) and his immediate supporters from British Columbia great comfort, it was the statement made by that hon. gentleman that, notwithstanding any treaty, the Japanese would have come in all the same. I am not quite able to follow my hon. friend's line of reasoning, and I do not like to characterize it as a statement devised on the spur of the moment for his own personal comfort and to console his constituents; but in another part of his speech he complained of the action of the Japanese government in having granted too many passports, and said that that was the real reason why so many Japanese came into this country. It was the right of the Japanese government to grant passports under the treaty which has caused all the trouble. Well, the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) that the Japanese would have come in despite any treaty, and his argument that their coming in was due to the exercise by the Japanese government of the right to grant passports given them by the treaty are directly contradictory.

But quite apart from that this government has again shown its aftersighted wisdom.

Mr. BRISTOL.

dom. On the 8th January of this year they passed an order in council as follows:

Therefore the Governor General in Council is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that, whenever in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, the condition of the labour market in Canada is such as to make the application of section 20 of the Immigration Act desirable or whenever in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, other conditions exist which is a special degree render necessary the application of sections 26 to 30 inclusive of the said Act, immigrants may be prohibited from landing or coming into Canada unless they come from the country of their birth, or citizenship, by a continuous journey and on through tickets purchased before leaving the country of their birth or citizenship.

And I find in the 'Globe' of January 11th, in a special despatch from Ottawa, the following statement:

The new regulation applies equally to all countries, and is designed principally to prevent the influx of Japanese from Honolulu and Hindoos from Hong Kong. It will thus have a large effect in preventing the continuation of oriental immigration in the west which now comes via these two ports.

So that not merely had the government the power in 1897 to make this treaty in a form which would have prevented this immigration, not only had they the opportunity in 1905 to negotiate a similar treaty, which they did not even attempt to do, but they had the power under the Immigration Act to pass this same order in council to prevent immigration from Honolulu or the Sandwich Islands, or any other objectionable point. But they waited until after the damage was done before they passed this order in council. I submit, therefore, that our people have the right to complain of the action of the government in all these respects. If you go to British Columbia you will find it commonly said out there that the people of eastern Canada have no knowledge of the conditions existing in that province regarding this matter and take very little interest in it. Certainly, in view of the course taken by this government in the past few years in view of the neglect shown by this government of the interests of the people of British Columbia, the people of that province have the right to complain that during the past seven years the present administration has not given that attention to their interests which those interests demand.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What about British Columbia before 1896?

Mr. BRISTOL. The first treaty was made in 1894, and in 1895 the Conservative administration advocated the policy of restricting Japanese immigration, but they had not the power to embody that policy