

lowed by a protocol in 1895, by which self-governing colonies could obtain the benefits of that treaty and still retain control of their immigration. Contrast the position of Japan in 1894, when that treaty was signed, with her position in 1905 or 1906 or 1907. In 1894, Japan was a third-rate or a fourth-rate power, at the present time she is classed among the first-rate world powers. This position, it is true, has been won by a great struggle, in which she not only showed her great resources, but also the bravery and patriotism of her men. Therefore what Japan might have been willing to concede in 1894 or in 1897, at the time when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition says she was willing to treat with us on the basis of giving us control of our immigration regulations, she could not concede at the time this treaty between Canada and Japan was signed, that is, discrimination against her people.

Now, what was the object of Canada in entering this treaty with Japan? The object was that she might enlarge her commercial relations with that country. Canada, as a young and growing country, must constantly seek an outlet for her increasing productions and her expanding trade; and looking at Japan on our western border, we saw a promising market for Canadian goods. Our Minister of Agriculture went there some years ago, and returned with a favourable report to the government. So that our reasons for entering into a treaty with Japan were purely commercial reasons, having in view the benefit of both countries. When we come to consider the benefit to be derived from this commercial treaty with Japan, I for one will not minimize the importance of that consideration. Up to the time that treaty was entered into, there was very little to give an impetus to our trade with Japan. The possibilities all lay in the future, and those possibilities promised to be great. Now, I admit that we can pay too great a price for even the possible advantages of this treaty. That price would be to my mind the flooding of British Columbia or of Canada with Japanese immigrants. We from British Columbia have stood out against that, and we are still standing out against it. We want to have restricted the immigration of orientals of every description, and the closer and greater the restriction is the better pleased will be the people of British Columbia, and the better pleased shall we be as the representatives of those people.

That brings us to the question, whether the government of this country is liable to criticism for the manner in which it entered into this treaty with Japan. The hon. leader of the opposition has directed the greater part of his speech to a criticism of the acts of the government in that regard. Let us see if that criticism is merited. I believe the best way for us to

Mr. GALLIHER.

judge of that would be to consider matters as they were before the treaty was entered into and to suppose that we had before us to-day the question whether or not we should enter into a treaty with Japan unrestricted in its terms as to immigration.

Let us for a moment divest ourselves of our political differences. Let us imagine ourselves a harmonious body, not divided into division of government and opposition, or Liberal and Conservative, but simply and purely discussing this question as a business proposition in order to decide whether or not it was in the interests of Canada to enter into a treaty with Japan. If we put ourselves in that position, we can best judge whether or not the government is open to the criticism which has been bestowed upon it by the leader of the opposition. Of course the hon. gentleman is quite within his right, in criticising the government on this or any other matter that comes before the House, and I am not at all questioning that right. But assuming the position of a body discussing this matter free from any political bias, what do we find? In about the year 1900, there was a good deal of agitation over the influx of Chinese into British Columbia and commissioners were appointed to investigate. I note that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) said that some fifteen or twenty years ago, Chinese immigrants were welcomed into British Columbia. I wish to correct him on that point. I have been in that province some twelve or thirteen years, and certainly during that period the Chinese were never welcome in our country. And if the hon. minister will turn to the 'Hansard' of 1884-5, he will find there a resolution moved by the then hon. member for Nanaimo, Mr. Gordon, regarding the undesirability of Chinese or oriental immigration into British Columbia. That was during the administration of the late Sir John Macdonald. This commission, which was appointed in the year 1900, went to British Columbia and took evidence, and recommended the imposition of a \$500 poll tax upon Chinese. That recommendation afterwards became law. But in that same recommendation, the commissioners advised that a similar restriction should not be placed upon Japanese. Why did they so recommend? There must have been some reason. The reason was that the consul general of Japan in Vancouver talked this matter over with the commissioners and assured them that the Japanese government would restrict Japanese emigration, and did not desire that a similar restriction should be imposed upon their people as was to be imposed on the Chinese. The commissioners relied upon this assurance and so did the government. The result was that from 1901 until 1907, the number of Japanese coming into British Columbia did not exceed the number to which the consul general of