

crude article on which they have paid the duty. Is it right to take a man's money under the circumstances and at the same time deprive him of the benefit arising from the trade which he has been carrying on?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—If I were not a Privy Councillor, I would say it would be a dishonest thing for any government to do.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Being a Privy Councillor will scarcely warrant dishonesty.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I am only one.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—My hon. friend says that if he gave his opinion, he would say it was a dishonest thing to do. If it would be dishonest in an individual to do it, it is equally dishonest in a government, and much more so because the government is able to refund the money to these people. I do not think it follows that because we object to the Mongolian race becoming numerous in this country, or simply because they are Chinamen, that there should be any different law applied to them in the management of their business. If there is, I frankly confess I am unable to see it. I agree with all the hon. minister has said with reference to the deleterious effects of the use of this article, but would the hon. gentleman or the government have introduced a bill of confiscation such as this if this business had been carried on by white people? I doubt it very much.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes, most certainly. When the attention of the government was called to it. If the hon. gentleman were educated up to it he would come to a different conclusion. Any government, after knowing the facts, and having had an investigation and getting a report, would certainly feel it their duty to take action.

Hon. Sr MACKENZIE BOWELL—I am discussing the question from what I consider a fair equitable dealing in a business transaction. I am not arguing in favour of the Chinese. I would use the same argument precisely with regard to negroes or white people. How long have we been permitting the carrying on of this trade? When I was Minister of Customs, I had a good deal to do with the question of the importation of opium. At that time, about twenty years

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

ago, the duty imposed upon the crude opium was \$1 per pound and on refined opium \$5 per pound. In the United States, a duty of \$5 was imposed on the crude opium and \$10 on the refined. The result was that in Victoria and Vancouver no less than thirteen refineries were established and they found a market for their product. I do not hesitate to say, not so much in British Columbia or in Canada as in the United States. The United States, learning that large amounts were being smuggled into that country of the refined article manufactured in Canada, lowered the duties upon the crude opium and increased it upon the refined; the result was that the United States, being a much larger market for the consumption of this article, the refineries in Canada were reduced to about three, and they increased in the United States on account of the lowering of the duty upon the crude material. The revenues fell off upon this article, and the crude opium went to the United States where it was manufactured. The United States, finding the extent of the business in that country and the ill effects arising from the use of it, passed laws prohibiting the importation of opium altogether. Our government is now following in the same line. I find no fault with that, but I do find fault with taking their money and confiscating it. Looking at the history of this question as intimated by the Hon. Secretary of State when he made his first statement, we know that war arose on this question between England and China a great many years ago. England recognized the fact that in the interests of humanity the suppression of that trade would be to the benefit of the human race. What have they done? In India, the great poppy producing country where the opium is manufactured, England, India, Hong Kong and China have entered into an agreement by which, at a certain date, the prevention of the importation or exportation or growth of the poppy will cease, and it is based upon equitable principles. India and Hong Kong, with the consent of England, have come to the conclusion that they shall pass a law preventing the exportation in ten years; that is ten per cent of the exportation from the time at which the law was passed should cease every year, so that at the end of ten years no further exportation of the article could