

vented them from becoming voters in the Province of British Columbia. I am sure that if he had not taken that step, my hon. friend would never have sat in this House. I have no doubt that the wise foresight which the right hon. gentleman then exercised, and which has always marked his dealings with the Dominion of Canada in promoting the development of its political power, will be used on this occasion to secure British Columbia, and the whole Dominion, the advantage that I know will be recognized.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a great deal of sympathy with the hon. members from British Columbia, with regard to the condition of affairs existing in that Province. I am very glad this question has again come before this House; and I hope it will receive most thorough and careful consideration, in order that anything that can be done in the interests of so distant and so worthy a Province as British Columbia, may be done. It may not be that this House will at this time so thoroughly settle this question that it will not arise again, but it is quite possible for us to take the first steps in that direction. I have sympathy, I say, with British Columbia, and I have no sympathy with the idea that, because it is a distant Province, therefore we, who come from other parts of the Dominion, should pay little or no heed to what British Columbia says. I believe we are one Dominion. If we are not one to such an extent now as we ought to be, it will be the effort of my life, and I am sure it will be the effort of the young men who have come to this Parliament for the first time, to leave nothing undone to make the sentiment of unity in this country a continually growing and a continually welding power. It is not for Ontario, or for Quebec, or for any of the other of these great Provinces, to dismiss with a wave of the hand, a complaint or grievance that comes up from a distant Province of this Dominion. I also agree that it is not the right thing for us to continually point towards British Columbia, and say that it is costing us a great deal of money, that we are building the railway, and so forth. We are building that road for the whole Dominion, and for British Columbia as an important part of it. There are certain considerations which dispose me, and I am sure other hon. members of this House, to listen respectfully to what British Columbia says. In the first place, we find that the Legislature of that Province has decided, almost unanimously, if not unanimously, to petition this Parliament in favor of some measure of relief with reference to the Chinese within its borders. We find that the delegations of members who come to this House year after year, are almost, if not wholly, a unit in asking for the same thing. I think, therefore, that some grievance must exist, and that it merits consideration at our hands. There is another circumstance which I think will dispose this House to attempt to remove this grievance. The Australian colonies have felt the same difficulty, and they have met it in a certain way; and that is a fair precedent for us. Then we have the example of the United States, which a year or two ago, after a thorough and careful consideration of the question, passed a Bill excluding the Chinese from the United States for ten years. All these facts show that there is something vital in this question, and it will not be proper or Parliamentary for us to dismiss it as something with which we have nothing to do. But I desire to point out to this House that, although there may be a grievance, it is quite possible that an indiscriminate restriction might not be the proper policy for this country to adopt. We must recollect that we are legislating in the light of open day, that we are legislating for the whole Dominion, that we are legislating as one amongst great countries and great Parliamentary bodies, and that we are about to adopt a policy which will be historic in this country. I think every hon. member of this House will agree with me that what Canada needs to-day is development, and this resolves

itself in my mind largely into a question of immigration, and the kind of immigrants we will have. There lie our immense resources at the sea; there lies our great mineral wealth, culminating as an hon. member says, in those mountains of gold in British Columbia; there are greater, and better than all, those immense acres in the West, every one of them filled with the potency of life, and ready to yield its wealth at the touch of labor. And I think every one will agree with me that the machinery of this development is of two kinds—first, capital; and, second, labor. These two things together will develop this country of ours, and make it one of the greatest countries on this earth. Capital and labor are joined with each other; the one depends on the other. Capital will go where it finds labor to use it as an instrument. Labor will come where it finds capital to set it at work and pay it its wage. If capital is cheap, other things being equal, labor will be the more abundant, because more capital will be expended in the development of a country's resources; and if labor is cheap, other things being equal, capital will get a greater return for its outlay, and its expenditure receive greater impetus. There is another question to be considered in this connection. I think this House will agree with me when I say that the opening up of internal communication and the bringing in of immigrants from other countries, are the two prime interests of this country, and the two best means that can be adopted to promote this bringing in of capital and setting to work of labor. I acknowledge that not many years ago, as I was seated in the gallery of this House, when the measure was brought in to build a line of railway from one end of this country to the other, involving the expenditure of a large amount of money, I, at first sight, drew back and wondered whether this country could afford that expenditure, and whether the policy was a wise one; but when I began to think, when I heard the matter discussed—saw in my imagination what is now almost a reality—a broad line of communication stretching across this continent, along which capital and labor poured in, I felt it to be one of the wisest and best strokes of policy that any Government ever inaugurated for the country. I found it was not an extravagant expenditure, but that, looking into the future, it was the best and wisest expenditure we could make. I think I have come pretty near to what I consider the line we should draw in this matter of immigration—what should be the class of immigration we should have. If the hon. Minister of Agriculture were standing before three great classes of laborers, brought for his inspection, so that he might decide which of the three was fitted to be introduced into the country, I would bring up one of the class as a representative and say: "This man is very industrious; he works hard and constantly, but he is ignorant and not very honest." The hon. Minister of Agriculture would say to him: "Stand aside till I see the others." I would then bring up a representative of the second class, and say: "This man represents a class who are strong in labor, industrious and intelligent, but not very good and honest in character." Again, the hon. Minister would say: "Stand aside until I hear from the third." If I could bring up the third, and say: "Here is a man, the representative of a class of immigrants who is not only industrious, intelligent and strong, but is good, honest and true. The class which he represented would, I think, be the one chosen by the hon. Minister as the most proper to settle in the country. That is where I would draw the line—if we are to draw any line—not a line of race, creed or color, but a line which would take in these three great distinctions. While I would sift out the idle, ignorant and immoral, I would bring in as far as possible, the industrious, the intelligent and the honest. I think that is a better line to draw than to say that after these centuries of progress and refinement, during which the tendency has always been to break