

Now, it seems to me that the position of the matter was practically this. The government tell us that at that time and continuously since they have received assurances that Japanese emigration would be restricted. They certainly produce a letter from Mr. Nosse, written in March, 1903, which would indicate the truth of this statement, and which of course we cannot deny and do not wish to deny. But, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a memorandum of Mr. Scott, the Secretary of State, of September 25, 1905, in which he states that the government proposes without reserve to adhere to the treaty of 1894, and goes on to say:

Since those dates Japan has enacted a law limiting emigration to foreign countries, thus removing one of the objections that influenced the government of Canada in declining to become a party to the treaty with Japan in 1897.

I merely wish to say that whoever wrote this memorandum lost sight of the fact that in 1897 it did not matter what Japan did in regard to emigration, because this country had the absolute right, in becoming a party to that treaty, to reserve our rights with reference to the regulation of immigration; so that the reason given is both fallacious and untrue. The memorandum of Mr. Scott goes on to say:

It is doubtful whether Japan would now agree to a treaty on any other basis than the proposals contained in the original treaty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the people of this country have a right to complain of is this. The government say that they have assurances ample and clear from the Japanese government that emigration of Japanese labourers will be restricted. If they have those assurances, they have been warned that any laws restricting emigration from Japan could be revoked. If the Japanese law restricted emigration, I would like to ask why this government did not ask to have the restrictive clause put into the treaty, that being in exact line with the policy of the Japanese government, as embodied in its statutes, and the verbal declarations of its ministers and officials. Can it be alleged that Japan would not agree in 1905 to what was its declared policy? Had the Japanese one policy for the closet and another for the public? No; the conduct of Japan throughout this whole matter has been thoroughly honourable. If anybody is to blame, it is not the Japanese government, but this government, in failing to have inserted in the treaty the clause which the Japanese had agreed to in 1897, and which their assurances from that day to this have been fully in accord with. It was the duty of this government, in the interest of the labouring people and all the people of this country, to maintain the right of Canada to control its own immigration. They failed to

ask for that very thing which the assurances they are now boasting of would undoubtedly have given them the right to ask for if those assurances were true in fact. This government, however, were willing to rush wildly into this treaty, not only without having reasons of a commercial character for doing so, but also without asking for those assurances which the government of Japan ever since 1897 had been willing to give. So if we have an unsatisfactory state of affairs in British Columbia to-day, it is due to that failure on the part of this administration. I do not believe my hon. friends from British Columbia were as fully apprised of the facts in relation to this matter in August, 1905, as they are to-day, or I venture to say that all of them would have been after the government to see that they did not overlook the interests of British Columbia in this matter. If the members from that province will examine the records of parliament they will be convinced that both in 1897 and in 1905 this government has been derelict in its duty not only to the people of British Columbia, but to people of the whole of Canada.

At six o'clock. House took recess.

#### After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

#### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—Mr. Telford.

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

#### SUPPLY—JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

House resumed debate on the motion for Supply and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. BRISTOL. In commenting on the action of the government in 1905, when it rushed into this treaty with Japan, I do not lose sight of the fact that in September, 1905, the government, or some member of it, received a letter from Mr. Nossé telling them that while he gave every possible assurance that there would be no trouble over the immigration question, at the same time he thought the Japanese government would refuse to enter into the treaty in the way in which they had agreed to enter into it in 1897. I venture, however, to submit that in a matter of so much importance this government ought not to have taken what might be, in the language of the street, termed the bluff of Mr. Nossé, and have allowed themselves to be drawn into making an absolute treaty with Japan. On the contrary, the duty and obligation rested on this government, if they proposed to enter into this treaty, of negotiat-