

contains some features which render it almost equally objectionable to the Bill which was before us last year. The junior member for Halifax has with great propriety called attention to a defect in the first clause and has expressed his desire to make an alteration in it. I concur in the view he expressed, but would go a little further: if we want to do the right thing, instead of putting a tax of \$50 on Chinese women, I would give them a premium for coming. I believe it would be for the interest of this country to induce respectable married Chinese women to come to this country, instead of putting a tax on them. The second clause is, to my judgment, somewhat unnecessary, inasmuch as the old law provides that tourists and scientific men can pass through the country without a tax of this kind. I would be quite unwilling to put the matter so entirely and exclusively under the control of one individual as to say that all the regulations as to the passage of tourists and scientific men through Canada should be in accordance with and under such regulations as may be made by the Minister of Customs for such purpose—putting it in the power of one individual to make such regulations as would affect the whole of this matter—the entry, passing in and through our country of every visitor or tourist from China. I think it is entirely wrong and entirely unnecessary. Then I notice in the next clause, which provides for the issuing of permits to depart and return, that if the Chinaman does not return within three months his original certificate may be cancelled, and, on returning to Canada after that date, he is to be subject to a payment of a fee of \$50 as in the case of a first arrival. I believe the Minister has intimated his willingness to extend the permit for a term of six months. My hon. friend from Alberton has shown that six months is scarcely time enough to go from Canada to China and return, if the Chinaman wishes to stay a short time with his friends and relatives. Further on I find that there is a sub-clause which, it appears to me, conflicts with clause 17 of the Act which it professes to amend. It also changes the penalty, and increases it very much. Under the former law the penalty was

not to exceed \$500. In this Bill it is proposed that the penalty shall not be less than \$500, and a very serious addition to it of imprisonment for a term of not less than twelve months. A little further down I notice another change in the law, providing that certain portions of the money shall be returned to the province where the immigrant has landed. I do not like to treat this Bill with such disrespect as to move that it be read this day three months, and I am disposed to let it go to Committee, there to deal with the clauses that are thought desirable to amend: but I should certainly greatly prefer, if I got any encouragement from the House, to bring in a Bill to repeal the Chinese Act of last year.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Move it and you will be supported.

HON. CARVELL—I do not agree with the hon. gentleman from Alberton in his opening remarks in which he expressed regret that this subject should be again brought before the House. I think it is a matter of congratulation not only to the Senate but to the country at large that there should be another and better opportunity, such as has been afforded this evening, for hon. gentlemen to express their disapproval and disapprobation of the Chinese restriction legislation in existence in this country. I have always felt from the time the question first came before the House that it was legislating in the wrong direction, and is not creditable to us as Canadians and British subjects. I would be very glad if every hon. gentleman in this House would express his feeling against it, and that it should go forth to the world that the Senate of Canada has no sympathy with this unjust treatment of the Chinese.

HON. MR. DEVER—I do not wish to be considered as a great philanthropist in this House, but I rise to say that I wish to record my vote against the principle of this Bill. It is one of those measures that is completely hostile to my feelings as a liberty loving man. In this Canada of ours, instead of showing to the world that we are obstructionists, that we are not desirous of mingling with or having intercourse with the world, or