

pass, there is ground, outside and beyond that which to-day is pre-empted and well worked by the corporations, for the beneficent working of government ownership in a thousand different ways and with great advantage to the people of Canada.

Let me go on now with the Japanese and Chinese question. I do not think I ever heard quite such an argument as my right hon. friend put before the House and this country to-night. Mr. Speaker, what was that argument? Will you allow me to present it, just in plain English? You cannot, he says, treat the Japanese as you would treat and have treated the Chinese. Well, why not? What are his reasons why? One power is powerful and has a big stick, the other is weak and disunited, and therefore you must treat it justly, but you can be unjust to it. What an argument for the right hon. gentleman who heads the government of Canada. Another argument: the one has rich gain in her lap for you; the other you have not much chance of getting trade gains from; therefore treat them differently, because sordid, selfish gain would prompt you to do it. The argument is immoral, publicly immoral. If there is anything like right and truth and justice, the Chinese should have his measure of it just as much as the Japanese. It should not depend on might or power, pelf or gain, getting or giving. It should depend on the real rights of men to certain treatment in certain cases. I take issue with my right hon. friend as to the question: suppose you were going to put yourself into disfavour with either people, which would you put yourself into disfavour with? It is not necessary to put yourself into disfavour with either. I make no disrespectful allusion to the great progress and the quick development of the Japanese when I tell you that that old civilization which lies on the other side of the water opposite to Japan, with its three or four hundred millions of patient, diligent, sober people, has in its possibilities which so far outshine and outswamp those that belong to Japan, with its smaller country and its confined areas, that to the sagacious statesman looking to the future there is no question at all, if you put it on that low ground, as to whose susceptibilities we should be careful of. Does my right hon. friend think the Chinese are altogether uncivilized? Has he forgotten that for fifteen hundred years or more the germs of a great and mighty wisdom have settled into their hearts and minds and moulded their character, and that in these late years of inspiration and upheaval such a change has taken place in the mighty empire of China as has not taken place amongst any other people in modern times? But again, I come back to this, that you should treat the peoples of the earth from right and justice, and not from expediency of gain or from fear. Now my

right hon. friend comes again with his private correspondence. It is the old North Atlantic Trading Company again. There he had something which he would show to the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition thanked him and said, what is good enough for me is good enough for my followers behind me, and it is fair that all should be treated alike. Now my right hon. friend comes and says, I have private correspondence which I may some time show the leader of the opposition which will exonerate me. For my own part, I am not disposed to press this question unfairly. I will state simply my own view of it. When I voted on that Japanese treaty ratification last session, I did it on the strength of the representations that were made by the Prime Minister as to the limitations of emigration from Japan and on my own knowledge of what I thought the commercial result might be to us. That I did understand; the other I knew not. But when my right hon. friend made the statement, which of course he acknowledges to have made, and which he leaves us to infer he made in good faith—and I am not going to question it for a moment—then I say that responsibility for the ratification of that treaty fell off my shoulders and the shoulders of gentlemen on this side of the House and in this House generally. But there has been some miscarriage. My right hon. friend is not going to charge the Japanese government with failure and we do not wish him to do so. If the Prime Minister's version of it turns out to be true, there must be this simple explanation that in a moment of inadvertence and in the press of work after the great war the Japanese government forgot the limitations it had placed in the hands of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier); and no doubt, as soon as its attention is brought to these limitations, that government will honourably carry out every pledge it gave. I am willing to let the matter rest until that is solved, and I let it rest in the hope and the belief that a just solution will be reached. I am not disposed to draw a colour line in this country. I am not disposed to put up a race line. I am not disposed to say that any man in the universe, because of a certain colour or race, no matter what may be his attainments and character or qualifications in other respects, shall be shut out from this country. But I am bound to maintain that we have the right to keep this a white man's country and not allow the interests, the institutions and the labour of this country to be dominated by any other element. And I have no doubt, if we are wise and patient, we shall have no trouble in preserving our integrity and preventing any such result as we would all deplore. British Columbia, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says, has no neighbour but Japan. He has forgotten