

the inherent racial pride of the Anglo-Saxon that forbids him, and I for one am not prepared to stifle that racial pride, as it is the secret of our national success.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the rate of wages paid to Asiatic labour in the sawmills, on the farms and in the fisheries?

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot say exactly; but I understand that now in our sawmills some of the more trained Asiatics who have been working for a few years get as high as \$1.75 a day. In the fisheries men are usually paid for the fish they catch. I have already pointed out that on the fisheries of the Skeena, whereas fifteen years ago the white fishermen were paid 25 cents a fish, to-day the Asiatic fishermen are paid only 10 cents or 12½ cents. But let me only supplement that with this observation—when the canners paid 25 cents fifteen years ago, the canneries received only \$4.50 to \$5 a case for their fish pack, to-day they are receiving as high, I think, as \$9 a case. I am not sure what this year's pack brought, but it was somewhere in that neighbourhood.

This shows that they could well afford to pay the white fishermen. I do not blame the cannery men for getting all they can secure; but I do say that it is the duty of the people of this country to build up on their coast line a population which I am always glad to denominate a defence line for their country. I was taken to task in the lobbies of this House a year or two ago by a friend from Nova Scotia, for my attitude in this matter. I said to him: 'You have a fine fishing population in Nova Scotia.' He answered: 'We have, and we are proud of it.' I said: 'Suppose that inside of a year or two those fishermen were supplanted by Japanese, how would you feel about it?' It is not a case of maudlin sentiment about these people or admiring their advancement; it is a case of self-preservation from the national standpoint, and it is the duty of this country to see to it that every avenue of leakage is stopped so far as our national life is concerned.

Now, referring to the Hindu question. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) in a rather tragic manner, drew attention to this question in terms something like these. He said: Mr. Speaker, how would you like to be placed in the position this Hindu was placed in, who was a British subject as you are and as I am? I am quite prepared to agree that

the Hindus, of India, generally speaking are British subjects. But I draw a distinction which, I am frank to say, very few people agree with me in, but still I am going to give it. While the Hindu is a British subject and entitled to the protection of the British Crown, he is not a British citizen even in his own country, because he does not exercise the rights of citizenship in a democratic way. There are only sixteen millions of people in India who live to-day under an elective form of Government, and these include the populations of the city of Calcutta, Bombay, Rangoon and others. These sixteen millions live under an elective form of Government, but only half the council is elected and the other half is appointed by the Government of India. So, there is practically no such thing as democratic government and citizenship in India. I hold that before the Hindu has the right to come to Canada or any part of the empire and claim the privileges of citizenship, he should at least attain that right in his own country. I am not going to enter into a discussion whether or not home rule for India is a desirable thing. That is a distinct question from this, and I will not confuse the two. I point out that the Hindus do not exercise these rights in India, and I say they have no right to come and demand here a privilege that they do not exercise in their own country.

There is another aspect of the question: My hon. friend from Rouville was very eloquent in his defence of a certain Hindu named Bhagwan Singh. It is my intention to deal with that case; and I know from my observations of the last two or three years that the hon. member for Rouville would not, and will not, support a man who has been guilty of actions such as Bhagwan Singh and his friends are guilty of at the present time. The trouble is that the hon. member spoke without being properly informed as to the actual facts. His intentions were good, but when an hon. member undertakes to bring a charge of dereliction of duty against a government, he should first familiarize himself with the details of the case. The hon. gentleman based his information upon two or three newspaper reports, written at the coast and sent to the eastern newspapers, and he also quoted the authority of a gentleman named W. W. Baer. Mr. Baer is the Liberal organizer for British Columbia, but I do not think that at the present moment he is in the