

Alberton in his expression of regret that the Bill has been re-introduced to-day, because it has given rise to this discussion. I think it is a very great advantage that we have had this discussion, and have had the pleasure of hearing the noble sentiments that have been expressed here to-night with respect to this blot that is upon our statute books, and that we have had such very emphatic and distinct testimony as to the sobriety, the industry and general good behavior of those people whom by our law we would exclude from the country. I think, therefore, instead of it being a matter of regret we should be well satisfied that this discussion has taken place. I very fully concur in the sentiments which have been expressed with reference to the inconsistency of such a law being found on the statute book of any part of Her Majesty's dominions. It seems to me utterly incongruous with our idea of that freedom and liberty which every branch of the human family, no matter what their creed or color, is supposed to enjoy under the British flag, if they are peaceable and law abiding citizens. I think it is utterly inconsistent with the profession that we make as Christians. I can conceive of nothing more derogatory to our character as Christians than such legislation as we have now before us. The hon. member for Ottawa has expressed his determination that at a future stage of the Bill he will propose an amendment which will confine its operations to the Province of British Columbia. I think the whole measure is so bad, so utterly wrong and utterly indefensible, that I would not impose such a law upon British Columbia even. I do not believe that the majority of the intelligent respectable people of British Columbia desire such legislation. Whether they do or not it has been shown very forcibly to us to-night that they have no right whatever to impose on other parts of the Dominion such an obnoxious Statute. Does any other Province really wish that those Chinese should be excluded from their section of the Dominion? Would they not be welcomed in all the other Provinces? Why then should we have a law which prevents the Chinese from having the privileges which are so freely offered to them by the other

Provinces? Instead of confining the operation of this Bill to the Province of British Columbia, my idea would be, recognizing the feeling in this House, and believing that the feeling is strong enough to sustain the view that I hold, why should we allow this law to remain on our Statute Book any longer? Let the Senate, at all events, do its part toward removing this foul blot on our legislation; let us in this Chamber at all events pass a law repealing this Chinese Immigration Act. It may not be acceptable to the other House, but it will show that we have proper views of British freedom and the responsibilities that are attached to our professions as Christians. I would greatly prefer to introduce a short bill simply repealing the Chinese Immigration Act than to add on a rider or final clause restricting the operation of the Act to British Columbia. I feel satisfied that if the hon. gentleman who now leads the Senate had been with us last year, and had heard the debate on this subject he would not have introduced this Bill this session. He would have so fully recognized and appreciated the feeling of the House on this subject that he would have at once told his colleagues that there was no use in introducing such a bill as this, that it could not be passed through the Senate, and I have no doubt that they would have been guided by his opinion on the subject. He had not the opportunity of being with us last session, and very likely took no particular notice of the animated and interesting discussion we had on this subject; therefore I can readily understand that he was not prepared to raise his voice against the introduction of such a measure. Why has this Bill been introduced? I was not present when the reasons were given, but I believe they were briefly explained to the House. I know that something has been said about the Chinese evading the law, and the difficulty of maintaining the identification of parties, &c. I attach so little importance to these things, so bad do I conceive the law to be, that I would not care how often it is broken; and so far from removing any difficulty in the way of enforcing the law I would rather increase the difficulty. The Bill as it now stands