

some special offence hovering around the word "exclusion," but if it was thought that there was, we were prepared to substitute for it another word. Now, how are we met? We are met, in the first place, by an amendment which says that it is the duty of Canada to put in operation a policy of effective restriction. If that had the same meaning as what we desired to have Parliament express, that would be quite as good to us; but "effective restriction" is one thing and "effective exclusion" is another. Restriction means letting in certain—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend a question, please?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the difference between the expression "effective exclusion" and "exclusion"?

Mr. MEIGHEN: None at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not pretend there was. But effective restriction means that we should adopt a policy of letting some more into this country and keeping some others out—letting some in and keeping some out. That is what effective restriction means.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is it that is murmuring? Am I not making myself clear?

Mr. DUFF: Do not look at me, please.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For myself, I do not want to be a party to a resolution which affirms it to be the will of this Parliament that we should adopt a policy of letting some more into the country. I do not approve of that course, even if it is accompanied by a policy of "effective restriction." Now, my hon. friend says that we can have exclusion all right if we do not use the word. Well, I have tried to meet him in that respect, and I will try again. But I want him to understand now—and I say this without the slightest offence—that I am not prepared, for my part, to agree to a resolution which means something that I do not believe should be the future policy of this country, even

[Mr. Meighen.]

though to say that may help him to make something else the policy. I do not think that is the right way of getting any policy. If we want a certain policy, let us express our desire for it, not in language that is offensive; let us choose language that can carry with it no offence at all. I do not know why "exclusion" has become a word to be shunned, but if it has, let us use something else. I used the word "prohibition," and also I suggested that after the word "immigration," in order that there could be no room for misunderstanding at all, the words "for residence purposes" be inserted. My hon. friend does not discuss the merits or demerits of the word "prohibition." I adopt it only because it is the word that had been adopted before in the language of the act of 1910. Now, I suggest this—and I ask the Government to consider it; if they do not, then it appears to me there is no use of our trying further to come to common ground—that instead of the words "securing the exclusion of future immigration of this type" we use this phrase: "bringing to an end further such immigration for residence purposes."

Some hon. MEMBERS: What is that, again?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will read the whole resolution with that inserted instead of the words it would replace. I am not moving it by way of amendment for the moment, but I should be glad to have that done if it meets with the approval of the Government:

That, in the opinion of this House, the immigration of oriental aliens and their rapid multiplication is becoming a serious menace to living conditions, particularly on the Pacific coast, and to the future of the country in general, and the Government should take immediate action with a view to bringing to an end further such immigration for residence purposes.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) which was carried on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,	Cahill,
Beaubien,	Caldwell,
Béland,	Campbell,
Binette,	Cardin,
Bird,	Carrall,
Black (Huron),	Carruthers,
Boivin,	Chevrier,
Boucher,	Chisholm,
Bourassa,	Clifford,
Brown,	Copp,
Bureau,	Crerar,