

retail merchants associations of British Columbia are to a certain extent, or to a considerable extent, very strongly affiliated with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and we all know the scope, the policy and the politics of that particular body. I do not think we should give the impression from British Columbia that any strong body of the people there are opposed to this bill. Far from it. There are minor faults or minor flaws in the bill which I hope the government will see their way to remedy. That is what the committee is for. I would suppose, having introduced the bill and admitted the principle of it, the government will be consistent enough to see that it is made workable.

But apart from the minor faults, which I will briefly refer to later, I will say that the only fault I have to find is that the minister did not insert the words "Asiatic origin" instead of the words "Chinese origin" which would make it apply to Japanese. If he had taken that step how he would have immortalized himself in western Canada! We would have been hanging halos around his hallowed brow for all time to come. But apart from that feature, I think it must be admitted that this bill is a sincere attempt to carry out the assurances given last year by the Prime Minister, and it will meet with a certain measure of support in British Columbia so far, at least, as it goes. Just last week I picked up a British Columbia paper. You know they carry a column headed "Twenty Years Ago," and in that column it mentioned that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had moved in the House—this is about three weeks ago now—a motion to increase the Chinese head tax from \$100 to \$500. Of course the paper at that time applauded the increase. That, so far as I know, has been the only genuine attempt to deal with that question from that day to this, and twenty years have come and gone since then. It is only twenty years after that occasion that we again find a Liberal government taking hold of the situation.

There are one or two clauses that, I wish to point out, could be improved. Paragraph (b) of clause 5 says:

The children born in Canada of parents of Chinese race or descent, who have left Canada for educational or other purposes, on substantiating their identity to the satisfaction of the controller at the port or place where they seek to enter on their return;

I think that should be made more definite. Only to ask them to substantiate their identity when they return is not sufficient. They ought to substantiate it before they go. Until recently, at all events, if we went home to Great Britain, which might be our native

country, we had to have passports and to go through considerable red tape to get them. Surely it is not too much to ask Chinese children, who go to China intending to return to Canada, to substantiate their identity before they go, so that possibility of evasion when they return might be made less easy.

Paragraph (c) of clause 5 is the one that deals with merchants and students. That has been badly printed. By a mistake in the way it is printed, the intention is materially changed. The word "degrees" at the top of page 4 should be the end of a line, and then it should begin "who shall," in such a way that the words "who shall substantiate" would apply to both merchants and students. As it reads now, it gives the impression, which I have heard repeatedly commented upon, that the word "merchant" in subclause (1) has absolutely no restriction on it whatever, and that is the meaning of it as the paragraph is now printed. It goes on to say "students. . . who shall substantiate" but for lack of precision in printing and its being printed in the way that I have mentioned, a wrong impression is given—it is really intended to say that both classes, merchants and students, shall substantiate their status. The way the paragraph is printed, it applies only to the one word "student," and this has given rise to the impression that the merchant is going to have a very wide-open door.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said that it was decided to determine who should be considered as merchants or students before they left China, and the drift of his remarks was that their status would be ascertained, if not decided, in China. As regards that clause, I was glad to hear that explanation; but the clause says only that the passports shall be endorsed or visé by a Canadian immigration officer at the place where the Chinamen leave. But it also says that the final decision shall be at the port of entry, because there the Chinamen shall substantiate their status to the satisfaction of the controller, subject to the approval of the minister. We have there a sort of dual control. Certainly it would appear to me that the first officer in China had little or nothing to do except to put his imprimatur on the passport. If it was intended that he should be the deciding official, his powers in that regard should be better defined. As two men are involved, this matter of putting the visé on the passport will drift into a mere formality. He will do what is formally known as visé-ing a passport; he will simply put his name on it. I think the bill could be improved a great deal in that respect.