the present moment the Act they then proposed would not be satisfactory to them, and we hope that the legislation now proposed, and which is more stringent than the Bill they suggested, will satisfy the most exacting, as well as the most reasonable men who are interested in the progress of the Province. In 1884 the British Columbia Legislature sent a petition to this Government asking that "an Act be introdaced by the Dominion Government restricting and regu-lating the immigration of Chinese." I am quoting this last and most forcible demand of British Columbia to compare it with the measure which is now before the House, the title of which and the provisions of which are exactly the same as suggested by the petition of 1884. I might now, perhaps, mention the measures of repression adopted, the different Acts passed by several colonies and nations of the world in respect to Chinese immigration into those countries. As far back as the end of the 16th century and the begginning of the 17th, in the Island of Manila, the Chinese were found to be too numerous, too obtrusive and too much inclined to encroach upon the rights of others. We read in history that edicts and regulations were resorted to to prevent the influx of Chinese; they had become so numerous that the Spaniards took up arms in 1603, and a general massacre which 30,000 Chinese ensued in were killed. In 1634, 39,000 Chinese were still on the island. Another massacre took place in which 20,000 were killed and at that time 7,000 surrendered. Strange to say 50 years afterwards the Chinese were again masters of the island, and it was only after a strong administration had passed a decree that they were expelled in 1709. In 1762 they were still in sufficient numbers on the island to be of great assistance to the British forces in conquering it. In Java the same treatment was given the Chinese by the Dutch population who had settled upon that island. In 1730 a measure of oppression was passed against them, and in 1740 the Chinese were all deported ; but a little time afterwards the race had returned in such numbers that history relates that 10,000 of them were killed. At Singapore, Penang, Malacca under British rule there are now over 200,000 Chinese, who are considered, I must say, as most valuable settlers in the interest of British trade in those islands. In the Australian colonies to which we have to look for legislation in regard to this question, an Act was passed in Victoria in 1864, which was afterwards repealed by an Act passed in 1865, which contained the following provisions :-- "The master of every ship having passengers on board shall distinctly specify and state in his list of passengers, to be examined by the Collector of Customs, those who are Chinese immigrants, and in default the offender shall be liable to a penalty of  $\pounds 200.$ " Penalties are also enacted against those who obstruct officers in the discharge of their duty. By the Act of 1881 a penalty of  $\pounds 100$ was imposed upon all owners and masters of vessels who carry a greater number than one Chinese immigrant for every 100 tons register of the vessel, and each immigrant is called upon to pay £10 entry money, an exception to those penalties being made in the case of Chinese who come into the colony and who are British subjects. I must say that the provisions of the statute appear to be rather severe. In New South Wales, in 1881, legislation was passed somewhat similar to that 1 have already mentioned, and also imposing an entry payment of  $\pounds 10$ . If we wanted precedents for legislation upon the subject we would have to come to the United States. The Chinese restriction Act was passed on the 5th August, 1882, after an agitation that had continued from 1872 to that date, or over 10 years. That Act was not superseded exactly but was amended by an Act passed in 1884, on the 5th day of August, which came into force 90 days after it was | should have happened, but you know the presidential elecpassed, and is to continue for ten years. That legislation, as | tions are coming, and we must reckon upon the Irish votes, is well known, is prohibitory legislation. As to whether it has | and the Irish population are all down on your people and worked beneficially in California is a question which is not they would resent any action taken in this matter. I am yet well settled. Whether it is owing to the too great much afraid you will have to swallow the insult to your fellow

stringency of the law or to the persistency and constancy of the Chinese immigrants coming into that renowned land, it is difficult to say; but complaints are made that the Act up to this moment has not worked very satisfactorily, and has given rise to a great many suits and proceedings before the courts. So we see that almost everywhere the Chinese have grown, except where British rule prevails, they have gradually grown to such an extent that stringent measures had to be taken against them. From 1849 to 1859, after the period of the discovery of gold in large quantities in California, Chinese immigration b gan; and not only was it well received in the United States, but it was welcomed, it was induced to come. And when a treaty had been made with China, opening five of her ports to the commerce of the European nations that had forced that treaty on her, every one knows that in 1856 a special treaty called, I think, the Burlinghame Treaty, was entered into, at the instance of the American Government, between China and the United States, creating more intimate relations with the American Government than even those which had been imposed by these European nations upon China by the first treaty. Strange to say, in that land of extreme liberty, persecution raged as fiercely as amongst the Spaniards of Manila one hundred years before, and the strong arm of the federal authority could alone prevent the renewal of those brutal massacres. "Although," an American writer says, "they had been welcomed, and they were our friends; although in 1862, they took part in the processions of the 4th of July, and were received as good citizens of the United States, if they chose to be so; yet in 1872 it would have been impossible for them to show themselves at our feasts and holidays; they would not have dared to mix in the national festivities." Between 1872 and the date of the passing of an Act of Congress the most atrocious acts of barbarity were committed upon them, under the eyes of the authorities of the State of California-committed against a peaceful population, who had been brought to American shores by American diplomacy, and by the inducements of American merchants and agents. The "Sand lotters," as they were called, having at their head the notorious Dennis Kearney, kept San Francisco in a state of terror, and everyone who has read, knows what atrocities were committed during a long period of time, under the eyes even of the Federal authorities without repression. It is true that there the laboring element, the voting element. in a great measure, in that land of universal suffrage, prevailed, and was soon turned into a mob element-an element which was so strong as to prevent even the Federal Government from enforcing the laws of that country. That reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a little reminiscence of those days, a word of witty sarcasm attributed to the Chinese Consul General in San Francisco, and it will prove that that nation is not so far behind, or so degenerated as some people would believe them to be. The wit of the answer which was given by this gentleman, was worthy of any English or French wit. The story goes to say that one day, before the eyes of an officer, two or three young Chinese children were pelted by soldiers, first with apples and then with stones. An English gentleman who happened to be present, had remonstrated, but in vain, and had reported the inhumane conduct of the soldiers and the criminal stupidity of the officer. The Consul General heard of it, and being on his way to Washington, when he was there, he made representations to the Secretary of State, asking him that the authorities should take proceedings so as to punish the offenders. The American Minister after hesitating a little, smiled and said : "Well you know, sir, I think it is very wrong that such a thing