

orm work which perhaps is necessary to the last degree for the public convenience or comfort, he is not to be hindered in doing it because a body of white men, acting in union and exercising influence upon members of Parliament, wish to prevent him." They have no right to say that any body of immigrants shall not come into this country or work for whatever wages they are willing to take: it is an interference with natural liberty, an interference with the liberty of the whole country, and ought not to be permitted for one moment. I am willing to accord fully and freely to all laboring men such rights as are indefeasible, but I do not think we should allow them to become tyrants, whether the people over whom they domineer are Chinese or white men. We must stand up not merely for the rights of the Chinese, but for the rights of all who are willing to labor. I feel that we should be doing ourselves great injury by throwing unnecessary obstacles in the way of the introduction of this useful body of laboring men into the country. Since the House resumed, I have not heard from any one gentleman any of the old subjects of declamation against the Chinese; therefore, it is quite unnecessary for me or anybody else to defend them. If the Chinese are open to any objections on the ground of immorality or dishonesty, or if they violate our laws in any other way, I say by all means place them under the most rigid police regulations, but that is a very different thing from a prohibitory law, and I think the distinction ought to be quite clear between the two. Control the Chinese, by all means, when you have them here: if they do not behave as they should, compel them to obey the law, or banish them, but do not prohibit their entering into the country because of their nationality. I do not see how it is at all consistent with the treaties that Great Britain has made with China, for one of her colonies to place on the Statute book, and maintain there, such a law as we are called upon to discuss this evening. One other instance I recall of a nation injuring itself by refusing to grant religious liberty to its subjects, and another nation receiving those subjects and being benefitted

largely by granting them an asylum: I allude to France at the time of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. There were in France, at that time, a people who exercised their religion under a charter derived, I think, from the great Monarch. That charter was abrogated, and the consequence was that this large body of Protestants refused to remain in their native country; they exercised, in my opinion, a sublime act of courage and sincerity. They left their homes; they left whatever they could not carry with them, and established themselves in various parts of the United Kingdom. Their descendants are there to this day. They are to be traced by their names, and in many instances by other indications as well. They have always been a body of people remarkable for their high-toned morality, their industry, their taste and skill. To them England owes her success in the silk manufactures. In that particular branch they have always been exceedingly successful. Anyone who is well acquainted with the old country recognizes particular spots where these exiled Frenchmen have been settled for several centuries. We ought to look at these things and learn something from the lessons of history. It is no use to shut our eyes to facts. Here is an industrious population and we want industrious people in Canada. They offer to come to us, and we say "you cannot come except under certain conditions"; it seems to me that it would be wise, not exactly to reject the Bill, but to deprive it of its obnoxious features.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THE ORDER DISCHARGED AND A NEW BILL INTRODUCED.

The order of the day having been balled—second reading of Bill (L) "The Indian Act Amendment Bill"—

HON. MR. ABBOTT said: This Bill was handed to me without having had proper revision by the Minister in whose