

but I may remind him that very much cleverer and very much greater men than he is have come into my own constituency and have discussed this matter. In fact, when the right hon. gentleman who is his leader was in that constituency in the year 1910 he was able to lay aside the great thoughts which must have occupied his mind and come down to parochial politics and say a few words about that telegram. In addition to that my opponent in that constituency, who is the owner of a daily Liberal paper—very Liberal, almost Grit—featured this particular matter daily throughout the campaign. The net result of all the cannonading that went on was that my majority was increased from 13 to 484. Having stood, as we have, the onslaught of the great guns of the Liberal party, the hon. member for Moosejaw must pardon me if I do not get very much excited at the noise that a political pogon like himself sometimes makes. The hon. gentleman twits the members from British Columbia with regard to the action they took on the debate on the Japanese treaty when that matter was up for discussion last year. I am not now going into an argument on that question. I was not in Ottawa at the time of the debate, but I have read it very carefully since, and all that I wish to say is that I am thoroughly satisfied with the interpretation and construction put upon that treaty by the leader of the Government, and I do not think it is necessary to refer further to that to-night.

With regard to the speeches of the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for Rouville this afternoon, there was a very great difference between them. I do not wish to misconstrue the language of the hon. member for Rouville, but I must say that the impression he left on my mind was that the Chinese were good and would make good citizens because they were good domestic servants, and because we wanted to trade with them; that the Japanese were good, and would make good citizens because they had a very excellent state of civilization; and that the Hindus should be allowed to come in because they were British subjects. I may have misinterpreted the hon. gentleman's remarks, but that is the impression he left on my mind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If that is the impression the hon. gentleman received, it is a wrong impression.

Mr. BARNARD: I am prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's statement; but at any rate he radically differed from the views expressed by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and it is with the latter that I find myself in accord.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend would allow me to make my position clear, I might say briefly that I am against the Hindu immigration, but I discussed this afternoon the right of even a Hindu immigrant to claim the benefit of a writ of habeas corpus as a British subject. Second, I am for the Japanese immigration under the terms of the agreement arrived at between the Japanese authorities and the Canadian authorities. As regards the Chinese, I say that there is a very heavy tax imposed upon the Chinese; it cannot be decently increased if we are to have any regard for the market of the Orient, and besides that I consider that the fact that all my friends from British Columbia employ them as domestics shows that after all they are not bad immigrants.

Mr. BARNARD: All I can say to my hon. friend is that I think he had better very carefully revise 'Hansard' to-morrow morning. I am not going to-night into the question of the merits of Hindu immigration. That ground has been very fully covered by the hon. member for Vancouver and, at any rate, I do not think that it is a matter which admits of any argument from the point of view of British Columbia. One has only to look at the disturbances in Natal to-day, or go to the southern states of America, to see what a racial question means, where you have a large body of citizens in a country who cannot assimilate with the majority. The people of British Columbia will not stand for Hindu immigration. It may just as well be understood, and in no uncertain terms, for as I know these people there—and I say it in all seriousness—I firmly believe that in resisting immigration of that kind they will go to lengths which it is very undesirable indeed should be discussed here.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on some points connected with this discussion that I flatter myself are somewhat important and more or less new. First of all, let me refer to the usual severe onslaught made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) upon imperialism. He sets up, as usual, a man of straw and proceeds, with considerable