

cling tenaciously, and upon which I believe, Sir, this question may be decided one way or the other. If you admit we clearly have this right to restrict—yes, Sir, to refuse admission to Canada—all persons we consider not to be desirable, if we once admit that right, if we once realize that that right has been asserted by the British government and by the Overseas Dominions, surely we place ourselves in a position where we no longer fear the argument. But we have it again in the Statutes of Canada, 111-IV George V, 1913, referred to this afternoon by the mover of this resolution. Let me just put on record what is definitely stated in the statutes:

Nothing in the said treaty or in this act shall be deemed to repeal or affect any of the provisions of the Immigration Act.

Now I have read the provisions of the Immigration Act as they are and as they have been on the statute books for many years. I have read this treaty with Japan. In other words the Japanese government in 1896, in 1905, and in 1913 admitted and embalmed in these treaties our right to restrict their immigration if we so chose. The Imperial government has urged us to so restrict it. Now, Sir, what remains to be done? Simply that we exercise this inalienable right in the interest of the Dominion of Canada as a whole.

Now let me turn to another point in this matter, let me refer to the Washington Conference. It has been said that owing to the peculiar manner in which the British Empire was closely, and intimately one could say, allied with Japan that nothing should be done by Canada that might in any way disturb the kindly relations between the two. With that I am wholly in accord but, Sir, only a few months ago in Washington this dual responsibility was ended, and the burden of the solving of the problems of the Pacific was placed upon the shoulders of four great nations—Great Britain, France, the United States and Japan. These four great nations entered into a treaty that, whenever questions arose of a perplexing or threatening character, a conference would be held and a solution would be found. I want to say to the House that that pact at Washington removed from Great Britain a very serious anxiety and perplexity indeed. Now, Sir, I wish to take a step further. Leaving that Imperial question, leaving the international question which I think I have shown—

Mr. McKENZIE: Before my hon. friend leaves that point with which he has been
[Mr. Stevens.]

splendidly dealing, does he notice the distinction which the mover of the resolution makes between "restriction" and "exclusion." The two things are very different indeed. Which of the two does my hon. friend favour?

Mr. STEVENS: I take, without reservation, the position of exclusion. I am grateful to my hon. friend for raising the point. It was that there is a finely drawn distinction between what was an adequate restriction on the one hand and exclusion on the other, and that brought about these very conferences and the correspondence to which I have referred, and which resulted in the Natal Act being adopted by the other Dominions, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand. While, perhaps, the act does not state frankly that they are going to exclude, yet in effect it does exclude, and it was to obtain that result that this act was passed. This is not a restrictive act; it is an exclusion act. I said a moment ago that I was not here to say that this is the best method, but I do say that it is an effective method, and if we are to go by precedents, if it has been adopted, as it has, and been in operation for many years by the other Dominions, we are justified, at least, in taking a step to that extent.

"Canada a white man's country" is not merely an empty phrase. I want to say to the House that this is an essential doctrine. The time has come that we must determine in Canada whether we are going to preserve this country as peculiarly and essentially a white man's country, or whether we are going to share its resources, its national, social and economical life, with other races, whose type of civilization, however good, is distinct wholly from ours. The other Dominions have had this problem before them for many years in a very active and vital form, but you will notice that in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa there are large areas that are semi-tropical, in which, perhaps, there is some excuse for saying that those areas are not a white man's country, but no man on earth can say that Canada is not essentially, climatically and in every other way a white man's country. It is necessary for us to take cognizance of this point, that we must determine whether or not Canada is going to be preserved as a white man's country. We may make blunders in taxing or in penal laws, but we can rectify those blunders at the next session of Parliament, or in the next generation, but if we make a blunder in this regard and allow the entry