

Government Scored Re Japanese Immigration



THE question of Japanese immigration and the recent visit of Hon. Mr. Lemieux to Tokio in connection therewith was the subject of a prolonged debate in the House today. Mr. Borden pronounced upon the problem, moving what was in reality a vote of censure on the Government for refusing, in spite of the warnings of the British Government, to insert a clause in the treaty with Japan which would enable Parliament to control immigration when that treaty was ratified in 1907. The speech of the leader of the Opposition was an arraignment of the blind carelessness of the Government which had led to the present troubles. The British Columbia members reiterated their faith in the assurances obtained by Mr. Lemieux, while Sir Wilfrid Laurier laid down the doctrine that voluntary control of immigration by Japan was in every way preferable to Canadian legislation restricting the same.

There was a remarkable admission made at midnight by Hon. Sydney Fisher. Mr. Foster asked why the Minister of Agriculture had not produced the written assurance he declared he had received in Japan in 1903, while in Japan, that immigration would continue to be limited. Mr. Fisher said he had no such written assurance, although Hansard reported him as having said he had. The only excuse he could make was that he believed at the time he made the statement that he had such a document. However, he had not, and never did have. This gave Mr. Foster an opportunity of pointing out how careful Mr. Fisher should be in his assertions. That statement of the minister's had interested the House, and, after the treaty had been passed, or some time after that, Mr. Fisher blandly stated that he must have made a mistake. A very serious mistake it was, in Mr. Foster's opinion.

Mr. Foster's speech, which was not concluded until after midnight, was an eloquent criticism of the new policy of Canadian diplomacy.

Mr. Fisher continued the debate at 12:30 a. m.

Dr. Sproule followed Mr. Fisher at 1 a. m., and was followed by Armand Lavergne, who signified his intention of supporting Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the subject, as he deemed the Lemieux agreement the only solution before the people at the present time. Mr. Kennedy, of New Westminster, and Mr. Herron, of Alberta, also spoke, and Mr. Lemieux replied for the Government at 2 a. m.

Mr. Lemieux warmly defended the policy of the Government. Had Sir John Macdonald or Sir John Abbott been leading the Opposition, Mr. Lemieux claimed there would not have been this lengthy debate, but the agreement brought back by him from Japan would have been promptly ratified.

The division was taken at 2:55 a. m., there being a good attendance of members. This is the latest sitting this session. The amendment of Mr. Borden, censuring the Government, was defeated by 100 to 45, a majority of 55. The vote of the British Columbia members was greeted with derisive applause from the Opposition. A tired House adjourned at 3 a. m.

Japanese Immigration

Mr. R. L. Borden, on motion to go into supply, took up the question of Japanese immigration and Mr. Lemieux's mission. Mr. Borden thought in Mr. Lemieux's speech there might have been less eloquence and more information. He quite agreed, however, that in international arrangements, mutual confidences must be respected. The Government of Japan negotiated the treaty with Canada at the latter's instance, and were not asked that a clause should be inserted restricting immigration. Mr. Borden declared that Mr. Lemieux had referred to a tacit understanding, and assurances which Japan had carried out. When he, therefore, justified Japan he condemned the Canadian Government, as these assurances had not evidently been of the character which Canada demanded. Not sufficient safeguards were taken by the Canadian Government. Mr. Lemieux had adopted a wise course in immediately placing himself under the aegis of the British ambassador at Tokio. Had he not had the support of the British Government, Mr. Lemieux would have come back with a few polite words from Japan, his mission a total failure. This Government had got Canada into a serious predicament; from which it could not extricate it, and it was solely due to the influence of the British Cabinet, that relief was able to be sought.

Mr. Borden said Canada was merely on the threshold of the great question of control of Japanese immigration to Canada. He then dealt with the question of the treaty between Great Britain and Japan. The British treaty did not include a clause, such as America had taken the precaution to include, to restrict Japanese immigration. There was no need to do this, so far as Great Britain was concerned, as she had no fear of a Japanese invasion. So far as the United States was concerned, the conditions were totally different. The Pacific was a highway for the people of Japan and they were taking advantage of it.

Mr. Borden then dwelt at length with the history of what had occurred in 1895, when the then Conservative Government in the Dominion had called attention to the dangers of unrestricted immigration of Japanese laborers and artisans into Canada, declaring that any

adhesion of Canada to the treaty between Japan and Great Britain should be accompanied by such a stipulation as would enable Canada to control immigration. Japan had in the following year, after the interchange of representations on the subject, consented to such a stipulation in the adhesion of Canada to the treaty. That showed, declared Mr. Borden, that the Conservative Government then in office had recognized the dangers which might ensue from the control of the Japanese immigration. In 1896 came the change of Government, and the present administration came into office and Mr. Chamberlain sent a despatch asking if Canada would adhere to the treaty. Adhesion, however, was not made at that time, and Sir Richard Cartwright, minister of trade and commerce, on the 20th of July, 1896, submitted a report to the Privy Council, the purport of which was that in view of the putting into effect in a short time of the British preferential policy, and that adhesion to the treaty might be harmful to it, the Government did not desire at that time to accede to the treaty. These fears, Mr. Borden declared, were groundless. On September 18, of the same year, Mr. Chamberlain advised the Laurier Government that Queensland had refused to accept the treaty without a protocol, restricting immigration, and on October 8 of the same year the British ambassador at Tokio, in a report to Lord Salisbury, stated the Japanese Government had at last come to an understanding with him regarding the exact terms of the protocol, which should reserve to the self-governing colonies the right to restrict immigration. However, the Liberal Government made no move until 1903, when Mr. Sydney Fisher, in a speech in Parliament, declared Canada was prepared to adhere to the treaty without any control of immigration. The British Government promptly called attention to the attitude of the Conservative Government in 1895 on this important matter. Then on June 7, 1905, an order-in-council was passed declaring that previous obstacles to the acceding of Canada to the treaty had been removed. In view of the fact that the Colonial Secretary had before him the attitude of the previous Government respecting the need of restricting immigration, and the consent of the Japanese Government to such a proviso, Mr. Borden declared it was small wonder that the attention of the Laurier Government should be drawn to this apparent inconsistency, and Mr. Lyttelton, then Colonial Secretary, twice notified the Canadian Government that they had abandoned the proviso of great importance, and asking whether they really did not desire to have a restriction clause inserted. The Laurier Government, however, had not thought the suggestion of sufficient importance to warrant a reply, but eight months afterwards had wired the Home Government pressing for speedy entrance into the Anglo-Japanese convention. Mr. Lyttelton had wired that before taking steps in the matter he desired an answer to his telegram, pointing out the immigration proviso. The Government, however, Mr. Borden declared, in spite of these warnings, accepted adhesion to the treaty, holus bolus, entered into it, and it was ratified by Parliament in 1907.

Mr. Borden then enquired where these assurances were which Mr. Lemieux referred to so frequently? Would it not have been worth while for this Government to have made an attempt to insert a clause restricting immigration before adhering to the treaty in 1906? These assurances Mr. Lemieux had said were conveyed to the Government by Mr. Nosse, and Mr. Borden had yet to learn that a consul-general had any diplomatic authority which would have permitted the Government to accept these assurances. All standards of international law laid it down that a consul-general had no diplomatic standing. Mr. Lemieux had stated that the Government of Japan, accepted responsibility for Mr. Nosse's assurances. The real object of Mr. Lemieux was to seek to get

Japan to control what Canada should have been able to control herself. Having passed the control of immigration to Japan, Mr. Lemieux had to be sent to Tokio by the Government. Mr. Borden said the Japan Government had exhibited a wonderful forbearance in refraining from enjoining her full treaty rights. What had Mr. Lemieux brought back? A courteous letter from Count Hayashi, the minister of foreign affairs. Why should special conditions in Canada, which should be controlled by the Canadian Government, be transferred to the Japanese Government to control? The action of the Government had handed over control of immigration to Japan. A new Government might come into power in Japan, and abolish every regulation restricting immigration, and we should be exactly in the same position as before Mr. Lemieux went to Japan. Of what avail were these assurances? Yet Mr. Lemieux had laid so much stress on them. He trusted these assurances would answer all the minister's expectations. The principle for which the House should stand was that Canada should not enter into international arrangements without retaining control of immigration into the Dominion.

Mr. Borden's Resolution

Mr. Borden therefore moved the following resolution:

"That all the words after the word 'that' be left out, and the following substituted therefor: 'By order-in-council of 3rd August, 1895, the ministry then in office in Canada called attention to the dangers of unrestricted immigration, and declared that Canada's adhesion to the treaty of 1894 with Japan should be accompanied by such a proviso or stipulation as would enable Parliament to control the immigration of laborers and artisans.'

"That Japan in 1896 consented that such a proviso and stipulation should accompany the adhesion of Canada to the treaty."

"That notwithstanding such consent the present Government in 1905 deliberately abandoned every such proviso and stipulation, although its great importance was twice called to their attention by the British Government during the course of the negotiations, and having entered into the treaty of 1906—which brought into force in Canada the treaty of 1894, absolutely and without reserve—the Government secured its ratification by Parliament in 1907."

"That the ratification of the said treaty of 1906 was almost immediately followed by a great influx of Japanese laborers into Canada."

"That in the opinion of this House, Canada should not enter into or accede to any treaty which deprives Parliament of the control of immigration into this country."

"That this House, while expressing its profound appreciation of the friendly intentions and courteous assurances of the Japanese Government, and while declaring its sincere desire for the most cordial relations with the Japanese people, desires, nevertheless, to record its strong protest against a policy under which our wage earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition except by entreating the forbearance and aid of a foreign government."

Mr. Gallihier's Views

Mr. Gallihier, Liberal member for Kootenay, who followed Mr. Borden, claimed he was content to abide by the assurances Mr. Lemieux had received from the Japanese Government, which would, he hoped, be a solution of the difficulty.

Mr. Gallihier enlarged on the fact that, in spite of the fact that the United States had a proviso restricting immigration to her country, she was, at the same time as Mr. Lemieux was in Tokio, endeavoring to put an end to the influx of Japanese. That fact, Mr. Gallihier contended, should be a proof of the assertion that if the Canadian Government had had such a

proviso in the treaty it would not have necessarily followed that all immigration would have ceased.

Mr. Gallihier maintained that British Columbia must be kept a white man's country, and the flooding of it with Orientals was too high a price to pay for the advantage of a trade treaty. He claimed that in 1907 the Japanese Government would not have accepted the protocol restricting immigration, which she accepted in 1897.

Mr. Bristol Sarcastic

Mr. Bristol referred sarcastically to the sorry spectacle of the British Columbia members trying to square themselves. The Government had sacrificed the interests not only of British Columbia but of the whole of Canada in rushing blindly into the treaty. What reasons existed for a restriction clause, he asked, in 1897 that did not exist in 1907? It was the duty of the Government before they entered into the treaty not to have been content with Mr. Nosse's assurances regarding restriction, but to have got into direct touch with the Japanese Government. But the fact remained that no such effort was made. The Government also had the power to prevent the coming in of Japanese immigrants via Honolulu three years ago, and yet only on the 8th of January of this year had an order-in-council passed to that end. No wonder the people of British Columbia had the right to complain of the unwarranted lack of ordinary care on the part of the Government. Mr. Bristol claimed that while the Government was boasting of its ability to make treaties it had proved the most incompetent amateur in that respect. So far as the denouncing of the treaty was concerned the responsibility for that must rest with the Government.

Mr. Duncan Ross

Mr. Duncan Ross thanked Mr. Bristol for his sympathy with the British Columbia members for trying to square themselves. No squaring, however, was being done or required. The Conservatives voted unanimously for the ratification of the treaty and if any squaring was necessary it was on the part of the Opposition. Mr. Ross argued that it could not be expected that in a friendly trade treaty between two countries the right of either to enter each other's territory should be denied. He reviewed the history of the negotiations. So far as the British Columbia members were concerned they accepted the assurances of the Prime Minister that the Japanese would restrict immigration and therefore they had consented to the ratification of the treaty. Mr. Ross blamed Mr. Borden for not raising his objections when the treaty was ratified. He had the correspondence in his hands then, but he had to wait a year to raise his voice against the action of the Government. There was no doubt, declared Mr. Ross, that British Columbia was in favor of keeping out the Japanese labor. He believed, in connection with this question, Sir Wilfrid had succeeded in solving it in a satisfactory manner, and he believed the people, not only of British Columbia, but of the whole of Canada, would be satisfied.

Mr. W. F. Cockshutt declared he had no prejudice against the Japanese as a people, but if they came here overwhelmingly they would lower the rate of living. He would sooner favor denouncing the treaty than run the risk of further influx.

Mr. Ralph Smith

Mr. Ralph Smith, of Nanaimo, dealing with Mr. Borden's resolution, said there were more Japanese went into the United States during the twelve years the proviso restricting them had been in the American-Japanese treaty than in the twelve years previous, when there was no such restriction. He would not vote for Mr. Borden's resolution. The Opposition, before the treaty was ratified, pressed the Govern-

ment to do so because of the trade advantage it would entail. He congratulated the Government in preventing the Japanese coming in from Honolulu. The successful arrangement whereby contract labor would be cut off was also a matter for congratulation. He supported the ratification of the treaty of 1907, because immigration would be regulated. If it were found that the Japanese assurances given to Mr. Lemieux were not carried out, then he, for one, would advocate the abrogation of the treaty, which could be done by giving six months' notice.

Mr. Macpherson an Atom

Mr. Macpherson, of Vancouver, also had to explain his stand on the matter. Mr. Lemieux had stated the arrangement was satisfactory, and he would accept that assurance. The settlement of the question was hailed with delight, and he felt he had seen the last of any great influx to Canada from any Oriental country. He accepted the question as settled for all time. What did it amount to if he was defeated? He was an atom in the make-up of the country, only a unit in the House—Laurier. He had succeeded in turning the attention of the Government to a serious grievance, and his duty was done.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier

At 10 o'clock the Premier rose. He welcomed the speech and resolution of Mr. Borden, because it made the line of cleavage clear. The policy of Mr. Borden was to gain restriction of immigration by hostile legislation on a friendly power. The central fact was that in all countries where the Oriental races and the Caucasian races came together there was friction. There was more in the question than a labor agitation. The population of British Columbia was still small, and if the Oriental influx was to come in unchecked the balance of power would be threatened. Sir Wilfrid referred at length to the rise of Japan to the status of a first class power. Japan had shaken off her lethargy and shown herself on land and sea a peer of other nations. The offensive and defensive treaty between Japan and England made it possible that some day the fleets of the countries would ride out to sea side, by side against a common enemy. When the request came from British Columbia to restrict Oriental immigration, the Government refused to keep out Japan entirely by a Natal Act, but entered into negotiations with Japan to restrict immigration of her own accord. The result had been successful. The proof of Japan's backing up the assurances of Mr. Nosse given to the Canadian Government in the years 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906 was that during those years Japanese immigration to Canada was very small. Sir Wilfrid claimed that if a treaty had been passed with Japan with a proviso restricting immigration, the treaty would not have been operative long, for the moment immigration came in and Canada passed restrictive legislation, the Japanese would have abrogated the treaty by the six months' notice. Canada was determined now to use every means to permit Japan to control emigration. Abrogation of the treaty was a last resort, and should not be resorted to until every other effort had failed. Mr. Lemieux had brought home the assurances of the Japanese Government. Today, Sir Wilfrid claimed, Canada was in a better position than if she had a restrictive clause in the treaty. The United States had a sample of what a restrictive clause meant in the San Francisco education trouble. Did anyone believe that if a similar provision had been in the treaty the trade between Japan and Canada would develop? Sir Wilfrid concluded by dilating upon the difference between Mr. Borden's policy of restriction by legislation and the Government's policy of voluntary conciliation. He was not afraid of the feeling in British Columbia when once the question was explained to the people of that province.

Mr. Foster Sarcastic

Mr. Foster, following Sir Wilfrid, made sarcastic remarks in reference to the attitude of the British Columbia members, who had behind the screen that they believed the question was settled for all time because Mr. Lemieux told them so. He twitted Mr. Smith with going back on his recent laudation of the clause in the American treaty with Japan, which permitted of restrictive legislation by the United States. The trouble between the United States and Japan was not one of immigration. It arose because Japan did not think the United States was giving her subjects equal treaty rights once they had settled there. There had been no trouble between 1894 and 1906 with reference to immigration with the United States and Japan. Mr. Foster ridiculed Sir Wilfrid's preference for voluntary arrangements instead of treaties; treaties bound nations, promises merely bound the man who was in a position to make them. If the present Government in Japan were swept from power tomorrow what would become of this voluntary arrangement?

"I'm so happy," said Mrs. Oldcastle. "My son is to get his bachelor's degree this year." "Is he?" replied her hostess. "Well, I can't blame you for feelin' as you do about it. I never thought much of that snippy Wilson girl he's been going with. How did you get the match broke off?"—Chicago Record-Herald.

The Man of the Hour In Russia

RUSSIA, who, like Diogenes, has long been in search of a man, may be congratulated on having at last found him. It might perhaps be more correct to say that she has at last recognized him, his name having been long familiar—Piotr Arkadyevich Stolypin. So writes Dr. E. J. Dillon, as special correspondent of the Daily Telegraph.

"This minister may aptly be likened to the stone which the Russian empire-builders rejected, and which is now become the head of the corner. Hardly a fortnight has gone by since he was looked down upon by all the popular parties as an individual of little account intrinsically, an insignificant bureaucrat whom some mischance had pitchforked into a position of eminence, while the most zealous of the Czar's partisans set him down as the Nicodemus of the Revolution. But now that that is changed; like George of Byzance, he has been unexpectedly credited with a brilliant victory over the dragon of the revolution and raised to the rank of a demigod. He has quelled the social and political storm—so runs the legend—set up machinery which will propel the ship of state, and, together with Vladimir Nikolayevich Kokofftseff, the honey-

tongued minister of finance, has set out in search of the Golden Fleece, with the hope, nay, the certitude, of bringing it home.

"Today M. Stolypin has but to speak from his seat in the Tavrada palace to render a sitting, nay, a whole session, memorable in the annals of Russian parliamentary debates. He will probably stamp an epoch with his name and fill a chapter with his deeds. A maker of history, his words appeal to a vast audience whose minds, it is thought, are wax to receive and marble to retain. When the Premier is expected to make a statement in the name of the government, or his own, there is not a vacant seat in the assembly hall. And when he ascends the tribune a thrill of excitement passes visibly over the audience, necks are craned, hands placed behind ears, and the audience is intense. Even his softest syllables, his pianissimo tones are waited all over the apartment. Nor does achievement seemingly fall much short of promise. His eloquence, like his character, is mainly, and his delivery dramatic; his accents betoken sincerity, and his manner is warm with the heat of suppressed enthusiasm. Hence, when he sits down men are full of the orator's praises. For in the third duma M. Stolypin has carried everyone

with him, his friends, the indifferent, and even his enemies.

"M. Stolypin is one of the most chivalrous individuals one could meet outside the realm of legendary lore. With him, word and thought, promise and achievement, are identical. He is incapable of baseness, fearless of danger, ready for self-sacrifice; and in the ranks of Russian bureaucrats men of his moral calibre are not as plentiful as blackberries. The third duma is here, and here it will remain. 'J'y suis et j'y reste.' During its existence it will continuously grow less and less conservative than it was; even the members of the Moderate Conservative party will probably move with the current, every individual becoming deeply impressed by the truth that without the duma he is nothing.

"At the end of its five years' legal limit it is probable that the third duma will be much less inclined to render to the Czar the things that are the Czar's than it was a few weeks ago. The country, too, will have moved with its representatives, and when the chamber which has abolished the autocracy has been dissolved, it will surely be succeeded by one which will abolish much else and establish constitutional government of a democratic kind on a firm footing."

ASSENT TO BE GIVEN

Natal Act Will Become Law
—Once—Agents for Its Enforcement

DR. MCGUIRE'S REPLY

Ottawa Department of Investigation Industry

(From Tuesday's) The lieutenant-governor of the session of the house, his assent to a number of bills, among them the Natal Act, and the act amending the act, while eight other bills, of less technical nature, finally passed. The Natal Act is the bill incorporating the bill of incorporation of Chilliwack.

It is stated on good authority that the agents to enforce the act, already passed, are pointed. They will be given the power of passing the "educational" bill, which will leave for Vancouver to its enforcement. The budget speech will be delivered until the first of March, as a number of departments as yet completed their formal motion was adopted which permits the government to the budget at any time of the educational department received in all probability it was handed over to the department for publication and returns in this department have printed.

The report of the immigration will be rendered tomorrow.

The railway committee yesterday and the bill came up for second reading. The committee expected a struggle, as it is a interesting one, as, if through, there will be a saddle it with various. Some of these were referred to the committee. One that will be proposed is that the promoters deposit the finance committee to twelve miles of the road, which will be completed within twelve miles when completed.

Yet another proposal, rival road, which is being by Vancouver people, shall be referred to the committee. Hon. Richard McBride, Donald and J. H. have been invited to be present at the meeting of the platform of the A. O. U. Wednesday evening next, Martin will address the question League of this city.

The sitting of the day was largely occupied upon the motion of Dr. the Ottawa government to investigate the coal industry. That motion sets forth that from the probable that a conspiracy of trade exists amongst the coal and that it is a matter of public interest that the department of trade and Ottawa.

Dr. McGuire set forth a number of facts of the case. He stated that the cost of production of the coal is sold in the market at a lower price than the cost of production. John Oliver, vigilant the much work nor responsible heaped on the shoulder of the government at Ottawa. The matter of the subject of an investigation select committee of the dentally, he again forestall the thornwaite. It was his day that the member for aged to get his resolution the dismissal of the lieutenant upon the order paper of the gentleman from the day he bailed a lengthy Mr. Hawthornthwaite's clause. This is the one which investigation of the conditions underground. Mr. Cere, it into a single heading it with a "whereas" in the preamble to his resolution the thunderbolts of Jove, stolen twice with impunity the Socialist member for may, for Mr. Hawthornthwaite through it all.

The second reading of Young's university bill, Stuart Henderson has amendments on the order will come up when the bill is introduced. The member for industry accused Dr. Young of rowing the Saskatchewan like nature. His amendment very convincing.

Dr. Young did not take the time to answer very seriously referred to them in question of the amendment upon when the bill is introduced. The coal tax act was time and passed. This is a tax on coal from 5 to 10 cents and on coke from 10 to 15 cents.

The speaker took the clock. Prayers by Dr. McCoy.

Budget on Monday. On motion of Hon. Mr. was resolved to go into committee on Monday next; that the budget will in all be delivered on that date.

As to Price of Dr. McGuire (Vancouver) to move, sir, that where appear that the cost of consumer in the province of Columbia is out of all proportion to the cost of production of the coal deposits in the and the proximity of the supply to the market, the to the consumer in British