

risk is mine. I am willing to take that risk. I think this arrangement will have the effect of renewing and confirming confidence existing between this government and the government of Japan. I supported the treaty in 1907 on the understanding that this immigration was to be regulated within very reasonable limits, and I am prepared to say on the floor of this House that whilst I believe that six months will demonstrate that an influx of orientals into this country under this arrangement is impossible, if, this arrangement be entered into between the representatives of Canada and the representatives of Japan, is not maintained I will support the abrogation of the treaty which can be brought about by giving six months notice.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver). I do not wish to give a silent vote on this question, because after all, it is the most vital question affecting the province of British Columbia we have ever had before this parliament. In a few words I shall place my views before the House and before my constituents. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said that the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition is nothing more and nothing less than a motion of want of confidence in the government. Well, that being the case I cannot support the motion for the reason that the government have done exactly what I have been trying to get them to do for the last six months. They have carried on negotiations with Japan which have resulted in stopping for all time any further influx of Japanese coolies into our country.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you know?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I will tell my hon. friend how I know. The Minister of Labour has just come back from Japan and he has stated in parliament upon his responsibility as a minister of the Crown, that we need never fear any further immigration from Japan. That statement has been accepted by the House; that statement has been accepted by the country.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend says 'no.'

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that statement is accepted by the House and the country. Had we not years ago a similar statement from the government that the Japanese would regulate immigration, and yet the Japanese government have not regulated immigration to the satisfaction of even the hon. member himself?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) mean to say on his responsibility as a member of this House, that the mission of the Postmaster General to Japan has been fruitless? No matter

Mr. R. SMITH.

how politically prejudiced the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) may be, I doubt if he will have the temerity to state on the floor of this House that the mission of the Minister of Labour to Japan has been fruitless, and that the statement made by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) on the floor of the House is entirely erroneous. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not desire to say that at all, but I want to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) what greater reason have we to believe that the arrangement now made will bring about the restriction desired, than we had to accept the statement of the Prime Minister when we entered into the treaty with Japan, that the Japanese would restrict immigration. The Japanese government did not restrict immigration.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) interrupts me to ask a question, which I do not mind, but I have some objection to being interrupted while he makes a long statement. However, the hon. gentleman has answered his own question. He tells us that he would not state that the mission to Japan has been fruitless. Therefore, I say that the people of this country are prepared to accept and must accept as a fact the declaration of our minister that the question is settled, and that he has entered into a satisfactory arrangement with Japan. In view of that declaration by a minister of the Crown I have confidence that the government will see that the arrangement is carried out. Let me quote a telegraphic despatch from Japan in to-day's newspaper, which reads:

Replying to interpellations in the Lower House of the Diet this evening, Foreign Minister Viscount Hayashi spoke at length on the foreign policy of the government, including negotiations with the United States and Canada.

He announced that the Canadian question has been definitely settled, and read the correspondence with Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, the Canadian Commissioner of Labour, wherein Japan has agreed to restrict emigration to Canada within reasonable limits.

Viscount Hayashi, continuing, said it was the duty of the central government to conserve the interests of Japanese subjects resident in other countries by preventing a further exodus of their countrymen which might be prejudicial to those already residing abroad, and the restrictions therefore would be extremely rigid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, treaties have been entered into by all governments in all times and treaties have been lived up to by all nations. This arrangement is practically a treaty entered into between the two governments, and I say that so far as the present is concerned we have a settlement of this question that is bound to prove satisfactory. Of course, it may not be satisfactory to the man who wants to make politi-