

treaty these restrictions will be continued. In view of this letter to Mr. Nossé, in view of the statement that Japan could not agree to the reservation which had been offered to Queensland and in view of the fact that during all the intercourse with Japan, and when other legislation was introduced a similar undertaking had been given and carried out, I believe that the government were justified in accepting this assurance if they wanted the treaty ratified and if they wanted the benefits to be derived from the ratification of the treaty. I think I remember the dates; Mr. Nossé's letter was written on July 19 and the day following, or two days following, a telegram was sent to Mr. Lyttelton saying that they wanted the treaty absolutely without reserve having received assurances from Mr. Nossé. The treaty was ratified. The correspondence was brought down and laid on the table of this House in connection with the ratification of the treaty. As I said at the outset, it was brought down at the request of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). When the ratification of that treaty came up for discussion in this House that correspondence was passed over to the hon. leader of the opposition. Had he looked at the correspondence as the leader of the opposition should he would have found none of those assurances in that correspondence, but still he accepted it without any assurances at that time. He accepted that treaty without any assurances and without any explanation from the government excepting the explanation of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who, in response to a question from my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy), said that the restrictions which had hitherto been in force would be carried out notwithstanding the treaty. The hon. leader of the opposition was the first to urge upon this government—he is upon 'Hansard' and I have already quoted his speech at that time—the necessity of having this treaty ratified. When the treaty came up for ratification his only contribution to the debate, although he had the correspondence without the assurance in his possession, was to ask: What is the value of a yen? He has these assurances now and he has the explanation of the government now. If he could support the ratification of the treaty in 1907 without assurances and without explanations how can he oppose it in 1908 when he has these assurances and these explanations? Surely, if there is any squaring to be done it must be done by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am bound to say that my own position in the matter is the position of every member of this House. We knew the gravity of the immigration question as far as these oriental nations were concerned. We appreciated it. We knew something about the negotiations between Japan and this government in con-

Mr. D. ROSS.

nection with the \$500 Chinese tax. We knew that there was an understanding between this government and Japan, we accepted the word of the leader of the government that these assurances would be continued, and we made no protest against the ratification of the treaty. The leader of the opposition did exactly the same thing. I do not want to be condemned by the leader of the opposition for having done exactly what he did, although it places me in rather distinguished company, but I am bound to say that when he did accept the treaty in 1907, when he accepts the assurance of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) that the arrangements entered into with Japan will work out satisfactorily, and which we are bound to believe will work out satisfactorily in so far as the province of British Columbia is concerned, it would be more in keeping with his position, having once accepted the ratification of the treaty without assurances, to wait and see the results of the negotiations entered into by the hon. Postmaster General before introducing a motion of censure into this House, censuring not only the government but censuring also himself who was primarily responsible, because it was he who asked for the correspondence, in not giving to this House the nature of that correspondence and in having accepted that treaty without any assurance in reference to immigration. It seems to me, as I pointed out before, that in so far as the leader of the opposition is concerned, his criticism of the government would be far more effective if it did not come a year or two soon or a year or two late. He would be perfectly justified a year ago when the treaty was up for ratification to point out to this government—were there not these assurances—that no arrangement had been made to protect this country against the influx of Japanese labour, because the correspondence as brought down did not contain the Nossé letter. He would have been perfectly justified then in pointing this out to the House, and I am sure that if he had done so, that treaty would not have been ratified without the assurances which the government gave at a later date. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden), is also unfortunate that in his motion of censure he does not seem to have the support of these great newspapers which are pleased to support him in his ordinary political programme. The Montreal 'Star' of January 26, speaking of the settlement arranged for by the Postmaster General, has this to say:

The statement of Hon. Mr. Lemieux, following the report of Mr. Mackenzie King, seems to put the Japanese question into about as satisfactory a position as the country could hope. The Japanese government did not break faith.

We could hope for nothing more exclusive short of the right to put up the bars entirely