

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 foreign government.

Now, we are all of one mind as regards this idea, both Liberals and Conservatives: we do not want to see any competition in labour in British Columbia that is not fair and is not warranted. We desire, where the labouring people of British Columbia have to enter into competition with others, that that competition shall be fair and that it shall not be with people who can work for less wages, who can maintain themselves for less, or who will lower the standard of living of the labouring people of British Columbia or of Canada at large. But, what does this resolution mean? Supposing we all cast our votes for this resolution there is nothing in it which relieves the situation of our own people. If the hon. gentleman had gone farther and stated the proposition whether in view of these circumstances it is advisable to at once give notice to repeal the Japanese treaty he would have proposed something definite and substantial, but the hon. gentleman carefully avoided that. He puts forth an amendment here which sounds very well, reads very well and is very patriotic, but which accomplishes absolutely nothing and which means nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. It means a vote of censure on the government for their neglect to safeguard British Columbia's interest when they had an opportunity to do it.

Mr. GALLIHER. So long as it means—and I will accept the hon. gentleman's explanation of it—merely a vote of censure, I am prepared to drop the subject. I will not detain the House any longer. The subject is one on which I feel keenly and have felt keenly all along. I would like to mention, however, that some of the papers—I am satisfied that they have no authority for saying it—are making the statement that coolie immigration from Japan to Canada is limited to 1,000. I am satisfied that they have no authority for saying that because I am prepared to state to the Minister of Labour in this House that if I believed it was limited to 1,000, or to considerably less than 1,000, I would stand up in this House and object to such an arrangement.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am satisfied from the words of the hon. minister—and on this subject he must know the feelings of the people of British Columbia—that the number must be less than that stated because otherwise the members from British Columbia would not be satisfied. Now, I think I will conclude.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the limit?

Mr. GALLIHER.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is one of the features that, the Minister of Labour stated in this House for diplomatic reasons, he was unable to disclose.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The statement made by some of the papers that the limit is fixed at 1,000 is published without authority.

Mr. GALLIHER. I will hope so.

Mr. TAYLOR. If it should be correct, what then?

Mr. GALLIHER. If it is correct this House will find me on my feet protesting against it and asking for the cancellation of that treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. The limit is not large enough?

Mr. GALLIHER. The limit? I trust that both parties in politics and that the press who supports either party in politics will consider that the arrangement which has been made is entitled to a fair trial and that nothing will be done to inflame the public mind one way or the other. Let us give the matter time and prove whether the words of the Minister of Labour are true and whether the Japanese government are in earnest in dealing with the government of this country and whether they will maintain the arrangement they have made.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting spectacle to see our distinguished friends from British Columbia trying to square themselves with the people of that province and trying to justify the mistake which this government has made in sacrificing not merely the interests of the people of British Columbia but the interests of the people of Canada by limiting the right which the people as a whole have through this parliament to control immigration into this country. Now, my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Galliher), it seems to me, has evaded a good deal of what we might fairly consider in this resolution. The first matter brought to the attention of this House was an order in council as far back as 1895, wherein the administration of that day pointed out the danger that there would be to Canada from Japanese immigration unless it was restricted in some reasonable way and declining that Canada should enter into this treaty unless some restriction were put upon the immigration of Japanese labourers.

The present government came into power in 1896 and they had the opportunity of deciding this matter one way or the other in the interests of the people of Canada, and they had before them for good or for bad the opinion of the previous administration on the question. But what did this government do? Did they make any inquiry as to the volume of the trade of Canada with Japan before they acceded to