

defend himself in the press, as we can do ourselves or get others to do for us. That is the way we treat the Chinese, and yet we boast of our great civilization. I always feel very small, in my own estimation at all events, when I reflect on this disgraceful condition of affairs. We impose a tax of \$50 on every Chinaman who enters this country: for \$50 the most profligate man, the greatest criminal in China may be landed on our shores. The amount of the tax is the great criterion. No matter what his character may be, if the tax is paid he is admitted to the country. On the other hand a man may be a gentleman of the highest education, the peer of any man in this Chamber in education and ability, and still he is classed with the criminals—he must pay his \$50 before he is admitted into the Dominion. We know that in China there are several grades of men—there are as many classes as you find in European countries—but we do know this, that from the highest to the lowest, throughout every class of the population of China, there is a taste for education and a fitness for it, showing that the population of that great empire recognize and inculcate one doctrine—that is, obedience to the laws of the land. That is certainly not a bad trait in the character of the people. A gentleman who has lived for some time in the North-West, and who has had excellent opportunities of forming an opinion on the subject, says that it is a question, after his experience of the Indians in that Great Lone Land, whether we have anything to boast of in our modern civilization. He says, place 1500 white people out on the open prairie, with no laws to govern them, no force to call upon to quell riots and disorders, none of the restraints imposed upon the population of civilized lands, and it is doubtful if they would be as well-behaved as the Indians are. The gentleman who has expressed that opinion has been a great traveller, has been in nearly every civilized country in the world, and has reached middle life, and he is still doubtful whether, after all, we have anything to boast of in a comparison with the life of the Indians. I think this restrictive law on our Statute Book is a very bad precedent. We know that

within a recent period a great step forward has been taken with regard to the manufacture of iron in Canada. We must necessarily, in the development of that industry, attract to our shores many people who are not here now. They must come from some other land; we have scarcely enough people here who can be spared from the ordinary industries of the country to enter this new field of labor. It is necessary, therefore, that we should attract to the country cheap industry, and where can we look for it with such certainty as to China? Where can we get people of more industrious habits than the Chinese? If you employ them and bargain to pay them so much for their work, they do not band together and force their employers to give them more. In every country where they are employed they keep to their engagements, whether they are good or bad. We have endeavored to make a great country of this Dominion by building a transcontinental road with its western terminus almost at the door of China. We are putting on lines of steamships to run between British Columbia and China and Japan with the hope of attracting to our shores the trade of the east. Those great countries are without railways and are about to construct them and must obtain the iron somewhere. We are about to develop the manufacture of iron in this country and we are endeavoring to cultivate an Asiatic trade in iron. We know that in all countries in which railroad construction is about to commence, iron is indispensable, not only for the building of the railroads, but for creating the machinery with which to construct them, and yet, while we are seeking to get a subsidy to cultivate that trade with China and Japan and endeavoring to attract to our country people to develop our mining industries, we put a tax upon an industrious people who seek our shores. We say to the Chinaman, "If you are in British Columbia and want to go to some other part of Canada you must be sent through in bond with a ticket on your back." Why? Because he is industrious, abstemious and honest in keeping his engagements? Is that a good and sufficient reason for discriminating against these people? Can we say that because