

ents. I could read from this same 'Hansard' how the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and other leaders of the opposition party who are opposing this arrangement to-day, pressed on this side of the House the tremendous importance of these trade relations with Japan being immediately entered into. I could read from the speeches of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who, in 1905, who, again in 1906, and who again on frequent other occasions pressed upon this government the importance of making these negotiations complete in the interest of the commercial relations of this country with the empire of Japan. I noticed with some amusement some of my hon. friend's statements in Toronto a few months ago in criticising the treaty after the excitement had been created in Vancouver, but he did not say that in 1905 he had pressed upon this House and before the government the practical necessity of negotiating to bring about a settlement of the question. He did not say that in 1906, a little over a year ago, he had also given expression to his views on this subject. In 1906 he said :

A person who was not acquainted with the history of this matter might very well have supposed from the speech and from the remarks that were made that this was a brand new treaty made with the young and rising empire of Japan and for which the government might very well take to themselves special credit. Well, when one looks into it, it all simmers down to this, that it is but the late confession of a blunder—

What blunder?—that they had not negotiated the treaty earlier. The blunder, according to the hon. member for North Toronto, consisted not in entering into negotiations for a treaty in 1907, but that they had not entered with negotiations for a treaty some years before that.

The fact of the matter is that in 1894 a treaty was made with Japan by the British government. This government at that time, I suppose, carefully looked into the matter and they came to the conclusion that they would not be included in the treaty and consequently would not share in its benefits. And from 1896-7 up to the present time Great Britain and Germany and France and the United States of America have all had the benefit that flowed from the treaty or similar treaties, whilst Canada has been absolutely debarred from any of those benefits. Some two years ago, I think it was, we on this side of the House drew attention to the fact that there was still a possibility that Canada might be included within the provisions of that treaty. Then, and then only, this government woke up, then and then only it stirred around, and after the lapse of two years they come to us with what is called a treaty with Japan. Well, Sir, if there is one reason now why this treaty should be hailed and acclaimed with delight and with applause as I believe it should be.

As I believe it should be! What was the treaty! It was the British treaty.

That British treaty did not contain a provision retaining power in Canada to regulate immigration. Not at all, but the hon. member for North Toronto accepted the British treaty when he said that. He accepted it just as fully as he could have accepted it and he complimented the government upon having secured its ratification :

Well, Sir, if there is one reason now why this treaty should be hailed and claimed with delight and with applause, as I believe it should be, there were ten reasons ten years ago why it should have been adopted and its provisions taken advantage of by this country, simply because ten years of added benefit over and above what this country can now obtain would have been obtained by intercourse with that country at a period of time when probably its demands upon such products as Canada could have afforded would have been even greater than they will be in the years to come.

But, I say I support the arrangement of the government because the leaders of the opposition party were constantly pressing upon the government the importance of negotiating this treaty and not the importance of negotiating a treaty with any special provision to regulate immigration, but the importance of negotiating the treaty passed in Great Britain in 1894 which contained no powers at all in regard to the regulation of immigration into this country. Now, the government have done three things that I think ought to be supported by the House. First, they have passed an order in council preventing Japanese coming from the insular possessions of the United States, and if any member of this House looks over the records he will find that 60 per cent of the Japanese that have come into Canada during the past two years have come from the American islands. If we remember also that combined with the Japanese trouble in Vancouver has been the Hindoo question we will see at once that the government, by the operation of this treaty, have closed out entirely the immigration of orientals from this source. Then again the government have provided against the making of contracts for bringing in Japanese immigrants into this country without the consent and authority of the government. I contend that if the Minister of Labour had done nothing more in Japan as the representative of this country than to place a check upon the private arrangements of contractors for oriental labour and to bring into operation the principle that these people cannot carry on their operations without the authority of the government he would have done sufficient to justify the support of this House. For these two reasons and for any other arrangements which have been made that will accomplish the object of keeping these people out of the country I am prepared to support with my vote the proposals made by the hon. Minister of Labour. If there is any risk about it then the