

ber. Here are the facts: The whites paid £30 11s. 4d., and the Asiatics paid £1 6s. 4d. In other words, over a period of ten years, on careful investigation by the British government, it was found that the white man paid into the public treasury \$22 for every \$1 paid in by the Asiatic. That is something we should think about when we talk about filling up this country and the distribution of taxes. Let us keep these figures in mind when we speak of bringing in immigrants for the purpose of sharing the burden of taxation.

There are those who suggest the importation of Asiatic labour in the form of indentured or contract labour. I wish to register very briefly, because I have not time to discuss it, my absolute and unqualified opposition to that. There is not a country in the world where indentured labour has been tried, where it has not been found that the labour that was indentured formed a very difficult problem in the country after the expiration of the indenture. I am not going to discuss that. All I wish to say is this: Canada, above all others, is not a suitable country for indentured labour. This is a country for Canadianism, for democracy, for men and women to build homes in, where we may have a standard of living at least commensurate with the ideals of the white race, and in such a country as ours indentured labour, which on its face is branded as of an inferior type, should have no place.

I wish to deal as briefly as I can at this late hour with perhaps the most important point in this whole discussion and one which I apprehend may be thrown into the arena in this debate by the Government itself, because the Government must take cognizance of it. I want to say to the Prime Minister that in approaching this part of my remarks, I do so, as far as I possibly can, free from any prejudice or from any desire to offer embarrassment to his Government or to the Imperial authorities. I think if he will follow me closely, I can show to the Government and to the satisfaction of this House, that the argument against our position because of Imperial reasons is not a well-founded argument.

In regard to that particular phase of the question, I hold in the first place that it is the inherent right of Canada, in common with all other countries, to determine the conditions upon which any one may be admitted within the bounds of the state. I lay that down as a primary and funda-

[Mr. Stevens.]

mental right, referred to indirectly by other speakers. Let me repeat it; that it is the inherent right of Canada, in common with all other countries, to determine the conditions upon which any person from any other state may enter its jurisdiction. Am I stating that too strongly, or am I in any sense violating what is known as international or recognized statutory law? Let me refer the House to this fact: that that principle, that doctrine, is recognized in the statutes of Canada, and has been for years. I hold in my hand the Immigration Act. I shall not read any lengthy portions of it, but just very briefly cite what is to my mind a vindication of my position and of that doctrine. In clause 38 of the Immigration Act under which we are operating, and have operated for years, it is provided that:

The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order whenever he deems it necessary or expedient—

Do what?. Several things I shall not refer to, and then comes this:

—prohibit or limit in number for a stated period or permanently the landing in Canada of immigrants belonging to any—

What?

—to any nationality or race or of immigrants of any class or occupation by reason of—

What?

—by reason of any economic, industrial or other condition temporarily existing in Canada or because such immigrants are deemed unsuitable having regard to the climatic, industrial, social, educational, labour or other conditions or requirements of Canada or because such immigrants are deemed undesirable owing to their peculiar customs, habits, modes of life, and methods of holding property,—

And so forth. Could any one ask for a clearer declaration of the principle to which I have given utterance than is embalmed in our own statutes? I am not however, limited to that. I have in my hand the Sessional Papers of 1907-1908 where I find that this Parliament laid on the Table the correspondence between the government of the day and the Imperial government. I want the House to get this point because it seems to me if they do, we meet absolutely and without any difficulty the problems of Imperial complications. I find here certain correspondence of which I shall only read brief extracts, and anyone who desires to peruse the correspondence will find it in Sessional Paper 74B, in the session of 1907-1908. Lord Lyttleton who at that time was Secretary of State for the Colonies, I believe, wrote to the government of the day in Canada pointing out