

orientals absolutely. No oriental if he lived a thousand years in the States could be naturalized.

I wish to Heaven we had the same provision in British Columbia. In Canada, as you know, we do allow them to be naturalized to our everlasting regret; and on looking up some old books I found that as far back as 1898 there was a scandal on account of Japs being naturalized after they had only been four and a half months in British Columbia. It was discovered after investigation—you will find it all recorded in the sessional papers of British Columbia—that Japs over from Japan and only a day, in some case two days, in Vancouver, were posted up to the Skeena river and given naturalization papers, certifying that they were naturalized British subjects. They were naturalized in batches, and where there was a rush to get them to the canneries they did not even stop to naturalize them—they rushed them right up and got a notary public afterwards to make out naturalization papers and sent the tickets up to these men. That is all to be found in the evidence in the sessional papers referred to. That is how we in British Columbia naturalized Japanese who were supposed to have been in the country four or five years whereas, as I say, some of them had only been four and a half months. It is in the light of these experiences that we are asking to-day that you shall not naturalize oriental aliens.

In the States, however, there is also another different condition. If a man is born in the States, no matter what his parentage is, he is a United States citizen and has all the privileges connected therewith. He becomes a United States citizen, even though he is the child of an alien, since he has been born in the States. We, of course, have the opposite attitude here. We refuse the franchise to even the children of a naturalized alien born here; but we only do so by a provincial law and we never know the moment that law may be attacked and perhaps successfully attacked. There was a very clever pamphlet got up a few months ago appealing to every sentiment of the British ideal fair play. It spoke of "Taxation without Representation" and was a very cleverly gotten up thing, demanding and begging that the Japanese in Canada should be given a vote. We have refused them as yet under our provincial law but the subject will be more complex when the children born in British Columbia become twenty-one years of age. Therefore we too are asking that

[Mr. Neill.]

oriental aliens, as in the States, should never be naturalized. I see that in the States also they are asking that they should not give to aliens born in that country any privileges as citizens. In other words we require what they have and what we lack, and they are asking to be given what we have and what they lack. It shows how close together our wants come in that regard.

As regards this rigid exclusion I want to ask the House this question: Is rigid exclusion unfair? Japan says it is but let us seek for the answer to that in the acts rather than in the words of Japan. This is what Japan does herself:

The policy of exclusion is that followed rigorously by Japan herself by section of the Imperial Ordinance No. 353 against Koreans and Chinese. The reason she gives is that to permit the entrance into Japan of such aliens whose standards of living are lower than the Japanese would submit their own people to disastrous competition.

Substitute the word "Canadians" for "Japanese" and you have exactly our sentiments in British Columbia to-day. Surely precedent is better than argument. That is what Japan does, not what she says, and that is what we are asking to have done—only to follow the example of the Japanese themselves.

Now the second clause asks that the control of this immigration shall be put into the hands of the United States instead of left in the hands of Japan. Roosevelt, who arranged this Gentleman's Agreement, added a clause to it that if it was not effective the States would immediately pass an exclusion law. Unfortunately he left office and Taft who succeeded him allowed that clause to be taken out so that the United States surrendered every atom of control over the situation. The Gentleman's Agreement of the States was more rigid than our agreement. It did not permit, as we do, the entrance of 400 labourers a year; it called for the exclusion of labourers entirely; but it said that when a man came along from Japan with a Japanese license or immigration certificate he would be admitted, that being proof he was not a labourer; and the labourers flowed in by the thousand. They had tickets from Japan which said "This man is not a labourer" and in he had to come even though the officials knew he was a labourer. So they kept coming in by the thousands. That is the result of handing over, or surrendering, the rights of any nation to deal with their own immigration. Roosevelt truly says that never in the history of the