

Hon. gentlemen opposite maintain that the representative of Japan agreed that his government would endeavour to keep out Japanese labour. I am free to state to this House that on the strength of that assurance, that Japanese labour would be restricted, as it had been previous to the ratification of the treaty, I voted for the treaty. We have now the further assurance of the responsible minister who has personally visited Japan and entered into direct negotiations with the responsible ministers of the Japanese government, and this is a further reason why I am prepared again to vote in favour of the arrangement that has been made by the Minister of Labour, which will prove a final, satisfactory settlement of the question.

Now, the amendment of the leader of the opposition sets out with the statement that in 1895 the Conservative government provided for the restriction of Japanese immigration into Canada, and that in 1897 the Japanese government voluntarily agreed to insert a provision in the treaty that they would regulate immigration to Canada. Now it must strike the House that there must have been some reason why the government refused such negotiations. If the Liberal government could have had the treaty in 1897 with all the provisions for regulation of immigration, why didn't they take it? Because Japanese trade in 1894, and the three or four years following, was not an important factor for this country, and was not considered by the government of so much importance as the exclusion of Japanese labour. I heard the correspondence that was read by the leader of the opposition to-day. What was the underlying principle of the refusal of this government to negotiate on this question? Because there were other international trade connections of so much more importance to us that it was not necessary to consider this question in relation to Japan. But the intervening years have entirely changed the status of that country and have increased the importance of our trade relations with that country. What was a good reason in 1894 is not a good reason in 1907; what might be considered reasonable in 1894 is not for many reasons nearly so important in 1907. Then the amendment goes on to say:

That in the opinion of this House we should not be deprived of the power to control immigration.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I will show that that is exactly what the government have done. The leader of the opposition referred to my explanation of the proviso in the American treaty. Let me say that the American government made reciprocal arrangements with Japan concerning immigration. How did they operate? In 1894, the same year the British treaty was agreed to, the American treaty was made. When was the proviso

Mr. R. SMITH.

placed in the treaty? Twelve years afterwards. Why did they not take advantage of this proviso during the whole of those twelve years? How is it, if that proviso was of such importance as between the United States and Japan and Canada and Japan, that for twelve long years no application was made of it until exactly twelve months ago? There is only one answer, namely, that more Japanese came into the United States during the twelve years under the treaty which contained a proviso empowering them to make their own regulations, than in any twelve years previous, which proves that the United States did not enforce their law but negotiated voluntary settlements. I want to say this, with due regard to the safety and security of the provisions that they sought to enact in their treaties, there are ten times as many orientals coming into the United States, notwithstanding the restrictions against Chinese and the proviso in the treaty against Japanese, ten times more than are coming into Canada. The provision was good, but evidently could not be enforced or at any rate was not. They passed the regulation a year ago. Did they enforce the regulation? Did they apply it against Japanese immigration? No. The very same kind of negotiations that took place in Canada took place in the United States. Why did they not apply the regulation? The treaty provided for it. They passed a law in 1907, and they sent their representative to Japan, just as Canada has sent her representative to Japan, and to-day the United States are negotiating for a voluntary understanding on this question, just as Canada has done. For these reasons I am not prepared to vote for the amendment. I will give a few reasons why I will vote for the government.

An hon. MEMBER. We all know that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Well, we are speaking to the country through this House. If hon. gentlemen don't want to be enlightened, the people do, and that is exactly what we are here for. I am going to support the position that the government has taken on this question because of the special trade arrangement with Japan, and because I believe their agreement with Japan will keep out these people for all time. I have already said that it is of great importance. I think that can be maintained, and yet I think the arrangement can be made effective in regulating immigration into this country. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite did a great deal to press the importance of this treaty upon this House some time ago. I could read from 'Hansard,' if I wanted to take up the time of the House, how just two years ago, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), representing the demands of an industry located in that city, insisted upon the establishment of trade relations with Japan in the interest of his constitu-