

High Contracting Parties shall have the right to terminate it separately at any time on giving twelve months' notice to that effect.

Now that treaty may, or may not, preclude us from adopting a policy of exclusion in regard to the Japanese—that is a matter as to which I do not care at this moment to express an opinion. But it has other effects. It prevents the legislatures of the various provinces from enacting what may be termed discriminatory legislation. In British Columbia, at various times in the past, enactments which might be placed in this class have been passed, and irrespective altogether of the political complexion of the majority of the legislature at that time. Last year the present Government passed an order in council which provided that all leases and grants of timber lands should contain the condition that Chinese and Japanese should not be employed thereon. That order in council was afterwards ratified by act of the provincial legislature. In February of this year a decision was handed down by the Supreme Court of Canada to the effect that that order in council and that act were *ultra vires* of the legislature of British Columbia, because the subject of naturalization and aliens, under the British North America Act, is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament, and because the act and the order in council conflicted with the treaty to which I have just referred. Now I submit that a request should be made to the British government to give notice to Japan to terminate that treaty in July of next year. That notice can be given by Great Britain on behalf of Canada without reference to the other parts of the Empire involved in the treaty. There is also in effect what is known as a "Gentleman's Agreement". In 1907, and previous to that time, large numbers of Japanese came into British Columbia; I think in 1907 over 7,000 Japanese landed on our shores. There was a great deal of objection to that from the people of British Columbia, and in the city of Vancouver there were unfortunately race riots which resulted in considerable damage. Upon the matter being brought to the attention of the government, the present incumbent of the Speaker's Chair of this House was sent to Japan to see if some friendly arrangement could not be made to restrict immigration from Japan to this country. Some kind of an arrangement was entered into which is the "Gentleman's Agreement" referred to. The terms of that agreement have not been made public, we have not been able to ascertain

what they are; and it is questionable to my mind whether it is a proper thing to have an agreement of that kind in force, and to place in the hands of a foreign nation the right to say who shall come to our country. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that agreement should be cancelled.

Immigration laws of this country as they exist to-day are apparently objectionable to the Chinese. A despatch from Montreal, dated March 23, appeared in the *Vancouver World* on that date and reads as follows:

Canadian immigration laws as regards the Chinese are a disgrace and should be remedied without delay, declared Hon. C. Teur, Chinese consul-general to Canada, in the course of an address to members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association here Wednesday.

"There is no reason why such discriminating laws should be in effect," he said. "Chinese labourers do not want to come to this country, but Chinese students do."

It is quite true that the Chinese have a right to complain, I think, that they are being badly treated, inasmuch as a head tax of \$500 is imposed on any one of their subjects who desires to come to this country. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be much better, indeed, in that regard if a change were made, and that, instead of having the \$500 head tax, we should have exclusion altogether of Chinese immigration to this country.

The Japanese are very fond of protesting against discrimination by Canadians against their people. It might be very interesting to look at the situation so far as Canadians in Japan are concerned. In Hansard of May 5 of this year, on page 1514, I find answers to questions which were handed in that day by the Prime Minister in reply to the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. Tolmie). These answers show that, in common with other foreigners, Canadians cannot, as individuals, hold land in Japan, and may not become owners of ships flying the Japanese flag, and may not, as individuals engage in mining. The answers continue:

They may not become shareholders of the Bank of Japan, the Yokohama Specie Bank, the Bank of Korea, the South Manchuria Railway Company, the Oriental Development Company and certain other companies, or of shipping companies in receipt of a Government subsidy. They may not become members or brokers of the various exchanges in Japan. They may not as individuals become members of Japanese Chambers of Commerce. They may not engage in the emigration business or hold shares in any company so engaged.

Foreign unskilled labourers may not pursue their callings in Japan outside the limits of the former foreign settlements or the "mixed residence" areas without the express permission of the administrative authorities. Labour-