

law at all, that won't get us where we frankly want to get, namely, to the point of exclusion, because after we have exclusion there is going to be a sufficient multiplication of these races in this country to constitute all the race problem that we want to have for many years to come.

We want to get to the point that is at all events mentioned. I know it is the almost unanimous opinion of British Columbia, and I find that opinion moving eastward pretty rapidly. There is no doubt in the world that before very long opinion in Alberta will be just as pronounced as is opinion now in British Columbia, and at the rate this immigration is going on that opinion will in time be as pronounced in provinces further east. Let us therefore take occasion by the hand now at a time when it is less difficult, because the more Asiatics you get here the more difficult the problem is going to be. Permit those races to be multiplied twice, three times, four times over, whether by procreation, immigration or by some other process, and then put your exclusion up and you will be faced with an infinitely more difficult problem than confronts you to-day.

Therefore I think we must go to the length of saying to the Government that the will of this House is that we have effective exclusion of the oriental type of immigrants. Let us go that length. By what language you achieve that goal I care not. The language suggested by the Prime Minister would not reach that goal at all, and for that reason I cannot accept it.

Let it be understood that so far as I am concerned I favour exclusion. I think we must have it. I do not care how it is brought about, but I do think it has got to be brought about. Restriction will not do. It must be restriction of such an absolute character that it excludes. That is the position I take on this motion, and I appeal to the Government to help us reach a wording that will leave no doubt in the minds of the people of Canada or in the minds of the people of Japan as to just what the will of this Parliament is.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with close attention to this debate, for naturally as the minister in charge of immigration I am intensely interested in this question. I am interested, too, because it has become a question we must take notice of in the province from which I come. I know something, although not

a very great deal, of the conditions existing in the province of British Columbia, where the question has become so acute.

I am not going to enter upon a further discussion of this question to-night, because I think everything has been said about it that could usefully be said. All I want to add is that there appear to be two or three salient facts. I think my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), knowing full well as I do the care which he exercises with respect to matters of this kind, slightly overstepped the mark in the position he has taken to-night. I agree with what my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has said. Indeed, I agree with practically everything that has been said, except in respect to this one word in the resolution which everyone who has spoken this afternoon has asked for—that the Government "exclude" the immigration of orientals into Canada. That is what is being asked for.

You admit in the same breath that there is an agreement between Canada and Japan which you are not very clear upon, and that that agreement has been lived up to. If I followed the speeches correctly this afternoon, nearly all the speakers referred to what is known as the Lemieux arrangement.

Mr. STEVENS: Although I know the minister would not do so intentionally, still I would not like to have our position misstated. We do not ask for exclusion and for the continuance or recognition of that agreement. We say that the agreement and the existing methods have been ineffective and disastrous, and we ask for the abrogation of that agreement and the substitution of exclusion.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Exactly; I had not misunderstood my hon. friends. There is an agreement in effect. I am not arguing whether it has been lived up to or not, I do not know, but in my short experience in public life I have learned upon more than one occasion that an agreement is a sacred thing and an agreement with Japan is just as sacred to the people of Canada, at least to those of British stock, as an agreement with any other nationality. Therefore that must be taken into account when you are dealing with this matter in a resolution of this character.

Mr. CLARK: Does the hon. minister suggest that the agreement with Japan was made for all time?