

they voluntarily come to our doors, as Christians we ought to send missionaries amongst them here, and when they do leave the Dominion to return to their own country they will go back as Christians to spread the blessings of Christianity in the land from which they come.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The discussion has certainly assumed a very wide range, and I do not now propose to make a speech on the principle of the Bill; but I would suggest that as nearly all that has been said turns on the details of the measure, it might be as well to give it a stage now and leave it to the tender mercies of the Committee.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—I think I can speak with a little authority, coming as I do from the hotbed of this agitation against the Chinese, and first of all I may say that I fully agree with the opinions expressed by the majority of this House, and I wish to express my satisfaction at the fact that a people who have been treated so rigorously and ungenerously, who are unrepresented, and who have been hunted to the death, should have found representatives to stand up on the floor of this House and speak on their behalf. This Bill is a great improvement on the Act of last year, which was, to say the least, a diabolical Bill. I would suggest amendments, however, which might make this Bill a very great improvement on the law as it exists on the Statute Book. It will be impossible, if we repeal the Act in this House, to repeal it in the Commons; therefore, there is no use in trying it. The House last year passed on the Chinese Act, and they have passed on this Bill, adopting the principle of restriction in both cases. I think the first clause should be amended to provide that children, as well as their parents, should be exempt from the duty. Then, in the thirteenth section, if the time limit of the permit is extended to one year instead of three months, as it is in this Bill, it would be an improvement and it would be only reasonable.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—There is no objection to that.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—Then the fine and penalty are too severe. Instead of making it not less than \$500 it should be not more than \$500, and leave it in the discretion of the judge. If Chinamen have evaded the revenue in some few cases—which has not been proved, by the way—how much do the white men evade the revenue in every scale of social life? I think that those amendments to the Bill would be a great improvement to the Act as it now stands. We had a very long discussion on this subject last session. I then quoted a number of extracts from speeches and reports of gentlemen in California who had employed Chinese labor for years, and I showed plainly that they were an industrious, frugal and reliable people. The laborers of British Columbia object to the competition of Chinese labor, and although the Government resisted the demand for this legislation for a long time they finally gave way and imposed a tax.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—That is an excuse not a reason.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—My hon. friend from Ottawa spoke very warmly on this matter; if he had thought for a moment he would have remembered that it was the hon. gentleman from New Westminster and myself who called attention to this legislation last year when the Chinese Bill was before this House. When the first Bill passed in 1883, the hon. gentleman and myself were in the same boat—we both agreed to that Bill without a murmur, and the only gentleman in this House who can claim to have been a consistent opponent of this legislation is the junior member for Halifax. He was the one who opposed it when it first came before us; he opposed it again when the amending Bill was before us last year, and he is now opposing the Bill before the House. In contrast to what we are now doing, what did we find done in China last year? The Governors of all the Chinese Provinces issued edicts to their officials all over the country that they should treat foreigners with the greatest kindness and courtesy; that they should treat them as their own