

forthcoming, and that they were in a position to conjure with names which, to the statesmen of Japan, would not be without significance or weight. In justice to Japan and to the prejudice which has been aroused against her people in some quarters, in consequence of the sudden influx of her countrymen in large numbers to Canada, it is not to be forgotten that in the regulations, which were issued about April of the present year, the exception permitting emigration companies to send labourers to Canada was made conditional upon the production at the Foreign Office of Japan of the duplicates of bona fide agreements with responsible employers of labour in this country; the bona fides of which agreements the Japanese government required should be certified to by her consuls resident in Canada. If there was a change in the policy of Japan, it was not one which could adversely affect the interests of this country without a Canadian citizen, or a Canadian corporation, first placing upon it the seal of his or its approval.

Now, while Mr. Mackenzie King sets that forth as a—I will not say as an excuse—but rather as an amelioration of the offence, if any, committed by Japan in allowing more than the restricted number to come to Canada direct, still I take a little different view. I do not excuse the Japanese government for this at all. All the dealings that Japan had with us respecting immigration had been with the Dominion government, and notwithstanding the fact that corporations, which may be influential in the west, or any other interest or citizens of the west, had signed the contracts for immigrants for the purpose of supplying labour, I say that Japan is not wholly blameless in that she did not come to the fountain head, the Dominion government, before she granted passports to these people, for she must have known that the number that came—nine hundred—was in excess of the number to which immigration had been restricted.

Now, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) sought to make a point out of the fact that as late as March, 1903, in answer to a telegram sent by Japanese Consul General Nossé to the government of Japan, the government of Japan expressed its willingness to enter into an agreement with the Canadian government with regard to immigration. The hon. gentleman's point was that, as late as March, 1903, the Japanese government was willing to make to Canada the same concession with regard to immigration as it made to the United States. He gives the broadest possible interpretation to that letter. In fact, I do not think it is susceptible of that interpretation. All it means is, in effect, this: You have verbal assurances from us that we would restrict immigration into British Columbia and into Canada to a certain number each year; if you are not satisfied with these verbal assurances we will enter into an agreement with you; we will put these verbal assurances into writing. That is all that letter

Mr. GALLIHER

can be construed to mean, no matter how broadly you interpret it.

Now, then, coming to the subject of the mission of the Minister of Labour to Japan, the Prime Minister of Canada, acting as a statesman should after, realizing the responsibility of his position, and in order that Canada might not be placed in the wrong by committing any hasty act, sent one of his ministers to negotiate with the government of Japan. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition partly attributed his success, because he did not say the mission was not a success—to the cloak of protection that was thrown around him by the British Ambassador at Tokio. Well, no doubt the British Ambassador was a great assistance to the Minister of Labour. Canada was entitled to all the assistance he could give our Minister of Labour, because, for Imperial reasons, on more than one occasion, Canada has taken an attitude which she might not have taken had those reasons not existed. This was one of those reasons, and therefore I say that the Canadian minister was entitled to all the aid, and prestige and co-operation that the British Ambassador in Tokio could give him. We all recognize that the mission of the Minister of Labour to Japan was one of great delicacy. We must all appreciate that a matter involving a semblance, at least, of possible discrimination between races, is one of great delicacy indeed. The Minister of Labour came back to this country, and in a very able speech stated to the House the results of his mission, and he also added that there were matters which, for diplomatic reasons, he was not in a position to disclose. Now I may say that, as a member from British Columbia, I would like very well to tell my constituents and the people of that province what was the exact nature of those restrictions that would warrant the minister in using the words I propose to quote later. In that respect I am almost as curious as my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) was, when he asked a question of the Minister of Labour while he was delivering his speech. But I fully appreciate that in matters of this kind there may be conditions of settlement which it is not in the best interests of either Canada or Japan should be published. As a supporter of the present government I have to take one of two positions. I have either to say that I am not satisfied with this arrangement or I have to say that I am willing to trust the minister who negotiated it, and to place implicit faith in him when he says, as he did say in his speech last Tuesday, in effect, that with the avenue from Japan carefully regulated, and with the avenue from Hawaii absolutely closed we have eliminated from this issue anything that may give rise to further trouble with regard to Japanese immigration. Now the minister himself must be the