

1908. Of these 51, 22 were women and children, so that as a matter of fact only 29 Japanese labourers entered British Columbia in June, 1908. In July, 1908, 39 Japanese entered British Columbia, and of that number 16 were women and children, leaving only 23 Japanese labourers coming into the province in the second month after the settlement. In August, 1908, only 27 Japanese entered that province, and of this number 19 were women and children, leaving only eight Japanese labourers. In September, 1908, only 21 Japanese entered the province and of these seven were women and children, leaving 14 Japanese labourers entering in September. In October, 31 Japanese came to British Columbia, and of these eight were women and children, leaving 23 labourers entering the province in October, 1908. In November, only 12 Japanese came into British Columbia, and in December only 16. Thus in the whole period of six months since the settlement, only 198 Japanese have come into the province of British Columbia.

Let me remind my hon. friends from British Columbia of another thing. During the same period of six months the immigration of Chinese was extraordinary. In June, against 51 Japanese, there were 154 Chinese; in July, against 39 Japanese, there were 418 Chinese. What is the conclusion? That the successful enforcement of the Lemieux settlement drove the employers of British Columbia who always want orientals, to pay the \$500 head tax on every oriental labourer coming into British Columbia. Thus it seems to me that the settlement of the question of Japanese immigration has been very successful in attaining the object which the people desire, that is that the Japanese should be kept out. If they are kept out by the settlement of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) there can be no complaint. Our hon. friends received the political advantage of the suspicion of the people of British Columbia that the Japanese would not adhere to their contract, but these figures demonstrate clearly that the Japanese government have lived up to their contract. What are the conditions of that contract? There are two or three important conditions that perhaps may not be known to all the members of this House. One is that Japanese coming into Canada must come directly with passports from Japan, cutting off absolutely the immigration from the American islands where the principal immigration used to come from. The next is the definite provision that no contract Japanese labour may be brought into British Columbia without the consent of this government. I cannot imagine that any restrictive legislation connected with the treaty itself could accomplish that purpose in a more direct and practical way than it has been accomplished by the settlement

Mr. RALPH SMITH.

of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux). As I say it is what the people want, they want to keep the Japanese out and the settlement has kept them out successfully.

Is there any evidence of the operation of that provision? Yes. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company some time ago wanted to put 300 Japanese on their irrigated lands in the district of Calgary. The company made an application to this government to suspend the provisions of that agreement and let them bring these men in under contract, but the government refused to do so and the 300 Japanese labourers could not be brought in and placed upon the irrigated lands, contrary to the terms of that agreement. Thus the agreement has been successful and that is exactly what the people want. I think I am right in the statement that that agreement, that is the treaty between Britain and Japan, expires about 1911. My opinion is, and I say it boldly, that if the present condition of Japanese immigration can be strongly maintained for the next two years, by the operation of the settlement which the government has with Japan, then in the renewal of the treaty necessary to meet the sentiment of British Columbia absolutely, may be inserted and that will give absolute satisfaction to the people of British Columbia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend is excited at the position I take, that this thing ought to be remedied according to his own judgment. If this suggestion is wrong my hon. friend's leader was wrong. Not a single man on the other side of the House said a word with regard to the matter, no one made any complaint, every one said that this was in the best interests of Canada, and there was no suspicion that the understanding that was arrived at with Japan would be interfered with in any way. The intention of every man in this House was to accomplish a principle of commercial interest that was good for British Columbia, and we did not know until we had passed the law that some other precaution might have been taken. Of course my hon. friend lays great stress on the necessity of taking that precaution. He goes further and on Friday night made the statement that the treaty with Japan made it impossible for this parliament to regulate Japanese immigration under any circumstances. He said that the 40,000,000 Japanese, the blind, the halt, the lame and the undesirable, could all come into this country and according to the terms of that treaty nothing could prevent them. I looked up the record and disputed that opinion last session very strongly. Of course my hon. friend is a lawyer and I am not; all I do is to apply common sense and I am convinced that in many cases that will get ahead of the lawyer. What I said last year and say again is that my hon. friend's reck-